

I Kū Mau Mau: How Kānaka Maoli Tried To Sustain National Identity Within the United States Political System¹

Noenoe K. Silva

Introduction

After nearly a century of cultural, economic, and political intrusion and domination, between 1893 and 1900 the United States took political control over Hawai‘i in three complex steps. First, a military intervention on January 16, 1893 facilitated a takeover the next day by an American-identified oligarchy. Second, the United States military, using Hawai‘i as a coaling and staging site for their war to take the Philippines, occupied Hawai‘i under the nominal but illegal (under American and international law) annexation of 1898.² Third, in 1900, Congress enacted the Organic Act, which set up a colonial government in which the citizens of Hawai‘i were given the right to vote in local elections and to elect a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives, but, as in other colonies of the United States (e.g., Puerto Rico), were not allowed to vote for their governor, or for the President of the United States. Appointments to the judiciary were also made by Washington, D.C. or by the appointed governor.³

Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians), along with many other citizens, fiercely resisted every action of the United States in the taking of their country.⁴ In 1893, immediately following the military intervention and coup d’état that deposed Queen Lili‘uokalani, thousands of Kānaka Maoli and their supporters formed the Hui Aloha ‘Āina. The purpose of the organization was to “preserve and maintain, by all legal and peaceful means and measures, the *independent*

autonomy of the islands of Hawaii.”⁵ The Hui had both men’s and women’s branches. In 1893, they reported 7,500 members in the men’s branch, and 11,000 in the women’s branch. From 1893 to 1898, the Hui Aloha ‘Āina, often in coalition with a slightly older organization, the Hui Kālai‘āina, organized mass meetings, petitions, and citizen testimonies. In 1897, when the American-identified oligarchy negotiated a new treaty of annexation, the three hui, together with Queen Lili‘uokalani, organized a massive petition drive that resulted in 38,000 signatures protesting the planned annexation. The male leadership traveled to Washington, D.C. and presented the petitions to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The petitions and the petitioners’ presence in Washington contributed to the defeat of the annexation treaty. Hawai‘i was subsequently illegally annexed by a joint resolution of the United States Congress.

What happened to these organizations after 1898? How did citizens react to the apparently unmoveable American military presence in their islands? This paper documents some of the thought and actions of the Hui Aloha ‘Āina and the Hui Kālai‘āina,⁶ who, following the military occupation of 1898, attempted to gain local political power through establishing the Home Rule Party in order to affect at least the local laws controlling their lives and to maintain their own cultural identity against increased efforts towards complete cultural hegemony by Americans.

The sources for the research in this essay include the archive of Hawaiian language newspapers, written by and for the Kanaka Maoli, which are rarely drawn upon for historical or political analysis. The U.S. colonization of Hawai‘i included numerous colonizing strategies, one of which was to supplant the indigenous people’s language with that of the colonizer. In 1896, the colonial oligarchy banned the Hawaiian language as a medium of instruction in all schools, public and private.⁷ From that time on, all formal governmental, legal, and financial transactions were conducted in English. The majority of people in succeeding generations of Kanaka Maoli grew up ignorant of their heritage language, and it eventually ceased to be one of the commonly spoken languages of the land. It was, and is, kept alive on the island of Ni‘ihau and in the Ni‘ihau community on Kaua‘i, and among the few elderly native speakers who remain.⁸

Language is, moreover, one the most important sites of such anti-colonial struggles. As in many other cases, the colonial state attempted from the beginning to bring the colony into its national narrative, which as Michael J. Shapiro has noted, aims to produce “a reified, unproblematic existence.”⁹ The continued production of literature and history (*mo‘olelo*) in the native tongue by Kānaka Maoli after the U.S. political takeover is central to understanding this period because the literature written by the natives, invoking their own sense of history and time separate from the new colonial state, disrupts the colonial state’s attempts to create that smooth and unproblematic version of its existence.

The widespread suppression of the native language assisted the production of a history unproblematic to the colonial state. The major histories of our ‘āina

and our nation in use since the early to mid-twentieth century have all been written in the language (English) of the colonizers. The historians whose work is most widely cited—Gavan Daws, Lawrence Fuchs, Ralph Kuykendall, and William Adam Russ, among others—did (and do) not read the Hawaiian language.¹⁰ Therefore, although the Kanaka Maoli had become literate in the early part of the nineteenth century and had established their own newspapers and presses, publishing their own accounts and opinions of Hawaiian history and the events they lived through, mainstream historians have not deemed it necessary to learn the language and read what they wrote. Instead they have relied—and most continue to rely—on the English language sources available in libraries and archives that reflect primarily the perspectives of the colonizers. Because the Kanaka Maoli, however, were in struggle against the English-speaking community, it is impossible to comprehend fully Kānaka Maoli responses to United States cultural and political domination by relying solely upon the English-language press, or even upon English-language archives. It is crucial to emphasize that Kānaka Maoli have contested those histories, in particular through the production of their own mo‘olelo in their own language.

The annexation period (1893-1898) provides examples of the kinds of stories that are missing in the mainstream histories, and the kind of pro-colonizer, anti-Kanaka Maoli point of view that is prevalent. Fuchs characterizes the head of the oligarchical government, Sanford Dole, as representing “the best of the haole missionary tradition in Hawai‘i,” despite noting his racist assertion that “government should be ‘placed in the hands of the Teutons.’”¹¹ Although he noted that an organization called the Hawaiian Patriotic League (the Hui Aloha ‘Āina) opposed annexation, he makes little note of their activities, and none at all of their leadership or the extent of their membership.¹² His lack of interest and research in this area leads him to errors of fact as well as of omission. He says, for example, that after Queen Lili‘uokalani was arrested and imprisoned, “her supporters were broken.”¹³ As my previous work has shown, nothing could be further from the truth. Fuchs’ account of this period contains nothing about the massive organized resistance to annexation that resulted in the petition against annexation that ended the 1897 drive for an annexation treaty.

Similarly, Daws was able to simultaneously dismiss the organized resistance against annexation and disparage the Kanaka Maoli:

The Hawaiians had lost much of their reason for living long ago, when the kapus were abolished; since then a good many of them had lost their lives through disease; the survivors lost their land; they lost their leaders, because many of the chiefs withdrew from politics in favor of nostalgic self-indulgence; and now at last they lost their independence. Their resistance to all this was feeble.¹⁴

To say that such accounts were biased against Kanaka Maoli would be putting it mildly. More important than overt bias, however, which historians might recognize and attempt to balance, is that the writers in the English-language press saw and described the Kanaka Maoli as “Other.”¹⁵ The historians themselves, being more like the earlier English speakers, continue the same sort of representation of Kanaka as “Other.” The discourses at the turn of the twentieth century, from which these histories were drawn, were a continuation of those of the nineteenth century—that Kanaka were childlike, primitive, and in need of civilizing in the form of good colonial government.¹⁶

For example, as I will show later, the Home Rule party was established for the purpose of ameliorating some of the predictable disadvantages of American colonial rule but Fuchs characterizes the politically active Kānaka of this period as “frightening.” While the Home Rulers’ insistence on holding meetings in their own language can be better understood as resistance to the drive to make Kanaka Maoli assimilate, Fuchs repeats the colonizers’ charge that they were “antihaole.”¹⁷ Daws, drawing on the same sources as well as on Fuchs, stereotypes the same elected leaders as “worse than anyone thought,” since “[a]s long as the Home Rulers” had a majority “nothing much would be accomplished.”¹⁸ Neither is the least curious about who the members of the Home Rule party were, how they came to organize themselves into a party, or how the loss of nationhood might have affected the behavior of the people or of the elected Kānaka. Both historians characterize the conflict between the oligarchy and the Kanaka in terms that reflected the American obsession with race. But while the Kanaka well understood that it was in part their color that facilitated American disdain for their government and treaties, their main arguments were *not* that they hated or resented the haole, but that the United States had no kuleana (legitimate authority) in their land, and that Hawai‘i was an independent nation-state recognized by many other countries. For them, it was not a question of race, but a question of their national independence and sovereignty. Reading the Hawaiian-language papers allows us to see this continuity in Hawaiian political thought from the struggle against annexation to the struggle to maintain at least some political power and cultural and national identity.¹⁹

I therefore use the Hawaiian-language papers to recover Kanaka political activity and thought for, as Foucault has put it, “an insurrection of subjugated knowledge.”²⁰ Moreover, I hope here to create a deeper understanding of the experiences and thought of the Kānaka of this period by including some details of the flourishing of Kānaka mo‘olelo (meaning both history and literature) that appeared in the newspapers affiliated with the Home Rule party. While I realize that this means bringing a perhaps unexpected discussion of “literature” into my narration of “history,” I hope that it will be a fruitful crossing of boundaries, or as Edward Said has written, “a smuggling of ideas across lines, a stirring of intellectual and . . . political complacency.”²¹

Partha Chatterjee has noted how “anticolonial nationalism creates its own domain of sovereignty within colonial society well before it begins its political

battle with the imperial power.” National culture is created and maintained within this domain, where “the nation is already sovereign, even when the state is in the hands of the colonial power.”²² The production of literature based on the oral tradition in newly colonial Hawai‘i at this time is an analogous situation; literature in the native tongue kept the nation alive in a cultural domain, even though, politically, national sovereignty had been snatched away. The production of literature in the native language was one tactic, in addition to the attempts to gain limited political power, in what James Tully has described as

the vast repertoire of resistance to survive and revitalise their cultures, nations and federations, to keep indigenous ways of being in the world alive and well for the next generations, to adapt [their] ways and stories to [their] present strategic situation, to comply with and participate in the dominant institutions while refusing to surrender, to regain degrees of self-rule and control over their territories when possible and so to seek to transform internal colonisation obliquely from within.²³

Background

The colonization of Hawai‘i might be said to have begun with the arrival of Calvinist missionaries in 1820. The missionaries confused converting the Kanaka Maoli to Christianity with coercing them to change nearly every facet of their lives to conform to New England customs. Sally Engle Merry explains how the missionaries believed their project was to “civilize” the natives. “Civilizing” included establishing an alphabet for the language and then creating a literate society; instituting a system of constitutions and laws; and conforming sexual, marriage, and family practices, dress, and even ways of eating (a table and utensils rather than a mat and calabashes) to Puritan norms.²⁴

By the end of the 1860s, missionaries and their descendants had established a system of colonial capitalism in the Islands. They had persuaded the king and advisors to change the traditional Hawaiian system of land tenure, in which chiefs ruled over land and people, but land was not owned or inherited, a change that dispossessed the majority of Kanaka Maoli. They themselves purchased large tracts of land, established sugar plantations, and worked to convert Kānaka Maoli into plantation laborers. They also moved into positions of influence in the government, where they established a colonial school system and created laws that deprived women of political participation, along with a host of other colonial ills, such as the 1850 Masters and Servants Act, which set up an oppressive contract labor system, and the establishment of prisons.²⁵

In 1887, descendants of these missionaries succeeded in a coup d’état when, through threat of violence, they forced King Kalākaua to sign a constitution that has since then been referred to, by Kanaka Maoli and others, including historians,

as the Bayonet Constitution.²⁶ This constitution instituted property requirements for voter eligibility and, for the first time, instituted a racial barrier to prevent Asian immigrants from voting. The King's executive powers were also stripped: every executive action required the consent of the Cabinet. To make matters worse, while the King could appoint his cabinet, he could not dismiss it. The Legislature was given the power to ratify cabinet appointments and could also dismiss the cabinet, which they did frequently.²⁷ The upper house of the Legislature was elected by property owners, including any "male resident . . . of Hawaiian, American, or European descent . . . hav[ing] been domiciled in the Kingdom for one year. . ."²⁸ As Jonathan Osorio puts it,

Thus the participation of the Natives in their own government was severely compromised by equating them with virtually any Caucasian, including Portuguese immigrants literally "fresh off the boats." Birth and devotion to the Native Hawaiian nation would count for absolutely nothing because no elector would be required, as formerly, to renounce their previous nationality and swear allegiance to the king.²⁹

Kānaka Maoli protested the Bayonet Constitution in both violent (e.g., through an armed attempt to force Kalākaua to accept the previous constitution) and non-violent ways (e.g., the establishment of a political organization called the Hui Kālai'āina,³⁰ which coordinated the gathering of signatures on petitions to the King pleading for a new constitution). They also established coalitions with other organizations to gain control of the Legislature, but the property requirements for the franchise instituted by the Bayonet Constitution undermined their efforts.³¹

King Kalākaua died in 1891, passing the throne to his sister, Lili'uokalani, whose subjects continued to petition for a new constitution. When she attempted to do so in January, 1893, the same group of wealthy, mostly American, men who had forced the Bayonet Constitution on Kalākaua appealed to the U.S. Minister John L. Stevens for assistance to keep themselves in power. Stevens ordered armed American troops onshore from the U.S.S. *Boston* on January 16. The next day, the group took over a government building and proclaimed themselves the "Provisional Government." The Queen surrendered under protest, with the following statement (quoted here in part):

I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose Minister Plenipotentiary, His Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu, and declared that he would support the said Provisional Government.

Now to avoid any collision of armed forces, and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest and impelled by the

said forces, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representative, and reinstate me in the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands.³²

The provisional government attempted to have Hawai‘i annexed at that time through a treaty, but a new president, Grover Cleveland, withdrew the treaty after receiving protests from Queen Lili‘uokalani and others. Kānaka Maoli organized to protest this military occupation and coup d’état through peaceful means. Joseph K. Nāwahī and others founded the Hui Aloha ‘Āina for the purpose of supporting the Queen and preventing annexation by the U.S. Nāwahī’s wife, Emma ‘A‘ima Nāwahī, along with Kuaihelani Maipinepine Campbell, an ali‘i [noble; ruler]³³ and wife of millionaire James Campbell, founded the Hui Aloha ‘Āina o Nā Wāhine (for women), which was not a women’s auxiliary, but an active political entity that drafted and sent protests to foreign governments and organized mass meetings.³⁴

Two years later, in January 1895, Kanaka Maoli Robert Wilcox and others attempted an armed counter-coup to restore Lili‘uokalani. The coup was unsuccessful, and Wilcox and about 200 others, including the Queen, were arrested. In 1896 they were all pardoned by the oligarchy and released.

When William McKinley became President of the United States in early 1897, the annexationists, comprised mainly of the members of the same oligarchy that had perpetrated the Bayonet Constitution and the 1893 coup, again attempted to gain a treaty of annexation. They were led by missionary descendants Lorrin Thurston, Sanford Dole, William R. Castle, Sereno Bishop and others. The “missionary party,” as Lili‘uokalani called them, was opposed by Hui Kālai‘āina, which consisted of approximately 17,000 men and the two Hui Aloha ‘Āina organizations (7,500 men and 11,000 women), who worked together to prevent the annexation.³⁵ Their protests included a massive drive that resulted in 38,000 signatures (of a Kanaka Maoli population of approximately 40,000) on a petition to “earnestly protest the annexation of the said Hawaiian Islands to the said United States of America in any form or shape.”³⁶ Delegates of the Hui took the anti-annexation petitions to Washington, D.C. to show the U.S. Senate that the “government” of Hawai‘i did not represent the people of Hawai‘i, especially on the issue of annexation. The delegates’ presence in Washington and the petitions they brought appear to have been compelling, for the treaty of annexation was “shelved for a lack of votes” in the Senate.³⁷

Just months later, however, the United States declared war against Spain, the object of which was to gain control over a weak Spain’s colonies in the Caribbean and in the Pacific, especially the Philippines. The United States almost immediately attacked Spain, not in Cuba, where the USS *Maine* had blown up, but in the Philippines. The American public and the U.S. Congress were now persuaded by both annexationists and imperialists such as Theodore Roosevelt

that taking Hawai‘i was imperative, since “the Hawaiian Islands lay directly on the route from North America to the Philippine Islands. With its supplies of food, water, and coal, Hawai‘i was the only place to replenish a troop ship within several thousand miles.”³⁸ According to historian Tom Coffman, “friends of annexation [in the House of Representatives] . . . set in motion the machinery of a joint resolution. . . .”³⁹ Although many anti-imperialists opposed the measure, war fever overrode their arguments. “[L]ongtime skeptics said that to vote against the annexation of Hawai‘i had become like voting against a war resolution while America was under attack.”⁴⁰ On July 6, 1898, the joint resolution, called the Newlands Resolution, passed both houses with a simple majority, with one-third of the Senate abstaining.⁴¹ Although the Congress was well aware that the Republic did not represent the people of Hawai‘i, the Newlands Resolution included the provision that the Republic of Hawai‘i would

cede absolutely and without reserve to the United States of America all rights of sovereignty of whatsoever kind in and over the Hawaiian Islands . . . and also to cede and transfer to the United States the absolute fee and ownership of all public, Government, or Crown lands, public buildings or edifices, ports, harbors, military equipment, and all other public property of every kind and description belonging to the Government of the Hawaiian Islands.⁴²

U.S. troops descended en masse on Hawai‘i shortly thereafter, bolstering the regime that had taken power.

The Po‘e Aloha ‘Āina and the Newspapers

Members of the Hui Kālai‘āina and the two Hui Aloha ‘Āina were organized and educated in politics, ready and able to rule their own country, but they were confronted with the military might of the United States. One of their main resistance tactics during these difficult years was to organize and communicate through newspapers. The palapala—reading and writing—was one of the most important ways that the Kanaka Maoli used to keep intact their identity as a lāhui—as a distinct people with their own language and traditions. They used the palapala to communicate, organize, and support each other over the years of struggle with the foreigners who had come to exploit their land and labor and to subjugate them, and through the traumatic years that saw a depopulation of genocidal proportions.⁴³

As previously noted, the early missionaries had created an alphabet for the Hawaiian language and had offered to teach reading and writing. The ali‘i immediately grasped the utility of literacy and greatly encouraged all of the people to become literate. Kamakau’s 1868 account of the ali‘i enthusiasm for the palapala has been translated:

As soon as the chiefs saw what a good thing it was to know how to read and write, each chief took teachers into his home to teach the chiefs of his household. [Queen] Ka-‘ahu-manu . . . sent some of them to other islands to teach, and all the other chiefs sent teachers to their lands to teach the people to read and write. . . . This was why education spread so rapidly. When the missionaries began to settle in the outer districts they found that the people already knew how to read.⁴⁴

The missionaries also established Lahainaluna seminary on Maui in 1831, to which the ali‘i sent their advisors and other promising young men. (Although women were prominent as ruling ali‘i, the seminary was controlled by the missionaries, so only men were enrolled.) In 1834, when the school received the mission’s old printing press, teachers and students produced the first Hawaiian-language newspaper in the Islands, *Ka Lama Hawaii*.⁴⁵ Kānaka students not only wrote for one page of the paper; they also learned how to operate the printing press—and thus the entire process of editing and publishing a paper. In subsequent years, the mission published more papers with wider circulation, and in 1856 the government also began to publish one, *Ka Hae Hawaii*.⁴⁶ Kānaka worked at all of these papers in all capacities—as writers, editors, typesetters, and so on. As a result, newspapers became popular among this literate people, who desired all types of reading material. But all of these papers were also controlled overtly or covertly, by missionaries. All except *Ka Hae Hawaii* were mission publications, and *Ka Hae* was controlled behind the scenes by Richard Armstrong, a former missionary and head of the public school system.

By 1861, some missionaries had become owners of sugar plantations and government officers. They succeeded in getting a number of laws passed that were oppressive to Kanaka ways of life, such as making the English language version of laws the binding one, and strict marriage and divorce laws.⁴⁷ In response, a group of Kanaka Maoli men organized to publish their own newspaper, free of censorship or control by the missionaries. In the paper, *Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika* (The Star of the Pacific), Kanaka Maoli authors recorded stories from the oral tradition, along with chants and genealogies, as well as their political views.⁴⁸ This began a tradition of counter-hegemonic action through newspaper writing and publication that lasted well into the twentieth century. In the anti-annexation struggle and in the subsequent years (roughly 1893-1900), *Ke Aloha Aina*, *Ka Makaainana*, and *Ka Loea Kalaiaina* newspapers, among others, served as organizing forces for the two organizations. Other newspapers, which we will examine, served the same purpose for the Home Rule Party that grew out of those two organizations.

Aloha ‘Āina

It was in and through these newspapers that Kānaka Maoli articulated the concept of “aloha ‘āina,” which can be translated as “love of the land,” and it came to be used as equivalent for “patriotic.” As I have pointed out elsewhere, the concept does not match exactly with the English word “patriotic” as it does not share its genealogy; nor is it gendered male. Aloha ‘āina is an old Kanaka concept based on the family relationship of the people to the land, and on the idea that people actually were born of the material of the land. According to traditional Hawaiian cosmologies, all things on the earth are alive and are the *kinolau*—the many physical bodies—of gods, who are themselves physically related to people in genealogies. The ancient cosmologies say that the islands themselves were given birth by women, most prominently Papahānaumoku, who conceived through sexual intercourse, experienced pains of pregnancy, and endured labor.⁴⁸ She is the same woman whose daughter gave birth to the first taro and the first human being. The islands, the taro, and the people are thus conceived of as members of the same family who love and sustain each other. In the struggle against annexation, Joseph Nāwahī, John Ailuene Bush, and others developed “aloha ‘āina” as a discourse of resistance, and simultaneously as a particularly Kanaka style of defensive nationalism. That is why Nāwahī’s hui and his newspaper were named aloha ‘āina. In Nāwahī’s time, aloha ‘āina meant supporting an independent Hawai‘i governed democratically by Kānaka Maoli, in a constitutional monarchy headed by Queen Lili‘uokalani.⁴⁹

After Nāwahī’s death in 1896 and the U.S. military takeover in 1898, the lāhui did not simply give up their convictions about aloha ‘āina, nor did they willingly let go of their language, traditions, or aspirations for self-rule.

Wilikoki and the Birth of the Independent Home Rule Party

Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox, called Wilikoki in Hawaiian, who had led the armed resistance to both the Bayonet Constitution in 1889, and to the U.S. overthrow and oligarchical government in 1895, was elected by the Hui Kālai‘āina in 1899 to travel to the United States and lobby to restore the Queen to her position of power and authority. According to his own account, “I traveled north to join up with [Edgar] Caypless [a colleague] in Seattle. We started work there towards the restoration of the monarchy.” When they arrived in Chicago, however, they learned that “there was no hope because the Newlands Resolution had passed, and it was secure.”⁵⁰ They then traveled on to New York, not yet giving up. But soon, “When we fully realized that the restoration of the Queen was impossible, we decided to work towards getting voting rights for the Hawaiian people.”⁵¹ Their first act upon arriving in Washington, D.C. was to meet “with the Queen most affectionately.” Queen Lili‘uokalani was already in Washington attempting to get back her lands, which the oligarchy was handing over to the United States as part of the “ceded lands.”

At the time, the U.S. Congress was debating the provisions of the Organic Act, which would determine how Hawai‘i would be governed. Members of Hawai‘i’s oligarchical government were also in Washington. They had helped to draft the original bill, which would continue the practice begun in the Bayonet Constitution, of restricting the right to vote to men who could prove that they owned “real property in the Territory of the value of not less than one thousand dollars, and upon which legal taxes shall have been paid . . . or shall have actually received a money income of not less than six hundred dollars.”⁵² This was the same provision that had restricted all but wealthy Kanaka men from voting since 1887. “I made great efforts, going to the Senators night and day,” Wilcox wrote, “talking about the restrictions that have been put upon the Hawaiians.” Wilcox and his company prevailed, and the property restrictions were not included in the Organic Act.

That all men could now vote meant that Kanaka Maoli could possibly control local politics, provided they all voted together. With a population around 40,000, they they were still the largest group in Hawai‘i, except for Japanese immigrants, who were prevented from voting through language and citizenship provisions in the law.⁵³ Wilcox believed that establishing a separate political party for Kanaka Maoli was the best avenue for achieving at least local political representation.

When Wilcox returned to Hawai‘i, he went to the presidents of the Hui Kālai‘āina and Hui Aloha ‘Āina (for men), David Kalauokalani and James Kaulia, respectively, and persuaded them of the importance of creating a single Kanaka Maoli political party. The first action the three men took was to visit the Queen (who had also returned the same week) and ask for her permission for this course of action. It seems that they did not want her to view them as abandoning her or their convictions about aloha ‘āina, and wished for her blessing on their idea for a political party. The Queen responded:

Aloha to all of you: I did not think that you, the lāhui, were still remembering me, since ten years has passed since I became a Mother for you, the lāhui, and now, the U.S. sits in power over me and over you, my dear nation. What has befallen you is very painful to me, but it could not be prevented. My mind has been opened (hoohamama ia) because of what the United States has now given to the lāhui Hawai‘i. Here is what I advise—that the people should look to the nation’s leaders, Mr. Kaulia and Mr. Kalauokalani. A great responsibility has fallen upon them to look out for the welfare of the lāhui in accordance with the laws that the United States has handed down, to ensure that the people will receive rights and benefits for our and future generations, and I will also derive that one benefit [i.e., the welfare of the people]. We have no other direction left, except this unrestricted right [to vote], given by the United States to you the people. Grasp it

and hold on to it; it is up to you to make things right for all of us in the future.⁵⁴

The next step was to gain the approval and enthusiasm of the people for the idea of a political party. According to Davianna McGregor, the hui organized a convention in Honolulu attended by delegates from the other islands. The delegates voted unanimously to form a separate political party to be called the Independent Home Rule Party.⁵⁵ The two organizations then called for a joint mass meeting, on June 9, 1900, to which women as well as men were invited.⁵⁶ Kalauokalani, president of Hui Kālai‘āina, was called on to present the idea to the people. He first explained that the United States had not and was not likely to begin heeding the demands of the lāhui to restore the Queen. He went on to say that the only hope was for the people to participate in the government that the United States was handing down to them, through exercising their right to vote. This was a major shift in strategy for the lāhui because Kānaka Maoli, including those who had qualified under the property requirement, had refused to vote in the oligarchical government set up by U.S. missionary descendants since 1893. That government, first called the Provisional Government, and later, the Republic of Hawai‘i, had required would-be voters to sign an oath of loyalty to the government, including a promise not to work for the restoration of the Queen. To sign such an oath was impossible for most Kānaka Maoli, since, nearly unanimously, they supported the Queen.

Kalauokalani then turned the meeting over to Wilikoki, who reported on his trip to Washington and on his hopes for political power for the lāhui through a party called the Independent Home Rule Party. The crowd responded enthusiastically to Wilikoki’s idea, cheering him several times.

Kaulia then spoke, reading the platform planned for the new party. He argued that the Democratic and Republican parties were both parties of annexationists, and therefore the lāhui should have its own party. He declared that the Home Rule party would prevail, shouting, “Pepehi ka moo!” The English papers interpreted this as “Slay the dragon!” and seized on it as evidence that the Home Rulers were an anti-haole party. At this same meeting, John Wise (of both Kanaka and haole descent), responding to the charge that the party was anti-haole, reminded people of how hospitable and open the Kanaka Maoli had been, and how, as a people, they had elected many haole to legislative positions. In contrast, he said, the haole had often acted as anti-Kanaka: “When 1893 arrived, when the haole took the executive power of the government, the haole fired the Hawaiians (na Hawaii) from their government jobs, and put their own family members there to eat the fat of the government.”⁵⁷

“Pepehi ka moo!” (kill the mo‘o) can be interpreted in several ways, but it can only mean “Slay the dragon!” if one is drawing from a set of English language cultural references, because dragons do not exist in Hawaiian traditions. In Hawaiian traditions, mo‘o are supernatural beings, sometimes lizard-like (sometimes not). Sometimes they are benevolent ‘aumākuā (family deities), and

sometimes supernatural beings dangerous to humans. In the epic story of Hi'iakaikapoliopole, who is the youngest and most beloved sister of the volcano goddess Pele, Hi'iaka travels the islands and disposes of the mo'o that are harmful to human beings. It is most likely that Kaulia selected this image as a metaphor in which the lāhui, like Hi'iaka, might prevail over forces that had harmed them. There is no doubt that the lāhui had been harmed during the years of oligarchical rule, through deprivation of the vote, loss of jobs, and racist laws directed against them.⁵⁸ Later in this paper, I will further examine how the story of Hi'iaka is intertwined with the political resistance of the lāhui.

Once the crowd in Honolulu approved the merger of the two hui into one political party, the leaders traveled throughout the islands, meeting with the people in rural areas to bring them into the party as well. McGregor says that

Voting for the Home Rula Ku'oko'a candidates was portrayed [by Home Rule Party leaders] to be a matter of love and loyalty to one's country and countrymen and a stand for Hawaiian independence. It was a vote against the haole elite who had overthrown the Hawaiian monarchy.⁵⁹

Some time shortly after the formation of the party, Emma 'A'ima Nāwahī and her paper, *Ke Aloha Aina*, decided not to support the Home Rule Party, but rather the Democratic Party, whose candidate for the non-voting seat in the U.S. Congress was Ke Keikiali'i (Prince) David Kawananakoa, Queen Lili'uokalani's nephew. The Home Rule Party therefore did not have their own newspaper or the support of *Ke Aloha Aina* during this campaign. It is still possible, however, to see the continuity of aloha 'āina discourse for the Home Rulers in the pages of *Ke Aloha Aina*. The editors assert several times that because of the decision of respected po'e aloha 'āina to join the Democratic party, that party was "aloha 'āina" as well. This editorial on September 22 called on readers to "E Ike a e Hoomanao" [Know and Remember] that

there are true aloha 'āina people in the Democratic party circle; these are people who were abused/beaten (hoomaewaewa ia), who slept on the cold stone floor of Kawa [jail] because of their love for their birth sands.⁶⁰

Kawa jail was where many po'e aloha 'āina had been imprisoned after the 1895 attempted counter-coup. Another editorial was entitled "He Aloha Aina Ke Kahua o ke Demokarata" ['Aloha 'Āina is the Platform of the Democratic Party'].⁶¹ *Ke Aloha Aina* recommended that the two parties merge, in fact, under the name "Independent Democratic Party" or "Democratic Independent Party." John Wise, a well-respected aloha 'āina, wrote that the platform of the Democratic party was identical to that for which the Hui Aloha 'Āina and Hui Kālai'āina had stood for the past seven years: to oppose the greedy and unfair actions of the

wealthy Republicans, and also their unfair representations, or public insults, of Kanaka Hawai‘i (na hana hoowahawaha ... i na Kanaka Hawaii).⁶² Wise went on to equate the Republican party with the oligarchy that had just dispossessed the Kanaka Maoli of their nation.

Ke Aloha Aina seems to have supported the Democratic party mainly because of loyalty to the ali‘i. An editorial called “O Ke Alii Wale No Kuu Makemake” [The Ali‘i Is All that I Want] says that people should vote for Ke Ali‘i Kawanakoa so that

America will see the determination, the unshakability, and true aloha of this people for their country and their true ardent support for their ali‘i, and in order to show the truth before them and the whole world, that these convictions are held fast in our hearts, and cannot be changed or erased until this people disappears from the face of the earth.⁶³

The decision to support the young ali‘i against the wishes of the two hui was so difficult that the paper ran an editorial announcing that Mrs. Nāwahī was contemplating selling it. The editorial said that her husband had founded the paper in the belief that America would act honorably to restore the people’s government, but now the United States had instead established a territorial government that the people had no hope of turning back. Mrs. Nāwahī no longer wanted to be in the midst of political struggles.⁶⁴

Although the Home Rule Party had neither the support of *Ke Aloha Aina* nor their own newspaper, the membership of the two hui was apparently so large and loyal that the party swept the first elections in November 1900, winning “the overwhelming majority of seats in the Territorial House of Representatives and Senate, as well as the coveted delegateship to the U.S. Congress.”⁶⁵ Home Rulers won 9 out of 13 Senate seats and 14 out of 27 seats in the House. Robert Wilcox became the Hawai‘i delegate to the U.S. Congress, after winning 4,083 votes. Samuel Parker, Republican, won 3,056, and David Kawanakoa, Democrat, received only 1,650 votes. Wilcox departed for Washington in December 1900.⁶⁶

We might at this point ask why the people, so recently determined not to be annexed to the United States, would now participate in the U.S.-mandated local government. While Wilcox had been in Washington in 1899, a series of articles had appeared in the newspaper *Ke Aloha Aina* under the banner, “E Hoomau I Ke Kupaa No Ke Aloha I Ka Aina,” or “Continue in Determination For Aloha ‘Āina.” In these articles, Edward Kekoa invoked the words and philosophy of the beloved Joseph Nāwahī, urging the people to continue to strive for independence. He reminded readers that in 1893, the most dangerous time for eliciting recriminations from the oligarchy, many men had bravely tattooed the words “aloha aina” on their chests. In the same essay, he said that Wilikoki was an “aloha aina oiaio,” a “true aloha aina,” who needed the support of the lāhui.⁶⁷

At the same time, people were extremely frustrated by and resentful of the oligarchy, which had previously shut them out of governmental politics through the property requirements and the loyalty oath. Without any consent or participation on the part of the lāhui, the oligarchy had enacted numerous odious laws, including the one banning the Hawaiian language as a medium of instruction in the schools. Many of the po‘e aloha ‘āina must have hoped that the territorial government would be less oppressive than the oligarchy. Henry Iwasa has put it this way, “The idea of a free Hawaii becoming an insignificant part of a powerful United States . . . was not as repulsive as a free Hawaii controlled by a minority of the people.”⁶⁸ Universal adult male suffrage for Kanaka gave hope that laws beneficial to the people of Hawai‘i could be passed locally in Hawai‘i. It was clear, through the debates going on in Congress over the Organic Act, that Hawai‘i was not to be admitted to the union as a state, and that its people were not to have the full rights of U.S. citizenship.⁶⁹ But “Home Rule”—the name they selected for their party—meant that the po‘e aloha ‘āina believed they had an opportunity to influence the laws of the land within the framework of these colonial restrictions.

Narrating Aloha ‘Āina in Mo‘olelo

Governmental politics was only one aspect of aloha ‘āina. Throughout the struggle against annexation, opposition papers had asserted their particular Kanaka identities through use of figurative language rooted in Kanaka traditions and through publication of mo‘olelo (including histories, legends, and stories) from the oral tradition, as well as mele (songs and poetry) and prayers to the ancient gods. This remained true in the era of the Home Rule Party. It is illuminating to consider the political speeches and activities intertextually with this literature. During these years (ca. 1900-1912), *Ke Aloha Aina* continued to publish mainly political news and opinions, but its contents were expressed exclusively in Hawaiian, usually in highly metaphorical language that only very fluent speakers conversant with the traditions could understand. Here are some examples from a letter of thanks to their various hosts around O‘ahu, written by Kalauokalani, Kaulia, and Wilcox. They addressed each area by epigram:

E ka I‘a Hamauleo o Ewa

[To the Voice-Silencing Fish of ‘Ewa]

E ka Ulu n[iu] o Pokai a me ka makani kaiaulu o Waiānae

[To the Coconut Grove of Pōka‘ī and the Kaiaulu wind of Wai‘ānae]

E Laiewai i ke Eh[e]u a na manu

[To Lā‘iewai on the wings of the birds.]⁷⁰

Each of these requires some knowledge of Hawaiian traditions to comprehend fully. *Ke Aloha Aina* also maintained the practice of calling Queen Lili‘uokalani by traditional titles, rarely even calling her “Mō‘īwahine,” their contemporary

term for “Queen.” Instead, they called her “Ke Ali‘i ‘Aimoku” [Island-Ruling Ali‘i] or “Kalani” [The Heavens] (which is metaphorical for “ali‘i”).

Ke Aloha Aina remained steadfast in its commitment to the Hawaiian language even after the U.S. takeover in 1898. Use of the native tongue was specifically counter-hegemonic during this time when the United States had made English the official language not only for all schools, but for government business as well. Constant pressure was exerted to maintain discourse in English in virtually every aspect of Hawaiian life. Understanding the commitment of newspapers like *Ke Aloha Aina* to such counter-hegemonic acts allows us to re-read some of the actions of the Home Rule Party. As I mentioned earlier, both Fuchs and Daws faulted the Home Rulers for speaking Hawaiian in the Territorial Legislature. Fuchs wrote, “Strongly antihaole, the Home Rulers carried on many of their legislative meetings in Hawaiian.”⁷¹ Daws created a list to follow his sentence, “The first territorial legislature was worse than anyone thought it could be.” The first item on the list was “The Organic Act directed the legislators to do their business in English, but the Home Rulers insisted on speaking Hawaiian.”⁷² The insistence of the Kanaka Maoli legislators on doing so can be better understood as reflecting continued resistance to the colonial takeover and as part of the Hawaiian intelligentsia’s drive to keep the language and literature alive against the hegemonic pressures to erase them. Fuchs and Daws, who did not consult these newspapers, represent these actions as frightening or ridiculous.

For the Home Rulers, the keepers of aloha ‘āina, this was just the most recent in the long history of struggle to maintain their language, culture, and native political and economic practices against the rising tide of American hegemony. In the nineteenth century, as a result of missionary colonialism, Hawaiian had become “the language of . . . low-order government service . . . local church systems, the public education system . . . blue collar jobs, and the subsistence life of the country districts, while English was the language of high-paying upper administration jobs, and big business.”⁷³ However, during the Republic, as mentioned above, Hawaiian was completely replaced by English in the schools as well as in official government business. This continued as a provision of the Organic Act, although the majority of the population spoke Hawaiian rather than English.

As part of making Hawai‘i into an outpost of the United States, the Hawaiian language was attacked most vigorously, and “at its most vulnerable and important point,”⁷⁴ in the school system. “Hawaiian was strictly forbidden anywhere within school yards or buildings and physical punishment for using it could be harsh. Teachers who were native speakers of Hawaiian were threatened with dismissal.”⁷⁵ Young Kanaka children were even punished for failing to understand English on the first day of school.⁷⁶

Members of the Home Rule party resisted these increasing attempts to eradicate Hawaiian by refusing to follow the rules set down in the Organic Act, but also by striving to keep Hawaiian language and culture alive through mo‘olelo

published in newspapers. Two papers, *Kuokoa Home Rula* and *Ka Nai Aupuni*, were closely associated with the Home Rule Party, and both were also closely associated with Joseph Mokuohai Poepoe. (Because of space limitations, my discussion will be limited to *Kuokoa Home Rula*.) Poepoe was exceptionally well-versed in Hawaiian language, literature, and oral traditions. He was an enigmatic character who was an attorney and legislator, as well as an author and newspaperman. Although dedicated to Hawaiian traditions and to the Kamehameha dynasty, in 1895, after the attempted counter-coup, he advocated annexation by the United States, perhaps out of frustration with the oligarchy. At that time he edited the *Nupepa Kuokoa*, the pro-annexation Hawaiian language paper.

In 1901, the *Kuokoa Home Rula* [Home Rule Independent] was established apparently as the newspaper of the party. Unfortunately, the first six years of the paper have been lost so we do not know who originally established the paper, nor do we have access to Poepoe's reasons for joining and then becoming the voice of the Home Rule Party. Poepoe published at least two versions of epics based on Hawaiian oral tradition in serial form for this paper: *Ka Moolelo Kaa O Hiiakaikapoliopole*, the aforementioned "Legend of Hi'iakaikapoliopole" (1908 to 1911), and *Ka Moolelo Hiwahiwa O Kawelo* [*The Esteemed Legend of Kawelo*] (1909-1911).⁷⁷ In his introduction to the Hi'iaka epic, Poepoe expressed concern that young Kānaka Hawai'i were not learning the language well enough and consequently were "neglecting these very valuable traditions of the native land." He and the editors were determined to publish as much as they could of the ancient stories, to ensure the preservation of whatever could be preserved "e kakou, ka lahui" [by ourselves, the lāhui].

In the story of *Hiiakaikapoliopole*, Pele the volcano goddess migrates to Hawai'i with her family, of whom she is the ali'i nui (highest ranking, above all the men). Later, in Hawai'i nei, the focus is on Hi'iakaikapoliopole, a young woman who comes of age through traveling the island chain, fighting mo'ō, sharks, and rapacious men, with two other young women as companions. Her skirt is her greatest weapon—a symbol of specifically female power. These supernatural women are related to (but not ruled by) the male gods, Kū, Kāne, Kanaloa, and Lono.

This mo'olelo presents Pele and her family, as well as her foes, as at once both human and landscape or forces of nature. Pele herself is a beautiful woman capable of physical lovemaking, but she is also a volcano that can erupt and a goddess that can cause destructive floods and windstorms. One of Hi'iaka's foes is the evil Pana'ewa, both man and forest. Pele's mother is Kahinaali'i, the tsunami, and her father is a mountain named Kānehoalani. This kind of identification of humans with the landscape and the weather reinforces the precepts of aloha 'āina through which, as I explained above, Kanaka Maoli have a familial relationship to the land.

Such concepts are difficult to understand without a foundation in Kanaka traditions. Today, those conversant in Hawaiian read the Hi'iaka story only very

slowly, looking up figurative expressions in reference books. In Poepe's day, foreigners familiar with only conversational Hawaiian would not have understood it because of the many allusions and connotations based in ancient mele and mo'olelo. This undoubtedly allowed Poepe a certain freedom to be Kanaka, and to speak to the Kanaka population, urging them to hold on to their Kanaka identity.

Hiiaka is also a story about women's freedom and power, and in that sense, reinforces the traditional native world view against the increasing hegemony of the United States in Hawai'i. The *Hiiaka* story was written and published by Poepe, a man. In writing and publishing such a mo'olelo, Poepe demonstrated to his readers that Kanaka men need not be afraid of women's power, because women's power was a valuable aspect of their ancient traditions. This was counter to the hegemonic view that men should protect their male privileges by fearing and suppressing women's power.

Both *Hi'iaka* and *Kawelo* are stories filled with details of the ancient religion: prayers to the ancient gods and details of appropriate ceremonies and sacrifices. It is not an accident that these same two epics had also appeared in 1861 in *Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika*, the first newspaper free of missionary control that I mentioned earlier, because they are both particularly inspiring hero epics. Both 1861 and 1893-1912 were times when the Hawaiian culture and language were under serious attack. *Hi'iaka* is a hero: when mo'o, sharks, or anything threatens human beings, she dispatches them mercilessly; she also heals people of illnesses and injuries. *Kawelo* is another kind of hero: a proud warrior who is faithful to the gods of the ancient religion. Both hero stories are inspiring for the people—one for women, and the other for men. But at another level, it is possible to see the story of *Hi'iaka*—seemingly just a young girl, yet clearing the land of maha'oi (intrusive) malevolent elements, particularly mo'o—as an allegory for the lāhui who are powerless against the might of the U.S. military. Reading the epic intertextually with Kaulia's comment "Pepehi ka mo'o" allows for a different understanding, beyond the English papers' construction of the comment as anti-haole racism. *Hi'iaka* only kills mo'o when they have killed or otherwise seriously threatened humans, and she does so with magical powers derived from her devotion to the ancient akua (deities). It is also possible to read the phrase "pepehi ka mo'o" as "the mo'o kills," rather than "kill the mo'o." In either case, Kaulia is clearly speaking either metaphorically or allegorically, appealing to a Hawaiian tradition in which the unlikely little one prevails.

Ka Hoku O Ka Pakipika had published these same epics as a way of recording and enacting the culture on the page, when it was difficult or impossible to do that any other way. *Hi'iaka* and *Pele* are the goddesses of hula: if the people could not dance, their deities would dance on the pages of newspapers. *Kawelo* reminds Kanaka men how to "ku i ka moku" rule over islands. The main message of *Kawelo* is to keep the ancient gods and traditions; the ali'i who does so is the ali'i who will rule. The message in 1911 was similar: if the lāhui could not rule themselves under the imperialist U.S.A., at least they would keep

their language and traditions and not lose their identity, their sense of themselves as a unique people and nation.

Pehea Nā Wāhine (What About the Women)?

The women of Hui Aloha ‘Āina played major roles in the anti-annexation struggle, and the men considered them and their opinions important and valuable in politics. In the era of the Home Rule Party, few women are visible as political actors, perhaps because women could not vote, according to the “civilized” standards of U.S. law. However, the ability to vote had not mattered to women when the nation’s sovereignty was at stake: women assumed responsibility for the welfare of the nation outside of the voting system. It should be remembered, however, that research in this area is not complete, and that it often takes more effort to identify women’s activities in the historical record. It is possible that the women’s hui, perhaps evident in Mrs. Nāwahī’s decision, decided to work for the Democratic rather than the Home Rule Party. Women do, nevertheless, make some interesting appearances in the texts of the newspapers, although not as overt political actors.

The story of Hi‘iaka and Pele, as mentioned above, represents Kanaka women as strong, active, confident, capable, and heroic, as well as angry, vengeful, and lusty. In his biography of Kamehameha (1906), Poepoe included the story of a company of rifle sharpshooters who were ali‘i women from the island of Hawai‘i. They were on Kamehameha’s front line in the famous Battle of Nu‘uanu (when the O‘ahu warriors were driven off the Nu‘uanu Pali). In the story, the ali‘i nui Ka‘iana was fighting on the O‘ahu side, and one of his wives, Kekupuohi, was in the line of women shooting at him. Ka‘iana was shot and Kekupuohi left the line to cradle his head while he died.⁷⁸

What is remarkable about these stories is that the Kanaka *men* wrote and published them, apparently without feeling threatened by images of strong, active, and powerful women. In the ancient traditions, women were respected and able to pursue various paths to power. Those traditions are the foundation for the stories and for the dominant collective worldview held by both Kanaka men and women even until the early twentieth century. That worldview or some version of it has survived until today among many Kānaka Maoli, particularly among cultural practitioners.

The Home Rule Party’s support for women’s suffrage is consistent with that worldview. For example, in 1906, Home Rule party candidate Charles Kahiliaulani Notley promised that he would work toward a constitutional amendment to allow women to vote.⁷⁹ One reason he gave was that women were entitled to civil rights, but another was more practical and oriented towards winning elections: he said that the wealthy people in the islands were bringing in many immigrants, thus diluting the power of the Kanaka vote. As research progresses, more details on the role of the Home Rule Party in the struggle for women’s suffrage will become known.

Conclusion

I hope that this paper has shown how reading Hawaiian language sources, particularly the newspapers, creates a more complex and more complete understanding of the historical actions and thought of Kānaka Maoli. Furthermore, I have tried to demonstrate that reading and analysis of what Kānaka wrote for each other in their mother tongue can be a powerful tool for contesting racist and colonialist representations made of Kanaka in mainstream histories. Most important, using such sources demonstrates that it is not enough to read political history in isolation from the stories (and poetry and songs) surrounding it in the same texts, such as the Hawaiian language newspapers. As Stuart Hall has observed, “You have to treat culture as formative of human life, human agency and of historical process.”⁸⁰ Reading the historical and political intertextually with literature allows us to see how some of these processes work and gives us a fuller understanding and appreciation of who the Kanaka Maoli of the time were. It should also add to our collective understanding of the immense variety of possible modes of resistance to colonialism.

Cultural, linguistic, and political resistance to the United States has continued unevenly and intermittently from the turn of the twentieth century to the present. Several Hawaiian language newspapers remained in print until the late 1920s. The last one stopped publication in August 1948, a mere twenty-five years or so before the start of efforts to revitalize the language. Thousands of contemporary Kānaka Maoli have learned to speak, read, write, and compose in our heritage language. Thousands have also engaged in other forms of cultural revival and resistance, including long-distance voyaging across the Pacific, hula, kapa (tapa) making, kalo (taro) farming, and fishpond restoration. A vigorous sovereignty movement emerged in the late 1970s and continues to develop in a variety of directions, all of them nonviolent. As a century ago, the language and political movements continue to be intertwined.

Notes

1. “I Kū mau mau” is the first line of a call and response chant originally used when people worked in unison to haul the huge logs for canoes from the forest to the shore. It was used by the Home Rule Party as a call to unity in 1906, and is commonly used today for the same purpose. See, for example, Charles Kahiliulani Notley, “Ka Leo Hea o Kahiliulani ka Elele a ka Lahui Hawaii!” *Ka Na’i Aupuni*, 5 November 1906, 2.

2. The legality of the annexation is highly contested, and has recently been the subject of a case at the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague. See arguments and documents pertaining to the case at www.hawaiiankingdom.org.

3. Roger Bell, *Last Among Equals: Hawaiian Statehood and American Politics* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1984), 42.

4. Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

5. U.S. House of Representatives, “Ka Hui Hawaii Aloha Aina (Hawaiian Patriotic League) Constitution,” *Executive Documents, Foreign Relations of the United States 1894, Affairs in Hawaii*, 53rd Cong., 3d sess., 1985, 930.

6. “Hui” can be translated as “organization,” “association,” or “league.” Hui Kālai‘āina is often called Political League, and Hui Aloha ‘Āina, Hawaiian Patriotic League.

7. *Republic of Hawaii Session Laws 1896*, 189.

8. In addition, today there is a thriving language revitalization movement. See Sam L. No‘eau Warner, “The Movement to Revitalize Hawaiian Language and Culture,” in *The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice*, ed. Leanne Hinton and Ken Hale (San Diego: Academic Press, 2001), 133-144.

9. Michael J. Shapiro, *Methods and Nations: Cultural Governance and the Indigenous Subject* (New York: Routledge, 2004), 34.

10. Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom vol. III: 1874-1893 The Kalakaua Dynasty* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1967) and other works; Lawrence H. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono: An Ethnic and Political History* (Honolulu: Bess Press, 1961); Gavan Daws, *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1968); William Adam Russ, Jr., *The Hawaiian Revolution (1893-1894)* (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1992 [1959]), and *The Hawaiian Republic (1894-1898) and Its Struggle to Win Annexation*, (Selinsgrove, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1992 [1961]).

11. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*, 32-33; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.

12. *Ibid.*, 33-35.

13. *Ibid.*, 35.

14. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 291.

15. Stuart Hall, “The Spectacle of the ‘Other’,” in *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 249.

16. See, for example, Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*, 39.

17. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*, 157.

18. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 294-295.

19. While the omission of Hawaiian-language sources is surely one of the main reasons that historians have produced accounts in which Kānaka are absent or Othered, it is apparently not the only one. Kanaka historian Davianna Pōmaika‘i McGregor, using a few Hawaiian-, but mostly English-language, sources, produced a much more balanced account of this period, in which the Kanaka leaders are prominent. Unfortunately, her dissertation has never been published, so it is not so accessible to the public as the histories by Fuchs and Daws. Davianna Pōmaika‘i McGregor, “Kūpa‘a i ka ‘Āina: Persistence on the Land” (Ph.D. diss., University of Hawai‘i, 1989), 201-225.

20. Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 81.

21. Edward W. Said, “Foreword,” in *Selected Subaltern Studies*, ed. Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), x.

22. Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 6.

23. James Tully, “The Struggles For and Of Freedom,” in *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, ed. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patton, and Will Sanders (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 42.

24. Sally Engle Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i: The Cultural Power of Law* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000). See also Patricia Grimshaw, *Paths of Duty: American Missionary Wives in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1989).

25. For more on the change in land tenure to private property, see Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desire: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992). For more on the role of missionaries and their descendants, see Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*. See also Merry, *Colonizing Hawai‘i*.

26. Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002). See also Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. III*, 370.

27. Osorio, *Dismembering*.

28. *Ibid.*, 244.

29. *Ibid.*

30. Davianna McGregor-Alegado, “Hawaiian Resistance: 1887-1889” (MA thesis, University of Hawai‘i, 1979), and David William Earle, “Coalition Politics in Hawai‘i 1887-90: Hui Kālai‘āina and the Mechanics and Workingmen’s Political Protective Union” (MA thesis, University of Hawai‘i, 1993).

31. Earle, “Coalition Politics.”

32. House, *Executive Documents*, 866.

33. Hawaiian society was characterized by several “classes”: ali‘i, who managed land and governed; kāhuna, professionals, priests, and political advisors; and maka‘āinana, ordinary people who farmed, fished, etc. The terms “noble,” “chief,” and “ruler,” are all inadequate to describe these roles and relationships. See Larry Kimura, “Native Hawaiian Culture,” in Native Hawaiians Study Commission, *Report on the Culture, Needs and Concerns of Native Hawaiians v. II* (Honolulu: Native Hawaiians Study Commission, 1983), 182-184; and Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii* (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, 1992) for full descriptions.

34. See Noenoe K. Silva, "Kū'ē: Hawaiian Women's Resistance to Annexation," *Women in Hawai'i: Sites, Identities, and Voices, Social Process in Hawai'i* 38 (1997): 2-15.
35. These membership figures were self-reported to U.S. Commissioner James Blount in House, *Executive Documents*, 911.
36. U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, file 55A-J11.2, RG 46, 1897 U.S. National Archives.
37. Tom Coffman, *Nation Within* (Honolulu: EpiCenter Press, 1998), 282.
38. *Ibid.*, 302.
39. *Ibid.*, 303.
40. *Ibid.*, 309.
41. The Newlands Resolution has been shown to violate both the U.S. Constitution and international law, since an internal instrument is insufficient to annex another country. See Coffman, *Nation Within*, and Hawaiian Patriotic League and Nā Maka O Ka 'Āina, *An Historical Overview of the Events that Prevented Annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States*, (Honolulu: Hawaiian Patriotic League and Nā Maka O Ka 'Āina, 1998).
42. Newlands Resolution, U.S. Congress Resolution no. 55, 55th Congress, 1898.
43. Jonathan Osorio has summarized estimates of the precontact population: "[David] Stannard's estimate of a prehaole population of 800,000 is a projection . . . and has been challenged as extravagant. But even that challenger postulated that a reasonable estimate would have been closer to 500,000, meaning that the depopulation at the end of the nineteenth century would have been 92 percent," *Dismembering*, 10. Also see David Stannard, *Before the Horror: The Population of Hawai'i on the Eve of Western Contact* (Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, 1989), and Robert C. Schmitt, *Historical Statistics of Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1977).
44. Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*, rev. ed. (Honolulu: Kamachama Schools, 1992), 248-249. See also Albert J. Schütz, *Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994).
45. Esther Mookini, *The Hawaiian Newspapers* (Honolulu: Topgallant, 1974), iv.
46. *Ibid.*, 9.
47. Silva, "He Kanawai E Hoopau I Na Hula Kuolo: The Political Economy of the Banning of Hula," *Hawaiian Journal of History* 34 (2000): 29-48; Merry, *Colonizing Hawai'i*, 99-102.
48. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.
49. See for example, "Ke Mele A Pakui" in Abraham Fornander, *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum of Polynesian Ethnology and Natural History* vol. IV (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1916; Millwood, NY: Kraus Reprint, 1985), 13-16.
50. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.
51. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 16 June 1900; I have translated this and subsequent citations of materials from *Ke Aloha Aina*, from the Hawaiian into English.
52. *Ibid.*
53. U.S. House, *A Bill to Provide a Government for the Territory of Hawaii*, 56th Cong., 1st sess., 1900 H.R. 2972.
54. Schmitt, *Historical Statistics*, 25.
55. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 9 June 1900, 2.
56. McGregor, *Kūpa'a i ka 'Āina*, 201-205.
57. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 9 June 1900, 3.
58. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 16 June 1900.
59. See Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.
60. McGregor, *Kūpa'a i ka 'Āina*, 208-209.
61. *Ke Aloha Aina* 22 September 1900, 2.
62. *Ibid.*, 20 October 1900, 1.
63. John Wise, "Ke Kahua o Ka Aoao Demokarata," *Ke Aloha Aina*, 8 September 1900, 4.
64. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 20 October 1900, 4.
65. *Ibid.*, 29 September 1900.
66. McGregor, *Kūpa'a i ka 'Āina*, 212.
67. *Ibid.*, 212-213.
68. *Ke Aloha Aina*, 24 February 1900, 3.
69. Henry K. Iwasa "The Home Rule Party: Its Short Life and Decline," Unpublished paper, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2.
70. See "Congressional Debates on Hawaiian Organic Act," reproduced from *Congressional Record* 1900 vol. 33, parts 1-8. Reproduced online at: <http://libweb.hawaii.edu/libdept/hawaiian/annexation/organic.html>
71. D. Kalaaukalani, Jas. K. Kaulia, and R. W. Wilikoki, "Hoomaikai i na Hoa Makaainana o ka Mokupuni Oahu," *Ke Aloha Aina*, 30 June 1900, 5.
72. Fuchs, *Hawaii Pono*, 157-158.
73. Daws, *Shoal of Time*, 294-295.

74. Kimura, "Native Hawaiian Culture," 193.
75. *Ibid.*, 196.
76. *Ibid.*
77. Sarah Keli'ilolena Nākoa, *Lei Momi o 'Ewa* (Honolulu: Tongg Publishing, 1979), 19.
78. Although based on the oral tradition, Poeopoc's versions of these are not merely transcriptions of the stories as he had heard them. He enlarged and embellished the stories, changing them into some of the finest examples of literature in Hawaiian ever written.
79. *Ka Na'i Aupuni*, 24 August 1906.
80. Notley, "Ka Leo Hea o Kahiliaulani," 2.
81. Martin Jacques and Stuart Hall, "Cultural Revolutions," *New Statesman* 126, no. 4363 (5 Dec. 1997): 24.