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Abstract

There is very little planning literature that focuses on indigenous planning. This research examines the link between education to the necessity of land among Hawaiian-focused public charter schools. It is my position that these schools offer a unique research perspective that centers on ʻāina-based knowledge production and transmission. I argue that the dominance of positivist planning, observed through land use rules and regulations, interrupts Hawaiian knowledge production and its transmission in overtly spatial ways. By identifying how educators think about ʻāina, we can grasp the critical interplay between Hawaiian epistemology in order to apply what was learned to a Hawaiian planning framework. Designed as a qualitative inquiry, this research informs a larger conversation among mainstream planners by questioning: How can societies accommodate multiple epistemologies and what is the role of indigenous planning in addressing this transformation? I argue that a Hawaiian contribution to indigenous planning is premised on relationships and an understanding that a genealogical connection to land utilizes the successive accumulation of knowledge over time as fundamental planning method. Future research should examine Hawaiian-focused planning cases to understand Hawaiian knowledge impact in terms of methodology, process and policy development.
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CHAPTER 1. THE CASE FOR HAWAIIAN SPATIAL LIBERATION

The Hawaiian-focused public charter schools highlighted in this paper utilize ʻāina as a basis of their educational innovation, and in doing so, their habits of being and ways of knowing are expressed through their use of space and place. The term “ʻāina” as it is used here does not equate easily to its commonly translated usage as “land.” In this paper the term is used to mean: ʻai, to eat, enjoy; an eating; the means of eating, that is, the fruits of the land (Andrews, 1865; Pukui & Elbert, 1986). One of the unique markers of the charter school movement in Hawaiʻi is the presence of Hawaiian language and culturally focused schools. There are approximately 18 Hawaiian public charter schools out of the 34 schools that operate under a state charter (Payne, 2014). The majority of these schools enroll a higher percentage of Hawaiian students, have a higher percentage of Hawaiian teachers who teach in either their own indigenous language or through a curriculum taught in English utilizing among other things Hawaiian practices. By bringing Hawaiian-focused education into view with ʻāina, we are able to examine significantly larger systems of spatial power and the ways in which they structurally determine what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use. The term spatial power is used here to mean the dominant economistic ordering of space and place. We examine these systems of spatial power as codified methods of land use relative to a uniquely indigenous Hawaiian knowledge system that fundamentally relies on that very same land as a source of knowledge production and knowledge transfer. By way of this examination we engage in a critique of planning as a settler endeavor in order to seriously examine a old “(k)new” field of indigenous planning (Edwards & Hunia, 2013). By privileging Hawaiian land use from a Hawaiian educational point of view we are able to recast the way in which a old (k)new story about planning is told in Hawaiʻi. The significance of the story is not the uniqueness of the subject matter, but rather it is significant
because it honors a point of view that essentially frees the analysis from the dominance of capital or corporate driven planning paradigms. In the course of understanding the lived realities of Nā Kumu, Nā Poʻo Kumu, Nā Mākua and the School Governance Boards, that is, those who are responsible for the implementation of Hawaiian-focused public charter schools, we move beyond dominant planning theories and instead ground ourselves in a milieu of beliefs, spirituality, and physical connections to ‘āina in order to articulate what indigenous planning can mean in Hawaiʻi.

Several scholars have theorized planning as an imperial discipline and colonial practice that is primarily associated in the west (Jacobs, 1996; Matunga, 2013; Porter, 2010). They describe planning’s dominant practice as linear, rational processes in which their fundamental tools and methods, more often than not, have served to displace Indigenous Peoples globally. A number of indigenous political struggles have challenged the dominance of planning systems because of their role in the production of space. Sandercock (2004) observes:

Since the 1970’s, there has been a global movement on the part of Indigenous peoples to reverse injustices and dispossession . . . at the heart of this movement are land claims that are potentially destabilizing of established practices of land use planning, land use management and private property laws . . . the core of planning practice. In the claims of Indigenous peoples for return of, or access to their lands, planners are sometimes confronted with values incommensurable to modernist planning and the modernization project . . . which privileges development in which exchange value usually triumphs over use value. (p. 119)

Matunga (2013) identifies three epochs of indigenous planning that provides a periodicity that is particularly relevant and useful to frame a historical discussion of Hawaiian spatial
liberation. The first epoch is the Classic tradition, which covers the pre-colonial contact phase. This phase is characterized by traditional indigenous worldviews and their approaches to environmental management. Since indigenous planning predates colonial imposition, communities were planned according to their own traditions and practices. The second epoch, the Resistance tradition, accounts for the immediate post-colonial phase up until the 1970’s. This phase considers both active and passive indigenous resistance to aggressive hegemonic settler governments. The third epoch, the Resurgence tradition, generally considers the period in the 1980’s onward in which Indigenous Peoples move beyond protests of resistance and couple with broader global indigenous rights movements to assert their worldviews as a means of human rights to land, language, culture, education, health, governance and resource management among other things. What is valuable about this periodicity that Matunga describes is that it frames what we are observing today, which is, the active resurgence of ‘ike kupuna or ancestral knowledge that emerged as a result of resistance by Kanaka Maoli¹ to settler hegemony and the logical extension of that activism into the realm of Hawaiian education. Stated another way, what is being asserted today through Hawaiian education, is the ancestral wisdom that came to the forefront of our collective Hawaiian consciousness because of Hawaiian activist struggles over land and their urban based use in the 1970’s in Hawai‘i that resulted from Democratic economic reforms.

The origins of the Hawaiian public charter school movement pays respect to their genealogical links to contemporary Hawaiian political struggles such as those that erupted in Waimānalo, Sand Island and Waiahole-Waikane (Goodyear-Kaopua, 2013; McGregor-Alegado, 1980; Trask, 1987). What lay at the heart of these struggles was the right to enjoy living as

¹ I use the term Kanaka Maoli, Kanaka ʻŌiwi, Hawaiian and Native Hawaiian interchangably in this paper.
Hawaiians in Hawai‘i. That enjoyment, as it turns out, involved the collective mobilization of Hawaiians as part of a larger global Indigenous Peoples movement to struggle for voice, land rights, autonomy and economic opportunity on their own terms -- meaning through their own worldviews. By adding education back into planning conversations, we are able to sharpen our focus on spatial liberation by questioning the complex political and cultural issues involved with: knowledge (who has it and who doesn’t); power and how it is used (that is, spatial technologies and the power that planners wield); process (how certain processes exclude certain people); land and property rights (the incommensurability of western and indigenous ways of thinking about these). Hawaiian-focused public charter schools not only bring focus to these issues in liberatory ways but more importantly do so in a way that Kanaka Ōiwi knowledge can make a contribution to this old (k)new field of indigenous planning.

1.1 The Land Use and Educational Context for Hawaiian Spatial Liberation

Hawai‘i was one of the first states in the U.S. to develop a system of land use. The State Land Use Law, enacted as Act 187, was adopted in 1961. The system set out to classify all lands into one of four land use districts: urban, agriculture, rural and conservation. By creating a system of land uses, it was believed that the state would be able to preserve agricultural lands and produce a mechanism for urban development while containing urban sprawl simultaneously. Four categories of land use stand in stark contrast however to the multitude of Kanaka Maoli names and categorizes that were used to not only manage resource use but also served to characterize, animate and even revere ‘āina. Chief Mā‘ilikūkahi is generally credited for clearly marking and reorganizing land boundaries (Beamer, 2014; Connelly, 2014). The mokupuni or island was typically divided up into moku, that is districts, and then further into ahupua‘a. An ahupua‘a is a land division that usually, but not always, extends from the uplands to the sea.
(Pukui & Elbert, 1986, p. 9). It was termed as such because the boundary was marked by “a heap” of stones (ahu) mounted with an image of pig (pua’a). It may have also been named in this way because a pig or other tribute was laid on the altar for the chief as a tax. Andrews (1865) remarks that the term ahupua’a refers to “a city; a village; a settlement” as in “the capital of said ahupua’a” (p. 25).

The ahupua’a system was the fundamental land use system that enabled konohiki to know the range of productivity available for their respective resources. Oliveria (2014) explains that the konohiki managed the ahupua’a and was also known as the ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a. The Hawaiian economy was based on an exchange system that existed within the ahupua’a that provided everything needed in close proximity. Kānaka ʻOiwi planned their kauhale around their cultivated field systems and other necessary material resources and this defined their settlement patterns in terms of adjacency, access and configuration under this system. The kauhale was comprised of a group of homes that made up a Hawaiian home (Puku‘i & Elbert, 1986, p. 135). Andrews (1865, pg. 233) remarks that a kauhale was a place where a house has been or where one is designed to be. The ʻohana were generally able to maintain long term relationships with a specific parcel of land even though the ali‘i or chief might change. It was into this ʻāina-based system that children were born, and reared, and experienced a type of learning that was practical, skill-oriented, socially useful and in tune with a reality that was enviornmentally-aware and conserver-cognizant (Kelly, 1982). Immersion in their real world surroundings was what nurtured an individual’s physical and spiritual relationship with ʻāina during the course of their life long learning.

The narrowing of ʻāina into four state-defined categories of land use is significant because it parallels the narrowing of state sanctioned educational performance indicators.
Goodyear-Kaopua (2013) argues that Hawaiian culture public charter schools are the tangible outcomes from earlier Hawaiian nationalist struggles. The movement to establish Hawaiian culture-based charter schools have been framed around the notion of “kuleana” that is oriented towards obligations and rights that are influenced by genealogy and land. An important concept of moʻokūʻauha, or Hawaiian genealogy, is that one can establish genealogy through familial ties, but also through “sustained practice, presence and commitment to people, places and causes” (Freitas and Saffery, 2015). The main force behind Hawaiian public charter schools was the pull of governance, localized curriculum and direct resources. Stated another way, it was the bringing together of distinctly Hawaiian ideas of genealogy and land through educational governance over curriculum. However, this educational innovation continues to struggle to find legitimacy in Hawaiʻi. Legitimacy in this educational context is concerned with what is taught, when, where and how. Because of the lingering impacts of No Child Left Behind and the impact of standardized testing, Hawaiian school schedules increasingly dedicate classroom time to math, sciences, English and social studies in ways that take time away from being on the ʻāina for purposes of learning these very subjects and more culturally focused subject matter.

Roy (2005) argues that state power is reproduced through the capacity to construct and reconstruct categories of legitimacy and illegitimacy. I argue that planning is implicated in the enforcement of land use categories thus ensuring what is considered a legitimate land use. In this sense, state defined knowledge and land use filter out Kanaka Maoli knowledge production and its subsequent transmission and this is done in overtly spatial ways. Thus, Hawaiian culture public charter schools that utilize ʻāina as a fundamental basis of their education must constantly struggle to reaffirm their moʻokūʻauha to ʻāina. Liberatory action, or liberation, means being responsible for the design and control of our own processes, methods, assessments/evaluations –
essentially gaining control of our own internal and external affairs (Kahakalau, 2003; Smith, 1999). In this sense then, Hawaiian-focused public charter schools provided fertile ground to examine a relationship-based planning process that redefines the fundamental uses of ʻāina in the course of knowledge production and transmission. Every school that opens an ‘auwai, builds a lele, or chant their moʻokūʻauhau of their waʻa kaulua, in very overtly spatial ways, bring back Kānaka ʻŌiwi to ʻāina, thus enabling our own epistemological reflections in our own places. As Kumu Hula Piʻilani Smith stated at the Native Hawaiian Education Summit, “there is nothing worse than looking around and not seeing yourself” (2014).

1.2 Research Overview: Motivation Formulates Research Questions

The motivation for this inquiry came from a project I worked on about five years ago as a planning consultant with a Hawaiian-focused public charter school that was located in a relatively remote, rural region on an outer island. My task was to develop a place-based educational framework that would guide future development of the school. This particular school was located on parcels of land that were abundantly rich with both, natural and cultural resources that seemed well suited to their culture-based educational philosophy and project-based objectives. I have a very vivid memory of the environmental studies teacher asking if we could include both native and non-native plants in the plan layout especially those that had pleasant smells. She advocated for this so that she could teach outdoors, but more so, that her students (especially the little ones who have short attention spans), while moving from one part of the campus to another could engage all their sense in the course of their school day.

Working closely with the teachers during several site design workshops where they were asked to draw what they considered to be their ideal campus, I was constantly struck at how their designs were coherently linked and informed by Hawaiian cultural knowledge. In other words,
Hawaiian cultural knowledge would inform their rationale, or the backbone of their educational facilities and site lay out. It dawned on me that as planners we miss a great deal of innovation (in contrast to our problem solving posture) by not being able or willing perhaps, to even incorporate indigenous vocabulary or local ways of knowing with any degree of consistency or seeming aptitude into our planning practices and let alone processes.

As I continued to work on the project, I recognized that there was a complexity to this project that seemed to underscore the ill fit between state defined land use systems and Hawaiian ways of knowing. On the one hand, this particular school seemed to be located in a geographic region that in very fundamental ways served their educational philosophy. The site itself was the source of learning; it was the “textbook” and the “outdoor classroom.” However, the land use laws as I saw it seemed to be so heavily weighted in rational and linear processes that it fundamentally shifted and came to dominate the value, use and function of that ʻāina for that school. The land use system trigged a complicated regulatory environment that the schools administrators now had to navigate and this was beyond learning to understand building codes and their own set of permitting requirements.

That land use regulatory environment was further complicated by a gross inequality between regular schools and standalone charter schools. Generally, charter schools in Hawaiʻi receive about half the amount per pupil than mainstream schools and they do not receive any fiscal or planning support for facilities. Charters are expected to build, purchase, renovate and maintain their facilities with no supplemental funding for those purposes. Basically what this means for public charter schools is that they would have to mount capital campaigns to supplement funding for day-to-day school operations as well as for facilities. Moreover, the school’s administrators also had to fulfill the role of principal, planner, architect, occasional
engineer, facilities manager, and grounds keeper too! By my estimation, the school seemed to reflect the larger struggles that Hawaiian communities and families faced, that is, enduring in a land use system that is incongruent with Hawaiian ways of knowing and being.

Indigenous Peoples globally have been declaring that we have a duty to honor our ancestors and as their descendants, we have to work towards liberation from the present systems that are based on dominant Euro-American paradigms and traditions. One of the major strengths of place-based education is the adaptation of unique locally bound characteristics that may serve to overcome the dislocation between school and a child’s life (Gruenewald, 2003). I argue that, that unique adaptation in Hawai‘i is through ʻāina. I believe that by framing research questions that identify how ʻāina teaches and by being attentive to their Hawaiian epistemic articulation, we may begin to construct an ʻŌiwi conceptual planning framework that is scaled for an island setting like Hawai‘i. By understanding the convergence of Kanaka ʻŌiwi based concepts of ʻāina and education, as unique adaptations to our local setting, we identify expressions of space and place in ways that inform conceptual ideas of indigenous planning. By combining two streams of thought that are rarely, if ever, brought into the same space with each other, we are able to address larger theoretical questions that coalesce around how societies can engage in transformative planning by utilizing multiple epistemologies. Epistemology inquires into the nature of knowledge and truth (Chilisa, 2012, p. 21). “Relational epistemology” acknowledges “systems of knowledge built on relationships” (Wilson, 2008 quoted in Chilisa, p. 21). Meyer (2001) goes deeper into the fundamentals of Hawaiian epistemology as:

How one knows, indeed, what one prioritizes with regard to this knowing, ends up being the stuff of identity, the truth that links us to our distinct cosmologies, and the essence of who we are as Oceanic people. It is a discussion of place and genealogy. (p. 125)
Thus an indigenous paradigm “comes from a fundamental belief that knowledge is relational . . . it is shared with all of creation . . . it is with the cosmos, animals, plants . . .” (p. 21). It is from this point of view that I question how does a place like Hawai‘i utilize indigenous epistemologies in the practice of planning? As an epistemological approach, I become concerned primarily with how alternative policies are derived and expressed (Fainstein, 2010). By travelling a parallel track that examines education and land use, there is an opportunity to create, implement, and evaluate our own planning models. Therefore, as a “practice-oriented approach” I examine the process of choosing among alternatives (Fainstein, 2010). Thus, a second overarching question is how does this local examination inform indigenous planning and practice? What might factor into a Hawaiian framework of indigenous planning? How do we go about designing and implementing our own indigenous planning methodologies in ways that reestablish relationships between ourselves, our families, and our communities and with the ʻāina and the built environment? Thus, the empirical questions focus on a set of schools that address the following:

1. What are the important elements of Hawaiian epistemology that are related to the use and functions of land?

2. What important Hawaiian epistemic elements form the pedagogical foundations of Hawaiian culture public charter schools?

3. What key ʻāina functions define Hawaiian culture public charter school pedagogy?

4. What are the unique cultural characteristics that the schools involved with this inquiry have in common that define them as Hawaiian-focused public charter schools?

5. What kind of learning activities occur on and off site and where?

6. What kind of natural, cultural or community resources are involved in learning activities?
1.3 Significance of the Study

In 1999, Hilo, Hawai‘i, hosted the World Indigenous People’s Conference and asserted through the Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Peoples Rights in Education that, among other things,

Meaningful, empowering and culturally sustainable education for Indigenous Peoples will be possible only when Indigenous Peoples have the control (a fundamental right) and the resources (an inarguable responsibility of States/governments) to develop educational theories, curriculum and practices that are Indigenous and are able to determine the environment within which this education can best occur. (1999)

This examination is significant because it draws from two seemingly unrelated areas of inquiry, land use and education, in order to expose the ways in which the planning, almost uncritically, reinforces powerful notions of what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use. In essence, issues of control and access are the heart of this paper. By critiquing planning’s dominant paradigms we create an intellectual space to introduce alternative spatialities. Furthering scholarship in this area is important for a profession that seems to demonstrate very little understanding and appreciation for the situation and experiences of indigenous communities, and is either unwilling or unable to fashion a planning pedagogy that is inclusive of multiple ways of knowing and being.

1.4 Limitations of the Study

Limitations associated with any study should be taken into account when considering its contributions. First, the focus of this inquiry is on indigenous planning practice and not education. The discussion privileges Hawaiian ideas around education and land. The discussion links education to the necessity of land for Hawaiian-focused public charter schools in an attempt
to develop a Hawaiian framework of indigenous planning. Therefore the inquiry does not attempt to define Hawaiian education or ʻāina-based education nor does it detail the curriculum that schools implement. Rather, the paper focuses on the ways in which the individuals involved with Hawaiian-focused public charters have developed their ideas about ʻāina as a result of their work with Hawaiian-focused and Hawaiian language charters. Further, it tries to use that knowledge to articulate the foundational elements of a Hawaiian framework of indigenous planning. In this way, as I stated earlier, I believe we can shift to a relationship-based planning practice in order to impact planning from a Hawaiian epistemic lens.

While a total of 29 individuals were interviewed for this inquiry, there were four stand alone Hawaiian-focused culture public schools that participated as institutions in the inquiry. Specifically, they included three Hawaiian-focused schools and one Hawaiian language immersion school. Stand alone public charter schools do not use state Department of Education (DOE) facilities and as such are responsible for all costs related to facilities development, operations and maintenance. Conversion schools, however, are regular DOE schools that converted to a public charter but use DOE facilities and thus receive state facilities funding support. Therefore, there are limitations as to the generalizability of the results across all public charter schools in Hawai‘i. Also, the bulk of the interviews were conducted in 2013. Unfortunately, one of the schools that participated in the inquiry has since closed. While the closure has been a very public affair locally, I am only making note here that the school is closed and do not speculate as to reasons for its closure by way of this dissertation.

This paper offers a brief historical review of education in Hawai‘i. In the last ten years, Kanaka Maoli scholars have built a compelling case that maintains that the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy in 1893 was illegal under international law. Several scholars maintain that
colonial theories are ill suited to address the prolonged occupation of Hawai‘i under the terms of international law. Colonial analysis continues to lend itself to understanding social relations as well. I intentionally describe the operations of state agencies who implement policies that directly impact land use and education. I do so in the hopes that what is presented is pragmatic and actionable now on the one hand yet provocative and grounded enough for further exploration on the other.

Lastly, in my discussion of time, space and place I refer to the Indigenous Peoples of Canda’s Northwest Territories, the Tlicho Dene. Because of software limitations I am unable to provide proper diacritical markings to their words -- e kala mai ia‘u. Finally, readers not familiar with Hawaiian language may refer to the glossary of terms provided in the appendix of the dissertation. I encourage readers to access Hawaiian language dictionaries or on-line resources like pukewehewehe.com and http://ulukau.org should they wish to look up words and become familiar with their depth of meaning and usage for themselves.

1.5 Overview of Chapters

Chapter 2 explains the need for the alignment of indigenous research methodology with grounded theory and participatory rural appraisal techniques. This alignment addresses the difficult issues that indigenous researchers face when dominant social science research methodologies are not congruent with indigenous commitments to justice, cultural tradition or our realities.

Chapter 3 serves to frame the discussion of Hawaiian spatial liberation by asserting that space, site and form are by no means neutral – they are indeed historical and political (Lokko, 2000; Uduku, 2000). I first discuss several characteristics of positivist spatiality and their influence upon planning’s dominant paradigms. In order to widen the epistemic scope of
spatiality, I describe indigenous ideas surrounding space, time and place by describing geneaological relationships to land from among Hawaiian, Maori and Tlicho Dene communities.

Chapter 4 provides a historical and political view of education in Hawai‘i in order to ground the resurgence of Hawaiian education in the 21st century. This chapter asserts that during the period of Kānaka ʻŌiwi wale nō, ʻāina was critical to ʻohana based learning and an individuals relationship to land was not severed in the course of life long learning. Universal education, a decentralized school system and the set aside of national school lands characterized public instruction in the early period of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The intense struggles over political and cultural hegemony erupt in the Kingdom from the middle to the end of the 19th century, and by the 20th century educational policy in the islands makes a methodical and systematic alignment along U.S. federal standards. This trend continues until political consciousness among Hawaiian activist of the 1970’s engage in intense land struggles that eventually spill over into the realm of education.

Chapter 5 picks up this thread by arguing that the implementation of land use zoning in the 1960’s served to sharply define an urban-rural divide by the 1970’s especially on O‘ahu island. Hawaiian activists mobilize to protect the last vestiges of their Hawaiian subsistence lifestyles that were under threat from what seemed like unbridled urbanization. By the 1980’s, as a result of those Hawaiian struggles and their influence on ideas such as aloha ʻāina and mālama ʻāina were clearly articulated and heavily influence the Hawaiian charter school movement. This chapter ends by juxtaposing the day-to-day reality of charter schools as they struggle to interface with state defined land use rules and regulations.

Chapter 6 examines the nature of educational practices among four Hawaiian-focused public charter schools in order to grasp the fundamental epistemic elements or drivers of
Hawaiian charter schools. Chapter 7 concludes the dissertation by first proposing suggestions for public charter schools. Second, I propose the conceptual elements of a Hawaiian planning framework. We learn from the inquiry that a relationship-based planning practice looks towards genealogical connections to land in ways that discover a new way of knowing and applies planning methods based on the utility of knowledge. Future research should examine through case studies the degree to which relationship-based planning influenced land use policies.
CHAPTER 2. IN SEARCH OF METHODOLOGY

Methodology in its most fundamental form asks how did you get to the end of your research. This chapter answers this question by first, grounding the inquiry and second, by detailing the techniques and methods used to describe the components of a Hawaiian planning framework.

2.1 Positioning and Grounding Indigenous Inquiry

How can societies accommodate multiple epistemologies? By using Hawaiian-focused public charter schools as a site of inquiry, we may begin to understand how Hawaiian educators involved with public charter schools as institutions articulate the ways in which ʻāina influences their ways of knowing and ways of being. In turn, I apply those ways of knowing and being to a Hawaiian framework of indigenous planning and by doing so, Kānaka Maoli are able to make their contribution to the old (k)new field of indigenous planning.

ʻĀina holds significance among Kānaka Maoli and that significance is in part related to Kanaka ʻŌiwi concepts surrounding ʻohana. ʻOhana can be used to describe extended family relationships. The word is rooted in origin with the kalo plant (*Colocasia esculenta*) with ʻohā referring to the shoot or the part of the plant that is cut and replanted to begin the next generation of kalo. ʻOhana by definition and literal reference links families to the land by way of the kalo.

“ʻIke aku ʻike mai, kōkua aku kōkua mai; pēlā iho la ka nohona ʻohana” is an ʻōlelo noʻeau, or wise saying, tells us that the extended family is the most important part of life for the Hawaiian (Pukui, 1983). This saying guides us to recognize others, be recognized, offer help and in doing so put our ʻohana first.

Kahakalau (2003) explains that our ʻohana, in part, is why we have aloha. Honoring family relies on custom and tradition such as knowing your moʻokūʻauhau, your genealogy. “I
ulu nō ka lālā i ke kumu” is another saying that explains that we would not be here if not for the ancestors; symbolically the saying explains that the growth of the tree limbs (lālā) is because of the tree (kumu). While there are many ways to enunciate your moʻokūʻauhau, there is one format in which the individual introduces themselves relative to where it is that they come from. The individual offers their name, their one hānau, their mauna, their kahawai and their kahakai. At the most basic level, an individual introduces themselves by way of where they were born (one hānau, literally birth sands), their mountain (mauna), their stream (kahawai) and their seashore (kahakai). Not only are they letting everyone know exactly who they are and where they come from but they are reinforcing their relation to those places each time they correctly introduce themselves. In this way we are constantly reminded that “you are somebody, other than yourself” and therefore you need to be grounded in order to live up to your responsibilities by virtue of your moʻokūʻauhau, your genealogy (AU, personal communication, 8/16/2012).

In her article entitled, “I Am This Land” (2005), Pualani Kanakaole Kanahele explains the importance of knowing “your place as a human in this environment” (p. 28). She observes that while we can use what is provided to us by the environment, or literally “what is in our reach,” when we do, we must do so with the responsibility to not let it become “unreachable” meaning through “pollution, overdevelopment, abuse or over use.” In essence “if we are still committed to life in the islands, committed to Hawaiianess, and to island lifestyles, we are responsible to the this land, to the honua” (pg 28).

This manaʻo stands in contrast to state land use codes that were designed to support urban development and large scale agriculture first and foremost. What our examination of Hawaiian-focused public charter schools shows is a constant struggle to use ʻāina in a way that respects and reinforces their ancestral ways of knowing and being such as those expressed above.
Similarly, the practice of planning in Hawai‘i is dominated by economistic practices that are either unwilling or unable to consider multiple ways of knowing. My research asks Hawaiian educators to explain how ʻāina teaches (as opposed to what does ʻāina teach) in order to identify the ways in which ancestral Hawaiian knowledge can be applied to contemporary planning contexts in Hawai‘i. In much the same way that indigenous research methodology leads us to a relationship-based practice, our inquiry into ʻāina-based public charter schools can lead us towards a relationship-based planning practice. In this way, planning practice addresses who we are by way of a discussion around place and genealogy thereby widening the meaning of time and space, their nature and significance.

One of the difficult issues faced by indigenous researchers is how do we search for methodologies that are congruent with our social commitments to justice and to our cultural traditions and life experiences (Brown & Strega, 2005; Kovach, 2005; L. T. Smith, 1999). All methodologies hold assumptions that shape what constitutes legitimate data, and how those data are collected and analyzed in order to arrive at findings. The problem however is the lingering dominance of positivist methodology that offers very little room for other ways of knowing to enter the field on its own methodological terms. What is needed, as Sandercock (2010) argues, is a reworking of our modes of inquiry, forms and meaning making, and a way of knowing. Whereas qualitative and quantitative research see political and social purposes as separate concerns, the goal of indigenous approaches to research are to critique and transform research relationships that are inclusive of political and social goals (Brown & Strega, 2005; Chilisa, 2012; Kovach, 2010). Indigenous research methodology departs in significant ways from positivist paradigms. Evidence of community involvement, shared goals, actionable outcomes, respectful research and the honoring of relationships (both seen and unseen) characterize such
differences. The need to rework modes of inquiry has led me to travel two aligned paths for this project. This paper relies on an indigenous methodology that utilizes the theory building approach found in grounded theory and the research techniques found in participatory rural appraisal. By combining these systems I was able to develop a workable research structure that have led to findings that I believe are reliable.

Indigenous methodology stems from a way of knowing from which we can draw new concepts and theoretical insights. Importantly for this project, that epistemological source draws heavily upon the language, worldviews, metaphors, philosophies and experiences that straddle both written and unwritten texts of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other indigenous communities. Coupling indigenous research methodology with grounded theory and participatory rural appraisal has allowed me an expanded course of complementary research actions. There are two important implications that I see as a result of this alignment. First, it invites long-term relationship, mutual understanding and support between the researcher and those individuals whose words and ideas comprise the dissertation. Second, it is inclusive of research techniques that privilege Hawaiian worldviews that are embedded in ʻōlelo makuahine, moʻolelo, ʻōlelo noʻeau, mele, moʻokūʻauhau, wahi inoa and wahi pana in order to respectfully ground the dissertation.

Grounded theory is not a prescriptive endeavor. Rather, as a qualitative effort, it is a set of principles and practices that implicitly factor in the degree to which researchers are indeed a part of the world that we study and the data we collect (Charmaz, 2006). We are not separate or apart from the effort. Grounded theory develops concepts and ideas from the data and from the views of those you are working with. Gathering data and informing the inquiry under these conditions allow for rich and detailed data to be placed in their relevant situational and social contexts thus pushing the margins for more voices to come forward in the course of the research
endeavor. Recognizing that issues are embedded in larger systems that are comprised of interrelated parts, I was able to understand how the day-to-day operations make up the larger system of policies that influence the actions across individuals, schools, organizations and state agencies who are involved with Hawaiian-focused public charter schools. What became clear from this perspective was how systems operate from their respective parts. Lastly, by utilizing iterative coding techniques I was able to identify my voice as I attach abstract meaning from segments of data thus making my own contribution to the overarching discussion.

Participatory rural appraisal (PRA) offers a family of methods and techniques that were particularly helpful to this project because they are action-oriented research processes that are intentionally context specific (Chilisa, 2012; Gaber & Gaber, 2007). Participatory rural appraisal assumes that popular participation is a fundamental ingredient to project planning. Based on “Ground Up” initiatives, PRA techniques help communities to mobilize their human and natural resources to “define problems, consider previous successes, evaluate local institutional capacities, prioritize opportunities and prepare systematic plans of action at the village level” (National Environment Secretariat Kenya, 1991, p. 5). Utilizing PRA data collection techniques give participants the latitude to communicate from their frame of reference using their own vocabulary, terms and concepts. Capturing detailed quotations from participants was an effective way to clearly define, record and convey their insights and experiences apart from my own. Using facilitation techniques at gatherings between schools, community and ‘ohana involved with public charter schools was another useful PRA method employed in this project. Finally, the use of graphic and visual tools aided in conveying meaning or questions that would otherwise remain ineffective if communicated through text or verbal instruction alone.
2.2 Participating Schools

A total of 4 stand alone New Century Public Charter Schools agreed to participate in this research project. Three schools identified as Hawaiian-focused public charter schools and one school as a Hawaiian immersion school. Borrowing the “rule of thumb” from focus group research, planners strive to get both saturation of observations and the best representative sample of the community therefore three to four groups of one type of participant is considered sufficient (Gaber & Gaber, 2007, p. 79). Based on a list of schools provided on the DOE website, a total of 20 public charter schools identified Hawaiian culture as an objective for their schools in 2013. Of those 20 schools, I contacted six Poʻo Kumu by email to inquire as to their interest to participate in this project. The decision to contact only six schools was based on three main criteria, my general familiarity with the school, my travel budget and an overall assessment of my capacity to manage the volume of information that would be collected as a result of interviews and workshops. My initial electronic messages were followed up with a phone call to the Executive Directors or Principals. These calls were designed to personally introduce myself, explain the project, answer their questions and gauge their interest in participating in this project. The four schools that participated in this project were located on 3 islands and the first school to receive their charter was in 2001. It was really my good fortune to have been introduced to many active and interested individuals who work tirelessly on behalf of these schools and their communities. The following is a brief description of the four schools.

Our first standalone Hawaiian-focused public charter school is located in a rural district that provided six to twelfth grade instruction. The school provides instruction focused on environmental stewardship, Hawaiian culture and project-based learning. Based on DOE enrollment data, the school maintains an average enrollment of 200 haumana, or students. Their
geographic location supports their school focus with access to regional coastal and mauka (inland, upland) resources that encompass several wahi pana, celebrated places and or significant places. The campus must conform to both the state conservation rules and regulations and the county agriculture district. Based on my observation, this school perhaps more than any other, held a deep commitment to keeping their students and ‘ohana in their community and on their island rather than succumb to what is commonly termed the brain drain whereby the best and brightest are actually encouraged to move away or out of their communities to seek greater opportunities (whether it is better universities, career advancement, or simply seek greater financial wealth). It was clear from speaking with the administrators and Nā Kumu that one goal of the school was to develop a campus infrastructure, like a certified school cafeteria for example, so that it could assist parents, families and their children to develop entrepreneurial opportunities through cottage industries. By making limited campus infrastructure available, ‘ohana could harvest and process products from the natural resources of the local area and combine them with community skills to develop a sustainable economic existence. In this way the campus was conceived of as a place where students and their families learn skill sets that respond to local needs rather than being a school that unwittingly encourages students to leave because of the lack of economic opportunities in the region.

Our second school was located in a rural area that provided a kindergarten to 12th grade education. Their campus was centrally located on the island and captured a fairly broad service area that sustained an enrollment of approximately 130 students. As a WASC² accredited school, their leadership has always emphasized preschool to college ethos of Hawaiian education and their physical location strategically reinforces this attitude with preschools and college campuses

² The Accrediting Commission for Schools of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (ACS WASC) process recognizes schools that meet an acceptable level of quality, in accordance with established, research-based WASC criteria.
in close proximity to their campus. Their standalone campus operates on state owned land that is zoned for agriculture. This was the only school that I interviewed that had secured a grant to complete their charter application and had included a campus site selection process. The funds allowed them to hire a consultant who helped them through a careful site selection process. One of their governance members recalled the process:

And so we’d meet, we’d talk about what we were looking for. We filled out a survey as to what was our ideal place . . . we surveyed ourselves, the board members, interim board members to try to prioritize what we were looking for. So we had that, then we started looking at available places. We visited those places and they all had their respective strengths and weaknesses . . . [one site] was a beautiful place but right under the airport . . . and there was nothing there so we would have to have started from scratch. The base yard was industrial. The police station, the building was pretty good, it would have required some renovation, but right in the middle of town, no yard you know; basically like an urban kind of setting. And so we what we finally ended up with was seeing about this place and it was almost like our first choice for a couple reasons; [it was] centrally located, which is great, [we] get students from both sides of the island. This area itself is a nice area. (Board Member)

It was also my observation that there was a clear goal between their governance board, their principals and teachers that their students must develop a sense of responsibility to care for the mokupuni. Thus, the grant also funded a curriculum position that carefully laid out an integrated academic program founded on Hawaiian knowledge about their islands wahi pana, cultural practices and also articulated a commitment that their school be a community asset for their island. Their curriculum was designed to give students a well-rounded, place-based
understanding of the different areas of the island. Their students learn all the ahupua‘a and the different moku (an island district) in order to develop that sense of responsibility and that desire to care for a place by knowing it intimately and working side by side with “the aunties and uncles” who live there as well. Their educational approach was explained to me this way, their students must be ready “to sail and navigate into the deep blue ocean” and “do what they need to do but with the idea that, like generations and generations of rain,” they are able to “come back home to nurture their ‘āina once again” (Po‘o Kumu).

Our third standalone school was located in an urban area. They engaged a project-based learning with a Hawaiian focus and maintain an enrollment of approximately 150 students from kindergarten to 12th grade. When asked whether or not they considered themselves a ‘āina-based school given their campus location, their Po‘o Kumu and Kūmu replied “yes” because they had strong community networks that afforded opportunities for ‘āina-based education for their students despite their urban location. Families who enrolled their students in this school valued the way in which the school was able to build character, identity and a sense of self-worth for their children. Their use of off campus sites provided hands on education considered by parents to be successful strategy for many of their children. As one parent testified, the school served under privileged, often “at-risk” keiki that the state, the parents felt, had historically “let slip through the system.” Emphasizing culture and hands on learning the parents took great solice in knowing a simple fact – their children don’t “fake a sick day” and actualy their children faked being well just so they don’t miss school” (Makua testimony). Another parent explained that, “My daughter may have been at this school for one year, but the improvements . . . go well beyond that year. She has not only brought her grades up, but learned that school can be a place where she can fit in . . .” (Makua Testimony).
Our final school enrolls 130 students from six to 12th grade. They are a WASC accredited school with a Hawaiian cultural focus that engages in project base learning including the arts and science, technology, engineering and math. This stand alone campus is located in a state conservation zone and they hold a long term lease that allows use for only a smaller portion of the overall acreage contained in the lease. Overtime they have developed a stable working relationship with their surrounding communities and the State. Due to the size of the lot they are allowed to use, they have developed a conserver-cognizant land use ethic. Significantly, the school had been able to weave cultural practices with their conservation ethic and their larger ‘āina-based pedagogy. As their site coordinator commented that:

So for us, I’ve always felt the concepts most pili to us is aloha ‘āina, mālama ‘āina, I think most charter schools that’s one of their core foundations . . . Part of that is the maka‘āinana part, you know, it’s part of being on the land . . . I believe we try to go on a direction of he aliʻi ka ‘āina, he kauā ke kanaka.

Their goals are to cultivate students who know their campus and surrounding community, and develop a sense of personal identity and a sense of responsibility to serve. It is from that educational vantage point that the school instills in their students the importance of being grounded their own ancestral body of knowledge first, and from that foundation they can then relate to other cultures, to other languages, and learn to critique what is going on at global scales.

2.3 Informing the Inquiry

The bulk of the data that was collected for this project was through a combination of field interviews and facilitated workshops. A total of 29 semi-structured open ended interviews and three facilitated workshops were conducted for this project. I was truly blessed to have a range of participants who felt that this topic was important enough to warrant their time to interview with
me and to trust me enough to allow me to record their words -- I hope to continue our working relationships well past this dissertation.

The groups and individuals who participated were as follows: Nā Kumu (Teachers), Nā Po‘o Kumu (Principals), School Governance Board members, Directors of non-governmental educational organizations, a parent (makua) who also served as a School Governance Board member; State of Hawai‘i Charter School Commission, former Charter School Review Panel members, and State Board of Education member; state facilities planners and architect from the Hawai‘i Department of Education and, finally, staff from the Department of Land Natural Resources (See Table 1.).

Table 1. List of Participants by Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educator/Education Organization</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nā Kumu</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Governance Board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent (SCB member also)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nā Po‘o Kumu</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Agencies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project received approval from the UHM institutional review board in 2013 and the interviews and workshops were conducted in the summer of that same year. (See Appendix A for the UHM IRB approval and Appendix B for Consent form.) The overall effort was augmented through library research examining primary and secondary data sources that were accessed in both Hawaiian and English.

Semi-structured interviews were useful in this study because they allowed for more time to first, engage in conversational talk-story in between questions and second, when appropriate,
walk about campuses. This method is also better suited for smaller sample based studies (Gaber & Gaber, 2007). All participants who were interviewed were asked the same set of open ended questions that allowed for comparison and contrast among the various responses or detect subtle nuances between them. Additional questions were tailored for specific groups such as state agency personnel who were interviewed. All participants received questions prior to our meeting. (See Appendix C for the open ended interview questions.) For consistency, the interview protocol I used during the face-to-face interviews contained all opening and introductory statements that needed to be conveyed to the interviewee to ensure their written informed consent to participate. The protocol listed the interview questions to be asked as well as additional follow up questions. It also contained transition prompts for me to move from one set of questions to another. The protocol included space for my brief notes during the interview and a space for recording short reflective notes after the interview was completed. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed. Audiotapes were destroyed once they were transcribed. All transcriptions, once completed, were sent back to participants for their verification of what was recorded. While not all participants offered corrections, transcriptions were considered final once deletions or corrections that I received from participants were made.

There were a two instances where individuals during the course of their interviews offered contact information for other people who they felt could add greater insight into the inquiry. In these cases, the interviewee either offered to act as an intermediary by offering to introduce me to their contact by email and, if the contact was willing to participate, the new contacts information was provided to me. Otherwise direct contact information was provided to me by the interviewee either at the time of the interview or via email shortly thereafter. It was
through this referral method that additional interviews were conducted with former charter school administrators primarily.

It also became apparent to me during the course of conducting these interviews that I needed to talk to a larger circle of state personnel and staff from the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) and the Department of Education (DOE) facilities branch. There were several reasons for this. First, two schools held leases for lands in the conservation zone. I wanted to learn whether or not the DLNR had any tailored policies for public charter schools located on their lands. This was significant to me because I was learning that while public charter schools had to conform to educational performance indicators as all other public schools had to, in the absence of public facilities funding, they had to operate as if they were private developers when it came to facilities and leasing. For some schools the biggest challenge was, first, finding a location for their schools and then, second, depending on that location, securing necessary permits from a range of county and state agencies. It still amazes me that stand alone charter schools are able to keep their doors open considering they receive no state support for facilities and less per pupil funding compared regular DOE schools.

Second, I was surprised to learn from DOE planners that the Department generally does not hold title to state school lands. Rather, the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) approves those leases since they are the land owners. I wanted to understand how this could possibly be the case since other state departments hold title to their own lands so why was education different? That singular question triggered my research into the origins of education in the Hawai‘i and provided a critical parallel understanding about the relationship between land use and education in Hawai‘i. The participation by state personnel provided me valuable insight
into the historical, regulatory, and policy environments vis-à-vis those public charter schools who placed a heavy pedagogical emphasis on ‘āina-based education.

A total of three workshops were conducted in coordination with two schools who participated in this inquiry. For two of the three workshops, I was asked by the school’s Executive Director if I would be available to facilitate their School Governance Board strategic planning meeting. Providing facilitation would allow the Executive Director to participate in the meeting. At the second workshop, I was asked again by the same school to facilitate a community meeting that involved school board, their school staff, surrounding community members and the land owner. The purpose of the meeting was to inform those gathered about future plans for the school campus. In both of these cases, the agenda items, invitations, meetings notes and records of decision were the responsibility of the school who hosted the workshops. My role was to facilitate the meeting to ensure that it began and ended on time, to ensure that everyone had a chance to speak, and to manage time so that the group discussed all the items on the agenda. It was agreed that in exchange for facilitation that I be able to take my own notes and observations about the meeting for this dissertation project.

The final workshop was a design workshop conducted with a school that agreed to be involved with this inquiry. At the time of the interviews with a schools Executive Director, I would ask whether or not they were interested to participate in a design workshop with their teachers and staff. Of the four schools that participated in this project, one took up the offer. Based on participatory rural appraisal methodology, the workshop included highly interactive activities that utilized visual and graphic exercises as a way to give participants the power to define, locate and display what they know and feel about their school. The purpose of the workshop was to understand how teachers, staff, and po’o kumu would first design their campus
and second, understand the rationale behind their respective designs given their schools ʻāina-based focus. The exercises allowed participants to describe how they use everyday spaces, describe their social processes, and provide images of social events thereby giving participants through their own voices the forum to describe and listen to each others ideas about their own contextual “place” (B. Blaich, 1999). The design workshop provided an opportunity for teachers, administrators, executive directors and school board members to discuss together the meanings and priorities that they each respectively hold regarding their educational space. A simplistic example of this can be seen between a charter school board members and teachers. Both the Board member and the teacher may share the same vision and goals for ʻāina-based education, however, the school governance board member might be more concerned with liability issues involved with a taro patch near a stream versus a teacher who wants to teach students mathematics by taking students to the taro patch next to the stream. Thus, in these contextualized ways we can grasp how educational spaces hold different meanings.

The design workshop agenda and activities were developed in conjunction with the school and were designed to assist with their campus needs as well as inform this inquiry. Fourteen individuals from the school participated in the workshop including: their elementary principal and high school principal, their Executive Director and Kumu. All participants signed research consent forms. The record produced from the workshop was comprised of handwritten notes and site drawings developed during small group sessions. No individual names were recorded on maps or group notes. A separate set of meeting notes were recorded by my assistant who diligently helped with set up, break down and take notes during the workshop. Site drawings were recorded on large base maps that were overlaid with clear acetate film and only participants developed site drawings. The base maps used for the design exercises were provided
by the school. Small group maps and notes were collected at the end of the workshop, transcribed and digitized and subsequently returned back to the school for their use. No videotaping or audio recording was conducted during the workshop. Only a handful of pictures were taken during the gathering.

Field notes (or memoing in grounded theory) played an important role during the entire research process and in particular during the analysis cycle. The practice of journaling consisted of questions, musings, drawings and speculations about the data and emerging theory (Creswell, 2007; Patton, 2002; Saldana, 2013). My field notes described what I observed. I made conscious notations to indicate where I was making judgements or interpretations of the events that occurred. I also noted where I was inserting my own ideas based on the observations or comments of others. My field notes contained what people said using direct quotations. I consistently recorded dates of events, where my observations took place and who was present. To the degree possible, I recorded the positions or roles of individuals. I described what the physical setting was like and the nature of social interactions that took place including the activities.

2.4 Analysis Process

This project relied on three iterative coding cycles in order to theorize a set of assertions that rendered the ways in which planning can accommodate multiple epistemologies. Charmaz (2006) makes a distinction between theorizing and theory. A theory connotates a universal conclusion that, in positivist fashion, is used to explain and predict generalizations and universalities through linear reasoning. Theorizing in grounded theory is seen as a practice or activity that engages the world and constructs abstract understandings about it and within it. Interpretive definitions of theory seek understanding and acknowledge that multiple realities,
facts and values are linked. Thus knowledge, that is, theories, are situated and located in particular perspectives, positions and experiences. This iterative coding process therefore provided a clear and purposeful way to continually define and refine the analysis while writing the qualitative analysis.

The first coding cycle produced codes and sub codes that were re-presented and reorganized into a larger set of categories. The second cycle coding focused categories in intentional ways so that I could develop a set of themes or concepts that were theorized as a set of assertions in the third cycle of coding. I utilized Saldana (2013) focusing strategies as a way to manage the magnitude of the study by intentionally focusing the parameters of the project in order to find the core categories, a process also known as theoretical coding. Consistently applying what Saldana terms “the touch test” I was able to examine a developed set of categories and codes in the second cycle coding to question whether I could touch what they represent. For example, Saldana explain that “you can touch an old house in poor disrepair but you cannot touch the phenomenon of poverty” (p. 247-248). Thus, he concludes, if you can touch what codes and categories represent, then you are in a position to reword them and transform them into more abstract meanings to transcend the particulars of the study. This strategy when done in concert with research questions produce higher order “theoretical renderings” that can explain the subject matter under consideration (Charmaz, 2006). In constructing the dissertation narrative, the writing moved back and forth between theoretical interpretation and empirical evidence. The theoretical context linked literatures, critically examined categories, presented my analysis and provided data to support arguments (Charmaz, 2006; Saldana, 2013).

In qualitative data analysis, a code is a researcher-generated construct that symbolizes and attributes interpreted meaning to each individual datum, or basis of measure, for the later
purposes of identifying patterns, theme’s, categorization, assertion development, theory building or other analytic processes (Saldana, 2013). Coding can be seen as the critical link between data collection and their explanation of meaning. A theme is the outcome of coding. The following codes were used and several were adapted to apply to each iterative coding cycle for this study.

Descriptive or topical codes are generally a short word or phrase that summarizes the basic topic of the passage under consideration. It describes what is talked about or written and not the content of the message. Subcoding, or second order tags, were assigned after the primary descriptive code to detail or enrich the primary descriptive code. Subcoding in general, described the range of a particular descriptive code but not the content of the passage. These two codes in particular offered the “organizational grip” needed during the initial cycle of coding as I tried to understand the participant’s standpoints, their situations and actions but not the content of the passage. These two codes established the initial structure and vocabulary for the study. It assisted with my learning about what I saw and heard in general rather than scrutinize nuances of people or social action.

Invivo codes were applied to a word or short phrase from the actual language used by the participants themselves. This is a valuable technique in grounded theory because it lends itself to recording indigenous terms and language within its original context – it is one way to honor or prioritize the participant’s voice. All invivo codes were placed in quotes. In analysis, invivo coding allowed me to get attuned to words or phrases used by participants thus allowing me to grasp and check what was significant to a participant.

Process or action coding, refers to the dynamic accounting of events. Process coding used the technique of gerunding, that is, the documenting of participant words that use the suffix –ing, to connote the action in the data or simple observable activity. Cues for process type statements
include words such as: if, when, because, then etc. Recording the ordering processes, numeric series of actions or historic contexts are another technique of gerunding. This code was important to this study because it helped to identify actions or steps in response to an identified goal or problem by all actors involved with Hawaiian culture public charter schools. Further, process coding helped to order those individual tactics, strategies, routines and actions that made up the larger or higher order acts, historical events or processes.

The following is an example of how processing coding helped me to identify the magnitude of impact when schools do not receive adequate funding. The Kumu at one school wanted a māla ‘ai, or garden so as to teach certain science concepts and cultural practices together in the same educational space on their campus. In accordance with their schools process, they put in a request to their School Governance Board to open their māla ‘ai in a particular area on their campus. The Board reviews the request but denies it because they are awaiting a decision on a funding request they submitted to an external agency to build in that exact same area where teachers plan their māla ‘ai. However, as time passes, the Board’s proposal for the funding gets denied but the Board fails to inform teachers. The Kumu lose hope with the planning process in place because there is no tangible evidence of progress, meaning they still have no māla ‘ai. This procedural interplay explains how events originate and evolve and indicate how, in terms of process and or procedure, significance and perception can shift over time.

Values coding applies a code to data that can indicate a participant’s values, attitudes, and or beliefs. It is a way of representing their perspective or worldview. While applying the distinctions between a value, attitude and belief was initially difficult, the iterative process of coding refined their application by the third coding cycle. Saldana describes value as the
importance we attribute to ourselves, other persons, thing or idea. Attitudes are the way we think and feel about ourselves, another person, thing or idea. A belief is a part of a system that includes values and attitudes, plus, personal knowledge, experiences, opinions, prejudices, morals and other interpretive perceptions of the social world – beliefs form our rules for action. In this study, values helped to determine participant motivation, agency, causation or ideology and provided a means to differentiate between them. Clues for researchers when identifying values include terms such as; it’s important, I like, I love, I need etc. These terms indicate what is valued, believed, thought or felt. Terms such as I think, I feel, I want, indicate an attitude. Values coding used in conjunction with my memos helped me to explore the origins of participant and or group/organizational values, attitudes, and belief systems.

Versus coding identifies dichotomous or binary terms the individual, group/organization, social system, process or concepts etc. that are in direct conflict with each other. This code is appropriate for policy studies or critical discourse because it can suggest strong conflicts or competing goals within, among or between participants. In grounded theory, this code helps to look for conceptual tensions or metaphors of opposition. When used in analysis, versus codes are categorized into thirds to identify the who, the perception of issue and the issues. Memos can help explain why opposition exists in same empirical space. For example, in this study I ended up with situational analysis that identified:

- The Who -- primary stakeholder → Hawaiians, farmers, Kūmu vs State, DLNR, DOE.
- The Perceptions/actions -- how each side perceives and acts towards the conflict → state land use categories trigger developer based permits vs public
chart schools are not developers and can’t afford the planning or the permits.

- The Issues -- central issue at stake \( \rightarrow \) state values urban development vs Hawaiian ʻāina-based uses within an educational context.

For versus codes to be effective, they must be grounded in actual, observable conflicts and not abstractions for example, student vs god. Data in this technique of coding are viewed for conflicts, inconsistencies and contradictions that prohibit action or resolution/decision-making. While some will argue there are \( N \) sides to an issue, versus coding makes power issues apparent as binaries or dichotomies. For this project, the use of versus coding allowed for a manageable way to initially understand power issues involved with public charter schools. Moreover, this technique helps to discern the conflicting power issues as way to initiate resolution or positive social change.

Coding prompts developed by Saldana (2013) were referred to constantly during the entire iterative coding process. The prompts listed below provided vital guidance that generally helped me to gradually focus the coding process. More importantly, it helped me to keep track of what I observed and heard from participants separate from my own positions and assumptions. It forced me to recognize where my own position was in tension with those of participants in terms of divergent values, beliefs and attitudes.

- What are people doing?
- What are they trying to accomplish? How exactly do they do this?
- What specific strategies and/or means do they use?
- How do members talk about or characterize what’s going on?
- What assumptions are they making?
• What do I see going on here?
• What did I learn from these notes?
• Why did I include them?
• What strikes you?
• What surprised you? (Useful for tracking my own assumptions)
• What intrigued you? (Useful for tracking my own positionality)
• What disturbed me? (Useful for tracking tensions with my own values, attitudes and belief systems)

A theme is an extended phrase of sentence that identifies what a unit of data is about and or what it means. Minimally, it organizes possible observations. Maximally, it interprets aspects of the phenomenon under consideration (Saldana, 2013). At the manifest level, theming accounts for that which is directly observable in the information. At the latent level, it accounts for the underlying phenomenon. Searching for themes is strategic in the sense that it is dependent upon the project design, questions, goals and existing knowledge. The overall goal is a condensed textual view that is organized into higher order concepts. Adding the verb “is” and “means” thus expands on the code(s) while keeping them grounded in the data as you transcend them (p. 205). Clues to identify potential themes include identifying:

• Repeating ideas
• Participant or indigenous terms
• Metaphors and analogies
• Transitions or shifts in topics
• Similarities or differences of participant expression
• Linguistic connectors (because, since, then . . .)
- What’s missing
- Issues suggested by the data

Third iteration coding and shifting towards narrative development involved pulling together various pieces, such as my categories, themes and concepts to form connections. Writing up the results entailed noting a description of categories and how they were connected based on participant experiences. Writing the findings involved my interpretation of those results. This is where my theoretical frameworks and library research tied into how I located my arguments and supported them with evidence. Specifically, this is where an indigenous perspective influenced my critique of planning’s dominant paradigms and their legitimizing imposed land use and education in ways that deeply impact Hawaiian knowledge, its production and transmission. The more I wrote, the more direct words and tighter phrasing brought abstract ideas to the forefront. During the writing period categories, themes, concepts were repeatedly examined for their contribution to the overall contribution to the papers arguments and analysis. In instances where categories lacked relevance, they were collapsed.

Grounded theory consists of coding and recoding until all the incidences can be classified and categorized and those categories are considered saturated and sufficient when patterns emerge with regularity (Miles & Huberman, 1994). There are two key considerations to determining when coding and recoding have run their course. The first is with respect to the research approach itself, when repeating and patterns start to emerge. The second is a practical one, choice is dictated by time and budget constraints. By taking a three cycle coding approach there was sufficient occasions for me to identify when coding had run its course.
2.5 Trustworthiness

The goal of this inquiry is to embrace a context-specific and context sensitive approach. Indigenous knowledge operating within the realm of academic research means trying to incorporate relational, collaborative and inclusive research practices in order to expand and accommodate multiple realities. Further, it means doing so in ways that brightly illuminate the wisdom from among those communities with whom the knowledge rests.

Issues of trustworthiness center on the interrelatedness of two questions: Is the account valid and by whose standards? Trustworthiness involves clarifying my position relative to the study. I am a Hawaiian woman working within my own community. While I work in higher education, I have no teaching experience in charter schools. Only recently I have begun to serve on a public charter School Governance Board therefore, I am only now understanding the magnitude of challenge that public charter schools face. However, I do have planning history that involves working with Hawaiian-focused public charter schools. Sharing the insider role working within and among Hawaiian educators, affords me unique access to certain data or knowledge that an outsider wouldn’t have because I come from the same worldview as the participants. This also allows me a “second sight” in those instances where Hawaiian thoughts or ideas emerge that others may disregard as unimportant or miss all together. Moreover, it has been my experience that for some participants in studies such as this, there is a relief in knowing that between the researcher and the participant, we may share worldviews to the degree that the participant does not have to spend time justifying their daily lives and by extension, their work.

In order to validate the project research, I contacted the educators whose words were quoted in the study by email. They were provided the chapters and I indicated the page numbers and highlighted the text where their words were quoted and used. While I had originally had the
consent of all participants to use their names, except for one individual, I elected to *not* attribute any individual’s name or the name of any schools to any quoted material. Thus, when I contacted them for the final review of their text, I asked each individual whether or not they would like to have their names associated with their manaʻo after they reviewed their text. Therefore, you will notice among the quoted materials those occasions where names are cited in the text.

Lastly, lifelong research engagement means that I must continually build community relationships, constantly work on developing trust, continue my learning of culture and Hawaiian language, and be forthright to check for misinformation that stems from either me as the researcher or the participants. Hawaiian language was used in participant interviews and community mapping events. They were not translated. The project rests upon Kanaka ʻŌiwi values that believe in a sacred animate and inanimate world and in the interdependent, familial, dynamic and fluid relationships that exists between people, nature, gods, and deities. This worldview explains the connections between ʻāina-based education and the larger endeavor of planning. Being cognizant of the important role that storytelling, moʻokūʻauhau and ʻōlelo noʻeau in respectful inquiry means that I am held accountable for its accurate and responsible use.
CHAPTER 3. FRAMING HAWAIIAN SPATIAL LIBERATION

3.1 A Critique of Dominant Planning Paradigms

Today, planning is generally synonymous with the West and continues to be weighted towards the values of the Enlightenment period. The predominance of “Euclidean geometry” rendered space to be considered as a “neutral container; a blank canvas which is filled with human behavior . . .” (Hubbard, 2011, p. 4). The Enlightenment period, as a linear construct, maintains a progression, advancement, or higher development from one state to another thus anything at the beginning of the construct is considered inferior to anything that follows it at the end (Merculieff, 2010). The idea of linear progression, as a scientific method, is often associated with logic, common sense, validity, reliability and empirical visual observation. This construct illustrates the ways in which space and place are used to conceptualize and analytically make sense of the world; it influences what we observe or choose to observe.

Positivism, under the rubric of planning, “requires that social science investigation conform to the same procedures as natural sciences” (Fainstein, 2010, p. 24). Space was restyled, mostly in the 1950’s and 60’s, as a positivist spatial science that sought to construct a theory of spatial laws based on statistical analysis (Denzin, Lincoln, & Smith, 2008; Hubbard, 2011). The era ushered in a constructive spatial science, a new scientific paradigm that focused on identifying patterns based on distance, direction and connection (Hubbard, 2011). The possibility to discern regular patterns opened up new venues for mapping, modeling and new planning language (for example nodes, hierarchies, movement and networks) to emerge and be played out on the earth’s surface. Enlightenment values of the market, rationality, objectivity, technical expertise, and value-free neutrality became the established practices of planning -- as modernist and state-directed projects.
Reacting against positivism and “people-less” spatial science, the 1970’s ushered in a new thinking (and critique) about distinctive types of space and place that were defined and constructed by way of lived experiences. The critique of positivist planning argued that “the calculation of what matters and how much weight to place on each consideration is necessarily value-based and includes a number of important considerations that may have been excluded from the start” (Fainstein, 2010, p. 25). Attention to cultural identities highlighted how concepts of place and space have brought into sharp focus its contested nature thus opening up multiple interpretations that critically analyzed the “take it for granted” ways of representing the world (Hubbard, 2011). Bauman (2000, cited in Hubbard) describes “places without place” in which the core of consumer society is effectuated via “spatial strategies of purification and exclusion”. Augé (1995, cited in Hubbard, 2011) for example discusses the concepts of contemporary western spaces, practices and cultures as they evolve around “nonplaces” such as supermarkets, shopping malls, multiplexes, airports or highways. “Nonplaces” are symptoms of a super-modern global society where there is an accelerated flow of people and goods around the world. “Nonplaces” do not act as localized sites for the celebration of real places that are familiar, organic, localized, occupied and meaningful.

Graham and Healy (1999) reflect on the difficulty of current planning practices with representing space as well as explaining its nature and significance. This is because the planner’s training focuses so intently on economistic spatial concepts that are articulated through policy agendas. Too often, the relational time-space concepts are stylized after powerful, corporate economic and social interests. They are presented as the single alternative available to capture and represent a “place.” Design-based solutions therefore tend to “narrowly crystallize the time-space requirements of dominant interests in the built environment” (p. 641).
Instead, Graham and Healey argue for a relational planning practice. They advocate for a “new, relational non-linear, non-contiguous meaning of time, space, and place in ways that allow us to understand the complexities of the contemporary world” (p. 641). Suggesting that planners consider relations and process rather than objects and forms; Graham and Healey, ask us to further consider that relational dynamics must be specific and not assumed under universal generalizations. They stress the need for multiple meanings of space and time thus forcing the questioning of whose space and time. Is it corporate only? They advocate for a range of spatialities and temporalities to shape a place and fill it with value. In order to move towards a relational planning practice, the next section discusses a trialectic of spatiality as a way to a challenge the ‘take it for granted’ ways of presenting the world.

3.2 Trialectics of Spatiality

The “trialectic of spatiality” examines cultural practices, representations and imaginations as a three way dialectic between perceived, conceived and lived spaces (Lefebvre, 1991; Porter, 2010; Soja, 2010). The perceived space or ‘first space’ is the material engagement with the space, it is the concrete form(s) and specific patterning of the urban as way of life (Porter, 2010, p. 15). The conceived space is the mental or ideational field of spatial imaginations, often, the subjective representations of space in ideas, images and ideologies – it is the place of the technocrat, planner, urbanists, subdividers, and scientists for example (Soja, 2010; Porter 2010). This space is the work of dominant systems of thinking in the course of, and for the purposes of, administering and remaking space. Lived space encapsulates the everyday lived experience and expression of the social in space (Porter, 2010). Our discussion focuses on the experiences of Hawaiian educators to the extent that the conceived space has come to dominate their lived space. It is the invisibility of planning’s own spatial ontology that acts as a basis of pervasive
forms of spatial dominance that continues to marginalize Indigenous Peoples. Understanding first how ʻāina constitutes a “lived space” among Hawaiian-focused public charter schools allows us to expose land use mechanisms that impose their “conceived space” in powerful epistemological ways. As one Hawaiian educator put it, “ʻāina is our first teacher” and as such it constitutes the fundamental basis of Kanaka ʻŌiwi lived space. By understanding how the mechanics of rules and regulations structure contemporary land use as a matter of modern state economistic planning, we can contrast the lived experience of Kānaka Maoli educators to the powerful conceived space of the state.

The early practices of spatial ordering or planning -- mapping, renaming, town building and the varied intricacies of land policy -- were to become not only the fundamental activities of modern planning but in many cases were complicitous in the politics of dispossession and capital accumulation. Particular spatial activities of government are culturally specific and bounded activities. These activities operate with sets of practices from a locatable and cultural worldview that very often go without critique especially from the point of view of those who lives are bombarded with those dominant practices. In the course of understanding, or rather questioning the spatial practices of ʻāina based schools; we begin to comprehend how educators discuss ʻāina as a lived relational experience. An analysis of an ʻāina mindset reveals the epistemological undercurrents that allow us to grasp the spatial implications of the dominance of Cartesian and Euclidean ideas of space from an ʻōiwi perspective. In doing so, we come to terms with the fundamental struggle over ʻāina, the struggle between the conceived space and lived space.

In trying to frame relational practices from a point of view that couples education and land use, I refer to Dei (2012) who offers a paradigm that is grounded in his African heritage. The concept of suahunu is discussed here in order to expand our planning scope to include a
trialectic space that is inclusive of the body-mind-soul interconnections; the culture-society-nature interface; and the sacredness of activity. Dei proposes suahunu, meaning if one learns one will know and acquire knowledge, as a way to counter the prevailing conventional visions that have come to dominate education in contemporary contexts. “Conventional knowledge” has come to regulate everyday societal relations, producing as an ethic a particular code of conduct on the indigenous body which in a cryptic way “scripts the lived experiences of young African and indigenous learners” (p. 825). Suahunu is a way for young learners to come to know the “essence of their lived experiences” (p. 826). It “informs how Africans, Indigenous and colonized peoples make meaning of their lives” (p. 826). Suahunu embodies local indigenous languages, affirms the African/Indigenous spirituality, and provides ancestral connection.

Dei explains further how an anticolonial approach to education positions indigenous knowledge as a positive concept that is proud of ancestry, history, and heritage, and discovers the essence of their Africaness in ways that promote conscious understanding of their own historical situation. Young learners discover what identities mean and may become actively involved in the politics required in making such identifications. Action-oriented spirituality allows the trialectic to form our ways of knowing that brings an ethic of care and affirmation onto the identity of the African and Indigenous body; and to act positively to change current social conditions.

Schooling from this perspective is a place/site and opportunity to challenge dominant paradigms and academic reasoning while working collectively to bring change. Anticolonial approaches to schooling would examine how local voices shift beyond mere critiques of the current order towards transformative options that genuinely educate all learners.

This pursuit of knowledge also serves African people’s needs, aspirations and concerns. As an African centered paradigm, it expresses an indigenous ontology that values wholeness,
connections and the interrelationships of self, group, and communities as well as the nexus of body, mind, soul and spirit in the coming to know. This paradigm provides a space for learners to interpret their experiences on their own terms, within their worldviews and understanding.

Culture is critical to knowledge production. In fact, cultural paradigms shape knowledge. In other words, Dei explains we need to be the subjects or the ones who describe the “agency” therefore making ourselves the subjects of our own histories, stories and experiences (p. 828).

Discursive practices (or descriptions of agency) are storytelling, Indigeneity, and the engagement of spirituality as well as intellectual agency, the power of history, historical memory that enables us to relate to our past and imagine futures. History is power in terms of its omissions, negations, silences, denials, and absences, therefore anticolonial trialectic spaces reaffirm our histories, culture, traditions, spiritualties and identities as essential to the learning process.

Dei’s description of trialectic space is useful to our discussion on several accounts. The deeper meaning that Dei articulates is that suahunu encompasses a trialectic space that is grounded in a worldview that includes (a) body, mind, soul, (b) culture, society, nature and (c) the sacredness of activity. While Porter and Soja’s trialectic descriptions are very useful as a starting point, it is Dei that provides a spatiality that is inclusive of sacredness, and values the ancestral presence. Also, this spatial composition takes up intellectual and political dialogue as a necessary component for social change to happen. Thus as an analytic tool, we can comprehend ʻāina-based education in ways that are transformative because they are cognizant of intellectual and political engagement. Second is the question of epistemic space -- the innate, intuitive ways of being and knowing that are associated with long-term dwelling within particular ancestral spaces. Understanding how Hawaiian-focused public charter schools reserve historical or ancestral space through ʻāina-based practices allows us a useful measure of the uniquely
grounded ways of Hawaiian knowing and being. Third is a trialectic thinking that works with embodied histories of numerous identities through space and time, and colonial geographies. This thinking assists in understanding the fluid contextual nature of education in Hawai‘i and the Hawaiians unique agency in it.

3.3 Old (K)new Knowledge: Reclaiming Indigenous Planning

The trialectic of spatiality provides a useful understanding of the mechanics of a lived space and conceived space. Dei, through his sharing of suahunu, deepens our concepts of spatiality in ways that resonant with sacredness, spirituality and ancestral connection. Maori scholar Shane Edwards (2013) helps us to arrive at a (k)new space -- a third space that offers (k)new interpretations. Edwards defines a third space where Indigenous Peoples may finally offer their own interpretations of what they are observing and experiencing. It is not a space of justifying their interpretations or merely being present in the conversations which he refers to as the second space or the place of mere presence and justification when Maori (in his case) encounter the dominant group.

Coming from a Maori context, Edwards (k)new space is an opportunity to re-member, re-position, and re-think elements of Maori knowledge and wellbeing. It is a space beyond that offers opportunity, contribution, articulation, occupation and an expanded space beyond established, demarcated and restraining territories. Mātauranga Maori is considered in relation to epistemology, indigenous knowledge and alongside kaupapa Maori within the Aotearoa context. Edwards positions Maori knowledge and their ways of knowing and being as the catalyst for Maori explanations of reality and their inherent practices and by doing so opens up a (k)new space to engage in, again (pp. 43-44). Mātauranga Maori is an ancient concept in a new time says Edwards and the third space concept moves us beyond the first space where it is all about the
dominant group and the second space where the dominant groups attempts (or dictates) when to bring us into the conversation. The third space is not about expending vast amounts of energy validating or translating our meanings, explaining ourselves or justifying our ways of knowing. Given this context, the value of Edwards contribution to our discussion is twofold. First, third space privileges “us knowing us” -- we are expending precious energy on ourselves in order to prepare us for entering into discourse with the second space (p. 49). As a method, third space employs “ancestor lensing” which involves “attempting to explore, ask, and find out how tupuna would have viewed and treated any activity, event and problem” (p. 50). This gives utility to ancient wisdom in a contemporary context. This way of knowing is dynamic, advanced and has an ancient rigor while fully embodying contemporary utility.

Third space is the lived space where our reality occurs. Indigenous planning, as a third space of sorts, may generally be composed of common themes: the primacy of the collective (versus private property or individual rights), the importance of shared historical experience, epistemology, knowledge creation, agency and process in the making of place and production of space (Jojola, 2008; Lane & Hibbard, 2005; Porter, 2010; Sandercock, 2004). In the process of claiming planning there is an “adoption/recovery of an indigenous vernacular or idiom to describe it, give it form and to reflect a local Indigenous community history, reality and experience” (Matunga, 2013, p. 6). Moreover, indigenous planning is the formulation of a theory of action that represents “a radical re-examination of contemporary planning practices through long-term learning, the empowerment of community voice and the advocacy of culture and tradition” (Jojola, 2008, p. 42). As a practice, we follow land tenure traditions and perpetuate the unique cultural perspectives of Indigenous communities. As an approach and movement, it reformulates planning to afford traditional knowledge and cultural identity as the foundation of
action. As a worldview it stresses distinct community traditions that have evolved over a history of shared experiences.

Jojola is generally credited for explaining the emergence of indigenous planning among Tribal nations located in the geographic regions of the United States of America. Historically non-native practitioners have applied non-native community development approaches to Native contexts that were mostly paternalistic or missionary in nature. This approach resulted with the repression of Natives Americans developing their own capacity to assume their own governance. Out of this context emerged the concept of indigenous planning. Idealistic native scholars (in 1992 at MIT) wanted the nature of their situation to be recognized and made the basis of policy and action and it led to a philosophical movement that was nurtured in a tradition of collective action. Conceptually, their ideas recast Indigenous community development as a history of shared actions and experiences—known as “Indigenous worldview” (Jojola, 2008, p. 42). The notion of indigenous worldview served to unite Indigenous Peoples and distinguish them from nonnatives who did not share a collective history. The result was the emergence of what was termed indigenous planning, which called for a reexamination of contemporary planning practice through long-term learning, empowerment and community voice and advocacy of culture and tradition.


- Whose future?
- Who decides what this future should or could look like?
- Who is doing the analysis and making decisions?
Who has the authority, the control and final decision-making power?

Whose values, ethics, concepts and knowledge?

Whose methods and approaches?

What frameworks, institutions, and organizations are being used to guide the planning processes that most affect Indigenous Peoples?

Where are Indigenous Peoples positions in the construction of the future?

Matunga rightly observes that as a tradition, indigenous planning must position its own history to “better understand its contemporary shape with its own form and focus and as a planning approach with its own sets of methodologies” (p. 6).

Indigenous planning is fundamentally community/kinship based and place-based (p. 5). Land tenure in land-based communities was marked by long, sustained patterns of ownership among families for whom birthright and stewardship was the primary means of maintaining it over time. Thus, the legacy of land tenure encompassed a long time range, a collective concept that superseded any individual’s lifetime. In contrast, land use as applied in “Western planning practice is both temporal and corporal in nature” (Jojola, 2008, p. 43). Community development is based upon the regulation of land usage in a way that “balances private property rights and dominant notions of public welfare” (p. 43). In this way land use:

becomes the embodiment of a corporate entity that develops land with the primary intent of raising capital value . . . when that value is maximized, the land is resold. There is little incentive to hold on to land as land is no longer necessary especially after it becomes unproductive. Such behavior leads to “slash and burn economics” [i.e. it prompts short-term economics for gain] and encourages migratory behavior. (Jojola, 2008, p. 43)
The significance and implication of worldviews among land-based communities invokes particular ideas about history, cosmology and genealogy as they form the foundation of mental and physical orderliness, notions of time and space, and the significance of place. For Hawaiians, ka wā mamua and ka wā mahope provide critical yet comfortable time orientation. Thus, as Kame‘eleihiwa (1992) observes, “the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers to present day dilemmas” (p. 22). Native Hawaiian scholar George Kanahele (1993) notes how Hawaiians perceived the orderliness of the universe in terms of the regular and predictable movements of the stars and planets (p. 142). Hawaiians live not in a static but dynamic universe and this notion of time, not only accounted for in daily celestial observations but also captured mythology. The Hawaiian scholar of the Kumulipō, Rubellite Johnson (Johnson, 1981; 2000), observes how the 2,000 lined genealogical creation chant describes a coherent understanding of the dimension of time – the Kumulipō ordered the sky in space and time (2000, p.v). The Kumulipō, “comprised of sixteen wā (or canto) in which there are 7 for pō (night), representing a time for beginnings of parts of the larger world; space - au, time - au, earth - honua, sky – lani” (p. 29). There is a “given” structure of time and space:

. . . a combined existence of both space and time (au). On another level of meaning this is the “stem” (au) of a lineage, as in genealogy, when the element of human birth is considered, and linear time creates the history of the ancestors. (p. 32)

Kame‘eleihiwa writes further how genealogies are the Hawaiian concept of time and how they order the space around us and serve as the history of the people. Importantly, moʻokūʻauhau serves as the ancestral link to those alive today to the “primeval life forces” and to the mana that
first emerged at the beginning of the world. As such, genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe and give us the comfort of continued existence here on earth (p. 20).

Maori scholar Ranginui Walker (1996) comments that the worldview of the Maori encapsulates whakapapa in which there are implicit ideas of orderliness, sequence, evolution, and progress. By extension, these ideas are embodied in myths, traditions and tribal histories that trace the origins of human beings from the creation of the universe to the creation of first woman, man and the development of culture and human institutions (p. 13). Concepts of time under the Maori worldview Walker notes encompassed essentially two dimensions: past and future. The past was designated mua, and the future was muri. These formulations of time had a double meaning. Mua also meant in front, or ahead, thus signaling that the past is conceived of as being in front of human consciousness because only the present and past are knowable (p. 14). Muri designating future also means behind because the future cannot be seen. Thus, “the individual is conceptualized as travelling backwards in time to the future, with the present unfolding in front as a continuum into the past” (p. 14).

The Tlicho Dene peoples of north Canada have narratives that contain “knowledge of considerable time depth” (Legat, 2012, p. 61). They recognize four era of time: “time when all beings were the same, time when life was harmonious and places acquired their names, time of our elders and time of living memory” (p. 66). An important aspect of time is coupled with the importance placed upon stories relative to the dè (translated as land, ground, dirt, or earth). In their worldviews, events and occurrences that took place in the past continue to unfold as they surface in the present. Personal experience, gained through various means (e.g. trapping, hunting, dreams, meetings etc.), validate occurrences as described in stories. These stories in turn are shared and repeated so that the truth of occurrences through oral narratives is reaffirmed at the
same time an individual’s experiences is augmented and shared (Legat, 2012). Here we see an example of shared knowledge systems. For the Tlicho Dene then,

Knowledge cannot be removed from the context of its production because one becomes knowledgeable through action. One starts with the occurrences and happenings shared through stories and then converts the information in the story, through a personal experience, into one’s own knowledge and skill. Thus there can be no distinction between the acquisition and the application of knowledge. For Tlicho, experience, skill and knowledge are not separate. (p. 30)

Without the consistent flow of narratives, a danger that comes with increased domination of Kweetii (people of English speaking descent) ways, individuals risk losing a sufficient amount of personal knowledge and skill necessary to cope with the unpredictable dè.

The significance of ‘āina and our relationship to it links ancestors to place in which traditions and cultural practice fuels these ancestral memories to keep them in the forefront of our consciousness and operating in our daily lives. Pualani Kanaka‘ole Kanahele (2003) gracefully articulates how our popular interpretation of Mauna Kea as “white mountain” masks the true meaning of the prominent earthly featured as a namesake to Wākea, or Sky Father. When afforded this kupuna status, it signifies the intimate and familial nature of the mountain to the Hawaiian people. The tribute and respect for the elder transcends people and is inclusive of land forms and this tradition has “wound its way into the present . . . . The thread of ancestral memory” (p. 4). Her explanation of the name Mauna Kea points out that there are only two places in all of Polynesia that are honored with ka inoa akua (godly names) which indicates that these areas are endowed with godly mana. Implicit in Kanahele’s interpretation is genealogy and godly presence, which defines a hierarchy that shows what is important to Hawaiians.
The notion of tradition in the Maori view for example may relate to the doings of real men from canoe voyages to Aotearoa in the settlement of land in contrast to cosmogonic myths that relate legendary heroes in a remote time and place of their Hawaiki homeland (Walker, 1996, p. 26). Maori traditions from about the 15th century onward record tribal warfare over land. War according to Walker “was the means by which tribal boundaries were defined and political relations established” (p. 27). Natural physical features marked tribal boundaries, and echoing Jojola, lands were occupied for a thousand years by their ancestral discoverers. Being occupied over long periods of time, Maori “blood was spilt” in the defense of land that was over time, “hallowed by [the] ancestral bones buried there” (p. 27). In time, Walker explains, the people came to think of themselves as being literally “joined to the land as tangata whenua.” Conceived of as prominent physical features on the landscape similar to mountains, rivers or hills, Maori were identified with their founding ancestors and stood as symbols for a tribe. Maori sayings mark this kind of symbolism: “Hikurangi is the mountain, Waiapu is the river and Porourangi is the ancestor.”

Walker links land, ancestral human remains, and natural features to Maori concepts of order, time and the significance of land. Edward Kanahele (as cited in Van, 1991) clearly outlines the significance of place to the personal well-being of the Hawaiian. Wahi pana (significant or sacred places) provide a sense of history and stability to Hawaiian families (p. ix). This is accomplished through stories that serve to inform Hawaiians of who we are, where we come from and who we are related to (p. x). The concept of wahi pana merges the importance of place with that of the spiritual. Native Hawaiian wahi pana include the dwelling places of the gods, deities, venerable disciples, shrines, selected observation points, cliffs, mounds, mountains, weather phenomenon, forests and volcanoes (p. x). Events, individuals, and functions define
wahi pana. It is the belief, held by some Hawaiians, that life integrates the world of the seen and unseen as complementary parts (p. x). This balance and lōkahi is necessary for a healthy and natural existence. In this way, wahi pana provide a sense of belonging to an individual or their ‘ōhana—to both the living and those who have passed on. Places offer a sense of well-being (p. xi). To knowing destroy wahi pana is to deliberately destroy our ability to lead a balanced life (p. xi).

Hawaiians view the relationship between the living and their ancestors as premised on the concept of interdependence. This interdependence, or more importantly, our ability to maintain it, is crucial to the balance or pono of human existence in the physical, emotional, cultural and spiritual realms. This notion of lōkahi is best illustrated in the Hawaiian creation story of Papahānaumoku and Wākea. Hoʻohōkūkalani with Wākea bore a child name Hāloanakalaukapalili. Hāloa died prematurely and his remains were buried, or kanu, meaning planted. From that spot sprouted the first kalo, also named Hāloa. Kalo remains until this day a staple food of the Hawaiian people. Thus, to the Hawaiian mind, we are nourished from the foods fertilized by the bones of our ancestors thus perpetuating a balanced and interdependent relationship between the living and the dead. To kanu iwi, thus, the natural process of decomposition results with ancestral remains imparting mana into the ‘āina, literally feeding descendants, families, and thus strengthening the ancestral foundations.

If we learn to pick up intercultural cues, or at least expand our views to include them, we can celebrate the diversity of people’s perceptions of place, space and time. As Porter (2010) intimates to decolonize planning we must transform it so that we are able to acknowledge if not celebrate, the non-rational, contextual nature of planning knowledge and action. To do so means to reformulate problems so an expanded course of actions and strategies are possible, sensible
and agreeable. Indigenous worldviews as philosophical constructs are fundamental to all of humankind’s community planning role and its application towards a balanced relationship to the natural world (Jojola, 2008). This relationship is the basic building block that configures space.

### 3.4 Indigenous Educational Space

Smith (2005) states that indigenous epistemology can lead to new kinds of educational experiences and outcomes as well as pose new research questions. An anthropological view of education, she observes, casts issues two ways, (a) the study of education in other cultures and (b) the study of other cultures in education. The first discussion seeks a description of worldviews, cultural patterns of socialization, and development in non-western cultures and societies. The second view is more concerned with issues of diversity, pluralism and multiculturalism in western societies. The key to discussing indigenous epistemologies and education Smith argues, is to “speak back” by way of identifying practical problems that Indigenous communities have identified rather than from disciplinary concerns. Indigenous communities ask different questions about epistemic self-determination that includes language and culture. Indigenous frameworks about schooling present new and different ways to think about practices, purpose, and outcomes of school systems. The use of indigenous epistemologies can lead to different school experiences therefore producing a different kind of learner.

Indigenous inquiry is premised on our worldviews that encompass space, place and time orientation that links education to ‘āina use and function. Our material culture and beliefs are important to defining the cultural identity of a place—this is what provides an area its form-giving elements. Tradition and culture create links between principles and patterns that are expressed through built form (Samadhi, 2001). Tradition may be defined as a constant handing down of elements of a culture. These elements serve as the source of the distinct characters in
space since it is generated by local culture and its operative customs (p. 560). These principles are what binds groups together and help them to decide to be a part of that group, community, or society. The more clearly the built environment reflects their culture, the more successful those patterns are. Therefore, understanding spatial linkages between ‘āina and pedagogy is a critical step in indigenous education.

“Pedagogy refers to more than educational methodology and technique; it refers to the cultural politics that are the context of the institution of schooling” (Furman & Gruenewald, 2004, p. 58). Pedagogy in a broad sense then refers to the political expression of the cultural politics of the school and the fundamental purpose of schooling. A pedagogy aimed at addressing cultural, environmental, and ecological innovation must critically problematize the typical assumptions and outcomes of conventional education. To understand the dynamic relationship between culture and educational systems requires a shift in emphasis from simply teaching about culture to local culture being the foundation for all learning (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2004). Thus, for some Hawaiian educators redefinition of space, place and facilities requires greater thought and integration between these elements.

A new ethics of place making in settler colonial contexts demands a diverse understanding of how place comes into existence (McGaw, Pieris, & Potter, 2011). In this sense then, indigenous place-making challenges the hegemony of Euro-centric notions of place and its constitution. Indigenous place-making thus forces the public recognition of a particular history amidst cultural and political landscapes that only admits certain narratives. Thus, manifesting in place through public discourse and storytelling we are able to achieve a degree of spatial justice. Stuart and Thompson-Fawcett (2010) focusing on urban transformations of Aotearoa for example, question the degree to which the urban built environment reflects Maori values and
aspirations. Specifically, they ask, how can you effectively manifest matauranga Maori in the urban environment? Indigenous knowledge is the accumulated understanding that a local community develops over many generations. It commonly encompasses values, skills and practices that guide the long-term behavior and actions of a group in its locality (p. 12). Because the built environment is not only a settlement in physical spaces in which people live but also an expression and extension of identity, they contend that Maori interpretation of the built environment is fundamentally different from Western conceptions. Thus, the physical landscapes are inseparable from tupuna, events, occupations and cultural practices (p. 14).

Hoskins (2008) remarks that a key issue for Maori iwi in maintaining a sense of place involves a sense of being to that place (as opposed to the place belonging to you); it is reciprocal and recognizes the mauri in all things thus respect and protection as key to the “ensemble of connections.” The framing of relationships to place via the people of that place is fundamental to understanding cultural landscapes and a Maori sense of place. Stated another way, relationships are the tangata whenua coupled with their whakapapa. Maintaining a grounded connection to place-based on ancestry ensures an ethic or responsibility to safeguard the interest of the environment. Traditionally that sense of place was exercised through rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. Hoskin maintains that with regard to urban environments, you are generally dealing with dual notions of connectedness and disconnectedness. Settlement and development processes have progressively overlaid physical landscape with alien development that inhibits one’s ability to connect with these places on a spiritual and cultural level.

Lokko (2000) examines the interaction between the phenomenon of race and architecture by questioning who has the right, privilege, or power to decide what form and functions constitute space. Further, how does architecture serve to evoke or enforce hidden aspects “of
racial superiority, cultural hegemony, and dismissive “othering of people and language” (p. 29). She rightly observes that space, site, form, architecture and uses are themselves historical and ideological, not universal and neutral (p. 16). Ola Uduku (2000) in her article entitled “The Colonial Face of Educational Space” discusses the ethos and practice of education in the former British colonies of west and south Africa. Pointing to conventional arguments that link education to social, cultural, economic and philosophical development, education is a dominant indicator (through literacy, the presence of schools, and universities for example) of the attainment of development (p. 46). As such, the school building remains a powerful symbol reinforcing local beliefs associated with the prestige of Western knowledge therefore she argues the school building cannot be underestimated in its relevance in shaping and developing the colonial (post-colonial) city (p. 46).

The preeminence of the image of the school as the primary source of knowledge has a rather short presence among non-European societies (p. 48). The Judeo-Christian influence established ‘schools’ among the larger physical structure of the mission. In west and South Africa for example the idea of the “mission” was literally a collection of buildings such as the school, church and sometimes a hospital. These spatial configurations quickly became symbolic of development and progress (p. 48). Importantly, Uduku argues that traditional African systems by which education and learning where transfered and utilized by communal spaces were not forgotten to the local populous. Instead, they were adapted to the new dominant colonial educational requirements so as to not challenge the primacy of the Western education conveyed through the classroom structure (pp. 48-49). For example, Uduku remarks how traditional education rituals that initiate female and males into adulthood still occur in African nations. However, those the practices take place during school vacation periods or after school. More
often they may occur in the residence rather than their former temporarily constructed sacred and specialized spaces (p. 49).

Second, Uduku discusses the impact of permanent colonial style architecture that requires new materials, knowledgeable and trained labor to construct it. First, it eclipses African local architecture and it intimates through the built form, concepts of what constitutes valid and progressive forms of architecture. In this sense then, “talk and chalk,” with the table in the front of the room type designs that support standarized curriculum, large group instruction and teacher-centered lectures continue to leave unaddressed the requirements and concerns of the Indigenous community. Second, in the case of South and West Africa, despite policy changes in curriculum, the overall educational system has been unable to provide facilities or designs necessary to meet new policy initiatives designed to respond to pressing global learning conditions. Third, there is the observation that financial limitations coupled with limited local to national curricular linkages, and their corresponding school design, meant that authority, standards and styles kept its colonial influence in many post independent African countries. Strategically, Uduku turns to the concept of external flexible spaces that link local goals with scarce fiscal and material resources to address these failings. Referencing Neville Alexandar, she refers to a radical flexibility model that extends the use of educational space to enable its transformation to accommodate the conventional schools population plus wider community. In this way, schools can be “shared with as many” in ways that benefit from physical design changes.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter celebrates the non-linear, non-rational, contextually-based nature of ancestral knowledge and spiritual action. Further, it privileges ideas of space and time from a
place-based, genealogical point of view. The trialectic of spatiality allows us to arrive at a third space -- the space of old (k)new knowledge. Spatial and temporal discussions from Nā Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, Nga Tangata Maori and the Tlicho Dene peoples contextualize Smith’s (2005) conclusions that utilizing indigenous epistemology can lead to new kinds of educational experiences and outcomes. These scholarly works when applied collectively, frame Hawaiian-focused public charter schools through a spatial pedagogy in which ‘āina use is premised upon relationships that are grounded in epistemology. In this context, schools imagine/re-image education based on indigenous systems of knowledge and practices. Actively fashioning educational systems based on the accumulated wisdom of ancestors over time and space stokes contemporary Hawaiian experiences and intellectual engagement. Together these powerful forces re-imagine the “school” and signal significant reversals of power in terms of what constitutes legitimate knowledge and ‘āina use.
CHAPTER 4. THE CONTEXT OF HAWAIIAN SPATIAL LIBERATION

4.1 Ka Wā O Ka Po‘e ‘Ōiwi Wale Nō

In order to understand the educational context in Hawai‘i it is worthwhile to outline the social and environmental context that children were generally born into the time of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi wale nō. Approximately twelve to fifteen hundred years ago the first people to arrive at our pae ‘āina settle and clear lands for agriculture. Around 1100 AD Hawaiians implemented new living techniques that were in better proportion to the carrying capacity of watersheds (Connelly, 2014). In order to provide for a large population through agriculture and aquaculture meant that the land had to be well defined and structured; that order was produced through palena -- bounded areas and resources that resulted with a series of land divisions (Beamer, 2014, p. 34). On O‘ahu island, Chief Mā‘ilikūkahi is generally credited for clearly marking and reorganizing land palena; ali‘i on other islands would have implemented similar systems. It is important to understand that historical time is often marked by ruler and not in terms of years such as 1100 AD. Mā‘ilikūkahi was the son of Kūkahiaililani (k) and Kokalola (w) of the Maweke and Puamakua families. His period of rule over O‘ahu is distinguished as a time of peace and abundance. By dividing land into orderly divisions, Mā‘ilikūkahi was able to bring about greater productivity to the lands. Boundary setting in this context served to lessen conflicts among future ali‘i who would be in control of the bounded lands, it protected the commoners from poor ruling chiefs and brought peace and prosperity. Beamer maintains that the term palena could mean “protected place” but translates it to mean “place-boundaries” since “it is a particular type of boundary, one created in a specific context, which defines a place that has unique functions” (p. 32). He observes that:

3 Distinguishes the period of time when Kānaka ‘Ōiwi only inhabited the islands.
In the ‘Ōiwi system of old, palena created places—spaces of attachment and access to both the metaphysical and physical worlds. They delineated the resource access of makaʻāinana and aliʻi on the ground, literally connecting people to the material and spiritual resources of these places . . . they were cataloged and maintained visually and cognitively . . . passed on orally from generation to generation by inhabitants knowledgeable about the place. (p. 32)

Boundary setting established the following land divisions: moku, ahupuaʻa, ‘ili kūpono, ‘ili ʻāina and moʻo ʻāina. Ahupuaʻa were “diverse and complex divisions, ranging in size, shape and geography . . . bounded by mountain ridges and peaks” and “since they defined resource accesss, they usually extended into the ocean” (pp. 41-42). The ahupuaʻa was the unit of land that played an important role in the annual Makahiki procession dedicated to Lono akua in which hoʻokupu were “made and collected and spiritual rejuvenation bestowed upon the ahupuaʻa and its inhabitants” (p. 40). The ahupuaʻa also comprised an important aspect of the overall land use system that enabled konohiki, who served as agents to the chiefs and had legitimate control of the ahupuaʻa, to know the range of productivity available for their respective resources. The size and shape of each ahupuaʻa were dictated by the boundaries and the land use practices within each was designed to take full advantage of the ecology of the system and the resources attainable, while at the same time following strict rules of practice designed to protect and preserve the integrity of the ecosystem. Importantly, regulation recognized the interconnectedness of the different regions within the ahupuaʻa, ranging from the mountainous headwaters of the drainage basin to the sea. Thus, it was recognized that any land use practices put into place upstream would have a direct impact on downstream ecosystems. The individuals who accessed and utilized resources, by necessity, had to be mindful of the chain of
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environmental interactions that linked the upstream and downstream ecosystems. Human land use practices, therefore, were closely tied to the healthy ecological functioning of the land. The land agents, moreover, lived in the districts and to some degree needed to take an active part in the life of the people (Wise, 1965).

The Hawaiian economy was based on an exchange system that existed within the ahupua’a that provided everything needed in close proximity. Kānaka ʻŌiwi planned kauhale around their cultivated field systems and other necessary material resources and this defined their settlement patterns in terms of adjacency, access and configuration. The ʻohana, were generally able to maintain long term relationships with a specific parcel of land even though the aliʻi might change. Further, they could leave to live in the territory of another konohiki or aliʻi (Van Dyke, 2008). The makaʻāinana did not hold title to the land, rather they utilized it in consultation with the konohiki or some other agent of the Mōʻi (p. 14). The aliʻi managed Hawaiian social hierarchy in accordance with their akua (gods) through careful spiritual and political guidance in concert with ritual conduct that continually worked to direct mana towards a proper and just system. Interdependence marked the society because the makaʻāinana relied on aliʻi to maintain long term tenure and cultivate lands. Conversely, the aliʻi relied on the makaʻāinana to provide them through their skill and labor, basic sustenance such as food, clothing, and housing.

Within this land use system developed the means of knowledge production and its transmittal. The idea of education was “practical, skill-oriented, socially useful, in tune with reality, environmentally-aware and conserver-cognizant” (Kelly, 1982, p. 13). How and what children were taught reflected those skills and values important in a fully functioning subsistence society in which the basic socio-economic unit was the ahupua’a. Functioning watersheds or more generally the surrounding ecology naturally provided the fundamental educational milieu.
during this period. Immersion in real world stimuli nurtured an individual's physical and spiritual relationship with ‘āina during the course of life long learning.

The ‘ohana system of living in an ‘ili of an ahupua’a resulted with children being surrounded with many people who, through their actions, conveyed standards of familial community-based living. In the ‘ohana system, parents, grandparents, and other family members had much to do with the basic advancement of learning among children. This system is revealed in the ‘ōlelo no’eau, ka ‘ike a ka makua, he hei na ke keiki; the knowledge of the parents is absorbed (unconsciously) by the child (Handy & Pukui, 1972). Learning could be acquired through subtle forms of teaching that occurred through everyday living by children observing the daily activities of family and community members. With time, children eventually try out tasks for themselves or along side brothers, sisters or cousins. The idea of laulima, literally meaning many (lau) hands (lima) or example allowed learning to occur among peers by working together apart from adults. Blaich (2003) for example, discusses the importance of laulima in her case study of the Waipā Project on Kaua‘i island that linked various educational research that found a higher degree of learning for most Native Hawaiian students in settings where cooperation is emphasized. Kānaka ‘Ōiwi relied on functioning members of their subsistence society thus the age of children was not measured by years but rather what they could do or accomplish. Handy and Pukui (1972) discuss sharing and the division of labor in all work (laulima) such as fishing, planting, housebuilding, lo‘i and kuauna, loko, work on ‘auwai, in rituals, and including war, was also a way of education for everyone did their part. What was done by one or another was subject to the direction of the ali‘i and their priest or konohiki. Largely, what was done was determined according to status, age and sex in accordance with traditional custom. Even children had their duties to fulfill according to size; ka nui e pa’a ai i ka huewai meaning the size that
enables him to carry a water bottle, or about two years old (pgs. 177-179). Therefore, exposure to real world stimuli combined experience with a larger community and family in which children were expected to react to appropriately.

Reliance on the surrounding environment for basic living meant for our Hawaiian ancestors that “culture furnished the natural and basic content material of their education” and a part of that “curriculum include[ed] attaining an intimate, discriminating knowledge of nature, including names, characteristics and habits of plants, fish, rains, surfspots, just to name a few” (Kahakalau, 2003, p. 38). Learning was a continuous and lifelong endeavor that safeguarded daily survival and alignment with a larger environment. The basic Hawaiian economy of agriculture and fishing that developed over time relied on cooperative social labor in order to provide for all of life’s necessities from within the island society itself. The ahupuaʻa formed the basic socio-economic unit that allowed those who resided within it a degree of economic independence since access to resources was generally guaranteed. Within this socio-economic context, children at about the age of seven were considered “to have reached the age of responsibility” and were given specific tasks to perform thus beginning their formal contributions to daily family life and its attendant activities (Kelly, 1982, p. 8). In this context older children and or older family members assumed their roles as teachers.

The age of responsibility may also mark the time for specialized training with an expert outside the ʻohana who would have the responsibility to pass on a particular field of knowledge to a particular child. To become a master of a specialized practice or craft involved years of apprenticeship in a formal setting under an expert. As a student’s development and maturation progressed, their aptitude, behavior and characteristics were observed and assessed by family members who could suggest areas of specialty in which mastery could be achieved through
apprenticeship with experts of that field (Kahakalau, 2003; Pukui, Haertig, & Lee, 1972). Viewed as authorities, experts or professionals in their fields, kahuna were keepers of traditions and wisdom and they were also the producers, creators and organizers of knowledge. In contrast to contemporary standardized achievement across ages, in the course of learning basic skills, specialized training and individual instruction was tailored to the learner. The realization of the potential of a child, especially among those of chiefly descent, began with the nurturing of both “physical and psychic measures” as it was believed that the child could be shaped in body and spirit (Pukui et al., 1972). Physical training was coupled with ritual and ceremonial learning.

Hawaiian methods of teaching and learning were based on apprenticeship, mastery, kinship and community (Pukui et al., 1972). Learning through observation, listening and repeating are known methods of Hawaiian instruction until today. A well known ‘ōlelo no‘eau reinforces the trilology of methods; I ka nānā no a ‘ike, i ka hoʻolohe no a hoʻomaopopo, i ka hana no a ‘ike. By observing one learns, by listening one commits to memory, by practice one masters the skill (Pukui et al., 1972, p. 48). For example, a contemporary student of hula related how their Kumu might challenge them “to do as their Kumu thinks” (Nunes, 2014), thus indicating a sophisticated degree of what ‘ike, hoʻolohe and hoʻomaopopo could potentially mean in a learning context. In other circumstances, the Kumu may allow a haumana to observe and then attempt a certain technique without being told exactly what to do so on the one hand demanding repetition and practice while allowing independence to problem solve. The conveyance of knowledge involved regular, hands-on, repetitive doing of a certain task until it was mastered therefore notions of perfection, mastery and excellence are hallmarks of Hawaiian education and worldviews.
The oral transmission of knowledge embodied a broad spectrum Hawaiian life lessons that relayed important values and traditions. Considering our kūpuna were able to orally transmit chants or mele such as the Kumulipo, a 2,000 line genealogical mele, over hundreds of years indicate highly developed skills of memorization, vocalization and composition. Wise sayings such as nānā ka maka (observe), ho‘olohe ke pepeiao (listen carefully) and paʻa ka waha (being quiet) meant that Hawaiians were “highly visible learners” with the capacity to absorb details and concepts from visual information (Kahakalau, 2003, p. 42). Ma ka hana ka ‘ike, roughly meaning, to know by doing, reflects how real world learning applied knowledge that was acquired through observation and then doing. Further, the saying hoʻokahi leo ua lawa, sets the expectation that a onetime explanation is sufficient. Perfection, excellence and mastery meant that children/students were taught to finish a task completely and correctly, even if it meant redoing the task or project in order to attain a flawless result (p. 43). Assessment of learning was primarily performance based, as in the notion of hōʻike, loosely meaning to demonstrate the attainment of knowledge or a practice.

From this context then, what is key is that the presence of ʻāina was necessary to the act of teaching and learning. Stated another way, a child's relationship with ʻāina was held in tact during the process of learning and teaching and, as such, was vital to the subsequent knowledge produced as result of the process.

4.2 Public Instruction in the Hawaiian Kingdom Period

By the turn of the nineteenth century, the Hawaiian archipelago was unified under a single ruler, Kamehameha I and the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi was established. However, by this point Kānaka ʻŌiwi would have experienced catastrophic depopulation in the immediate years following contact with ka poʻe haole. Beginning with the arrival of Captain Cook in 1778, there
was an ever increasing volume of foreign traders, drifters, beachcombers, whalers, missionaries, merchants and settlers who came with bacteria, viruses and disease that decimated the Kānaka ‘Ōiwi population as illness spread unabated. Historians debate the number of Hawaiian at the time of Cook’s arrival in 1778. For example, Schmitt (1968) estimated about 300,000; Stannard (1989) in Before the Horror argued that there were about 800,000 with an estimated 80% decline within the first 50 years of contact. Kameʻeleihiwa (1992) argued that Hawaiians suffered about an 83% depopulation rate in the first forty-five years of contact.

In 1809, Kamehameha decreed his son Liholiho (Kamehameha II) heir to the throne with Kaʻahumanu serving as his Kuhina Nui. On May 8, 1819, Mōʻī Kamehameha II, by disavowing the ‘ai kapu, ushered in fundamental societal and religious change by relying on chiefly laws for governance rather than past Hawaiian religious laws (Sai, 2011). The fortuitous timing of the American missionary arrival in March of 1820 was marked by this powerful societal and political dynamic that was already in motion. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) held as their objective the spread Christianity worldwide. Their Christian representatives were largely Congregationalist in origin but accepted missionaries from Presbyterian, Dutch-Reformed and other denominations. When the Chiefs realized that the missionaries were from the United States and not Britain, they initially were prohibited from landing, however, based on the assurance of the English settler John Young, they were allowed to land (p. 28). Kamehameha Liholiho granted the American missionaries a license of one-year residency which he later extended. With the aid and support of the chiefs and the Kanaka ʻŌiwi themselves, the missionaries almost immediately started teaching reading and writing.
4.2.1 “All the People Shall Learn Palapala”

Kanaka Maoli actively engaged in learning palapala between the years 1820-1830. While Kamehameha II was on a diplomatic mission to England in 1823, the Regent Kaʻahumanu instituted, from among several of her proclamations, that “when schools are established, all the people shall learn the palapala” (Sai, 2011, p. 28). Andrews (1865) writes that “the whole system of instruction as first commenced at these islands was summarily called by the Hawaiians the palapala” (p. 452). Early on, education was largely associated with Hawaiian literacy which truly relied on the joint efforts of missionaries, Kānaka Maoli themselves, and the provision of printed materials to structure these early efforts. The missionaries effectively had to learn the Hawaiian language and produce it to written form since their initial efforts to proselytize in English resulted with so few converts that it was considered too costly in terms of time and effort. Kuykendall (1938) for example writes that up until the end of 1821 the first classes taught in the English language resulted with the total number of Hawaiians having received instruction “probably did not exceed two hundred” (p. 106).

In the year following her proclamation, Kuhina Nui Kaʻahumanu and the highest chiefs declared the establishment and maintenance of schools for common people which brought about “a rapid increase in the number both of schools and of pupils” (Kuykendall, p. 106). Wist (1940, p. 23) records that during the period from 1824-1827 “almost the whole adult population of the Hawaiian islands went to school” and by 1832 more than 53,000 pupils enrolled in 900 schools. Overwhelmed, missionaries trained and placed native teachers in schools (Stueber, 1982). Schoolhouses during this period were constructed as hale pili and their condition and upkeep were generally dependent upon the konohiki of the district. As the bulk of the adult Hawaiian population had learned to read and write, enrollment in schools began to dip by the late 1830’s. It
is at this period that the scope of educational efforts shifted toward developing a system that
enrolled children into schools and necessitated the provision of well trained teachers, texts and
reading materials and the construction of substantial and permanent schoolhouses. Early
development of the educational infrastructure occurred despite complications by tax officers
failing to deliver collected taxes for the purposes of education to schools resulting with the
accumulation of large school debts early on in Hawai‘i’s educational administrative history.

At this time two school systems emerged. The first, common schools, were taught by a
missionary trained native teachers and attended largely by the children of Hawaiian families.
These schools were supported by the native people themselves with books coming from the
mission press. The second, select schools, were taught by members of the mission directly and
attended by a select group of native children of which it is assumed were of the chiefly class.
Hawaiian language was the medium of instruction in both school systems. Another class of
select schools were independent schools. These independent schools were taught in English by
the missionaries themselves (or mission related teachers) with Punahou School representing the
keystone in the “arch of missionary work” (Stueber, 1982, p. 22). Significantly, the US financial
crisis in 1837 affected the income of the ABCFM and prompted local island missionaries to
appeal to the King and chiefs to assume the educational obligation (Kuykendall, p. 112).

4.2.2 Universal Education and Decentralized School System

On October 8, 1840, Kamehameha III approved the first constitution incorporating the
Declaration of Rights, promulgated in 1839, as its preamble (Sai, 2011, p. 47). The constitution
recognized three divisions of the monarchy; the King as the Chief Executive, the Legislature, and
the Judiciary. In that same year, the Kingdom’s Privy Council enacted universal education in the
islands. Chapter VII, A Statute for the Regulation of Schools administratively organized
education as a national function by first establishing a Superintendent of the Whole who was later called the Minister of Public Instruction (Hawaii Sovereign, 1841). The legislature appointed one superintendent for the whole pae ‘āina and one general school agent or kahukula for each of the five main islands. The first luna or school superintendent was Hawaiian scholar, Davida Malo, who held the post for four years. The first kahukula or school agents to be appointed were five Kānaka Maoli who managed all government schools across the five major islands. They were John Ŭī for O‘ahu, Pāpōhaku for Kaua‘i, Kanakakai for Moloka‘i, David Malo for Maui and Kanakaahuahu for Hawai‘i. These ʻŌiwi leaders were responsible for a range of institutional activities such as granting of teaching certificates, overseeing teachers, monitoring the progress of students and to be the judges of the school law and provide for teacher’s salaries (Kuykendall, 1938; Littler, 1929).

The law required that a school be maintained in every kulanakauhale where there were 15 or more children. A lunaauhau (tax officer) would give notice that the makua kane in each kulanakauhale were to elect a local committee of three members from amongst themselves and apply to the kahukula and together find a teacher and determine a salary. The teacher in return for service would be assigned a piece of land, receive exemptions from the labor and poll tax and male pupils would work six hours each week for the teacher. Teachers were certified from either Lahainaluna or general school agents.

By 1842, keiki enrollment in common schools had reached 18,034 with many hale pili still serving as school sites. The Organic Act adopted in 1845 set up a new school system. The Department of Public Instruction was established as one of five executive cabinet departments, the Department was superintended by a Minister of Public Instruction. Administratively, the Kingdom was divided into 21 districts with each district appointed a general superintendent of
schools (kahukula) by the King in Privy Council based on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Instruction. The 21 districts were further divided into “minor districts” which replaced the former local school committees. A lunakula served as a “sub-agent” who was appointed by the general superintendents. A labor tax was applied to support the common schools.

What is important about the process of state making in this early period is that the national education system was initially developed and led by Kanaka ‘Ōiwi statemen who relied upon the existing ‘ohana social organization and konohiki management system for its operation. Konohiki coordinated building schools in their respective kulanakauhale and the makua kane of ‘ohana were involved along side missionaries to get kulanakauhale scaled schools operating. Thus, Kānaka and their Chiefs relied on their own social organization systems to get those early education efforts started. The outcome evidenced in literacy rates, as we know, were quite phenomenal.

4.2.3 National School Lands

In 1848, Richard Armstrong accepted the position as minister of public instruction. Armstrong focused on “developing the habits of industry among the people and in the promotion of agriculture as a means to that end” (Kuykendall, 1938, p. 356). This philosophy maintained that early on that “the two outstanding problems of Hawaiian government were education and land utilization and they were interdependent” (Wist, 1940, p. 60). Aside from providing tax measures to support schools, in 1850 Hawaiian national lands were designated for schools through a specific land classification. On July 9, 1850, an act was passed to “provide better support and greater efficiency of the public schools” (Kuykendall, 1938, p. 352). Specifically the act provided that “one-twentieth part of all lands then belonging to the Government should be set apart for the general purposes of Education” (Van Dyke, 2008, p. 58). There were a finite
number of school grants that were numbered one to 44 although a single grant may have contained many ʻāpana, or several portions or land parcels. The act also provided that the Minister of Public Instruction was authorized to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of school lands from which the income would be used for designated school purposes. At the close of 1881, a total of 3,312 Royal Patent Grants had been issued to purchasers and the revenues received were applied towards the erection and maintenance of buildings and teachers’ salaries (p. 58). The term "Royal" indicates that the document was issued during the Hawaiian Monarchy (up to 1893). Royal Patent Grants were issued on land commission awards and māhele awards as evidence that the Government's right to commutation therein was satisfied. An award together with a patent perfected the awardee's title to the property.

4.2.4 The Struggle for Political and Cultural Hegemony

In 1855, the Ministry of Public Instruction was administratively reorganized to a Department of Public Instruction that would be led by a Board of Education (BOE) whose members were appointed by the King. The BOE would then elect a President who would act as the chief executive officer who presided over a five member Board that was superintended and directed by a committee of the Privy Council. A significant change also provided that the Minister of Interior to be designated as the official “through whom educational reports to the legislature would be made” (Wist, 1940, p. 62). Thus, the national objective of education became once removed from the executive. The education system continued to be administered by school agents who were stationed in twenty-four school districts through the Kingdom. The agents worked semi-independently fulfilling their primary responsibilities. They were responsible to hire, pay, transfer and evaluate teachers. They were expected to build and maintain the buildings and grounds of the schools. They regularly provided reports to the Board on accomplishments,
teaching effectiveness and attendance. Lastly, they conducted population census and disbursed funds allocated by the district tax collectors.

After leaving the Protestant mission Rev. Armstrong was appointed as the second minister of public instruction following the death of William Richards who only served 13 months in the position. Armstrong became the president of the BOE in 1855 and served in that capacity until until his death in 1860. Aliʻi Mataio Kekūanāʻa replaced Armstrong to serve as the president of the Board of Education until his death in 1868. Aliʻi Kekūanāʻa articulated the need to promote an “inclusive national character” among schools and despite the establishment of policy funding streams for education, he “spent a significant amount of time discussing his concern for the lack of adequate school facilities resulting from insufficient funding” (Goodyear-Kaopua, 2013, p. 18).

Chief Kekūanāʻa voiced his position for Hawaiian language in schools as a means to keep Hawaiian national identity by urging the legislature to increase funds for schools taught in Hawaiian. Stueber (1982) writes that during this period “a debate raged for nearly a decade over whether or not select schools for an emerging middle class would . . . undermine the last vestige of Hawaiian culture and morale, the Hawaiian language” (p. 23). Aliʻi Kekūanāʻa’s insistence on Hawaiian national identity through Hawaiian language was not unfounded. His predecessor Armstrong was responsible for the establishing a small number of government English select schools through the Kingdom on a trial basis. In the case of English select schools, parents paid half the cost for the select education and the government paid the other half. The English select schools were expensive to attend since haole English teachers “commanded” higher salaries. Appropriations given English-medium schools as well as salaries paid to teachers meant job loss
for many Hawaiian teachers and increased job opportunities for the English-speaking community (Lucas, 2000).

Charles Reed Bishop served as the BOE President from 1870 up until 1883 when the reigning monarch, King Kalākaua and his privy council forced Bishop out. However, with the imposition of the Constitution of 1887 forced upon Kalākaua, commonly known as the Bayonet constitution, Bishop was reinstated as the head of the BOE and remained in that position until 1893. It is during this period that Hawaiian common schools experienced the most debilitating funding and policy impacts as funding for English language schools increased as Hawaiian language school funds were cut. For example, by 1884, for the first time in Kingdom history, students of English were the majority (67%) of the total student population (Balutski, 2011). The pupils at this time were either pure or part Hawaiian or 81% of the total student population (p. 117). By 1890, only a small minority of the population was enrolled in government native schools that taught Hawaiian as the medium of education. In the years from 1886 to 1890, only 7.7% of the total student population was attending common schools. Bishop championed industrial based vocation over literacy based education thus providing the labor skills necessary for large scale sugar plantations (Goodyear-Kaopua, 2013). Moreover, during this same period, while Bishop worked to influence policies that involved laborers for the sugar plantations he also held large investments in the industry itself. To understand the magnitude of investment opportunity in operation at the time, for example, the amount of dollars invested in the sugar industry in 1872 was four million dollars and by 1892 the figure had increased to 32 million. Shortly after 1898, investments had increased to 85 million and were 150-175 million right before the economic collapse of 1929 (Stueber, 1982, p. 24).
In 1893, backed by the US military, the armed dethronement of the reigning monarch by a small group of white, sugar allied, businessmen resulted in the establishment of the Provisional Government of Hawai‘i (1893-1894). When the oligarchy realized they would not secure a treaty of annexation with the U.S., they formed the Republic of Hawai‘i (1894-1898). In 1896 under the Republic, Act 57 significantly reorganized education. The Board of Education was replaced with a Department of Public Instruction headed by a Minister who operated as a chief administrative officer with a commission of six members. The Republic of Hawai‘i in that same year published its infamous law that is often considered the official ban on the Hawaiian language:

Pauku 30. O ka olelo Beretania no ka mea e aʻo ia ai iloko o na kula Aupuni a me na kula kuokoa apau. Eia nae, ma na wahi i makemakeia ae e aʻo ia kekahi olelo e ae mawaho ae o ka Olelo Beretania, ua hiki no e hoomanaia aʻo ana e ka Oihana mamuli o kona mau rula ponoi, na rula paha o ke kula, a i ole ia, mamuli o ke kauoha maoli ana pela. O kekahi mau kula i hooko ole e like me na mea i hoakakaia ma keia pauku aole no lakou e ikeia a hoomaopopoia paha e ka Oihana.

Translation: The Official Decree: Act 57, Section 30: The English language shall be the language medium in all government and independent schools. However, in places that wish to teach a language other than the English language, it can be authorized by a Department, the Superintendents of the schools, or by a law. Regarding the schools that disobey the things clarified in this section, they will not be recognized by the Department.

While the law gave schools the option not to participate in the ban of Hawaiian language, nonparticipating schools would not be recognized and therefore would not receive government funding. The number of Hawaiian medium schools dropped drastically from “a high of 150 in
1880 to zero in 1902” (Lucas, 2000, p. 9). The issue of the “ban” on Hawaiian language was not addressed again until 1978.

Lastly, the Hawaiian national school lands that were set apart for the purposes of education were confiscated by way of the 1895 Land Act that formally merged the Crown Lands with the Government Lands to become “Public Lands” during the period of Republic. Therefore, those national schools lands that were established in 1850 under the Hawaiian Kingdom became public lands during this process. In 1898, about 1.75 million acres of the former Crown and Government lands were ceded to the US by way of the Newlands Resolution that was passed by the US Congress (Van Dyke, 2008, pp. 212-13). Specifically, the Newlands Resolution stated that the Republic of Hawaii would cede and transfer to the United State of America “the absolute fee and ownership of all public, government or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the government of the Hawaiian Islands together with every right and appurtenance thereunto appertaining” (Horwitz & Finn, 1969, p. 15). The resolution however did declare among other things that the US Congress shall enact special laws for their management and disposition and second, the revenues from Hawaii’s public lands be put into a separate fund for the inhabitants of the Hawaiian islands for education and other purposes.

There is an important contemporary point to be made here regarding annexation. There is compelling scholarship in Hawai‘i that argues, because there was no treaty of annexation, the United States Congress had no authority or jurisdiction to annex a foreign state by way of an internal U.S. process such as a congressional resolution. Contemporary law and political science theorist have begun to argue that the US is a belligerent occupant of a sovereign Hawaiian nation, thus influencing renewed historical and political debate regarding colonial and occupation
theories and their applicability to Hawai‘i. Thus, this examination of ‘āina-based schools becomes a focal point that joins land and education in such a way that brings much needed understanding to our contemporary Kanaka ʻŌiwi make-up in the 21st century.

**4.3 Education During the Territory and Statehood Years (1900 – 1959)**

Education from the 1900 to 1959 would focus on the task of Americanizing the islands largely non-haole populous and English language would serve as a measure of that Americanization. In parallel fashion powerful agriculture industrialist would influence the educational trajectory from the end of the 19th century and well into the Territorial Period. In 1900, the Organic Act brought the Hawaiian Islands under the domain of the US as a territory and set the course of Hawai‘i’s political structure and relationship with the US. The Territory was governed by Republican party politics which was largely led by the descendants of those white-owned and white-managed sugar industrialist of the preceding century. The plantation system that would eventually become organized around five major agencies, commonly known as the “Big Five.” The “Big Five” was a name given to sugarcane processing corporations that maintained considerable power that extended into the Territorial period and maintained Republican party interests in the islands. The Big Five were Castle and Cooke, Alexander and Baldwin, C. Brewer & Co. American Factors (Amfac) and Theo H. Davies & Co. They centralized the sugar industry primarily from Honolulu handling everything from capital and technical mechanics by ensuring their needs were met not only through the political system but the education system as well.

The plantation system had effectively created a master/servant relationship between haole and non-haole and education was influenced by a new industrial agriculture economy. The public/private educational divide that articulated the difference between common and select
schools that took root in the earlier era became even more sharply defined during the Territorial period. The task of Americanization brought with it peculiar contradictions however as the non-haole students, that is a largely Asian population, who, in the course of assimilating knowledge, skills and English, put to the test the extent to which they would truly be welcome into the American community. For example, the spread of non-haole languages and culture, such as Japanese and Chinese, and the subsequent development of pidgin creole in the islands was judged to be interfering with the assimilation of the new second generation labor immigrants therefore calling into question whether or not Americanization was even possible (Stueber, 1982, p. 25).

The Organic Act of 1900 left the education department intact. The Minister of Public Instruction however was renamed to the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Act also provided that they be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the senate. By 1920, the policies of centralization vastly reduced school districts from 24 to eight and the Territory shifted school building and maintenance operations to the counties. County building and maintenance resulted with a complicated set of procedures that required the superintendent to submit a construction budget to a committee of estimates comprised of Mayor of Honolulu, the chairman of the three county boards and superintendent. Their budget in turn would be submitted to the governor who then submitted it to the legislature. The legislature would in turn separate out the county amounts, and when totals were approved, the sums were collected through the general property tax. The funds would be transmitted from the territorial treasures office directly to the county instead of the Department of Education (Littler, 1929, p. 136).

Education was funded directly through legislative enactment to purportedly provide equal financing to all public schools in the islands. Unlike the U.S., public education in Hawai‘i was
not fiscally separated from other governmental responsibilities. In the US education system, schools are broken up into schools districts funded from local property taxes, thus more affluent schools receive more educational monies because the tax base receives higher amount of taxes from the richer residents of the area compared to poor areas. The post-1920 curricular policies established a dual system of vocational and English standard schools. Vocational education was implemented through mass secondary education of a largely non-haole population. The Territorial wide system of select public schools, that came to be known as English Standard schools, were entirely supported by the government and were attended almost entirely by haole children (Stueber, 1982). For many haole children, this was the first time that they would attend “public” schools. By 1929, mandatory enrollment in either a public or private school was required for every child between the ages of six and 14. The range of educational curriculum included grade school, junior and high schools, deaf and blind schools, industrial schools, a normal school, and university.

In 1930, under Act 284, the administration of the department was assigned to the Board of Commissioners of Public Instruction and removed the Superintendents office. By 1940 Hawaiʻi had 23 high schools and “the entire school curriculum took on mainland American standards and expectations” (p. 31). The impacts of the post World War II reverberated throughout the islands as second generation immigrant populations would eventually attain new positions of power and influence by taking advantage new educational opportunities afforded them through veteran benefits and by receiving job placements that were formerly reserved generally for the planter elite. A two party system emerged when the strong collective labor movement coupled with democratic party ideals ushered in Democratic party domination of the islands political scene. At this point, Honolulu on Oʻahu island would account for nearly “four-
fifths of the total population” (p. 32) and in sharp contrast to what seemed like a slower paced, pre-war island society, a new urban complexion began to emerge. In the more remote areas of the islands however, small scale rural agriculture and pockets of Hawaiian communities continued to live their lives based on ‘ohana subsistence practices.

Through the 1950’s the department continued to reorganize along bureaucratic lines by establishing staff offices under the supervision of the Superintendent and District Superintendents. The new office structure was to improve and unify the Territorial wide curriculum that had expanded to include the needs of handicapped, slow learners and the disadvantaged. In 1959, the offices were renamed to the Department of Education (DOE) and the Board of Education (BOE). In 1966, a system wide reorganization allowed the BOE to appoint the Superintendent. Administratively this separated the policy making from the administration of policy by the Superintendent. The BOE became an elected board rather than an appointed one.

Lastly, with the passage of the Admissions Act (specifically HRS 26 Sec 15) most of the lands in the Public Land Trust transferred to the state with explicit trust responsibility outlined to those lands. In section 5(b) of the Act, Congress transferred almost 1.4 million acres of public lands back to what is now the State of Hawai‘i. In section 5(f) of the Admission Act, congress explicitly stated that these lands are held as a “public trust” by the state and that revenues generated are to be used for five specific purposes: (a) support for the public schools and public educational institutions; (b) for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians (as defined by the HHCA 1920); (c) for the development of farm and home ownership; (d) making public improvements and (e) provision of lands for public use. Today, the remaining parcels of those 1850 Hawaiian Kingdom ‘school lands’ are held in the Department of Land and Natural Resources with their disposition being determined by the Board of Land and Natural Resources
and not the Department of Education. The Organic Act of 1900 created a Commissioner of Public Lands who maintained public lands which were comprised of Crown lands and Government lands. When the Admissions Act passed, these public lands eventually came under the jurisdiction of what is now known as the Department of Land and Natural Resources.

Another important point to acknowledge about education and land in Hawai‘i is in general, the DOE does not have deeded title to any state lands. The DOE typically negotiates for school properties as if they were the owner but its name does not appear on deeds (HM, personal communication, May 27, 2014). Rather, the Board of Land and Natural Resources votes to accept the lands. Beginning as 1820, the konohiki had the responsibility to work with the kahukula to build hale pili for education. The Hawaiian Kingdom, initially with the missionaries, established permanent facilities for education with the Kingdom eventually assuming full responsibility. In the post overthrow period and into the Territorial period the counties built and maintained schools and the Territory managed everything else regarding schools. Unfortunately, since that time onward, that arrangement has resulted with confusion ever since over who rightfully maintains upkeep and maintenance of schools. In 1967, an attempt was made by the legislature (through Act 203, SLH 1967) to sort out county and state responsibilities especially with regard to land, buildings and construction. However, the bill did not appropriate money for the transfers and the bill was seemingly ignored. It remains a source of continual confusion until today. Given this brief historical accounting, it is reasonable to understand why the DOE no longer maintains deeds for their lands. It also explains the role of counties in maintaining some school facilities but not all. Further, over time those national schools lands have seemingly become separated from their original intent which was to provide greater support and efficiency to public schools. This point is even more stinging when some Hawaiian-focused public charter
schools (as we will learn) struggle to locate sites for their campuses or provide facilities since they receive no facilities funding. Even more weighty is implementing a Hawaiian-focused curriculum in a highly westernized standard testing environment.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter takes a historical approach to explain the trajectory of education in Hawai‘i including its administrative and legal contexts. Importantly, the chapter describes the crucial link between land and education. Taking the lead from Matunga’s periodicity, we begin in the classic tradition, or the period that covers the pre-settler contact stage. At the time of Kānaka ʻŌiwi wale, we discuss the context into which a child was born and in this respect we make connections between the necessity of land to the production and transmission of knowledge. I contend that an individual’s relationship to land was held in tact during this life long process of learning. The production of knowledge and its subsequent transmission preserved an individual’s relationship to land and it is here where we find a contemporary resonance. What we are witnessing today among some Hawaiian schools is the resurgence of those older ʻāina-based relationships. Importantly, they are premised upon places and spaces that reflect familiar Hawaiian settlement patterns, such as, lo‘i kalo or loko i‘a. Yet, as we will discover in the next chapter, ʻāina-based pedagogy continues to struggle to revive this old (k)new relationship.

As we move into the formative years of state making in the Hawaiian Kingdom, I highlight what seem to be glossed over realities about this period. Universal education was a national policy of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1840. Prior to this, Kūhina Nui Ka‘ahumanu in 1823 enunciated a formal edict that all people shall learn palapala. Thus, education was a significant national endeavor. It was so important that lands were set aside for the purposes of education. While it is conceivable that the land set aside created lucrative land sales under the
guise of inadequate funding, the Kingdom still set aside their lands for educational purposes.

Section 5f of the Admissions Act still carries this same language. Second, the administration of education in Hawai‘i has a genealogy (of sorts) that actually stretches back about 175 years. In this sense, the innovative character among public charter schools is easily lost in such a large, old system that has had bureaucratic infrastructure built upon it over time.

Further, the missionaries were not the only ones involved in education. As we learn, perhaps most clearly through the actions of Ali‘i Kekūanāo‘a, education was critical to maintaining the Hawaiian national character. Education during this period relied on Native Hawaiian leadership that shaped what I interpret as a decentralized educational administration. Decentralization relied upon a functioning yet familiar Hawaiian settlement system. As early as 1823, the konohiki and makua kane of a kūlanakauhale had roles, in addition to the missionaries, in building the first hale pili for instruction and securing teachers for their area. This indicates to me a functioning ʻohana system and a konohiki management system that somehow survived high rates of Hawaiian depopulation and foreign in-migration. Positively though it does explain, in part, the phenomenal success of adult literacy acquisition in early Hawai‘i.

The final section examines educational change as it paralleled Hawaii’s political and economic shifts of the 20th century. This section speaks to two fundamental elements that Richard Armstrong (as early as 1848) had characterized as problematic -- education and land utilization -- a problem that seemingly recedes with the imposition of a new industrial agricultural economy. The educational bureaucracy and curriculum continued to reorganize as the task of Americanization with its deep racial undercurrents were related to the economic necessities of large scale agricultural enterprise that evolved primarily around sugar and pineapple industry. The next chapter picks up this historical thread as Hawai‘i enters the 1960’s
and 1970’s with the urban-rural divide taking clear shape under the Democratic Party’s land use policy. It is this important historical policy divide that provides fertile ground for the Hawaiian language and culture focused charter school movement to take root.
CHAPTER 5. THE CLASH OF LIVED REALITY AND CONCEIVED SPACE

It is my position that bringing Hawaiian-focused education into view with land use we are able to examine significantly larger systems of spatial power and the ways in which they structurally determine what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use. The chapter exposes the “lived reality” or lived space of Hawaiian-focused charter schools to that of a state defined “conceived space.” As a lived space, I describe the everyday challenges, experiences and expressions of ‘āina-based schools as conveyed by our educators. As a conceived space, I trace the implementation of Hawaii’s land use system and couple it with education to demonstrate the degree to which they powerfully administer space through policy making thereby remaking it, or worse, completely regulating Hawaiian spatiality out of existence.

Importantly, in this chapter we first link a land use policy that implemented the Democratic ideal of urban based economic development to the emergence of land based struggles that organized a Hawaiian activist movement. Second, I highlight how, for instance, the Kaho‘olawe island struggle to stop the US military bombing of the island catalyzed Hawaiian consciousness around the philosophy of aloha ‘āina, to love the land, and mālama ‘āina, to care for the land. By the 1980’s, this philosophy would heavily influence the pedagogy among some Hawaiian-focused public charter schools. I argue that Hawaiian public charter schools represent the logical extension of the Hawaiian activist movement to promote through a formal means an ‘āina-based education that produces and transfers Hawaiian knowledge. However, what Hawaiian-focused schools want to do in the face of unequal funding allocations, no facilities support on the one hand and conformance to state defined education standards (via testing mechanisms) lends credence to what Roy (2005) argues -- state power is reproduced through the capacity to construct and reconstruct categories of legitimacy and illegitimacy.
5.1 Planning Administration and Organization

During the Territorial period, Hawai‘i centralized government planning where by land use was regulated by local boards. Prior to 1905, planning control was concentrated in the Territorial government. In 1907, the Territorial legislature established county level government yet, significantly, O‘ahu island was the first and only island to receive a delegated portion of the legislatures power as a city and county. In 1937, the Territorial legislature established the Territorial Planning Board and in 1939, the Board produced the first comprehensive report that inventoried the physical, social, economic, industrial and educational resources. The Honolulu Star Bulletin reported at the time that the document was a “...requisite for proper planning for the future” (Territorial Planning Board, 1939; Downes, 1986). The Territorial Planning Board expired in 1941 and was briefly revived in 1954-55. The Board was succeeded in 1955 by the Economic Planning and Coordination Authority that was established by the Territorial legislature. In 1957 the Territorial Planning Office was established by the legislature and in 1959 that office became the State Planning Office. The state Department of Planning and Research was organized later and began its planning activities in 1961 (Downes, 1986). With the Admissions Act of 1959, the local boards were reauthorized under county jurisdictions pursuant to HRS Chapter 46.

5.2 The Conceived Space: Democratic Urban Based Reform

Between the years 1950 - 1960, Democrats enacted several measures intended to bring greater social and economic reforms to the island populous. They did this through internal state measures and by capitalizing on external factors. They raised taxes on major land owners, made assessment practices more uniform for everyone and gave outer island counties zoning power that O‘ahu island alone had enjoyed since 1939. The islands economic situation changed
drastically with statehood and jet travel as outside capital could find a way into the islands affecting tourism, enabling expensive residential development and increasing military training (Cooper and Daws, 1990; Downes, 1986; McGregor, 2010). Given the economic trends and their impact on land uses, two issues were focusing public land use policy: public infrastructure provision and prime agricultural land preservation. Public agencies were becoming increasingly unable to provide public infrastructure due to the costs associated with the spread of urban development. Moreover, the spread of urban development was encroaching upon the states prime agricultural lands. Prime agricultural lands were those lands that were best suited for large scale pineapple and sugar agriculture and had the potential to buoy the state’s economy in the long run compared to urban development.

The State Land Use Law, enacted as Act 187, was adopted in 1961. By creating a system of land uses it was believed that the state would be able to preserve agricultural lands (as well as preserve its political economic relationships), produce a mechanism for urban development (for democratic reform purposes) while containing it simultaneously (thus making it cost effective for government). The state land use system classified all lands into one of four land use districts: urban, agriculture, rural and conservation. By 1963, the Democratic Governor implemented a highest and best use approach to land development. To further demonstrate the economic policy of highest and best use approach to land development, the Session Laws of Hawaii (1963) merged the Planning Department with the Department of Economic Development to become the State Department of Planning and Economic Development. Moreover, incentives were created by offering lower tax assessments on buildings rather than land, thus creating an incentive to build. Critically though, the law did not affect taxes on large land owners but rather it was their lessees who ended up paying, therefore, by not addressing land ownership:
Overall and over time, while the Democrats in power did start out down the land reform track in the name of social justice . . . [they] opted instead for land development as an essential part of the way to broad social and economic reform. (Cooper and Daws, 1990, p. 7)

Development it was believed, could create new wealth, increase standards of living for middle and working class therefore, instead of cutting up the “old pie of land wealth, the idea was to make the pie grow rapidly and continually by developing land intensely so that everyone could have more without giving up anything of significance” (p. 7). The land use zoning supported the pro-development ideology which meant that the few remaining pockets of rural Hawaiian communities and small farmers would begin to feel the pressure to urbanize.

5.3 The Lived Reality: Political Organizing and Hawaiian Activism

The history of political organizing has particularly deep strong roots among Hawaiian people. The scale and skill of political organizing is probably best reflected through the Kūʻē petitions which received roughly 40,000 signatures, a figure equal to the number of Hawaiian alive at the time. “Loud, organized and articulate,” Silva (1998) writes, Kanaka Maoli “protested encroachments upon their rights, their lands, and their ways of life” (p. 43). In the post-annexation era from 1900 through 1920, The Home Rule Party for example opposed American domination of Hawaiʻi and successfully ran Hawaiian legislative candidates. This political strategy resulted with Hawaiians maintaining the majority of elected offices and government jobs during this period. For example, “through 1935, Hawaiians held almost a third of the public service jobs, although they comprised only 15% of the population. This complexion did not change until 1954 with the defeat of the Republican party by the Democratic party” (McGregor-
Alegado, 1980, p. 32). The impact of this strategy came with trade-offs however as the alliances with the Big Five and the Republican party may have allowed Hawaiians to resolve their problems through political office, and as effective this may have been for some, it also “restrained Hawaiians from voicing their concerns or rocking the boat because of the effect it might have on friends and relatives in government positions” (p. 32).

Between 1930 and 1950, Hawaiian political organizing takes a labor based activism and unionizing form although not specifically addressing Hawaiian rights. The approach of World War II and the war itself brought an influx of dollars, personnel, construction and new ideas that would impact island life from that of a rural, isolated oceanic community to an increasingly urban locale. After World War II, labor unions and the Japanese American community allied together and reorganized the Democratic party. The Democratic take over of the Territorial legislature in 1954 significantly “reduced Kanaka ʻŌiwi political influence and changed the make up of Hawaiʻi politics through out the last half of the 20th century” (McGregor, 2010, p. 313). The influence of Asians in Hawaiʻi promoted “the ideal of American democracy” which would come to stand at “ideological odds with indigenous critiques of US colonialism” (Fujikane and Okamura, 2008, p. 2). Contemporary Asian settler discourse maintains on the one hand that it is important to honor the real struggles of the Asian ancestors who came to Hawaiʻi and endured a brutal, humiliating and often times violent plantation system. It is equally important to recognize the fact that they entered a settler colony and now make claims to Hawaiʻi, thus furthering US colonization.

In the process of pursuing the American democratic ideal, the influence of the Asian settler “claim to place” in Hawaiʻi involved the “erasure of Native people and places” by moving from the plantation society to a modern urban society (p. 2). Overtime as migrant plantation
workers accepted that they would settle in the islands rather than return to their own home lands, they claimed their labor that went into “building the plantation system, the industries, roadways, shopping centers, schools and new sub-divisions – in short the physical manifestation of US settler colonialism in Hawai‘i” (p. 2). The Asian “claiming of place” is further complicated through the “mythologizing of the 100th Infantry Battalion and the 442nd Regimental Combat Team over simplify the complex convergence of events and factors that enabled local Japanese to gain power in post World War II Hawai‘i and it obscures the tragic consequences of this development for Kanaka Maoli” (Fujikane and Okamura, 2008, p. 13).

As Asian settlers filled the ranks of government jobs, the subordination of Hawaiians in their own homelands became more striking when looking at the broad sweep of change among the “indices of political power” (Fujikane and Okamura, 2008). Between the years of 1960 to 1980, Fujikane and Okamura (2008) found that Japanese averaged 50% of the total membership of both state legislative houses and from 1955 to 1980, Japanese Democrats in the Legislature were twice the percentage of Japanese in Hawai‘i’s population. In 1980, they report that Chinese were 5% of the population but 10% of the Democratic legislators. Filipino Democrats, in 1983, were roughly equal to their Filipino percentage in the population at 12%. In contrast, Hawaiians in 1980 were about 18% of the population but 3% of the Democratic legislators (Cooper and Daws, 1990, p. 42).

Also, the make-up of organized labor unions like the Hawaii State Teachers Association and the Hawaii Government Employees Association, further illustrate the makeup of political power. Organized labor unions provide endorsements, physical campaigning and financial support to political campaigns (J. Okamura, 2002). Fujikane and Okamura write:
As Japanese settler politicians are supported by Japanese settler teachers and administrators – educators who help shape Asian settler understandings of their role in Hawaii – we can see the importance of the ways in which Asian settler histories are interpreted and taught in Hawaii. (p. 25)

Within the Department of Education (DOE) they demonstrate the “complex interconnections between the materiality of state politics and the ideological production of knowledge” (Fujikane and Okamura, 2010, p. 25). For example they report that DOE data from 2005 indicate that among the 13,207 public school teachers, the largest group is the Japanese (34%), follow by Caucasian (27%), Hawaiian (10%), Filipino (6%), Chinese (5%), Korean (1%), African American (0.5%), Samoan (0.4%), Puerto Rican (0.3%), Mixed (6%), and Other (10%).

With the imposition of statehood in 1959, urban based economic reforms bring 10 years of uncontrolled urban growth despite having enacted land use laws. As Hawai‘i entered the 1970’s, public awareness grew increasingly critical of the excessive urban growth, the loss of small scale family agriculture, the high cost of living, lagging salaries, and unaffordable housing (McGregor-Alegado, 1980; Trask, 1987). Development threatened the remaining rural pockets of Hawaiian community who, for generations, had relied on ‘ohana subsistence practices as a way of life. Moreover, the broader issues of education, employment, wages, housing, legal justice, social services and the concentration of land ownership indicated severe problems the Hawaiian community faced at the beginning of the 1970’s (McGregor-Alegado, 1980; Trask, 1987). By 1972, the majority of Hawaiian wage earners received incomes that fell within the low-income level. “The annual median income for Hawaiians was $9,969 compared to $14,077 for Caucasians, $14,725 for Chinese and $13,708 for Japanese” (McGregor, 1980, p. 37). In the
category of miscellaneous type occupations, Hawaiians held higher percentages compared to professional, technical and administrative positions, and compared to the state population as a whole, the unemployment rate was also higher for Hawaiians (p. 37). Among educational indicators for that period, only 50% of the Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians over age 24 had graduated from high school and the dropout rate (according to the 1970 census) was 23% compared to the Hawai‘i average of 13% and the census also showed that only 4% of the Hawaiians had graduated from college (p. 37). Among other social indicators, she found that despite being lower than or equal to the arrest rates for the population as a whole, 49.6% of the adult inmates at the Hawai‘i State correctional system were Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian (p. 40).

Further, despite years of large scale agriculture of the previous century erasing large swaths of Hawaiian landscape, the remaining wahi pana, or significance Hawaiian places such as heiau, fishponds and village sites that had remained untouched were threatened by uncontrolled urban development. Influenced in part by similar cultural movements from the late 1960’s and early 1970’s in the U.S. and abroad, the Hawaiian movement revived cultural practices and found political voice to articulate a resistance to urban development and the outright destruction of ‘āina and their cultural landscapes. Beginning in the 1970’s, intense land struggles erupted first on O‘ahu island against unbridled urban development into the few remaining Hawaiian communities and small rural pockets (Cooper & Daws, 1990; McGregor-Alegado, 1980; Trask, 1987). Community based struggles were occurring across our islands and were many included for example, Hālawa Housing, Kalama Valley, Ota Camp, Waimanalo People’s Organization, Old Vineyard St. Residents’ Association, Waiāhole-Waikane Community Association, He‘eia Kea Residents Association, Mokauea Fisherman’s Association, Hale Mōhalu ‘Ohana, Niumalu Nawiliwili Residents and the Sand Island Residents ‘ohana (McGregor, 1980, p 41).
These land struggles catalyzed Hawaiian consciousness around the concepts of Hawaiian rights and the resurgence of Hawaiian language, cultural practices such as hula, and traditional farming methods such as lo‘i kalo and loko iʻa. The Kahoʻolawe island struggle gave life to the notions of aloha ‘āina and mālama ‘āina. At the beginning of World War II the island was taken over by the US Navy for live fire-ordinance exercises and combat training. These exercises grew in scale and intensity. For example, during the cold war period, in 1965, a one-kiloton nuclear explosion was simulated on the island when the US Navy detonated 500 tons of TNT. In January 1976 Native Hawaiians staged an occupation of Kahoʻolawe to bring national attention to the desperate conditions of Native Hawaiians (McGregor, 2007, 2010; Morales, 1984). In March 1977, George Helm and Kimo Mitchell, were mysteriously lost in the ocean off of Kahoʻolawe during a protest of the US bombing of Kahoʻolawe. The movement for which they had become martyrs grew into an island-wide movement that not only stopped the military use of the island in 1996 but also sparked the revitalization and resurgence of Hawaiian culture, music, navigation, arts, agriculture and aquaculture, McGregor comments:

The contemporary rediscovey of Kahoʻolawe as a sacred island dedicated to Kanaloa led to a revival of the traditional Hawaiian value of aloha ‘āina or love and respect for the land. Ancestral memories of the kupuna focused upon aloha ‘āina as the Hawaiian value at the core of traditional spiritual belief and custom. (p. 264)

McGregor explains that kupuna were sought out to help this younger generation understand the significance of Kahoʻolawe. They explained the levels of respect enshrined in the value of aloha ‘āina. On one level, family genealogies link contemporary Hawaiians to various
kahuna or professions such as navigation, fishing, engineers, healers, planters for example. On a second level,

a deeper level, beyond these human forebears, ancestral chants trace Hawaiian origins to such great gods as Papahānaumoku, the earth mother and birth mother of the Hawaiian islands, Wākea, sky father; Kāne, the springs and streams; Kanaloa, the ocean and Pele, the volcano. Hawaiians are the genealogical descendents of the earth, sea, sky and natural life forces. (p. 264)

The idea of mālama ʻāina teaches Native Hawaiians the kuleana or responsibility to protect the land and all its resources for one’s lifetime and for the lifetimes of future generations. Aloha ʻāina reinforces layers of responsibility to: protect the physical land and resources, organizing to have the standing in order to exert your responsibility to protect these resources, and maintaining spiritual dedication to honor and worship the gods who were spiritual life of these forces of nature (p. 264). Another significant outcome of the the movement to stop the bombing of Kahoʻolawe was the “reestablishment of the Makahiki and other Native Hawaiian cultural and religious ceremonies and practices on Kanaloa . . . ” (p. 270). These practices and ceremonies reconnected a generation of Hawaiians with their ancestors as well as reconnect the pragmatic use of ceremony, as in the case of Kahoʻolawe, which was to bring rain so plants could again repopulation the islands.

In 1982, PKO conducted what might be the first public Makahiki ceremony in honor of Akua Lono since High Chief Kekuaokalani conducted the Makahiki ceremonies before going into battle in defense of Hawaiian religion in 1819 in the year of ‘Ai Noa, or Abolition of the Kapu . . . The purpose of the ceremony was to attract the akua Lono, to
Kanaloa in the form of rain clouds to soft the earth and to ready it for young plants to revgetate the island. (p. 272)

Following the occupation of Kahoʻolawe in 1976, the 1978 Constitutional Convention resulted with the voters of Hawaiʻi ratifying amendments to the state constitution. Three key amendments continue to be significant to the resurgence of Hawaiian language and culture and re-introduce education formally back into the realm of culturally based knowledge transfer. The first amendment, Article XV, Section 4, provides that “English and Hawaiian shall be the official languages of Hawaiʻi” (Lucas, 2000, p. 15). At that time, and according to convention reports, the delegates who drafted the language wanted to “overcome certain insults of the past where speaking of Hawaiian was forbidden in the public schools system” and where, at that time, Hawaiian was listed as a foreign language at the University of Hawaiʻi (p. 15). Unlike several states of the US, Hawaiʻi maintains two official languages.

The second amendment, Article X, section 4, mandates that the state promote the study of Hawaiian culture, history and language and further, the article provides that the state shall provide for a Hawaiian education program consisting of language, culture and history in the public schools. In its deliberation at the constitutional convention, the education committee reported that the proposed constitutional amendment was a reflection of the committee’s belief that the study of Hawaiian culture, history and language “should be vigorously promoted and encouraged” (p. 15). This constitutional language opened the way for Hawaiian content to enter the existing educational system once more.

The third amendment, Article XII, section 7, provides that the State reaffirms and shall protect all rights, customarily and traditionally exercised for subsistence, cultural and religious
purposes by ahupua‘a tenants of Hawaiian ancestry subject to regulation by the State. The
convention committee on Hawaiian affairs decided that it was important to provide a provision in
the state constitution that “encompassed all rights of native Hawaiians . . .” and in affirming
those rights they felt that much needed judicial guidance would be provided and enforced by the
state courts rather than ignored through narrow interpretations as had been the case up until that
point in time (p. 17). Subsequently, the courts issued a landmark case in 1995 that created an
enforceable ahupua‘a tenant right to practice their traditions and customs under state law in their
decision in Public Access Shoreline Hawaii vs Hawaii County Planning Commission. Lucas
(2000) explains that in the case, commonly known as PASH, the courts provided specific though
not exhaustive guidelines interpreting the nature and extent of rights under Article XII, section 7.

The Supreme Court held that a practitioner must show that the right which is sought to be
exercised is reasonable, traditional and existed prior to November 25, 1892. Once a custom or
practice is established, the burden shifts to the party opposing the practice or custom to show
actual harm would result by the imposition of the practice or custom. While state officials have
authority to regulate the exercise of such rights, the court held that they do not have the
unfettered discretion to regulate the rights of ahupua‘a tenants out of existence.

Importantly, the central call that united all these Hawaiian resistance struggles was the
demand for land as the key to solving a multitude of problems faced by Hawaiians. Land was
seen as a way to perpetuate Hawaiian culture that was traditionally organized around the
cultivation of land and fishing for subsistence. Economically, a Hawaiian land base was seen as a
way of providing material resources for the Hawaiian community to grow food, make farmers
and surrounding communities self-sufficient. Politically, some viewed the land as the basis for
establishing a sovereign Hawaiian nation, this demand in essence “recognizes the specific and historic rights of Hawaiians as the native people of Hawaii” (McGregor, 1980, p. 43).

Thus, from at least one perspective, the period between the 1960’s and 1970’s represented the confluence of two significant events in Hawai‘i. The first was the establishment of Hawaii’s land use law that served among other things to implement a pro-development ideology by the Democratic Party. A recent report by the Office of Planning indicates that over the past 50 years, between 1964 to 2014, “The Urban District has experienced the greatest increase in acreage from 117,800 acres in 1964 to 203,699 acres in 2014, an increase of 73%”. While the report is quick to note that the urban district only represents approximately 4.9% of the total land use, with agriculture and conservation comprise 95% of all lands in the state (State Land Use System Review, 2015, pp. 2-4), it is important to recognize the cumulative impacts associated with urban development and further, recognize who carries the brunt of the development policy.

The second was an organized Hawaiian activist movement against the deplorable conditions of Kanaka Maoli in their own homelands by 1970. Between the years 1970 - 1990, we observe the alignment of several key events. First, Hawaiian resistance to development pressures that infringed on the lifestyles of the few remaining ‘ohana based subsistence communities as well as small scale agricultural communities in the rural areas. The enactment of key state amendments that among other things affirmed Hawaiian language as an official language of Hawai‘i, the study of Hawaiian culture, language and history through Hawaiian education programming and the protection of customary and traditional rights of ahupua’a tenants. Finally, the articulation aloha ‘āina as viable land use principles and management standards. By the close of the 20th century, a full blown Hawaiian nationalist movement was underway. Hawaiian-
focused public charter schools represent logical extension of the Hawaiian activist movement to promote a ‘āina based education as a way to transfer Hawaiian knowledge.

5.4 Resurgence: Hawaiian-Focused Public Charter Schools

Since 2000, Kanaka Maoli have utilized New Century charter schools as vehicles for intervening in a history of hegemonic schools practices perceived as disrupting pono relationships between Hawaiian people, our ancestral knowledge’s, and lands.

(Goodyear-Kaopua, 2009, p. 59)

One of the unique markers of the Hawai‘i charter school movement is the presence of Hawaiian-focused public charter schools. More than half of the charter schools in Hawai‘i, 18 out of 34, are categorized as a Hawaiian-focused school and their implementation may range from Hawaiian culture to full Hawaiian language immersion (Payne, 2014). Six of the 18 are considered immersion language schools (p. 68). Not unlike earlier kūlanakauhale configuration during the Kingdom period, Hawaiian-focused schools tend to be community and ‘ohana based, small scale and staffed by a large percentage of Kanaka Maoli teachers. About 90% of the students served by Hawaiian-focused public charter schools are of Hawaiian ancestry and approximately 62% are considered socioeconomically disadvantaged children by mainstream Hawaiʻi Department of Education (HDOE) standards. Faculty and staff at Hawaiian-focused schools generally have the latitude to implement innovative teaching methods and curricula that are grounded in Hawaiian values, culture and practices thereby setting their curriculum according to the resources that are specific to the places within the communities that the school is a part of. School maintain a small student-to-teacher ratio and methods and curriculum are oftentimes student-centered, place-based and project-based.
However, budget constraints and negotiating knowledge regimes that devalue indigenous language and cultural practice are what characterized the context of many Hawaiian-focused charter schools. Funding comes with oversight and assessment measures that do not necessarily align with Hawaiian community values whereby cultural learning falls outside state defined core areas of academic knowledge, that is, math, science, English and social studies. Schools are subject to state assessments and curriculum content standards that leave little room for defining what communities feel are important to know and do. For example, in 2011, the HDOE decided to implement a translated version of the Hawaii State Assessment (HSA) and move away from its predecessor the Hawaiian Aligned Portfolio Assessment (HAPA). The translated HSA however was criticized for not taking into account the complexities and nuances of the Hawaiian language leaving its validity in question (Fujii, 2013, pp. 38-39). The issues of Hawaiian language validity were so profound that in 2012 a large number of charter school parents exercised their option to “opt out” of standardized testing for their children. In fact, three charter schools had a disproportionate percentage of parents choosing to opt out of standardized testing.

Under Strive HI, schools that do not meet the minimum requirement of 95% participation in HSA are assessed a “low participation penalty.” When large numbers of students opt out of standardized testing, a school’s achievement index score can drop dramatically when the low participation penalty is applied. Another two charter schools protested their designation as Priority schools under Strive HI because of the low participation penalty.

While the issue of unequal funding is heard most loudly from charter schools, understanding exactly how funds are calculated is far from straightforward. Act 134, passed by the state legislature in 2013, ensures that regular HDOE and public charter schools receive the same non-facilities per pupil funding amount; stated simply, they are required to provide all
schools the same amount of operating funds. Section 123 of the act requires that “the director of finance shall ensure that non-facility per-pupil general fund amounts allocated for the department of education and charter school students are equal on an annualized fiscal year basis . . .” Yet a comparison of funding amounts indicates that HDOE schools receive more than charter schools.

On the public charter school side of the ledger, in fiscal year 2013, the non-facilities per pupil funding amount for charter schools was $6,127. In 2014-2015, charter schools received an increase in their funding allocation to $6,315. It is estimated that in the 2016-2017 fiscal year, the non-facilities per pupil amount is to increase to $6,520. Yet in 2013, the HDOE per pupil funding amount was $12,226 (DOE, Office of Fiscal Services, 2013). There are several reasons for such a large funding difference. First, charter schools receive a pro-rata share, or proportionate allocation, of state general funds only, and second, they only receive funds from four out of the seven education budget categories. Third, the regular DOE expenditures account for several charter schools costs. For example, Instruction and Related funding for special education (let’s say for counselors to offer services in a public charter school) is paid directly by the HDOE thus the public charter school will only receive the service but not the direct funding. Lastly, HDOE schools receive facilities funds and stand alone charter schools do not. Therefore, one may generally attribute the differences between the figures to solely to facilities funding alone but that is not an accurate accounting.

Because stand alone public charter schools receive no funding for the acquisition, construction, leasing or maintenance of facilities, they must divert operating funds for these purposes or seek additional funds to cover these costs. Conversion public charter schools in contrast receive maintainance support for their schools because they occupy an existing public school facility. In total, there are 256 public school campuses that occupy almost 4,000 acres of
land and 19 million square feet of building space. HDOE schools on average are about 65 years of age and cost approximately $200 million annually for repair and maintenance (Eagle, 2013). A new high school in Hawai‘i will cost approximately $150 million for the department. For example, the newly planned Kīhei High School on Maui island is estimated to cost between $70 million and $140 million depending on the cost of materials for the 77 acre project. When the net zero high school is completed it will serve grades 9 to twelve in the south Maui region and support 1,650 students and approximately 206 supporting staff and faculty (Osher, 2015). In 2013, it was estimated that statewide, charter schools spent more than $8 million, or $817 per student, on facilities operations and maintenance with the majority of that cost representing rent (Kalani, 2014). Moreover, in 2012, the Hawai‘i Educational Policy Center concluded that for the whole HDOE system, there was one departmental support staff for every 86 students, but there was one staff for 1,100 students in the charter school system.

Mainstream educators might argue that public education requires three main things; facilities, teachers and administrative support. Hawaiian-focused schools require three more components, ʻāina, community and place specific resources. However, the inclusion of ʻāina and place specific resources involve other government agencies that further compound the implementation of innovative education, an ethic that many Hawaiian culture public charter schools have come to embrace.

5.5 Epistemic Collisions: The Reality of Schools and State Conceived Space

Our school is envisioned to be, I believe a vessel of change, of progress, of restoration, of hoʻoulu lāhui. (Kumu Winchester)
What schools want to achieve and what state policy allows are symptomatic of the clash between conceived space and lived reality. “Charters were developed to be research laboratories of innovation . . .” but “more and more and more it’s putting us in the box that we were never supposed to be a part of . . .” explains one educator. For an ‘āina-based school this collision plays out on two fronts; one that is knowledge based and the other that is based on ‘āina use. The fallout from these collisions are indeed serious as one administrator indicated, “One thing goes wrong with a charter and instead of you know, addressing it, they’re so reactive and taking it to law.” As one Principal put it, the states education models “are archaic at this point” and the “infrastructure and mechanisms and ways of doing things . . . it’s a very old, big bureaucratic system that is not efficient or necessarily functioning as best they can.”

Acknowledging this historical trajectory then, for our contemporary Hawaiian-focused schools, the absence of funding parity means that scarce program funds must go toward covering the costs of facility planning, development, operations and maintenance. For example, only one school involved with this inquiry had assigned a “school site coordinator” but this individual was also a Kumu. One Executive Director explained how they must serve not only as principals but they must also develop and negotiate a knowledge terrain that spanned planning, permitting, engineering and architecture when it came to their campus development. Of the four schools involved in this inquiry, only one school managed to recruit a board member with professional planning background and there was only one other school that had a board member who was motivated to learn their county permitting system in order to shepard their campus development plan through county processes. A former director who worked for a charter school support program explained, schools “had to seek out that kind of facilities expertise and stack your board that way in order to navigate those bureaucracies.” Without those skills “you would be subject to
just feeling your way through the bureaucracy and it’s just impossible to do without knowing what you’re doing.”

What is perhaps more confounding beyond the lack of funding parity is the history surrounding the beginning of the “no facilities funding policy.” One story goes that charter school advocates agreed initially to forego facilities funding when the first charter school legislation was under consideration and subsequently passed. It was reasoned that the overall charter legislation should not be held up because the state of Hawaiʻi legislature could not resolve the facilities question. For the legislature the debate was over funding -- if authorizers continually grant charters with the promise of facilities, eventually the legislature would run out of money for bricks and mortar. Thus, the legislature would pass the charter school law and eventually get to the question of facilities funding in due time (TH, personal communication, 8/30/13). Therefore to those who recall this history, the question of facilities funding for public charter schools remains the “greatest last issue to be resolved” (TH, personal communication, 8/30/13).

There is yet another vastly different story that endures in the public memory operating today, especially in the legislature. When the charter school legislation was originally passed by the legislature, Charter school advocates at that time agreed to forego facilities in exchange for the charter school authorization (RT, personal communication, 9/17/13). Implicit in authorization was the latitude for educational innovation among other things – but that was it. Since the passage of the first charter school legislation, standalone charter schools have received only sporadic facilities funding from the legislature. Thus, as one Poʻo Kumu explained, “those funds have never been a reliable source of income” for public charter schools.
A critical observation of this paper is that ‘āina-based schools are grounded in uniquely Hawaiian epistemological ways that manifest spatially. This spatiality spans both ‘āina use and knowledge production in culturally grounded and relational ways. ‘Āina-based schools that participated in this inquiry tend to share a few spatially driven characteristics. They tend to support small scale sustainable design and operations for their campuses. Schools tend to function by way of a “non-contiguous” campus model. This means they integrate off campus sites in ways that perhaps move beyond our common understanding of a school field trip. Applied learning and cultural transfer of knowledge unfolds as a result of relationships built with their surrounding geographic communities and or their local cultural practitioner communities. Finally, schools generally access and integrate a range of natural and cultural resources into their curriculum.

State policies however are seemingly unwilling or unable to align with these needs, desires or aspirations. “It was so so hard” a former Director explained, “schools didn’t have the support to navigate the larger system of land use” it was “the permitting and all of the regulatory things [that] were the biggest challenges.” There are significant impacts incurred by not including schools, especially ‘āina-based schools in the larger enterprise of state planning. Schools are often treated as afterthoughts or generally accommodated through crisis management rather than thoughtful and deliberate planning. Crisis management plays out in conservation districts, in state and county parks, schools sited upon poor quality lands and in sometimes in less than welcoming communities. The following sections describe the ways in which the day to day rules and workings of governmental structure and process give force to what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use and in turn regulate the Hawaiian spatial presence practically out of existence.
5.5.1 Finding A Home

... the land is living and it’s a part of you, our ancestors, it was a part of them but yeah bureaucracy just made it almost impossible for charter schools to thrive. (Director)

Given the state policy concerning facilities, several schools found that once they were able to secure their charter, locating a site for the campus was one of the biggest challenges. Moreover, securing a site or a parcel did not necessarily equate to having a facility either.

“When you don’t have school facility some of those things work against you, instruction time gets eaten up . . . And you know the there’s the flies, temperature, wind, rain, trucks, mud from last night’s rain” (Former Program Director). One Kumu recalled,

We didn’t have any money for buildings or anything. We got an OHA grant for tents and they’re the tents you still see actually. And we got enough for at least to get us into something and we put up the tents, cleared everything out. Parents came did the work.

The reality for some public charter schools is that children and youth are taught in tents, in parks, in make shift classroom constructed from freight containers. Yet our educators persist in very resilient and innovative ways to open their schools. Kumu Winchester makes the insightful comment that:

What this place is now, was not what it was you know when we first arrived here. It took a lot of, a lot of work, a lot of students . . . This isn’t a campus that somebody else built.

One staff person I spoke with shared that they had to relocate four times in six years before securing a long term lease. For schools that utilize ‘āina as a fundamental part of their curriculum, and devote time to community development, the absence of land tenure called into
question their pedagogy. Our educator recalled that because they had to move so many times it “placed incredible stress on everybody in the ‘ohana.” The absence of secure land tenure made the school “kind of reluctant to dig in too deep wherever we were which was a really weird factor because you had a mālama ‘āina driven curriculum . . .” (Educator). The school administration had calculated that their commitment to mālama ‘āina translated into “several thousand hours of sweat equity” that involved the cooperation and coordination among community groups, parents, kids and then “one day they (landowner) said oh you can’t have this space.” Thus the absence of tenure forced them to question their fundamental concept of mālama ‘āina:

Well you can mālama ‘āina but it’s kind of weird . . . while we were doing it we knew that we would never be there to enjoy it. And so it changed personally, professionally, why do we mālama ‘āina? Do we mālama ‘āina so we can use what the ‘āina produces, or do we mālama ‘āina because of the reason that mālama ‘āina exists, for the joy of mālama ‘āina? And the relocating and the nomadic life that we lived really made that challenging. (Educator)

One Director recalled that once they did locate a facility for their school (after the first site fell through) it seemed as if “. . . the flood lights were on . . . and [people] weren’t looking like, wow look at this wonderful thing, it’s like, who’s that?” (Executive Director). “So going out, finding facilities was one of our biggest challenges” (Educator). One charter school found that while they didn’t have a problem recruiting students to enroll in their school, once they started looking around for facilities they couldn’t find anything:
We looked and from Pa‘auilo all the way to Kawaihae, warehouses and whatever else
and it was like we were supposed to start in August and it was July and I remember
coming up from Kawaihae and somebody said there’s an old ag experiment station at
Lalamilo. But um just to find something of the scope and breathe that we needed we just
couldn’t. And so you know we were just all pule, pule, and cry . . . (Dr. Kahakalau)

This school was able to locate an underutilized agriculture facility. And the only way
they were able to secure the facility was because the land managers “came and looked at us and
they really, and he told me that personally, they really didn’t think we could do what we said we
were gonna do.” Thus it was the underutilization of a facility that secured this school a campus
site. It was not a public ethos for public education or planning on the land owner’s part for that
matter.

The lack of planning or policy development for ‘āina-based public charter schools plays
out in ways that lean towards a one-dimensional idea of the school house versus a broader
concept of land for education. For example, the state Department of Land and Natural Resources
does not maintain educational policies for obtaining a lease for their lands but they do find
themselves involved in siting charter schools on their conservation lands. Conservation lands are
the most restrictive of land use categories in the state. It was explained that the agency
occasionally finds itself being approached to lease land to a charter school (WA, personal
communication, 8/14/14). In the past, the department may not have been compassionate towards
schools but now the agency takes a case by case approach and recognizes that the highest and
best use for their lands may not be economically based. The department will typically try to
determine the needs of the school in terms of acreage and then match those needs with their
inventory. If there is a match, and depending on where the lands are located, a school may have to navigate as many as four divisions within the DLNR alone to complete a review process in order to secure some kind of tenure on the property. The DLNR maintains a large corpus of state lands including the former Hawaiian national school lands and is in a position to site public charter schools and they have. The department admits that it can be difficult to interface with small, non-system level public schools such as charters, but developing an administrative rules procedure for all charter schools to follow may represent a way to accommodate public education through state land use in the conservation district.

Schools might also end up in places that cannot accommodate growth or even normal schools functions. Public charter schools overall in Hawai‘i are experiencing enrollment growth. Existing schools that can feasibly grow their enrollment are able to bring in more budget for operations through per pupil funding dollars. However, some schools may find themselves on parcels that cannot accommodate any feasible growth. One former Executive Director reflecting on their space needs noted how at their school they are turning away students “. . . we’re maxed out over here . . . I could have two grade ones, two kindergartens. I have so many requests for kindergarten every year that I have to turn away. I could move those kids up but I can’t” (Executive Director).

One Local School Governance Board that wanted to explore (among other things) whether or not the school should make a commitment to a long term lease for their existing property. The Board was able to explore four growth scenarios in order to weigh the opportunities, costs and benefits associated with each scenario against their schools vision, goals and community commitments. If they accepted a “no growth scenario” they would really forego their vision and goals for the schools under unacceptable existing conditions such as inadequate
temporary facilities that could not accommodate technology upgrades or their waiting list of students. A conservative growth scenario meant that the school would still have to engage in large capital campaigns in order to meet maintenance and operations of existing facilities. A medium growth scenario meant that site constraints triggered by an onerous state regulatory regime would become an increasing priority issue and the school would still have to engage in substantial capital campaigns in order to maintain and operate any campus improvements. A large growth scenario would close the gap between the cost to run the school and income but they would no longer be in compliance with their lease terms (because of too much growth). They would either have to split their campus or move to a new site.

In other instances, schools face challenges with the daily expectations of running a school. Poorly sited schools find that “It’s such a delicate balance with the neighbors there; the noise, the traffic, the safety along that road” (Makua). “To have Aha Makua, the parent meeting at night time, where even if half of the families show up, that’s 60 families; [and there’s] parking, there are no lights; it’s not safe to be up there at night time. You know if you cannot see.” Fundraising options, albeit much needed, become nearly impossible to implement “you want to bring people to see your campus, that’s like partly recruitment, that’s just sharing with your community as well as being a fundraiser” (Makua).

Schools may also be presented with lands that are not conducive to ‘āina-based teaching. While a school may be able to secure a long term lease, the condition of the ‘āina can very well turn out to be an entirely different experience. ‘Āina-based schools require lands that are workable and healthy as Kumu Atkins explained the “Availability of flat land that doesn’t have metal in it, it’s very very precious. We got 5 acres, but plenty of it is under this gravel, the concrete, the asphalt, and the classrooms or all along the stream is all metal and plastic and you
cannot grow food in that. So it would be wonderful to have healthy ‘āina close by.” Another educator observed that “I guess our ‘āina dictates the project that we do too.” Thus campus resources dictate what kinds of projects you can develop for your curriculum.

Trying to align natural resources to the curriculum while conforming to state defined standards is equally challenging for many ‘āina-based schools. Public charter schools are subject to the Hawaii Standards Assessment (HSA) and curriculum content standards which produce external pressure to improve test scores. One educator made the observation that you have to “teach to learn” versus what might be happening now which is “you teach because test scores are low . . . So we gotta get better in math because the test scores are horrible? No, because the kids not learning math.” There have to be expectations of what should be learned because you have to know certain things because if “education is our business” then “place would lend itself to that product.”

Another Kumu noted that initially their school struggled to find a permanent campus therefore they utilized “key auxiliary sites,” or off campus sites as contiguous to their main campus. Off campus sites “became a vital part of learning for the ‘ōpio” because it “afforded the opportunity to address different kinds of learning styles.” For “some kids, (they’re) book worms, open the book they’ll read it take the test, they’ll pass.” However, for other students, they have to watch first, observe, and then perform the task. Off campus sites, for this particular Kumu was “was the biggest success.” The challenge with off campus sites, however, was connecting what students were learning in the field with satisfactory performance on standardized tests that evolved mainly around the material that was conveyed in the classroom. Our educator noted how “you have a student who missed a 100 days of school while going to another public school in Hawai‘i because they just weren’t interested and ended up at [here] and fell in love with a canoe
and never missed a day of school. That was huge, huge success. Unfortunately that [didn’t] translate into the standardized stuff” (Educator).

With ‘āina based learning there is the external need to perform well according to state sanctioned assessment that affect day to day operations in the schools. One Kumu explained that there is “always a tension of time” which is to say external forces drive internal change which means less hands on time out on the ‘āina. However, what we learn from our Kumu is that change “. . . should mean that the quality of learning in the hands on time increases or is different.” What is critical is to continually work at striking a balance with the “intellect while we keep the spirit.” This is sense “academic Hawaiian cultural knowledge” as public education, needs space to continually grow and develop.

5.6 Conclusion

The challenges that Hawaiian-focused public charter schools confront are symptomatic the collisions between a lived reality and conceive space. I argue that Democratic economic reform policies crystallized a state conceived space that implemented a highest and best use policy approach to land use, that is, an urban based economic development. The adoption of the American democratic ideals that initiated claims to place by a largely Asian American populous involved the erasure of Native Hawaiians and their places. The reality of the policy directed urban pressure upon those “lived spaces” where Hawaiian families and many non-Hawaiian families managed to continue their subsistence lifestyles or rural living. The Hawaiian movement to stop the bombing of Kahoʻolawe Island by the US in 1976 became symbolic larger issues facing Hawaiʻi and Hawaiians in particular at the time. Through an elevated articulation of aloha ‘āina and mālama ‘āina, the extension of the Hawaiian movement outright challenged settler hegemony through the resurgence of its own trialectic of sorts, that is, Hawaiian language,
cultural practices and education. The Hawaiian public charter schools highlighted here formalized a uniquely Kanaka Maoli pedagogy that focused on a ‘āina-based education as the means to produce and transmit Hawaiian knowledge. The educators whose words fill these pages truly see their schools as a means of change, progress, and sites of educational innovation that is based in part on Hawaiian knowledge and cultural practice.

However, negotiating those knowledge and land use regimes exhibit the tensions that Roy (2005) describes as the way in which state power is reproduced, constructed and reconstructed in terms of what is legitimate and illegitimate. The task of finding a campus or developing facilities for Hawaiian-focused public charter schools was challenging even though there seemed to be demand. From this point of view then, the absence of planning for public charter schools that place a high use value on ‘āina, means that the schools operate in a public-private manner whereby they are private developers when it comes to campus and facilities and public entities when it comes to demonstrating achievement of state defined educational standards.

In order for the most basic facilities to be developed under this public-private model, schools must implement capital campaigns, redirect program funds or seek out public or private grants. This happens even though the facilities costs for small scaled schools are less compared to the large plant facilities that the state currently constructs. Moreover, the absence of planning and facilities support puts the onus on schools and their Boards to possess the knowledge necessary to negotiate state or county permitting or leasing regimes. We learned that even when schools were able to find suitable areas for their campuses, there was no indication of the conditions of the land itself which is a significant factor in ‘āina based education. Further, the
lack of a secure land tenure for some schools called into question the fundamental issues surrounding what it means to mālama ‘āina and or to aloha ‘āina.

In terms of practical responses to these issues I provide two moderate suggestions. First, determine the feasibility of developing rules and regulations or a master permitting structure for public charter schools to access lands that are suitable to their needs within the conservation district. Second, with the recent establishment of the Office of Hawaiian Education in the Hawai‘i Department of Education, perhaps it is time that those few remaining parcels of national Kingdom lands that were set aside in 1850 be returned for the purposes of education. At least in this way some leverage can be applied for their use from a Hawaiian educational point of view. Now that we have exposed the clash between lived and conceived space, the next chapter examines the epistemic nature of Hawaiian-focused public charter schools in order to first contextualize this ‘Ōiwi oriented pedagogy. In this way we may begin to think about what a Hawaiian contribution to indigenous planning can potentially be.
CHAPTER 6. UA AO HAWAIʻI: THE NATURE OF EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Important epistemic elements form the pedagogical foundations for Hawaiian-focused public charter schools when ʻāina is experienced as a living, animated, and revered element of education. This view of ʻāina, albeit in an educational context, departs in significant ways from dominant Euro-American notions of place and space whereby spatial compositions are “stylized after powerful, corporate economic and social interests.” Under the rubric of indigenous planning, the task of widening the epistemic lens of planning presents a worldview that recasts planning practice and process. The goal here is to transform practice and process in order to arrive at a (k)new space, a third space of sorts, that offers new interpretations beyond established and often times restraining spatial territories. Strong themes emerge from our educators that focus on the collective, on the importance of shared experience, cosmology and genealogy. These collective experiences, founded upon considerable time depth, form our ideas around physical orderliness, notions of time and space, and the significance and nature of place. Importantly, tradition and culture create the links between principles and patterns that are expressed through the built environment. In this way, the built environment does not only represent a settlement in physical space in which people live, it is an expression of identity; it is an extension of that identity it is truly composed of our lived reality, or our lived space.

This chapter offers rich detail from our educators that describe the shape and nature by which ʻāina “serves as our first teacher” in Hawaiian education (Educator). By understanding the impact of Hawaiian consciousness upon education, something as simple as morning protocol, for example, is a liberatory act that reconfigures and reorders our ideas of ʻāina in spatial ways. A closer inquiry into this critical link between liberation and spatial composition, I believe, is
where Kānaka ʻŌiwi can make their greatest contribution to the old (k)new field of indigenous planning.

6.1 Our Day Begins with Protocol

When they were learning cultural protocols and hands on and engaged . . . I saw the light come back on in their eyes. (Executive Director)

Three out of the four schools involved in this inquiry conducted a form of morning “protocol” or “ceremony” to begin their school day. Whether they referred to the beginning of their school day as “piko”, “wehe” or “wehena” -- this spatially anchored activity transcends place-making into a Hawaiian conception of time and acknowledges an individuals genealogical ties to place. As one educator explained, their morning ceremony of piko is “a place, a union of moʻokūʻauhau, [where] everyone starts their day as one.” The idea of beginning the day all together in a designated place “as one” is a highly inclusive act because students, faculty and staff are invited to recall the great deeds of their own ancestors, or the ancestors of that particular local. Others will recollect the significance or the physical make up of the places being ennunciated through the medium of chant. The act of perfect recitation in terms of place-making thus increases mana to the ancestor, to the places being recalled, to the place where the action is happening and to those uttering the words.

At our school on educator explained, “We have wehena, it’s a school wide practice. We blow the pū and everyone gathers at 8:00 o’clock in the morning and then it goes into first period, second period academics.” Wehena at this particular school involves students, faculty and staff gathering to sing, or chant and get their general school reminders or notices for their day in school. Critically, for this particular school, given its location, they are able to take great
advantage of their ambient environment. The term wehe means to open, unfasten, unfurl, unsheath (just to name a few) or can be understood as, ka wehe ‘ana, the opening as in “ka wehe ‘ana o ke alaula,” the opening pathway is the dawn” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). Their morning wehe is amplified by the sights, sounds and smells of their nearby coastal area. Their school, located in a region of relatively high rainfall, is surrounded by diverse native plants that still provide habitat for native and non-native birds. The region is a significant storied landscape and their school is nestled within these wahi pana or significant ancestral places. All of these elements, when taken in their totality, can heighten a student’s awareness of place and its spatial composition.

At another school, one educator felt that “... the neatest part of the whole experience [was] the way the day starts.” This school, located in the lower elevations of a watershed gathers together their students, faculty, staff (including any campus visitors) outdoors for their morning wehe. It was explained that “Everybody focuses through oli, there’s the usual oli that are a part of the repertoire that you know, a couple of oli that were written for the school that the kids recall the history and recalling the moʻokūʻauhau . . . nobody [is] monkeying around, everybody [is] focused” (Educator). Their students, front and center, are also responsible for sharing a manaʻo of the day as our educator explained further:

You know like what moon phase it is, what fish is good to catch today and even if they’re not feeling what they’re saying, like having that information be a part of everybody’s morning, every day was so special . . . just this sharing of ancient wisdom, you know the moon phases, the planting, the fishing and stuff with practical application.

At another school, it is the faculty who first set the tone of the coming school year by weaving a “lei piko.” Their kumu will come in a week before schools opens to students and “one
of the major activities is creating this lei piko that we all braid together”. The Kumu “wili lei” or physically braid their lei that symbolically binds their collective knowledge together and sets their intentions for that school year.

The Kumu will choose “a school building to center around” and that place will hold the lei piko to signify the start of school year. The lei is “hung at the center building and that’s where we gather” for piko. On the first day of school, with their students and staff, they cut the piko and discuss the meaning of the lei and the school. This is how one school chooses to begins their academic year. Having decided the place for piko, for the rest of the year “they [students, faculty and staff] do a morning oli, pule and then ask for permission to study”:

We do a morning oli, Ua Ao Hawai‘i, [we] do Hawai‘i Pono‘ī then the Kumu Alaka‘i does a mana’o for the day and does leads some sort of prayer and then after that the students do another oli for the waters of Kane and that’s actually the Kumu and the students, so we do that all together. After that they do the oli komo and the Kumu respond and before we officially close the piko . . . (Principal)

Ua Ao Hawai‘i, literally meaning Hawai‘i is enlightened or conscious, represents a clever play on the word ao since aʻo means to teach, training or counsel. Ao means light, day, dawn or to dawn or grow light. It also means enlightened, to regain consciousness. The coupling of ao, aʻo and piko is spatially symbolic in this instance. To the Hawaiian, piko refers to the naval cord, genital organs, and/or the crown of the head. Thus in the Hawaiian view, there are three piko, the top of the head, the center of the body (literally the naval area) and lastly, the genital area. As a spatial concept, the idea of conducting morning piko represents a physical space that transcends towards relational development. It is a space designated for ancestor-descendant relationship to
be continually nurtured over time. This notion can also be conceived of as lōkahi, or unity or accord.

However, accessing a place to conduct these activities is not easy for some schools. This difficulty is indicative of the larger epistemic collisions that ‘āina-based traditions experience when their “lived reality” extends beyond the parameters of western models of “conceived space.” To be clear, facilities are indeed important, however, the point here is that the physical plant alone does not define nor explain the totality of the educational experience for some Hawaiian schools. At least one kumu explained how being part of larger DOE complex as a school within a school offered them much needed facilities but that alone did not necessarily accommodate their cultural and linguistic needs.

We really weren’t able to fulfill the goals of the program which was to have the students be bilingual, proficient in Hawaiian and then later on in English and be proud to be able to speak Hawaiian. So both of those were compromised, both of those goals were comprised by being a smaller school within a school. (Principal)

The lack of campus autonomy and the feeling of being a “second class citizen” on a larger DOE campus interfered with their “freedom to do curriculum” and “do what they really wanted to do.” A School Governance Board member explained some the weighty process involved with deciding to move from a DOE campus (where facilities are maintained through state funds) to a become a “standalone,” that is, a campus without public funded facilities support:

I think they [the teachers] just wanted to have more freedom with the curriculum and stuff like that. Like piko was a problem. They couldn’t do piko over there [at the larger
complex school] because some of the [non-immersion] teachers would complain about
the noise. When you’re on somebody else’s campus you don’t have that kind of
autonomy. Over here [on their own campus] we do piko, we don’t have to ask. (School
Governance Board member)

Thus, if we accept that pedagogy refers to more than educational methodology and
technique, and it includes the cultural politics that form the context of the institution of
schooling, then morning protocol privileges ancestral knowledge in a way that sets the
fundamental purpose of schooling. One principal explained that the significance of a cultural
protocol was to allow students to recognize and access ancestral knowledge first through spirit
and ceremony. As Kawakami and Dudoit (2000) state, Hawaiian oral tradition transmits
knowledge, reinforces the sacredness of activity, and serves to maintain proper relations between
an individual and the world around them. What is important in this respect is the way in which
individuals are offered the chance to relate in familiar and familial ways to the world around
them. Through the words that they speak, they internalize and subsequently are able to recall and
hence reflect on their surroundings. Stated another way, they develop the skill of observation by
linking the knowledge embedded in orature (that is chant, mele and ceremony) to the location
that they are in. A Po’o Kumu explained that their daily practices such as hula, oli, and by
extension, ‘āina-based observations privileges knowledge that is ancestrally and locally relevant
and familiar first. This sets the stage for students “to see themselves in that ecosystem whether
it’s a forest of Hawai’i island or where ever . . .” (Executive Director). Something seemingly
irrelevant (yet oddly controversial) as morning wehe and piko indeed serves as an important
source of grounding in ‘āina-based education.
6.2 How Does ʻĀina Teach?

In order to understand the interplay between Hawaiian epistemology as it unfolds in an educational context we question how ʻāina teaches. This question is distinct from asking what we learn as result of ʻāina-based education. Here we analyze the qualities of ʻāina within an ʻŌiwi context to grasp how it shapes knowledge and our sense of being. In the section to follow we outline five ways that describe how ʻāina teaches. The list is surely not exhaustive nor is it meant to be. What is significant about it is that it reflects a lived reality, a lived space. What follows are the profound ideas that emerge from our educators about how ʻāina teaches: it does not discriminate; it teaches as a living medium; it instructs as a corpus of reverence; it teaches spiritual action and it teaches a methodology.

6.2.1 ʻĀina Does Not Discriminate

One of the most profound lessons about how ʻāina teaches is that “ʻāina does not discriminate.” Hawaiian scholar, Dr. Ku Kahakalau reflects on her extensive experience in Hawaiian education:

It took me awhile but okay what it is, the ʻāina does not discriminate. There is no discrimination at all if you interact with the land. That stream, if you go in there and it’s too fast, everybody, whether you’re smart, skinny, whether you’re beautiful, it doesn’t matter, ʻāina, it’s you know either the stream is too fast and everybody is gonna eat it, you fall down, everybody bleeds.

With ʻāina and her students, Kahakalau has noticed that regardless of class, race, intellect, or ability, they can get the same kind of interaction with the land if they are open to it.
Reflecting on her tenure as a high school teacher, she observed that once a student steps into a classroom that student, whether right or wrong, is subject to opinions and judgments:

And so you know for so many kids and it’s still a reality now . . . when the Hawaiian walks into the classroom there’s a different expectation then when a Kepani walks into the classroom or when a Haole walks into the classroom . . .

She has observed that when students go out on the land, “there’s an equal playing field and the ‘āina will treat everybody equal based on your contribution to the ‘āina.” For example, Dr. Kahakalau couldn’t understand how the students she taught in high school could be articulate, smart and funny in her classes but “based on their report cards they were failures.” This observation was similar to another charter school principal who commented on their early educational experience when a “very burnt out SPED teacher” arrived to their outdoor program with a class that was predominantly comprised of Hawaiian students. Our administrator recalled how the teacher would “stand there with her hands on her hips and watch the kids work and say why do you even bother with those no good for nothing lazy Hawaiians.” Importantly, indigenous frameworks about schooling present new and different ways to think about practices, purpose, and outcomes of school systems. The key to discussing indigenous epistemologies and education, as Linda Tuhiwai Smith argues, is to “speak back” by way of identifying practical problems that indigenous communities have indentified. For our administrator that demoralizing and racist experience continues to serve as inspiration and motivation throughout “the whole difficult charter school journey.”

Reflecting on the concept of aloha ‘āina, Dr. Kahakalau has come to observe how students receive positive feedback through reciprocal interaction that couples the Hawaiian value
of aloha with ‘āina. Common thinking is that aloha ‘āina means “let’s love the land” which is not a wrong idea. However, the value of aloha ‘āina is inclusive of the reciprocation. Kahakalau explained that “the more important value is the aloha ‘āina coming this way (motioning towards herself) then going that way (motioning away from herself).” In this way for “those students who need aloha, the land can give it unconditionally.” She explained that for many youth the organic structure and order of ‘āina can offer clarity, purpose and meaning to their personal lives in ways that they may not receive from their family or community. Students can get positive feedback by working the land and seeing the results of their work based on simple organic environmental processes. Students have the opportunity to experience reciprocity through their hands on work with the ‘āina – ma ka hana ka ‘ike – indeed through working one learns.

Because the land does not discriminate, connecting the child to ‘āina promoted healing, positive self-identification and self-pride. The idea of a 50/50 program that is, one week in the environment and one week in the classroom was a foundational element of Dr. Kahakalau’s charter school. “One week you do the research out in the environment and the next week you process all of that and you create . . . I’m still a 100% advocate of fifty-fifty minimally . . .” The results of this type of body-mind-soul connection for some students were “just phenomenal” as Kahakalau explained the physical transformation among some of her students who participated in an early culture based program:

Kids that was [sic] overweight, hilahila, they never like hemo their shirts because momona . . . in the beginning and in the end [of their program] they stood there in their malo with their chests out and chanted like they never chanted before. The parents was

---

4 Hawaiian language contains directional particles; mai, aku, iho, aʻe. Mai directional particle is towards the speaker, as in hele mai, come or welcome and hele aku, as in go.
crying, couldn’t recognize their kids . . . it’s been phenomenal and I’ve seen that consistently since then when we do this kind of hands on, in the environment, a relationship-based type of education.

An anticolonial approach to education posits Hawaiian knowledge as a positive concept that is proud of ancestry, history and heritage. In this way, ‘āina in this way teaches how to be pa‘a, or firm as in reaffirming, and feeling good about yourself. The same way that the ‘ōhā is pa‘a in the land, so to, do our children find affirmation and strength to grow and develop in positive ways when they huli ka lima i lalo, which means “to turn the hands downward and be productive.”

Another observation about how ‘āina teaches considers a reciprocal engagement that embodies a “childlike quality.” Kahakalau argues that this quality was vitally important in education. She explained how attentive work on the land results with “a reward because that’s what the land is, in that way of an innocent giving back.” Somehow it seems that the notion of “innocent give back” or that “childlike quality” in ‘āina-based education becomes perverted or characterized as extracurricular or play time and as a result ends up falling outside of state defined, or legitimate, core areas of academic knowledge such as math or English. However, our educators make a clear distinction between childlike qualities versus immaturity. Students who are open to ‘āina-based learning can develop real-world skills and it requires discipline and maturity for this to happen. Moreover, for others the ‘āina is a vital source from which they can practice and hone their leadership skills and capacity building. Discussed earlier as “the age of responsibility”, as a student’s development and maturation progresses, their aptitude, behavior, and characteristics are assessed. Kumu Winchester observed how his students in this way can be “respected as men and women but also as people who can get things done.”
6.2.2 ʻĀina Teaches As a Living Medium

ʻĀina is a critical pedagogical element for these schools because they recognize how it teaches as a living medium. It has an immersive quality as Kumu Kealoha observed “. . . I can actually touch things, smell them, eat them, that’s teaching right there.” She continued,

It’s a living laboratory right here. You can walk right outside. It’s okay we’re gonna go look at the noni right now you know what I mean? We’re gonna smell the laua’e and pick some right now and make hoʻokupu and we’re going to go pick our ‘auamo.

Kumu Atkins explained how ʻāina as an authentic medium can serve learning in ways that can be more apparent especially when making connections between abstract ideas and practical application. “When students are out taking care of a stream, or opening ʻauwai, learning about water quality, cooperation becomes important, aloha becomes important, mālama becomes important so ʻāina is to me the most authentic medium.” [My emphasis added.] Under these conditions the most mundane of tasks take on heightened importance because abstract ideas or values become apparent in a stream that students are dealing with, or measuring for water quality. For Kumu Atkins by applying the concept of kona to a mundane task as weeding it was explained that “we can teach ourselves how to be better people, how to interact with one another.” Therefore, authenticity can teach abstract ideas or values “best when you’re on the ʻāina” in comparison to being “in a classroom [where] you kind of have to be intentional about teaching something like that.” Another educator offered that when we think about Hawaiian education we should consider western academics and Hawaiian cultural knowledge as one in the same. Coining the term “academic Hawaiian cultural knowledge” our educator felt that “it is the
mindset that forces you to go outside that makes you understand that I cannot just learn in this building. I gotta go outside. It’s more of a mindset than a place.”

That mindset for Kumu Winchester explained how teaching outdoors was “to be surrounded by history.” It further emphasized how equally important it was for “our kids to build their story also.” By working the land, or having the mindset to work the land, “brings new relevance to the term makaʻāinana. You put kānaka on the land [and] see what can happen.” Importantly, for many of the schools involved in this inquiry, the physical transformation of the land to what eventually became their campus was “. . . sort of indicative of that pulling out of all that invasive stuff and planting the native stuff; it’s indicative of a school.” To see ‘āina as authentic and living reflected the “physical manifestation of decolonization . . .” and understanding that we are “trying to plant something for the future.” Critically, our educator felt that the “physical plane carriers over to what I think our school is about, which is the mind, the body, and spirit because we’re all connected, the things that we learn in the class or outdoors is all connected to how we feel.”

Reflecting on the mind, body and spirit connection, one mākua explained their decision to send their child to a Hawaiian culture public charter school. Our makua felt that the experience has been “transformative” for their child. The school they chose promoted project-based learning through being on ‘āina and teaching by way of a distinctly Hawaiian technique. Our ‘ohana felt that they needed to do something different for their child because of a diagnosis that evolved around the nature of their child’s learning ability. At their child’s previous school, the classroom structure our makua remarked seemed to reinforce the degree to which their child did not fit in. In this way, acquiring conventional knowledge produces an ethic, a particular code of conduct that, as Dei explained, “scripts the lived experiences” of indigenous learners as
learning disabled. “It was just hard” our makua explained, their child started to get “disrespectful”, “moped around” and was generally “unhappy.”

Importantly, the public charter school they eventually sent their child to, in contrast, emphasized an ʻāina-based learning environment in which a haumana was judged on their strengths and their abilities too. Our makua felt that, for instance, the oli that the students learned and the way that it was taught by hoʻopili mai, or the kumu says it and you repeat, for their child it emphasized a style of learning that was oral based and played to their child’s strength. “And so [their child] feels good.” They also noticed how their child figured out that “If I can do this I can do other things.” Our makua recalled how “all of a sudden it mattered that [their child] passed the HSA [Hawaii Standards Assessment], it mattered that [their child] did the homework. [Their child] started to take responsibility for [their own] learning. To me that’s the most that a parent could ask, right?” Our Makua explained that their child’s personal development of self-esteem and confidence reinforced their ʻōpio to take responsibility for their own learning. The schools philosophy, the kumu and the nature of the ʻāina based projects in this instance fit well with their child’s strengths.

6.2.3 ʻĀina Teaches as a Means of Service

Emphasizing the value of building close relationships with their communities was a prominent principle held by all the schools involved in this inquiry. On the one hand, it was important that students first establish a relationship with ʻāina. This was considered significant because a relationship-based education teaches students “how to work together, [and] the ʻāina definitely does do that for sure.” Furthermore, that relationship extended beyond their own schools. It was clearly articulated that these schools held a kuleana to be active and of service in their communities. It was explained that ʻāina teaches students to “know how to work at a place”
(Executive Director). One school has a motto of sorts that underscores the value to “mālama i kou kuleana” or care for your responsibilities. Closely linked to this ethic is the idea that students have a kuleana, or responsibility, to themselves but also, they have a kuleana to enter communities in ways that are reciprocal. They can go into a community to learn but in the course of learning they need to be of service too. One school for example, utilized their curriculum as a way to cultivate aloha for their moku thus in turn nurturing the desire to care:

One of those things of the curriculum is the idea that you cannot foster that love, and desire to take care of a place unless you’ve been there and worked it. (Principal)

All of the schools included in this inquiry offered kōkua to their surrounding communities or to a specific cultural practitioner community. One school administrator explained that they relied on their kumu to establish and maintain close community relationships over time. This approach, beyond showing commitment to community and place, offered consistency with their schools project base from one school year to the next. One principal explained that this is relationship is for the long term, “so it’s not that we going and Uncle needs help, and we help him do it” and then it’s “okay Uncle, the school year pau, a hui hou and we never see them again.” The only thing that does change, are the students as they advance through their grade levels. In this way, the projects remain, the teachers remain, the children might be different, but “the relationship stays there, we kōkua” (Educator).

The principle of kōkua supported and fulfilled a community’s respective vision of place. By working side by side with community members students begin to learn how to utilize and care for that areas ‘āina’s resources. One school has their keiki learn particular skills on their campus such as learning to thatch a small scale hale pili or practicing dry stack rock construction
(uhau humu pohaku) before going out in to the community. It was explained by the poʻo kumu that the idea of this curriculum was that, “you learn about that moku, you work with the people in that moku and kōkua.” The point is to become engaged with community and get involved. Therefore students come to “Know [the] community of practitioners” and in the process learn a practice and care for places so that they can assume some sense of responsibility eventually. One of the hopes expressed by another kumu discussed their schools strengths and how a students learning experience begins to make sense and becomes more relevant over time and with personal maturity. This maturity and sense of responsibility is in part owed to the role of community in Hawaiian education:

. . . by the physical act of doing that I think as they get older . . . and I’m a big believer in maturity . . . but I hope it becomes relevant. At least the physical work to the, let’s say academic work, to the protocols and the cultural aspects of what our school is strong in I believe. It think that’s our strength. It’s protocol, its culture. I think that is what’s strong about other schools as well. (Educator)

In this context, the community is the site of applied learning where students can be exposed to a wide variety of projects that reflect the aspirations or needs of that particular community. The ethic of community service and working the land means knowing how to enter and work in community and much of that training comes from these schools. Many schools have conducted activities such as water quality testing, crab studies, fish counts, monitoring and observing aquatic life cycles and patterns of endemic aquatic species and reforestation activities. Kumu Kealoha explained how they were able to conduct a range of community based work:
We also do forest inventory. So going out and doing transect lines in the forests and doing species counts within a certain plot, there’s a transect line and there’s plots along that transect line, and doing inventory of the plants and then taking that information and putting it into excel and species counts and percentages of native versus non-native species and stuff and then just species presence, plants and stuff.

One Executive Director explained how on a trip they realized that other Pacific Islanders were actively reawakening their past cultural practices so “We said let’s have a niu festival, that’s perfect for us.” They understood that their community has “the mo’olelo and these trees and we brought it up to the [charter school] board . . .” Another board member added how “ʻulu [was] more specific to their location and we said perfect”. Thus, their community sponsored a festival in conjunction with several other community partners. It was estimated that about 1,000 people attended the event. In turn, their students developed and conducted the survey work to verify and or validate the persistence of those culturally significant fruits in their community. Our educator explained:

Some of the 8th graders for the first time did a survey. So we didn’t do a hands on project, but what we did was . . . create, take and send home and collect a survey on ʻulu and niu use in our community. So, we had a large number of questions. We learned a lot technically on how you handle all this data. And so we asked questions a few demographic questions . . . do you eat ʻulu, do you eat niu, what preparations do you use with a list of check offs. What other uses do you use for each of them?

Community partnerships were about perpetuating cultural practices of their region or ahupua’a or conversely play a role in the reawakening of a past practice. In this case, that reawakening
happened because the school’s leadership looked to and made relevant connections with another Oceanic community’s model.

However, aligning these sorts of community engagement and or service with curriculum and doing so in ways that meet state assessment standards are a continual challenge for Hawaiian-focused charter schools. Kumu Winchester explained the significance of opening lo‘i kalo in the area of teaching:

We try to design things around agriculture . . . planting styles, how to balance water . . . There’s all those small little things that you’re not going to find on the state standardized tests but it’s about problem solving, figure it out.

For Kumu Winchester “getting [students] into the lo‘i [is] not just for the novelty of a Hawaiian school getting into the lo‘i,” it was about letting students who may not otherwise “shine inside the classroom” assume leadership roles by being in the lo‘i. The lo‘i kalo was a space in which a student could “feel a sense of value and worth at school.”

Kalo as the older sibling in the Hawaiian worldview reinforces a relationship-based education. What these stories convey in essence are the elements of long term relationships, community engagement, valuing cultural or locally based knowledge and knowing how to enter a community with the intention of kuleana. The relationship development within this context transcends several dimensions whether it be the student, the school, the ‘ohana or a particular community involved with the school or the community in which the schools is embedded. Moreover, this pedagogy produces graduates who “‘ike ʻāina and have an intimate relationship with ʻāina” (Educator). One kumu made the insightful observation that their school is re-teaching youth how to be interdependent versus being independent or individualistic. To our kumu, it was
that “we are teaching you to be interdependent in order to be independent as a lāhui.” As another kumu explained, Hawaiian charters were seen as a vehicle; a chance to create something but it was not necessarily seen as a final answer. It was a chance to address the “incompatibility further than those governing the current system” and “whose vision or lens we really are forced to operate through” (Educator).

6.2.4 ʻĀina as a Corpus of Reverence and Spiritual Action

The moʻolelo of Hāloa instructs us on the responsibility of younger sibling to care for the elder. It is the godly presence of the elder sibling that introduces us to the concept of reverence in ʻāina-based education. Kumu Kealoha explains that “there’s a reason why we’re learning this kind of stuff, [it’s] to give reverence to the place or to the activity that were going to be doing outside.” An executive director explained that ʻāina affirms relationship and responsibility to land through daily practice within an educational context: “We’re always chanting, every morning we’re chanting our genealogy and our direct relationship and responsibilities to the land, to Hawaiʻi and reaffirming it.” In this respect we can observe how reverence, coupled with cultural practice and academic application from a uniquely Hawaiian worldview involves mālama ʻāina.

Kumu Atkins linked mālama ʻāina activities to the goal of systemic change. The “First day this year we’re gonna go up mauka where we have a little mala where we’re taking care of kalo up there.” It was explained that the value of this work is “so they [students] learn the whole process from the beginning of the year to the end. They see every step of the process of just growing your own kalo” and if a student has space in their yard “they go home with huli.” The importance of students taking home huli was conveyed as an element of systemic change. By taking home kalo to mālama, students make the ancestral connections they have with their older
sibling Hāloa. In this ways students “. . . start to view their yard as ‘āina as opposed to simply a yard.” There is a difference between the idea of yard versus ‘āina. Importantly, the lesson is for students to “. . . see what ‘āina can be, how we treat it now and how we could be treating it.”

The connections between genealogy, fostering relationship and responsibility are the fundamental recurring elements among our schools. By influencing their respective pedagogy and curriculum, we can observe what Dei calls “spiritual action.” One po’o kumu explained that we learn to view life through deeper, culturally grounded dimensions and cycles:

‘Āina is the best teacher about relationships, and competition, and struggle, and rebirth . . . [We can] Interpret struggle whether it’s Namakaokahai and Pele, you know. You could interpret struggle with you know, native Hawaiian out plantings that are trying to survive in a weedy landscape or noxious environment.

Another kumu relayed this story about how their students applied their ‘āina experiences to a larger community action. One school participated in an environmentally conscious film festival that watched films from throughout the world. There were valuable connections that students made between their own ‘āina-based work and with people as far away as Ecuador and India who were also working on their respective lands. What was critical, it was explained, was that students found common understanding around “the exact same problems” between themselves and with people from other countries. Students in this way realized the global context of their ‘āina-based work. Students, in this particular case, were able to identify energy, food and water as three common themes they shared globally. Our Kumu’s students then “wrote testimonies to deliver to the BLNR and other state entities”: 
. . . they had their testimony ready and they read it at the film festival audience and it was pretty moving. The comments from the audience were that the students clearly knew ʻāina . . . It’s not like we learned in class that telescopes are bad for the water table, it’s more like no, we pulled trash out of our stream and we know exactly what happens when we’re irresponsible with our places. It was a week after school got out and still two-thirds of the class showed up for nothing, no credit no nothing. They just wanted to hōʻiʻike.

An action-oriented spirituality allows young learners to participate in their own process of identification and come to terms with the politics involved in that understanding (Dei, 2012). Our kumu concluded that “We want them to be aware, and this is the Hawaiian way to do it, and they are respectful of each other, of the land, and the environment. We have to mahalo for whatever we have.” The idea of being thankful is indeed a deeply held value for many cultures across the globe. Critically, however, one kumu made the insightful observation that:

Yeah, it’s a fine line the charter schools walk between being thankful for what we do have and demanding more or demanding equal treatment. I think that’s where we get taken advantage of. It’s like oh these people are happy with what they have and it’s like no, that’s a cultural value. It’s not license to discriminate funding and facilities, capital funding. That’s just the cultural value.

Thus, there is a fine line between being thankful as in a cultural value and the interpretation of “being thankful” as giving license to discriminate.

6.2.5 ʻĀina Teaches a Method of Kupuna Lensing

From his Maori homeland Edwards (2013) offers us the concept of “ancestor lensing” (p. 20) as a framework that grounds and reframes questioning and analysis from the Maori
worldview. Instead of asking questions from purely economic points of view for example, we are able to apply ancestral knowledge, or an ancestral lens, to our contemporary situations through a method of questioning, seeking solutions or reinforcing what works. Dr. Kahakalau utilized the ancestral idea of “kūkulu kumuhana” when they launched their summer program in Waipi‘o valley on Hawai‘i island as a form of ancestral lensing:

So as soon as we moved up to the big island we were doing some kūkulu kumuhana, the pooling of strengths, spiritual, physical, mental, intellectual for a common purpose which was basically to find out how our kupuna learned and is that way still working today . . .

As far as she was concerned they found an old (k)new way to model learning. “It was an ancient way and that ancient way was extremely modern” she discovered. It was a “juxtaposition of traditional and modern, ancient and contemporary . . . was really awesome.” Learning from experience, it was observed that systemic change drew on an old (k)new way to learn. Kumu Atkins gives us detailed insight into modeling old (k)new knowledge in contemporary settings:

I just heard a quote, you cannot love something unless you know it. If we don’t know the names of the places, then how do we know what those places are good for, famous for, why are they worth protecting or cultivating? So I do put a lot of emphasis on names and making sure people understand where they are and in reference to what.

The concept of kupuna lensing is important to widening our methodological approach by asking what a place is good for? What a place was known for? Who was a place known for, what god or chief? What are the various place names? Where are these places and in reference to what else? One kumu gives an example of how ‘āina and our making connections between ‘ike
kupuna, or ancestral knowledge teaches as a methodological framework and how that knowledge base can indicate how we treat land:

I want to know the wind and rain names, and I want to know what aliʻi ruled, had rulership, or how it changed hands and what the people did. What was their economic basis . . . like Kualoa, was this a place of the aliʻi? What kind of mana are you dealing with? Who is around? That kind of dictates how we treat it.

Place names, stories give an intimate awareness and alert us to our own potential impact upon place and space. We are already given instructions of how to treat a place from our ancestors and we continually train ourselves to discover these meanings. “ʻĀina in its true sense, its place names, stories, its songs; it’s an awareness of the world around you and it’s an awareness of your impact on the world around you” (Program Director). Kupuna lensing represents the distinction between economically based problem solving or question framing versus a genealogical or moʻolelo sourced system of knowledge, and their attendant questions and problem solving methods.

6.3 Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the epistemic underpinnings of schools by questioning how ʻāina teaches. We learn from our educators that: (a) the ʻāina does not discriminate and shapes a reciprocal relationship, (b) ʻāina teaches as a living, authentic medium, (c) ʻāina instructs as a corpus of reverence, (d) ʻāina teaches by way of spiritual action and (e) ʻāina teaches a method of ancestral “lensing”. Given these broad, or higher order lessons, I question, what does knowing how the ʻāina teaches have to do with indigenous planning? I believe that based on what we have learned in the last two chapters, a second order or a pragmatic set of lessons can be gleaned from
our educators. They include: (a) knowing how to enter and work with/in community; (b) possessing skills to grasp the value of Hawaiian knowledge and apply it to planning contexts; (c) informing planning solutions based on Oceanic models and not solely relying continental scaled models; and (d) advance a planning training that uses Hawaiian sourced materials such as land commission awards or Hawaiian language newspapers. Given these lessons, we turn our attention to conceptualizing a Kanaka ʻŌiwi planning framework.
CHAPTER 7.  A KANAKA ʻŌIWI CONTRIBUTION TO THE OLD (K)NEW PRACTICE OF INDIGENOUS PLANNING

There is very little planning literature that focuses on indigenous planning. By bringing Hawaiian-focused education into view with land, I argue that we can examine larger systems of spatial power and how they determine what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use. I propose that an ʻāina-based pedagogy produces and transmits Hawaiian knowledge. However, the dominance of positivist planning, observed through land use rules and regulations, interrupts this vital process. A historical explanation of land use and education, in part, explains the nature of these epistemic collisions over land and their uses in Hawaiʻi today. I highlight through interviews with educators and schools administrators how they understand ʻāina as a living, animated and revered element in their pedagogy. This view departs in significant ways from dominant economistic driven land use. By adding education back into planning conversations, we are able to sharpen our focus on spatial liberation by questioning the complex political and cultural issues involved with: knowledge (who has it and who doesn’t), power and how it is used (that is, spatial technologies and the power that planners wield), process (how certain processes exclude certain people), land and property rights (the incommensurability of western and indigenous ways of thinking about these).

This concluding chapter utilizes the idea of moʻo, which among other things, means succession or series (as in a genealogical line, lineage) and hoʻomoʻoʻo, to follow a course or continue a procedure. As an epistemic approach, we are concerned with how policies are derived and expressed. I use the idea of moʻo as a way to ask how Hawaiian knowledge has been applied to the planning context as a matter of practice. Our succession of stories, essentially our history, has been built up over a period of considerable time depth. Acknowledging our own sense of
Oceanic time depth and recognizing their spatial implications requires us to draw from a much wider knowledge base in the process of planning. Another critical question evaluates how has that ancestral knowledge faired in the contemporary context? Thus, a Kanaka Maoli contribution to indigenous planning engages in a transformative practice that utilizes our knowledge and is attentive to the processes by which it is used.

Therefore, this research has led me to two lines of thought that are presented in this section. One is conceptual and the other is practical. Conceptually, I argue that a relationship-based practice looks towards genealogical connections to land as a way of knowing and applies methods that are based on the utility of that knowledge. Until planners are able to detect the utility of the knowledge presented they will be challenged to apply it towards land use policy and development. In practical terms, I offer two suggestions that address public charter schools specifically. Future research should extend this conceptual framework through a longitudinal examination of planning documents to examine various ways that this Kanaka ʻŌiwi knowledge has been applied and trace its influence on land use policies.

7.1 Findings and Recommendations

During the Kānaka ʻŌiwi wale period, the educational mileu into which children were born was reliant upon the role of the ʻohana who settled in an ahupuaʻa within their respective kūlanakauhale. The process of learning was linked to this basic settlement pattern. The land, and a child’s relationship to it, was vital to producing knowledge that was not only necessary to daily living but also vital to the subsequent transmission of those lessons to the next generation. Immersion into the surrounding environment and knowledge of the ecology nurtured an individuals physical, spiritual, and cognitive needs. Immersion led to constant learning, management and negotiation their surrounding environment. Therefore, a child’s relationship to
the land was not severed in the course of learning. The schools highlighted in this inquiry are trying to re-establish this ʻāina-based relationship. That relationship relies on the immersive qualities of their surrounding community and the larger ambient (and healthy) environment in order to cultivate the whole child thereby producing relevant knowledge and a means for its transmission.

The discussion of the Hawaiian Kingdom period analyzes the legal, political and administrative trajectories that explain education in Hawaiʻi today. When Kuhina Nui Kaʻahumanu first enunciated the edict that all people shall acquire palapala in 1823, operationalizing it relied upon, as we well know, the missionaries. What is often glossed over however is a functioning Kanaka ʻŌiwi social system that operationalized the proclamation. Further, Davida Malo, in his capacity as the first School Superintendent, took a decentralized approach to implement a national policy of universal education. During this time, the characteristics of the most common schools in the 19th century were that they enrolled students of Hawaiian descent, were taught largely by Hawaiian teachers in the medium of Hawaiian language. Today, many Hawaiian-focused public charter schools mirror some of these very characteristics. Moreover, the schools involved in this inquiry have enduring relationships with knowledgeable Hawaiian cultural practitioners or community leaders who were willing to share their knowledge with students because they manage loko iʻa, loʻi kalo or have skills in hale pili construction. With the preservation of some practices and resurgence of others, and even if it is at a small scale, the fact that these cultural places are alive and operating through familiar social systems is indeed something to be celebrated.

In 1850, a category of national Hawaiian lands, known as school lands, were set aside. By making grants available for sale, these lands provided a source of funding for building
schools, facility maintainance, and teacher salaries. By the mid-century however, the struggle for political hegemony intensified and played out until the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893. Education, as Aliʻi Kekūanāoʻa understood, bound the Hawaiian national identity. By 1884 however students of English were the majority of the total student population; a student population in which 81% were either pure or part Hawaiian. The Republic of Hawaiʻi in 1896, significantly reorganized education and in that same year published the law that is often considered the “ban” on the Hawaiian language. Hawaiian language was not addressed again in Hawaiʻi until a constitutional convention in 1978.

What is relevant for Hawaiian education today are those Hawaiian national school lands that set aside one-twentieth of all lands belonging to the Kingdom for educational purposes. While several school land grants exist until today (they are managed by the DLNR), they seem to be removed from their education purposes since they are available for lease by anyone for any purpose. While it seems fair to argue that any charter school can lease these lands, the reality of no facilities or planning funding coupled with the costs and time involved with securing a lease makes this proposition less likely. However, the recent establishment of the Office of Hawaiian Education (OHE) in the HDOE seems like a good home for these lands to be returned to for use by Hawaiian schools. The Office would have additional leverage to either lease, license, or perhaps provide rights of entry for use of the property according to their own needs and discretion in much the same way the lands were originally intended.

Between the years of 1900 – 1959, the task of Americanization was the main thrust of educational policy. Educational alignment with US curriculum paralleled the political and economic shifts that were occurring locally in Hawaiʻi. The ascent of the Democrats into power ushered in a land use plan that was designed to respond to urban sprawl while simultaneously
implementing an urban economic policy and while preserving prime agricultural lands. The land use regime either wittingly or unwittingly (to be polite) gave little consideration to the people on the land, or rather, to those whose lifestyles were still based on family scaled agriculture or Hawaiian subsistence practices. Conscious political resistance to the outright destruction of land and the few physical remnants of Hawaiian cultural patrimony gave articulation to aloha ‘āina and mālama ‘āina that in time would deeply influence the resurgence of Hawaiian education.

The emergence of the charter school movement in the 1980’s – 1990’s in Hawai‘i took shape with some schools identifying as Hawaiian-focused schools or Hawaiian language immersion schools. The HDOE is required by law to ensure that regular DOE schools and public charters receive the same non-facilities per pupil funding. Accounting for public charter school funding and regular DOE schools leaves the impression that the fiscal inequalities that do exist are solely accounted for by the absence of facilities funding but this is not quite the case. While it is true that public charter schools have received some facilities funding over time, these funds have not been a consistent or a reliable funding source. Public charter schools operate under a public-private model whereby they are public entities that must conform to state defined educational achievement standards and operate as private entities when it comes to campus development. From this point of view we come to terms with what constitutes legitimate knowledge and legitimate land use.

We learn from our educators just how challenging it was “finding a home” for their schools. Public charter schools must mount capital campaigns to fund campus development and maintenance. They generally may not possess the technical expertise, or be able to afford to hire the expertise, to navigate the maze of state and county permitting processes. Some schools may end up in areas where the land itself is may or may not be suitable for ‘āina-based education.
Moreover, the absence of land tenure as we learned can fundamental challenge a schools philosophy of why you aloha ʻāina or mālama ʻāina in the first place. I do not know of any other school that has to question their fundamental philosophies and values in this way.

A second recommendation suggests the establishment of rules and regulations or a permitting structure for public charter schools to access conservation lands. I restrict the conversation to conservation lands because these lands fall under the state DLNR who exercises authority over all conservation lands in the state. To address lands in other land use zones would require broad agreements across state and county jurisdictions—an examination beyond the scope of this current research. The establishment of rules and regulations for charter schools who may seek leases on conservation land (for example) can bring procedural clarity to an expensive and convoluted land use system.

This approach would be similar to the master permits for Hawaiian fish ponds. Under this model there is a statewide programmatic general permit and programmatic agreement that facilitates the restoration, repair, maintenance and reconstruction of traditional Hawaiian fishpond systems across Hawaiʻi (Honua Consulting, 2013). The program facilitates a discretionary streamlined and simplified permitting process in order to receive necessary approvals to undertake the repair, reconstruction and maintenance of traditional Hawaiian fishpond systems. The process provides fishpond owners and operators the option to obtain the necessary federal and state approvals by submitting a single application to the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Office of Coastal and Conservation Lands (OCCL). The application is reviewed by an advisory panel of representatives from federal and state agencies. Therefore, at a minimum, under a unified and agreed on process aimed at permitting, conservation land use could be designed to address Hawaiian education. A pedagogy aimed at
addressing cultural, environmental, and ecological innovation requires local culture being the foundation for learning. For some educators the redefinition of space, place and facilities requires greater thought and integration between those pedagogical elements and conservation lands may fulfill those needs.

I have used ‘āina-based education an entry point to question the “take it for granted” attitude towards planning. We have learned several profound lessons from our educators about the nature and significance of ‘āina. The ‘āina does not discriminate. Reciprocation and self-actualization characterize the degree to which an individual can receive positive feedback from the land based on their own contribution to it. This is a very different operating philosophy compared to the American ideal that seems to view education in and of itself as the great equalizer. If we agree that ‘āina functions as a social equalizer, then we can comprehend how it can serve as an indice of spatial justice. Conceptually, this view departs from an economic point of view in which land is a means to personal financial or corporate wealth. The transformative opportunity that we glean from our schools is that aloha with ‘āina or, aloha ‘āina, redefines or at least widens the ethics around what constitutes land use.

Personal affirmation happens when schools conduct certain activities on ‘āina. That affirmation relies on a genealogical link to a vast range of places and wahi pana. Relational affirmation relies on the recollection of Hawaiian deities or perhaps ancestors. It provides a means to venerate our animated environment. By framing relationship to place we nurture and cultivate one’s ability to connect with these places on a spiritual and cultural level. By observing reverence, we are reminded about our collective responsibilities to ‘āina -- that which feeds us. An anticolonial approach to education positions indigenous knowledge in the positive so as to be proud of ancestry, history and heritage as well as be aware of your own historical situation (Dei,
Knowing your historical situation connects identity with politics in ways that can influence action. The challenge to indigenous planning is to promote relationships that do not sever our cultural connections through settlement patterns.

We identified how ‘āina teaches as a living medium. Not unlike the ways in which children were taught during the Kānaka Maoli wale period, ‘āina has an immersive quality that “is like a living laboratory.” Indigenous epistemology can lend itself to new kinds of educational experiences, outcomes and does so in a way that “speaks back” to the practical problems that Indigenous communities have identified (Smith, 2005). We learn from our educators that there is a “mindset” that applies an academic method and cultural practice, or an “academic cultural knowledge” as one educator termed it. To conceive of the land as a living medium makes apparent how work on the land is directly related to improving poor overall environmental quality. Thus, understanding an areas sacred nature makes apparent the need for conservation or a its scaled use. In this way, abstract notions such as aloha, mālama or kuleana take on practical meaning by virtue of practices within a place.

Knowing where you come from develops self-identity. One Executive Director explained the importance of learning about their island home, “when you know where you are from you are pa’a with who you are . . .” From this perspective the importance of ceremonial space deepens the vast array of lessons that we are priviledged to learn. Moreover, schools that value community participation provide opportunities for their haumāna to learn how “to work at a place” and serving a long term goal of how to become members of a community. They develop their community identity through the idea of “kōkua aku, kōkua mai.” Cultivating (enduring) relationships with families and individuals who carry on certain traditions and custom is vital to
the transmission of cultural knowledge and their accompanying practices. It also implies the access to the natural resources needed for those practices to endure over time.

The useful concept of ancestor lensing and kūkulu kumuhana reminds us how a genealogical system of knowing can redefine methodology. Kupuna lensing allows much needed space to redefine questions or reframe issues in ways that that align and resonate along Kanaka Maoli epistemic lines. In this way, it challenges the Eurocentric notions of place and their physical constitution (McGaw et al., 2011). This in turn can influence a new ethic of place making and shifts our understanding of how places come into existence therefore achieving a degree of spatial justice.

7.2 Conceptualizing a Kanaka ʻŌiwi Planning Framework

He moʻolelo a he moʻokūʻauhau kō ka ʻāina a me ke kanaka. Places have stories and genealogies just like people do. (Saffery, in press)

Ultimately, I return to my original inquiry, are Hawaiians doing planning as someone else, or are we doing conscious planning while being influenced unconsciously by our kupuna, their mana, ʻōlelo makuahine, wahi pana, moʻolelo, ʻāina and so forth? I offer that a Kanaka ʻŌiwi planning framework relies on a genealogy of knowing and a utility of knowledge. Reclaiming the space to interpret what we are observing and experiencing relies on our aptitude to “re-member, re-position, and re-think elements” of Hawaiian knowledge that are founded on an ethical attitude of aloha ʻāina (Edwards, 2013).

A genealogy of knowing allows relationship to place to be nurtured and brought back into our consciousness in ways that may not produce profit but rather respects a conserver-cognizant design. We can do this from the perspective of the future, or ka wā ma hope. In this way, we
make decisions based on past knowledge in order to provide all future generations opportunities to enjoy Hawaiian evolution in place. We look to our values to inform how we can move along this relational path. Thus in this inquiry our educators annunciated several values that can inform a relational planning practice:

- Aloha, unbound, all encompassing, just and equitable.
- Aloha ʻāina, reciprocal, give aloha in order to be open to receive it.
- Kuleana, to serve, be responsible, ethical and moral.
- Mālama ʻāina, you aloha or care for a place, you belong to a place (rather than a place belonging to you).
- Pilina, nurturing relationship rather than severing relationship.

Second, a genealogy of knowing through its utility critically examines the path the planner takes in order to arrive at a set of alternatives. The utility of knowledge involves acknowledging how question framing and analysis shape practice and how the outcomes shape and inform our built environment. It affords planners a “methodological space” of sorts to kupuna lens our contemporary land use issues and offer a means of critique and create greater shared contexts. Passively applied, a genealogy of knowing tells Kānaka Maoli how we are portrayed in plans, that is, distinguishing between portrayals of Hawaiian culture (sans people) in need of preservation or a dynamic living people who’s knowledge is sourced as legitimate and of utility. Applied with agency, ‘ike kupuna is brought to bear on critiques, analysis, decision making and policy setting.

Hawaiian place making means that our material culture and beliefs are important to our cultural identity of place because of their form giving elements. Tradition and culture create links between principles and patterns that are expressed through organic or built form (Samadhi,
Hawaiian place making is an organizing principle based on Kanaka Maoli epistemic foundations. The significance of place and its use in this respect is in part derived from the long term occupation and spatial creation by kupuna over time. Drawing from this inquiry then, the emphasis that schools place on tradition and culture create organizing principles that struggle to emerge as patterns that successfully link ‘ike kupuna to ‘āina from an educational context. Those principles and patterns create relational bonds between student and ‘āina, student and ‘ike kupuna, and community and students. In this way we are unconsciously influenced by our kupuna.

Students working in specific, localized places alongside knowledgeable Hawaiian practitioners or ‘ohana, together, use ‘āina and its bounty to transfer community based principles to traditional land use patterns. ‘Āina in this respect provides a longer sense of time thus there is the opportunity to develop policies based on land uses that rely on long term relationship rather than short term profit. If we learn to pick up these intercultural cues, or at least expand our views to include them, we can celebrate the diversity of people’s perceptions of place, space and time. Therefore, the lessons from our educators about how ‘āina teaches are the fundamental building blocks that nurture Hawaiians to ‘āina in relational ways. Thus, the more clearly we see ourselves and our ancestors in the built and natural environment the more successful those principles and patterns are.

The Kanaka Maoli contribution to indigenous planning when applied with agency explains whose spatial story is being told. Is Hawaiian knowledge a nice albeit useless story with little impact on decision making or does our way of knowing register on decision making scales? By kupuna lensing, we are able to discern the degree to which Hawaiian knowledge has been utilized (or not) in the course of observing and interpreting the spatial story. In this way, the use
of Hawaiian knowledge or discovering its utility in planning, grounds questions and gives analytic shape to take action or to make decisions. That utility has been accumulated over time and it continually shapes our identity in the 21st century, including, what we think prosperity and wealth means. This is important because the methodology itself redefines physical land use and development. Integrating a genealogy of knowing reorients questions, as we learned from our educators, by asking for instance:

- What was a place good for?
- Who is a place known for?
- How has a place been used before?
- What are the place names, the names of the wind, rain?
- Where are places and in reference to?

The real challenge for indigenous planning thus is relating these and other questions to developmental scales. How can we source our own knowledge to construct policies that directly relate people to a living and dynamic landscape through policy design? Part of that challenge can be met if we carefully consider what Matunga (2013) articulates. As a tradition, indigenous planning must position its own history to “better understand its contemporary shape with its own form and focus and as a planning approach with its own sets of methodologies” (p. 6). I propose that an approach to indigenous planning inquiry must: (a) examine the process of engagement, (b) develop the skills necessary to grasp the utility of accumulated traditional knowledge and apply it, (c) utilize Oceanic models to inform planning and design solutions; and (d) reposition planning training to access Hawaiian sourced materials to link older sources to contemporary spatial solutions.
If ʻike kupuna is not brought to bear on land use, you cannot expect relationships between principles such as aloha ʻāina and their patterns of land use. In the absence of Hawaiian form giving elements, the built environment, or the accumulation of structure(s) that occupy a space, take on foreign proportions. If our knowledge is not brought to bear on spatial function then we have not made any utility of ʻike kupuna. That opportunity is lost, or worse, it fades into the background as insulting architectural symbols and facades that statically cling to exotic memories of Hawaiians in need of preservation. The inability or unwillingness to bring this ʻike kupuna forward forces Kanaka Maoli to insist that our “ancestors be left in the country” which is to demand that their ancestral mana be left alone, sacred and untouched (Fantin, 2003).

In Hawaiʻi today, some Kānaka ʻŌiwi abjectly refuse a particular development paradigm as a non-indigenous imposition and kūʻē, or resist physical development. The pace, scale and sheer mass of development, seemingly fuel by profit-ability, creates tremendous inertia to sacrifice Kanaka Maoli principles and patterns. This structural problem exposes the underlying flaws of planning that views its practice as legitimate, objective and neutral in its application as land use. This is the incommesurability of modern state planning that Sandercock (2004) and others talk about.

It is my position that the function of a framework is to bring a unified idea of what constitutes Hawaiian planning in Hawaiʻi or at least, it can begin to move us in that direct. This framework serves as a step in between, which is to say that I believe Hawaiian planning happens, its uneven in application though. It happens when it seems to be convenient, perhaps affordable, or even demanded but it is never consistently applied as a matter of public policy. Thus, future research should assess spatial policy development from an ʻŌiwi context. In an effort to answer the degree to which Hawaiian knowledge has contributed to indigenous planning a mixed
method survey of Hawaiian-focused plans would identify Kanaka Maoli principles and their application in a policy context. A matrix could potentially identify Kanaka ‘Ōiwi spatial indicators that would be culled from the documents in the following areas:

- The principles that were applied to guide the planning.
- The indicator or measure used to implement Hawaiian principles or standards.
- The nature of question framing or problem identification.
- The degree to which Kanaka ‘ōiwi methodology was introduced or applied.
- The knowledge base that was sourced to examine planning solutions.
- The policy outcome and implementation.

Interviews with Native Hawaiian planners or planners involved with Hawaiian land use issues can complement the quantitative survey by examining how professional and community practitioners think about planning and its meaning to contemporary land use contexts.

### 7.3 Conclusion

Lefebvre (2003) writes that at a theoretical level, the urbanist has replaced the “concrete space” with “abstract space” (p. 182). He contends, that the urbanist

. . . takes off into the abstract space of vision, of geometry. The architect who draws and the urbanist composes a block plan to look down on their “objects” buildings and neighborhoods. These designs move within a space of paper and ink . . [and] only after this nearly complete reduction of the everyday do they return to the scale of lived experience. They are convinced they have captured it even though they carry out their plans and projects within a second-order abstraction. (pp. 182-183)
This two fold “substitution and negation” creates “an illusory sense of affirmation”, that is, the return to the “real life”. What was often forgotten or misunderstood was that the bureaucratic society and through its extension planning and public policy, affects all those living in the city proper and imposes their powerful influences everywhere via the operations of the state and market (Soja, 2010). The urbanist, that is the technicians and specialists are unaware that their so-called “objective space is in fact ideological and repressive” (p. 183).

Space, site, form, and their uses are not universal or neutral, rather they are historical and ideological. When taken to an extreme, we can touch the perspective from among those whose lived realities are regulated out of existence. From this view then, the preeminence of the image of the western styled school as the primary source of knowledge cannot be underestimated. At the spatial level, the imposition of western styled schools eclipsed indigenous architecture and this included the decoupling of all the skills, resource materials and practical know how that go with that built environment. This spatial imposition however forced knowledge underground from its communal sphere where it served fluid and dynamic worldviews. Once the imposition was complete, communal knowledge was transmitted away from the school, occurring perhaps after school when “legitimate” learning was completed. Poignantly, as Uduku (2000) observes, for some Indigenous Peoples, their adaptation to imposition and spatial occupation meant that their ways of knowing and simply being wound its way back into the home. Ways of knowing and being returned to the family habitat where they continued on as familial practices and custom. From this perspective then, perhaps we can understand the push back from families who never relinquished their subsistence practices in the 1970’s. Some knowledge had been kept by families through subsistence practices, and others, through cultural practices.
Thus, what this inquiry concludes is that Hawaiian-focused public charter schools were influenced by an activist Hawaiian movement that critiqued a conceived space from the position of a Kanaka ʻŌiwi lived reality. The reemergence of Hawaiian education in the 21st century, influenced by the Hawaiian movement’s articulation of aloha ʻāina focused a worldview that speaks back to the conceived space that continues to define what constitutes legitimate knowledge and land use. The idea of a Kanaka ʻŌiwi contribution to indigenous planning explores in a provocative way, rather than a definitive one, how we may utilize these findings to bring Hawaiian land use values into balance with an economic exchange value.

A genealogy of knowing and the utility of knowledge is an on-going process that brings clarity to what Kanaka Maoli believes constitutes spatial value, meaning and purpose. In this sense, we move beyond the physical space that we inhabit to see it as an expression and extension of Hawaiian identity that is in constant evolution. Kameʻeleihiwa reminds us how genealogies are the Hawaiian concept of time and as such they order the space around us and serve as the history of the people. Moʻokūʻauhau serves the important ancestral link between ka poʻe Kanaka who are alive today and the mana of our universe. Genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe and give us continual comfort and stable existence here on earth. Our educators express how important morning protocol is because it is a grounded connection between themselves, their kūpuna and the ambient world around them. All senses are brought to bear so as to bring mana to a place, to the names spoken, and to the individual committing the ceremonical act. That behavior, repeated time and again crystallizes the relational dynamic. This is the epistemic stuff we need today to influence island planning. This, I believe, is why we need ʻāina-based schools and this is how Kānaka Maoli contribute to indigenous planning -- by
offering aloha ʻāina as a way to speak back or rather push back against dominant, one-dimensional economic interpretations of space and place.
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APPENDIX C. Interview Questions

1. If you could describe your educational philosophy, what would that be?
   - Can you describe a unique learning activity that you feel best reflects your approach to teaching overall?

2. What is a typical day at your school?

3. In many Hawaiian Culture Charter Schools, the ‘āina serves as a teacher. I assume this is/was true for your school as well. I was wondering if you could talk a little about that.
   - In what ways does the ‘āina teach the children?
   - How does your curriculum and pedagogy of your school integrate the ‘āina in their learning and developmental process?

4. Can you describe/demonstrate learning activities that you would like/wanted to do but can’t/couldn’t?
   - What kind of constraints do they operate under that interfere with fulfilling their educational goals/mission?

5. Does the school rely on any cultural practitioners or knowledgeable community people to help teach or conduct learning activities for the school?

6. What do you hope your students get from your school that they might not get at another school?

7. Would like to receive a copy of your interview transcript?

8. I’m interested in the history of your school, can you tell me:

9. Was the school responding to particular needs or issues?

10. What was the vision for the school?
GLOSSARY

ahupua’a – land division often running from mountain to sea

‘āina – that which feeds, land

aloha ‘āina – love of the land or of one’s country, patriotism

akua – god, gods

alaula – first dawn, early dawn

ali‘i - chief

aloha – love, affection

ao – light, day, daylight, dawn; enlightened; to regain consciousness

‘āpana – piece, section, land parcel

au – time, a period of time

‘auamo – pole or stick used for carrying bundles across the shoulders

‘auwai – ditch

hale pili – thatched house, typically using pili grass (Heteropogon contortus) for roof/sidewalls

hana – work

haumana - students

hei - adept, deft; to absorb, as knowledge or skill.

hemo – taken off

hilahila - ashamed

hō‘ike – to show, exhibit; to test

honua – land, earth, world

ho‘okupu – to pay or gather a tax; to give freely, to make a present to one

hoʻolohe – to listen
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hoʻomaopopo – to understand
hoʻopili – to repeat
hoʻoulu – to cause to increase
hou – again, more
huewai – water calabash
hui - group
humu – to sew cloth; fasten together by sowing
iʻa – fish or any marine animal
‘ike – to see, know, perceive
‘ili ‘āina - land section, usually a subdivision of an ahupua’a
‘ili kūpono – independent land sections
inoa akua – inoa, name; akua, god, gods
iwi – bones
Iwi (Maori) - iwi are extended kinship group, tribe, nation, people, nationality, race; often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor
ka wā mahope - future
ka wā mamua – past
kahakai – beach
kahawai – stream
kahukula – school supervisor
kahuna – priest, expert in any profession
kaitiakitanga - guardianship, stewardship, trusteeship, trustee
kalo - taro (Colocasia esculenta)
kanaka – man, person; Hawaiian (distinct from foreigner)

Kanaka Maoli – Native Hawaiian

Kanaka ‘Ōiwi – Native people of the land

kaona - hidden meaning, as in Hawaiian poetry

kanu – to plant or bury

kauā – servant

kauhale – small cluster of houses (formerly comprising a Hawaiian home)

kauna – layered meaning

kaupapa - topic, policy, matter for discussion, plan, purpose, agenda, subject, program, initiative

keiki – child

kōkua – to help, aid

komo – to enter, go into

konohiki – chief who managed an ahupua‘a

kuauna – bank or border of taro patch; stream bank

kuhina nui – premier, regent; highest officer next to the king

kūlanakauhale - village

kuleana – responsibility, right; small parcel of land awarded to commoners during Māhele

kumu – teacher

kumulipō – origin, genesis, source of life; name of Hawaiian creation chant

kupuna – grandparent, ancestor

lāhui – nation, nationality, gather together, assemble; to prohibit, forbid; proclaim a law

lālā – branch, limb; member as of a society

laua‘e – a fragrant fern (Phymatosorus scolopendria syn. Microsorium scolopendria)
laulima – cooperation, joint action; group of people working together

lawa – enough, sufficient, ample; to have enough, be satisfied

lei – necklace of flowers, shells, feathers

lele – to jump, fly, leap

leo - voice

lōkahi – unity, agreement, accord, harmony

loko – pond

Lono akua – one of the 4 major gods

luna – high, upper, above

lunauhau – tax collector

lunakula – school master, school superintendent

maha ‘oi – rude, cheeky, presumptuous

mahalo – thanks, gratitude

mahele – to divide, appportion, cut into parts

makaʻāinana – common people, populous

makahiki – year, age

mākua – parents

māla ‘ai – garden, cultivated field, patch

mālama – to take care of, tend, attend, care for, protect, save

mālama ‘āina – to protect, care for the land

malo – traditional loincloth worn by men

mana – power, authority, authorization, privileged

mana‘o – thought, idea, belief, opinion
mātauranga - knowledge, wisdom, understanding, skill; sometimes used in the plural
matauranga Maori - traditional Maori knowledge
mauka – inland
mauna – mountain
mauri - life principle, vital essence, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions; the essential quality and vitality of a being or entity; also used for a physical object, individual, ecosystem or social group in which this essence is located
mele – song, music, chant of any kind, poetry
mō‘ī – sovereign, king, queen, majesty, ruler
moku – district
mokupuni – island
momona – fat, fertile, rich
mo‘o – succession, series
mo‘o ‘āina – a division of land that was subdivided into a paukū ‘āina
mo‘okū‘auhau – genealogy, genealogical accounts
mo‘olelo – history, story, tradition, myth; discourse
mo‘omeheu – culture, cultural
nānā – to look at, observe; to care for, pay attention,
noho – to live, reside
nui – big, large, great
‘ōhā – taro corm growing from the older root; fig., offspring, youngsters
‘ohana – family, relative, kin; related
‘Ōiwi – Native
ʻōlelo makuahine – mother tongue, Hawaiian language

ʻōlelo noʻeau – proverb, wise saying

oli – chant not danced to

one hānau – birth sands

ʻōpio – youth

paʻa – to be firm, assert perseveringly, to affirm positively

paʻe ‘āina - archipelago

palapala – document of any kind; writing of any kind, literature

palena - boundary

pau – finished

pepeiao – ear

piko – navel

pili – to cling; to be associated with; close relationship

pohaku - rock

poʻo kumu – principal

pū - large triton conch or helmet shell (Charonia tritonis) as used for trumpets

puaʻa – pig

rangatiratanga – chieftainship, right to exercise authority, chiefly autonomy, ownership, leadership of a social group, domain of the rangatira, noble birth, attributes of a chief; or kingdom, realm, sovereignty, principality, self-determination, self-management

tangata whenua - the people of a place; local people, hosts, Indigenous people of the land; people born of the whenua

tupuna - ancestor, grandparent; western dialect variation of tipuna
ua – rain, to rain

uhau – to pile together; to build up as a wall

ulu – to grow, increase, spread

ʻulu - breadfruit (Artocarpus altilis)

wā – period of time, era

waʻa kaulua – double canoe

waha – mouth

wahi inoa – place name

wahi pana – legendary place

whakapapa - genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent - reciting whakapapa was, and is, an important skill and reflected the importance of genealogies in Māori society in terms of leadership, land and fishing rights, kinship and status. It is central to all Māori institutions.

wehe – to open
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