

**KULEANA: TOWARD A HISTORIOGRAPHY OF HAWAIIAN
NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS, 1780 -2001**

By Kanalu Young*

- I. CONTEXT AND CONCEPT
- II. PERIODIZATION
- III. PRE-NATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY
- IV. AN OCCUPIED HISTORIOGRAPHY
- V. KULEANA IN KAPU AND NOA
- VI. CONCLUSION

I. CONTEXT AND CONCEPT

This article applies the indigenous Hawaiian value and practice of *kuleana* (a received sense of ancestrally-based responsibility) as a basic theme to propose a historiography for a Hawaiian national consciousness in the contexts of several historically citable transformations of power that occurred in the country from 1780 c.a. to 2001. Some of these transformations have been subtle and others radical with their long-term effects continuing to directly impact people, places, and ideas here and abroad to this day.

My work advocates a context-based approach for the development of a body of publishable research that gives life and structure to a Hawaiian national consciousness and connects thereby to the theory of State continuity. To begin to restore fully a sources-centered study of Kingdom law, governance, and politics for domestic affairs today, may better assure the physical reality of more situation-appropriate "real world" tests of sovereign Hawaiian Statehood tomorrow. A national restoration platform for Hawaiian intellectualism must include historiography as a key building block. The presumption here is that such a connection to the past as a most effective teacher is vital to the reestablishment of a historically authentic Hawaiian national identity. The Hawaiian government as the voice to speak again someday for the sovereign and independent international person or State first requires sequential stages of specific intellectual and broader community and institutional reformulation.

One necessary piece of that intellectual support structure is this article as an initial blueprint for a more inclusive, intra-national and international, event-based Hawaiian historiography. To encourage others in such a quest from their own respective fields and sets of research interests is one

* Kanalu Young is an Associate Professor at the Kamakakuokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

way to properly honor our rich and proud history in the name of Pai`ea Kunuiakea Kamehameha, the country's founder. Articulating the basic elements of this proposal within the confines of a journal article is a challenge. Not to make the attempt is simply unthinkable.

What is also imperative for inclusion in this blueprint is to more clearly acknowledge ancient institutions, values, and knowledge systems that in the context of historiography, must serve as the referent, if not the (Saussure-inspired) sign for any work with a Hawaiian national focus which also acknowledges State continuity. From these history-doing locations it is then possible to identify the processes of institutional change public and private that took place in the country during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The depth of temporal experience for this century barely has the girth to be included in the modern history of the Hawaiian Islands. For my immediate purposes more recent years (2002-2006) are acknowledged as a period of events from the immediate past that are only historical in the largest and most rhetorical frames of reference.

Ali`i Nui (nobles of highest rank by genealogy) who lived during the *ʻOiwī Wale*¹ era were born into an autocracy and nurtured to lead from that point on. It was a life framed by the *kuleana* of leadership. The community of peers for such a person was the body of hereditary nobility or *noho ali`i*. Over countless cycles of lunar time and the expanse of natural and reconfigured island space, the ancient ancestors led by respective island contingents of *noho ali`i* developed a synergistic method of administrative control over four separate island polities from Hawai`i in the southeast to Kaua`i in the northwest.² As pre-national leadership roles were either modified or eliminated successive generations of *Ali`i Nui* were variously challenged to continually fulfill their respective *kuleana* albeit under a much less favorable set of relational power terms and conditions of law, governance, and politics after the mid-1870s than before.

Kuleana can also serve as a point of cultural orientation for ethnographic research whereby the stories of Hawaiian national consciousness are traceable over time in primary sources from subject-specific library

¹ This is a term that I coined for use in an earlier work to describe that era of exclusively indigenous influence on this island chain from first arrivals to the eve of the Cook expedition. Rather than privilege the historical point of contact which is Eurocentric in etiology or use a Western date like 1778, the choice here is to establish the antiquity of the aboriginal civilization with a phrase from the Hawaiian language. More important than a postmodern assertion of literary nationalism, such a phrase honors in an indigenous context set by those who came before. This total amount of time by the Gregorian calendar is equivalent to nearly 1800 years. For more information on this process of haku mo`olelo see Kanalu G. Terry Young, *Rethinking the Native Hawaiian Past* (New York: Garland, 1998), 3-26.

² See Samuel M. Kamakau, *Na Mo`olelo o ka Po`e Kahiko* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1991), 39-40.

collections and archival locations. Oral traditions encoded in writing during the nineteenth century and conveyed in many forms offers a wealth of Hawaiian language sources for ethnographic research, much of which exists in the form of newspapers that have not yet seen the light of contemporary investigative eyes. Ships logs, government documents, journals, letters, and even hastily hand-scribbled notes augment and corroborate the newspaper accounts to more completely tell the stories and interpret their respective historical significances. In these sources, rest the catalysts for an intellectual paradigm shift that acknowledges proper sequencing of historical events to more accurately view both the pre-national and national Hawaiian pasts. There is an option for any so inclined to apply the ethnographic field research method from an intra-other position of nationality not just ethnicity so that such an endeavor in historiography is inclusive of all nationals regardless of ethnicity. The postmodern "green light" to do so comes however from nationality that is Hawaiian on behalf of ethnicity that is also Hawaiian but in that order.

This is reasonable to expect. Take an event from the pre-national era, a topic like Kahekili's retribution against selected O`ahu districts for instance. State continuity and the acknowledgment of the Kingdom government being in abeyance since 1898 are the only legal history frames that offer *bona fide* scholarly base for defining, researching, and publishing on the subject of the O`ahu raid as a historical antecedent for the transformation of power in the context of Hawaiian national modernism. Such historical alignment also directly connects to the government under siege from 1887 to 1897. In this way, pre-national events from history can be interpreted by cyclical and linear temporal frames of reference. Rather than look at the binary relationship and implied or express a climate of conflict between aboriginal Hawaiian and Euro-American worldviews, it is possible to accommodate both within the more inclusive perspective of Hawaiian national consciousness.

From the Hawaiian modernist perspective, the plundering done by that Maui Mo`i's "Bristling Dogs" elite battle unit *circa* 1780 could be interpreted as a historical precursor to the equally calculated actions of one of his sons against the other in the Battle of Nu`uanu, genealogical debates notwithstanding. By extension of the supposition and in historical consequence of it, Hawaiian modernism's place in the context of the national consciousness offers a more overarching historiography that could just as easily accommodate a treatise to research how and why instituting the `Ainoa in 1819 was nothing more or less than the latest political volley up to that time between respective power factions from Maui and the island of Hawai`i. In 1819, the dispute between the traditionalists and the non-traditionalists was a regional conflict and episode of national unrest within the *non-sovereign State* known to Europeans and other foreigners of that time as the Sandwich Islands.

This is an example of how to use pre-national perspectives in the doing of history that acknowledges the synergy of spiritualism, law,

governance, and politics as the skeletal framework upon which the sinew of culture, economy, and social life is then built. And in the time period being used as an example, American discourse, intellectual, historical, or legal are completely irrelevant because that national consciousness and its State personality does not figure in a conversation germane to Hawaiian national affairs in 1819.

This is a significantly different strategic position for postmodernism to in turn hold. Hawaiian State continuity can be thought of as immutable by *omission* from 1893 to 1995. It has been immutable by *commission* since December 10, 1995 when the initial steps were taken to restore the Hawaiian government in an acting capacity under severe circumstances as provided for in the Constitution of 1864. Postmodernism's ideological offspring, Hawaiian national history, like any postmodern representation of knowledge unique to a specific national consciousness, was dormant until 1995. Hawaiian postmodernism, then, was one of the phenomena spawned in this era because of the need to follow the law that would begin the process of full restoration. Hawaiian national consciousness now restored takes care of the rest until de-occupation establishes new circumstances.

Without citing the acting government as a temporary voice for the conduct of only the essential affairs of State to be accomplished at this time, there is no Hawaiian national platform from which exposure and then transition will occur. This is the cause for much misunderstanding about sovereignty today. It does not have to be obtained, only reasserted and reaffirmed in proper context as a facet of the continuous Hawaiian State. Simply put, persons of aboriginal Hawaiian ancestry cannot express postmodernist intellectualism on the structural back of America's national consciousness or international spine of State continuity.

American colonialism in the context of the tenets of public international law and our country's national consciousness has no basis in fact because since 1843 and until today Hawaii the sovereign independent State has not merged with America or any other State. States occupy States, in any other case a State colonizes the territory and its aboriginal populace. The 1843 recognition by France and Great Britain prevented colonization of the Hawaiian Islands. There is no need to de-colonize, but the platform from which de-occupation can take place is currently being built by like-minded Hawaiian nationals throughout the country.

Further, American colonialism did exist in 1898 in the Philippines when that indigenous people was colonized by the United States after its former colonizer Spain lost the war. Guam and Puerto Rico were also colonized by a victorious America after that war. Hawaii, by contrast, was occupied after that war subsequent to US military ships of war violating neutrality in accordance with bipartite Hawaii-US treaty obligations. The contemporary remedy for this historical injustice is not de-colonization of aboriginal Hawaiian descendents. Self-determination

lies in the restoration of the Hawaiian government domestically so that it may properly voice the international agenda of the Hawaiian State. That native Hawaiians are the indigenous people of these islands is not contestable. To claim this ancestry as the only basis for defining the national population, its territory, and its government ignores the fact of the most significant processes of modernization that began in the country under absolutist rule beginning in 1839. The indigenous identity that belongs to Hawaiian nationals of aboriginal blood is a historical expression of ancestral consciousness and traditional practice for forums domestic and international, but not to attain political self-determination. Again, Hawaii presents a unique situation. Many of the kanaka maoli progeny who uphold indigenous traditions in the future will also function as Hawaiian nationals in venues from the Ministry of the Interior domestically to the world stage of the United Nations General Assembly.

Consistent, fact-based action to expose the history of State continuity is the priority now. In time, this will, in the best case scenario lead to a negotiated plan of transition as agreed upon between acting Hawaiian government representatives or their successors in the restored Ministry of Foreign Affairs and America's State Department officials and Senate members. Such hypothetical situations are framed by what is known today about State continuity. This important conjectural exercise can only be proposed and conceived of in 2006 because Hawaiian nationals of an earlier era sought and received a recognized form of independence and sovereign Statehood that has never been legally relinquished.

Another example that may help readers to understand the value of Hawaiian State continuity and governmental restoration centers on the issue of nationality. A formidable multiethnic national collective will be mobilized here when the definition of nationality according to the Constitution of 1864 is applied as the legal precedent. It would then be possible to identify hundreds of thousands more as Hawaiian nationals in accordance with their birthright. What is more, for the purposes of this hypothetical, replace the adjective "local" wherever it is found today to denote island identity with "national" and one begins to realize how pervasive a justice-based change there will be. Just as importantly, defining who is not a Hawaiian national could someday relieve the strain on natural resources and ecosystems because not all aliens may have the privilege of working and living here when Hawaiian immigration laws rather than American regulations are finally enforced. For the researcher/writer on Hawaiian Kingdom and Hawaiian State topics, such semantics have an important function. Many in today's local population share a history with the indigenous people whose ancestors rightly extended nationality to those not of aboriginal blood long ago. In a revival of this positive value comes the further enrichment of the citizenry with skills, abilities, and passions to infuse even more life into the prospects of any public or private Hawaiian national enterprise. The international implications in time make the country a prospective economic juggernaut of the future because geographical size in the age

of electronically conveyed information is no longer an absolute guarantee of economic marginalization by continent-based States and their governments. This is especially true in the Hawaiian case because there is corporate, multi-national, trans-Pacific commerce in this region and our country by geographical location, skill level of workforce, and intimate working knowledge of American institutions and corporate culture, holds a potentially enviable economic position.

Defining Hawaiian national consciousness and its companion academic structure in historiography sets the context today for the kind of high-end exposure to establish the eventual transition plan of American de-occupation and Hawaiian governmental restoration. One thing is certain, any change of this magnitude will take a long time to negotiate much less implement. This is why the international law proviso of temporary allegiance allows Hawaiian nationals under occupation to comply with occupier policy, regulation, law, governance, even politics. It is a necessity dictated by historical consequence and hegemonic action left in disrepair now for over a century.

In the context of Hawaiian national consciousness research is a *kuleana* that when fulfilled serves as the impetus for more pragmatic studies in agricultural diversity, solar energy technology, desalinization, and environmental protection. The more esoteric historical questions may still be asked albeit in contexts of governmental restoration and State continuity. What *really* happened in 1892 when Lili'uokalani made a decision to promulgate a constitution or in 1897 when an everyday Kingdom subject took the time to sign an anti-annexation petition? The answer of course is rhetorical because the past, like death itself unless you believe in reincarnation, only happens once. Does the historical remembrance of a disaffected *Ali'i* like Boki who reportedly sailed away from the homeland in search of more sandalwood never to return have significance in the context of a Hawaiian national worldview and consciousness? And after all, is not the recorded circumstance of this event more logically interpretable when the doing of history comes from a relevant interpretive base of national history that is not American but Hawaiian instead?

If the context for research is Hawaiian nationality then topics like internecine warfare, the non-sovereign State's participation in the China trade, and post-*Aikapu* (post-1819) politics and governance under Ka`ahumanu, each foster an array of relevant implications *vis-à-vis* the country today not just yesterday. The key term of reference is Hawaiian nationality rather than American nationality because the latter has no place or representation except as one of any number of foreign actors who in the context of domestic affairs are for the most part bit players on a primarily Hawaiian national stage.

The ability to de-center the occupier's aversive hold on the treasure of Hawaiian national ideas and identities is itself an act of cognitive de-

occupation. I propose this phrase as a theoretically oppositional identification to what indigenous peoples of the world underwent and in some cases are still experiencing in the context of colonialism. A historiography of colonization and or decolonization comes from a completely different set of legal, governmental, and political circumstances than does the Hawaiian national experience. A history of those who were actually colonized (using here the definition of the term colonization from public international law) had absolutely no national moment to transition from non-sovereign State status to international standing recognized by other States as sovereign and independent. The process of de-colonization, then, is not applicable where there was no previous colonization. The condition here in our country is accurately described as a prolonged occupation.

Consequently, there are decidedly different legal avenues of redress and timelines to follow to eventually bring about a de-occupation. One major difference is the occupation affected all nationals and their institutions here regardless of ancestry. For the purposes of historiography, demographic studies must be done to better identify the numbers of Hawaiian nationals living today versus the non-nationals, including hundreds of thousands of American nationals and other foreigners who have become citizens of the United States on the pretense that the Hawaiian Islands are US territory by merger. This kind of research will help to clarify the practical picture and long-term implications for the very real cadence of everyday life here. This means that the tenets of State theory positively correlate with selected elements of practice in quantifiable studies from a field like demography.

Another point to make regarding research possibilities is that census records exist from the Hawaiian Kingdom of 1890. From 1900 on, census records were kept by occupation forces. These are both potential primary sources for research in historical demography. The most recent editions of American census records form the database that identifies Hawaiians by ethnicity. The body of historiography for Hawaiian national consciousness needs statistical data that gives the most accurate possible reckoning of who is of the country by citizenship and who is not.

The nature, scope, and prospects for achieving international legal redress in a colonial context are decidedly different and do not apply in northern Polynesia. On the other hand, colonialism in international legal and political contexts does exist in southern Polynesia. A most specific example is the island of Tahiti Nui. In Tahiti Nui, a colonial administration was and is foisted upon the aboriginal group by the French government as the voice of that European country's State personality and within the ancestral homeland of the aboriginal population. There was a government there before French colonizers intervened. There was also a defined territory and population under that government's control. This means the island of Tahiti Nui had the basic

criteria to function as a non-sovereign State under the Pomare regime. Such an entity, though, with no internationally recognized State status can be colonized. And the process by which this non-sovereign State or colonial territory is no longer subjugated by the colonial metropolitan power is known post-1945 as decolonization.

While it is true aboriginal Hawaiians and their descendents are Kingdom subjects, not all Kingdom subjects are aboriginal Hawaiians. The egregious harm was done to the entire national population and only a historical discourse of de-occupation addresses this injustice adequately. There is no doubt that those who trace ancestry to the pre-national past can feel a deeper emotional affinity for the cultural elements of the forebears' legacy than a history of public works projects in Honolulu from 1840 to 1880 might inspire. Still, the more compelling interest in the former topic does not eliminate the viability, however droll, of the latter. More importantly, unlike any other indigenous group of descendents in Oceania in 1843, our history includes a documented national moment of transition from non-sovereign State to internationally recognized sovereign and independent State. And that transition will forever define in historical terms our subsequent parallel identities of aboriginal Hawaiian descendent by ancestry *and* Kingdom subject or Hawaiian national post-1843. To research, write, and publish treatises in the context of these distinctions offers future generations a body of scholarly literature that is sequentially aligned with every time period of our past.

Our country's occupation means that a national as well as an indigenous historical consciousness can only enjoy the academic fruits of postmodernism if the scholarship is situated in Hawaiian national discourse. To frame the aforementioned ethnographic history topics in an American national context and intellectual conversation misses the mark. It would be like using the window of Hawaiian national discourse to frame the ethnographic question of black and Hispanic cultural contributions to American popular music, a non-sequitur of gargantuan proportions.

Kuleana frames as well the chosen workload of the modern-day researcher and writer. My academic field and research base is the country's national history although I teach in a relatively new (1986) interdisciplinary field called Hawaiian Studies. A canon of Hawaiian national historiography may offer some refreshing perspectives on any number of historical topics rife for the aims of revisionist scholarship. For interest to grow and more national research to be carried out, scholars of this kind must step forward to propose the veracity of the Hawaiian national consciousness idea to a worldwide readership.

In this way, actions shall speak in an affirmative rather than a reactionary voice through scholarly works that express substantive, evidence-based thought in the context of an emerging State theory. In this way, island

local identity—richly multiethnic in the vast majority of kanaka maoli progeny—can metamorphose into a potential populace of Hawaiian nationals whose country is defined by the eight surrounding seas and the archipelago that lies within them.³

An analytical window for framing such works of history is not only possible; it is a mandate in the context of *kuleana*. One method used today to interpret the past is ethnography. Ethnographic history is practiced by national ethnographers of aboriginal ancestry throughout the Pacific Islands and elsewhere. This is an especially valuable academic strategy when the fusion of anthropology and history requires field investigations. One of ethnographic history's narrative tools is thick description.⁴ This process of close observation of contemporary cultural traditions rooted in antiquity may have value for those who engage in comparative studies of cognate phenomena elsewhere in Polynesia. Whether the investigator is in the classic sense situated by otherness or not is, in the context of postmodernism, inconsequential. Otherness as a state of being can by alternate definition include the aboriginal descendent in some frames of reference. The most obvious example is anyone born into a certain culture who is by adoption or other social circumstance not raised to know and act much less feel an aboriginal identity as defined by his or her own ancestral group's worldview.

An extension of the aforementioned political situation offers an alternative method to historicize both indigenous and national Hawaiian identities. They need not be perceived to be in conflict with one another if sequencing and alignment are considered. To offer the kind of historical significance in one's work that I am suggesting the scholar need simply acknowledge pre-national (pre-1795) and national (post-1795) time periods to categorize both topics and research. The former is ethnicity and culture dominant. The latter concerns itself domestically in

³ This is a reference to an ancient definition of the Hawaiian Islands in terms of the beloved ocean that tradition speaks of as our source of origin. The epithet "Na Kai Ewalu" is an honorific reference to the eight sea channels that connect rather than divide the main inhabited Hawaiian Islands and their tributaries. It connotes a profound value associated with defining self and group in the context of the vast expansiveness of the resource rich ocean as the ultimate spiritual source from which the land was born. Hawaiian nationality and the pride and potential associated with this resource rich environment is what prompted King David Kalakaua to propose a pan Polynesian federation in the 1880s. Contemporary Oceania has thriving examples of the King's earnest, patriotic vision. One of them is the so-called Melanesian Spearhead of independent and sovereign States: Fiji, Vanuatu, and the Solomon Islands.

⁴ The term "thick description" came to my attention in the work of Clifford Geertz who as an outsider observed and analyzed a Balinese cockfight to determine historical "webs of significance" where symbol, metaphor, and multiple representations of reality proposed the interpretability of culture as a manifestation of meaning's deepest core in human behavior. Insider use of the same methodology is of more recent vintage. My own experience debating the possibilities of "indigenous ethnography" dates back to various seminars led by David Hanlon and Brij Lal from 1988 through 1991. For more on thick description see Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (Princeton: Princeton Press, 1973). See especially Chapter 15 "Deep Play—Notes on a Balinese Cockfight."

part with the preservation and perpetuation of the aboriginal culture but there is more. Hawaiian nationality does not racially discriminate. Hawaiian national consciousness is inclusive of the ethnic Other. The historical examples I offer are my great-grandparents from China who lived in these islands as denizens. To de-center American hegemony as a perceived inevitable presence in our lives must include a method by which the history of the last three decades is framed and offered meaning.⁵

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

The nineteenth century program of nation-building here was remarkable when placed in the proper context. It is also true that the legal and governmental source responsible for nineteenth-century domestic affairs is the very same source for restoration efforts now: the Constitution of 1864.⁶ That governance document was so effective that it took all manner of political conniving to circumvent its supreme authority over domestic affairs.

The occupation has continued to adversely alter all aspects of life in the country including Hawaiian national historiography and demography. This, in turn, converted Hawaiian nationals into a largely ignored and long occupied political minority. A minority that has found it necessary to react against contemporary injustices foisted upon them by the occupier from an identity based in legal quicksand. Structures and institutions from the American Republic replaced in wholesale fashion Hawaiian national entities that had been in place since initial modernization efforts began with the Declaration of Rights of 1839.

⁵ From 1970 to 1995 indigenous Hawaiian identity flourished under resurgent cultural, political, and spiritual fronts largely as a reaction to American hegemony and the indifferent often arrogant and dismissive attitudes of military and civilian occupation forces of the United States now localized for over a century. On December 10, 1995, initial steps were taken on behalf of the Hawaiian Kingdom that would eventually restore that government to its lawful place. The legal offshoot of that action was established 10 years ago. The Acting Council of Regency's nearly decade-long exposure phase of public education may be reviewed as a cumulative body of work that includes treatises and source documents at the web site <http://www.hawaiiakingdom.org>.

⁶ This is an incontrovertible fact. The duly constituted law of the land is the document promulgated by Kamehameha V in 1864. No legal action or process foreign or domestic has ever altered that historical reality. Illegal actions and processes were implemented to ultimately do what the rule of Hawaiian Kingdom law and the provisions of State sovereignty ably forestalled for 50 years. It was not until overt foreign incursion by the United States supported the seditious acts of a handful of Hawaiian nationals and others in 1887, 1893, 1894, and 1898 that finally tipped the scales in favor of American authority and forces.

Sixty-one years later under the more benign moniker "territorial administration" that was and is nothing but the civilian arm of a belligerent military occupation, Organic Acts were instituted as the American template for occupying everything from the country's geography to the revered symbols of its national identity.⁷

The prolonged occupation, with its most deleterious effects, has historically marginalized the expression of important identities, first the Hawaiian national, then the indigenous Hawaiian, to benefit key interests of the occupier. From 1900 on, the occupier methodically required assimilation by processes of educational indoctrination (brainwashing in colloquial parlance). This indoctrination went to such a level that what was finally spawned as *Hawaiian* resistance in the 1970s often came in the contexts of Native American and World indigenous counterculture activism discourses. I say inappropriate because such identities only serve to cloud the actual national picture of governmental restoration and internationally, the evidence-based reality of Hawaiian State continuity. What is indigenous connects to a cultural identity that is thousands of years old. This is an important foundation, but not the best one to serve as the legal template for national restoration. The occupation so diluted Hawaiian national consciousness that it took considerable time just to locate the correct path for national restoration much less begin to walk it. One of the historical byproducts of this dilution was advocacy of a political strategy that called for resistance. This strategy was adopted because at the time it is what the 1970s-1990s aboriginal Hawaiian activist leadership knew to be available tracks for collective betterment.

Also, the previous era of the 1960s was an American decade of social and political unrest. Revolution politics was something aboriginal Hawaiian descendents of that generation (born between 1946 and 1964) self-identified with. Some of these Hawaiians were college students living away from home for the first time. In the course of and discourse of political questions put to established authority, intra-US indigenous activism seemed to be the most useful strategy to effectively protest military maneuvers (including the bombing of an island for target practice), rampant development, and environmental degradation of fresh water and surrounding ocean. Another aspect of that heyday came with not knowing our own history thoroughly enough then in those technical aspects of law, politics, and governance to separate practical policy from polemic passion. Taking from the "works in progress" adage, it is truly the journey rather than the destination that produces the greatest lessons and opportunities for new knowledge paradigm constructions and their most positive applications into the future.

⁷ The national ensign of our country, its coat of arms, even its national anthem were looted shamelessly by the American tributary arm of military and civilian power. This power was so entrenched here by 1959 that the so-called "State of Hawaii" became the next level of orchestrated deceit designed to detract attention from the central issue—a belligerent military occupation that had been ongoing since 1898.

With the development of succeeding generations of scholars, who can frame their work using Hawaiian national consciousness as an applied and testable theory, will in all likelihood come the parallel emergence of research on topics like long-term effects of the occupation on opportunities for economic development, detailed functions of various Hawaiian Kingdom institutions and ministries of government, and any number of studies on the issue of land tenure. It is to these ends that the Hawaiian Society of Law and Politics is fervently committed. The canon I envision will offer the opportunity for revision. More importantly, it will provide the springboard for more dialogue, more intellectual discourse, and more relevant applications of the Hawaiian State continuity thesis to studies of all societal phenomena relevant to the country's lifeblood in general and scholarly interests. This is what I mean by Hawaiian national consciousness.

To advocate the focused development of such a canon is fine, to demonstrate the possibilities of such scholarship is better. The *Hawaiian Journal of Law and Politics* exists to serve that objective. From scholarly discourse in this field that acknowledges Hawaiian State continuity as a theoretical base, there could develop countless relevant and practical community applications for such knowledge in the context of governmental restoration. Such applications would be far superior in concept and practicality because the funding apparatus was itself a Hawaiian national government and not a foreign occupying one as is the case today. In the future, the State would once again function as a benevolent protector and public source for the greater good of the aboriginal Hawaiian descendent without fear of conflicting with convoluted definitions of reverse racism.

It is an academic, historically grounded, national reconstruction that also openly recognizes the gift of the remote ancestral past in a defined period to be known as pre-national. It is from that referential base that the contemporary constructions of ancestral knowledge can safely rest to teach future generations in this twenty-first century and beyond. The structuring of contemporary expressions of that pre-national past has been so successful in the last thirty-five years that it has exposed a few important limitations.

Advocating practices of the ancestral culture is in many respects a parallel form of continuity to which those of aboriginal Hawaiian ancestry must turn for cosmogony-based knowledge construction, but is not the national or international political path to follow for the restoration of the monarchical government. It is also true that today's scholar who acknowledges, at least in theory, the probability that the Hawaiian State is continuous, provides a different perspective from the indigenous political viewpoint in both framing the problem and actively solving it. It is disjointed logic to accept the incalculable value of literary works from Malo, Ūi, and Kamakau and yet reject the domestic governance structure and international State apparatus that gave them standing as

Kingdom subjects. These men had Hawaiian nationality their entire adult lives while colonialism ran rampant in the rest of the Pacific and around the world. This too is our birthright and the more appropriate one on which to base Hawaiian law and governance in the years to come.

Another example of the value in democratic tradition of Hawaiian national consciousness rests with the issue of the right to responsible free speech. For Hawaiian Kingdom subjects, this right was granted under the 1839 Declaration of Rights that also included the absolute abolition of slavery. In the United States at the same time, the so-called governmental bastion of equality and freedom still sanctioned the repugnant public policy of enslaving another human being based on the color of his skin and ancestral origin.

In the United States by comparison, the process that took place within the circle of American founders established its Bill of Rights as something of an afterthought. Evidence for this contention comes from the fact that the American Bill of Rights collectively represents the first ten amendments to the United States Constitution and not any of the original articles of it. Terms and conditions were placed on individual freedoms as a reaction to how the original Articles could lead to a furtherance of the kind of tyranny the colonists wanted separation from to begin with. It can thus be concluded that the primary reason for inserting a Bill of Rights was fear. In the Hawaiian case, the sovereign did not surrender these rights as a consequence of revolution. Instead, the rights were granted in the spirit of freedom and a new knowledge that defined what an enlightened leader of the time did simply because it was the right thing to do.⁸ These grants were intended for the King's subjects to improve their condition and make it comparable to the standards established by the governments of European States. It is interesting to note that kanaka maoli descendents of this era, who find constitutional monarchies irrelevant and obsolete, are really parroting Americans, who, because of their founding history, reject such a system of governance.

It is debatable that America's governance system -- a Republic of Federated states -- had anything to do with the initial occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom. It is not necessarily a superior system. This American form of governance is not better or worse, it is simply different from our own. The military arm of the United States was and is the sole reason for the prolonged occupation of the country our nineteenth century ancestors knew as Ko Hawai'i Pae `Aina (the country that belongs to Hawaiian Nationals). This awareness of a sense of belonging included the transition from the long-standing, honorable, hierarchical

⁸ For an ethnographic history, rooted in the principles of indigenous governance theory but directly related to such a decision from the Hawaiian Kingdom of 1848 with respect to land tenure, see the way one scholar frames the dilemma Kamehameha III faced on the issue of instituting the Freehold estate system in his realm: Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea La E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992).

Polynesian feudal-like structure of governance to a unique, necessarily modernized governance hybrid that existed nowhere else in the world.⁹ In the sub-sections that follow, the theme of *kuleana* will be used as the *mo`o ho`omana`o* (theme progression touchstone) for all ideas that advocate connectivity between various historical eras that gave the homeland a past life. Such connectivity in an eventual body of historiography offers the potential to comprehensively address and actively restore Hawaiian national consciousness to Ko Hawai`i Pae `Aina, its nationals who live in their country as an occupied State, and to the legacy that future generations can only experience if the present day *kuleana* is met.

II. PERIODIZATION

One of the many aspects of the Hawaiian national consciousness to restore, strengthen, and let thrive again comes directly from a more accurate understanding of the relationship between our pre-national (before 1795), national (1795-1898), and occupation-era (1898-present) histories.¹⁰

For the composers of such a national historiography to effectively focus on their respective research interests within any number of major content components, a definition of periods is vital. Kamehameha I's unprecedented success at unification was a pivotal step toward modernization. That particular year, 1795, clearly distinguishes the meaning of events that occurred both before and after it. The Battle of Nu`uanu ended separate chiefdom indigenous politics. National indigenous politics and the Stateless Hawaiian nation began under the banner of *Ka Na`i Aupuni* (the conquering government of Kamehameha I). It consolidated the absolutist authority formerly vested in Maui's paramount as a separate political administration from that of Hawai`i Island. By 1810, a separate authority that governed Kaua`i had been ceded. With the cession came complete unification. The governorships he established on the major islands reinforced Kamehameha I's absolute authority because no *Ali`i* of high rank were appointed to these positions. As a result, fomenting rebellion was next to impossible given the fact that lower ranked *Ali`i* had not the resources to muster a significant challenge. Furthermore, their loyalty is what Kamehameha confidently expected and the corollary to that by tradition defined his proper place as the personification of absolute authority to whom they pledged their

⁹ See Ralph S. Kuykendall, *The Hawaiian Kingdom, Vol. 1 1778-1854*, The Hawaiian Kingdom, vol. 1 (Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press, 1938), 159-160.

¹⁰ Rather than think of these time periods as mutually exclusive, they suggest temporal content areas that generally reflect the predominant transformation of power discourses and where they both intersect and demarcate three distinctly different elocutions of relational power as well. For more on the concept of relational power as it relates to Hawaiian State continuity see the web site for one of my political science doctoral advisees David Keanu Sai via any number of his scholarly works that articulate an index of power he calls "reverse power relation differential."

service. It is in this context that the warrior culture of the kanaka maoli parallels both the Bushido code of feudal Japan, and the era of European chivalry. The pretext for a foreigner-recognized, domestically sustainable Stateless nation from 1795 to 1819 was based on the balance between war and peace offered by the annual four moon-long seasons of peaceful pursuits known as Makahiki. It is this instituted peace that is the singular mark of Hawaiian national consciousness, and it reigned supreme from 1795 on. There was civil unrest but never again protracted warfare between kanaka maoli combatants. The source for Hawaiian national pacification was Kamehameha himself, arguably and ironically, the most cunning and progressive kanaka maoli warrior leader ever.

From the time period of the Stateless nation can come studies of the nature of its absolutist rule, the tributary system of produce reallocation in the context of chiefly service to a ranking lord, or more particular and in-depth examinations of social, economic, political, and cultural "safety valves". Such a safety valve was the concept and physical location for rehabilitative criminal refuge called *pu`uhonua*. It was verified as an oral tradition and chronicled in several nineteenth century sources that this geographical place also existed as a parallel state of mind and spirit. If one reached it of their own volition, their wrongdoing could be forgiven.¹¹

A specific research question that traced this phenomenon from antiquity into the related articles of the Hawaiian Constitution would offer evidence of the possible transition of this value and practice from an earlier time into the *modern* era of the 1800s. For the purposes of constructing the body of historiography the point is, enough of a mindset that acknowledges the 1800s as a time period of modernity in a comparative sense. This gives the researcher/writer a more detailed and accurate comprehension of contexts for living life that mattered most to the people of that time. Every opportunity to avoid the specter of presentism that can so easily affect historical interpretation and the processes of how history is done must be internalized to truly tap into the formative structures of Hawaiian national consciousness.

The succession of *Ali`i Nui*, who functioned as the titular leaders of society after 1795, adhered to tradition while accepting the need to modernize, but this was hardly a unilateral act. That also is the broader tone of Hawaiian national history. To say that modernization was altogether a negative phenomenon ignores the central issue of how the forces of change occur everywhere in the world. No one in 1840 could have predicted with certainty the depth and breadth of American imperialism that did develop by the end of that century, much less the level of eventual deception by US military authorities to conceal its

¹¹ A rebuilt replica of such a place exists today on the island of Hawai`i in the Kona district at Honaunau. The common English name for this location is "City of Refuge" which is actually a misnomer because it is not the entire geographical place Honaunau that was so designated.

belligerent occupation under the guise of a purported annexation. Yet today's ever-growing rebirth of Hawaiian national consciousness in the face of mono-superpower American geopolitics also defied prediction during the mid-twentieth-century when loyalty to the United States during the early Cold War era was by far the rule rather than the exception.¹²

Another sub-period that requires the kind of in-depth research and analysis that an application of Hawaiian national consciousness would provide is that of 1819 to 1839. In these two decades, Christian morality and ethics were institutionalized and Protestantism practically nationalized. It was the vanguard of influence brought by the Maui ma under the leadership of Ka`ahumanu and represents the last twenty years of the Stateless nation period. Maui may have lost the battle for unification in 1795, but it arguably won the peace from 1819 to 1839. The titular leadership of the renowned Kuhina Nui provided stability to the government in advance of Kamehameha III's accession to the throne. And although Ka`ahumanu died in 1832, it was not until Kamehameha III proclaimed the Declaration of Rights in 1839 that actual precursors to recognized State begin to signal the ushering in of a distinguishably different historical time period.

The reign of Kamehameha III from 1832 to 1854 saw the transformation of power take place in many fronts of the society including law and governance, commerce and trade, and social life and customs. There was also the necessity of continued negotiation and compromise in the face of adverse foreign influence that had to be executed by the Hawaiian national leadership of the nineteenth-century. Research on this sub-period as the point of origin for sovereign and independent Hawaiian Statehood demands a much closer read of all Ministry of Foreign Affairs documents from that era. Little is known about domestic, day-to-day government operations. The nature of election campaigns for seats in the House of Representatives is worth a monograph as is a biographical compilation of the various members of the House of Nobles, not to mention the speeches of Kamehameha III and each of his personally proposed executive initiatives. Moreover, each of these research opportunities to be particularistic has its own ripple effect to broader issues that emanated to touch individual and community lives. The socioeconomic, cultural, and educational implications seem infinite. The bridge from government policy to every day community life has not often been crossed when the national context frames the research picture with the theory of Hawaiian State continuity.

The sub-period from 1854 to 1873 finds great historical significance in the actions of two brothers and a cousin who grew up together to each

¹² It was a sociopolitical phenomenon known as McCarthyism and has been forever labeled as the era of "naming names" of Communist sympathizers before Congressional panels of inquisition that in both houses of the Congress called themselves committees on un-American activities.

take his turn as sovereign. The government's executive branch was headed in succession during that time by Alexander Liholiho (Kamehameha IV), Lota Kapuaiwa (Kamehameha V), and William Charles Lunailo. There are no comprehensive, historically annotated biographies for any of the three. Such scholarly texts must be envisioned and suggested before being researched, written, and published. In the context of Hawaiian State continuity, a biography series with a volume dedicated to each of the Kingdom's Mo'i¹³ is one of many approaches for filling the vast literary chasm as a national treasure that defines in part a national identity in the spirit of a post-occupation future.

It is also possible to frame a period so that historiography develops around the dominant theme of the era. An example is 1874 to 1897. A period of drastic economic decline and civil unrest occurred during these years. Ironclad mortgages began the exponential increase in land dispossession among Kingdom subjects of aboriginal blood in 1887.¹⁴ Up until that time and since the 1840s, recent research shows that hundreds of thousands of acres of land were held by Hawaiian nationals of indigenous ancestry.¹⁵ *Hui* or partnerships represented a common method for owning land and conducting business among the everyday populace of native Hawaiian subjects. These subjects maintained the demographic majority well into the 1890s in spite of a holocaust-like population collapse of perhaps as high as ninety-six percent in slightly more than a hundred years.¹⁶

¹³ Its original meaning suggests titular island paramount during the era of separate chiefdoms. The term was later used to define the royal personage of the Hawaiian Kingdom from 1819 (beginning of the reign of Kamehameha II) to 1917 (year of Queen Liliuokalani's death).

¹⁴ For important evidence of ironclad mortgages and their deleterious effects see Robert Stauffer, *Kahana: How the Land Was Lost* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005). While I do not ascribe to the central thesis of this work, specific research on ironclad mortgages as the key influence for land disposition among native Hawaiian subjects from 1874 on is a definite contribution. This revises the long-held belief that decline was precipitous beginning as early as 1848 *vis-à-vis* land tenure changes and the process of dispossession. The year should be 1887 and not 1874 the year of the non-judicial foreclosure law. Stauffer has the dispossession from 1887-1905. The term ironclad mortgages comes from Joseph Nawahi's correspondence to James Blount in 1893.

¹⁵ Jason Jeremiah, "Land Tenure, the Mahele, and the Kuleana Act.", stating the author's conclusions based on his research: "The amount of land natives received within [the Royal Patent Grant Index is substantially higher than previously recorded. 2,493 grants were issued to grantees with Hawaiian names, which totaled approximately 151,132 acres. This is the acreage that has been left out of the previous scholarship" [long cited as a much lower figure, no more than 33,000 acres], 14.

¹⁶ Depopulation was profound. The native population had no natural immunity to foreign disease. Only polar extremes of demographic research currently exist in the literature. The ultraconservative figures can be found in the work of Robert Schmidt. More recent research on the topic has been done by David Stannard whose work represents higher end estimates for the population of these islands as the O'wi Wale era came to an end with the arrival of James Cook. For this estimate and the justifications for making it see David

The story of how resilient these people were, in the face of relentless epidemics and living generation to generation with reproductive system damage and genetic predispositions overtime caused by repeated episodes of sexually transmitted diseases like gonorrhea, has yet to be written. It is a sorrowful epitaph for the time but compelling stories of courage, compassion, and perseverance transcend time and stand as examples in historiography that attach honorably to people, places, and similar issues in world history.

Political unrest in this era began in earnest in 1887 with an internal *coup d'état* that was attempted in the National Legislative Assembly. It resulted in a putative constitution that was not lawful because it was not ratified by the Legislature that actually had the legal authority to enact the document. The 1887 document superseded the Constitution of 1864 by a tyranny of the minority and the rule of treasonous men, not by the rule of law. An ethnographic account of those events would be invaluable. The dominant theme of dispossession, both economic and political, led to further erosions that would touch upon the indigenous and national identities of native Hawaiians and their progeny for years to come. An extended piece on this decade (1887-1897) of civil unrest could very well bring into focus the cumulative nature of adverse effects and how they shaped the future. In the restoration of indigenous and national identities today comes the parallel potential to eventually perpetuate spiritual, cultural, and natural resource-related interests. These interests use the Hawaiian State apparatus and the restored government as respective international and national protectors of what is fragile and irreplaceable because it is *kanaka maoli*. Academic treatises can very well lead to the ideas that form future national policies when the time is right. There need not be a literary flair inherent in a contemporary report on waste disposal here from 1850 to 1900 for instance, but the practical aspects of governmental restoration are another practically untapped field for research. The same is true of the waste disposal topic during the era of occupation. Both could provide important baseline data for government planners who were to display in their work a Hawaiian national consciousness.

Because civil unrest was an ongoing decade so were concerted efforts to counteract domestic and foreign incursions. The last of these came with anti-annexation petitions, circulated for signatures then forwarded to Washington, DC on behalf of loyalist Kingdom subjects by Queen Lili'uokalani herself. This national resistance resulted in actions by the U.S. Senate to withdraw the annexation legislation being proposed within that house of the Congress. The Hawaiian stand, while successful, was circumvented by a joint resolution masquerading as an annexation treaty, and illegality by US domestic law and public

international law as it pertains to the honoring of relations between treaty partners that are States. A comprehensive historiography of this time period from domestic and global perspectives would go a long way to better articulate the Hawaiian voices of that era and the noble struggle that for many must have consumed every waking moment.

The period 1898 to the present is the era of occupation. This subject can be treated in sub-periods: 1898-1921 (Advent of Occupation to the Occupier's Hawaiians Homestead Act); 1921-1959 (Urbanization of Occupied Honolulu to the End of the So-Called Territorial Administration); 1959-present (So-Called American Statehood to the Exposure Phase of Hawaiian State Continuity). The same span of years can be periodized to reflect US military abuse of the country by the occupier's staging of its wartime actions: 1898-1921 (Spanish-American War, World War I); 1921-1959 (World War II, Korean War); 1959-present (Vietnam, Persian Gulf War, Iraq War). The above citations of military conflict on the part of the United States only reflect the major hostilities. Each period as defined above also included the bolstering of and fatal blows to dictatorial regimes and revolutionary factions depending of course on American interests in the region and the impact of that on US national security and economic opportunity.

III. PRE-NATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Traditional society featured a knowledge system that relied almost entirely on storage and conveyance by processes of intense memorization and oratorical skill. Geographical and atmospheric space was defined meticulously and the functional elements of time-telling were naturally structured and linguistically coded. The subparts of the system of authority could only have been given its foundation from direct accountability principles of a feudal-like, polytheistic autocracy. It was abolished in 1819 by the faction in power according to the standard historical read of events from that time.

Every day authority was meted out, as were punishments and rewards, directly from that hierarchical system of authority. This was the *kuleana* of the *Ali'i Nui*. Paramount island leaders of this pre-national era were hereditary, well-trained, and synergistically dynamic individuals. The synergistic dynamism came from the level of spiritual life force or *mana*, which in a sense accrued, to them from consistent acts of situationally defined propriety.

The tributary socioeconomics of extended family modes of production and daily sustenance of the pre-national era was the produce base for maintaining both survival and quality-of-life for everyone it is true, but chiefly authority was the hereditary oversight to that. In addition, this economic system prevailed well into the nineteenth century despite concurrent efforts by the national government to modernize the economy. A possible research question from this set of opinions is: how

compatible were the respective subsistence and mercantile capitalist economies from 1800 to 1900 if quantifiable data exists to create a gross national product index that factors in and ratios both subsistence and money economy produce, manufactured goods, and services regulated by municipal law? If actual tax records can be researched, then such an index may very well be possible to construct. Further, if descriptive statistics can be gleaned from tabulated raw score coefficients, then it may also be possible to compute inferential statistics from the data.

The absolute authority of the leadership instituted the overall regulation of how the produce moved and to where, in what quantities, and for what stated, usually non-static, purposes. The law, politics, and governance of that era was in the same hands, *Ali`i Nui* hands, and only then to the hierarchy of *konohiki*, most of whom were lower ranked chiefly relations called *kaukau ali`i*.¹⁷

Declarations of descent from more ancient lineages in oral recitations marked the *Ali`i Nui`i*'s sense of time as well. The intrinsic value of one's rank through genealogical heritage established positive self-fulfilling prophecies founded in ascription but most effectively sustained by observable achievement.¹⁸ Internal and external order was attributed to the leadership in part because of the intergenerational credentials that a respectable genealogy afforded. If you knew your genealogy, you knew your place, and you were much more likely to keep it rather than run the risk of an attempted usurpation of authority that simply could not be carried out to any appreciable advantage.

Propriety of action filtered from the lofty position of the nobles to every other tier of the society. *Ali`i Nui* protocol required perfection to remain in step with the great spiritual sources. They were also the models for deportment in rules of conduct and the administration of both war and peace. Just how particular were these requirements and what evidentiary record of these meticulous standards survived to this time?

The effectiveness or mana of a pule lay partly in the words and names used. The words of a prayer, like those of a mele or dance chant, had to be good words in their connotations, and not words whose composition or sounds might be offensive to akua or aumakua. And the proper names, be they

¹⁷ Regarding the lesser ranked nobility who served as *konohiki* or "land stewards" see Young, *supra* note 1, for description and analysis of their historical place in traditional society.

¹⁸ For more on the multiple origin epics that logically come from extended families of the nobility whose connection to an arrival in these islands varies in era and landfall location, see the problematized issue as rendered by one of the first nineteenth century historians of aboriginal Hawaiian blood educated to use the Euro-American historiography model of that day see, David Malo, *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1898). 6-7. Regarding the ranks of the nobility see Martha Warren Beckwith, *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian Creation Chant* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1972), 11-14.

personal or place names, must also be good in their connotation and pleasing to the beings listening to the prayer. The gods and guardians were relatives, more sacred and powerful than any living person. If a member of an alii family were chanting or dancing for the beloved (and, because of his mana, revered with awe) senior alii, the words and the steps and gestures must be good and pleasing. Furthermore, the recital must be correct and unflinching.¹⁹

So correct and so unflinching were the behavioral expectations that were based on these norms, that certain death for failing to adhere to them properly could result. The network of tribute in society was organized through the definition of rank- and task-specific regulations for daily living, some blanket in their coverage, others mandated for a certain societal group like the *Ali`i* exclusively. These regulations or kapu were definitive of the parameters within which one would lawfully operate.²⁰ Law here connotes the consistent application of orally conveyed, particularly functional rules to live by, rather than an exact linguistic equivalent to the meaning of the Western term.

The best framework, for understanding the synergistic nature of aboriginal Hawaiian law and politics and the possible connections that aided the transition to successive historical periods, is to appreciate the principle of consumption as a literal definition and a metaphor. *`Ai* literally means "to eat." The framework for sustaining life itself begins with this basic principle. The attendant frame within which the related aspects of consumption did in turn operate demonstrates the sequential thinking of the aboriginal Hawaiian ancient. Such meaning-related terms were given intentionally to develop the oral and aural linkages in various knowledge classification sub-systems. Ordering life in this manner was their grounding in the law and the foundation for their politics, spirituality, cultural practices, and economic tasks. Where produce was gathered, grown, or caught was defined as *`Aina*. Typically translated as "land" the term actually can also connote an extension of terra firma into the ocean as a saltwater *field* surrounding islands.

The synergy of the *`Ai* framework was further delineated at the first step of *Ali`i* authority over specific segments of *`Aina* to define a "district level" or *moku*. An *Ali`i* with oversight for a *moku* was known as *Ali`i `Aimoku*. This contraction of "*Ai*" and "*moku*" was believed to also contract the spiritual life force inherent in both words. The contraction of its *mana* further infused the bearer of the title with the life force that was definitive of a socially sanctioned form of administrative consumption. Any number of linguistic or cultural studies could be

¹⁹ E.S. Craighill and Mary Kawena Pukui Handy, *The Polynesian Family System in Kau, Hawaii* (Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1972), 141.

²⁰ From the point of view of a Kingdom subject who actually lived.

carried out based on this theme of practical institution of various terms that include the prefix `Ai.

The literal sense of to "consume a district" conjures up a powerful visual image. This consumptive power explained to perfection what it meant to be *Ali`i*. It was even a prerogative of their rank to be as excessive, in a social context with that rank, as was allowed by precedent. Moderation was of course an option and so was consumption something born of privilege. The ethnocentrism of austere religious fundamentalist foreigners eventually contributed to the redefinition of such behavior as morally or ethically negative. As long as the traditional system survived, so did the particular normative values, mores, folkways, and codes of conduct. When that traditional system of law, politics, and governance became more hybridized of necessity it was not so much that all old ways were replaced completely. Research efforts in the context of transitions from the rules of antiquity to the rule of law would constitute an excellent thesis or dissertation in sociology and or political science.

IV. AN OCCUPIED HISTORIOGRAPHY

Historical alignment is one prescription that can be applied to reestablish personal and public dynamics of national identity. Such alignment counteracts the most adversely virile foreign contagion within. To revise the discourse will eventually shift the paradigm. Appreciating our national history and writing it from that perspective is imperative. Alignment does not mean a monolithic approach whereby a party line of political resistance doublespeak creates simplistic "bad guys and good guys" scenarios for public *cheerleading* purposes. Instead, the alignment of law with politics and governance offers a frame through which history can be written to more accurately reflect what actually took place in the nineteenth century by giving voice to the people of that time to tell their stories in ours. This demands no molding of what it would be most useful to report, rather the most comprehensive presentation of evidence from all sides of an issue to let the reader decide the merits or lack thereof for what is being asserted. Some of the research in this vein will be decidedly technical of necessity.

With the establishment of foreign introduced, Hawaiian nobility-adopted religious precepts in the 1820s, is there evidence to show the desirable aspects of such change on the part of the aboriginal population? After all, the twentieth century was replete with native Hawaiian Christians of many denominations who were neither easily duped nor robbed of their personal integrity by foreign influence. It seems logical such individuals came from parents and grandparents of nineteenth century stock who developed the more modernist-influenced values and codes of conduct that they then conveyed to successive generations. Only studies of Hawaiian Christianity will begin to determine the fact from fiction and the practicality from the passion. If Christianity aided and abetted in the capture of non-Christian, aboriginal Hawaiian spirituality as

overwhelmingly as someone have you believe, then by what basis of presumed spiritual continuity are any pre-national cultural practices authenticated today?

Certainly the moral backbone of non-violent governance that someone like Queen Lili`uokalani demonstrated can be attributed at least in part to scriptural teachings of the Christian faith. When prejudging is largely eliminated from the enterprise of historical research, getting to the particulars of what the voices from that era are saying about life then can be more audible. There was simply too much perceived value in the tenets of indigenized Hawaiian Christianity to dismiss it as "foreign brainwashing." It is a world religion with a sordid history, but the faith as practiced by the everyday faithful brings the same light to its communicant today as it did to kingdom subjects of the nineteenth century. To research the kernels of reality that answer the question "why" offers another line of positivist research to be done.

Certain Hawaiian language texts offer ethnographic knowledge from the taproot of that age and it sounds as credible as it reads. One of Kamakau's contributions, *Ke Kumu Aupuni*, illustrates one aspect of the national archive that many of us are only beginning to explore. This treatise on the inner workings of law and governance is entirely in the Hawaiian language. While the English language became the preferred lexicon for legal matters because of its precision, the fluidity of thought with sound allows the historian who uses Hawaiian language a literary departure. First, the orator was expressed for tens of centuries. Next came the transcription of what was heard to the written page. Kamakau becomes a bridge of Hawaiian historiography between the oral and written methods of conveyance. His placement in time can be seen as a metaphorical midpoint between our own and the remote past. Of Kahekili, Kamakau remarks in part:

He alii puni kakau ma ka ili, ua paele ia kekahi aoao o Kahekili mai ke poo a ke kapuai, ua hapalua ia ke kino; he alii leo hanopilo. He alii ikaika I ke kua, a he alii naauao, a he noonoo, he alii hakilo i ka po, me ka hoomakaulii i ka po no ka ohumu, no ka olelo ino, no ke kipi. He alii moe pu ole me na wahine, aia kona wahi e noho ai ma luna o na puu, a ma laila e kkulu ai I kona hale.²¹

The Battle of Nu`uanu signaled the end of internecine warfare for the most part. The synergistic elements of leadership, that required certain spiritual protocol to be conducted post-victory, also demanded a

²¹ A rough translation of the passage is as follows: "he was a noble whose skin was tattooed, half of the body of Kahekili from head to toe was black; a chief as well with a raspy, weak voice. He was a strong paramount in warfare and intelligent, a thinker, a warrior leader who was stealthy in the night, one who could be secretive when with wastrels who spoke ill and were rebellious. A chief who did not sleep with his woman, he built his dwelling on a hill away from" [the populace]. See Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni* (Honolulu: Ahahui Olelo Hawaii, 1996), 17-18.

reallocation of the land to his wartime assistants and principals that the *Mo`i* essentially held in trust for all the people (by 1795) on all the islands. Tradition required such a redistribution that was an intra-societal rebalancing of power to the advantage of the victor. In the aboriginal Hawaiian autocracy, though, complete fulfillment of the obligation by one who held the *Mo`i* title could only achieve proper synergy when spiritual, political, economic, and social elements were in right alignment. To do so was to be right with the greater climate of deified beings whose omnipresence was acknowledged by the observable evidence of causation in a plethora of examples from nature itself.

A challenge to the emergence of a historiography rooted in Hawaiian national consciousness comes from the non-critical often tacit acceptance of a source without adequate verification. Foreign writers, doing history on Hawaiian indigenous and national topics, may not be automatically suspect for their foreignness, but a thorough review of such a person's life and times is a good way to determine the mechanics of their historiography as researchers and writers. The most compelling and voluminous early twentieth-century example of Euro-American academic contouring begins with the first volume of Ralph S. Kuykendall's documentary history *The Hawaiian Kingdom*.²²

This author and US citizen was contracted by the civilian occupation authority of the 1930s to write the definitive history of these Islands. Kuykendall espoused a common belief of his generation of scholars that history was properly the objective study of written primary sources meticulously researched in archival and library locations far removed from where the stories are told as palpable, emotion-filled oral accounts. Consequently, nearly two millennia of aboriginal Hawaiian life and customs were reduced to eleven pages of Kuykendall's so-called "glimpse" of the ancient past. Granted, the title of the work indicates the primary topic. Devoting even one chapter to the foundations of antiquity, though, could have signaled a more respectful acceptance of what came before in chant, dance, and spoken oratory. Yet that foreign perspective of Kuykendall's also had its historical and historiographical antecedents.

The occupation itself is one such historical antecedent that established the legitimacy of Kuykendall's project without question. The political objective of US civilian authority here from 1898 on was to sanitize the Hawaiian national past, its precursors, and the oral and written record that did exist. This was damaging to the foundation mythologies of the so-called territorial administration. Institutional racism of that era set the groundwork to preclude any resurgent nationalism on the part of Hawaiian subjects based on ulterior political motives to maintain hegemony and absolute social control. The recognition of the native

²² Apparently the author thought that a glimpse was all that was needed of the *`Oiwī Wale* era past. For the brief overview he offers of at least 18 centuries of history, see Kuykendall, *supra* note 9, 1-11.

Hawaiian intellect rooted in good part in the traditionalism of the ancients had to be recast. The evidence was often reframed and intentionally marginalized. Many derivative works, especially monographs on more particular topics, came from the Kuykendall template. One condensed history, *Shoal Of Time*, by Gavan Daws, is of this ilk. A Hawaiian national history on the life and times of King William Charles Lunalilo for instance would in all likelihood not feature a chapter on the monarch's reign of just one year and entitle it "Whiskey Bill" as Daws did. There are certain boundaries of respect that civil scholars do not violate.

The historiography in that genre produced by foreign scholars of earlier times would not have been possible at all were it not for the diligent efforts of so-called "cultural informants." Such informants were kept largely in the shadows of foreign scholars when in fact they were the rightful editors and authors of their own indigenous and national pasts. To dismantle the national identity to the point that twentieth century progeny of the native population and other kingdom subjects could no longer be at the academic forefront was an egregious blow that would adversely affect successive generations.

The American historical profession, as Kuykendall practiced it, eventually felt the hammer of temporal might. After being "enthroned" and "besieged" in the twentieth century; objectivity eventually gave in to the counterrevolution of the 1960s in American culture and politics. Peter Novick states plainly the requiem for objectivity that comes at the close of the last century:

Schools of historical interpretations are never politically neutral. Overall views of the past are tied in countless ways to visions of the present and future. Which is to say they are in a broad sense, ideological.²³

There is certainly great merit in learning about the structures of knowledge that went into the construction of then-fully-functioning institutions of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The arguable point is this: the country, in its sovereign continuity to this time and place, never legally discontinued. This point offers the proper platform upon which to reestablish intellectual relations in discourse with everything from archival records to revived oral traditions in advance of future international relations with foreign States. The two are by no means mutually exclusive propositions.

V. KULEANA IN KAPU AND NOA

The regulatory control of society came from various spiritually based sanctions or *kapu*. Commonly defined as "restrictions," the actual

²³ Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The Objectivity Question and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge University, 1988), 458.

purpose of *kapu* was, not to restrict or forbid entrance or egress, as implied by more recent usages of the term, but to warn would-be trespassers. Regulatory balance of resources whether they be human, human-produced, natural, or supernatural were the component areas that different kinds of *kapu* organized within an ancient society and sometimes regulated in the wider environment. It had been a long-standing priority to maintain balanced relationships between the three principal forms of life that to the ancestors was actually a single, synergistic form. There are many examples of how *kapu* operated as a regulator of relations between the nobility. From the island of Hawai`i, there was the *Ali`i* named Keaweikekahiali`iokamoku, sometimes referred to in Hawaiian tradition with the abbreviated name "Keawe."

One of the epithets used to honor Hawai`i Island in oratory for poetic identification employs the name of this leader. *Moku o Keawe* is a figurative oratorical synonym for the term "Hawai`i Island." It was from this clan of Hawaiian leaders that Kamehameha I came to assume his place as a ranking executive officer to the Hawai`i Island paramount Kalaniopu`u. Nineteenth century national and to this day a recognized paragon of Hawaiian historiography is Samuel M. Kamakau who describes Keawe's relationship to those around him in the context of *kapu* saying:

During Keawe's reign, [the district of] Ka`u was set aside for his son, Kalaninuiamamao, and chiefly tabus were given to him. The chiefly tabu then belonged to the Chiefs of Ka`u, and the wohi tabu to the Chiefs of Kona.²⁴

This is the effect of *kapu* when it relates directly to the synergy between spiritual propriety, appropriate practice of a routine nature, and the bestowed authority of an elder to various successors in different districts. The qualitative difference in the spiritual life force of these individuals required a different type of *kapu*. Without the synergy of spiritual reality, legal and political administration would [should this be "could"] not be properly aligned. There could also be no assertion of what was correct, true, and rightly which is the meaning of *pono*. Even by conservative estimates, the declaration of Keawe took place sometime between the late sixteenth to early seventeenth centuries. A decision of governance based on the rule of law for that time resulted in the keeping of an oral tradition that Kamakau reformatted according to the indigenized appropriation of print literacy.

For those who lived outside the confines of *kapu* and their enforcement through delegated authority were known as *kauwa*. These non-law abiding people were not allowed in the living communities of any self respecting social group of humans. They were reviled for the way they lived primarily because one of the basic definitions of being a decent

²⁴ Samuel M. Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai`i*, 1992 ed. (Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992), 64.

person came directly from how well one conducted oneself in accordance with the system of established and observed *kapu*.

When the *Ali`i Nui* went outside the protocols of the rank to which they belonged by heredity, it was usually because a rival had acted in a manner unbecoming to their own station or because of an intimate attraction with someone of inferior rank. Avarice instead of generosity, suspicion in lieu of trust, aggression where passivity should have been expressed, all led to the estrangement that ultimately resulted in a battlefield showdown. This is what took place between Kamehameha and his cousin Kiwala`o. The options to bring about a desirable solution to the problem fell directly into the hands of the former when the choice to demonstrate avarice, suspicion, and aggression was made by the latter.

Succession to the control of Islands or parts of them after warfare or the death of a paramount noble was instituted through the practice known as *kālai`aina*, which by the nineteenth century, would assume a different form of necessity.²⁵ In 1784, though, Kiwala`o's enactment of the long-standing practice did not meet with Kamehameha's approval. Taken as an intentional slight to his place in the leadership hierarchy, Kamehameha decided to settle the matter using the spiritual life force of the inherited warfare related deity "who snatches the land" *Kuka`ilimoku*. And settle the matter he did. The action against his cousin led directly to Kamehameha's eventual rise to paramountcy over his entire home Island.

Ethnographic accounts of indigenous pasts thrive on such texts written by the cultural descendents of these historical figures. In addition, in this case, the immediacy of the story in spirit is perpetuated through the print literacy as an approximation. This writer still feels compelled to hear the sounds of the words as spoken or chanted when the topic is from the bygone days of *kapu*-informed life. Lest the reader fall hopelessly into the romanticized interpretations of that past, recall the saying that characterized the attitude of Puna's locals who expressed temerity when word came that they were to support Kiwala`o against Kamehameha: "*Apiki Puna i lele apiki, ke nana la i Nanawale*."²⁶ This is translated metaphorically as "The people are but followers and obedient to their rulers."

The context for such a saying is shaped by the very human attitude of the everyday folk anywhere in the world to register some reluctance about engaging in conflicts not entirely of their own making. A proverb like this certainly humanizes the historical picture. After all, it would be laughable to think that every supporter would be consistently gleeful at the call to yet another battle. To normalize the unpleasant tidings with

²⁵ For one scholar's take on the issue of institutional change as it related to land tenure in general and land redistribution in particular, see Kame'eleihiwa, *supra* note 8, 83, 134, 159, 287-288.

²⁶ Pukui et al., 1983, #233, 27.

such an utterance could only come from that era as remnant commentary on that era, first heard during that era. This is an example of how to authenticate ethnographic history in the context of Hawaiian national consciousness using oral traditions. Only the most skilled language specialists of this time could properly revive such thought and emotion from an earlier composed oral text and offer it to the rest of us as their gift of intellectual dexterity that transcends time itself.²⁷

One of many ironies in the story of Kamehameha is that his errant cousin's own biological father, Kalaniopu'u, made the deathbed proclamation that his son should inherit the island and its administration, but that Kamehameha should be entrusted with the inherited war deity. The foresight to establish separate but related lines of authority by Paramount nobles from that bygone era underscores the desire for synergy in the relations between leadership factions. This is a logical option to all-out warfare. It seems evident that Kalaniopu'u placed the *kuleana* on the son to redistribute the lands fairly. If he did not, the nephew (Kamehameha) would, by the same synergistic precedent, have the opportunity to make right that which was in his mind made wrong by the cousin. The two met in armed conflict to properly settle the matter.

Kamakau offers a number of exquisite descriptive phrases in the Hawaiian language that could best be appreciated if converted back to the oratorical source from which it sprung. Exchanges in advantage between the principals are captured eloquently in Kamakau's prose.²⁸

Hawaiian national historiography acknowledges such an intra-historical process. Rather than understanding it as a conversion from one system of knowledge to another, the same kapu can be seen as assuming various forms from actual practice, to an orally recorded and transmitted documentation of actual practice, to part of a written chronicle in the work of Kamakau. It is in a sense, a seamless text, an intellectual genealogy on a cellular level, and a no less important testament to the meaning of *kapu* for this writer that when it was first spoken and carried out as a declaration from Keawe himself. The ethnographic history from an indigenous ethnographer can take another interesting turn. To recodify this knowledge, a process known as *haku*, "to compose," can, with the right purpose and for the right reason, recast this knowledge as

²⁷ Mary Kawena Pukui was such a scholar. She literally lived in both worlds and was schooled to eventually develop the intellectual dexterity to access either knowledge paradigm with equal ability. For more about this remarkable individual see the several introductions to some of her most important works: Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986). *Mary Kawena Pukui, 'Olelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings* (Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 71, 1983). While these are among her major accomplishments in the sphere of publications, it does not scratch the surface of the voluminous amount of translated, cataloging, and technical assistance she lent to other scholars and rarely received the credit she most certainly deserved.

²⁸ Kamakau, *Ke Kumu Aupuni* (Honolulu: Ahahui 'Olelo Hawai'i, 1996), 72.

an oral text in a chant. Perhaps this knowledge tells again for this time, the story of Keawe and one example of his legal and political authority being exercised.

By contrast, the state of being that is the diametric opposite to *kapu* is captured in the concept of *noa*. The monograph to vividly highlight all aspects of the contrast between these two ideations of behavior in pre-national historical contexts has yet to be either chanted or written in this time and place. Where *kapu* indicates a spiritually based, literally spellbound kind of intensity in a sanction, *noa* expresses the notion of *kapu's* absence or negation.

This entire sub-section of the article is an actual example of what Geertz calls "thick description." Mentioned previously in another vein, thick description can, in the context of ethnographic history, lead the researcher/writer into webs of significance spun around only the most complex and therefore *mana*-charged situations, examples of work, and demonstrations of culture in practice.

VI. CONCLUSION

History based in Hawaiian national consciousness requires continuous, thoughtful academic presentations in a variety of texts and contexts, including journals of published scholarship, monographs, and surveys. To do so means to step away in the contexts of value formation and national identity from the directionless and ahistorical climate of fractured twenty-first century US nationalism and its two-party political system whenever possible. The American domestic voice seems content at this time to offer *status quo* attention to the role of history as a framer of appropriate contexts for modern-day appreciation of the law, politics, and governance. Its national populace on the North American continent grows restless. Its executive leadership is now spending the so-called political capital that it never really earned in the first place. While its opposing party, the Democrats, long a bastion for progressive action in the name of the downtrodden, retains no such substance at this stage.

The once great American republic is sinking slowly but all too surely in its own political quicksand. Only its people can be its salvation. The organic declaration of freedom and equality announcing its independence had a profound effect in places like France. That revolution over tyranny in the person of the monarch was possible in those terms spoke volumes to the disenfranchised working classes. Consistently and without precedent, United States institutions for public policy in law and governance were revamped to better the human condition on domestic and international fronts. In the process, though, the same privilege has destroyed the dreams and aspirations of other States, indigenous peoples, and in America itself, the underrepresented populations of the poor in areas like Appalachia and urban Detroit.

Further, the unprecedented economic success that has come to the United States via the private sector and the rest of the world's natural and human resources is also built on the measure of its imperialist reach. That history is completely ignored today. Hawaiian nationals cannot be ostriches whose heads remain buried in the same historical sand as the purveyors of the occupying forces here. It is true for the United States that incomparable wealth and unimagined power is now theirs, but at what moral, ethical, and spiritual cost? There can only be a different kind of country thriving in these Islands if there is first the restoration of the literary canon in the Hawaiian and English languages that intellectually architects the canon and trains successive generations regarding the importance of both academic and community-based education structures of individual and group *kuleana*.

The restoration of the country's currently disparate parts comes at an opportune time in the history of the world. Micro-States can make a difference on the international stage, but only if the leaders of such entities first establish the ideological and intellectual courage necessary to conjoin the traditional past with the national past. The applied processes of responsible positivism that attend by the well-researched scholarly word to the restoration of properly sequenced and periodized indigenous and national histories of the Hawaiian experience can offer any more interested a correctly aligned Hawaiian national spine. It is only upon this skeletal structure of the rule of law and the practice of Hawaiian national politics that there can again be a high road constitutional form of governance functioning to perpetuate the kinds of interests that will ultimately save these precious Islands from environmental ruin. This is perhaps the most compelling reason to advocate for the restoration of the government and active continuity of the Hawaiian State in international affairs.

Hawaiian national consciousness proposes the documentation of what is possible based on what was possible and already achieved at least once in history. It is the fervent hope for tomorrow based on what can be done today. In addition, it is the assertion of a national historical identity that simply is of a completely separate ideological and epistemological perspective to what broadly exists in the literature as of this writing. There is no brand of activism needed to articulate the independence of such a historical agenda or body of historiography. It comes from looking closely at the sources and engaging them in an open-minded, time-honoring dialogue then writing about it. The past will offer up what needs to be known as long as it is respected and not manipulated by careless, misguided but often well-meaning polemical blasts from ego-driven historical scholars who place contemporary agendas before those of the historical actors themselves.

The beacon for guidance in the swirl of the Academy and what it can seductively offer comes from the older voices and traditional methods for making them accessible again. My choice for this is *oli* or "chant."

Spiritual grounding enables all else. The human being given the human condition cannot hope to contribute to the Hawaiian national restoration of the historical canon without acknowledging the ancestral sense of what came before and why it has relevance in the present. From there, my choice is to understand the processes of historical hybridity that came because of transitions and transformations of Hawaiian law, politics, and governance from the pre-national epoch to their State era counterparts.

A thorough comprehension of that historical transition becomes a springboard for further research along lines of social, economic, spiritual, cultural, religious, and interdisciplinary scholarship. If a cadre of scholars is willing to dedicate themselves to such an endeavor, then those that follow will no longer be purely reactionary in their respective choices of intellectual location and qualitative discourse.

The revisionist historian is in this context an unabashed national patriot who has the insight as well to be critical of those historical moments. Their poor judgment, avarice, or fear personified rose up to dash any options that would have produced more positive results. Such a stance is necessary to restore balance to the enterprise of interpreting the past responsibly. Far from a mere desire to interject a polemical treatise that is reactionary, this effort is designed as a template for future researchers and historical writers. The tools of Western scholarship when fairly applied, enables the casting of significant intellectual light. An intimate knowledge of what came before European arrival is the only appropriate foundation for understanding everything that transpired since those first fateful days.

The ethnographic historical optic embraces such systems of knowledge, not at the expense of documentary evidence, but to the augmentation of it as a spiritual cohesive. This is as vital as is a particular prayer for a particular purpose. From the first arrival of canoes to these Islands to the death of Kamehameha I, the spiritual life force, inherent in oral chronicles in forms chanted, danced, and carved, no longer receive inferior status to the written word. The key is the inclusion of the emotional component. More than anything, this distinguishes Hawaiian national tradition and our Academy from the conservative Euro-American perspective that rules out a spiritual aspect altogether. Intellectual historians like Dominic La Capra have questioned their more conservative colleagues about such constraints on the definition of textuality across the many dimensions of meaning that different languages can bring. He cautions that processes of signification are inextricably bound up with actual dynamics so that "the very reconstruction of a context or a reality takes place on the basis of textualized remainders of the past."²⁹

²⁹ Dominick La Capra, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Text, Context, Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), 23-27.

Lest any reader think this work, provincial in its scope, be advised that many scholars of any number of respective nationalities have concluded that the meaning and knowledge within the pages of any tome are not necessarily confined to the paper and ink.

History itself shaped the time and place for such an inclusive idea from a European thinker whose genealogies, ancestral and intellectual made many other genocidal stops at indigenous locations. This occurred before privilege afforded a latter day welcome to the alter-Native textual definitions of his anthropological Other. Such scholars nevertheless built enough of an amiable bridge between history and anthropology, history and politics, and history and the law to enable the indigenous ethnographer access. With that access, a more pointed national affirmation could be given voice. The messenger was good, the message was better.

American scholars developed a military occupation-based historiography here predicated on their own misrepresentations of the indigenous and national Hawaiian pasts and their own last century of illegal control here. Selected nineteenth-century primary and secondary sources were then contoured to the needs of the occupier government apparatus to provide school children with knowledge that indoctrinated as it educated. Despite philosophical and substantive political differences with the next quoted author, Noenoe Silva, her words below speak to what I call the worst single effect of the belligerent military occupation of the Hawaiian State:

The erasure of the history of struggle weighs heavily on the self-perception of the kanaka maoli of the present and past several generations, who carried the burden of resisting the ugly stereotype while also being handicapped by a lack of resources to effectively oppose it.³⁰

When the prospect of governmental restoration seems unattainable, it is important to refocus on the earlier examples of articulated national consciousness. It evidences the best of the Hawaiian national past where Kingdom subjects were a quick study in decided benefits of modernizing the legal system and form of governance. In one such example, quoted below, the voice in these words is assured that social betterment is at the heart of what it means to be a national of a country of laws, which stand above the avarice of Man:

Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people together with their lands, building lots, and all their property, while they conform to the laws of the kingdom, and nothing

³⁰ Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: American Colonialism in Hawaii* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 163.

whatsoever shall be taken from any individual except by expressed provision of the laws.³¹

³¹ See: 7 June 1839, Declaration of Rights, Both of the People & Chiefs, §5 and 8 October 1840, Declaration of Rights Both of the People and Chiefs, §5. See also, John H. Wise, "The History of Land Ownership in Hawaii, in Ancient Hawaiian Civilization: A Series of Lectures Delivered at the Kamehameha Schools" (1999), 81-93.