

AN INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY OF THE TERM “HAWAIIAN”

Kanalu Young, Ph.D.*

- I. INTRODUCTION: LANGUAGE CONTEXT
- II. ABORIGINAL AND OTHER SELECTED ADJECTIVES
- III. INDIGENOUS THE ADJECTIVE AND HISTORICITY
- IV. HAWAIIAN NATIONAL: REAL IDENTITY RIGHT NOW
- V. WORD HISTORY AND WHO IS HAWAIIAN?
- VI. THE HAWAIIAN NATIONAL OR HAWAIIAN KINGDOM SUBJECT
- VII. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS ON THE TERM “HAWAIIAN”

I. INTRODUCTION: LANGUAGE CONTEXT

Words, like their related constructions – sentences, phrases, and paragraphs are not used simply to communicate. It is the deeper meaning in words, their layered definitions, and even intentional ambiguities, which rivet the attention and evoke the tears, clarify the thought and articulate a position. Words in their almost infinite combinations convey anything from sublime ideas graphic insults, which intend sarcasm, irony, parody, satire, or simply a clear definition suitable for government use by regulations-obsessed bureaucrats. Whatever one’s purpose, our skilled acquisition of language as humans is based on understanding it as a system of signs. These signs are in one sense arbitrary until meaning is ascribed to them which then allows, by group consensus, to establish relational functions, which in turn enables our intentions to be spoken, written, and perhaps in a more abstract sense – danced, sculpted, painted, or drawn.¹

In the most remote cultural and historical contexts for the `Oiwī (indigenous population of the Hawaiian Islands) and a handful of native speakers today from that historical weave, spoken language has been the foundation of life itself for nearly two thousand years. The same spoken language was utilized for all purposes. Various types of knowledge were organized in this manner using memory and mnemonic devices, much of

* The author is an Associate Professor at Kamakakuokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai`i at Manoa.

¹ For a theoretical base regarding the concept of language as a system of signs, Jonathan Culler, *Ferdinand de Saussure, 2nd Ed.*, (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1976), 45.

it encoded in highly specialized systems of signs relating to multiple signifiers whereby contexts assumed functional importance. Speech determined both foundations and flourishes of epistemology according to the style, structure, sound, and systematic organization of tasks and the tendency to continually codify values in practical daily action as well as in aesthetic language that was honorific. This means what they believed came directly from what they did: acts of economic sustenance, prayer and offertory tribute, cohabitation and procreation, systematic observation and therefrom, education.

Dirge chants were done in a style vocally reflecting a mournful attitude with a gut wrenching, wailing tone as a sign of sympathy. Structure conveyed feeling. *Oli* not only commented on sadness in lyrical form, the presentation itself was a melogenic lamentation, a direct version of what sad meant to those Ancients as a word production. Most ancient prayers possessed such multiple qualities as well as layers of meaning from literal to deeply symbolic.² When print literacy came into being during the 1800s, the descendants of those same Ancients adapted its use to their lives in countless ways, including the recording of chants and genealogies in written form. Today, we engage in both methods.

This work focuses on the fact that even one word is a potential indicator of an entire array of meanings and connotations of changed meaning over time. Moreover, with the years, then centuries, the same word can lose certain meanings, take on new ones, and then recapture a more original connotation, as a function of the change process in a society. In and of themselves words chosen to indicate a new context can challenge conventional thinking, and stir all kinds of feelings some of which directly tie to hopes and aspirations not yet accomplished, others that simply mark time and explain how layers of meaning through language expressions define reality. Such is the case in 1819 when the *`Aikapu* is abolished by iconoclasts who succeeded leadership at the death of Kamehameha I. *`Ainoa* is the term to describe “the absence of *`Aikapu*.” Action was taken, it must have seemed chaotic to some while perhaps frightening to others. Yet there was a bottom-line confidence leadership demonstrated publicly. This indicated the change was going to work. For the purposes of this discussion, a new sign became the signifier of social order. Moreover, it must be said the previous example in context brought historically significant change.

² In the symbolism was the particular definition of a chant’s relationship between human practitioner and intended deity or spirit source. For a prayer book that reflects such poetry in the context of various chant types, See, Theodore Kelsey, *Na Pule Kahiko, Ancient Hawaiian Prayers*, ed. June Gutmanis, add. trans. Ester Mookini, (Honolulu: Editions Limited, 1983), 1-2.; For a discussion of words as constructions of and about the past, see, Kanalu G. Terry Young, *Rethinking the Native Hawaiian Past*, (New York: Garland-Taylor/Francis, 1998), 11-12, 27-33.

The particular view of this effort is on the word “Hawaiian” as it has developed its own historicity. This is what I define as an “energized quality the source of which has its origins in the past use of the term with relevance still for the present to signify a particular history of a thing or idea.” The term Hawaiian possesses its own historicity today in part because of how the word was used to identify the Hawaiian Kingdom’s citizenry, its subjects or nationals beginning in the 1800s. This work is also an analysis of how “Hawaiian” has taken on other meanings since then and why some of those acquired meanings now obstruct the clarity we all seek when discussing the issue of who is Hawaiian today based on what criteria and evidence.

To better understand this historicity, I broaden the evaluation of the word Hawaiian to achieve clarity on how related uses of the term may or may not be compatible, in the case of Hawaiian as a descriptive term, for an entire century.³ There are also multiple definitions of Hawaiian as well as more than one use of it in phrases that have become commonplace, yet if overlooked and improperly referenced, to signify certain perceived meanings, there could be errors which then lead to grave misunderstandings. This is the particular issue, one of utility, function, and purpose. Moreover, this entire work is a suggestion. No one should conclude from what they read that the author intends to censor anyone’s use of any term.

While the central term is examined for its historicity, related words will be introduced as contextual word companions to suggest the diversity of alternative meanings and related definitions that either are relevant to popular use or become problematic when used together with the word Hawaiian. This process culminates in the final question about the word Hawaiian to ask, based on the study of its historicity, “who might be considered a Hawaiian today and why?”

II. ABORIGINAL AND OTHER SELECTED ADJECTIVES

A positive use of Hawaiian as a noun is with the term aboriginal as an adjective. Often, when Hawaiian is presented in a text there is an implication that the quality, experience, or condition of being the original society of humans here in these islands or having that ancestry, is best defined by using the phrase “aboriginal Hawaiian.” What does it mean to be aboriginal? An aboriginal Hawaiian? In reference to the outside world as it commonly refers to the native people of what is now Australia, the

³ For a history of the relationship of American historians to another word, objectivity, and a parallel to this discussion of historicity concerning the assertion of historical energies in the U.S. by African-Americans and other minority groups, see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988) 469-521.

word aboriginal comes to mind. I have also seen aboriginal used before the noun “blood” to indicate a particular kind of ancestry. It is also used in legal parlance. To begin this analysis, I suggest that the two most common equivalents to aboriginal in the context of defining the noun Hawaiian are native and endemic. The latter term has a historicity of its own, within the field of botany for example. In particular, the area of taxonomy where species of *flora* are classified, such researchers would use the term endemic liberally. Endemic in its strictest definition separates in meaning from aboriginal. In the case of Hawai`i’s natural history, endemic strictly defines. One Nature Conservancy official estimates that 90 percent of the plant species growing here when the first human arrivals established settlement no later than 200 A.D. are not found anywhere else in the world. This 90 percent is “endemic.” “Endemic” is used almost exclusively in this context of natural science. It is not a precisely equivalent term to aboriginal because human beings are not described as being endemic. They are sometimes defined with the next synonym for study, native.

Native as a description to modify the word Hawaiian is much more general than endemic in applied usage. It is a suitable albeit more broadly applicable synonym for endemic but has other connotations as well. Native connotes two additional meanings germane to the discussion of Hawaiian as a term that has been historicized over time. The first of these is birthplace. It is acceptable in the English language to presume that because you were born in Kansas that you are a native of Kansas or a Kansas native. It matters not if your parents were born there or any other ancestors for that matter. In this instance, native is a secular term with no relevance for defining ancestral connections to a particular homeland. It is not a political reference, it does not signify anything negative, and in this context has been used through many historical eras to mean the same thing and define the same condition.

Put more abstractly but to support the notion that not just the aboriginal population is included when speaking of a birthplace not just a residence, think of the obituary for the late Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink, a tireless fighter on behalf of marginalized and underprivileged populations when in session in faraway Washington D.C. The people of Hawai`i honored this woman of pure Japanese ancestry with a state funeral. The Maui-born political dynamo whose diminutive stature belied a lion-hearted spirit inspired many. Newspaper accounts could have very well referred to her as a Hawai`i native, although this beloved figure was not of aboriginal Hawaiian descent. Hawai`i was her birthplace and such an association to her career in politics on behalf of Hawai`i would define this woman as a native daughter of these islands by deed not simply by birth.

Moreover, perhaps such a reference using the term native can even be extended to someone who went to school and was raised from an early age in one place as well, but not necessarily born there. Suffice to say at

this point, native, unlike endemic, applies to a description of someone not just something. In addition, it is usable in both word contexts, scientific and social, as a more general but still appropriate synonym. Native, then, more diversely applied in concert with Hawaiian than aboriginal, would indicate, by comparison, a specific subgroup of these islands and their descendants, even though prior to 1778, defined everyone. There is more ambiguity of meaning with the adjective native than aboriginal. With improper or inadequate context, Hawai`i native or native Hawaiian could become problematic phrases.

The second rather obvious connotation for the term native comes with its use to describe Otherness. The native is used here in opposition to non-native which, in turn, connotes the Euro-American or someone else who assumes the qualities of being foreign. Particularly, the word native defined the kind of Otherness European explorers first encountered in those who they met in “New Worlds.” Along with everything else, strange creatures that in some fashion resembled humans, had to be labeled, identified, and categorized because of how different (inhuman) they were perceived to be from the European explorers. It is highly likely the reverse was true in most instances and reported in the locality by whatever means was used back then. At the same time, the Europeans kept journal notes about the so-called “Savage” and his “primitive” customs. It was exotic, enticing, and erotic...for the European foreigners.⁴ The perception of difference continued to color foreign judgement of the Other so completely at one point that European players including military powers and post-Westphalia nation-states saw natives as their opposites in cognitive ability and any capacity to acquire knowledge as defined by foreign constructions of knowledge. The stereotype in the context of earlier considerations of international law began to erode when the United States, France, and Great Britain recognized Hawai`i’s independence as a nation-state during the years 1842-1843. By this time those, whom one Protestant missionary from Boston in 1820 had remarked as “naked, chattering, savages” had become well versed enough in international relations to achieve the highest form of political status possible given the world’s geopolitics in the 19th century.

The European expedition leader in “deepest, darkest Africa” was the stereotypical British gentleman and the anthropological *Other* happened to be the native – anyone who the gentleman encountered in his exploration of realms “unknown.” Cultural difference predisposed the necessity in the mind of the European to distance himself, ultimately, through specificity of terms in his use of language. Setting the proper social distance catalyzed for a very long time, just how close the Other

⁴ A work that captures the historical and cultural grip these perceptions have had on Euro-American popular culture and academic fields is Marianna Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 3-12.

would dare to come without fear of some form of retribution from the European explorer or scientist.

Much has been written on how pejorative terms developed as they seep into the developing nomenclature of Western science and the broader context of power from which the particular endeavor has been placed historically. Calling someone a brute, savage, heathen, or pagan in the late eighteenth century was for European scientists, missionary zealots, and others a dispassionate, professional choice of words. Presentism and polemics can allow detractors to say anything they wish about those Euro-Americans from that time past; in terms of history, it will never change a single thing, which occurred. What remains for the descendants of aboriginal populations worldwide? If there are still effects of the history which directly influence descendants, that is the reason change is mandated. To bemoan original uses of pejorative terms accomplishes nothing. To document present abuses that stem from historical references that were pejorative can lead to greater awareness and real change. History, though, as an interpretation of the past is not the culprit.

Categories of scientific description began with crude terminology that was refined over time. Similarly, the activities of these outsiders took on meaning within the respective worldviews of the so-called “natives” within their cultural contexts, systems of knowledge, and experience-based perspectives with foreigners. The famous line in revision of Margaret Meade’s sojourn and academic legacy in Samoa has become, “no Samoan family of any social standing was without its resident anthropologist.” It is not so easy a first contact ball of twine to unravel. The point to emphasize is that foreign perceptions of individuals with aboriginal ties to certain places in light of their observed abilities and perceived limitations were encoded in the word native itself. This becomes a Euro-American shorthand for conveying meaning which indicates a brutish nature, as well as lead of associations with nature itself: inhuman, uncivilized, wild, untamed. Essentially, the non-native shaped the native into a creature less human out of need. A conquest needed a population to vanquish if you were a Spanish conquistador in the 16th century. In addition, 18th-century explorers for European science were the discoverers who of course needed “subhuman” definitions of the discovered to fulfill their missions. This was the measurable study of Otherness. Finally, the Christian missions of London and Boston and elsewhere of the early 19th-century in the Pacific needed a heathen to justify another kind of mission. It was designed to offer the “benefits” of Western society, both sacred and secular, in one tidy package. A wretched, depraved soul himself according to some Protestant liturgies, the white missionary could only save his own being for eternity if he brought the less redeemable before God to convert and thus, receive salvation. In every example, the needy ones are not the native actors. The self-loathing of the Euro-American that Freud and others built upon to create the study of psychology places the non-native center stage. The structure of individual behavior needs aberration, abnormality. It

operates on the inalienable quality of the human mind in a universal sense to be predisposed toward evil. The ultimate “savage monster” in the context of imperial then colonial Europe, though, is not anyone explorers supposedly *found*, but instead the one who looked back from a mirror.

A European or his descendant caretaker in the realms of the “New World” the white, Anglo-Saxon American would openly admit to the humanitarian aspects of a “civilizing” process. This is by no means a blanket assessment but enough thought this way to institute what can be called the prevalent attitude within Euro-American society to equate native with “inferior.” Those were the historical steps to Dominion: observe, engage, defame, take, conquer, control, institutionalize, to the point that members of the native community then indoctrinated each other in a specter of foreignness. A few examples per decade of different behavior from Euro-Americans are also on the record, but as a distinct minority view and set of implementations.

The meaning of native in this anthropological context of history fell for a long time with the description cluster that included often glib references to a backward way, regressive thinking, and similar stereotypical image productions as the academic field itself went through its own growing pains and maturation.⁵ Popular literature of the time further mythologized the attitudinal barrier of Otherness. Witness Edgar Rice Burroughs’ *Tarzan* novels. By that time, the presence of a white male had reversed itself to denote his superhuman ability to conquer an entire continent. To demonstrate superiority over all of deepest darkest Africa, where native people were part of the wild landscape and rugged lifestyle was to assert definitive dominance. Raised by apes, this ethnically Caucasian jungle wonder Tarzan, bested Negroid-descended native persons by the tribe, suggesting through authorial intent that the measure, or ratio, of superior whites to inferior black natives was about 1 to 1000, at least when Hollywood’s Johnny Weissmuller was starring as Tarzan in the age of black and white B movies let out that bloodcurdling native cry through the backlot wilderness of the 1930s.

In her excellent look at the history of primatology through the rubrics of gender, race, and nature Donna Haraway accommodates this perspective as she asks how it is that “material and symbolic threads interweave in the fabric of late twentieth-century nature for industrial people.”⁶ Acknowledging our human place in the primate family had and has

⁵ This view grew out of the historicity of Otherness as new groups of Europeans ventured into their version of the “New World” repeatedly. For documentation of this as an historical process and the birth of anthropology, see, George W. Stocking, Jr., *Victorian Anthropology*, (New York: The Free Press, 1987), 78-109, 186-208.

⁶ Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science*, (New York: Routledge, 1989), 1-13, 155, 267, 403.

serious repercussions for Euro-American self-imaging, Creationism, and the march of science Haraway explains how certain groups, by association take on the characteristics traditionally ascribed to the apes. Native is encoded into this consciousness and native Hawaiian is too, witness Hollywood's portrayals of `Oiwī throughout the 20th century on television and in feature films as supporting cast members, bunglers best fit for any role expected to produce comic relief or dramatic subservience.

In life away from fiction, in a place like Great Britain, the Victorian-era white man's burden and the evolving discipline of anthropology grew concurrently, particularly if you were a gentleman English scientist and British subject. Social Darwinism erroneously applied theories of natural selection to human societies for some in the scientific field, so what you were eventually studying was the skull of a native Kenyan brought from the colonizer's overseas territory back to the motherland of the scientist. The historical energy given to the term native in this context would come to represent institutional racism and be refuted from within the disciplines of archeology and anthropology as well as from without, in time. Historicity in the word native helped to foster misinformation and bigotry surrounding the signified. A British anthropologist, in London, studying an African skull during the Victorian era implied an official significance to the man's work as that of a *bona fide* scholar-scientist. The approach for actual measurement and examination would be emotionally distant; to display the kind of detachment that properly established cranial analysis as the act of a professional. This was science, devoid of any other analysis framework more reflective of the native sense of customary practice. The ethnographic perspective came much later in anthropology's history. Physical evidence was the primary investigative milieu. The presumption being, measurements of the skull were for scholarly purposes in the advancement of science. Native remains were objectified in such horrifying ways for centuries.

The practice continues. As of this writing, the controversy swirls in Honolulu on the issue of who are appropriate (and inappropriate) stewards for the repatriation of aboriginal Hawaiian remains. A local museum would like to play the role of steward, some in the `Oiwī community are in total disagreement, myself included. Such an institution cannot represent the interests of our ancestors as properly as we can. Nor should a community group of native persons expect to assume responsibility for the entomological collections of insects that the same museum takes charge of and appropriately houses. The maintenance of distinct roles helps to sharpen our use of the terminology we employ to self-define. It allows for clarification of historical meaning and contemporary intent. It can also contribute to the equitable division of roles between conflicted social and cultural groups when necessary.

The view of these islands as anyone's homeland into the not so distant future is in great jeopardy. Biologists today chart evidence of a final

decline of life as we know it. Hawai`i is a living laboratory for this ecological collapse. For whatever time we have left, let us all commit to saying exactly what we mean. Using language in a historically conscious, purposeful, precise, and thoughtful manner is well worth the effort. When the historical usage of the term native carried over time to the point where in laboratories worldwide there were also scientists of color who were of Ainu, Kikuyu, or `Oiwī descent working in the Academy, the profession as well as definitions of *professionalism* gave way to a less bigoted approach at times by force not by choice. We never seem to achieve it *all* but there have been advances. The subsequent rethinking of policies and procedures to prevent institutional racism in academic pursuits related to those who identify themselves as native people came with a tone of immediacy once missing. It exists today. One of its finest contributions is that this tone of immediacy now guides much of the effort to make institutional improvement and enforce the rules upon violators. In a particular area of work like the disturbance of sacred sites in field archeology, issues surrounding the repatriation of bones and funerary objects of a material culture using the protocols from that culture are now expected and occasionally required by law. In the United States, when the law itself is the problem, even opportunities for revision by amendment are available. There are no perfect political systems or governments. Nevertheless, laws like the Native American Graves and Repatriation Act of 1990 as an attempt to regulate burials and issues of stewardship equitably must be applauded.

The sensibilities and therefore level of protection can be very different when a native scientist studies archeological remnants that are in fact cultural or lineal ancestors of his or her own. Such descendant status can empower the term native to recapture our well being says one scholar. In a political strategy to successfully oppose the onslaught of pejorative references, well-known scholar, poet and political ideologue Haunani-Kay Trask capitalizes the word native in direct opposition to the similarly capitalized “Western.”⁷ This political assertion redefined the social justice template for aboriginal Hawaiians to have an overall primary identity that stood in the word battlefield head-to-head and eye-to-eye with the non-native. A small but significant practice, Native stood out. If there was such an identity, there was also a paradigm and worldview to go with it. This would include the developing canon of today. It continues to include practices, values, and insights from our own politics, history, arts, and culture to self-define and the same time rebuke Western misconceptions, inaccuracies, and half-truths. In this discourse, the term native is politically charged or so think those who apply it to these situations as a source of empowerment, asserting in unequivocal terms: ‘Oiwī and our ancestors, as well as items of their manufacture, are no one’s material objects without proper regulatory

⁷ Haunani-Kay Trask, “Politics in the Pacific Islands: Imperialism and Native Self-Determination.” *Amerasia Journal* 16, no. 1 (1990): 14.

authorization. Recently, as previously mentioned, even that avenue is now fraught with complexities and conflict in the native Hawaiian case.

The previous assessment shows how the noun Hawaiian with one of its most common adjective companions “native” is given connotations based on historical intent that can broaden, narrow, even convolute intended meaning. Sociocultural phenomenology is challenging enough to unscramble. There is another similar challenge when it comes to the unacceptable, extraterritorial, extension of U.S. jurisdiction in Hawai`i. Thought by most to be the modern-day product of a legal and orderly historical transition, it is now known that there was no such day.

In the context of American law, the phrase native Hawaiian has also been used to define a subgroup of aboriginal Hawaiians consistent with provisions enacted by Congress. But such definitions have only served to divide and conquer, something U.S. authorities required as a form of social control, especially in the early years after its military occupation of Hawai`i in 1898.⁸ Administrations of Hawai`i as a territory included the use of native to define those of aboriginal Hawaiian descent interchangeable with the term kanaka.

The mandate of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), an agency created under American domestic law, is to advocate on many fronts for the betterment of the conditions of individuals who descended from the first human inhabitants here. This government organization has made the distinction in the past through its Board of Trustees to define beneficiaries as either native Hawaiians or Hawaiians. The former group is required to be at least 50 percent blood quantum, the latter, any amount is sufficient. This distinction in turn becomes a criterion for service eligibility and beneficiary funding. The federal act passed in 1921 by the United States Congress to establish Hawaiian homesteads was the model for OHA’s incorporation of a similar policy. Such distinctions between members of the same cultural group in this way were not consistent with traditional practice.⁹ Institutional racism associated with the use of native has definite historical roots. Native is definitely part of this journey of inquiry regarding word meaning. It contributes much as a context for appreciating the historicity associated with the word Hawaiian, inseparable from the human saga articulated by political leaders in the `Oiwī community going back to the 1970s. The resistance intensified again circa 1980 with Trask and her sister, attorney Mililani, eventually returning from university training to take their places in the struggle of that day.

⁸ Tom Coffman, *Nation Within: The Story of America’s Annexation of the Nation of Hawai’i*, (Honolulu: Epicenter, 1998), 300, 306-308.

⁹ Trask, *supra* note 7, 16.

Native then was politicized as a word promoting pride for `Oiwī self-identity. It signaled a strength you did not want to confront under any circumstances whatsoever, although the protest actions taken have been nearly universal in their commitment to non-violence from 1970 to the present. Even the most vehement anti-American positions have been articulated in the context of nonviolent, civil disobedience as a prescription for taking collective action. This is a direct legacy of the Queen's pacifist position during the civil unrest of 1893 and subsequent U.S. military intervention that internationalized the incident to the watchful eyes of world history's eternal gaze. We are nowhere as lineal and cultural descendants of the `Oiwī if all that native means today is wardship, political status as native Americans or an ethnic minority, and perpetual landlessness.

Endemic, on the other hand, while acceptable for *flora* and *fauna*, is interchangeable with native in references to science, yet awkward as a synonym for aboriginal given the focus of this study. For example, unless the discussion is of native plants held in the context of a division of the natural sciences, like ethnobotany and the stellar work of someone such as Isabella Aiona Abbott is involved, perhaps endemic is preferred. Her own scholarship, though, does not support this in totality.¹⁰ Her book's title also affirms the common usage of Hawaiian with a preceding adjective, her choice being "Traditional".¹¹

Aboriginal Hawaiian is the more widely usable term given the need to clarify who is being referred to and who is not, for example, under international law. In disciplines that have taken on postmodern hybridity, like anthropology and history, it seems acceptable English language texts that fuse aspects of these disciplines, to utilize a Hawaiian language equivalent like `Oiwī, or the more common phrase *kanaka maoli*. The signal of meaning is clear. This will be the term employed whenever referring to those individuals who first inhabited these islands and their descendants of either pure or part blood. Current scholarship demands such specificity. Complexities abound. The goal is to prevent words from becoming the source of contention and adversarial engagement, but instead to choose them well enough that what they offer is clarity with accuracy and of course, basic respect.

III. INDIGENOUS THE ADJECTIVE AND HISTORICITY

The most critical word to analyze in this work as another possible context for appreciating the limits of the term Hawaiian used in a phrase is indigenous. Like endemic, indigenous has legitimate meaning in the

¹⁰ Isabella Aiona Abbott, *La'au Hawai'i: Traditional Hawaiian Uses of Plants*, (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 4.

¹¹ *Id.*

world of science where endemic plants that originated in the environments where they can still be found today or have a record that acknowledges extinction, different from the indigenous ones or “earliest arrivals.” Some of these came as a voyaging canoe’s intentional cargo, others as stowaways with first migration and settlement in regional communities like Polynesia. The humans too would also be considered indigenous, not just their food and fiber plants. Both would have been kept alive during an arduous voyage made thousands of years ago, but the keepers as well as the kept, were indigenous. In this context, as it relates to the Hawai`i experience of initial human migration and settlement, indigenous is a completely acceptable synonym for aboriginal. In applied usage, indigenous culture or indigenous spiritualism even the indigenous subsistence economy, each followed by “of the ancient `Oiwī society” is historically consistent.

The terms aboriginal and indigenous when applied to human beings relate most directly to any definition of those organized societal groups of a particular geographical location. Also included would be the feature of speaking a common language and practicing certain customs so that such activities become unique aspects of self-definition, basic elements of an indigenous identity. In the context of culture, spirituality, and first arrival in comparison to all later arrived groups, typically defined as immigrants, the respective phrases “indigenous Hawaiian” or “aboriginal Hawaiian” are equivalent. Citing a root language and culture and common origins to a more ancient line of humans, Polynesians and their ancestors had a history of open-ocean voyaging responsible for initial human habitation everywhere from Samoa and Tonga to Aotearoa New Zealand, Easter Island, and Hawai`i. The indigenous society’s world view and the aboriginal epistemology that came as its byproduct stands today as a major correction of many perspectives recorded by Euro-American academics and others who might have suggested such accomplishments were the stuff of lore and mythology nothing else.

In what context then does the term indigenous become problematic for use with Hawaiian? The particular concern to address here stems from the inclusion of indigenous as an adjective that modifies the noun *peoples* and is then presented as a particular identity like, “Hawaiians are an indigenous people.” Most of this usage began when aboriginal Hawaiians saw the possibility of international legal recourse to politically affirm their distinct place in the world and at the same time define ourselves in relation to the U.S. using the United Nations draft declarations and conventions on the worldwide status of indigenous peoples.¹² That type of international law makes specific references to

¹² Secretariat of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues, *Indigenous Peoples: A Report*, (London: Zed, 1987), xi-xiii.

indigeneity to modify the noun peoples to fit pre-existing definitions for eligibility purposes. It combines two terms designed to identify incidents of nation-state oppression against indigenous populations within State borders, and to seek international support for redress to end them. This level of international relations has been typical and definitive of political action taken by certain segments of the `Oiwī community as we began to formulate an agenda for a contemporary cultural nationalism at home. The logical strategy was to shape an indigenous political identity.

States in international relations with one another during the postwar era from 1945 on, agreed in principle to prepare the indigenous peoples, all of whose traditional governments predated the establishment of the U.N. and only Hawai`i's transition to the status of an independent State by 1843, stands in history as a different situation. This means indigenous peoples known as `Oiwī became Hawaiian nationals without the assistance of the U.N. or anything like it. Hawai`i achieved its self-determination on the world scene before any other non-Euro-American State.

The post-World War II phenomenon U.N. sometimes gave States the responsibility to prepare an entire region of indigenous peoples for self-governance. Such was the case of Micronesia and the mandate given to the United States to assist in this manner. Great Britain did so in individual colonies from India to Fiji, France in Algeria and Vietnam. It was a process of decolonization, the strategy reversal of what it meant to colonize using imperialism.¹³ For aboriginal Hawaiians, it seemed like the logical political path to follow from the 1970s into the 1990s. The United States and its defense interests in these islands received subsequent political framing as "American colonizers." However, Hawai`i was never colonized because it was never legally annexed. It is obvious other `Oiwī today either believe to the contrary or are privy to evidence I have not seen. Continuity of the independent Hawaiian State was verified 2001. It exists. Its government is militarily occupied rather than colonized. The last century has been an indoctrination resulting from an occupation. This is more than a subtle difference in the context of international law as it applies to relations between States. Since the end of WWI, most States have been established through the decolonization process with the notable exceptions being Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia that were de-occupied by, and de-annexed from, the Soviet Union. In 1962, Western Samoa (as it was then called) was the first State to receive recognition of its legal sovereignty since Hawai`i did in 1842-43. This is not a well-known fact. Foreigners have dominated the historiography for this region of the insular Pacific for

¹³ The world's Marxist-Socialist revolutionary thinkers did not concur. For evidence that decolonization was seen by some as the "middle class" solution to colonizer oppression see Chinweizu, *The West and the Rest of Us*, (New York: Vintage, 1975), 160-186.

nearly five hundred years. Contemporary perspectives for understanding culture's place in defining history for people from these and other islands is fifty years old. History and the history of writing history have contributed to the consequent lag. For a very long time, Eurocentric views and voices interpreted Oceania to their world. In this context, revisionism is a good thing. Establishing the indigenous Hawaiian identity in the 1970s eventually led to political and legal assertions here and abroad and became the first significant battlefield to challenge U.S. hegemony in these islands.

Grass-roots political consciousness grew in Hawai'i during this era of international indigenous peoples' protests. The native American indigenous identity in opposition to the white, Anglo-Saxon *ideal* on the continent was also a good political fit for `Oiwī early on in the Hawai'i-based movement. The reactionary strategies employed via civil rights and antiwar demonstrations during the 1950s and '60s were historical and political models for aboriginal Hawaiian cause building. The former struggle for African-Americans in the modern era dates back to 1954 in the Jim Crow American South with the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education*. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference is still committed to the agenda that had then been established for nonviolent, racial integration of American institutions in all U.S. states. Separate but equal was struck down as a legal course of action in the United States. More radical factions in the next decade, including the Black Panthers and the Nation of Islam, together with some strong dissent from college students on campuses across America were responsible for creating social upheaval and counterculture implosions some of which still resonate as unresolved issues in our time.¹⁴ An American national conscience had to be restored. Moral bankruptcy was consuming America. Some might contend nothing has changed into the twenty-first century for that republic. Eventually, some aboriginal Hawaiians adopted this truism for use in Hawai'i. Moreover, American control of Hawai'i with its indications that such control was legal, led aboriginal Hawaiian activists to the use of political strategies that other aboriginal Americans and immigrant racial minorities were applying as forms of organized resistance. At the time, there was no evidence to dispute U.S. jurisdiction here as there is now. The political and social processes intra-movement, though, stem from a misunderstanding that aboriginal Hawaiians are entitled to due process under American law, the assumption being: Hawaiians of aboriginal descent are U.S. citizens. Consequently, legal mandates, like free speech that allowed dissenting voices to be heard, were seen as constitutional guarantees as are monetary entitlements for health and education. However, they are appropriated by the occupier's national legislature. To the extent target populations are served, is not a terrible thing. The alleged legal structure

¹⁴ Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Weathermen were two radical organizations led primarily by young white self-defined revolutionaries during the 1960s and '70s.

that assumes Hawaiians are an indigenous people also assumes the United States annexed these islands by law. This is the reason asserting a legal or political indigenous Hawaiian identity feeds directly into the hands of those who would have aboriginal Hawaiians remain forever under the plenary powers of Congress. Those aboriginal Hawaiians who prefer American subjugation are mostly fearful. The basic fears: an independent Hawai'i would be defenseless against foreign enemies; little or no faith there is either a collective motivation or the actual resources for such an undertaking; even the cliché "it's water under the bridge" contributes to the apathy and the trepidation. Others have U.S. loyalties because of parentage, which in some cases actually makes them American citizens. In the previously defined context, many perceive the indigenous political identity and being native American a safe compromise making them separate, but not too separate, from a paternalistic superpower's deep pockets.

The roots of such dependency-based thinking go back to the early part of the last century. Every U.S. domestic law or proposed legislation from the 1921 Hawaiian Homestead Act to the 2004 Congressional Bill for recognizing a Hawaiian government entity once it is formed, steers us away from solving the legal problem and developing real political and economic solutions. Who we say we are is critical in all of this.

Whether the U.S. government's original intent was to turn Hawaiian Kingdom subjects into American citizens is not the issue. Moreover, the following response is not intended to disrespect any actions taken under temporary allegiance during U.S. occupation. History tells me I am a Hawaiian national. A subject of the Hawaiian crown, my citizenship is rooted in knowing when the occupation began and where my ancestors were at the time. My maternal great-grandfather was a Hawaiian subject. This was his political status. That is why it is mine. We share a nationality although I never knew him. His name rests peacefully within mine through the paradigm of indigenous culture, particularly genealogy. Our shared patriotism emanates from being Hawaiian nationals. No other political status in this time need be sought. And no domestic American experience of citizenship legally affects mine. Great-grandfather was also an aboriginal Hawaiian of pure blood. I am an aboriginal Hawaiian of part blood. The Hawaiian subject status is a nationality while the aboriginal Hawaiian ancestry is a declaration of ethnicity or race.

The decidedly Left-leaning political wildfire of the 1960s throughout America resonated worldwide from America's burning inner cities and its rural heartland as well. Private property was ransacked, longtime sacred cows of social etiquette and elitist propriety in the sphere of those elitist lives and so-called capitalist warmongers, crumbled in riots from Chicago to Los Angeles. A more conservative political climate could be found here. Even anti-war demonstrations were characterized as embarrassing and unseemly at first. In Hawai'i, there were minor

outbursts of similar social unrest, but nothing as sustained as the level of violence in U.S. controlled North America from 1965 to 1970.

At first, the struggle going that aboriginal Hawaiians needed to join in was ignored. To defy the U.S. military appeared disrespectful to most island people from the generations who witnessed the attack on Pearl Harbor and contributed much to the war effort and eventual victory for the Allied Forces. Emotions, undeniably strong and with good reason when considered in the context of their young, impressionable lives as Depression babies and young people, persisted during the Cold War. Many of these individuals also toiled under merciless conditions here to reach the middle class in the postwar years. There were families of indigenous Hawaiians who succeeded in this historical socioeconomic climb with second and third generation immigrants. Some 'Oiwi descendants have remained in the same cycle of poverty for generations. They still know under-education, under-employment, and homelessness. Such polarity within the 'Oiwi community became unconscionable to many, regardless of their personal situations or backgrounds. Coalitions developed. It was a necessary phase. My political consciousness was first raised in this very context. It was about lending support whenever and wherever support was needed. The service delivery had to be within a system of interdisciplinary parts: political, cultural, economic, spiritual. Our integration meant the American-dominated past of the last century denied us in substance what the present in the terms of a positive, collective future. The indigenous identity was taking root at home within a broader context of resistance at first.

Manifest initially in response to rampant resort and residential development, island-based demonstrations by young adults voiced most clearly in the names of organizations of the day: Kokua Hawai'i, Life of the Land, Save Our Surf. The manifesto had a number of ideological sources, including the Revolutionary Communist Party with 'Oiwi membership. The collective position was simple, being on islands where land and water were finite resources in the strictest terms, the wrong balance was being struck between the unchecked development of residential homes and resort hotels and environmental preservation. An offshoot of the latter position took the issue to a specific concern on the part of aboriginal Hawaiians regarding cultural perpetuation. It could no longer be assumed that the indigenous Hawaiian culture would carry on under the protection of American law and society that was also protecting the interests of developers and large landowners. The indigenous Hawaiian's political consciousness was raised.¹⁵ The grass-roots method to organize also fit well with the indigenous identity and for some, the victim role. Status quo-conscious power elites on all major islands only added fuel to the indigenous rights fire in those early years.

¹⁵ For strident but substantive political analysis on this era and the development of ideologies to empower aboriginal Hawaiians, see, Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, (Monroe, Me.: Common Courage, 1993).

Government rezoning made golf courses agricultural lands that gave the wealthy property tax breaks they could not receive for other commercial properties. Rezoning lands in the 1970s became the calling card of the Hawai'i Democratic party's elected officials and their back door Republican land baron cronies supported the acts in relative anonymity. Strange bedfellows these, historical opponents from the island political mainstream, who recognized common interests and played to their strongest suit when it counted most.¹⁶ Private sector developer funding, landowners seeking investors, and the government willing to do what it could to re-zone when and where profitable, led to uncontrolled environmental degradation. For the political mainstream, this was the perfect three-legged stool.

The grass-roots dissent matured ideologically and grew in both size and scope. By the late 1970s, some government efforts actually intended to use American municipal law and stolen Hawaiian kingdom land to aid in the "betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians." Native Hawaiians? This was the political status term (as previously mentioned) adopted by the occupier U.S. government to define those aboriginal Hawaiians who perceived their political status under the United States to be that of an American citizen. Within the context of this political status, certain aboriginal Hawaiians pursued and received recognition by international indigenous peoples organizations. Claims for redress using the conventions and draft declarations established in non-nation state units of the United Nations in Geneva and New York called Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) have been accessed and engaged. The rhetoric of "oppressed indigenous peoples" subjugated by the U.S. became an ideological freedom cry that has continued for some aboriginal Hawaiians and their supporters. In good conscience, those aboriginal Hawaiians who were not experiencing such conditions in their own ancestral homeland began to coalesce on behalf of their brothers and sisters as well as extended family members who were feeling the throes of such historically predicated oppression.

Solidarity with Native American nations, indigenous Alaskans, and others on an international level was and to some extent is, something the so-called "indigenous peoples of Hawai'i" believe is the proper path to be on using the appropriate grass-roots political identity with the quest being self-determination as defined by the United Nations NGOs which deal directly with issues of indigenous peoples and their claims for human rights against often repressive States. Palestine, a Stateless nation, struggles daily to exist against Israel, a recognized State and special Client of the U.S.

¹⁶ George Cooper and Gavan Daws, *Land and Power in Hawai'i: The Democratic Years*, (Honolulu: Benchmark, 1985), 86-166.

Some see these political position of indigenous status as a first step to something else, like more independence. Unfortunately, that is not how subjects of international law relate. And unlike other independent States, Hawai`i is not in a direct adversarial relationship with its aboriginal population today. In fact, Hawaiian nationals of aboriginal blood, pure or part, still maintain a numerical majority over subjects who are not `Oiwī descendants by a ratio of 4 to 1. To digest new evidence and apply it is also part of what it means to be a responsible scholar. This effort represents the digestion and assertion of a different legal and political position, the substance of which I openly affirm and am willing to defend.

IV. HAWAIIAN NATIONAL: REAL IDENTITY RIGHT NOW

Herein is the problem. The term indigenous peoples used in the political context to define aboriginal Hawaiians and their international status as an exclusive group seeking self-determination is legally speaking, not applicable to central concerns of the Hawaiian State because in our case, aboriginal Hawaiians as Hawaiian nationals are in control of the apparatus for engaging the American occupant State-to-State *i ka manawa ku pono*. The political status of every aboriginal Hawaiian living in 1843 and their progeny into perpetuity to this very day changed by a quantum leap when the Anglo-French proclamation recognized Hawai`i as an independent, legally sovereign, nation-state or State. The United States, ironically, gave its recognition the year before. We are not an indigenous people any longer with respect to domestic citizenship (occupation does not change it) or international legal status through the Hawaiian State (continuity affords this).

Through the work of our diligent ancestors in the 19th-century and their foreign advisers, today's aboriginal Hawaiians by blood, the `Oiwī, are Hawaiian by nationality. In this context, the term Hawaiian does not define an ethnicity or a cultural group. Neither does it define the descendants of the first human settlers in these islands exclusively. Instead, Hawaiian, without an adjective that modifies the meaning of the noun to indicate race or ancestry, simply identifies the citizenry of the country Hawai`i. It is here that historicism and presentism dovetail. The nationality is political. The ethnicity is not. The Hawaiian kingdom's majority population of nationals was and is of `Oiwī descent. From 1842 on the term Hawaiian meant "of the nation of Hawai`i." This included people of European (English, French, German, Swiss) ethnicity and Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Korean) descent who became subjects of the Hawaiian Crown by denization or birth. After Hawai`i became a member of the international community as a recognized nation state, all such individuals were Hawaiian nationals, particularly phrased given the government's structure: Hawaiian kingdom subjects, abbreviated to Hawaiian.

I offer a comparison from this time, but in reverse. Former sumo wrestlers Takamiyama and Akebono were born and raised in Hawai'i. Both applied for and received political status (citizenship) as Japanese nationals. Their ethnicity as aboriginal Hawaiians is unaffected. Their nationality changed from Hawaiian to Japanese.

You are born with your ethnic makeup, it is genetic. Your nationality is not. It is a social construct, a consequence of history, and it can be altered as it relates to contemporary life. It is something that it is entirely alienable. Alienable indicates that Hawaiian nationality is something that can be forfeited or relinquished, even acquired. This is not true for aboriginal Hawaiian ancestry. This context demonstrates that indigenous, as a term to modify the phrase Hawaiian peoples is irrelevant given the provisions of international law between nation-states.¹⁷

Why is this so critical today? Why is such a claim, and its supporting evidence, not merely assignable to history? More importantly, why is the semantic distinction so important?

V. WORD HISTORY AND WHO IS HAWAIIAN?

Following the flow of time back to the 19th-century allows further elucidation on the usage of the term Hawaiian or the mother tongue equivalent Hawai'i, to define nationality. In 1840, the autocracy ended and King Kamehameha III proclaimed a constitutional monarchy. This government ushered in significant changes that for the time were considered necessary strategies to develop the national agenda of political economy. Seen as a compliance issue, the son of Kamehameha chose to govern in a manner appropriate to the ways of the most powerful countries on earth. It was the avenue that at that time yielded the greatest power potential a place the size of the Hawaiian Islands could bring to its own advantage. Foreign countries could not colonize a fellow recognized State without grave consequences. Such modernization led to the recognition of Hawai'i as an independent State in accordance with the post-Westphalia era States of Europe and the origins of international public law within the Family of Nations. When further differentiation or particular references to a subgroup of the national populace was necessary, the Hawaiian language was replete with possibilities of definition. The Hawaiian subject of pure or part aboriginal descent was a *kanaka*, literally translated it means both man and human. In this context of subgroup definition where Hawai'i is its own country, *kanaka* refers to a Hawaiian subject of pure or part

¹⁷ For more detailed information on State continuity, the law of occupation, or other relevant aspects of international law, see Kanalu Young, *Where Do You Sit? Historical Perspective and the Hawaiian Nation State*. Unpublished manuscript available from author by written request, presented at the University of Hawaii William S. Richardson School of Law, May 2004.

aboriginal blood as opposed to any other Hawaiian subject who traces to no such descent. There were kingdom subjects who had Chinese ethnicity, or were descendants of English parentage, Hawaiian nationals came from ancestral homelands worldwide.

There are synonyms to *kanaka* within the Hawaiian language as well. The previously mentioned *kanaka maoli* meaning “the genuine people” or the “original people” can be found in government documents dating from the 19th-century and used to mean someone of aboriginal descent who is a Hawaiian subject or Hawaiian national. A term laden with more spiritual as well as cultural significance which also means person of pure or part aboriginal Hawaiian descent is what I often use herewith – ‘*Oiwi*. These are a few of the more exclusive terms for describing and defining persons of aboriginal Hawaiian descent. The list is by no means exhaustive. Poetical references abound, but are not privy to this particular line of inquiry except to say aboriginal identity is grounded in these poetics and enriched by such cultural forms.

VI. THE HAWAIIAN NATIONAL OR HAWAIIAN KINGDOM SUBJECT

Of course, to those who speak, read and write using Hawaiian language, it is also possible to use the term *Hawai`i* as a noun or an adjective. The direct English translation of *Hawai`i* as an adjective is simply, “Hawaiian.” One example of such a usage comes in the sentence: “He *Hawai`i au*” or “I am Hawaiian.” Factually, someone of Irish-Japanese descent or ethnicity could very well say this about himself if he were able to place the immigration of an ancestor here from Ireland or Japan to before August 12, 1898. If so, such a person may be a Hawaiian national, meaning a Hawaiian kingdom subject. Prior to that date anyone born in these islands, or properly registered in accordance with the pertinent law, was as much a kingdom subject as anyone of ‘*Oiwi* descent was. After 1840 and to July 10, 1886 there was a national population who swore allegiance to the same government, followed the same laws, and lent their talents and love of country to the same Hawaiian national ensign. In turn, this populace defined the national character or identity by participating in acts of representative democratic government and following its domestic laws.

Such a system of government was also the legal organ that spoke on an international level to other nation-states in the Family of Nations on behalf of these Hawaiian nationals, all of whom were subjects of the crown. The language of international law is the conversation between subjects of international law that are States. It is the State that must represent and speak on behalf of the individual who is a national before any adjudicating body for international relations. The fact of nation-state status means that the State bears its own legal continuity unless another nation-state interrupts that status via conquest, treaty of cession, or adjudication is a key point in the law of international relations. What this

means for descendants of 19th century Hawaiian subjects is, history has revealed a key set of corroborated points in the historical record that attests to the fact that no nation-state ever extinguished Hawai'i's continuity by any legal means. No war was ever declared. Similarly, no treaty of cession ever extinguished State continuity for Hawai'i either. Moreover, despite deposing the legal government on January 16, 1893 no act of international adjudication has extinguished nation state continuity or Hawaiian sovereignty. Consequently, the aim is not to *attain* sovereignty because sovereignty according to international law was never lost. The contemporary goal is to affirm this legal reality and frame as realists much of what we consider requires a look through this relatively new (but old) paradigm. The onus is now upon those who see this position in the context of disagreement or the need for further discussion to respond if they so choose. One thing is clear, without adjusting the evidence do not prematurely accuse or assume. Admittedly, this is a major conceptual shift.

In 1995, an *acting* Council of Regency began the process toward reestablishment of the legal government of 1893 headed by the Queen. The Hawaiian State's existence as a subject of international law was confirmed by the Permanent Court of Arbitration at the Hague in 2001. This ruling resulted from efforts spearheaded by the acting Council of Regency.

Demographic estimates indicate that about 17,988 people of non-kanaka maoli descent who lived in these islands in 1990 were Hawaiian subjects who erroneously self-identify as Americans for their nationality. Add to this all Hawaiians of pure or part Aboriginal blood in 1990, and the number increases to more than 164,225.¹⁸ All of them were Hawaiian, Hawaiian subjects not Americans. Moreover, for international legal purposes, Hawaiian subjects are accurately counted among the world's indigenous peoples.

When international law is applied to this contemporary situation, Americans are defined as any persons born on land over which the United States of America has legal, extraterritorial jurisdiction. This has been assumed to include those born in these islands from August 12, 1898 on and their progeny. The evidence presented challenges this assumption. If Hawai'i was belligerently occupied by U.S. military forces in direct connection to American overseas defense interests for the Spanish-American War, the so-called annexation is revealed as weak, desperately fashioned pretext to the true military objective.

The prolonged occupation has done much to alter the social, cultural, spiritual, political, economic, and demographic landscape here. I believe this is entirely reparable. Further, affinity may very well lead to

¹⁸See "Hawaiian subjects in the Islands estimated at 164,225," *Polynesian Newspaper*, October, 2000, http://www.alohaquest.com/arbitration/news_polynesian_0010c.htm. (accessed 27 July 2004).

accountability by the occupant. According to public international law governing relations between nation-states, such occupation should have also been enforced using Hawaiian kingdom law.

American courts have been used recently to adjudicate a case involving a Hawaiian kingdom-established educational institution known as the Kamehameha Schools. Its benefactress, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, was a Hawaiian subject. In the thirteenth codicil of her Last Will and Testament, she used language that indicates historicity with respect to the term "Hawaiian."¹⁹ Preference for funding a student's education at Kamehameha by the proceeds of the estate would go to "Hawaiians of pure or part aboriginal blood." The reference to Hawaiians in this phrase means Hawaiian nationals and identifies the generally eligible indigent group. Of this group, specific reference is made to those of aboriginal blood in part or in whole. Same country then as it is now. Why would we want to change this identity even if we could? The Hawaiian nationals of today are literally who we say the Princess was – a Hawaiian by nationality of aboriginal blood. The only qualitative difference in my personal situation is that I am of part aboriginal blood, not pure.

Unlike inherent sovereignty and internal sovereignty that come from political genealogies that have origins in post-World War II United Nations draft declarations on human rights and current U.S. domestic law, legal sovereignty is only attributable to a nation-state. The challenge here then is to match spiritual awareness and cultural resolve with the highest form of legal power to chart a national agenda and voice again our independent State's views to its fellow States. Moreover, in the context of that power, what gives Hawaiian subjects our best individual opportunities to attain economic development and other benefits of nationhood? Further, what political identity best accommodates Hawai'i's position as a recognized State player on the world stage on behalf of its government and populace? Affirming that we are who we were as Hawaiian nationals provides exactly those potential attributes. The Hawaiian meaning in this context is nothing short of visionary given its recent genesis as accessible, contemporary knowledge.

The implications of this are immense, almost unfathomable. The United States has maintained this deception of a military occupation masquerading as a legal annexation for so long that a veneer of legitimacy has covered the truth for 111 years as of this writing. It is like a festering sore that has developed a scab, yet underneath it, the infection remains. This is why the United States is not interested in getting to such key issues as "by what legal authority does it or its puppet regime the so-called state of Hawai'i derive title and maintain control over the crown and government lands of the Hawaiian kingdom?" or "how does the so-called state of Hawai'i warrant title to persons who claim they own

¹⁹ See Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate, "Will of Bernice Pauahi Bishop," <http://www.ksbe.edu/endowment/bpbishop/will/allwill.html>. (accessed 27 July 2004).

private property here purchased after January 16, 1893?” This also means the United States violated international law first by invasion, second by abrogation of treaty, and third by not establishing an occupation government here using Hawaiian kingdom law that is provided for under the international law of occupation. Hawaiians who care about their country can work in small but important ways to re-instill national pride now. Economic activities that link our national commercial interests to the global market can be tapped for an eventual level of prosperity that engages the U.S. and other fellow nation states as an equal not a stepchild. Wardship must end. The American military must de-occupy. Hawaiian nationals must expect this of the future, not beg for crumbs now as if it is the best long-term solution.

VII. CONCLUDING THOUGHTS ON THE TERM “HAWAIIAN”

This work has examined the word Hawaiian, its historical use, and contemporary potential for establishing a national populace here once again that can be the driving force for sustainable communities, well-managed ecosystems, financial prosperity, and the domestic legal protection and perpetuation of a precious spiritual and cultural resource the stewards of which are Hawaiian nationals. It was never the intention of the United States to accommodate Hawaiian nationals unless it served their own interests regarding defense and foreign affairs. The level of commitment and demonstration of caring about ourselves in these islands has ultimately rested with responsible people here, in these islands. The original national consciousness seeped into island ways, values, and choices for living full and productive lives here even after the occupation began. To make the best of a bad situation became the quest. The opportunity now presents itself to make the best of a good situation. Only fear will hold down such opportunity and the prospects for a future that sustains what we care about most as an island nation. It is a decidedly different agenda in some respects compared to the U.S. superpower and on that alone, we must maintain the resolve to live up to the word that defines us as fellow nationals: *Hawaiian*.