

UNFIT FOR A QUEEN: MO‘OKŪ‘AUHAU, NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND
EUGENICS IN TERRITORIAL HAWAI‘I.

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

HAWAIIAN STUDIES

MAY 2014

By

Kerry Kamakaoka‘ilima Ellen Long

Thesis Committee:

Antoinette Freitas, Chairperson

Jonathan Osorio

Jennifer Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua

Keywords: Eugenics, Mo‘okū‘auhau, Hawaiian Sovereignty, Ola Hou, Race

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction: Eugenic Shapings of ‘Ōiwi Identity.....	1
1.1 Scope of Research.....	4
1.2 Theoretical Frameworks.....	7
1.2.1 Ea: Mo‘okū‘auhau and Hawaiian National Consciousness.....	7
1.2.2 Ola Hou: Salvation through Death.....	12
1.3 Chapter Overview.....	17
 Chapter 2: Mo‘okū‘auhau.....	 20
2.1 Mai Nā Kūpuna Mai.....	20
2.2 Mai Ka ‘Āina Mai.....	23
2.3 In Defense of Hawaiian Nationality.....	28
 Chapter 3: Occupied Hawai‘i And The American Eugenics Movement.....	 34
3.1 “Race-Suicide”, White Supremacy And Race As Nation.....	40
3.2 Racial And National Anxieties Of The Territorial Oligarchy.....	42
3.3 The Medical Society Of Hawai‘i And “The New Science of Eugenics”..	45
 Chapter 4: Personalizing Eugenics. <i>Eugenics For Young People</i>	 49
4.1 Inherently Degenerate: Race to(of) survival.....	53
4.2 Naturalizing Oppression: Class-ifying ‘Ōiwi.....	58
4.3 “Good Citizenry”: The New Ola Hou.....	63
 Chapter 5: Ongoing ‘extinction’: Sterilization legislation and the institutionalization of the Unfit.....	 66
5.1 Review of Eugenic Legislation.....	67
5.1.1 First Eugenics Bills: ‘Ōiwi Vote Noe.....	67
5.1.2 Sterilization and Constructing the ‘Ōiwi Male Sexual Predator.....	69
5.2 Feeble-mindedness, Moronia and ‘Ōiwi Female Sexuality.....	73
5.3 The Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded.....	75
 Chapter 6: Conclusion: Continuity of Mo‘okū‘auhau and Ola Hou.....	 79
6.1 Mauna Kea and the Thirty Meter Telescope.....	82
6.2 Pele and Geothermal Energy Development.....	85
6.3 Kana‘iolowalu and Federal Recognition.....	87
6.4 Closing.....	90
 Bibliography.....	 92

LIST OF TABLES

1: Waimano Home to General Population (%) by ethnicity.....	77
---	----

LIST OF FIGURES

1: “Highest qualities” of Hawaiians in Eugenics For Young People.....	54
2: Favorable and unfavorable environments in Eugenics For Young People.....	58
3: Middle and upperclass ideals and opposites in Eugenics For Young People.....	59

CHAPTER 1. EUGENIC SHAPINGS OF ‘ŌIWI IDENTITY

Mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogical succession, pedigree)¹ is a critical component to Kanaka ‘Ōiwi² understanding of kuleana, defined by Young as “a received sense of ancestrally-based responsibility”, and is a most important part of the fabric of Hawaiian national consciousness³. A eugenics effort in US-occupied Territorial Hawai‘i would serve to assist in the erosion of an ‘Ōiwi national identity and in the construction of a Hawaiian-American racial and national identity specifically by framing ‘Ōiwi ancestry as degenerate and positioning good American citizenship as that which would save ‘Ōiwi from extinction.

Hawaiian Kingdom subjects who participated in the armed seizure of authority from the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893 were of American and European ancestry and held a U.S. American national allegiance. A political and ethnic minority, this small group of men became the civilian arm of the U.S. occupation of Hawai‘i⁴, maintaining oligarchic governance over Hawai‘i throughout the next six decades. The political domination of the new regime did not go unchallenged however as immediately following the armed dethronement of Lili‘uokalani in 1893, an incredible

¹ Mary Kawena Puku‘i and Samuel H. Elbert. *The Hawaiian Dictionary* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1986), 254.

² ‘Ōiwi is refers to those who are genealogically connected to Hawaiian lands.

³ Kanalu Young. “Kuleana: Toward A Historiography Of Hawaiian National Consciousness, 1780-2001” *Hawaiian Journal of Law and Politics* 2 (2006), 1.

⁴ Ibid, 11.

grassroots organizing effort fueled by Aloha ‘Āina (love for land and country)⁵, mobilized to defend the political independence of the Hawaiian Kingdom from the United States. A realignment of ‘Ōiwi national identity centered around mo‘okū‘auhau in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i to one based on race and racial order with the United States, would prove critical to the pacification of this staunch opposition to U.S. American control.

Positioning ‘Ōiwi mo‘okū‘auhau, a lifeline to nationalism, as degenerate would assist with such a realignment. Influenced by the American eugenics movement, the Hawai‘i arm took century-old ideas of ‘Ōiwi moral and physical decay⁶ and transformed it from a religious ideology to one couched in science and rationality. However, as with the advancement of such notions by missionaries in Hawai‘i in the nineteenth century, the twentieth century reproduction of these notions also served to position the haole as superior, more civilized and the natural keeper of power over Kanaka ‘Ōiwi and their lands.

Around 1911, a eugenics movement took hold in the period of U.S. occupied Hawai‘i known as the Territorial period (1900-1959). It was largely supported by the

⁵ In her book, *Aloha Betrayed*, Noenoe Silva notes that while the Hui Hawai‘i Aloha ‘Āina, a political organization that strongly resisted the dethronement of Lili‘uokalani and annexation to the United States, translated the term “Aloha ‘Āina” into English as “patriotic”, that the term ‘Aloha ‘Āina’ “has a genealogy of its own, based in traditional Kanaka cosmology. The term was again popularized in the 1980’s by the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ohana (PKO). Davianna McGregor writes that for PKO “aloha āina” included the protection of Hawai‘i’s natural resources, the organizing for Native Hawaiian rights and sovereignty and a spiritual dedication to the gods of nature. Aloha ‘Āina, based in ‘Ōiwi cosmology informs Hawaiian national consciousness and love for country as the word “patriotic” invokes but it seems that as the term continues to grow in popularity, it may or may not be used with an intention toward Hawaiian independence and sovereignty.

⁶ Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Lands and Foreign Desires: Pehea la e Pono ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 138-9.

haole (Caucasian, foreigner)⁷ oligarchy that worked to control all aspects of government, land and society in Hawai‘i. Eugenic unfitness supported the discourse of “natives as unfit to govern”⁸ which functioned to justify the forced seizure of authority from a uniquely ‘Ōiwi sovereign government to a small group of white American nationals. Unfit discourse centered particular American socioeconomic ideals of capitalism, individual success and labor as quintessential to “progress” while positioning poor, unemployed or institutionalized ‘Ōiwi as incorrigibly unable to progress into modern society and accordingly, as an economic burden.

This logic also served to erase the systematic oppression and displacement of ‘Ōiwi at this time and justified eugenic arguments for reproductive sterilization. The ever-present threat of the “elimination of the Unfit”, particularly sterilization, added a chilling layer to the narrative of the disappearing native. As foreign diseases had in the past, the medical procedure of sterilization was a new method through which to halt ‘Ōiwi mo‘okū‘auhau in it’s tracks. Positioned as the only escape from “elimination”, assimilation to eugenic social and economic ideals became imperative to survival. Unfit discourse justified the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom and ‘Ōiwi marginalization and encouraged assimilation as a means of survival and “advancement”. Unfitness depended upon a belief in the degeneracy of one’s kūpuna (ancestors), whom ‘Ōiwi shared both personally and collectively. Degeneracy re-presented mo‘okū‘auhau as a source of shame and misfortune. As ‘Ōiwi shared in a national history informed by

⁷ Puku‘i and Elbert, 58.

⁸ Saranillio cites, Ralph Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom: The Kalakaua Dynasty, 1874-1893*, (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1967), 634.

personal and chiefly mo‘okū‘auhau, Unfit discourse also served to interrupt the continuum of Hawaiian national consciousness.

1.1 Scope Of Research

Efforts to institutionalize eugenics in Territorial Hawai‘i spanned four decades. They changed shape and focus all along the way. The scope of my research focuses primarily on an early but significant stage of the movement in 1913 when the first eugenics legislation was introduced in Hawai‘i and a eugenics curriculum aimed at ‘Ōiwi youth was instituted at Kamehameha Schools. My focus on eugenics in Hawai‘i between 1911 and 1914 is a starting point in an effort to understand the foundations of a forty-year effort for eugenics and the impacts it had on ‘Ōiwi national consciousness and the development of Hawaiian race consciousness. Examining the manifestations of the eugenics movement at this time will provide insight into the ways in which ideological apparatuses such as schools, law and science were being used in an attempt to reposition ‘Ōiwi ancestry and solidify American-white power in Hawai‘i.

I will touch on the role of sterilization bills which were proposed as late as the early 1950s as well as the establishment of Waimano Home in the early 1920’s, especially as they contributed to racialized and gendered constructions of the “Hawaiian”. Each of these topics are worthy of much deeper research in Hawaiian Studies but are included in my thesis primarily to point out the role in which they served in eugenics and in perpetuating the narrative of the dying Hawaiian. The scope of my research excludes a discussion of Hawai‘i as a site for racial formation through research on phenotypes and miscegenation, such as that which came out of the University of Hawai‘i, championed by

famed professor of clinical psychology, Stanley D. Porteus. The studies on racial “types” that came out of Hawai‘i are as fascinating as they are significant in understanding racial hierarchy in both Hawai‘i and the US but are outside the scope of my research. I wish to focus on how the early manifestations of eugenics in Hawai‘i served to strengthen what was arguably an unstable haole grip on power in Hawai‘i in the early Territorial period. Perhaps using mo‘okū‘auhau as a framework through which to analyze ‘Ōiwi views of ethnic intermarriage in juxtaposition to the racial typing that came out of the University of Hawai‘i in the 1920s and 30s could contribute to an increased understanding of lāhui and race in Hawai‘i.

My thesis also alludes to larger stories of conscious resistance to American hegemony in the early Territorial period and sometimes specifically against eugenics. But the crux of this paper examines how eugenics in Hawai‘i served to transform ‘Ōiwi modes of ancestral recognition as part of a larger Americanization project as well as how it served to marginalize and even eliminate those who did not conform.

‘Ōiwi leaders continued to fight for the lāhui in the Territorial period, some targeting young people in particular, pleading with them to hold on to ancestral mo‘olelo and their ‘ōlelo mākuahine. Some ‘Ōiwi mobilized in opposition to sterilization legislation while others voted for it. The ways in which our kūpuna navigated through this period of national revolution is tremendous and part of the story that cannot be overlooked. At this time, however, these stories lay outside the scope of my thesis. Rather, I seek to better understand what our kūpuna were facing at this time, what narratives were being pushed and to what degree those narratives may live on today.

I am interested in the continuity and application of these modes of recognition, namely mo‘okū‘auhau and Hawaiians as a dying race. I see mo‘okū‘auhau as driving the narrative of a *living* lāhui whose values and practices, while dynamic and ever transforming, are nevertheless rooted in something old that through millennia of observation and practice were confirmed to serve our relationships to ‘āina and kānaka. I will take a critical look at mo‘okū‘auhau in contrast to the racialized Hawaiian who is inherently always dying whether it be from immorality, “indolence” or genetics. My thesis will look at how eugenics in Hawai‘i served to maintain this narrative of Hawaiians as a dying race with a twentieth century, reproducing Ola Hou ideology in the service of American imperial interests.

Understanding the Hawaiian Kingdom as an expression of mo‘okū‘auhau and a vehicle for self-determination, informs the growing consciousness of today’s ‘Ōiwi, when grappling with how to best empower and protect ‘Ōiwi practices and traditions. Taking a closer look at how mo‘okū‘auhau was targeted in efforts to realign ‘Ōiwi national identity from Hawaiian to American calls into question self-determination efforts that are guided and overseen by American national apparatuses such as the State of Hawai‘i or U.S. federal recognition. Cultural hegemony, as ‘Ōiwi poet, activist and scholar Haunani-Kay Trask asserts, “is the cutting edge of imperial enterprise...”⁹ And so this thesis is also a kāhea (call, cry out, invoke)¹⁰ to ‘Ōiwi to nurture a political national consciousness

⁹ Haunani-Kay Trask. *From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu, University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999), 42.

¹⁰ Puku‘i and Elbert, 111.

simultaneously with a personal cultural consciousness as essential in the effort to decolonize our minds and restore national and political justice in Hawai‘i.

1.2 Theoretical Frameworks

1.2.1 Ea: Mo‘okū‘auhau and Hawaiian National Consciousness

While Hawaiian nationality was not race-based or ethnically exclusive (until 1887), for ‘Ōiwi, our national identity under the Hawaiian Kingdom had a lineage that preceded the formation of a Hawaiian state and citizenry. Applying such to scholarship that addresses Hawaiian history, Young argues the importance of a national framework that spans political eras stating,

What is also imperative...is to more clearly acknowledge ancient institutions, values, and knowledge systems that in the context of historiography, must serve as the referent, if not the (Saussure-inspired) sign for any work with a Hawaiian national focus which also acknowledges State continuity. From these history-doing locations it is then possible to identify the processes of institutional change public and private that took place in the country during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.¹¹

Young’s call for the development of a national history spanning far beyond the formation of the Hawaiian Kingdom encourages contemporary ‘Ōiwi scholarship to consider the ways in which older institutions informed the construction of the Hawaiian nation-state as well as the experiences, perspectives and actions of our kūpuna citizenry who lived through it. My thesis will explore different ways mo‘okū‘auhau, as an institution, as the foundation of values and as a knowledge system, informed Hawaiian national consciousness, which calls for an analysis of the Hawai‘i arm of the American eugenics movement and its message of ‘Ōiwi ancestral unfitness and degeneracy.

¹¹ Young, 2.

As Young calls for an expansive understanding of national history, he is at the same time calling for contemporary scholarship to contextualize itself within a national framework in order to properly understand the impacts of different events in Hawai‘i’s history. Situating my research thusly helps illuminate the prominent role of older Hawaiian institutions such as mo‘okū‘auhau in the national consciousness of ‘Ōiwi subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom and today and concurrently, how this consciousness may have been compromised by a discourse of ancestral degeneracy.

Some question the compatibility of a Hawaiian indigenous identity and a Hawaiian national one, arguing that indigeneity supports the erasure of the Hawaiian Kingdom as a nation state and it’s subjects as citizens of such.¹² Sai points to the foundations of “indigeneity” as coming from the United Nations Security Council’s framework for moving native peoples toward self-determination *within* the framework of the existing nation-state-that being a US framework in the case of Hawai‘i. Pursuing self-determination within a US political framework, he argues, privileges US sovereignty over that of the Hawaiian Kingdom, its territory and resources. While Sai provides a compelling critique of “indigeneity” as a specific political term that serves American political dominance over Hawai‘i, his own interpretation of ‘Ōiwi connection to the term is somewhat short-sighted and equally relegates ‘Ōiwi national consciousness to foreign lands and frameworks.

Sai cites ‘Ōiwi political organizations of the 1970s and 80s including A.L.O.H.A. (Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry), Hui Alaloa and the Protect Kaho‘olawe

¹² David Keanu Sai. “A Slippery Path Toward Hawaiian Indigeneity: An Analysis and Comparison between Hawaiian State Sovereignty and Hawaiian Indigeneity and it’s use and practice in Hawai‘i today.” *Journal of Law and Social Challenges* 68 (2008).

‘Ohana as “Operating within an ethnic or tribal optic stemming from the Native American movement in the United States.”¹³ While organizations in the early decades of the sovereignty movement were undoubtedly inspired by and working in solidarity with activists in the Native American movement, relegating ‘Ōiwi sovereignty activism solely to Native American and indigenous frameworks ignores the rising consciousness of ‘Ōiwi of that time (and on to today) regarding their own genealogical connections to ‘āina and the uniquely ‘Ōiwi frameworks and institutions that add depth and conviction in the fight for land, identity and even sovereignty; depth and conviction that a legal framework alone can enhance but perhaps not incite. Accordingly, if indigeneity consigns self-determination to a US legal framework, then perhaps we should look to our own institutions, values and knowledge systems, as Young suggests, in order to speak to that which grounds, impregnates and gives birth to ‘Ōiwi national consciousness; that both supports and critiques legal frameworks for Hawaiian sovereignty.

Mo‘okū‘ahau, I believe speaks more accurately and honorably to that which informs our history of ‘Ōiwi national consciousness in that it privileges ‘Ōiwi genealogical connections to place and people as that which moves ‘Ōiwi to political action as well as that which necessitates and validates the operation of a Hawaiian nation-state under terms of international law. Mo‘okū‘ahau as an analytical framework helps to further clarify the impacts of race discourse on ‘Ōiwi identity and assertions to nationhood. Young argues that so long as Hawaiian national identity privileges indigenous identity, the two are perfectly compatible:

¹³ Ibid, 108.

Hawaiian national identity as a legal, political, and governmental shield for the perpetuation and protection of cultural and spiritual indigenous identity of kanaka maoli descendants must be historicized in the body of literature to demonstrate how the two perspectives of indigenous and national identity need not be mutually exclusive, but instead properly sequenced and aligned.¹⁴

He clarifies his position on the sequence and alignment of indigenous identity within a national context stating, “The indigenous identity that belongs to Hawaiian nationals of aboriginal blood is a historical expression of ancestral consciousness and traditional practice for forums domestic and international, but not to attain political self-determination.”¹⁵ While both Young and Sai illuminate well the problematics of indigeneity, the role of ancestry in the erosion of a Hawaiian national identity is under-emphasized, if acknowledged at all. Perhaps we should consider more heavily the role of “ancestral consciousness” in the attainment and perpetuation of Hawaiian political independence.

Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua warns against “disembodied” discussions on sovereignty and offers “Ea” (sovereignty, rule, independence, life, breath, to rise, go up)¹⁶ as a critical Hawaiian Studies approach to address intergenerational, embodied processes and actions that give both meaning and function to political independence. Ea supports a Hawaiian national framework while insisting that ‘Ōiwi, as descendants of the land and as a citizenry, remain bound to discussions of sovereignty, self-determination and political independence. Ea as an analysis of independence is inclusive of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi

¹⁴ Young, 10.

¹⁵ Ibid, 5.

¹⁶ Pūku‘i and Elbert, 36.

relationships to ‘āina mai ka pō mai.¹⁷ Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua explains, “Unlike Euro-American philosophical notions of sovereignty, ea is based on the experiences of people on the land, relationships forged through the process of remembering and caring for wahi pana, storied places.”¹⁸ These storied places are part of the fabric of mo‘okū‘auhau and as Beamer has illustrated in his research on ‘Ōiwi governance and land management, ‘Ōiwi relationships to such places were a critical component of the construction of the Hawaiian nation-state.¹⁹

In its inclusivity of kānaka and ‘āina (the substance of mo‘okū‘auhau), Ea substantiates sovereignty, self-determination and political independence in a way that is uniquely ‘Ōiwi. It allows us to assess the marginalization of these things in relationship to the marginalization of national identity and vice versa. Ea is a way to speak politically about what we love, what we aim to protect and why it is important for us to live, continue on and perpetuate our world-view and practices for generations to come. As such, Ea can also stand as a critique of sovereignty discourses that omit kānaka and their relationship to ‘āina and conversely, discourses about ‘Ōiwi futures that are uncritically void of the political frameworks established and supported by our kūpuna.

Discourses centered around notions of ‘Ōiwi ancestral degeneracy, I will argue, worked to unravel and diminish a Hawaiian national consciousness in the service of

¹⁷ Mai ka pō mai refers to the beginning of time in a Hawaiian world-view. Pō refers to the night and the darkness that preceded the creation of all living things and is where we as a people begin our origin stories.

¹⁸ Jennifer Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua. “Kū i ka Māna: Building Community and Nation through Contemporary Hawaiian Schooling” Ph.d. dissertation, (University of California Santa Cruz, 2005), 57-58.

¹⁹ Kamana Beamer. “Na Wai Ka Mana?: ‘Ōiwi Agency and European Imperialism in the Hawaiian Kingdom” Ph.d. dissertation, (University of Hawai‘i, 2008), 53-103.

American hegemony in Hawai‘i. Those who enacted and supported the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom could not use law or weapons to dominate the ‘Ōiwi citizenry as easily as they did the Hawaiian government and Kingdom lands and were so forced to launch ideological campaigns centered around notions of Hawaiians as a dying race. Eugenics served American cultural hegemony and worked to reconstruct ‘Ōiwi understandings of self, contributing to what Osorio describes as “huikau” or confusion amongst ‘Ōiwi in terms of national identity, consciousness and kuleana.²⁰

1.2.2 Ola Hou: Salvation Through Death

Eugenics discourse in Hawai‘i was premised upon the degeneration of ‘Ōiwi ancestry and offered ‘good citizenry’ as the key to adapting to ‘today’s conditions’.²¹ This was predicated upon the idea of an ideal ‘Ōiwi ancestor of long ago, one that theoretically degenerated over the generations due largely to the spread of disease. But the 20th century idea of ‘Ōiwi degeneracy lent to a discourse of ‘Ōiwi unfitness that was nearly a century old and which offered Christian conversion rather than ‘good citizenry’, as the key to survival to the dying (physical and moral) Hawaiian race.

The Calvinist, in their mission to Christianize and civilize ‘Ōiwi, came at a most opportune time. In March of 1820, five months prior to their arrival, the ali‘i nui (high chiefs)²² Ka‘ahumanu, Keōpūolani and Liholiho had officially abolished the ‘Aikapu and left Hawai‘i without an official state religion. Additionally, within one generation, at the

²⁰ Jonathan Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio. “What Kine Hawaiian Are You?: A Mo‘olelo about Nationhood, Race, History and the Contemporary Sovereignty Movement in Hawai‘i” *The Contemporary Pacific* v.13, n.2 (Fall, 2001), 539-379.

²¹ Uldrick Thompson *Eugenics For Young People* (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, 1913)

²² Puku‘i and Elbert, 20.

time of the first Calvinist arrival in 1821, ‘Ōiwi had experienced between a 70-83% population collapse since the arrival of James Cook, 23 years prior.²³

As Kame‘eleihiwa argues, the missionaries’ message of Ola Hou (revive, recover, restore to health, resurrect)²⁴, a term referring to the Christian idea of “salvation” or new and everlasting life, may have been the mana that Ka‘ahumanu and other ‘Ōiwi were looking for to remedy the devastating population collapse in Hawai‘i in the 1820s.²⁵ Upon missionary arrival, ‘Ōiwi concern was over the physical death of loved ones and Ola Hou offered a message of resurrection and new life. But for missionaries, the physical death of ‘Ōiwi was inherent to a moral, spiritual and intellectual death that was innate to being native. Missionaries claimed to have the key to stay the extinction of ‘Ōiwi - Christian conversion. But at the same time, Christian salvation itself necessitated the extinction of the Kanaka ‘Ōiwi spiritual practices, arts, medicine; those things that made ‘Ōiwi, ‘Ōiwi. Eugenicists offered ‘Ōiwi salvation through the adoption of good citizenry, American social ideals and adaptation to Laissez-Faire economics, just as missionaries offered salvation through Christianity, defined by moral codes that chastised ‘Ōiwi world views and practices and emphasized hard work and labor as the key to survival.

Osorio pointedly illustrates how the population collapse of ‘Ōiwi was continuously used by haole to position themselves (and whatever suited their interests at the time) as ‘Ōiwi’s only hope for salvation from death. In *Dismembering Lāhui*, Osorio

²³ Kame‘eleihiwa, 141; Osorio, 11. See also, David Stannard. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai‘i on the Eve of Western Contact* (Honolulu, University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989).

²⁴ Puku‘i and Elbert, 513.

²⁵ Kame‘eleihiwa, 142.

points to a speech given by William Little Lee in 1850 to the Royal Hawaiian Agricultural Society where Lee offers plantation labor as “the only weapon that can stay the hand of the destroyer” for the dying ‘Ōiwi population who was perishing from the “rust of indolence-the canker of sloth”. Osorio explains,

Hawaiians, having failed to be saved by the Mahele, liberalism, and the church, would surely be rescued by the reliable hand of commerce (or perhaps not). Moreover, because the Natives were portrayed as helpless and even reluctant recipients of commerce’s saving grace, the stage was set for completing the transformation of Hawaiians from the proprietors of the kingdom to a class of wage labor, subordinate to the capitalist haole who possessed the land.²⁶

Subordination in the interests of haole land possession has been continually offered to ‘Ōiwi as that which would save our ever-present problem with death. This ideology was reproduced nearly a century after the missionaries arrived, this time framed by science and rationality. The new science of eugenics in the 20th century labeled ‘Ōiwi as *genetically* defected, fixing their “immorality” via heredity. This gave historical stereotypes and myths about ‘Ōiwi a new permanency that was rooted in their ancestors and would inevitably continue on through all future generations. Bhabha explains the importance of the fixedness of the stereotype to colonial discourse stating, “...the stereotype, which is [colonial discourse’s] major discursive strategy, is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place’, already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated...as if [the nature of the Other] that needs no proof, can never really, in discourse, be proved.”

²⁶ Jon Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002), 103.

The anxious repetition of ‘Ōiwi degeneracy was exemplified in the *Eugenics For Young People* (EFYP) curriculum at the Kamehameha Schools and through the institutionalization of the “feble-minded” in places like the Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded. Both the EFYP curriculum and the imprisonment of ‘Ōiwi in mental institutions served to “prove” that which could not be proven, that a continually dead and dying (whether physical or moral) Hawaiian race existed that was in need of saving and new life.

Eugenics, therefore, also came with its own “Ola Hou” that being the assimilation to the qualities of good American citizenship. Middle and upper class American ideals were offered as that which could save ‘Ōiwi from a natural extinction due to generations of inherited degeneracy. Ngugi Wa Thiango’s influential writings on mental colonization by way of the “cultural bomb” is helpful in understanding not only how the eugenic discourse of degeneracy encouraged ‘Ōiwi to see their past as “one wasteland of non-achievement” but also how that perspective is used to position the oppressor’s agenda itself as the way to salvation. Ngugi writes, “The intended results are despair, despondency and a collective death-wish. Amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependent sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: ‘Theft is holy’.”²⁷

Building upon Kame‘eleihiwa’s research and analysis of Ola Hou, I see Ola Hou as a framework through which to analyze ways that ‘Ōiwi are historically and continuously offered some form of salvation at the expense of our genealogical assertions

²⁷ Ngugi Wa Thiango. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (Portsmouth: Heinemann Press, 1986), 3.

to ‘āina, presenting such sacrifices as progressive and necessary for a healthy and thriving future. Ola Hou in this way though depends on an ever-present threat of death, whether physical, moral or intellectual—that thing that is always on our heels that we must avoid and escape through methods, institutions and practices that ultimately ensure the dominance of non-‘Ōiwi over ‘Ōiwi and ‘Ōiwi lands. On the other hand, that very salvation requires the death of particular ideologies, practices or political or economic systems that were developed mai ka pō mai and that defined and sustained ‘Ōiwi in Hawai‘i for time immemorial. Our own solutions, our own methods of healing ourselves, increasing spiritual or intellectual capacities are not presented as that which can ‘save’ us but rather, that which is killing us.

Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s detailed attention to the relationship between Kamehameha Schools and American militarism offers valuable insight into the mechanisms through which ‘Ōiwi come to see institutions of oppression as a way “up but never out of an unjust social order” stating that, “But it was only in the context of an ascendant white supremacist order in the islands that American militarism could present itself as an “*opportunity*” for young men in the islands—an opportunity for social advancement and an opportunity to prove a new patriotic loyalty.”²⁸ Settler-driven oppression enjoys invisibility through this logic and worse, is remedied through that which will continue to feed it, whether Christian morality, plantation labor or, as students of Kamehameha Schools were offered, good American citizenry, always inclusive of military service.

²⁸ Jennifer Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, “Militarization, white supremacy and schooling in Hawai‘i” (paper presented at the annual conference for the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, Tucson, Arizona, May, 2010).

Eugenics in Hawai‘i was expansive in reach but targeted ‘Ōiwi in particular ways that supported narratives of a dying ‘race’ and that credited such to the inherent inferiority of our ancestors. Kamehameha Schools was one institution where this discourse was most concentrated. Students, the first generation of ‘Ōiwi born and raised entirely under U.S. occupation, were negotiating their own sense of self on the cusp of national revolution. At that time, members of the mākua (parents) and kūpuna (elders)²⁹ generation who fought diligently against U.S. occupation were still alive and were grappling with the loss of nation and an ongoing fight for dignity and survival in their own ways.

The eugenics effort in Hawai‘i was more than an educational front, it also advocated for the sterilization of those deemed “Unfit”, which included the “feeble-minded”, a label responsible for the isolation and institutionalization of many ‘Ōiwi at the Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded. The imprisonment of ‘Ōiwi in institutions for the feeble-minded further supported the racialized constructions of “Hawaiian”, though this time, morally and intellectually. Narratives of a dying race supported haole American dominance in Hawai‘i and promoted allegiance to haole cultural norms and American nationalism.

1.3 Chapter Overview

In Chapter two, I will discuss the importance of ancestry and mo‘okū‘auhau to an ‘Ōiwi sense of self and how this contributes to a specifically ‘Ōiwi world-view. I will examine how mo‘okū‘auhau, through ancestry and ‘āina informs Hawaiian national

²⁹ Puku‘i and Elbert, 231, 186.

consciousness. I will close the chapter with an analysis of Hawaiian national consciousness as it played out in the struggles to maintain independence from the U.S. at the end of the 19th century, posing a significant threat to stabilizing American political control over the islands.

In Chapter three, I will give an overview of both the American and the Hawai‘i eugenics movement. Here I will explore how eugenics, rooted in white supremacy, extended its reach to Hawai‘i. I will look at who was involved in the Territorial movement, and what political interests eugenics discourse may have served. In addition, I will provide an overview of efforts to implement eugenic beliefs and practices with a particular focus on how these efforts would serve the erosion of Hawaiian national consciousness as it attempted to change perceptions of ‘Ōiwi ancestry and eradicate those who fell outside of American moral norms.

Chapter four will look at *Eugenics For Young People*, a eugenics curriculum that was created and implemented specifically for the boys and girls of Kamehameha Schools, an all Hawaiian private school. My examination of *Eugenics For Young People* will serve as a case study through which to analyze how eugenic themes of Unfitness and degeneracy served to alter and deteriorate pride and attachment to ‘Ōiwi ancestry. This text in particular exemplifies ways in which young ‘Ōiwi were being indoctrinated with an American race and class consciousness, emphasizing entry into the middle and upper class as the pathway to survival for a dying race. The text is framed as a study of citizenry and therefore serves to instruct the ‘Ōiwi youth on what proper American citizenry looks like, emphasizing adaptability to a system of “Laissez-Faire” economics.

In Chapter five, I will look more closely at the roll of the “feeble-minded” in eugenics. Feeble-mindedness was an overarching term constructed by psychologist and eugenicists, amongst others to describe the mental deficiency of people who fell outside of particular Christian European social ideals. The feeble-minded were the targets of eugenic sterilization bills and particular mental institutions. In this chapter I will specifically look at how feeble-mindedness served to support the construction of the racialized Hawaiian as morally and intellectually dead. The relationship between the institutionalization of the feeble-minded and discourses of ‘Ōiwi sexuality reveal some of the ways in which eugenics served to reproduce a gendered oppression of ‘Ōiwi while also gendering the racialized Hawaiian.

Chapter six will conclude my paper by exploring the present-day impacts of eugenic discourse looking specifically at how the discourse of ‘Ōiwi as a dying or almost dead people, whether physically, intellectually or politically is reproduced by ‘Ōiwi in ways that serve American hegemony in Hawai‘i. In this chapter I’ll examine the continuity of both Ola Hou discourse and assertions of mo‘okū‘auhau in contemporary Kanaka ‘ōiwi issues.

CHAPTER 2. MO‘OKŪ‘AUHAU IN HAWAIIAN NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The ongoing 120 year U.S. occupation of Hawai‘i has been a key factor in the suppression of ‘Ōiwi culture and life-systems. It is, therefore, critical for ‘Ōiwi today to regenerate and reclaim identities embedded in mo‘okū‘auhau as we simultaneously work to dismantle imposed U.S. imperialist identities that have only allowed us to remain kanaka so long as we do so in ways that do not threaten their political dominance in our homeland. As Young asserts, “The ability to de-center the occupier’s aversive hold on the treasure of Hawaiian national ideas and identities is itself an act of cognitive de-occupation.”³⁰ Insisting that our mo‘okū‘auhau is at the same time ancestral, cultural, and national challenges U.S. political and cultural hegemony over our land and people with more strength than through either one individually.

2.1 Mai Nā Kūpuna Mai

Critical to the make-up of Hawaiian sense of self and kuleana is mo‘okū‘auhau. Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa states, “Genealogies are perceived by Hawaiians as an unbroken chain that links those alive today to the primeval life forces-to the *mana* (spiritual power) that first emerged with the beginning of the world. Genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe...” and “are a means of glorifying one’s ancestors and one’s past.”³¹ This suggests that, beyond a simple ancestral pedigree, mo‘okū‘auhau provides ‘Ōiwi a spiritual sense of place in the world that is strengthened through the practices and accomplishments of our ancestors. As an embodiment of the stories and places that defined their ancestors, each generation symbolizes the continuity and accomplishment of

³⁰ Young, 6.

³¹ Kame‘eleihiwa, 19-22.

their family lines. Trask offers mo‘okū‘auhau as “the great bloodlines of memory” through which we kept our stories.³² As a source of memory, mo‘okū‘auhau becomes a critical lens through which ‘Ōiwi define themselves.

While a means of glorifying one’s *own* ancestors, mo‘okū‘auhau also comprises ‘Ōiwi’s collective understanding of nationhood. Kame‘eleihiwa notes that though “the great genealogies are of Ali‘i Nui and not of the commoners, these Ali‘i Nui are the collective ancestors, and their mo‘olelo (histories) are histories of all Hawaiians, too.” Davida Malo, ‘Ōiwi historian and scholar of the early Kingdom period, wrote that, “Commoners and chiefs were all descended from the same ancestors, Wākea and Papa.”³³ This shared ancestry blurs the line between individual and larger collective genealogies amongst ‘Ōiwi.

The Kumulipo, a cosmogonic origin chant, is considered a mo‘okū‘auhau of the ali‘i that also includes the birth of sacred ‘Ōiwi ancestors Wākea and Papahānaumoku (Papa). David Kalākaua’s ability to rule as Mō‘ī (1874-1891) was met with consistent questioning not only by haole but at an unprecedented level by ‘Ōiwi alike. Osorio argues that because Kalākaua’s rule was due to the support of American interests, “his own legitimacy was constantly under attack from a small but very articulate Native constituency...”. He further elaborates, “His weakness, as far as some of the Natives were concerned, was not his character or his leadership, but his genealogy.”³⁴ When his

³² Trask, 118.

³³ Ibid, 19. Kame‘eliwa quotes David Malo, *Hawaiian Antiquities*, translated by Nathaniel B. Emerson (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1951).

³⁴ Jon Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, “*Dismembering Lāhui*”, 157.

position as Mō‘ī (King, queen, sovereign, monarch)³⁵ was called into question along with the security of the nation’s sovereignty, David Kalākaua published the Kumulipo to strengthen each of these critical components of Hawaiian nationhood. Noenoe Silva states that, “The Kumulipo, which connected the reigning monarch to the creation of the universe, assured the people that the nation was in the proper hands.”³⁶ She further offers Kalākaua’s publication of the Kumulipo as a “narrative of the lāhui from the beginning of time”, explaining that, “Kalākaua brought it forward during his reign in order to legitimize his right to rule, but it functioned doubly to legitimize the existence of the nation itself.”³⁷ Connecting the nation, the ali‘i and the maka‘āinana, the Kumulipo exemplifies how mo‘okū‘auhau connects national consciousness to cosmogonic origins.

This creation chant is over 2,000 lines and covers sixteen expanses of time from the Pō (darkness, the very beginning of life) to the birth of ali‘i nui Kalaninui‘iāmamau in the 18th century. Kamehameha I inherited this genealogy as well as his children and other chiefs who ruled the Kingdom of Hawai‘i through 1893. As a genealogical succession that extends from the beginning of time through to Kamehameha I and even Kalākaua and Lili‘uokalani, this mo‘okū‘auhau was important to Hawaiian national consciousness in that it contributed to a sense of national or collective continuity that stemmed back much further than the Constitution of 1840 or even the political unification of the Hawaiian Islands under Kamehameha I. This demonstrates how mo‘okū‘auhau informed 19th century ‘Ōiwi national consciousness as it connected the rulers of their political era

³⁵ Puku‘i and Elbert, 251.

³⁶ Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Duke University Press Books, 2007), 89.

³⁷ Silva, 92.

to the rulers and mo‘olelo of each preceding political era and to the lands over which they not only governed but from which they were born.³⁸

Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua importantly points out that mo‘okū‘auhau is also a framework through which ‘Ōiwi have always understood power, “a crucial aspect in determining who has the legitimacy and mana to govern.”³⁹ We see above how Kalākaua utilized the Kumulipo to legitimize his authority to govern through mo‘okū‘auhau. When the monarchy was deposed in 1893 and in the years following, ‘Ōiwi still defined political legitimacy through mo‘okū‘auhau, contesting entirely the authority of the provisional government and even the United States itself to govern Ko Hawai‘i Pae ‘Āina (The Hawaiian Kingdom). This contestation of US authority continues today.

2.2 Mai Ka ‘Āina Mai

Mo‘okū‘auhau not only connects ‘Ōiwi to political and national history, but also to land. Land and environment are equally intrinsic to ‘Ōiwi genealogy and sense of self. It is considered as much of an ancestor as one’s kūpuna wahine or kūpuna kāne who walked the earth. Malo and Puku‘i tell the story of Hāloanakalaukapalili, the first born child of the akua Ho‘ohōkūkalani and Wākea. Hāloanakalaukapalili, who dies at birth, is buried and from there grows a kalo plant. He is the elder brother of Hāloa, a human and the first ali‘i nui of Hawai‘i.⁴⁰ Many ‘Ōiwi recognize their own descent from this ancestor.

³⁸ One of the central themes in Young’s “Kuleana: Toward A Historiography Of Hawaiian National Consciousness, 1780-2001” is that an understanding of consciousness of Hawaiian state-continuity is critical to Hawaiian national consciousness.

³⁹ Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, “Kū i ka Mana”, 321.

⁴⁰ Davida Malo. *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: The Folk Press, 1987),159; E.S. Craighill Handy and Mary Kawena Puku‘i. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka‘ū Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1998), 193.

Kame‘eleihiwa concludes, “[t]hus the *kalo* plant, which was the main staple of the people of old, is also the elder brother of the Hawaiian race, and as such deserves great respect.”⁴¹ Encouraging us to consider the implications, she then asks,

What, then, are the lessons, or historical metaphors, that arise from the *mo‘olelo* of Wākea? The first lesson is of man’s familial relationship to the Land, that is, to the islands of Hawai‘i and Māui, and to the *kalo* Hāloa-naka, who are the elder siblings of the Hawaiian Chiefs and people. This relationship is reflected in the Hawaiian tradition of *Mālama ‘Āina*, “caring for the Land.”⁴²

The *mo‘olelo* (story, history, tradition)⁴³ of Hāloa implies that the people are not only related to the land but come from and are the land. The reciprocal relationship between ‘āina and kānaka that Kame‘eleihiwa identifies is nurtured through a life cycle that returns both *kalo* and *kanaka* to the earth via the practice of *kanu* (to plant, to bury).⁴⁴ *Mo‘okū‘auhau* such as this define ‘Ōiwi’s genealogical connections to the land. Trask demonstrates how our native language provides evidence of the inherent relationship between people and land, concluding that “Thus, in our way of speaking, land is inherent to the people; it is like our bodies and our parents. The people cannot exist without the land, and the land cannot exist without the people.”⁴⁵ Traditional connections to land were codified and protected in the Hawaiian Kingdom. One example can be found in laws within the land division system known as the *Mahele* of 1848 and the *Kuleana Act* of 1850. All land title that came about through these acts were subject to the rights of

⁴¹ Kame‘eleihiwa, 24.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 20-21.

⁴³ Puku‘i and Elbert, 254.

⁴⁴ S.M. Kamakau. *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 35; Malo, 69. See also *The Polynesian Family System in Ka‘ū Hawai‘i*; 151-3.

⁴⁵ Trask, 116.

native tenants (ua koe ke kuleana o na kanaka). Beamer describes some of the ways that traditional relationships to land in Hawai‘i were protected for ‘Ōiwi in the Kuleana Act: “The Kuleana Act also included section 4 which was mentioned earlier, that allowed the hoā‘āina to purchase government lands at reduced rates, and section 7, which attempted to codify ancient resource use and access into the law”.⁴⁶ He goes on to quote from the English version of Section 7 of the Kuleana Act,

When the landlords have taken allodial titles to their lands, the people on each of their lands, shall not be deprived of the right to take firewood, house timber, aho cord, thatch, or ti leaf, from the land on which they live, for their own private use, should they need them...The people shall also have a right to drinking water, and running water, and the right of way.

This law exemplifies one of the ways the Kingdom of Hawai‘i protected specifically ‘ōiwi land use practices defined by our genealogical connection to it. The Hawaiian Kingdom’s codification and (theoretical) protection of practices and governance that dated back to the ‘Ōiwi wāle nō era⁴⁷ exemplified how ancestral consciousness was institutionalized in the Kingdom. This also supports an argument that it was in the interest of ‘Ōiwi, specifically, to maintain the independence of their country and autonomy from the U.S. However, with an air of caution, Young differentiates between ancestral consciousness and assertions for Hawaiian independence stating that, “The indigenous identity that belongs to Hawaiian nationals of aboriginal blood is a historical expression of ancestral consciousness and traditional practice for forums domestic and international, but not to attain political self-determination.” But Beamer demonstrates how “ancestral

⁴⁶ Beamer, 201.

⁴⁷ Young uses the term “ ‘Ōiwi wale” to describe the era prior to the contact and settlement of Europeans and other foreigners. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua adds “nō” to the description in her book *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*, noting Dr. Noenoe Silva’s elaboration that adding “nō” is necessary to make the phrase entirely exclusive to ‘Ōiwi.

consciousness” itself was institutionalized in the Hawaiian Kingdom and therefore, for ‘Ōiwi, became a critical component to national consciousness. Further, Kalākau’s publication of the Kumulipo to legitimize his reign and, as Silva stated, “to legitimize the existence of the nation itself” demonstrates that ancestral consciousness and national consciousness were critically intertwined. This lends to the interest and kuleana of ‘Ōiwi, in particular, to uphold the independence of the Hawaiian Kingdom and would suggest that the ideological attacks on ‘Ōiwi ancestry in the early years of occupation were in service to the realignment of a national identity. While it would be a political and factual error to conceptualize the Kingdom of Hawai‘i as ‘Ōiwi wale nō, it is important not to undermine the role of mo‘okū‘auhau in national consciousness as this is what drove the political resistance against the take-over of Hawai‘i between 1887 and 1898.

Mo‘okū‘auhau also lends ‘Ōiwi political power in its ability to define the lāhui.

Kehaulani Kauanui acknowledges this political power stating,

Hawaiian kinship and genealogical modes of identification allow for political empowerment in the service of nation building because they are inclusive. The genealogical approach is not only more far-reaching [than blood quantum]; it is embedded in indigenous epistemologies whereby peoplehood is rooted in the land.⁴⁸

In that genealogy-based identity is more inclusive than politically imposed forms of identification such as blood-quantum, Kauanui points to mo‘okū‘auhau as increasing our numbers as a lāhui, and connecting us as one lāhui to the land. As much as mo‘okū‘auhau provides inclusive modes of identification for ‘Ōiwi, it also provides significant exclusive boundaries that have remained critical to determining issues of rights and entitlement to governance and land in Hawai‘i. While non-‘Ōiwi, or those who had no genealogical

⁴⁸ J. Kehaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 10.

connection to the land, were able to hold positions of power in the Hawaiian Kingdom, the highest position, that of Mō‘ī could not be obtained without the proper mo‘okū‘auhau. Even though the mo‘okū‘auhau of maka‘āinana may have deemed them insufficient to hold the position of Mō‘ī, it was a shared genealogical connection to land that made the connection between the ali‘i and maka‘āinana so strong, a rooted connection that made the Kingdom of Hawai‘i unique.

Between 1839 and 1850, the Hawaiian Kingdom codified this connection to the land through the 1839 Bill of Rights, the 1840 Constitution, the 1848 Mahele and the 1850 Kuleana Act.⁴⁹ In fact, as Beamer and Duarte point out, much of the state-initiated cartography done as part of these processes maintained traditional concepts of land division, relying upon a localized knowledge-base that resulted from generations of land stewardship in any one place. They state, “In this system it was the *kama‘āina* (long-time native residents) and not the surveyor who understood the traditional *palena*, which were detailed and often times quite precise.”⁵⁰ Using traditional understandings of land division to map the Hawaiian Kingdom’s territory exemplifies one way that ‘Ōiwi national identity was informed by ancestral modes of knowledge. Because the customs and practices that made ‘Ōiwi culturally unique stem from our relationship to the islands, birthed from ancestral parents, Papahānaumoku, Ho‘ohokūkalani and Wākea, for ‘Ōiwi, the same lands that inform our cultural and ancestral identity are as equally intrinsic to our national identity. Unlike most citizens of the United States, for example, who identify

⁴⁹ Beamer, 194-202.

⁵⁰ T. Kao Duarte and B. Kamana Beamer. “I palapala no ia aina - documenting the Hawaiian Kingdom. A colonial venture?” *Journal of Historical Geography* 35 (2009): 66-86.

as “American” nationally but perhaps Irish, Chinese, or Spanish, ancestrally, for ‘Ōiwi, there was no separation between national and ancestral identity until after the U.S. occupation began.

Manulani Aluli Meyer explains the importance of genealogy and land to Hawaiian identity, stating that, “[b]ecause Hawaiian epistemology is linked to a current ontological river that has never stopped flowing, there is still a strong sense of what we know of as ‘Hawaiian’...it is the notion that Hawaiian identity and continuity are drawn from genealogy and place.”⁵¹ According to Meyer, mo‘okū‘auhau is critical to the continuity of Hawaiian identity connecting us to kūpuna, ‘āina and kuleana. This would suggest that critical to the disruption of Hawaiian identity would be an ontological disconnection from genealogy and place.

2.3 In Defense Of Hawaiian Nationality

In the Hawaiian Kingdom, the end of the 19th century was and remains largely defined by the organized resistance against a small group of haole subjects and foreigners who overthrew the sovereign monarch toward and in support of annexation to the United States. Genealogical identification with the land and Kingdom immediately mobilized thousands of citizens, primarily ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i, into a grassroots organizing campaign to defend their country’s independence.

After the armed implementation of the 1887 Constitution (nicknamed “The Bayonet Constitution” due to the employment of an all-white militia called the Honolulu Rifles) thousands of ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i organized into the Hui Kālai‘āina in an effort to

⁵¹ Manulani Aluli Meyer, *Ho‘oulu, Our Time of Becoming: Hawaiian Epistemology and Early Writings* (Honolulu, ‘Ai Pōhaku Press, 2003), 81-82.

restore the powers of the Mō‘ī that were stripped away by the constitution and to re-enfranchise thousands of non-white subjects who, through the Bayonet Constitution, no longer met the race and economic requirements to vote. Article 62 of the 1887 constitution redefined the franchise in the Kingdom from “Every male subject of the Kingdom...” to “Every male resident of the Kingdom of Hawaiian, American or European birth or descent....” making this the first constitution where race became a determining factor in the right to vote. Through this logic of racial hierarchy, particular “descents” were more entitled to political say and power in Hawai‘i over others. Indeed, this logic superseded that of citizenry as a determinant for voting as non-citizen males of “American or European birth or descent” could vote despite being non-citizens while many Chinese citizens of the Kingdom, for example, were entirely disenfranchised as determined solely by their Chinese “birth or decent”. This exemplifies how those who enforced the Bayonet wished to govern Hawai‘i through logics of race, something that eugenics discourse would further support. It also demonstrates how racial construction in Hawai‘i blurred the lines between ethnicity and nationality.⁵² Additionally, while Hawaiians were not disqualified from voting via their “birth or decent” property value qualifications were also raised for the franchise, effectively disenfranchising many ‘Ōiwi male citizens.

⁵² Further evidence is found in the 1890 Hawaiian Kingdom census, overseen and officially analyzed by Charles Reed Bishop. The terms “native” and “half-caste” which in no way refer to a particular nation-state, Chinese and Japanese, which refer both to ethnicity and national citizenship and “American” which can only refer to national citizenship and is not an ethnic description are all used to describe the “nationalities” of the population of Hawai‘i in 1890. While on page 26, Bishop describes the “classification of each race and nationality according to occupation”, when figures of such are presented, no clear distinction is made between race and nationality.

Hui Kālai‘āina however, worked steadfastly to restore what had been lost in the Bayonet Constitution. They created new alliances to form the National Reform Party which won the 1890 election by a landslide and they drafted up and presented to Lili‘uokalani, a new constitution which she, after consulting with the citizenry, supported and worked to implement.⁵³ Returning powers to the Mō‘ī and the right to vote to many disenfranchised subjects through the implementation of this new constitution was the final threat for the oligarchy who wished to see ‘Ōiwi power lessen rather than increase. The inconceivability of returning powers to the Mō‘ī and the people moved these men to conspire with the U.S. military who together seized control from the constitutional monarchy in January of 1893. ‘Ōiwi national consciousness however, was not dampened by the overthrow, but only further ignited. Immediately following, thousands of citizens, primarily ‘Ōiwi, took action to display their unwavering commitment to the Kingdom and Mō‘ī.

As Noenoe Silva has written extensively about, the political upheaval of 1893 spawned a massive organized resistance to the take-over of the Kingdom by this small group of men. Following the overthrow, ‘Ōiwi showed overwhelming support for the deposed Mō‘ī Lili‘uokalani and successfully organized against a treaty of annexation to the United States, submitting petitions of protest, known as the Kū‘ē petition, to the U.S.⁵⁴

The inability of the oligarchy to sever the ties between the Mō‘ī and the citizenry did not go unnoticed. In years following the overthrow of Lili‘uokalani, many

⁵³ Lili‘uokalani *Hawaii’s Story: By Hawaii’s Queen* (Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990), 230.

⁵⁴ Silva, 123-64.

loyalists were jailed for supporting her. Many government employees lost their jobs after refusing to sign an oath of allegiance to the Provisional Government and Republic of Hawai‘i, swearing to never support the monarchy again. This began the criminalization and economic marginalization of Hawaiian national consciousness in Hawai‘i. If this oligarchy believed that ‘Ōiwi were “unfit” to govern themselves, the overwhelming majority of the ‘Ōiwi population and even many non-‘Ōiwi citizens staunchly disagreed.

Thus, as a measure to maintain power, those treasonous to Hawaiian Kingdom law, responsible for the Bayonet Constitution and the eventual forced take-over of Hawai‘i enforced economic and political sanctions against those who supported the continuation of the Kingdom and the ultimate rule of a native sovereign, the Mō‘ī. “Criminal” and “pauper” were included in eugenics’ overarching category of “Unfit”, which pulled those who resisted the takeover of the Hawaiian Kingdom into a discourse of ancestral degeneracy and unfitness, one that entirely overlooked external forces at play such as the criminalization of ‘Ōiwi self-determination. In this way, eugenics discourse would further serve to separate the lāhui from a Hawaiian national consciousness.

Stories such as these are an important part of ‘Ōiwi national history and continue to inform and develop the modern reconstitution of Hawaiian national consciousness and identity. Many of today’s Kānaka ‘Ōiwi can and have traced their own genealogy to those who signed the Kū‘ē Petitions, another example of how mo‘okū‘auhau and national consciousness intertwine for ‘Ōiwi.

Kame‘eleihiwa tells us that genealogies are so much more than a list of “whom begot whom” but are a “mnemonic device” by which our mo‘olelo, or stories are

recalled.⁵⁵ Genealogy is the method through which ‘Ōiwi remember our mo‘olelo that connect us to ‘āina, to ‘Ōiwi life-systems, and to historical and current politics. It is mo‘okū‘auhau as a “great bloodline of memory” that determines how we recognize and identify ourselves through our kūpuna.

Young explains the interests of the U.S. and Territorial oligarchy in erasing ancestral identification with the stories of resistance to foreign occupation that largely defined the turn of the 20th century for ‘Ōiwi Hawai‘i:

The prolonged occupation, with its most deleterious effects, has historically marginalized the expression of important identities, first the Hawaiian national, then the indigenous Hawaiian, to benefit key interests of the occupier. From 1900 on, the occupier methodically required assimilation by processes of educational indoctrination (brainwashing in colloquial parlance).⁵⁶

Mo‘okū‘auhau for ‘Ōiwi defines who we are in relation to each other, our histories, our fields of expertise, and all the trials and triumphs of our family mo‘olelo. In addition, mo‘okū‘auhau ties us to the land. It shapes our understanding of ourselves in relation to the land, that being in essence, one with the land. Mo‘okū‘auhau shapes Hawaiian national consciousness, that which drives toward Hawaiian independence. Shared national histories and genealogies take us as a lāhui back together to the time of ‘ōiwi wale nō and to those things that make us uniquely Hawaiian. The governance, family systems and modes of land tenure were crucial to defining the Hawaiian Kingdom and ‘Ōiwi’s relationship and kuleana to their government, Ke Aupuni Hawai‘i. Indeed, the ancestral connections between maka‘āinana, aupuni and ‘āina spurred the fight to

⁵⁵ Kame‘eleihiwa, 22.

⁵⁶ Young, 11.

maintain the independence of the Hawaiian Kingdom from any other country who wished to erode such institution for its own benefit.

CHAPTER 3. OCCUPIED HAWAI'I AND THE AMERICAN EUGENICS MOVEMENT

The eugenics movement took place in the U.S. and Europe through most of the first half of the 20th century. A predominantly caucasian, middle-class-centered social movement toward “race-betterment”, those who subscribed to eugenics believed that the characteristics and traits that placed individuals socially and economically were biologically inherent and passed on from one generation to the next. It was typically categorized into “positive eugenics” and “negative eugenics.” Positive eugenics aimed to increase the number of “fit” citizens through selective partnering/mating and negative eugenics advocated for the elimination of the “Unfit” through compulsory celibacy, sterilization, and institutionalization. Indiana was the first state to legalize compulsory sterilization in 1907 and was followed by 29 states in the coming decades.⁵⁷ The eugenics movement included legislation, literature, curriculum, “Fitter Family” campaigns, networks of eugenics societies, speeches, conferences, exhibits and social fitness awards. It included educational, social, legal and criminal justice institutions as well as practices such as the institutionalization and sterilization.

While the description of the eugenics movement above provides a very simple summary of eugenics and the American eugenics movement, some eugenics scholars emphasize the difficulty in reducing eugenics to any one definition or explanation. Bioethics and legal scholar Paul A. Lombardo argues the scholarly quandary of narrowing down a single interpretation of eugenics and instead focuses on the “many

⁵⁷ Eloy Axel Carlson, “The Hoosier Connection: Compulsory Sterilization as Moral Hygiene” in *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*, ed. Paul A. Lombardo. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2011), 21.

ways that term was used to justify cultural shifts, social programs, and laws in the United States.” noting that, “Eugenics took many forms, and different agendas were launched “in the name of eugenics.”⁵⁸ As Wendy Kline concurs, “...eugenic ideology comprised a complex combination of popular and scientific beliefs and interests that has confounded historians.”⁵⁹

While eugenics undoubtedly served as a tool of ideological construction and control wherever it was forwarded and applied, the Territorial Hawai‘i eugenics movement adds it’s own chapter to the broader story of eugenics. It compliments the story of a changing political regime from a native led independently recognized nation-state whose construction was embedded in ancient institution to one controlled by a small haole oligarchy driven by a thirst for land and capitalist exploitation and trade. Whereas American eugenics largely addressed perceived threats to white supremacy within the borders of the United States, such as immigration, the story of eugenics in Hawai‘i signifies an ideological campaign that served to justify conquest and seizure; seizure of land, of nationhood and of national identity itself as the US extended its imperial reach outward.

Eugenics was introduced in Hawai‘i at a meeting of the Social Science Society of Hawai‘i in Honolulu in 1886. The Social Science Society of Hawai‘i was a social club of white elite founded in 1882 that served to both share essays and modern thoughts on issues of race, science and governance as well as to inform and influence policy in

⁵⁸ Paul A. Lombardo, “Looking Back at Eugenics” in *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*, ed. Paul A. Lombardo. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2011), 2.

⁵⁹ Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality and Eugenics From the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 13.

Hawai‘i. Later, famed eugenicist Stanley D. Porteus would also become a member and in fact write the honorific introduction of a 1962 book about the Society. While eugenics itself was introduced in Hawai‘i via an essay reading in 1888, it didn’t gain traction as a movement in Hawai‘i until over two decades later, on the cusp of the American movement. However, other essays read by the Society inform eugenics relationship to race and in fact pave the way for dominant eugenic themes of race, degeneracy and the dying Hawaiian.

Two years following the essay on eugenics, at an 1888 meeting in Honolulu, missionary descendant, Reverend Sereno E. Bishop read an essay authored by himself titled, “Why are the Hawaiian People Dying Out?” In this essay, he aimed to answer the question, “In what respects, particularly and precisely, are the Hawaiians weaker than their White, or their Mongoloid guests?” The answers included “Unchastity” on which he spent the majority of his essay pointing to as the cause of Hawaiian weakness. Other dominant reasons, according to Bishop included “Drunkenness”, “Oppression of the chiefs”, “Kahuna and sorcery” and “Idolatry”.⁶⁰ Bishop offered hygiene instruction, Christianity, and education as some things that could save the dreadful fate of Hawaiians. This was typical of the Society’s interest in race and in particular, it’s relationship to governance in Hawai‘i. It also exemplified the continuity of the discourse of Ola Hou which positions ‘Ōiwi cultural practices, such as ho‘omana kahiko (pre-Christian religion) as their own worst enemy; as that which would drive them to extinction.

⁶⁰ S.E. Bishop, “Why Are The Hawaiians Dying Out?: Or Elements of Disability for Survival Among the Hawaiian People” Paper read at 1888 meeting of Social Science Society of Honolulu. California Digital Library, University of California. <https://archive.org/details/whyarehawaiiansd00bish> (accessed August - November, 2013).

Eugenics gained momentum as a movement around 1911, around the same time the American eugenics movement was gaining national popularity. In 1911, a talk was given at the annual meeting of the Medical Association of Hawai‘i, by physician Jon T. McDonald and for the following four decades, eugenicists in Territorial Hawai‘i attempted to pass eugenic legislation, implemented a eugenics curriculum at the Kamehameha schools, worked to build and strengthen a eugenics network through local and U.S. national eugenics conferences, and sway public opinion through local media. Collaborations between individuals, private and public institutions and local and national eugenic institutions made up the anatomy of the movement in Hawai‘i. Following McDonald’s 1911 talk, the Medical Society of Hawai‘i quickly threw their support behind sterilization efforts. Peter James Nelligan, whose dissertation addresses relations between race and rape law in Territorial Hawai‘i points to the social prominence of eugenics strongest advocates in Hawai‘i: “Those pushing the issue in Honolulu were not crack pots. Like the Citizens Protective Committee, which considered many persons supportive of eugenics, the movement drew its support from the haole elite and included such powerful figures as Governor Walter Frear, his wife and Judge Sanford B. Dole”⁶¹

Nelligan also points out that eugenics, which focused on preventing “criminals” from reproducing, was seen as a progressive and enlightened manner of addressing particular social problems in Hawai‘i in contrast to those who advocated for punishments such as whippings and even lynchings for criminal acts in particular pertaining to sexual assault. But the self-perceived benevolence of eugenic methods of “prevention” allowed

⁶¹ Peter James Nelligan, “Social Change and Rape Law in Hawai‘i” (PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i, 1983), 181. He cites the Pacific Commercial Advertiser, December 19, 1912: 1C.

them to widen the scope of who could be seen as a threat to society. While enforcing punishments such as lynching or whipping to a person convicted of rape may have found substantial support in Honolulu, it would be harder to convince citizens that such punishments were an appropriate response to poverty or epilepsy. Eugenics cast a wide net over all who the haole elite saw as undesirable, identifying “defective” heredity as that which tied everyone from the murderer, to the rapist to the “unemployable” and even “incurable drunkards” together.

In 1913, the first two eugenic laws were proposed in the Territorial legislature, one that would require a health inspection before a marriage license could be issued and the other for the sterilization of “Feeble-minded Persons, Epileptics, Rapists, Certain Criminals and Other Defectives.”⁶² At this time the legislature consisted only of haole and ‘Ōiwi legislators and the bill was defeated almost entirely down ethnic lines, haole voting “Ae” and ‘Ōiwi voting “Noe”. That same year, a pamphlet-style textbook called *Eugenics For Young People* was created specifically for and implemented at the Kamehameha Schools as regular curriculum for fifth, sixth and seventh grade boys.⁶³ This text was endorsed by members of the Medical Society of Hawai‘i. Society member and physician, Dr. Edward Goodhue wrote a number of newspaper articles advocating for sterilization legislation. In 1915 a pamphlet to supplement *Eugenics For Young People*

⁶² House Bill 181 *An Act to Prevent the Transmission of Venereal Diseases through the Marriage of Persons Afflicted with such Diseases, Adding a New Section to the Revised Laws 1913*; and House Bill 192 *An Act to Authorize the Sterilization of Feeble-minded Persons, Epileptics, Rapists, Certain Criminals and Other Defectives 1913*. Hawai‘i State Archives.

⁶³ The Kamehameha Schools Register, 1913-1914. Kamehameha Schools Archives. It is yet unclear how long the subject was taught. The archives are missing registers between this year and the 1920-21 school year, in which the subject does not appear. While eugenics was not found in the girl’s curriculum register for the same year, it is also unclear when an if it was taught to them. However the textbook itself states “For the boys and girls of Kamehameha Schools”.

was published called *Eugenics For Parents and Teachers*. Territorial eugenicists continued to propose legislation as far into the Territorial period as the early 1950s. In 1933, Dr. Nils Larsen, medical director of the Queens Hospital, Dr. Philip S. Platt, director of Pālama Settlement, E.S. McGhee, Deputy Attorney General, L.J. Warren, chairman of the Board of Prison Directors, and Dr. Thomas L. Taylor, Superintendent of The Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded, along with a number of other social organizations publicly advocated for another eugenic sterilization bill.⁶⁴

Along with the establishment of Waimano Home, the Territorial Legislature appropriated money to establish the University of Hawai‘i Psychological and Pathological Clinic under the management of the Board of Directors. The famed eugenicist Stanley D. Porteus was the clinic’s first director. Takemoto explains that in addition to research, “the clinic would be responsible for observing and examining any person referred by the courts, the superintendent of industrial schools, the asylum for the insane, the Department of Public Instruction or any other public institutions or organization.”⁶⁵ Legislation, education, public discourse, a vast array of Territorial institutions including the University of Hawai‘i, local social and medical organizations and charities were each part of a network that instituted eugenic doctrine and advocated for eugenic policies in Territorial Hawai‘i. To provide context for the Hawai‘i eugenics effort, it is helpful to understand the larger themes of the American movement that largely informed Hawai‘i-based eugenicists.

⁶⁴ Karen Reiko Takemoto, “Unquestionably Lolo: A History of Waimano Home (1921-1961)” (Masters Thesis, University of Hawai‘i, 1984), 10.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 49.

3.1 “Race-Suicide”, White Supremacy And Race As Nation

Birth rate differentials between the white middle class and non-white populations, increasing immigration and the belief that the best of the white stock were being sent off and sacrificed to war raised racial anxieties for some white Americans at the turn of the 20th century. These anxieties were expressed through the idea of “race suicide” which became a rallying cry for some supporters of eugenics.⁶⁶ The notion of race suicide was embedded in a belief in the racial and cultural superiority of whites and in a fear that the political control entitled to a superior race was threatened by a growing non-white population. Subscribers to the notion of race suicide believed that it was the responsibility of the best of the white race to reproduce with each other in order to maintain such superiority.

Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States from 1901-1909, was one such proponent of the idea of race suicide. As Kline explains, “Juxtaposing his imperialist foreign policy with an attack on race suicide at home, he argued that “no race has any chance to win a great place [in the world] unless it consists of good breeders as well as of good fighters.”⁶⁷ Roosevelt felt that a good and strong white race was critical to U.S. power in the world. In this sense, whiteness was critical to U.S. imperialism and U.S. imperial power was equally critical to whiteness. While the U.S. had invaded Hawai‘i to establish it as a military outpost, the population of Hawai‘i as primarily non-white would be a challenge that those wanting full inclusion into the United States would need to overcome. If the population could not be made white, perhaps they could be made to

⁶⁶ Kline, 11-12.

⁶⁷ Ibid.

exemplify American values and national allegiance. Eugenic belief in the inherent biological unfitness of those on the social margins would help bring American norms and ideals into focus in Hawai‘i. The prospect of institutionalization or sterilization stood as a threatening consequence to those who would not give great consideration to such ideals.

Tuhiwai-Smith elaborates on the relationship between imperialism, race and indigenous peoples, stating,

Imperialism provided the means through which concepts of what counts as human could be applied systematically as forms of classification, for example through hierarchies of race and typologies of different societies. In conjunction with imperial power and with ‘science’, these classification systems came to shape relations between imperial powers and indigenous societies.⁶⁸

Eugenicists utilized science to biologically fix ideas of ‘fitness’ and ‘unfitness’, functioning to order different races in relation to ability and entitlement to political power in Hawai‘i. In the Hawaiian Kingdom era (1810-1893), white missionaries defined such entitlement in terms of religion, deeming the native as savage and in need of ‘civilizing’ to white industrial norms. By the turn of the twentieth century, some were using science as a new and more sophisticated moral and social authority. As Jason S. Lantzer states, “Eugenics became a secular faith among the scientifically inclined who asserted that by obeying the commandments of biology, humanity could usher in a social millennium.”⁶⁹

In her article, *The Three Pillars of White Supremacy*, Andrea Smith, illustrates the relationship between white supremacy and U.S. imperial power using three different but

⁶⁸ Linda Tuhiwai-Smith. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (Dunedin: University of Otago Press, 1999).

⁶⁹ Jason S. Lantzer. “The Indiana Way of Eugenics: Sterilization Laws 1907-74” in *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*, ed. Paul A. Lombardo. (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2011), 28.

interlocking logics: Slavery/Capitalism, or the desire for non-white labor exploitation to sustain U.S. capital interests; Genocide/Colonialism, or the need for indigenous people to “disappear” in order to take their lands for capital exploitation; and Orientalism/War, the constant “Othering” of non-whites as having fundamentally conflicting values and interest to America’s in order to justify ongoing wars that expand capital and military interests.⁷⁰ Hawai‘i was economically and militarily dominated by haole who sought indigenous land and non-white labor to serve the economic interests of the American haole elite in Hawai‘i and the expanding imperial interests of the United States. The Territorial oligarchy’s allegiance to the U.S. may have upheld their power at this beginning stage of U.S. occupation in Hawai‘i but race/population differentials would put into question just how long that power could last and was therefore of interest to both the oligarchy and the U.S.

3.2 Racial And National Anxieties Of The Territorial Oligarchy

Territorial reports reveal that the racial make-up of Hawai‘i was of utmost concern to both Territorial and U.S. officials. The 1903 annual Report of the Governor of Hawai‘i to the [US] Secretary of Interior *opens* with the racial make-up of Hawai‘i as including “Hawaiian, Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese, Scandinavian, Spanish, and Teutonic, which includes British, German, and American.”⁷¹ It then reports that Hawaiian, Portuguese, Japanese, and Chinese school children outnumber “Teutonic” school children by 14,724, noting that “Almost all the [non-white] boys will be voting

⁷⁰ Andrea Smith. “Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing.” In *Color of Violence: the Incite! Anthology*, ed. Incite! Women of Color Against Violence. (Brooklyn: South End Press, 2006).

⁷¹ “Report of the Governor of the Territory of Hawai‘i to the Secretary of the Interior. 1903” (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1903), 7.

citizens when they reach voting age.”⁷² The report then communicates the Territorial government’s anxieties over the political implications of these numbers, stating:

At this rate, unless there should be a larger immigration of American settlers than now seems probable, the present numerical inferiority of those which may be classed as belonging to the Teutonic race..., will in a few years, become a still greater inferiority as compared with the then American citizens of the Hawaiian, Portuguese, Japanese and Chinese races.⁷³

Although every race is classified nationally as American, the report reveals anxieties over race *difference* when considering potential political power found through the franchise. This suggests a clash of political interests between the different racial groups of color and white residents of Hawai‘i in the early Territorial period. The report offers its solution to such political conflicts, stating:

This prospect emphasizes the importance of giving to all children who are American citizens a good common school education. The association of pupils of the different races with each other in school, work and the recreations of the playground go far toward breaking down race prejudices and tends to prepare them for intelligent political action in the future.⁷⁴

These statements equate the “numerical inferiority” of whites in the Territory to a struggle for “intelligent political action” in a place where the future franchise consists of the children of Japanese, Chinese and Hawaiian nationals, whose political loyalties remained with their own countries. The report conflates race and nationality and in this sense, “breaking down race prejudices” (amongst each other) seems metaphorical for breaking down national prejudices (against the American haole oligarchy). A good

⁷² Ibid.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

American education would be key to aligning non-white school children in Hawai‘i with American national interests, thereby preparing them for “intelligent political action”.

The conflation of race, intelligence and political action provides a window into the construction of racial hierarchy in Hawai‘i and the US, a hierarchy constructed upon white supremacy through which definitions of political inclusion and exclusion were given shape and meaning. While many Americans believed whiteness as intrinsic to U.S. power, in early Territorial Hawai‘i, if American-identifying whites could not ensure the dominance of U.S. interests in Hawai‘i by their own population size alone, then the next best thing would be to align the children of non-American nationals, all of whom would gain greater political influence within one generation, to American identities.

While this report comes nearly a decade prior to the establishment of the eugenics movement in Hawai‘i, it reveals racial and national concerns of those who governed Hawai‘i that would shape policy and social efforts in the coming decades. National concerns over race-suicide and the future of the US, popularized in the first decade of the twentieth century largely shaped the American eugenics movement that took off thereafter.

The Territorial oligarchy wished to secure power by encouraging Americans to consider Hawai‘i for permanent settlement but knew that their own racial anxieties as ethnic minorities in Hawai‘i would be shared by potential American settlers. The social effects of disease and urbanization in Hawai‘i created even greater image problems for those who supported American settlerism in Hawai‘i and such themes were prominent in

a talk on eugenics given to the Medical Society of Hawai‘i that immediately preceded an organized effort to institutionalize eugenic discourse and policy in Hawai‘i.

3.3 The Medical Society Of Hawai‘i And “The New Science Of Eugenics”

The urbanization of American towns stemming from the Industrial Revolution shifted how Americans viewed charity. Those who were once looked at as less fortunate and worthy of charity began to be viewed by some as degenerate and unable to keep up with progress. As Carlson explains, “Degeneracy theory found its origins in the...boom-bust economy. Accidents, ill health, and the tragedies of life (loss of a spouse, becoming orphaned, abusive home environments) that could lead to unreliability at work or unemployment compounded the structural economic challenges that strained American life.”⁷⁵ This perspective was utilized by some eugenicists who politicized the socially and economically marginalized as a financial burden on society. Carlson illustrates how degeneracy theory provided biological interpretations for the marginalized, “holding that the physiological imperfections that led to degeneracy were themselves marks of an individual’s inherent biological inferiority...”.⁷⁶ This logic held that factors contributing to any individuals inability to succeed financially, or help others succeed financially by simply showing up to work, were biologically inherent and would be passed on to their posterity, ensuring a perpetually inescapable financial burden on society.

The financial burdens on society caused by the Unfit were the focus of a talk given by Territorial physician Jon T. McDonald to the 1911 annual meeting of the Medical Society of Honolulu. The Medical Society of Hawai‘i was made up of the

⁷⁵ Carlson, 151.

⁷⁶ Ibid

Territory's haole elite, including those who helped orchestrate the overthrow and who consequently stepped into positions of great power after forcefully removing Queen Lili'uokalani from her throne. The Medical Society was one of the primary institutions of support for the Territorial eugenics movement.

McDonald's talk, titled "The New Science of Eugenics" emphasized the tens of millions of dollars that could be saved by charities and hospitals through the prevention of a wide range of problems from disease to deafness, to alcoholism to criminality, namely all those considered "unfit".⁷⁷ McDonald's subscription to eugenic policy is initially made clear toward the beginning of his speech when he describes the "eugenicist" as "...arriving at a knowledge of proper qualifications and requirements for parenthood, with a view always to a better and worthier race by the gradual elimination of the unfit."⁷⁸ He begins to define those who may fall into the category of Unfit by encouraging his listeners to question whether or not thieves, embezzlers, chronic gamblers, "the drunkard, or even the man who has to totally abstain on his account of his love of alcoholics", epileptics, "the feeble-minded", the congenital deaf, the degenerate, criminals and "paupers" should be allowed to reproduce on account of their cost to society and the possibility that they "transmit their mental traits to their offspring."⁷⁹

Wendy Kline provides clarification on the function of the term "feeble-minded" within the eugenics movement. She notes, "And because "feeblemindedness" had not been a precise diagnostic term to begin with it was easily transformed into a catchall term

⁷⁷ Jonathan T. McDonald, "The New Science of Eugenics" (speech, Honolulu, 1913) Hawai'i State Archives.

⁷⁸ Ibid

⁷⁹ Ibid

for any type of behavior considered inappropriate or threatening.”⁸⁰ Labels such as these that stigmatized the diseased and the economically and socially marginalized would consistently recur throughout the Territory’s eugenics movement.

McDonald’s focus on the economic burdens of the Unfit echoed the sentiments of the larger American movement. He emphasized that eugenics would bear its greatest fruit upon “the great toiling masses”, “Especially in the crowded tenement quarters of our great cities do we find the high birthrates, and, we may add, a correspondingly high death rate.”⁸¹ In Hawai‘i such a lens would bring particular attention to ‘Ōiwi families who found the effects urbanization and industrialization the cause of major economic hardships. As Davianna Pōmaika‘i McGregor’s research highlights, in 1910, over a third of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi lived in urban Honolulu and by 1920 the number had increased to 42% when 28% of those unemployed were ‘Ōiwi. The numbers continued to grow and in 1930 40% of those unemployed were ‘Ōiwi.⁸² She explains that following the 1900 burning of Chinatown tenements, “Hundreds of Hawaiian families were driven to build makeshift shelters...”⁸³ The high cost of fish and poi in Honolulu as well as the burden of rent and other living expenses left many ‘Ōiwi families in poverty. McGregor notes a 1912 Pacific Commercial Advertiser survey that “identified squatter camps along the shoreline near Fort Armstrong, along Ala Moana between Ward and Sheridan streets, under Diamond

⁸⁰ Kline, 25.

⁸¹ Birth-rate differentials between whites and non-whites fed racial anxieties that informed eugenics discourse. See Allen M. Brandt, *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880*, by for more on the issue.

⁸² Davianna Pōmaika‘i McGregor “Kūpa‘a i ka ‘āina: Persistence on the land” Ph.d. dissertation, University of Hawaii, 1989), 105-9.

⁸³ Ibid, 168.

Head, at the base of Round Top, at Moanalua, and near Iwilei.” With the exception of one camp, “...Hawaiian families made up the bulk of the inhabitants.”⁸⁴

Eugenicists advocated for the reproductive sterilization of such individuals as a means of lessening the economic burden of this group of people. “Unfit” became the catchall label for all targeted by negative eugenics including the poor, criminals, prostitutes, alcoholics, the physically disabled, the mentally retarded, the diseased and more. Labeling such populations as Unfit and targeting them as candidates for forced sterilization gave power to a particular definition of what was considered acceptable and desirable American traits, namely employed, chaste, disease-free citizens who had never been convicted of a crime.

Within two years of McDonald’s talk, eugenics had gained significant support in Hawai‘i. In 1913, two eugenic bills were introduced into the legislature and a curriculum was implemented at Kamehameha schools, created specifically for ‘Ōiwi boys and girls. In the following chapter we will take a closer look at these efforts and their implications in regard to ‘Ōiwi national identity.

⁸⁴ Ibid.

CHAPTER 4. PERSONALIZING EUGENICS, EUGENICS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AT THE KAMEHAMEHA SCHOOLS

The Kamehameha Schools is a 125 year old private school for ‘Ōiwi children. It was established through the will of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop and continues to be supported primarily through revenue generated from lands left to Pauahi from her Aunt, Ruth Luka Keanolani Kauanahoahoa Ke‘elikōlani, great grand-daughter of Kamehameha Pai‘ea. Following Pauahi’s death in 1884, The Kamehameha School for Boys opened in 1887 to create “good and industrious men and women” from its pupils. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua points out that although established through the will of Pauahi, the school opened “under the direction of a board of trustees wholly comprised of white, male annexationist, led by Pauahi’s husband, Charles Reed Bishop. She further elaborates that the annexationists’ belief in “the superiority of their race, their gender” drove racial pedagogies that were “predicated on defining Hawaiianness as a racial category, marked particularly by its spiritual, physical and cultural peril.”⁸⁵ The “peril” of Hawaiians positioned those who seized power from the Kingdom, the Mō‘ī and the citizenry as benevolent; “saving” ‘Ōiwi from their self-inflicted doom all the while further reinforcing a white superior/‘Ōiwi inferior binary by pointing to ‘Ōiwi’s inability to survive modern conditions.

In 1913, students of Kamehameha Schools were introduced to a eugenics textbook that used ancestry as a lens through which to determine their own degree of moral and civic ineptitude and the resulting future of their family line. I will look at this

⁸⁵ Jennifer Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua. “Kū i ka Māna. Building Community and Nation Through Contemporary Hawaiian Schooling” Ph.d. dissertation, University of California Santa Cruz, 2005), 99.

curriculum as a case study to demonstrate the political implications of eugenics discourse, as aimed at ‘Ōiwi, especially as they pertained to race and class.

That Kamehameha Schools student body was virtually entirely Kānaka ‘ōiwi is significant in that it provided the Americanists who ran it a concentrated population of young ‘Ōiwi to condition and socialize into an American citizenry that supported the values and systems of American capitalism. As previously noted, the generation that received instruction on eugenics was the first born under US occupation and at home were being raised by the staunch Hawaiian patriots that so actively and vocally opposed the take over of Hawai‘i by the US and by the haole oligarchy. These ‘ōiwi youth were growing up on the cusps of political revolution, social upheaval and a new construction/projection of Hawai‘i and its people. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua explains how students at Kamehameha Schools were pedagogical subjects within an institution that served the political domestication of Hawai‘i:

On a policy level, the aim was to fracture the historical precedent of recognizing Hawai‘i as an autonomous nation-state and instead establish a subordinate relationship between the US government and the Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, without our aupuni. On an ideological level, the goal was to transform Kanaka Maoli collective understanding of ourselves from a self-governing political body to a small and relatively powerless racial minority domesticated under the United States.⁸⁶

Eugenics For Young People (EFYP) powerfully substantiates Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s analysis in that as a curriculum of Kamehameha schools, it opened up and spelled out how exactly how ‘Ōiwi were in fact disconnected from their best ancestors of the past and from any national history at all.

⁸⁶ Goodyear, Ka‘ōpua, “Kū i ka Mana”, 101.

EFYP was comprised of twelve short chapters and was written by white eugenicist and then Vice President of Kamehameha Schools, Uldrick Thompson. Thompson, educated in the U.S. was a teacher by trade. He had a number of teaching positions in the U.S. before coming to Hawai‘i in 1889 as a teacher for the Kamehameha Schools. Ethnomusicologist, C.K. Szego who studied Thompson’s musical compositions about volcano deity Pele points to Thompson’s racial ambivalence toward ‘Ōiwi explaining that, “it was largely a matter of fascination with Hawaiians who were safely in the past and a condemnation of the majority of their stigmatized and very present children.” Szego concludes

It is also fair to say that Thompson’s feelings of ambivalence toward Hawaiians were held by many others of his social position. He admired Hawaiians’ past greatness and the ability of many to adapt to European American lifeways, but he was aghast at those who floundered in a Christian capitalist democracy or shunned it altogether.⁸⁷

EFYP was implemented as a regular subject in the 1912-1913 school year and was taught once a week to fifth, sixth and seventh grade boys.⁸⁸ One Sunday evening a month, a short paper was read to all the boys “reviewing points brought out during the month.”⁸⁹ It included all the major themes of eugenics including fixed degeneracy, the burden and elimination of the “Unfit” and emphasized particular social ideals as the antithesis of Unfitness. A number of individual and collective experiences particular to ‘Ōiwi qualified the students as Unfit. While using science to fix Unfitness as biologically

⁸⁷ C.K. Szego, “The Sound of Rocks Aquiver: Composing Racial Ambivalence in Territorial Hawai‘i” *The Journal of American Folklore* 123 no 487 (Winter 2010): 31-62.

⁸⁸ The Kamehameha Schools Register, 1913-1914. Found at the Kamehameha Schools archives.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

inherent, the text, nevertheless, provided students an out to the natural outcome of this inherited legacy-extinction. “Good citizenry” and adherence to particular social and economic ideals were, according to EFYP, the key to survival. EFYP provides a concentrated snapshot into one of the ways that eugenics discourse took shape in Hawai‘i. In the way that it was customized for ‘Ōiwi youth of the 1910s, it exemplifies how eugenics functioned to shape issues of place and citizenry through an inferiority-based lens of mo‘okū‘auhau.

The first chapter, titled “Eugenics” situates the emerging field of eugenics within other established sciences as an attempt to legitimize its own authority. Its ability to predict the quality of a person is compared to chemistry, which the text explains, informs people “what will happen when men put two substances together” and sociology which, according to the text, informs people “what will happen when people live under certain conditions”. Thompson elaborates on the definition of Sociology and then replaces the term entirely with the term Eugenics stating, “But I shall not call it Sociology because Sociology is too big a subject. I shall call it Eugenics.” As a pseudonym for eugenics, Thompson’s analysis and explanation of Sociology becomes a most informative framework for the rest of the textbook:

That is, if you tell a Sociologist just what kind of people live in a country, or in a city or in a part of a city; how much they are educated, how much they earn, how many saloons there are, etc, he will tell you what will happen in that country or city. Sociology means the study of people, - their nationality, their mental and physical powers, their training, their social conditions; whether they are capable of becoming good citizens; and *whether their children will become better citizens or poorer citizens than the fathers and mothers*. Sociology is also a study of how to improve human beings in every way.[emphasis added]⁹⁰

⁹⁰ Uldrick Thompson *Eugenics For Young People* (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, 1913), 3.

Thompson emphasized that the study of eugenics (in this text, formally Sociology) is the study of the quality of nationhood as determined by the quality of its citizenry. So the characteristics and conditions that Thompson lays out in the following chapters are presented as binaries of worthy (American) citizenry for these ‘Ōiwi students to consider for themselves and their children, this in opposition to the characteristics of Unfit, which intentionally described particular social and economic realities of many ‘Ōiwi at the time. The looming threat of “elimination” for those considered Unfit would postulate “good citizenry” as the path to survival and mere survival was presented above all else in EFYP as the primary concern for the lāhui ‘Ōiwi. The logic of future extinction depended upon a very specific perspective of the past that positioned ‘Ōiwi youth of 1913 not only as the biological legacy of degeneracy but also as without a legacy of citizenry or nationhood of their own.

4.1 Inherently Degenerate: Race To(of) survival

In the second chapter of *Eugenics For Young People*, Thompson begins the discussion on biological determinism by explaining that, “In most of us the good qualities of one ancestor have combined with the bad qualities of another ancestor. This makes us not so good as our best ancestors.”⁹¹ This assertion introduces the concept of degeneracy to the students. Where mo‘okū‘auhau is a means of membership and connection with all of one’s ancestors, and especially with the best of them, this beginning section of EFYP establishes and centers a perspective of *difference* from one’s “best ancestor”.

⁹¹ Ibid, 5.

The fourth chapter of EFYP, entitled “To A Remnant”, gives shape and meaning to the concept of the “best ancestor” as introduced earlier in the textbook. The idea of the “best ancestor” sets the highest possible standard for ‘Ōiwi to consider their kūpuna and what it means to be “Hawaiian” stating that, “Hawaiians possessed many of the finest qualities mankind is heir to, it is shown by what they did.”⁹² Thompson then lists a number of the “finest qualities” along with the practices that exemplified the qualities:

Quality	Evidence
Gigantic in stature and great in strength	Their spears and surfboards
Courageous	Their voyages in open canoes, thousands of miles without compass or chart Their battles and sport Plunging from a canoe underneath a fifteen-foot shark, with only a rude knife in hand
Patient and preserving	The carvings they did The tapa The wonderful feather cloaks
Industrious	The terraces and irrigating systems they left
Honest and hospitable	Testified by every visitor in early days
Intelligent	Hawaiian mele

Figure 1. “Highest qualities” of Hawaiians in EFYP

Through the lens of degeneracy, as introduced earlier in the textbook, the students are assumed to be less strong, less courageous, and less intelligent than generations before. Additionally, the idea of the “best ancestor” is confined to characteristics that pose no threat to American political hegemony but that rather exemplify an idealized

⁹² Ibid, 9.

symbol of the Hawaiian of the past, that which many Americans found exotic and fascinating as they gained greater exposure to Hawai‘i in the Territorial period. Any mention of the creation and governance of a constitutional monarchy, the degree of citizen engagement and discourse that continually shaped the country or even the monumental organized protest of the citizens and ali‘i to defend political independence at the end of the nineteenth century is entirely absent as examples of courage, patience and perseverance or intelligence. These things made up the rich national heritage of the Kamehameha students of 1913. More importantly, it was the legacy of the elder generations that these students needed to determine how to carry on. In this way, EFYP served what Ngugi refers to as the “cultural bomb” where, “a people’s belief in...their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves is “annihilated” in order for them to “see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement [that] makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland.”⁹³

The only reference to the Hawaiian Kingdom era in EFYP is a not-so-subtle reference to the extinction of ali‘i lines. In the section of EFYP, entitled, “The Elimination of the Unfit” Thompson writes, “Look about you. Everywhere you see lines becoming extinct through the slow-moving merciless laws of Nature. Such elimination has come to members of the strongest lines; and such elimination may come to members of your line, unless-”⁹⁴ Here, Thompson reinforces the idea of extinction and by mention of “the strongest lines” refers to ali‘i lines. As noted in Chapter two, the mo‘okū‘auhau of

⁹³ Ngugi Wa Thiango. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (Portsmouth: Reed Publishing, 1986), 3.

⁹⁴ Thompson, 16. Note: The paragraph in the textbook actually closes with “unless-” after which Thompson begins a new paragraph and sentence to open up a discussion on reproductive sterilization.

ali‘i were considered a part of ‘Ōiwi national heritage and as such were used in public formats, such as the publication of the Kumulipo and various other mo‘okū‘auhau published (and debated over) in the Hawaiian newspapers. In the nineteenth century, many ali‘i did in fact die without having reproduced, likely due to the contraction of diseases, while others lived on. To highlight the extinction of these particular mo‘okū‘auhau in EFYP served as a metaphor for the extinction of ‘Ōiwi national heritage.

Following the description of the “best ancestor” Thompson draws a clear line between the students and the best ancestor, stating, “Where, now, are those men of strength and endurance, of courage, of perseverance? Most of that stock was killed off in the wars; or died from diseases and drink introduced by the white men. Worst of all, most of them died without having reproduced their kind. And humanity is just that much poorer.”⁹⁵ Eugenics doctrine promotes the reproduction of only the best and highest quality of the race. The message to the children is that the “good Hawaiians” or “best ancestor” are non-existent. In other words, no matter how high the quality of their ancestors, the children are far from it.

Where mo‘okū‘auhau maintained inter-generational continuity, the chronological gap presented in EFYP between the students of 1913 and the “best ancestor” exemplifies how eugenics discourse was rooted in the difference and separation between a person their “best” ancestors. Where personal or national genealogical connections between ‘Ōiwi and their kūpuna of the Hawaiian Kingdom era was omitted, it was filled with

⁹⁵ Thompson, 9.

another defining component of that era to construct the idea of degeneracy, namely disease.

Disease is one of the most commonly referenced signs of degeneracy in EFYP. Population statistics compiled by Robert Schmitt and revised by Kame‘eleihiwa show a population collapse of 87-95% of the population between 1778 and 1896.⁹⁶ A number of scholars of ‘Ōiwi history have attributed the greatest portion of the population collapse to foreign diseases.⁹⁷ The magnitude to which ‘Ōiwi had been devastatingly affected by foreign diseases would make disease, and its stigmatization, as a measure of degeneracy a powerful reinforcement, if not virtual proof, for Thompson’s argument that these students were “only a small remnant” in terms of both quantity and quality of their ancestors. In terms of political control, a narrative of degeneracy served to situate the loss of power by the Hawaiian Kingdom as a “fall” rather than as an armed seizure, and to naturalize the control of Hawai‘i by haole as merely a transfer of governance to a stronger race, capable of advancement. It also positions ‘Ōiwi marginalization as a result of their own inferiority and not the effects of economic and political oppression. This paints a very grim picture for the future of the lāhui as it centers the narrative of native extinction and perhaps more detrimentally, offers significant doubt as to whether or not ‘Ōiwi are even capable of surviving, much less controlling or governing the future of Hawai‘i. Bhabba explains how the idea of degeneracy serves particular national interest, stating “The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the

⁹⁶ Robert C. Schmitt *Demographic Statistics of Hawai‘i: 1778-1965* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1968) 10, 74. and Kame‘eleihiwa, 141.

⁹⁷ Kame‘eleihiwa, 141; Osorio, 11. See also, David Stannard. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai‘i on the Eve of Western Contact* (Honolulu, University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989).

bases of racial origin in order to justify conquest...”.⁹⁸ Degeneracy theory was multi-functional, however. It worked to diminish ‘Ōiwi national history and also situated anyone on the margins of particular American moral and economic ideals as inherently unable to meet the qualifications of advancement.

4.2 Naturalizing Oppression, Class-ifying ‘Ōiwi

At the beginning of the text, Thompson positions eugenics as a science whose laws are comparable to chemistry. “Science”, “Nature” and “the laws of Nature” are each repeatedly used as a means of giving a higher authoritative voice (while at the same time a greater personal distance) to Thompson’s eugenic messages of Unfitness and the consequence of elimination. In the section titled “Environment”, Thompson points to a number of social ideals and their opposites. Defining “environment”, he lists what he considers “favorable” and “unfavorable” as presented in the table below:

Favorable Environment	Unfavorable Environment
Clean and comfortable home	Unpleasant home that does not attract children
Friends with good ideals	Friends are coarse and have bad habits
Wholesome food and plenty of it	Food is not well prepared
Well trained to some kind of work	Too little food
Find employment in a place where:	Children allowed to spend time on the street instead of being in school
Air is good	Children allowed to begin work too early
Surroundings are clean and sanitary	Work in a place where air is bad and hours long
Hours are not too long	

Figure 2. Favorable and Unfavorable Environments in EFYP

⁹⁸ Homi Bhabha, “The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism,” *Screen* 24, no.6 (Nov./Dec. 1983), 23.

Thompson’s definition of environment has much to do with American middle and upper class ideals and positions those living in poorer conditions or simply outside of American norms as inferior. Socio-economics become a new lens through which students can measure their fitness. Students who come from low-income or poor homes would find themselves not only in “unfavorable” conditions but also in the class of Unfit where elimination and extinction are the natural outcomes. Thompson poses the question, “Why do the middle and upper classes take so much trouble with their children?” He then goes on to list a number of examples:

Middle And Upper Class	Other
Taught principals of industry and honesty	Child has a gutter for a playground
Clean and sober	A saloon for its nursery
Send children to school and college	A factory for its college
	Drunkard for its example, thief for its teacher
To keep them morally clean and prepare them for a useful life	Cannot expect them to be clever, and moral, and thrifty and clean and sober

Figure 3. Middle and Upperclass Ideals and Opposites in EFYP

Here the social norms of the middle and upper class are centered as ideal, whereas conditions that are more likely found in poor families are positioned as the Unfit opposite. This recalls some of the statistics provided by McGregor in chapter three about the effects of urbanization on ‘Ōiwi families where in the “squatter camps” on and near the shorelines of Honolulu, “...Hawaiian families made up the bulk of the inhabitants.” McGregor explains that the settlement of Hawaiian families in the Honolulu area including Iwilei, Papakōlea, Kalawahine and Kewalo was a result of the increasing

difficulties of living a subsistence lifestyle in rural areas as powerful sugar companies gained more and more control over water. While some of the Honolulu settlements such as those in Kalawahine and Papakolea provided the necessities to grow kalo and uala and were relatively close to ocean food resources, they quickly became overcrowded and in the makai settlements such as those in Iwilei, families often lived in shelters constructed of “cracker boxes and pieces of lumber gathered by the dump there.”⁹⁹ Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua specifically addresses the ways in which eugenics served class construction and identification at Kamehameha:

It was during the first few decades of the twentieth century... that KS pedagogies more distinctly aimed to produce a middle class, civil service labor force of Hawaiians, differentiating them from the poor and more marginalized segments of Hawaiian society. Thompson’s urgings against the reproduction of “the Unfit” was an essential part of marking differentiations amongst Kanaka Maoli and of educating a Hawaiian middle class to collaborate with white elites.¹⁰⁰

In this way, these ideals are also presented as Ola Hou, or the pathway to salvation for ‘Ōiwi, and these values in particular share a genealogy with missionaries of a hundred years prior who as Sally Merry points out, “...pushed for individual land ownership in the 1840’s to promote industriousness and the emergence of the bourgeois family.”¹⁰¹ Centering American cultural ideals based on class as a measurement of identity served to sever ‘Ōiwi modes of identification such as mo‘okū‘auhau that not only connect us to our kūpuna and ‘āina, but to each other as well. As Kauanui notes above, a mo‘okū‘auhau-

⁹⁹ McGregor, 169.

¹⁰⁰ Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, “Militarization”, 19.

¹⁰¹ Sally Engle Merry. *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law*. (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000), 41.

based mode of identification increases our numbers as a lāhui, providing greater potential for political power.

These American middle-class norms were also presented as salvation from the confines of race. Goodyear-Ka'ōpua states

The pedagogies of KS during this period...constructed the lāhui Hawai'i as a race, defined by its fragility and peril. By emphasizing supposedly-inherent weaknesses in the Hawaiian race, KS administrators legitimized pedagogical intervention: saving a dying race through the cultivation of Christian morals and American cultural and political affinities.¹⁰²

Adopting these social and moral ideals were presented as a pathway to survival for 'Ōiwi as a race on a natural path toward extinction.

In section nine, entitled "The Elimination Of The Unfit", Thompson juxtaposes "Nature's" method of elimination to "Science's". "Science" is used as a euphemism for medicalized sterilization and "Nature" seems to mean anything else that could possibly lead to a persons varying degrees of misfortune but presumably, death. Pointing again to what are actually issues of class and economics, he defines cold, hunger, unemployment and even "unemployability" as natures method to eliminate the Unfit, deeming each of these conditions as natural, fixed and distant from larger political structures or parties.¹⁰³ According to EFYP, charities, hospitals and asylums were institutions where degenerates and the Unfit are found, exemplifying the eugenicist belief that degeneracy was incorrigible and that ultimately, the money spent on the Unfit through these institutions was a burden on society and a great argument for sterilization.

¹⁰² Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, "Kū i ka Mana", 102.

¹⁰³ Ibid.

He then both emphasizes his horror at the thought of having a degenerate in the family and normalizes sterilization by casually stating that “if one of my line shall become degenerate, either through accident, or through some foolish act of his own, I want, Science to end that part of my line, **right there** (original emphasis).” As an authoritative voice to the students, he is positioning sterilization as the most logical and rational choice upon the sign of degeneracy within one’s own family. With a population collapse of between 87-95%, it can be assumed that stories of reproductive sterility and death were carried in the families of many of these ‘Ōiwi youth. Not only is Thompson making light of a source of great historical trauma but he is offering death and extinction as a form of salvation, that ‘Ōiwi lines would be saved through the death their own family members.

Bringing greater focus to the capitalist center through which Unfitness was to be measured Thompson then poses the question, “What is your wish for the unfortunate ones that may come in your line, -you who believe in the present system of **Laisser-Faire**?”¹⁰⁴ Finding oneself on the fortunate side of unbridled capitalism is positioned here as the measure of human fitness and worthiness of life itself. Laissez-Faire economics was a significant driving force behind the seizure of the Hawaiian Kingdom by sugar planters and American business interests who wanted free access to American markets and Hawaiian national lands. It is unclear whether or not the young haumāna in Thompson’s class even knew what Laissez-Faire meant but when they did learn what it was, it was

¹⁰⁴ Thompson, 16.

clearly the framework through which they were expected to understand the future of Hawai‘i and the value of kanaka.

4.3 “Good Citizenry”: The New Ola Hou

As noted above, at the very beginning of EFYP Thompson emphasizes the value of eugenics in terms of analyzing citizenry. He positions eugenics as determining whether people are “capable of becoming good citizens; and whether their children will become better citizens or poorer citizens than the fathers and mothers.” While the issue of citizenry is stressed at the beginning of the text, Thompson’s analysis of the ‘Ōiwi students’ “best ancestor” lacks any hint of quality citizenry or even mention of citizenship as a component of “Hawaiian” at all. Excluding citizenry from this era and instead emphasizing disease and degeneracy with a focus on extinguished ali‘i mo‘okū‘auhau continually reinforced a narrative of ‘Ōiwi extinction. While the outcome of the fixed and irreparable nature of degeneracy is repeatedly established as extinction, Thompson does provide the students with the possibility of tapping in to the qualities of their best ancestor. The following quote is quite lengthy but is a vivid illustration of how mo‘okū‘auhau was manipulated and seemed intended to make the ‘Ōiwi students feel both ashamed of their degenerate past and hopeful that “as a remnant” some aspects of their ancestry might help them become good American citizens as a path to survival:

It is idle, perhaps, to enquire if the old-time Hawaiians could have adapted themselves to these new conditions. I believe they could have done so because they had the necessary qualities. Only the modern training of those qualities would have been necessary-But they are gone. Are these noble and necessary qualities latent in the remnant left?

We see young men and young women of Hawaiian blood who are meeting the new conditions and holding their own in the struggle for existence and advancement. And this suggests that the qualities that made the old-time Hawaiians great, in their time and under their conditions, have been transmitted and are still in the blood. Latent, if you will; but present; and capable of development. Perhaps not in all, for disease has decreased both vitality and, with vitality, the possibility of development. But in many, there is the possibility. The demand for the development of these qualities and the opportunities for their development are both present. It remains for this remnant of a great people to learn how best to keep and how best to transmit, to their children the qualities that they are proud to say their ancestors possessed. And they must learn these things and act upon this knowledge before it is everlastingly too late.¹⁰⁵

Edward Said describes a common rhetorical theme found in the way dominant races speak of the subjugated: “Their great moments were in the past; up-to-date empires have effectively brought them out of the wretchedness of their decline and turned them into rehabilitated residents of productive colonies.”¹⁰⁶ While Thompson maintains a consistent separation between “old-time Hawaiians” and the young men and women of “today”, it is made clear that “existence and advancement” is the goal that the students must “struggle” to attain. “Advancement” is presented as the key to existence and presenting such as a “struggle”, presented in this text as the result of generations of biological deterioration, positions extinction as the easier or more natural outcome of ‘Ōiwi existence in modern times, one that must be struggled against to avoid.

Additionally, Thompson proposes that the best ancestors of times past would have been able to “adapt” themselves to “today’s conditions” through “modern training”. The question of adaptability here assumes such as a matter of capability and not choice, positioning the students, and ‘Ōiwi in general, as passive agents in the larger political

¹⁰⁵ Ibid, 10.

¹⁰⁶ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1978), 35.

context. Kuleana for these students is reduced to mere survival from the defense of political sovereignty as with the generation prior. Survival would be attained by adhering to American moral codes and Laissez-Faire economics, which valued property rights and unregulated capitalism above all (and was the driving force behind the armed seizure of power in 1893). Maile Arvin's analysis of the racial construction of Polynesians as "almost but never quite white" sheds light on Thompson's logic of adaptation to modernity as the means through which to summon the "best ancestor" explaining that "They could truly be themselves (i.e. almost white) if they just submitted to, and allowed themselves to be possessed by progress". Arvin and Goodyear-Ka'ōpua both point to the role of white supremacy in both establishing the power to define 'Ōiwi demise as well as positioning their own interests as the key to 'Ōiwi salvation.

CHAPTER 5. ONGOING ‘EXTINCTION’: STERILIZATION LEGISLATION AND THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THE UNFIT

While *Eugenics For Young People* worked to shape ‘Ōiwi self-perception at Kamehameha Schools, other measures were simultaneously being pursued to physically control the reproduction of Hawai‘i’s people, namely, those considered “Unfit”. Legislation was introduced in the Legislature the same year EFYP launched that would prevent those deemed “Unfit” from marrying and that would legalize the sterilization of the Unfit. Less than a decade later the Waimano Home for the Feebleminded opened, institutionalizing many ‘Ōiwi who broke Christian-American social ideals in Territorial Hawai‘i.

An examination of both sterilization legislation and the institutionalization of the feebleminded gives insight into the ways in which the racialization of ‘Ōiwi was also at times very gendered. Pushes for compulsory sterilization often went hand in hand with the construction of both Asian and ‘Ōiwi men in Hawai‘i as sexual predators. Particular subcategories of those labeled Feebleminded, especially the “Moron” served to cast the sexuality of ‘Ōiwi women as a threat to society and the race itself. The first piece of sterilization legislation, introduced in 1913, reveals ‘Ōiwi legislators’ awareness of how this could be used against Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. These pieces of legislation tease out layers of racial tension that were present and building in Territorial Hawai‘i. Looking at Feeblemindedness and Waimano Home helps us to see how ‘Ōiwi were actually being impacted by discourses of Unfitness and sexual deviancy. Both sterilization and

institutionalization signified death and demise for ‘Ōiwi whether moral, intellectual or physical.

5.1 Review Of Eugenic Legislation

At this time, I’ve found five pieces of eugenic legislation that were either drafted or introduced to the Territorial Legislature, none of which were enacted into law. The first was HB 183, introduced into the 1913 House of Representatives and which would have required couples to obtain a certificate of health, verifying that neither party carried venereal diseases before receiving a marriage certificate from the government. The bill supported positive eugenics in that it encouraged and even rewarded couples who were seen as “fit” to reproduce. But it also supported negative eugenics in that it identified and labeled those who were unfit to do so.

5.1.1 First Eugenics Bills: ‘Ōiwi Vote Noe

The second was HB 192, the first sterilization bill introduced in the Territory by Representative Archer Irwin. On March 27, 1913, the Act was endorsed by the Legislative Committee on Health and Police and passed the second reading and placed for a third reading and upon passing, final vote.¹⁰⁷ The following day, after the third and final reading, HB 192 failed by a vote of 11 “Aye”s and 19 “Noe”s.¹⁰⁸ The vote was almost entirely divided down ethnic, and perhaps national, lines with all haole voting Aye and all ‘Ōiwi legislators, with the exception of Kawewehi, voting Noe. The difference in

¹⁰⁷ The Committee on Health and Police were legislators J.H. Coney, Julius W. Ash, Chas. K. Makekau, Archer Irwin and Henry L. Kawewehi.

¹⁰⁸ The Territorial Hawai‘i legislative reports spell the opposing votes as “Noe” rather than “No”.

votes along ethnic/national lines is evidence of an ‘Ōiwi consciousness of eugenics and its potential harmful impacts on the lāhui.

One of the Aye votes came from Maui/Moloka‘i Senator Geo Cooke and this vote was used against him in the following year’s special legislative election campaign where he lost his seat. Nearly two decades later, he was asked to introduce the 1931 bill drafted by a women’s social organization but declined stating that it had cost him the 1914 election and he promised his constituents never to support such a bill again. In 1933, those pushing for yet another sterilization bill were touring the legislators around different facilities in which voluntary sterilization was already taking place. A Honolulu Advertiser article reports that “Senator Cooke said that in 1913 a bill introduced in the house was interpreted to apply to Kalaupapa and that time he promised his constituency he would not support such a bill.”¹⁰⁹

If passed, this law would put anyone suspected of “feeble-mindedness” before a “panel of experts” who would then determine whether or not the person would be medically sterilized. “Feeble-mindedness” was an especially broad catch-all label that was developed in the early 20th century as a clinical diagnosis to describe people with mental deficiencies, deficiencies that were often defined by an individual’s moral character. Not only was the bill defeated almost entirely down ethnic lines (at a time when the Legislature consisted of haole and ‘Ōiwi only) but it received substantial community backlash so much so that another eugenics bill was not introduced in the Territory until nearly two decades later.

¹⁰⁹ “Sterilization Bill” *The Honolulu Advertiser*, February 20, 1933.

5.1.2 Sterilization and Constructing The ‘Ōiwi Male Sexual Predator

The third legislative act was drafted and pushed for by the Central Committee on Community Welfare (CCCW), a group with representation from several different women’s social welfare organizations, for the 1931 legislature (the Catholic Ladies Aid Society were the only dissenters to the creation of a sterilization bill). While meeting notes reveal previous interest in the topic, activity to draft and get a sterilization bill introduced in the legislature picked up after Dr. Thomas L. Taylor, Superintendent of The Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded, gave a talk to the Committee at their January meeting.¹¹⁰ The CCCW drafted an Act “To provide for the Sterilizing of inmates of the Waimano Home before discharge from said Home”.¹¹¹ Meeting notes from the Committee’s May meeting stated that, “No member of the legislature would introduce the bill although some were in sympathy with the purpose of the bill but felt it would be political suicide to introduce it.”¹¹² This refers to the response from the ‘Ōiwi and especially those with Hansen’s disease to the 1913 sterilization bill that was proposed. This bill did not go further than committee.

In October of 1932, another sterilization bill was drafted, one similar to the 1913 bill, casting a net far beyond the doors of Waimano Home. Titled, “An Act to Prevent the Procreation of Feeble-Minded, Insane, Epileptic and Criminal or Sexual Psychopathic Persons; to Authorize and Provide for the Sterilization of Such Persons and Providing for

¹¹⁰ Central Committee on Community Welfare monthly meeting notes. January 16, 1931. Hawai’i State Archives.

¹¹¹ Central Committee on Community Welfare monthly meeting notes. February 20, 1931. Hawai’i State Archives.

¹¹² Central Committee on Community Welfare monthly meeting notes. May 15, 1931. Hawai’i State Archives.

the Expenses Thereof”, this bill was drafted by people in positions more powerful than the CCCW and was to be introduced in the 1933 legislature. It was introduced into the Territorial Senate by Senator H.W. Rice, passed by a vote of 10 to 3 and was then sent to the House of Representatives for consideration. Schmitt writes that, “Amid great public controversy, the House postponed action numerous times, and finally, on May 19, ‘indefinitely.’”¹¹³

But both the powerful people behind this bill and the shift in focus from Waimano Home to a more widespread group of Unfit, with particular mention of Sexual Psychopathic Persons makes this bill notable. Peter Nelligan’s work on rape law in Hawai‘i sheds light on the role in rape cases and rape law in the racial constructions of Hawai‘i’s men of color. He notes in particular that the 1913 sterilization bill was seen by proponents as a humane way of addressing sex criminals. At this time a strong campaign by the Citizens Protective Committee, an organization formed in response to a number of sexual assaults on minors in Honolulu in 1912 and a number of church organizations pushed a strong campaign, supported by the Honolulu Advertiser in favor of subjecting sex offenders to whipping posts.¹¹⁴

But others at this time began to argue that sexual transgression was a biological defect that transgressors could not control. Once such person was Dr. Edward Goodhue, a Territorial physician and eugenicists who publicly deplored public whippings and advocated for the sterilization of sex offenders as a progressive and humane form of

¹¹³ Robert C. Schmitt. “Population Policy in Hawai‘i” *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 8 (1974), 96.

¹¹⁴ Nelligan, 177-80.

treatment. It was Dr. Goodhue, along with the Medical Association of Honolulu who most strongly advocated for the 1913 bill.

This points to a history, one that Nelligan goes into in much greater detail, of pushes for compulsory sterilization and racialized public uproar over rape. Perhaps it is worth noting the way in which the push for sterilization changed form after 1931. The 1931 bill, advocated by a women's social society and restricted only to certain Waimano Home patients upon release, never even made it to the legislative floor and was considered "political suicide" by some legislators.

Perhaps it is no coincidence that the following year, despite the failure of the 1931 bill, a much stronger bill, backed by a wider range of more powerful people, was drafted following the mistrial of five local boys, two of whom were Kanaka 'Ōiwi who were accused of abducting and raping a white woman, the wife of a Naval officer, Lieutenant Thomas Massie. Following the mistrial, Officer Massie with the help of a few others kidnapped one of the defendants Joseph Kahahawai and in an attempt to coerce a confession, shot and killed him. The case received so much national attention that the very status of Hawai'i's civilian government was in question.

US Assistant Attorney General Seth Richardson was sent to Hawai'i "to render an authoritative definition of the situation, and to determine whether any change was advisable in the organic law of the territory."¹¹⁵ Despite the fact that Kahahawai was murdered, much of the investigation was focused on the sexual nature of 'Ōiwi, especially 'Ōiwi men, the majority of Richardson's interviews taking place with haole

¹¹⁵ Nelligan, 259.

elite. Nelligan notes that “Many Hawaiians were resentful of the images of Hawaiians as lustful savages, preying on white women that had been disseminated by the Navy, the mainland press, and the more hysterical haole residents of Hawai‘i.”¹¹⁶ He adds that, “The Hawaiians profoundly resented the killing of Kahahawai and its approval in some quarters by haoles who had always exhorted Hawaiians to law observance.”¹¹⁷

This points not only to a period of heightened racial tensions in Hawai‘i due to what has become known as the Massie case but also of a hyper response to this alleged act of sexual assault largely because of the racialized relationship between the perceived ‘Ōiwi male aggressors and the white female wife of a Naval officer. This perhaps helps to explain the push for another sterilization bill that was much stronger and further reaching than the one that failed to even be considered just a year before.

The 1932 bill’s strongest and most vocal advocates included Dr. Nils P. Larsen of the Queen’s Hospital, Dr. Philip S. Platt of Palama Settlement, Deputy Attorney General E.R. McGhee, and Chairman of the Board of Prison Directors, L.J. Warren, Dr. S.D. Porteus who at that time was the director of psychological and psychopathic clinic at the University of Hawai‘i, A.G. Hodgins, of the Hawai‘i Medical Association and Dr. Isabelle Morelock representing the Hawai‘i Osteopathic Association.¹¹⁸ Newspaper

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 262.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ “Sterilization Aired Before Senate Hearing,” *The Honolulu Advertiser*, February 21, 1933.

reports of the time cite ‘Ōiwi Territorial Senator David K. Trask as the primary opponent to the bill.¹¹⁹

The 1933 bill specifically mentioned “Sexual Psychopaths” as qualified for mandated sterilization, this less than one year following the intensely controversial acquittal of five non-whites over the alleged rape of a white woman. This points to the relationship between the construction of ‘Ōiwi men as sexual predators and eugenic sterilization discourse in Hawai‘i.

5.2 Feeble-mindedness, Moronia And ‘Ōiwi Female Sexuality

The tool of measurement for feeble-mindedness was developed by French psychologist, Alfre Binet’s who created the “Measuring Scale for Intelligence” which gave clinical psychologists standardized definitions of “mental normality”. It was first translated and published in the US by by Henry Goddard, an American psychologist and “devout believer in the heretability of delinquent and immoral behavior”.¹²⁰ Goddard expanded upon Binet’s specific categories of “Idiot” (mental age of two or younger), “Imbecile” (mental age of three to seven) with the category of “Moron” (mental age of 8-12). As Kline elaborates, “It was thus in opposition to normality that mental deficiency came to be understood by physicians and psychologists. In the quest to categorize and diagnose the feeble-minded, a new language and a framework for ‘normal’ intellectual development emerged as a focal point.”¹²¹

¹¹⁹ Ibid. And “Senators See Vital Need of Sterilization”, The Honolulu Advertiser, February 25, 1933. Senator Trask is the grandfather of ‘Ōiwi activist and co-founder of the Hawaiian Studies program, Haunani-Kay and her sister, attorney Mililani Trask.

¹²⁰ Kline, 21.

¹²¹ Ibid.

Kline's work emphasizes the role of eugenics in both defining and regulating American moral ideals of the time and specifically in addressing the "problem" of the modern woman and practices of non-marital sex. "Moronia" diagnosed women who fell outside Victorian notions of female sexuality as mentally equal to the young adolescent (age 8-12) who had not yet learned to control their budding sexuality. 'Ōiwi women had long been the center of haole constructions of inherent 'Ōiwi immorality and indeed the cause for the population collapse in Hawai'i.

As the essay noted in Chapter three, read by S.E. Bishop entitled, "Why are the Hawaiian People Dying Out?" Bishop compares the "unchastity" of Hawaiian women who were "like males of other races, aggressive in solicitation" as the primary cause for the population collapse of 'Ōiwi. Hawaiian female "promiscuity" was so pervasive, Bishop argued, that not even "marital proprietorship" was safe in guaranteeing "chastity" due to "an invasion of the husband's right in enjoying his property without his consent." The "unchaste" Hawaiian woman in Bishop's essay was not only seen as a sign of the "weakness" of the Hawaiian people but was also the cause of the further mental weakening of the race. "Multiples died at once while survivors remained with poisoned bodies and enfeebled constitutions." Fittingly, Kline makes the connection between the American phenomenon of Moronia with discourses of savagery, a discourse 'Ōiwi were all too familiar with. Kline states, "Linking moral deficiency to mental deficiency, eugenicists and psychologists used mental testing to prove the primitivism of the

promiscuous by suggesting that such women were intellectually trapped in a savage, ancestral mindset.”¹²²

In Territorial occupied Hawai‘i, feeble-mindedness did not necessarily target women more than it did men. Both Kauanui and Arvin have addressed the settler colonial logic of “dilutable” native blood in Hawai‘i. While not necessarily pacifying haole contempt toward single sexually active Hawaiian women, settler colonialism’s need for native land which can be achieved through the whitening of native women’s offspring in turn presents native men as particularly sexually and politically threatening as evidenced in the targeting of ‘Ōiwi boys in the implementation of EFYP and later in the famous Massie case. What feeble-mindedness maintains for ‘Ōiwi as a whole, regardless of gender, is the discourse of the child-like native, inherently incapable of self-regulation much less self-governance.

These pieces of legislation served to reinforce the belief that such threats to society actually existed and were in need of remedy and captivity. Even the ‘Ōiwi legislators might have seen the dangers in such legislation to the lāhui, an awareness stemming from their familiarity with both the ideology and repercussions of such beliefs.

5.3 The Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded

None of these pieces passed and one must consider the role of ‘Ōiwi legislators and voting citizens in their failure. However the Waimano Home for the Feeble-minded was established and opened in 1921 and served to separate ‘Ōiwi from community and

¹²² Kline, 59.

‘ohana, reinforcing the existence of threatening ‘Ōiwi citizens and serving the century old construction of the Unfit native.

Feeble-mindedness was an important component of eugenics discourse as it served as an over-arching term for those considered degenerate and defective. Karen Takemoto’s master’s thesis on Waimano Home quotes the Director of the Massachusetts School for the Feeble-Minded, Walter E. Fernald, who described feeble-mindedness as “an important factor as a cause of juvenile vice and delinquency, adult crime, sex immorality, the spread of venereal disease, prostitution, illegitimacy, vagrancy, pauperism, and other forms of social evil and social disease.” Takemoto notes that although by 1918 Fernald had become publicly critical of his previous perspectives, that the Territorial Hawai‘i Commission to Investigate Feeble-mindedness in the Territory of Hawai‘i cited the quote above in reports used to establish Waimano Home through legislative support, evidence of their focus on “social evil” in defining who was “feeble-minded”.¹²³ Takemoto’s examination of the Waimano Home admission reports found that along with Puerto Ricans and Portuguese, ‘Ōiwi were “admitted in much higher proportions than their populations within the community.”¹²⁴

¹²³ Takemoto, 6.

¹²⁴ Ibid, x.

Table 1. Waimano Home to General Population (%) by ethnicity¹²⁵

	‘Ōiwi	Caucasian	Japanese
1920/1921	+20	-1.2	-31.8
1930	+5.8	-9.9	-17
1940	+22.1	-16.6	-16.6

A number of institutions became involved in the push for eugenics policy and practice. Waimano Home, as noted, was the most prominent institution, housing a population whose common label, feeble-minded, situated them at the center of eugenic discourse and policy making. Palama Settlement established a male sterilization clinic in 1930, although it's unclear what enabled them to do so outside of the proposed and failed sterilization legislation.¹²⁶ Children of leprosy parents, according to Takemoto, were often taken from their parents and given to relatives or the Kaiolani Girls Home or the Kalihi Boys Home. "Children who went to the Boys' or Girls' Home spent their first 18 years in these institutions. They were often then diagnosed as feeble-minded and sentenced to their adult life in Waimano Home."¹²⁷ Eugenics saw sterilization as a way to release the feeble-minded from institutions, saving society the costs, while ensuring that they did not reproduce their "kind".

But more dangerous, and perhaps more lasting than that was the role of the constructed feeble-minded in, to reiterate Bhabba's words, "proving that which cannot be proven". Waimano Home was not simply an innocent effort to help people with severe

¹²⁵ Ibid, 74.

¹²⁶ Schmitt, 96.

¹²⁷ Takemoto, 22.

mental health issues who perhaps could not take care of themselves. The name of Waimano Home for the “Feebleminded” alone points to its role proving the existence of such people, people who by definition only need live outside of American economic ideals and Christian moral ideals. Institutions such as the Waimano Home helped reproduce the construction of the Hawaiian as intellectually and morally dead, and if not entirely dead, as proof of its continued path toward extinction.

The EFYP curriculum, the sterilization legislation and the institutionalization of those deemed feebleminded serve as examples of a serious push in Territorial occupied Hawai‘i to both condition and regulate through law the terms of existence; who would count as a citizen and who would be pushed out. But in addition to regulating the terms for inclusion and acceptance in Hawai‘i, sterilization legislation and the institutionalization of the Unfit reminded ‘Ōiwi that despite the stabilization of the physical ‘Ōiwi population, that moral, spiritual and intellectual “death” remained a problem, for which sterilization and institutionalization served to address, providing for a continued physical extinction of ‘Ōiwi.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION: CONTEMPORARY CONTINUITY OF MO‘OKŪ‘AUHAU AND OLA HOU

Kame‘eleihiwa analysis of ‘Ōiwi terms for the past, ka wā ma mua, and the future, ka wā ma hope, impresses upon us that ‘Ōiwi stand facing the past to guide us into the future, stating, “It is as if the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers for present-day dilemmas.”¹²⁸ Ka wā ma mua refers to the eras that came before and predicates the ability to find pono in the future.

Changing how we see our past can change how we see our future. This was the goal of the eugenics discourse that served to indoctrinate young ‘Ōiwi at the Kamehameha Schools and that reproduced an older construction of ‘Ōiwi whose ever-present physical death was predicated upon her moral and spiritual death. But for ‘Ōiwi, sexual practices, subsistence living and socially and ecologically sound sciences were sources of life. Subscription to the logic of Ola Hou encouraged (not to say succeeded in) the death of those things which made us ‘Ōiwi.

Beamer’s discussion on agency and Ron Williams Jr.’s depictions of Christian ‘Ōiwi at the time of the 1893 overthrow, demonstrate the ways in which ‘Ōiwi themselves did not require the death of all practices mai nā kūpuna mai in order to confidently thrive as Christians and as Hawaiian nationals. But over time, and now, for that past 120 years of US occupation and the subsequent oppression of ‘Ōiwi, perhaps it

¹²⁸ Kame‘eleihiwa, 22.

is worth exploring how the logics of both mo‘okū‘auhau and of Ola Hou have remained with us and if so, how they are reproduced.

Kauanui illustrates early versions of ‘Ōiwi engagement with these logics, in particular how high-ranking ‘Ōiwi elite in Territorial Hawai‘i launched campaigns to lift ‘Ōiwi social and health conditions by returning them to the land. She points to the inclusion of both Hawaiian national consciousness and ‘Ōiwi genealogical connections to land as framing Jonah Kūhiō Klanaiana‘ole and John Henry Wise’s fight for the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA).¹²⁹ However, the HHCA was also the first piece of legislation that codified a blood-quantum definition of Hawaiian premised upon the logic that the more Hawaiian one was, the more in need of salvation via home-ownership they were. Struggling to maintain ‘Ōiwi ancestral and national ties to land for the sake of ‘Ōiwi health and welfare amidst American legal and political structures that recognized no such thing must have been and remains to be a definitive struggle for ‘Ōiwi in the context of US occupation. But perhaps it is worth questioning the weight of these logics when working to maintain and increase ‘Ōiwi authority over land and continuity of ancestral connections to those lands.

Today, I see how these frameworks are engaged with issues of land and governance by ‘Ōiwi, not necessarily exclusive of one another but used in ways that find ‘Ōiwi on opposite sides of different issues. What follows are three brief examples of how logics of both mo‘okū‘auhau and of Ola Hou are playing out within contemporary issues, namely the telescopes on Mauna Kea struggle, the campaign to develop Geothermal

¹²⁹ Kauanui, 97.

energy on Hawai‘i Island, and finally the Kana‘iolowalu Native Hawaiian roll campaign. Each of these campaigns push to control particular Hawaiian national lands and ‘Ōiwi claims to those lands for capital and political gain against ‘Ōiwi genealogical and political/national claims to those lands.

These campaigns are both supported and opposed by ‘Ōiwi. Those who oppose the efforts often articulate mo‘okū‘auhau either through genealogical ties to the land and sometimes through national claims. Those who support the efforts likely share the same sentiments of genealogical connection but also premise their support for the effort as the key to saving ‘Ōiwi from poverty and extinction, forwarding a logic that in effect compromises other ‘Ōiwi’s connections in order to save the lāhui from various forms of death.

Analyzing these campaigns through the lens of Ola Hou requires some understanding of the driving forces behind them that are beyond ‘Ōiwi interests and control. The effort to build a Thirty Meter Telescope on the summit of Mauna Kea is driven by both the University of Hawai‘i, its Institute of Astronomy and the University Board of Regents. Investments into this project come from Canada, India, Japan, China and two California Universities.

Geothermal in Hawai‘i is being advocated for locally by Innovations Development Group Hawai‘i (IDG), a company that asserts itself as a “native” company, populated and managed by Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. IDG’s parent company however is Eastland Group, a network of for profit companies lead by pakeha (haoles in Aotearoa) who have little to nothing to do with Hawai‘i or Kānaka ‘Ōiwi.

The Kana‘iolowalu campaign was championed by Hawai‘i State Governor Neil Abercrombie who has also driven such initiatives as the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope and the creation of the Public Lands Development Corporation, tasked to generate development-based revenues for the state from stolen Hawaiian national lands. Abercrombie is a strong advocate of the US federal recognition of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi, many ‘Ōiwi voicing strong opposition.

Proponents of both the Thirty Meter Telescope and geothermal development on Hawai‘i Island implement logics of the superiority of modern science to forward their projects, casting logics of mo‘okū‘auhau, the dominant premise for resistance, as irrational and irrelevant. Kan‘iolowalu, employs similar notions of progress and advancement of ‘Ōiwi to justify the rationality of the initiative and the irrationality of those who oppose it. While foreign profit-making institutions such as the Thirty Meter Telescope, Eastland Group and the United States of America remain in these islands and share in a history of colonial capital exploitation in Hawai‘i, I wish for the remainder of this closing chapter, to turn attention to the ways in which discourses of fitness, unfitness, Hawaiians as a dying race and mo‘okū‘auhau have either remained or gained prominence in contemporary ‘Ōiwi dialogues about pathways forward.

6.1 Mauna Kea And The Thirty Meter Telescope

Mauna Kea (Mauna a Wākea) is recorded in mele as the first born child of Wākea who, as noted earlier, is a sacred ancestor of all Kanaka ‘Ōiwi. This defines our genealogical connection to Mauna Kea, an elder sibling of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, who holds the sacred waters of Kāne and the iwi of sacred ali‘i. For over four decades, Kānaka ‘Ōiwi

have been struggling to protect the sacred summit of Mauna Kea (Mauna a Wākea) from the construction of giant astrological telescopes owned and operated by the wealthy nations and corporations. Currently, a new Thirty Meter Telescope is being proposed which much support from the Institute for Astronomy at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo. The struggle between the University and Kanaka ‘Ōiwi who oppose the telescopes have been presented as an issue of *modern* science versus *native* religion.

Science, by those who stand to gain from it, is given authoritative privilege over ‘Ōiwi relationships to the Mountain. In the name of ‘research’, the Institute of Astronomy and the University of Hawai‘i wage prolonged and expensive court battles against ‘Ōiwi who legally challenge the construction of the telescopes. Tuhiwai-Smith elaborates on the ideology of power that western science and research assumes:

Research ‘through imperial eyes’ describes an approach which assumes that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only ideas which can make sense of the world, of reality, of social life and of human beings. It is an approach to indigenous peoples which still conveys a sense of innate superiority and an overabundance of desire to bring progress into the lives of indigenous peoples - spiritually, intellectually, socially and economically.¹³⁰

Just as eugenics was framed to students in EFYP as “Science” in order to give it a higher authority over ‘Ōiwi lifestyles and perspectives on history and ancestry and provide them formula for survival that ultimately benefitted foreign interest, so is science presented, and employed, today as an “objective” form of research, distant from power, exploitation and the oppression of others. Economic benefit is promised as via the jobs the telescopes will create and the tourists it will bring to the islands. The University

¹³⁰ Tuhiwai-Smith, 56.

supports a narrative that presents astronomical research as the natural progression of 'Ōiwi ancestral knowledge of the stars, inviting 'Ōiwi to connect to their ancestors by supporting the telescopes. But most of all, the research done through the telescopes assumes higher intellectual value, as a truth, as intellectually valuable, as the pursuit of knowledge, altogether discounting the intellectual and spiritual transferences that take place between 'Ōiwi and our relationship to Mauna Kea. Some 'Ōiwi, while asserting their own spiritual connections to the mountain, actively support the construction of the telescopes within the struggle against them, opposing other 'Ōiwi 'ohana who are resisting their construction.

On November 8, 2013, a Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) hearing was held to decide whether or not to grant the request for the University of Hawai'i to cancel its current lease for the summit of Mauna Kea for the purpose of telescope construction and management and begin a new 60 year lease. The board heard testimony from citizens for approximately three hours. Aside from the University agents themselves, only two men, both Kanaka Maoli testified in support of the telescopes and therefor in support of the lease extension, the remainder of testimony opposing construction. One man's testimony in particular brought forward images of poor and destitute youth as one of his primary reasons for supporting the telescope construction. He asked the board, "And what is gonna happen to us? The potential for us, on that mountain is our future generation. How the next generation look at themselves. Are they

going to be folks that are proud of themselves? Are they gonna be downtrodden? Are they gonna look to education as being a big value? I think that's what is at stake"¹³¹

This man invoked the history of shaming young 'Ōiwi in order to support the telescopes as that which will invoke pride in young people. He also argued that without the telescopes, the youth of the next generation may not value education. This testimony exemplifies the perspective that our own knowledge, culture and history is “one wasteland of non-achievement” with nothing of its own to draw upon and find pride in. Rather, we need technologies and industries that some would argue, alter 'Ōiwi ability to engage in the practices that express our genealogical relationship to land in order to feel pride and value education.

6.2 Pele And Geothermal

Another struggle over 'āina and mo'okū'auhau is found in Puna, Hawai'i where 'Ōiwi have been fighting for decades to protect Tutu Pele, the volcanic lava beds of Puna, from the development of a geothermal energy plant. Recently the issue has resurfaced but this time on the front lines of advocacy for geothermal are Kānaka 'Ōiwi, some of whom were on the front lines of opposition before. In this most recent push for geothermal, it is well-known Kānaka 'Ōiwi who are advocating for geothermal and economic benefit is the premise of their argument, as well as their change of position on the issue.

In July of 2013, Kumu Hula, Cy Bridges, posted an editorial on Kealoha Energy's website heralding the Office of Hawaiian Affairs's decision to invest one million dollars into geothermal development on Hawai'i Island as finally “empowering Native

¹³¹ “Recorded livestream of 11/8/13 DLNR hearing re Mauna Kea Lease” YouTube video, 56:19, posted by H. Doug Matsuoka on November 11, 2013, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w60-jh8Mp-o&feature=youtu.be>.

Hawaiians as active participants in the shaping of their future”.¹³² No doubt, for good or bad, supporting geothermal development on Hawai‘i island will have an impact on the future but Bridges predicates ‘Ōiwi poverty as the reason why OHA and Hawaiians should support geothermal stating, “In the real world in which Native Hawaiians are disproportionately represented on all the indices of poverty, IDG demonstrated that it was prepared to move the ball forward on something that is critically important to our future: energy security.” Further, Bridges positions those who oppose geothermal as that which, “keeps us mired in the pettiness and poverty of the present.” But much of the criticism that comes from ‘Ōiwi is premised upon their genealogical connections to Pele, the deity of all volcanic activity in Hawai‘i.

Artist Terri Napeahi, at a Pele Defense Fund meeting in April, 2012 in Pāhoa, Hawai‘i, spoke in opposition to geothermal development on Hawai‘i island, stating,

Our deity, Tutu Pele, and the rest of the deities that we have, is important to us. It is *our* genealogy, it is my family. We treat our deities as our ancestors. And our ancestors are part of our land forms, our flora, our fauna, our water, and the elements. It is important for us as Hawaiians to understand that we have the direct privilege and kuleana to take care of it...We lose our aina, we lose us...I am an offspring and I am a daughter of my ancestors, thousands that stand behind me.¹³³

Where Bridges offers geothermal development as that which will save ‘Ōiwi from economic destitution, Napeahi invokes mo‘okū‘auhau to drive home the point that

¹³² “For Native Hawaiians, Supporting Geothermal Makes Cultural Sense,” Cy Bridges, July 2, 2013, <http://kealohaenergy.kealohaestate.com/2013/07/02/for-native-hawaiians-supporting-geothermal-makes-cultural-sense/>.

¹³³ “Pele Defense Fund May 8, 2012 - Terri,” YouTube video, 1:20, posted by “Occupy Hawaii” on May 15, 2012, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DxT6KtTe41I&feature=g-all-u>.

subscription to geothermal as that which will save ‘Ōiwi is actually that which will compromise our genealogical relations to the land.

The logic that Bridges offers suggests that the contemporary economic struggles that ‘Ōiwi face are a matter of delayed capital development which in turn erases the very seizure and power of resources by foreigners that was and continues to be motivated by capital development and that are threatened by the continuity of ‘Ōiwi genealogical relations to ‘āina. Just as EFYP encouraged young ‘Ōiwi of a century prior to accept Laissez-Faire economics to alleviate their own economic suffering, Bridges urges ‘Ōiwi to support geothermal in hopes of alleviating the economic stresses of today.

Each of these are brief contemporary examples of how the destitution of ‘Ōiwi is used to position enterprises that compromise the genealogical relationships and practices that ‘Ōiwi have to land as which can save ‘Ōiwi from destitution. ‘Ōiwi who oppose these enterprises regularly invoke genealogical connections to the land as that which moves them to a position of opposition. A national consciousness often reveals itself in these struggles as well, as when Attorney Dexter Ka‘iama and Kale Gumapac informed the BLNR members of their plans to file complaints against the BLNR in international courts on behalf of the Hawaiian Kingdom if they choose to renew the University’s lease for the summit of Mauna Kea.

6.3 Kana‘iolowalu And Federal Recognition

The recent Kana‘iolowalu campaign to encourage ‘Ōiwi to sign up on a roll that will be used to form a governing entity that will push for Hawai‘i State and US federal recognition employs the logic of Ola Hou in ever increasingly vivid ways. It is the most

recent of a number of initiatives pushing for federal recognition in the past decades while simultaneously, ‘Ōiwi resistance against forms of self-determination dependent upon the leadership and continued control of the US and void of any actual land base has only risen. These factors have contributed to much lower than desired roll registration rates, and as the Kana‘iolowalu campaign neared its deadline, its tactics became vividly desperate.

The headline for a recent advertisement published by Kana‘iolowalu in an issue of the OHA’s monthly newspaper, *Ka Wai Ola*, reads, “The future of the Hawaiian nation depends on you.”¹³⁴ This statement positions the existence of a Hawaiian nation as dependent upon whether or not ‘Ōiwi sign up for the roll. But a growing national consciousness over the past 30 years that sees full independence from the US as that which will afford ‘Ōiwi the return of national lands and greater freedom to control the destruction of Hawaiian lands by foreign capital and militarism have proven a barrier to the success of Kana‘iolowalu who accumulated only a small fraction of registrants compared to their goal of 200,000.

In the same *Ka Wai Ola* issue, Kana‘iolowalu ran an ad which featured a “Notice” at the bottom warning Hawaiians that if they did not sign up for the roll, they and their descendants may cease to be acknowledged as Hawaiians at all. The ad warns,

Those Hawaiians who choose not to be included on the official roll risk waving their right, and the right of their children and descendants, to be legally and politically acknowledged as Native Hawaiians and to participate in a future convention to reorganize the Hawaiian nation...and as a result may also be excluded from being granted rights of inclusion (citizenship), rights of

¹³⁴ “The Future of the Hawaiian Nation Depends on You” [Advertisement]. *Ka Wai Ola: The Living Water of OHA*, August 2013, Vol. 30, Number 8, 2.

participation (voting), and rights to potential benefits that may come with citizenship (e.g. land use rights, monetary payments, scholarship, etc).¹³⁵

The description of future potential “rights of inclusion” clearly points to US relationships with federally recognized Native Americans where inclusion and exclusion is determined by US law and the benefits of inclusion are largely monetary. The rights to land “use”, not a land base, are included in the description of possible benefits of inclusion, a right already codified, even under the Hawai‘i State Constitution.¹³⁶ A growing body of ‘Ōiwi scholars and activists have argued that this relationship to the US is a response to increasingly building challenges to the legal and moral legitimacy of the US in Hawai‘i by creating a process through which ‘Ōiwi consent to a legally bound relationship with the US that maintains US control over Hawai‘i and Hawaiian national lands. The various Kana‘iolwalu ads reproduce the narrative of Ola Hou in that the future of the lāhui depends on each individual kanaka ‘ōiwi’s consent and participation in structures of American dominance. Reversely, if ‘Ōiwi refuse participation in such then they risk legal and political recognition at all and the monetary benefits which are offered as they way to increase the betterment of the lāhui, essentially a civic death.

¹³⁵ “Public Notice To Native Hawaiians” [Advertisement]. *Ka Wai Ola: The Living Water of OHA*, August 2013, Vol. 30, Number 8, 7.

¹³⁶ Hawai‘i State Constitution, art. XII, § 7.

6.4 Closing

In the closing of *Dismembering Lāhui*, Osorio assesses the lasting impacts of western law and racial constructs upon ‘Ōiwi by posing the question,

In the wake of such astonishing changes in our society, have we simply given up trying to be true kānaka and given ourselves over to the pursuit of power, comfort, or haole approval? Are we merely doing the best we can to live as Natives in a foreign culture that seems to regard us as insignificant? Or are we just confused about who we are? Do we even know what it means to be Hawaiian anymore?¹³⁷

What it means to be Hawaiian I think has changed with each passing generation and era. However, engaging in struggle to retain and regenerate our ancestral connections to land and lāhui against an insatiable and increasingly powerful capitalist thirst has threaded the last two centuries of ‘Ōiwi together. Perhaps in the Kingdom era, that struggle was defined by the ways in which law was transforming the relationship between ‘Ōiwi and Ali‘i and if not that to land and economy, all this on top of a devastating, century-long population collapse. Perhaps struggle for ‘Ōiwi of the Territorial era was predominantly internal, grappling with the ideological shaming project that was forwarded through the banning of our ‘ōlelo makuahine, discourses of unfitness and the separation and institutionalization of loved ones. Today, some of us, (but many more of us than a generation or two ago), enjoy the fruits of consciousness regenerated by the Hawaiian renaissance movement and the Hawaiian sovereignty movement that the land struggles of the nineteen sixties and seventies gave birth to.

But the continuity of both tradition, imperialism and the ontological battles that occur at their crossroads remain embedded in our struggle today. If struggle is what links

¹³⁷ Osorio, “*Dismembering Lāhui*”, 251.

the past two centuries definition of what it means to be Hawaiian then perhaps it is struggle through which we assess Osorio's questions of identity. A state of confusion for 'Ōiwi seems undeniable. American hegemony relies on a state of confusion to embolden the lure of contemporary versions of Ola Hou. Ola Hou offers power and comfort that haole approval affords but most often at the expense of mo'okū'auhau-defined kuleana.

This helps me assess different kinds of contemporary struggles. I observe some 'Ōiwi who are struggling both for inclusion within the operations of global capital and against other 'Ōiwi who are struggling to maintain their genealogical kuleana to particular lands. There are 'Ōiwi today who are struggling for the betterment of their lāhui but who have accepted doing so against both genealogical and national claims to kinship and land. Laissez-Faire economics and the American national framework that exalts it as offered in *Eugenics for Young People* remain an alluring escape from the crushing struggle to remain genealogically and nationally gripped to land and lāhui. Every time we are asked by a kanaka 'ōiwi to change the way we perceive our ancestral connections to land we are being asked to consider the validity of those in the past who purported that 'Ōiwi spirituality, intellect and definitions of morality could no longer serve us and that if we insisted on continuing the values and practices of our kūpuna, then we insisted upon our own death and degradation. Today, the discourse of unfitness is forwarded by non-'Ōiwi and 'Ōiwi alike who do accept and perhaps benefit from the death of our own modes of land management, kinship, education and economics, those cultural and political components which make us uniquely 'Ōiwi, of the bones, and that will take us in harmony with our earth mother, Papahānaumoku, well into the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beamer, Kamanamaikalani, “Na wai ka mana? ‘Ōiwi Agency and European Imperialism in the Hawaiian Kingdom” PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i, 2008.
- Beamer, Kamanamaikalani and T. Kaeo Duarte “I palapala no ia aina - documenting the Hawaiian Kingdom. A colonial venture?” *Journal of Historical Geography* 35, 2009.
- Bhabha, Homi. “The Other Question: Difference, Discrimination and the Discourse of Colonialism.” *Screen* 24, no.6 (Nov./Dec. 1983).
- Bishop, S.E., “Why are the Hawaiians Dying Out?” Paper read at 1888 meeting of Social Science Society of Honolulu. California Digital Library, University of California. <https://archive.org/details/whyarehawaiiansd00bish>.
- Brandt, Allen. *No Magic Bullet: A Social History of Venereal Disease in the United States Since 1880*. Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Bridges, Cy. “For Native Hawaiians, Supporting Geothermal Makes Cultural Sense.” July 2, 2013. <http://kealohaenergy.kealohaestate.com/2013/07/02/for-native-hawaiians-supporting-geothermal-makes-cultural-sense/>.
- Carlson, Elof Axel “The Hoosier Connection: Compulsory Sterilization as Moral Hygiene ” in *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*, ed. Paul A. Lombardo. Indiana University Press, 2011.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Jennifer Noelani. “Kū i ka Māna. Building Community and Nation Through Contemporary Hawaiian Schooling” PhD diss., University of California Santa Cruz, 2005.
- Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, Jennifer Noelani. “Militarization, white supremacy and schooling in Hawai‘i”. Paper presented at the annual conference for the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association, Tucson, Arizona, May, 2010.
- Kamakau, Samuel Manaiākalani. *Ka Po‘e Kahiko: The People of Old*. Bishop Museum Press.
- Kanahele, Pualani Kanaka‘ole. *Ka Honua Ola: ‘Eli ‘eli Kau Mai*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2011.
- Kauanui, J. Kehaulani. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2008.

- Kame‘eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Lands and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992.
- Kline, Wendy. *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality and Eugenics From the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Lili‘uokalani. *Hawai‘i’s Story: By Hawai‘i’s Queen*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990.
- Lombardo, Paul A. “Looking Back at Eugenics” in *A Century of Eugenics in America: From the Indiana Experiment to the Human Genome Era*, ed. Paul A. Lombardo. Indiana University Press, 2011.
- McGregor, Davianna. “Kūpa‘a i ka ‘Āina: Persistence on the Land” PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i, 1989.
- Malo, David. *Hawaiian Antiquities*, translated by Nathaniel B. Emerson, Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1951.
- Malo, Davida. *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i*. The Folk Press, 1987.
- Merry, Sally Engle. *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Meyer, Manulani Aluli. *Ho‘oulu, Our Time of Becoming: Hawaiian Epistemology and Early Writings*. ‘Ai Pōhaku Press, 2003.
- Nelligan, Peter James. “Social Change and Rape Law in Hawai‘i”. PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i, 1983.
- Ngugi Wa Thiango. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* Reed Publishing, 1986.
- Osorio, Jon Kamakawiwo‘ole. *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002.
- “Pele Defense Fund May 8, 2012 - Terri.” YouTube video, 1:20. Posted by “Occupy Hawaii” on May 15, 2012. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DxT6KtTe41I&feature=g-all-u>.
- “Public Notice To Native Hawaiians” [Advertisement]. *Ka Wai Ola: The Living Water of OHA*. August 2013, Vol. 30, Number 8.
- Puku‘i, Mary Kawena and Elbert, Samuel H.. *The Hawaiian Dictionary*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 1986.

Puku‘i, Mary Kawena and Craighill Handy, E.S. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka‘ū Hawai‘i*. Mutual Publishing, 1998.

“Recorded livestream of 11/8/13 DLNR hearing re Mauna Kea Lease.” YouTube video, 56:19. Posted by H. Doug Matsuoka on November 11, 2013. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w60-jh8Mp-o&feature=youtu.be>

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Vintage Books, 1978.

Schmitt, Robert C. *Demographic Statistics of Hawai‘i: 1778-1965*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 1968.

Silva, Noenoe. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*. Duke University Press Books, 2007.

Stannard, David. *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai‘i on the Eve of Western Contact*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989.

Szego, C.K. “The Sound of Rocks Aquiver: Composing Racial Ambivalence in Territorial Hawai‘i” *The Journal of American Folklore* 123 no 487. Winter 2010.

Takemoto, Karen Reiko “Unquestionably Lolo: A History of Waimano Home (1921-1961)” Masters Thesis, University of Hawai‘i, 1984.

“The Future of the Hawaiian Nation Depends on You” [Advertisement]. *Ka Wai Ola: The Living Water of OHA*. August 2013, Vol. 30, Number 8.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. “The Birth of the Modern Hawaiian Movement: Kalama Valley, O‘ahu” *Hawaiian Journal of History*, 21, 1987, 126-53.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. *From A Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i*. University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999.

Tuhiwai-Smith, Linda. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. University of Otago Press, 1999.

Young, Kanalu. “Kuleana: Toward A Historiography Of Hawaiian National Consciousness, 1780-2001” *Hawaiian Journal of Law and Politics* 2. 2006.