

LANGUAGE, POLITICS, AND IDEOLOGY IN HAWAIIAN LANGUAGE NEWSPAPER  
DISCOURSE BETWEEN 1893 AND 1901

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

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE AND CULTURE EDUCATION

MAY 2025

By

Roy McGrath

Thesis Committee:

Yumiko Ohara, Committee Head

Kalena Silva

Scott Saft

Keywords: Hawaiian history, Hawaiian language, discourse analysis, language ideology,  
language revitalization

## ABSTRACT

This thesis examines how the complex multilingualism of late 19<sup>th</sup> century Hawaiian society was implicated in the political dynamics of that period. 495 Hawaiian language newspaper articles published between 1893 and 1901 that discussed the sociolinguistic landscape of the time were gathered together into a discourse corpus and analyzed qualitatively using Critical Discourse Analysis methodologies. This research project shows that the contours of linguistic difference across 19<sup>th</sup> century Hawaiian society, and the barriers to power that they engendered were manipulated strategically by speakers of both Hawaiian and English to their own political benefit. Both languages presented themselves as boundaries to communication, and thus boundaries to ideology, and were used as such to extend, perpetuate, or subvert political power. This study makes some reflective conclusions that relate the findings of this study to the Hawaiian language revitalization movement, namely that the question of language in Hawai‘i was always and primarily a political one, and any meaningful discussion of the current Hawaiian language revitalization movement must take into account its long and complex political history.

## MANA‘O HŌ‘ULU‘ULU

Kālailai kēia pepa puka laeo‘o i ka pilina i waena o ke kūlana pohihihi o nā ‘ōlelo ma Hawai‘i ma ka pau ‘ana o ke kenekulia 19 a me nā ‘ā‘ume‘ume politika o ia wā. Hō‘ulu‘ulu ‘ia he 496 ‘atikala nūpepa ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i i pili i ke kūlana ‘ōlelo o ia wā a kālailai ‘ia ho‘i ma o ke ki‘ina noi‘i ‘o ke Critical Discourse Analysis. Hō‘ike ‘ia ma kēia pāhana, ‘o nā palena i ho‘oka‘awale ai i ka ho‘ohana ‘ōlelo Pelekānia ‘ana a me ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i ‘ana ma ka nohona kanaka Hawai‘i a me nā palena mana e holo kōko‘olua ana, he mea ia i ho‘ohana ‘ia ma ke ‘ano he mea hana politika e nā kānaka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i a ‘ōlelo Pelekānia kekahi. He mau palena nā ‘ōlelo ‘elua no ka ho‘oka‘a‘ike, a he mau palena o ka mana‘o ko‘omana ho‘i, a ua ho‘ohana ‘ia

ho‘i ma ia ‘ano i mea e ho‘onui, ho‘omau, a e ho‘ēmi ‘ia ai ho‘i ka mana politika.<sup>1</sup> Ho‘ohua pū  
‘ia ma kēia pāhana he mau mana‘o pani e ho‘opili ana i nā hopena o kēia noi‘ina i ke aukahi  
ho‘ōla ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, ‘o ia ho‘i, he mea politika mau nō ka ‘ōlelo ma ka mō‘aukala o ka nohona  
kanaka Hawai‘i. Ma ia ‘ano ho‘i, inā e kālailai maoli ‘ia ana ke aukahi ho‘ōla ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i ma  
kekahi ‘ano, pono e hāpai like ‘ia kona mō‘aukala politika iho nō kekahi.

---

<sup>1</sup> He hua ‘ōlelo haku ‘o ko‘omana na‘u no nā ‘ōlelo a me nā mana‘o e ko‘o ana i ka noho mana ‘ana o kekahi  
kanaka, kekahi mau kānaka, a kekahi ‘ōnaehana paha ma luna o kekahi. Aia ma ka mana ‘ana o kekahi mea ma luna  
o kekahi he mau mana‘o e kāko‘oana i ia mana ‘ana, a ke ‘ae ‘ia ia mau mana‘o, lilo ia kūlana mana he mea  
ma‘amau a kūpono ho‘i i ka mea nāna ka mana‘o ko‘omana i ‘ae. Pili nō kēia hua ‘ōlelo i ka *ideology* ma ka ‘ōlelo  
Pelekānia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

2. LITERATURE REVIEW ..... 3

    2.1 Contemporary Hawaiian Studies ..... 3

    2.2 Sociolinguistic Histories of Hawai‘i ..... 7

    2.3 General Hawaiian Histories ..... 12

3. METHODOLOGY ..... 16

4. ANALYSIS ..... 23

    4.1 Language Discourse and Ideology ..... 26

        4.1.1 *English Language and ‘Progress’* ..... 26

        4.1.2 *Hawaiian Language and Nationalism* ..... 33

        4.1.3 *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa and Propaganda* ..... 37

        4.1.4 *Language Choice and Language Change* ..... 41

    4.2 Newspaper Language and Power ..... 48

        4.2.1 *Translation in Society* ..... 50

        4.2.2 *Translation in the Newspapers* ..... 58

5. CONCLUSION ..... 67

6. WORKS CITED ..... 71

## NOTE ON TRANSLATION

The language in which this thesis was to be written constituted a major decision, not just in terms of the formal qualities of the written work, but also in terms of the quality of the research and the way in which it would be interpreted. As the primary object of research in this project was Hawaiian language newspaper articles, to write in English would necessitate translation of the primary resources, entailing a loss of the broader context immanent in the Hawaiian language discourse that informed the newspaper articles. To write solely in Hawaiian would allow the newspaper articles to stand on their own, but would entail a kind of translation of its own, as the kind of research methodologies that inspired this project sit within their own discourse, with their own vocabularies and rhetorical structures, primarily constituted in English.

As an integral step in my methodological process, a version of this paper was written simultaneously in the Hawaiian language. This was done in order to create a version of the research in which the Hawaiian language newspaper articles could be analyzed without relying on translation, and as a way to strengthen my own Hawaiian language fluency. In the English version, all the translations of the original Hawaiian language newspaper articles are my own, and all errors to be found there are my responsibility alone. The English translations of the Hawaiian language newspaper articles are followed by the original Hawaiian from the newspapers directly afterwards or in a footnote.

## MANA‘O UNUHI

He ke‘ehina ‘ano nui ka ho‘oholo ‘ana i ka ‘ōlelo i kākau ‘ia ai kēia pepa puka laeo‘o, ‘a‘ole ma luna o nā hi‘ohi‘ona mālanī o ke kino kākau wale nō, akā ma luna o ka ma‘i‘o o ka noi‘ina a me kona ‘ano e ho‘omaopopo ‘ia ai. ‘Oiai ‘o ka nūpepa ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i ke kālele nui o kēia noi‘ina, inā ua kākau ‘ia kēia pepa ma ka ‘ōlelo Pelekānia, he mea pono ho‘i ka unuhi ‘ana o kēia

mau ‘atikala ma ka ‘ōlelo Pelekānia, a e nele ana ho‘i ka noi‘ina i ka ‘ole o ka pō‘aiapili nui aku e waiho ana kēia mau ‘atikala ma ka nūpepa. Inā na‘e kākau ‘ia ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i wale nō, he ‘ano unuhina ko laila kekahi, ‘oiai ua pa‘a nō nā ki‘ina noi‘i i ho‘oulu nui i kēia pāhana ma loko o kona ‘ōlelo pono‘ī iho nō, nona ho‘i he mau hua ‘ōlelo lua ‘ole a mau ‘ōlelo pokole ho‘i i loa‘a ‘ole ho‘i ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, a i kākau mua ‘ia ho‘i ma ka ‘ōlelo Pelekānia.

I ke‘ehina ki‘ina noi‘i, ua kākau like ‘ia he mana o kēia pepa ma ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. I mea ho‘i kēia e loa‘a ai he mana e noho ai nā hāpana ‘atikala nūpepa ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i ma kona ‘ano pono‘ī iho nō me ka unuhi ‘ole ‘ia, a i ha‘awina ho‘oikaika ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i na‘u iho kekahi. Ma ka mana ‘ōlelo Pelekānia, na‘u nō nā unuhina ‘atikala nūpepa a pau loa, a no‘u wale nō ke kuleana a me ka hewa ke pāhemahema paha ia mau unuhina ma kekahi ‘ano. Aia nō nā unuhina ‘ōlelo Pelekānia ma lalo pono o nā ‘atikala ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, a i ‘ole ia, aia ke waiho nei ma ke kuhia o lalo.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In the century following Captain Cook's arrival, Hawai'i's social and political structure underwent an enormous upheaval. For British and American interests, the economic and military implications of political control over Hawaiian land motivated long-term campaigns to extend and consolidate their power. For the Native Hawaiian majority being racked by disease and economic repression, to retain political control was a distinctly existential concern. These competing interests created a climate of intense and extended political jockeying throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century, culminating in the 1887 Bayonet Constitution, the 1893 overthrow of the monarchy, the Wilcox Counterrevolution of 1895, and the Organic Act of 1900. Language, specifically the issue of linguistic difference between the monolingual Hawaiian-speaking majority and the monolingual English-speaking elites, was a significant and constitutive feature in all of these interactions.

This project sheds light on 19<sup>th</sup> century Hawai'i's complex and unique sociolinguistic landscape through a detailed analysis of Hawaiian language newspaper articles produced during the political unrest of the 1890s.<sup>2</sup> Hawaiian language newspaper articles are explored not merely as a historical record of Hawaiian language use or cultural phenomena, but as discourse that was politically relevant and socially constructive. While being well bounded by language, Hawaiian language newspapers are an extensive body of discourse, with over 120,000 pages of newspaper material, equating to over 1,000,000 pages of printed text (Nogelmeier 2003). Determining what

---

<sup>2</sup> The term "sociolinguistic landscape" as used above refers to the various ways in which language played a constitutive role in society. Durk Gorter explores the use of the term "linguistic landscape" as a methodological tool, and finds that its broadest use "can be synonymous with or at least related to concepts such as linguistic market, linguistic mosaic, ecology of languages, diversity of languages or the linguistic situation" (2006). The use of the suffix "socio" is intended to emphasize the ways in which language is integrated into the broader social formation, especially in the realm of politics.

elements of this discourse are to be considered relevant or not to a sociolinguistic survey such as this presents a significant challenge. To resolve this issue, this project focuses on Hawaiian language newspaper discourse that mentions English or Hawaiian language, referred to in this study as a ‘language discourse,<sup>3</sup>’ to create a corpus that is small enough to be studied within the limits of this project, while also large enough to be representative of the broader sociolinguistic landscape. The specific research goal of this study is to define how the multilingualism of late 19<sup>th</sup> century Hawaiian society influenced, and was influenced by, the political contestations of the last decade.

This project begins with a review of contemporary Hawaiian studies as an academic discipline and its evolution within the University of Hawai‘i. This is done with the hopes of better positioning this project within Hawaiian studies, and to show in what direction this project progresses. Then a brief section on methodology defines discourse analysis, the theoretical framework of this project, and the way in which the research was carried out before the analysis section. The analysis is separated into two sections, one focused on analyzing the most prominent language discourses and ideologies in the Hawaiian language newspapers and their relevance to Hawaiian politics, and another section focused on how the Hawaiian language newspapers utilized translation to strategically navigate this complex sociolinguistic landscape. Finally, the conclusion section discusses the outcomes of the study, their implication for Hawaiian studies and their connection with language revitalization, as well as avenues for further research into Hawaiian language newspapers.

---

<sup>3</sup> In this project, a language discourse refers to the discourse that surrounds, describes, and imbues a language with its social meanings, such as descriptions of its use, analyses of its history, and valuations of its worth.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Contemporary Hawaiian Studies

While research about Hawai‘i has been carried out within the context of traditional academic disciplines since at least the early 20th century, contemporary Hawaiian studies research has found its own unique form of scholarship in the past 40 years. The broadest characteristic of contemporary Hawaiian studies is the reevaluation of the discourses which have historically been either selectively validated or otherwise dismissed. This entails taking a critical look at earlier productions on Hawaiian history, Hawaiian culture, and Hawaiian language with careful awareness for the discourses that were considered worthy of inclusion.

Analyzing the social repercussions of certain discourses’ omission is an equally important part of this research trend. Earlier works on Hawaiian history, culture, and language did not stay insulated within the walls of the university, but echoed throughout Hawai‘i’s educational system, and impacted the construction of Hawai‘i’s social and historical identity for generations. In “‘Ike Mōakaaka, Seeing a Path Forward: Historiography in Hawai‘i,” Ronald Williams Jr. similarly arrives at the conclusion that “elements within this dominant narrative not only shape understandings of specific individuals and actions but also work together to construct a general understanding of a people and their nation” (Williams 2011).

While scholars in the 1980s and 1990s such as Haunani K. Trask and Johnathon Osorio resisted the dominant narrative of the time by constructing vitriolic counter-narratives aimed at contradicting and correcting perceived errors and elisions, Puakea Nogelmeier’s 2003 PhD dissertation, “Mai Pa‘a i ka Leo” marked a shift in the focus Hawaiian studies towards discourse by analyzing the textual resources which were selectively drawn on or omitted from previous research. Nogelmeier’s research showed that vast swaths of native auto-representational works

were available to researchers, but were either not used at all, or were reduced to the translated works of a few native authors. These few translated works were then considered sufficient inclusion of primary native-language contributions for meaningful research. He affirmed that this “discourse of sufficiency” led to misrepresentational conclusions through the dismissal of pertinent information, as well as through mistranslation, decontextualization, and reordering of the original work (Nogelmeier 2003). By focusing on discourse, Nogelmeier was able to recontextualize outside theoretical frameworks such as Michel Foucault’s elucidation of power and knowledge or Edward Said’s work on the connections between textual discourses and worldly power into the specific context of Hawaiian studies research.

Various research projects have since been taken up by scholars that build on the foundation set by Nogelmeier. Ronald Williams and Noelani Arista have taken the issues discussed by Nogelmeier and applied them to a historiographical perspective, with Arista’s focus on the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and Williams’ focus on the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The vast scale of the Hawaiian language discourse that was completely ignored or researched only perfunctorily within Hawaiian studies has inevitably led scholars like Williams and Arista to critically reconsider the narrative of Hawaiian history within the university. As Williams writes, “it is also very important to note that an argument for inclusion of these [Hawaiian language] resources is not simply revisionist or resistant, but rather historiographical” (Williams 2008). Scholars working for the University of Hawai‘i (UH) constructed a historical narrative using certain discursal resources and not others, and the resulting narrative is one in which UH and its place within society is invested. Consequently, when we study Hawaiian history today, we must be aware that within native language discourse there exists other

historical narratives that were, to a greater or lesser extent, insulated from the historical narrative that became accepted at the university.

Hawaiian studies scholarship takes place through the forum and mechanisms of Western academia, but the Hawaiian language primary resources through which students are increasingly being educated are from a discourse distinct from the one that was previously perpetuated by the university. In the same vein, this research project progresses from an understanding of contemporary Hawaiian scholarship as a kind of discursive hybridization, or an overlapping, where two somewhat distinct discourses about Hawai‘i, one written primarily in English and the other in Hawaiian, each with their own historical narratives, forums of production, institutional and political investitures, and systems of knowledge-value, both have a genealogical connection to the current scholarly discourse. Noelani Arista considers this sort of discursive consolidation in her book “The Kingdom and the Republic: Sovereign Hawai‘i and the Early United States”:

In these attempts to re-balance the unequal measure of colonial histories of Hawai‘i with a native history of Hawai‘i grounded in the Hawaiian language archive, these scholars have made essential interventions, especially in their attempts to illuminate Hawaiian historiographic concepts, paradigms, and tropes through culturally literate interpretation of Hawaiian-language sources. But this revisionist work’s emphasis on restoring “agency” to Hawaiian historical actors carries another risk: the unreflective use of Western historiographical paradigms, tropes, and plots in telling histories of culturally Othered peoples. [...] *Different languages let us see different historiographies. This is the heart of correcting histories of unequal measure: we must seek an understanding of a multilingual and epistemologically diverse Pacific World, full of many kinds of exchange. We need to attempt an integration of the methodological and intellectual practices of both Hawaiian and American histories.* (Arista 2019, 6; emphasis my own)

What this discursive hybridization seems to entail is the inclusion of not only the textual content and information of Hawaiian language discourse within institutions of western academia, but also the motivations and political investments concomitant in Hawaiian language discourse. When Hawaiian language discourse is repositioned within Hawaiian studies as a valuable resource, the narratives, rhetoric, and ideas present in that discourse end up affecting students

and faculty, and ultimately end up redefining what Hawaiian studies is, and what it is for. The ideological formations present in Hawaiian language discourse are not merely subsumed by the framework of the university, but contribute to it.<sup>4</sup>

Since Nogelmeier's analysis of the discursive framework of Hawaiian studies, there have been many important contributions that explore its implications in more specific contexts. Kamanamaikalani Beamer's 2008 dissertation, "Na Wai ka Mana?" describes how certain discourses' selection or elision created a political narrative in which native historical agency was significantly diminished, a narrative which Beamer's thesis attempts to refute and construct anew. Many traditional Hawaiian epics published in the Hawaiian language newspapers have been used by scholars to describe and analyze cultural activities such as ho'opāpā (Damas 2017) or mele malama (Johnson 2024), or to explicate the entirety of the latent cultural detail in a given story (Perreira 2002). Other scholars have used these literary epics as forums to study specific linguistic constructions (Cabral 2004, 2016). The growing number of theses, articles, and analyses that have been written entirely in the Hawaiian language are especially important, both as an expansion of the Hawaiian language's linguistic domains, and as a striking examples of the hybridization of English language academic discourse and Hawaiian language literary/newspaper discourse. These scholarly productions written in the Hawaiian language serve as the typifying example of the discursive hybridization mentioned earlier, as they bear linguistic, rhetorical, and ideological connections to Hawaiian newspaper language, as well as institutional, structural, and rhetorical connections to English language academic discourse.

---

<sup>4</sup> Ideology, a term used frequently in this study, has various meanings within different disciplines and programs in the social sciences and humanities. Norman Fairclough's work on ideology in "Critical Discourse Analysis," wherein "features of texts are seen as ideological in so far as they affect (sustain, undermine) power relations" has greatly influenced the term's use in this study (2013).

## 2.2 Sociolinguistic Histories of Hawai‘i

In contemporary Hawaiian studies research, there are only a few research projects that delve deeply into the sociolinguistic history of Hawai‘i, and fewer still that use Hawaiian language newspaper discourse as a significant historical resource. Nalani Balutski’s 2011 M.A. thesis, “The Colonial Campaign for English-Medium Education,” takes a broad look at the evolution of the education system in Hawai‘i from 1824-1896. Using mainly the reports from the Minister of Public Education and reports from the President of the Board of Education to the Hawaiian Legislature, Balutski shows that the 1896 ban on Hawaiian language as a medium of instruction was the culmination of a decades long political campaign to propagate English language fluency throughout the Hawaiian population. Regarding the Hawaiian language newspaper discourse about the sociolinguistic situation, Balutski uses eleven newspaper articles printed between 1834-1865. Balutski’s research focuses on constructing a narrative to show how leaders of the education system in Hawai‘i made specific and intentional policy decisions throughout the nineteenth century motivated by a desire to change the linguistic behavior of the Hawaiian population. Balutski does not focus on the sociolinguistic detail of the Hawaiian language newspaper discourse that was occurring continuously throughout these changes.

Kahealani Lono’s 2014 MA thesis “He Mana Ko Ka ‘Ōlelo Makuahine: Nā Leo O Nā Kūpuna I Ka Wā E Ho‘okolonaio ‘Ia Ana ‘O Hawai‘i,” looks directly at the Hawaiian language newspaper discourse, specifically how language perpetuation was understood as a means of resistance to American influence and power. Lono’s thesis has an extremely broad scope, which she defines explicitly as newspaper articles between 1856 and 1948. The first half of her paper focused on the years between 1856 and 1896, and she identified five newspaper articles, and between 1896 and 1945 she identified three. The majority of the analysis in Lono’s paper is

concerned with constructing a historical narrative that follows the evolution of the education system and language policy in Hawai‘i, much like Balutski’s.

While broad historical and political narratives such as those studied by Balutski and Lono are an important part of any sociolinguistic research, this project will attempt to focus on the Hawaiian language newspaper discourse in much finer detail. What will hopefully become obvious in the course of this study is the fact that newspapers in Hawai‘i held extraordinary political and social importance, and exploring newspaper language in more detail is a highly worthwhile endeavor. Hawaiian language newspapers are still underexplored, and further research is necessary in order to more fully understand the impact of this discourse on the sociolinguistic history of Hawai‘i. This project attempts to contribute to this project, as well as to serve as a template for further research into this rich discursal terrain.

Helen Chapin’s 1996 “Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai‘i” is an extremely useful and comprehensive review of the evolution of the Hawaiian press. It describes, in significantly more detail than any previous work, how newspapers acted as the major vehicle for social and political action in 19th and 20th century Hawai‘i, with each publication’s specific stance reflecting and constituting part of a particular social force of the time. Chapin’s careful research into the institutional investment and financial support of each publication affords her a more critical reading of Hawaiian history. Her study explores the impact of newspaper language throughout almost 150 years of Hawaiian history, and because of the impressive breadth of her research, some of the complexities and details of the sociolinguistic landscape are missing at times. All considered, Chapin’s treatise on newspaper language is surely one of the most unique and encompassing readings of Hawaiian linguistic history to date.

Prior to the 1980s, research on the sociolinguistic landscape of Hawai‘i took the form of books attempting overarching historical reviews. John Reinecke’s *Language and Dialect in Hawai‘i: A Sociolinguistic History to 1935* was considered by Derek Bickerson and William H. Wilson, experts in creole languages and Hawaiian sociolinguistic history, to be “by far the most thorough and complete description of the sociocultural matrix of pidginization and creolization in Hawai‘i” (Bickerson and Wilson 1987, 65). While Reinecke’s thesis provides critical information about the linguistic, economic, and political forces that lead to a creole developing in the early 20th century, Bickerton and Wilson correctly identify that “the role of the Hawaiian language in the pidginization process” was inadequately addressed (Bickerson and Wilson 1987, 65). Indeed, Reinecke falls victim to the same “discourse of sufficiency” as did many of his contemporaries, and when finding a vacuum void of native voice, he fills in the gaps with assumptions and simplifications.

When providing background into the “long-continued influence of the English and Hawaiian languages upon each other,” Reinecke either ignores completely or greatly downplays Hawaiian language speakers’ linguistic agency from the very beginning of the languages’ mutual influence (Reinecke 1969, 23). Considering the linguistic situation between 1786 and the arrivals of the first missionaries, he writes that this period “had left little impression upon the native tongue” (Reinecke 1969, 26). In actuality, as is evident from Arista’s “The Kingdom and the Republic,” there was a significant amount of trade taking place at this time between English and American merchants and Hawaiian chiefs (2019). While perhaps not affecting the lexis or grammar of Hawaiian very much, these early interactions certainly served as precursors for the complex sociolinguistic landscape which later emerged. Hawaiian chiefs, for example, in seeking out the linguistic capital that would enable their mercantile and political advantage, found

translation a strategic necessity to be acquired by any means, such as ingratiating or subjugating English-speaking sailors, or sending young chiefs abroad to be educated in English. From that point on, the role of translation in Hawaiian society only grew in complexity and social significance.

The Hawaiian language press which emerged in the mid-19th century as a unique hybridization of foreign linguistic technology with native Hawaiian linguistic content, rhetorical form, as well as cultural practices is reduced in Reinecke's sociolinguistic history to the Hawaiian language "clothing itself with a literature in the western style" (1969, 30).<sup>5</sup> This sort of simplification ends up obscuring the Hawaiian language press's role as a unique cultural text, as well as its significant political power and influence—strikingly evident in the many contentious litigations and arrests of opposition newspaper editors in the late 19th century. In fact, the omission of the Hawaiian language press's political role was an integral part of the ideological underpinnings of the dominant Hawaiian history discourse. Evidence of Native Hawaiian political resistance and contention would immediately contradict the historical justification for the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and American annexation, namely that political change was inevitable, beneficial, and that the native population was politically impotent and passive.

Ignoring the content and importance of the Hawaiian language press also hides some of the most important and impactful strategies through which the missionary descendants consolidated their power and influence. For example, the prominent Hawaiian language

---

<sup>5</sup> The Hawaiian language press, while certainly containing institutional and formal connections to the English language newspapers which preceded them, bore its own striking and unique linguistic traditions as well. In Hawaiian language newspapers, one can find advertisements, mastheads, headlines, obituaries, as well as local and global news in daily and weekly publications, similar to newspapers in other languages; one can also find genealogies of chiefs attesting to their fitness to rule, songs and chants honoring famed places and chiefs, as well as prominently featured serial productions of traditional Hawaiian epics.

publication *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, while enabling the production of many significant Hawaiian language literary epics and historical annals, was also a major tool enabling the missionary descendants' campaign of political propaganda. Reinecke's sociolinguistic history describes this newspaper only as "an outlet for the literary and didactic ambitions of the Hawaiians" (1969, 30). The complex connections between Hawai'i's sociolinguistic and political landscapes at the end of the 19th and early 20th century are typified by the ways in which translation, mistranslation, or non-translation were used as tools to extend, influence, criticize, and subvert political power by both English and Hawaiian speakers. These resulting bilingual translations of government documents are simplified by Reinecke as "hav[ing] been due merely to political graft" (1969).

All that being said, the aim of Reinecke's thesis is to show how the sociolinguistic landscape and economic situation of the plantation period contributed to the formation of a creole language in early 20th century Hawai'i. The linguistic statistics and the conclusions he draws about them continue to be useful to scholars interested in Hawaiian linguistic history and the history of Hawaiian Creole English. What should be clear, however, is that all of the assumptions and simplifications in his analysis would have been made immediately more tenuous if the discourse within the Hawaiian language newspapers had been at all part of his object of study. The discourse within the Hawaiian language newspapers, as will be shown, contained overviews of Hawai'i's linguistic history, sociolinguistic analyses and theories, as well as proposals and essays aimed at affecting change in the sociolinguistic situation. All these are unquestionably relevant to any analysis of Hawai'i's sociolinguistic history. The isolation of the discourse written in the Hawaiian language from the missionary/academic discourse should be highlighted by the fact that the Hawaiian language discourse was being produced in the

newspapers up until the late 1930's, and there were many articles tantamount to sociolinguistic essays published in the Hawaiian language newspapers that were contemporaneous with Reinecke's thesis.<sup>6</sup>

### 2.3 General Hawaiian Histories

General histories such as R. S. Kuykendall's "The History of Hawaii" and Daws' "Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands" mention language only briefly and without any import or detail. The political power and influence of the Hawaiian language press is disregarded completely and its use as a source is negligible. To authorize the monoglossia of English language newspaper sources and missionary histories into a comprehensive work, Kuykendall's narrative takes on a didactic and unambiguous tone. Room for doubt or alternate histories is quashed by straightforward language and a lack of qualifying modal verbs. Daws, on the other hand, deals with the monoglossia by taking great liberties in his voice as a historian. His "Shoal of Time," while slightly more critical than Kuykendall's, is rife with unsourced extrapolation, narrative embellishment, and Daws' own opinion. Daws' history drew on Kuykendall's, which was itself a production of a discourse on Hawaiian history that was already quite cohesive by the early 20th century. This discourse began with explorers' and missionaries' journals in the early 19th century, then Dibble's *History of the Sandwich Islands*, Bingham's *A Residence of Twenty-one Years in the Sandwich Islands*, and Jarves' *History of the Hawaiian or Sandwich Islands* in the mid-19th century, and then Fornander's *An Account of The Polynesian Race* and William

---

<sup>6</sup> See "Ke Pokakaa Wale Mai Nei i ka Pali o Kalalau" for a letter from a Women's Suffrage group that details the political aspects of language choice in the legislature (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1912). See also, "Olelo Hawaii," published in 1917, and "Ka Olelo Hawaii a me ka Ninau Hoopulapula" in 1921, and "E Ae Anei Kakou e Make ka Olelo Hawaii?" in 1922, all discussing language shift in Hawaiian society, its causes, ways in which it can be halted, and hopes for the future (*Ka Puuhonua o na Hawaii* 1917, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1921, 1922).

Alexander's *A Brief History of the Hawaiian People* and *History of the Later Years of the Hawaiian Monarchy and the Revolution of 1893* in the late 19th century.

The historical narrative built up by these missionary histories and reinforced by each subsequent publication was invested in certain political aims. The worldview in these narratives, by way of the ideological and institutional investiture of the authors, naturalized a balance of political power with a few basic assumptions: the Native Hawaiians' loss of rights (linguistic and otherwise) was inevitable, and ultimately beneficial for them. While these early missionary histories were being written, a different historical narrative was being produced simultaneously in the Hawaiian language newspapers which stood in stark relief to the English language missionary histories. Missionary historians shored up their particular narrative against this by regarding the Hawaiian language auto-representational discourse as unsubstantial or nonexistent. As long as the Hawaiian language discourse was excluded from historians' sources, contradictions such as Daws' below would be an implicit part of their form.

*"The Hawaiians were not in the habit of explaining themselves or even exposing themselves in written form (this despite widespread literacy and the existence of a native-language press)." (Daws 1974; emphasis my own)*

Even as recently as 1994, popular works on Hawaiian linguistic and social history have reproduced these same contradictions and ideological frameworks. Albert J. Schütz's "The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies," defines its intellectual project in saying that "very little has been written about Hawai'i's post-contact linguistic history: how outsiders first became aware of the Hawaiian language, how they and the Hawaiian were able to understand each other, and later, how they tried to record and analyze Hawaiian vocabulary and grammar" (1994, xvii). Schütz, as an expert on Polynesian languages at the University of Hawai'i, takes it upon himself to define "Hawai'i's post-contact linguistic history," and does so

only in terms of English language speakers' interactions with Hawaiian speakers. Schütz's book compiles, categorizes, and narrates nearly all of the English language writings about the Hawaiian language up until the start of the Hawaiian language revitalization movement. Schütz concerns himself with the folk linguistic theories that characterized early linguistic reports of Hawai'i, the historical development of the orthography of Hawaiian and the spread of literacy, the creation of dictionaries and grammars of the language, and a final chapter dedicated to sociolinguistic concerns, namely language change, and the differences in prestige and power that motivated those changes. In this last chapter he draws on Reinecke's thesis, Benjamin Wist's history of education in Hawai'i, and the older staples of the English-language Hawaiian history canon to consolidate the English language narrative about language change. When considering the perspective of Hawaiian language speakers, he follows in the footsteps of Daws and Reinecke, and offers hypotheses about Hawaiians' motivations that, more often than not, end up reproducing the same naturalized linguistic ideology present in earlier writings.

From the Hawaiian point of view, however, perhaps it is misleading to discuss bilingualism as if it were a conscious goal. It is much more likely that many Hawaiians took their own language for granted and wished to be able to speak and understand English as well, for although they were still fascinated with the written word in Hawaiian, this type of literacy was not an immediate stepping-stone to success and power in the rapidly changing world that intruded on their own. (Schütz 1994)

In the span of two sentences, Schütz lays out his theory of the Hawaiian language's attrition, a careful reading of which reveals a self-contradictory linguistic worldview that relies on the ideological framework of earlier missionary histories. Schütz first finds that Hawaiians' desire to "speak and understand English as well as their own [language]" somehow does not equate with a "conscious goal" of bilingualism. As if to have such a goal, one must have the freedom granted by a position of social privilege to choose consciously, as opposed to the Hawaiians who were doing it out of necessity. Schütz further bifurcates Hawaiian society

completely into a “rapidly changing world” in which Native Hawaiian “success and power” was hampered and a world “of their own,” an obsolete world relegated to Hawaiians. The political choices, programs, and institutional structures that linked the worlds of the white business elites and the Native Hawaiians and are thus obscured, and the injustices, though regrettable, are made inevitable. However, as we will soon see, bilingualism was a specific and strategic goal that Hawaiians pursued for their social and political benefit. By using Hawaiian language newspaper discourse to explore the complex connections between language and political power, we will also find that literacy was most certainly “an immediate stepping-stone to success and power” in Hawaiian society, but not however an uncontested one, and was a significant and constitutive aspect of Hawai‘i’s social and political history.

### 3. METHODOLOGY

This project approaches the study of Hawaiian language newspapers from the perspective of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a research method that takes its object of study, discourse, to mean language in social use. As Gillian Brown and George Yule succinctly acknowledge, this broad and multi-faceted object of study “cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms are designed to serve in human affairs” (1983, 1). Discourse analysis therefore necessarily implicates political, cultural, as well as historical concerns in research, and as such it takes on an interdisciplinary form. The movement to integrate Hawaiian language newspapers as a resource in Hawaiian studies has, in a similar sense, created novel discussions on Hawaiian cultural practices, political and social history, Hawaiian linguistic studies, as well as research on discourse explicitly. While the discourse studied in discourse analysis can be as discrete as a conversation between interlocutors or as broad as a diachronic collection of interrelated texts, more global definitions of discourse are the more relevant to Hawaiian studies today.

Of particular note is the attention given in discourse analysis research to the socially constructive power of language. Norman Fairclough describes this critical understanding well in his introduction to “Critical Language Awareness.”

Discourse *constitutes* the social. Three dimensions of the social are distinguished – knowledge, social relations, and social identity – and these correspond respectively to three major functions of language . . . Discourse is shaped by relations of power, and invested with ideologies. (1992, 8)

The movement to incorporate Hawaiian language discourse within Hawaiian studies has its impetus in the ideological tension between two distinct historical narratives, each of which construed Hawai‘i’s complex social history in different ways. At the turn of the 20th century, as will be expounded on later in this study, Hawai‘i’s complex sociolinguistic landscape was the

battlefield on which the struggle for political legitimacy and ideological justification was fought, resulting in the ideological opposition of Hawaiian-language historical narrative and English-language historical narrative. Hawaiian scholars in the 1980s and 1990s moved towards this dialectic as an opening for study and sought to use their position within the university to denaturalize and expose the ideological investment of the English language historical narrative.

This goal of denaturalizing the ideological frameworks of a discourse is one of the defining characteristics of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a specific research program within discourse studies (van Dijk 2015, Fairclough 1995). As Norman Fairclough, one of the founders of CDA, defines the goals of ‘critical’ research, “it is argued that the orderliness of interactions depends in part upon such naturalized ideologies. To ‘denaturalize’ them is the objective of a discourse analysis which adopts ‘critical’ goals” (Fairclough 1995, 36). Exposing language ideologies in early 20th century Hawai‘i and their institutional manifestations is a major goal of this study, and for that reason, the analytic tools and methodological frameworks of CDA have been used significantly.<sup>7</sup> Because of the wide range of topics that CDA researchers focus on, many different research strategies are used, and they can be combined in creative ways to best fit the specific issue or form of discourse that the researcher is exploring. For Hawaiian studies researchers particularly, this affords many opportunities to adapt, hybridize, and create new methodologies to contend with the specifics of newspaper language and the complexities of Hawai‘i’s multilingual sociolinguistic landscape.

Because Hawaiian language newspapers are a historical rather than contemporary body

---

<sup>7</sup> Paul Kroskrity’s definition of the term ‘language ideology’ fits exactly with its use in this research project. “Language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group. A member’s notions of what is “true,” “morally good,” or “aesthetically pleasing” about language and discourse are grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to his or her political-economic interests. These notions often underlie attempts to use language as the site at which to promote, protect and legitimate those interests” (Kroskrity, 2000: 8).

of discourse, Ruth Wodak and Martin Reisigl's Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) to Critical Discourse Analysis offers attractive methodological tools that have inspired this research project. DHA aims to explore discourses or discourse fragments and create social critique at three levels, "text or discourse-immanent critique," "sociodiagnostic critique," and "future-related prospective critique" (Wodak and Reisigl 2015, 2). Because of the limited scale of this project, the first two levels of social critique mentioned above have been emphasized. The Hawaiian language newspapers present many opportunities for critique at the level of the text, however, the ways in which the newspapers were embedded within the political dynamics of the time make the "sociodiagnostic critique" the most relevant to the aims of this study. DHA also emphasizes the importance of "triangulation," which refers to a way in which the discourse or discourse fragment is positioned within a tiered conception of its social 'context':

1. The immediate, language or text-internal co-text and co-discourse.
2. The intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses.
3. The extralinguistic social variables and institutional frames of a specific 'context of situation.'
4. The broader sociopolitical and historical context, which discursive practices are embedded in and related to. (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 7)

As is common in CDA research, these and other methodological and analytical tools described in CDA and DHA research have been used selectively, guided by the research goals of (1) exploring the role of Hawaiian language newspapers in Hawai'i's socio-linguistic landscape at the turn of the 20th century, and (2) understanding the interplay of Hawai'i's society's complex multilingualism with the political dynamics of the time.

DHA methodology lays out eight general steps for research, each step of which is implemented recursively, such that as research progresses, "earlier" steps are revisited, reevaluated, and revised to fit the evolving research discussion. The first step is a literature review, or an "activation of theoretical knowledge" (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). Puakea

Nogelemeier's dissertation, as well as Ronald Williams, Noelani Arista, and Kamanamaikalani Beamer's work shaped an understanding of the current research landscape in Hawaiian studies from which this research project progresses. To further position this research within the broader sweep of Hawaiian studies research, the work of earlier researchers such as Schütz, Daws, Reinecke, and Kuykendall as well as earlier missionary histories were also explored. The perspective that these earlier histories provided was significant, as these histories greatly informed the English language historical narrative and discourse that was being produced at the same time as the Hawaiian language discourse of the late 19th and early 20th century.

Critically exploring the English language works on Hawaiian history provided important context for the second step, the "systematic collection of data and context information" (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). This entailed specifying and narrowing the research focus to Hawaiian language newspaper discourse that described, explicitly or implicitly, the sociolinguistic situation of the time. Focusing on newspaper language necessarily excluded certain discourse genres like personal letters written in Hawaiian, transcription of government speeches or journals of the legislature, and other Hawaiian language written discourse.<sup>8</sup> While this narrowing of the discursive field simplifies and thus limits the extent of the sociolinguistic situation which can be meaningfully analyzed, it does provide an opportunity for the complex internal characteristics and external relationships of Hawaiian language newspapers to be explicated specifically.

Specifying the period of time to be studied also constituted a major decision in research direction, as the sociolinguistic landscape of Hawai'i was constantly evolving in complex ways throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The decade at the turn of the 20th century was chosen because it was during this time that the constellation of political contestation and language

---

<sup>8</sup> Used in the Discourse Historical approach to CDA, genres are defined as "socially ratified way[s] of using language in connection with a particular type of social activity" (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 3).

ideology was at its most visible through newspaper discourse. At the same time, the political and ideological formations that achieved hegemony during this highly contentious time crystallized and became entrenched in the following decades. The Papakilo online Hawaiian language newspaper repository was used to compile the corpus, defined as Hawaiian newspaper articles published between 1893 and 1901 which included a mention of any one of the terms “olelo hawaii, olelo makuahine, olelo enelani, olelo pelekania, olelo haole, olelo kanaka” or “olelo oiwi.”<sup>9</sup> The search terms were chosen in order to, with as wide a net as feasible, capture the general discourse about the sociolinguistic situation. The years chosen as bounds for the corpus were the year of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy (1893), and the year in which the newspaper *Home Rula Repubalika* was published (1901). *Home Rula Repubalika* was a politically important newspaper, and publications of *Home Rula Repubalika* are unfortunately not yet fully digitized and included in the Papakilo databases and therefore could not be feasibly incorporated into the research corpus. While only one *Home Rula Repubalika* article published in 1901 was included in the analysis sample, many relevant articles published by other newspapers in the same year referred to *Home Rula Repubalika* articles that were inaccessible due to the technological limitations mentioned above. Because of the importance of the publication and its inaccessibility, this year was decided to be the upper bound of the corpus.

The corpus search resulted in 1,906 articles, which could then be pared down based on relevance and categorized based on publication, political stance, rhetorical strategies, and discourse topics. This fits into the third step of DHA methodology, “selection and preparation of data for specific analyses” (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). This process reduced the original

---

<sup>9</sup> The literal translations of these terms into English are “Hawaiian language, mother language, English language, British language, foreign [Caucasian] language, kanaka [referring to Native Hawaiian] language,” and “native language” respectively.

1,906 individual articles down to 495 articles deemed relevant to the research goals. This deep dive into the breadth of the discourse sample with the goal of categorizing and specifying the content provided the necessary familiarity with the time period for the fourth step of analysis, the “specification of the research questions and formulation of assumptions” (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). The general research interests formulated at the outset of the study could now be defined more specifically with respect to the generated corpus of newspaper articles. This specifically entailed focusing in on the complicated ways in which the multilingualism present in late 19th century Hawaiian society influenced, and was influenced by, the political contestations of the time.

In the process of paring down the original corpus based on relevancy, the beginnings of the fifth step in DHA methodology, a “qualitative pilot analysis” could then be attempted (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). Doing so revealed the concentration of the relevant newspaper discourse on certain important sociopolitical events such as Commissioner Willis’ report in 1893, the Republic of Hawai‘i’s constitutional convention in 1894, Lili‘uokalani’s travels to America in 1897, the passing of the Organic Act in 1900 and the first elections of the Territorial government in 1901. These important events, and the ways in which the issue of language and linguistic difference fit into them, became important topics through which this study was organized. The fifth, sixth, and seventh steps in DHA methodology are a “qualitative pilot analysis,” referring to the formulation of a general structure or framework of the larger discourse analysis, “detailed case studies,” or the critical analysis of specific articles, and “formulation of critique” (Reisigl and Wodak 2015, 10). As individual articles were analyzed and case studies were formulated, the “pilot analysis” was then altered with respect to the new information which led to the inclusion of more relevant case studies. This iterative process in which detailed case

studies informed to the general critique, which in turn informed and led to more case studies was an important part of arriving at a cohesive and comprehensive final critique of the discourse corpus surveyed.

While discourse analysis research identifies and analyzes patterns in language use from the level of vocabulary up to rhetoric and argumentation, this research project has focused on Hawaiian language newspaper discourse at the level of rhetoric or above. This project's main aim was to use Hawaiian language newspapers to explore features of Hawai'i's sociolinguistic landscape and the interaction of language with the political dynamics of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. This tended towards a focus on language policy, language ideologies, and the prominent political projects of the time, which could be most readily observed and analyzed at the level of rhetorical strategy and intertextual connections. However, Hawaiian language newspaper discourse is a complex and fascinating object of study for which both discrete linguistic analysis as well as more socio-linguistically focused research such as this are readily applicable.

#### 4. ANALYSIS

In 1822, the printing press was introduced to Hawai‘i by early missionaries as a means to aid their civilizing mission by creating easily distributable educational information (Chapin 1996). Over the following one hundred years, the printing press and the social value it offered spawned a press industry that was at the center of Hawaiian politics and urban society. By the turn of the century, the unique social value that newspapers offered was at play in many, if not all of the numerous social fields operating in urban Hawaiian society.<sup>10</sup> In this time of enormous social and political upheaval, the Hawaiian press was an integral part of the functioning of politics, law, education, economy, and trade in Hawai‘i (Chapin 1996).

At the core of the newspaper’s role in society was the value of information. Subscribers paid to receive information that they wanted to know, and advertisers paid to display information to the newspapers’ subscribers. The different types of information that subscribers wanted to know were reflected in the composition of the newspaper, and advertisers chose to advertise in publications that could communicate information to their potential customers. Martin Conboy writes of this relationship between the reader’s interest and the newspaper’s composition in *The Language of Newspapers*:

The language of newspapers has always encapsulated what would sell to audiences and how information could best be packaged and presented to achieve this commercial end at any particular time. Newspapers have therefore always attempted to fit into the tastes of their readership and sought ways to echo these within their own idiom. (2010, 1)

---

<sup>10</sup> This use of the term “social fields” is influenced by Bordieu’s social theory, in which “social fields” can be understood as “relatively autonomous spheres of ‘play’ that cannot be collapsed under an overall societal logic[...], in which participants vie to establish monopoly over the species of capital effective in it” (Bordieu and Wacquant 1992, 17). In Hawai‘i, the legal system, the legislature, the religious community, and the business world are all examples of social fields with their own unique forms of capital and functional structure. The Hawaiian press certainly constituted a social field of its own, but it also was the medium through which many of these other fields were connected, and thus served a particularly influential role in Hawaiian society.

However, it is important to consider, as we take newspaper discourse as an object of research, that the composition of the newspapers was not just a passive balancing of subscribers' and advertisers' interest with the newspapers' supply of information. While newspaper companies were aggregators of information that their subscribers may have wanted to know, the information that the newspapers chose to offer was done so with the specific intent to influence the reader in some way, chiefly to continue their subscription, but also to patronize businesses, to vote in certain ways, to be aware of certain laws, or to adopt a certain ideology. As the only medium through which this kind of information could be distributed immutably and reliably through society at large, newspapers, as a distinct institution of 19th century Hawaiian society, were an integral element in the processes of power.

Since the earliest interactions between foreigners and Hawaiian chiefs, the flow of information and thereby power was always a central concern (Arista 2019). At the heart of these interactions was the issue of linguistic difference, and the consequential incommunicability of information. This is not to say that interlanguage communication was impossible or did not occur, but that between monolingual English and Hawaiian-speaking interlocutors there existed a kind of discursual impasse. Communication between the interlocutors could be enabled despite their complete linguistic estrangement when a simple semiotic system could be formed between them, based perhaps on their shared environment and their perceived needs and desires. The impasse occurs however when communication or messages relied more significantly on interdiscursive references to be comprehensible, as would be the case if one of the first missionaries tried to communicate theological principles, or if a Hawaiian chief tried to explain how he or she was invested with political power. In these cases, some form of translation, or the adoption and use of one or the other's linguistic code would be necessary.

As the missionaries, their descendants, and other wealthy business owners worked over the next one hundred years to grow and consolidate their economic and political power at the expense of the native and immigrant majority, the issue of linguistic difference continued to prove important. The interplay of this issue with the social value that the press offered added a unique element to the role of newspapers in Hawaiian society. The ways in which linguistic difference, communication and non-communication, and political power came together in Hawaiian society in the 19th century are extremely complex and ripe for further sociolinguistic research. This project seeks to make inroads into understanding this complex multilingual situation in a few ways. Firstly, by exploring how newspaper discourse construed Hawai‘i’s sociolinguistic landscape in distinct and strategic ways linked to political goals, and secondly to show how the newspapers were used as forums for the manipulation of the sociolinguistic landscape through translation as a means to extend or subvert political power. Looking into this kind of discourse allows us to reflect on both the nature of the newspaper as an element in the broader functioning of power in Hawai‘i, as well as on the ideologies, imaginaries, desires, and understandings of social reality that individuals adopted.<sup>11</sup>

In Hawaiian language newspaper discourse, we can observe the articulation of language and power within language discourses in two distinct ways. One in which language is discussed as a social action, and another in which it is a historical object. These two ways of discussing a language acted symbiotically to create a cohesive ‘image’ of a language, or a language ideology. As social action, language was described as an action individuals could do, and was observed

---

<sup>11</sup> These individualized perspectives of social reality allow us to view decisions made by individuals as inherently strategic, rather than understanding them teleologically based on their outcomes. This forces a reconsideration of the previously dominant but declining folk linguistic theory postulating that Hawaiian people gave up their language in promise of economic success. This “strategy generating principle,” or habitus, is the other key element of Bourdieu’s social theory (Bourdieu 1977a, 72 in Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

and performed by individuals in their daily life. Individuals were then able to link its use to a manifestation of a kind of capital or power in a social field, but the objective historical reasons for these circumstances were less immediately visible. To fill this gap, languages were also discussed as abstract historical objects, or as broad social phenomena. The objective social and historical evolution of a language was obscured, and only visible to social actors in terms of the linguistic ideologies and discourses about language that were propagated. These two conceptions of language worked together to create powerful language ideologies which shaped people's behavior. In Hawaiian language newspapers, we can observe one of the most prominent of these language ideologies through which English was associated with a particular historical narrative characterized by the idea of 'progress'.

#### 4.1 Language Discourse and Ideology

##### *4.1.1 English Language and 'Progress'*

In the decade following the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, as missionary descendants and other business owners consolidated their power and legitimacy, the lines of power in many different fields of society tilted towards them more resolutely than ever before. Control over the Hawaiian judiciary system was particularly significant because of its implications for the missionary families' businesses, and because of how the political legitimacy of the Provisional Government and the Republic of Hawai'i relied on ideological and legal cohesion (Frear 1894). The efforts of missionary descendants and foreign business owners to consolidate control over the Hawaiian legal system had been going on for years prior to the overthrow, and were by no means hidden from public scrutiny or resistance.<sup>12</sup> One of the ways in which their efforts were

---

<sup>12</sup> See "He Apuepue a he Lili" (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1893), and "Makemake au e Ike i Hawaii Oiwi ma kou Noho" (*Hawaii Holomua* 1892).

carried out despite the public protest and obvious social injustice was through the changing languages roles within the judicial system, and the “language discourses” which framed them. Newspapers, as the most ubiquitous media in Hawaiian society, were extremely important in this role.

On December 17th, 1897, a letter to the editor of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* signed “Kaanapono” was published under the title “Ka Aha Kaapuni o Maui.” The article discussed news about the Maui circuit court, and consisted primarily of praise for Hon. John William Kalua as a hardworking, fair, and precise judge. Kaanapono writes:

Another praise-worthy quality of his [Judge Kalua] is his well-developed proficiency in written and spoken English. [...] When the lawyers are debating or reading legal references, he can comprehend completely and make rulings without mistake. It is a great blessing to have a Hawaiian of his caliber and his status, and he is a worthy person and reason for Hawaiians such as I to boast. It would be a great boon to have many more of his type.

O kekahi mea nani loa, oia no ka mohala pono o kona [Lunakānāwai Kalua] hoomaopopo i na mea i olelo ia a i kakau ia maka olelo haole. [...] Aia i ka manawa a na loio e haiolelo hoopaapaa ai a e heluhelu ai i kekahi mau kuhikuhi, ua hiki iaia ke hoomaopopo pono a hooholo me ka ewaewa ole. He pomaikai nui ka loaana o kekahi Hawaii o kona ano a kulana, a he mea a kumu kupo no na Hawaii e like me a’u e kaena ai. Nani loa ina he lehulehu ko lakou ano. (Kaanapono 1897)

Kaanapono’s appreciation for Judge Kalua appears to describe the linguistic necessities for a judge to play their role in the circuit court under the Republic of Hawai‘i. While certainly based on the real social capital that English language fluency could generate, Kaanapono’s praise belied the detrimental impact of the changing linguistic roles within the Hawaiian legal institution. As the economic and political power of English speakers gained preeminence after the overthrow of the monarchy and English language use became more intertwined with positions of social power, the changing linguistic roles in different institutions became further naturalized and harder to critique. Whereas 30 or 40 years prior, Hawaiian language fluency would have been a practical necessity to be a circuit court judge, it was now an impediment to be

necessarily overcome with English language fluency.<sup>13</sup> As is evident when Kaanapono specifically recognizes the noteworthiness of Judge Kalua as a Native Hawaiian, these changing linguistic roles were boundaries which impeded certain groups' or individuals' access to power.

Supporting the naturalization of the changing roles of English language use were newspaper articles discussing English language as a distinct historical object. This discourse framing 'English,' and its occurrence within society at the time, within a historical narrative that invested it with certain social meanings and qualities. In Hawaiian language newspapers, the central characteristic of this narrative was 'progress'. Texts in this discourse thread construed socio-linguistic reality in a manner which justified the changing linguistic roles while also mitigating their negative implications for Native Hawaiians social and political rights. 'Progress' was the rhetorical means of resolving the past century's complex technological, linguistic, economic, and religious changes into a more ideologically pointed and politically useful narrative. The social capital that English language use could manifest for its speakers, framed in this historical/linguistic narrative, created a cohesive understanding of the language and its place in society. It is important to note that the focus afforded here to this narrative should not be construed as implying that it was unchallenged. This narrative was certainly influential, but was only one of many. By the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, Hawai'i's urban society had a developed political and historical consciousness, and even within the Hawaiian language newspapers, there were always a myriad of opinions and theories.

Short advertisement articles such as "Ke Ao Piliiolelo Enelani," which announced *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa's* (1896b) efforts to publish information about English grammar in Hawaiian

---

<sup>13</sup> See Frear (1894) and Hawaii Oiaio (1894).

“for the benefit of young Native Hawaiians”<sup>14</sup> and to act as a “source of inspiration for a progressive lifestyle of knowledge and wisdom among the Hawaiian people”<sup>15</sup> contribute to this discourse of ‘progress’ that framed English as a historical object, as do longer discussion articles (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1896b). “Na Olelo Beretania,” for example, published in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* on October 25th 1901, encouraged Hawaiians to pursue learning English by setting forth a specific understanding of the social history of English in Hawai‘i.

English is the language of the entire world these days, and the haole who have traveled the globe have said that they heard the language in all of the lands. This language came to us several years ago, and now there are very few Hawaiian people, both men and women, who cannot speak English or comprehend what is spoken to them. However, the trouble is, there are very few of us who truly know the language. And within the young generation of this day and age, there are few of them who know how to speak Hawaiian, their ancestral language, and the language that they do know is the “hapa-haole” language.

O ka olelo Beretania ka olelo a ke ao holookoa i keia mau la, a ua hoike ae na haole i kaapuni i ka honua, ua lohe ia keia olelo ma na aina apau. Ua hiki mai keia olelo io kakou nei he mau makahiki i kaa hope aku nei, a i keia la he kakaikahi loa na kanaka Hawaii, mai na kane a na wahine, i hiki ole ke namu a maopopo paha i ka mea e namu ia mai ana. Aka, o ka pilikia, oia ke kakaikahi loa o kakou i ike maoli i keia olelo. Iwaena o na Hawaii i hoonaauao maikai ia he kakaikahi loa o lakou i hiki ke olelo ia ua ike maoli i ka olelo Beretania. A mawaena nohoi o na pulapula o ka lahui i keia manawa he kakaikahi loa o lakou i ike i ka olelo Hawaii, ka lakou olelo makua, a o ka lakou olelo ike paha, oia ka olelo “Hapa-haole.” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901d)

The main effect of this historical narrative is to frame the changes in Hawai‘i’s linguistic history as being inevitable, natural, and ultimately beneficial. Over one hundred years of complex linguistic interaction, policy, and education is reduced to “several years ago,” and the complex processes through which the linguistic change occurred are completely passed over.

---

<sup>14</sup> “No ka pomaikai o ka lahui Hawaii Opui e uhai-a-[holo] nei e ike [i] ia olelo waiwai nui” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1896b).

<sup>15</sup> “i kumu hooulu i ka nohona holomua o ka ike ame ka naauao iwaena o ka lahui Hawaii” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1896b).

These first two sentences create a sense that, as a natural consequence of English's arrival in Hawai'i, the language spread and displaced the Hawaiian language. This narrative, present in many other Hawaiian language articles,<sup>16</sup> mirrors the sociolinguistic history present in the missionary histories discussed earlier in Chapter 2. In the second half of the article quoted above, the author tries to resolve the contradictions between the social promises of *progress*, and the reality of native Hawaiians' disenfranchisement and repression. The social boundaries and inequities for non-English speakers that resulted are rendered in the article as an issue, or "pilikia,"<sup>17</sup> borne of Native Hawaiians' failure to progress adequately. Critically, by historically framing the social capital gained by speaking English, articles in this discourse thread explicitly sought to influence the linguistic behaviors that their readers make. The end of "Na Olelo Beritania" thus reads:

It would be beneficial for parents who can speak English to consistently speak English to their children and assist them in their study of this preeminent language from now on, so that they can eventually become legislators fluent in English battling for your rights, beloved Hawai'i.

He mea maikai i na makua i ike i ka namu e namu mau i ka lakou mau keiki a kokua nui hoi ia lakou ma ka huli ana i keia olelo alakai o kakou ma kea mua aku, a hiki i ko lakou lilo ana i mau Lunamakaainana ike i ka olelo Beretania, e paio ana no ka pono ou e Hawaii Aloha. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901d)

Articles such as "Na Olelo Beritania" always intertwined historical "language discourses" with practical aspects of peoples' social use of language. As opposed to the rhetoric which describes Hawaiian language speakers as passive subjects who gave up their language, this articulation of the historical discourses that framed practical benefits that people could achieve more accurately describes the specific social and linguistic strategies that people employed

---

<sup>16</sup> See "Ke Kumu o na Kumukanawai o Hawaii" (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1896a) and "Na Wai e Hoomalu Mai" (*Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893).

<sup>17</sup> "However, *the trouble is*, [emphasis my own] there are very few of us who truly know the language." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901).

during this time. In the case of “Na Olelo Beritania”, the historical narrative and associated linguistic ideology framed English as a natural progression and Hawaiian as a relic. However, that narrative could only have found salience because of the fact that English language fluency held real social capital that Hawaiians could employ within the field of politics to strengthen their influence and fight their disenfranchisement.

Also integral to this discussion is the fact that these “language discourses” propagated within the newspapers had specific political contexts, motivations, and impacts. The article “Na Olelo Beritania” was published as a part of a larger political discussion about the language in which the Territorial legislature would be carried out. The article’s historical narrative describing the arrival of English in Hawai‘i is directly followed by its supposed political implications:

Because we are now under American authority, and English is the language of America, and the constitution requires that the legislature be carried out in English, we can see the great value of this language from now on. Knowledge of this language is something that will uplift us, and because this is not our mother tongue, only with significant effort will we learn.

Oiai ua lilo kakou malalo o Amerika, a o ka olelo Beretania ka olelo o Amerika, a oiai ma ke kanawai kumu ua makemake ia e hana ia na hana o ka Ahaolelo ma ka olelo Beretania wale no, ua hiki loa ia kakou ke ike i ka waiwai nui o keia olelo ma keia mua aku. O ka ike i keia olelo kekahi mea nana e hapai ae ia kakou, a oiai aole keia o ka kakou olelo makua, me ka hooikaika wale no e ike ai. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901d).

Because the broad contours of language as a historical phenomenon are less easily observed than their specific individualized manifestations in social use, language as a discursal object becomes an effective tool for political argumentation. Framing English in a historical narrative imbued with a sense of inevitability, almost as a natural consequence or reflection of historical evolution or progress, obscured the political implications of each individual change in language policy, while also allowing it to be pointed to as social justification or evidence supporting a political movement. In Hawai‘i, the striking linguistic change that had taken place in the 50 years

prior to the dawn of the 20th century emerged as one of the prominent social features to which politically invested ideological discourses could be attached.

In the days directly following the overthrow of the monarchy, “Nawai e Hoomalu mai” was printed as an editorial in *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* (1893) making a direct argument for American intervention and, while not mentioning it explicitly, American annexation. After a foundation indicating that “it’s well understood that the people living on this land are unable to resolve this situation towards peace,”<sup>18</sup> the article discusses which foreign nation should intervene. The first point in the discussion is that “the foreign language of Hawai‘i is English. Therefore, an English-speaking country is necessary.”<sup>19</sup> In this article, the latent economic and political capital of English language use in Hawai‘i is leveraged directly to make a broad political argument, obscuring the fact that this very sociolinguistic capital was a phenomenon directly invested in Hawai‘i’s political history and status.

At the turn of the 20th century, there were many other foreign languages being spoken in Hawai‘i by people who significantly outnumbered English speakers (Reinecke 1969, 42).<sup>20</sup> English language speakers were, however, by far the most economically and politically powerful group at the time. English could only be reasonably construed as “the foreign language of Hawai‘i” because its political and economic power was readily evident, and because the actual contours of the multilingual demographics were less so apparent.<sup>21</sup> English in Hawai‘i, and language in general, was a politically useful discursive object because it was visibly powerful in

---

<sup>18</sup> “Ua maopopo, aole loa e hiki i na kanaka e noho pu ana ma kea aina e hooonopono ia lakou iho i maluhia ai” (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893).

<sup>19</sup> “O ka olelo haole o Hawaii, oia no ka olelo Enelani. Nolaila o kekahi aupuni olelo Enelani ka mea e pono ai” (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893).

<sup>20</sup> See also “Halawai Nui a na Pake” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1894a)

<sup>21</sup> See “Mahuahua na hana Kalepa o Honolulu” (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893).

everyday life while at the same time being diffuse over many social fields. This social diffusion, which gave language the effect of a kind of natural phenomenon, made it especially receptive to the ideological/historical discourses which framed it. Newspapers were the medium through which powerful “language discourses” could be disseminated, all of which were situated in the broader political milieu.<sup>22</sup>

#### 4.1.2 Hawaiian Language and Nationalism

While English language was securing its political and economic supremacy in post-overthrow society, Hawaiian language was still a prevalent and powerful language in its own right. Native Hawaiians and part Hawaiians made up the largest population group and a significant percentage of the adult population was monolingual.<sup>23</sup> Hawaiian language use was, then, a pragmatic necessity for many economic and political activities in Hawai‘i.<sup>24</sup> The obvious political contradictions resulting from a minority English government’s claims to democratic legitimacy while large swaths of the population were monolingual Hawaiian speakers were well recognized within the ideological battles of the time. For example, as the Provisional Government was consolidating its political control after the overthrow, it replaced various appointees with those supportive of the new government (Kuykendall 1926, 225; Daws 1974, 301). For the Hawaiian language newspapers, an inability to speak Hawaiian well or at all was an obvious criticism that could be leveled effectively.

---

<sup>22</sup> See “Ko Makou Manao” for *Ka Lei Momi*’s discussion of the newspapers prominence in perpetuating political injustices (1893).

<sup>23</sup> See “Hoike Kula ma Maui” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901a) for discussion of issues facing non-English speaking adults, and “No na Makua me na Opio” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901c) for the generational linguistic split in the context of church. See also “Language and Dialect in Hawaii” for more demographic information, (Reinecke 1969, 42).

<sup>24</sup> See “Luna Hooiaio Palapala” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1893), “Waihona Puke Hawaii” (*Ka Makaainana* 1895) and “Kumukanawai” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1894b).

In May of 1893 the Board of Health appointed a new director of the leper hospital in Kalihi. He was accused in an article of *Hawaii Holomua*, of “being unable to speak Hawaiian correctly, [...] buying his education, [... and that] his integration in the annexation party was the reason he became the director” (*Hawaii Holomua* 1893a).<sup>25</sup> Only a few days later, a letter signed “Kaiana” was published which denounced the removal of the Officer of Government Pastures from Kula, Maui, without cause. The new appointee was accused of “being unable to read” and unable to “understand the words of the laws that were printed in Hawaiian and English” (Kaiana 1893).<sup>26</sup> In the articles quoted above, we can observe a kind of ‘resistance’ to the language discourse which framed English as a necessary and inevitable societal progression from Hawaiian. By pointing out the contradictions between the sociolinguistic landscape that such a discourse construed and the sociolinguistic reality that social actors actually observed, the articles above were able to criticize and denaturalize latent language ideology. The continuing social necessity of Hawaiian language use could serve as stark evidence of the falsity of the narrative of inherent English supremacy. Evidence of cronyism which immediately placed a communicative divide between the appointee and a major sector of the population which they were meant to represent only bolstered these criticisms further.

The significant number of Hawaiian language speakers, combined with the fact that previous legislative and constitutional precedent was recorded mainly in the Hawaiian language, as well as its obvious historical primacy, gave the Hawaiian language significant social relevance and power. Even as the linguistic currents in the Provisional Government and the Republic of

---

<sup>25</sup> “Aole ona hiki ke olelo Hawaii pololei. O kona mea wale no i noho Luna Nui ai, ua kuai oia i kona naauao [...] a ua pau i ka lilo i ka hui hoohui aina” (*Hawaii Holomua* 1893).

<sup>26</sup> “Ike ole i ka heluhelu” and “[‘ike ‘ole]i na hua palapala o ua kanawai ala i pai ia ma ka olelo Hawaii a me ka olelo haole” (Kaiana 1893).

Hawai‘i tended towards propagating English use in political, law, and in the economic sector, the new constitutions afforded significant political roles for the Hawaiian language.<sup>27</sup> This created a kind of linguistic pressure for the new English-centric government to reconcile. Despite the political upheaval, Hawaiian language was still deeply integrated into the functioning of many social fields. More importantly still, in the years after the overthrow, Hawaiian language held significant cultural capital as the medium of the nationalist discourse of Hawai‘i.

In the years following the overthrow, the central political question was the choice between annexation by America or restoration of sovereignty, and thus the discourse and language of Hawaiian nationalism was in the spotlight. In 1897, two citizens’ meetings were held on September 30th and October 8th, one arranged by the nationalism and one by the annexationists. The annexationists meeting featured a long speech by US Senator Morgan, the author of the influential ‘Morgan Report’, which was interpreted by Luther Wilcox and later translated for Ka Nupepa Kuokoa by John Sheldon (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1897b). At the citizens meeting recalled in “Halawai Makaainana Lahui Nui” (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a), thousands gathered in Pa Alii Square in October 1897 as leaders of the Hui Aloha ‘Āina gave speeches and read aloud their memorandum of protest which had first been presented to President Dole in Hawaiian the month prior.<sup>28</sup> F. J. Testa was introduced, and read to the crowd the 13 paragraphs of their letter of dissent in Hawaiian first, and after it was finished “it was read in English over cheering voices.”<sup>29</sup> James Keauluna Kaulia, President of the Hui Aloha ‘Āina, took the stage next. His speech was recorded in the article along with the cheers of the crowd.

---

<sup>27</sup> See “Kumukanawai” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1894).

<sup>28</sup> See “Ka Olelo Hooholo Kue i ka Hoohui Aina” (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897c).

<sup>29</sup> “Ua heluhelu ia ma ka olelo Beritania iloko o na leo hulo” (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a).

To allow our annexation by America is the same as our allowing our people to be scoured from the face of our land ('Hurrah! Hurrah!! Hurrah!!' chanted). While this issue has been thrust upon us, is this the time for the leaders of our side to be slothful? ('No' chanted).<sup>30</sup> (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a)

O ko kakou ae ana aku noia e *anai* loa ia ko kakou lahui mai luna aku o ka lepo o ko kakou aina (hooho ia huro! huro!! huro!!)] Oiai keia mau pilikia e kau mai ana mamua o kakou, he manawa anei ia e hoopalaleha ai ke alakai o ko kakou aoao (hoohoia aole). (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a)

As was the case with examples of English language use in the language discourse by which English was associated with 'progress', in this case we find articles which highlight the prominence, political power, and cultural capital associated with Hawaiian language use. Along with these descriptions of powerful Hawaiian language use within both the political establishment and in popular political action, we also find discussion of language as a historical object, which interpreted the past, present, and future of the Hawaiian language, along with its associations with power and nationalism. "Ke Holomua Nei ka Oihana Naauao" (*Ka Loea Kalaiaina* 1898) is one such article that discusses the linguistic changes in society, focusing specifically on the generational split that was growing between monolingual English speaking children, and monolingual Hawaiian-speaking parents. The article laments the children's lack of fluency, and warns that if nothing changes, "the thought in all of our heads will come true, 'Hawaiian language will be completely lost.'"<sup>31</sup> The article quickly turns to the implications of the language loss on national or ethnic identity:

Consider how we can differentiate the Portuguese from the Spanish. It's not by their features, because [their features are very similar,] it is by their language. [...] How about the East Indian and the Hawaiian? We know that it won't by their features, but by their

---

<sup>30</sup> The chants attributed to the crowd in the article are actually "hulō!" and "'a'ole" (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a).

<sup>31</sup> "Ua pololei ka makou mea e manao nei, 'e nalowale loa ana ka olelo Hawaii'" (*Ka Loea Kalaiaina* 1898).

languages that we can recognize them. If the Hawaiian language disappears from the lips of the Hawaiians, will not the ‘Hawaiian-ness’ of their speech also disappear, and they be thought of as foreigners from India?

Pehea [la e ike ia ai ke] kanaka Potugala mai ke kanaka Sepania mai. Aole ma ko laua helehelena no ka mea, e like ana no ko laua mau helehelena [...] ma ka olelo. [...] A pehea ke kanaka Inia Hikina me ke kanaka Hawaii? Ua maopopo popo no aole ma ko laua mau helehelena iho, ma ka olelo wale no e ikeia ai kela me keia kanaka. Pehea, ina e nalowale ka olelo Hawaii mai ka lehelehe aku o ke kanaka Hawaii, aole anei e nalo kona ano Hawaii ma ka olelo ana, a manaoia oia he kanaka malihini mai Inia mai. (*Ka Loea Kalaiaina* 1898)

It is important to recall that at the time, the Native Hawaiian population was reckoning with a debilitating and consistent history of population decline, both in total number, and, by the turn of the century, in relation to other groups (Reinecke 1969). It’s no surprise then that a sense of distinct existential anxiety consumed the Hawaiian nationalist discourse. This existential concern extended past that of political sovereignty and, at its most intense, was characterized by a fear of the complete extinction of the Hawaiian identity. The obviously changing role of the Hawaiian language in society was a critically important aspect that tied the political to the existential.

#### *4.1.3 Ka Nupepa Kuokoa and Propaganda*

The Hawaiian language’s association with the discourse of sovereign Hawaiian nationalism gave it significant cultural capital and relevance. Missionary families’ interests in securing political control of Hawai‘i were well served by owning Hawaiian language newspapers that could influence public opinion. It’s worthwhile to remember that at the genesis of newspapers in Hawai‘i, they were specifically intended as tools of ideological indoctrination. By the late nineteenth century, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* was the Hawaiian language mouthpiece of the missionary families’ interests (Chapin 1996, 53-58). After the overthrow, it stood explicitly on

“the side supporting the tenure of the [Republic of Hawai‘i]” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1897).<sup>32</sup>

Support from the Hawaiian Gazette Co. and its owners’ close connections to the missionary families’ businesses provided the financial stability for *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* to continue publishing for decades on end and expand its readership widely while independent opposition papers often floundered (Chapin 1996, 53-58).<sup>33</sup>

*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*’s longstanding presence in Hawaiian society was a selling point through which its political stances could be justified.<sup>34</sup> “Ka Nupepa Makua,” an article published in 1895, did this explicitly, defining *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* as “the forefather newspaper, holding this quality with pride and singularity [among all other Hawaiian language newspapers ...] In this way we stand before the people to lead them on the path of a lifestyle of *progress*, true *independence*, and *unashamedness*” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1895b, emphasis original).<sup>35</sup> After describing the specific goals of the publication, the article concludes by relating its political position.

Above all, the *Kuokoa* will consistently and truly support the current Government [Republic of Hawai‘i] with just and fair behavior, and will battle fearlessly to fulfill the goals of the platform of the Republic of Hawai‘i that is establishing itself without doubt or uncertainty[.]

Maluna ae hoi o na mea apau, e kakoo mau ana ke Kuokoa, me ke kuio i ke Aupuni e ku nei i keia wa, ma na hana kaulike a hoopono a e paio ana ia me ka wiwo ole no ka hookeia o ke kahua a ka Repubalika o Hawaii e oni nei ma ka hopohopo ole. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1895b)

---

<sup>32</sup> “Ma ka aoao e kakoo ana i ke Au Nohona Aupuni Repubalika.” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1897)

<sup>33</sup> “Ka Hale Pai Hou o ‘Ke Kilohana Pookela o ka Lahui Hawaii” discusses a new printing house and expansion of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (1895a).

<sup>34</sup> See “Hoike I ka Oiaio no ka Nupepa Kuokoa,” a letter to the editor of the publication from S. H. P. Kalawaiaopuna which praises the newspaper for its longevity and trustworthiness (Kalawaiaopuna 1896).

<sup>35</sup> “Ka nupepa makua, e *keha* mau ana ke *Kuokoa* i keia kulana nona iho—a nona wale no. [...] Ma ia ano no e ku mau aku ai oia imua o keia lahui e alakai ana ia lakou ma ke alahale o ka nohona *holomua*, ka nohona *Kuokoa* oiaio a *hopepe* ole” (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1895b).

Along with its longevity, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*'s use of Hawaiian language was also a strategy of self-promotion which drew its value from the language ideology which connected Hawaiian language to nationalism and the common people. An advertisement for *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa*, the daily publication for *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, ran from February until December 1893, and promoted the newspaper as publishing "only in Hawaiian, not part-Hawaiian and part-English like some other newspapers" (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893c).<sup>36</sup> In *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*'s promotional rhetoric, we can observe the use of the same language discourse that connected Hawaiian language use to Hawaiian identity and nationalism. English language, as implied by the advertisement, is associated with a distancing from the common people and their interests. However, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* tapped into this cultural capital strategically, invoking that capital while pursuing a political agenda that ran counter to the explicit ideological commitments that empowered the language discourse in the first place. To use Hawaiian language in politics, in the courts, or in business at the time was to make an ideological statement about the value of the language, the value of Hawaiian identity, and the value of Hawaiian sovereignty. *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, however, was able to use Hawaiian language subversively, appearing to be ideologically committed in a certain way by its use of Hawaiian language, and benefiting from that appearance, while, in actuality, promoting and supporting political programs and policies that resulted in the continued degradation of Hawaiian rights, autonomy, and the perpetuation of the Hawaiian language.

The ideological commitments of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* were not, however, completely lost on politically engaged individuals of the time, nor was the significance of its capacity to misdirect

---

<sup>36</sup> "He nupepa [...] ma ka olelo Hawaii wale no, aole hapa ma ka namu a me ka olelo Hawaii e like la me kekahi mau nupepa e ae" (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893c).

and misinform its readership.<sup>37</sup> In these politically chaotic times, it was often subject to criticisms in opposition newspapers. After the Organic act of 1900, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* became the Hawaiian language newspaper of the Republican party, which was the continuation of the dominant political interests of the Republic of Hawai‘i. The opposition took the form of the Home Rula party, whose mouthpiece was the newspaper *Home Rula Repubalika*. In its first publication, the newspaper defined its “political stance and role” as “standing in the boxing ring that is the press and fighting through the power of the written word for the equal rights of all of the American citizens living within this Territory without capitulating to the pressures of the wealthy” (*Home Rula Repubalika* 1901).<sup>38</sup> The article expands on the contentious nature of the Hawaiian press at the time, “We are standing ready to do battle with the mouthpieces of the enemies of Hawai‘i—The English language newspapers that are owned by the enemies of the people, and the Hawaiian language newspapers as well who sycophantically serve the people who pay them.”<sup>39</sup>

*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* presents us with a fascinating challenge. With its wide readership and long production period, it has undoubtedly influenced the progression of Hawaiian history. As we have seen, this newspaper typifies the sociolinguistic complexities of 19th and 20th century Hawai‘i and their intrinsic political implications. However, this newspaper has been wholly underexplored in Hawaiian studies and Hawaiian history and has disappeared from general public knowledge. What this study can hope to illuminate is the necessity of further research into

---

<sup>37</sup> See “Mai Pihoihoi ka Manao” for an article responding to doubts about the veracity of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*’s political analyses (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1899).

<sup>38</sup> “[He] kulana kalaiaina e ku aku ai imua o ke kahua mokomoko o ka papa pai a paio aku ma ka mana o ka makakila no ka pono kaulika o na kupa Amerika a pau e noho ana maloko o keia Teritore, me ka nana ole ae i ka mana hookeke o ke kanaka waiwai[...].” (*Home Rula Repubalika* 1901).

<sup>39</sup> “E ku aku ana makou me ka makaukau no ka paio ana me na wahaolelo o ka enemi o na Hawaii—na nupepa namu e noho oni ia ana e na enemi o ka lahui, a me na nupepa Hawaii no hoi, e noho hoopilimeaa ana malalo o ka poe na lakou e hanai mai ana ia lakou.” (*Home Rula Repubalika* 1901).

the political discourse of the newspaper, its changes over time, its financial backing, its criticisms, and its historical impact.

#### *4.1.4 Language Choice and Language Change*

The language discourse by which Hawaiian language use was connected to Hawaiian nationalism and identity also positioned English language use as a choice necessarily made at the expense of Hawaiian language, a choice indicating a distance from that nationalism and identity. John Kauhane, a statesman who served in the government for over a decade, was subject to much criticism after the overthrow for serving in the legislature of the Republic of Hawai‘i, and for being in the pocket of the missionary families.<sup>40</sup> In a section containing snippets of local news, *Ka Oiaio* published criticism relating to Kauhane’s language use in the legislature (*Ka Oiaio* 1895). The snippet read, “Yesterday Kauhane gave a speech in the legislature, and he was heard saying “yes” in English. O the days of senility” (*Ka Oiaio* 1895).<sup>41</sup> The fact the mere exclamation of the word “yes” was singled out as an example of disingenuousness highlights the crucial fact that, in Hawai‘i’s complex multilingual environment, social and political critique was made not merely on the choice of content, but the choice of language itself.

The dichotomy between English language use and Hawaiian language use, as opposed to being a passive reflection of changes in political structure, was a powerful and strategically manipulated tool. This manipulation was achieved both through the discourses, historical narratives, criticisms, and justifications that shaped the language’s social meaning, and through the strategic regulation of its use for political gain. The linguistic boundaries that resulted at the

---

<sup>40</sup> For more on Kauhane and political criticisms against him see *Hawaii Holomua* (1893b,c) and *Pacific Commercial Advertiser* (1907).

<sup>41</sup> “Ma ka la inehinei i haiolelo mua ae ai o Kauhane iloko o keia Kau Ahaolelo, a ua loheia aku kona hoopuna ana ae ‘yes,’ ma ka olelo haole. Ola na la hapuea” (*Ka Oiaio* 1895).

turn of the century contoured and reflected the dynamics of power in society, and thus the choice between English language or Hawaiian language was always understood with reference to the political situation of the time. The most immediately obvious and immanently powerful examples of the political ramifications of this choice are the language of precedence in law, and the language in which the proceedings of the legislative sessions of the Provisional Government, the Republic of Hawai‘i, and the Territory of Hawai‘i would be carried out.

The question of linguistic precedence in matters of law had been debated in Hawai‘i for decades prior to the overthrow (Lucas 2000). Since 1865 however, English language had legal primacy because of an act in the 1859 civil code in which, if there was a “radical and irreconcilable difference between the English and Hawaiian version of any law [...] the English version shall be held binding” (§ 1493). In a letter signed “Hawaii Oiaio” published in *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* on April 24th, 1894, the political implications of this linguistic policy in Hawai‘i’s new government were discussed in detail. In this article we can observe the connection between language change and political strategy, as well as some of the latent linguistic ideologies that held the power to frame shifting linguistic roles.

The article begins by discussing a previous 1888 attempt to secure legal primacy for the Hawaiian language versions of laws and its eventual failure.

Despite support from certain members of the legislature], because of the loss of political control to the Caucasians reared in the foreign English language, the agency of the people who truly championed aloha for the land and for the Hawaiian people was constricted by the power of wealth and by the offices and occupations awarded to legislators as bribes.

No ka lilo o na hooponopono aupuni ana iloko o ka lima o na haole i hookahua ia maluna o ka olelo Enelani malihini, ua opa pu ia ka ikaika hoohana o ka poe i hooikaika maoli no ke aloha i ka aina a me ka lahui kanaka Hawaii e ka mana o ke dala a me na wahi oihana i haawi ia i kekahi poe lunamakaainana ma ke ano kipe. (Hawaii Oiaio 1894)

The author of the article connects linguistic changes to political control even more explicitly as they discuss the implications of the new linguistic policy in the new constitution.

In this way, control of our government has been wrested from the people whose land it is, and Supreme Court Justice Judd can boast that there is no value to the Hawaiian language, and that it will completely disappear.

Pela no i lilo ai na hooponopono ana o ko kakou aupuni mai ka lahui aku nona ka aina, a hiki ai ia Alapaki Lunakanawai Kiekie ke olelo hookano, aole he waiwai o ka olelo Hawaii, a e nalohia loa aku ana ka olelo. (Hawaii Oiaio 1894)

The author of this article shows an acute awareness of a critical aspect of the interplay of linguistic ideology and language policy: the manifestation of a linguistic ideology in policy results in linguistic change that can in turn justify and strengthen that same ideology. For example, the disenfranchisement of the Hawaiian language created changes in its role in political, education, and judicial fields, a changing role that could then be pointed to in order to further justify the language's disenfranchisement. Language use, as opposed to other socio-political features like suffrage, due process, or religious freedoms, is diffuse and integrated with all aspects of the social world. This makes its disenfranchisement particularly powerful and particularly difficult to pinpoint and critique.

After a section critiquing the changing role of language in education, the author continues his discussion of language policy change:

It's true, the lawyers working with the Supreme Court Justices as well as the Circuit Judges may say, the Hawaiian language is not suitable for use when discussing the constitution or for use in the complex legal explanations of legal scholars with knowledge of other countries' governments [...] I will say however with all seriousness that these are merely expressions of derision and greed. [...] It's true, at the time when a Hawaiian thinks of himself as having the necessary English knowledge to be a Supreme Court Judge or a Cabinet Lawyer, those people may indeed say, your English language fluency is not sufficient for these positions.

He mea oiaio, e olelo mai ana paha na loio e lawelawe nei i ka lakou oihana imua o na Lunakanawai Kiekie a me na Luna Kanawai Kaapuni, a pela no hoi me na Lunakanawai i olelo ia ae la; aole i lawa ka olelo Hawaii e ku maluna o ke kahua o na kanawai kumu a

me na wehewehe kanawai hohonu ana a ka poe hohonu o ka ike o na aupuni nui [...] No'u iho, ke olelo nei au me ke kuoo, he mau olelo wale no ia na o ka hooahaaha, a me ka alunu. [...] He mea oiaio, i ka manawa a kekahi kanaka Hawaii i manao ai ua lawa ka ike haole i loko ona, ua hiki iaia ke noho Lunakanawai Kiekie a Loio Kuhina paha, e olelo mai auanei lakou ala, aole i lawa kou ike olelo haole e noho ma keia mau wahi. (Hawaii Oiaio 1894)

The fact of the matter is, the varying levels of linguistic competency in Hawai'i's population had the ability to cleave Hawaiian society in two, and the difficulty for grown adults to reach even a functional level fluency in a language not acquired as a child makes the cleft in society all the more powerful. As English language speakers consolidated their power in the government, English language fluency became an increasingly naturalized requirement for positions of power and influence in Hawaiian society. The linguistic boundaries of access to power that, in the past, may have been a high level of fluency in either Hawaiian or English, were now solely based on English language ability. In "Language and Symbolic Power," Pierre Bourdieu reflects on the ways in which official languages come to dominance, and recognizes in particular how impactful language choice within the political world can be:

In order for one mode of expression among others (a particular language in the case of bilingualism, a particular use of language in the case of a society divided into classes) to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified and the different dialects (of class, region or ethnic group) have to be measured practically against the legitimate language or usage. Integration into a single 'linguistic community', which is a product of the political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relation of linguistic domination. (1991, 45-46)

What both obscured and empowered these relationships of "linguistic domination" were specific language discourses which construed the changing sociolinguistic environment in ways that justified and naturalized the changing linguistic roles and their social implications.

The language to be used in legislative proceedings was an important topic of debate both after the overthrow and after annexation. The following analyses found in the Hawaiian language

newspaper discourse should serve to elucidate both the depth of the political and linguistic awareness of the time, as well as the complexity of the sociolinguistic situation that people navigated. In the year directly following the overthrow, delegates from each county were selected and a constitutional convention was held at the end of May.<sup>42</sup> Newspapers analyzing and criticizing the proceedings of the convention mentioned language use with careful awareness of the political implications. In a section of local news snippets in an 1894 publication of *Ka Leo o ka Lahui*, we find two articles analyzing the implications of a procedural change in the convention, namely that the previous day's journal would be read in English only. One section states, "if we were also at this delegates' gathering, and it was decided that our mother tongue was to be discarded, we would quickly leave our seats, for such a decision would be akin to treating our continued service in the legislature with utter contempt"(*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894b).<sup>43</sup> The second section states the name of the legislator who raised the point and the voting lines of the Hawaiian members of the assembly. It also likens the procedural change to "discrimination against the members who don't speak English, such as Iosepa and Kauhane" (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894b).<sup>44</sup>

After the Organic Act, the question of the language use in the Territorial Legislature was debated intensely. "Ko Kakou Kulana Aupuni Hou" discusses briefly Hawai'i's new status as a territory and its new constitution (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1900a). The article praises broader rights of suffrage and regained access to public fishing areas. However, within the normally pro-establishment newspaper we find a rare criticism of Hawai'i's new political structure.

---

<sup>42</sup> See "Ke Koho Balota Elele" in *Ka Oiaio* (1894).

<sup>43</sup> "Ina o makou kekahi ma keia Aha Elele a hooholo ia ke kapaeia ana o ka makou olelo makuahine, haalele koke makou i ko makou noho; oiai ua like ia me ka hoowahawahaia mai ka noho pu ana aku maloko o ia Aha" (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894b).

<sup>44</sup> "Hoohaahaa ana i na hoa ike ole i ka olelo haole, oia hoi o Iosepa a me Kauhane" (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894b).

There is only one thing that we find fault with in this new bill, the fact that all the activities in the legislature will be conducted solely through English alone. In this way many Hawaiian people suitable to be national spokespersons in the legislature will be blocked from doing so, because our mother language is all they speak.

Hookahi wale no a makou mea i hoahewa ai o loko o keia bila kanawai, oia ka lawelaweia ana o na hana Ahaolelo apau ma ka olelo Beritania wale no. Ma keia ano e akeakea nui ia aku ai kekahi poe kanaka Hawaii kupono e lilo i poe waha olelo lahui no na kanaka iloko o ka ahaolelo, oia nae, o kahi olelo makuahine wale no ka lakou i ike. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1900a)

Comparing this article with another published in the same newspaper only a few months earlier highlights the complex linguistic and political boundaries that people had to navigate. “Na Poe Kupono e Koho ai,” published as a letter from “Opio Hawaii Makee Holomua” in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* on Nov 2nd 1900, listed qualities that voters should look for in senators and representatives. However, even before starting their list of qualities, the author begins the article with a linguistic argument.

Voters must choose people with a fluent command of English, who can comprehend what they read, write correctly and can translate legal language. The activities of that house (the legislature) are not coconuts, nor a time for farming or fishing, but are activities related to law, and comprise law in its entirety.

E pono i na poe koho balota e koho i ka poe ike i ka olelo haole, ike a maopopo, heluhelu a ike i ka manao, a hiki ke kakau a pololei, a i mahele ia mea he kanawai, aole na hana oia hale (Hale Ahaolelo) he mau niu, au mahiai a lawaia; aka, he mau mea pili kanawai, he poo a he hiu no ke kanawai. (Opio Hawaii Makee Holomua 1900)

In a society where English language use afforded access to political, economic, and social capital, Hawaiian-speaking voters were put into a double bind. A Hawaiian-speaking legislator would, by speaking Hawaiian in the political arena, make a meaningful statement about the value of language, Hawaiian identity, and autonomy, but would be institutionally disadvantaged and perhaps less effective at fighting for Native Hawaiians’ rights. An English language legislator might be more effective, but, by speaking English, could be seen as symbolically capitulating to the linguistic/political pressures that furthered the disenfranchisement of Hawaiian speakers.

In Hawai‘i’s complex sociolinguistic landscape, the choices that individuals made about language use were not made merely with regards to language’s role as a tool to enable communication, and thereby create social capital. Languages themselves were assigned symbolic value, and their use, and individuals’ linguistic choices were made in regards to this symbolic value as well. If one were to analyze the Hawaiian sociolinguistic situation on the grounds of the material profit to be gained through ones linguistic behavior, such as political positions or job opportunities available to English speakers, there would be no justifiable reason for one to continue to speak Hawaiian, and the determination of some Native Hawaiians to do so could only seem inscrutable and misplaced. However, the Hawaiian language use held significant symbolic value that, as can be seen so clearly in the case of the criticism of John Kauhane, could have real political implications.

These linguistic boundaries in Hawai‘i around the turn of the century, and the boundaries of power and access that they reflected and engendered can be characterized most generally by the disenfranchisement of Hawaiian language in the political establishment, and the symbolic connection of Hawaiian language use with the discourse of sovereign Hawaiian nationalism. What gave these boundaries their social power and influence was their capacity to hamper or completely inhibit communication. For Hawaiians to fight for their rights in congress, they had to be able to communicate with other members through the medium that the institutions sanctioned. For missionary families to propagate information strategically and take part subversively in the discourse of Hawaiian nationalism they had to use Hawaiian language newspapers to communicate with their audience.

The inability of English and Hawaiian speakers to avail themselves freely of the symbolic capital held in the use of the other’s linguistic code created a field of contestation at the level of

communication. Newspapers, as *the* important communicative media at the turn of the century, played a critical role in this linguistic and political conflict. So far, we've seen their role as a medium for perpetuating or critiquing the dominant linguistic ideologies and their respective language discourses. However, by far the most prominent and striking role of newspapers in the sociolinguistic landscape, which built upon their role as an ideological/discursive medium, was their function as conduits for translation.

#### 4.2 Newspaper Language and Power

Any meaningful discussion of the role that translation played in Hawaiian society within the context of a discursive medium as socio-linguistically complex as the Hawaiian language newspapers requires at least some theoretical consideration of what we mean by “translation,” and what the implications of that definition are. Historically, the study of translation in academia has concerned itself primarily with philosophical questions as to whether translation is possible, as well as prescriptive analyses on how translation should be done. However, in the past 50 years, the traditional relationship between the original text as unchanging exemplar and the translation or “copy” through which the original is faithfully recreated has been turned on its head. Scholars such as Charles Peirce, Jacques Derrida, and Roman Jakobson showed that the “originality” of the original text is only an illusion, and that any single text is only interpretable through reference to a whole host of other texts through which it obtains its meaning (Venuti 2018). The translation, on the other hand, as distinct from its conception as a passive recreation of an original, is a unique social and semiotic production that obtains its meaning from its relationship with the specific matrix of political, historical, and cultural structures in which it is situated. In his introduction to “Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology,” Lawrence Venuti describes the social nature of a translation well:

A text is a heterogeneous artifact, composed of disruptive forms of semiosis like polysemy and intertextuality, but it is nonetheless constrained by the social institutions in which it is produced and consumed, and its constitutive materials, including the other texts that it assimilates and transforms, link it to a particular historical moment. It is these social and historical affiliations that are inscribed in the choice of a foreign text for translation and in the materiality of the translated text, in its discursive strategy and its range of allusiveness for the target-language reader. And it is these affiliations that permit translation to function as a cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, contributing to the formation or subversion of literary canons, affirming or transgressing institutional limits. (Venuti 2018, 9)

While there exists in Hawaiian language newspapers a fascinating and underexplored literary tradition of translated works from around the world, this study specifically explores how translation acted as an integral part of Hawaiian political dynamics at the turn of the 20th century.<sup>45</sup> Exploring the political implications of translation exemplifies this view of translation as a socially productive enterprise, not merely as a reproductive one. As we will see, the translated works in the newspapers, whether from English to Hawaiian or from Hawaiian to English, were uniquely situated in Hawai‘i’s sociopolitical milieu, and played a necessarily different role or function from that of the “original work.” The type of research attempted herein situates and defines translation as a kind of linguistic behavior with a specific social and political value that derives from the linguistic boundaries which impede the flow of important information. The value of information and the linguistic boundaries at the turn of the century which impeded its transmission created a complex web of linguistic and institutional relationships that the English language and Hawaiian language presses mediated through translation.

---

<sup>45</sup> See Kamaoli Kuwada’s PhD dissertation and its subsequent book adaptation for a broader examination of translation in Hawai‘i (2018, 2025). In these works, Kuwada explores the power and influence of translation across all aspects of Hawaiian society throughout the entire sweep of modern Hawaiian history.

#### 4.2.1 Translation in Society

Throughout the 19th century, the proportion of Hawaiian language speakers to English language speakers declined steadily, especially in social domains of power and influence. During this period of linguistic flux, where both languages were associated with some social power and their speakers were vying for control and influence, translation was integral to the function of many social institutions. Verbal translation, or interpretation, was a common occurrence in politics, the courts, as well as in public speeches. The importance of institutionalized translation within 19<sup>th</sup> century Hawai‘i’s legislative proceedings is typified in Mark Twain’s vivid description of Hawaiian lawyer, newspaper editor, and government translator, William P. Ragsdale.

Bill Ragsdale stands up in front of the Speaker's pulpit, with his back against it, and fastens his quick black eye upon any member who rises, lets him say half a dozen sentences and then interrupts him, and repeats his speech in a loud, rapid voice, turning every Kanaka speech into English and every English speech into Kanaka, with a readiness and felicity of language that are remarkable. (Twain 1947, 110-111)

Even after the Organic act of 1900, one of the provisions of which was that the legislature be held in English, translation proved necessary. In fact, the role of translation in the inaugural Territorial Legislature was one of the first procedural points of contention, and the contours of either side of the debate can be glimpsed by exploring some of the newspaper commentaries on the first few days of the proceedings.

[Vice-Speaker] Beckley stood with a point of order. He stated that the Congressional Record could not be authorized and recorded if the English language version could not be translated by a translator that was sworn in. — How thankful are we for the wisdom of this youth in raising an important point. [...] The other wise legislators exclaimed aloud at the pertinence of young member’s point of order. The chair stated that his [the translator’s] swearing-in in Hawaiian would be sufficient because all the members are aware of the translator’s abilities. — What a careless way to proceed! —

Kue mai o Beckley i ka nee ana o na hana imua malalo o na rula. Hoike mai oia, aole i

mana ka hoopaa anao na moolelo o ka Hale ma ka Olelo Beretania ina aole i unuhiia na hana ma ka Olelo Beretania e ka Mahale Olelo i hoohikiia. –Nui ka mahalo i ka naauao o keia Opio ma keia ninau ano nui. Ka hana ia a makou na Opio, a e ike i ka Hawaii! Hooho like na lunamakaainana naauao i ke kupono loa o keia kua a ka lunamakaainana opio. Hoike mai ka Noho, ua kupono no kana hoohiki ana ma ka olelo Hawaii no ka mea, ua maopopo no i na poe a pau ka makaukau o ka Mahele Olelo. –He kapulu keia hana! —  
(*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901a)

While the exact nature of Vice-Speaker Frederick Beckley’s point of order is difficult to ascertain (it seems to be related to the translator not being sworn-in in both English and Hawaiian), the fact of its mention in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*’s publishing of the proceedings of the house, the newspaper’s editorial commentary in an article that is otherwise a cut-and-dry list of the proceedings, and the reported reaction of the other members of the house all point towards the significance of translation within the legislature, and its social relevance at-large. The continuing importance of the role of the translator within the legislature even after America’s ascension in Hawai‘i also reveals the continuing relevance and power of Hawaiian language speakers at the time. This role was not, however, taken for granted as a necessary part of the functioning of the congressional proceedings as it had been in the days of the Hawaiian monarchy. The divisiveness of the question of language in the first days of the congress is echoed in Ronald Williams Jr.’s study of the first territorial legislature.

Governor Dole insisted that the Organic Act clearly mandated the sole use of English during official business—a significant problem for those native representatives who did not speak English. The fact that Hawaiian was being spoken had been reported by the secretary of the Territory, Henry E. Cooper, who had been sent by Dole to observe the actions of the House and had set up his own desk on that body’s floor. Rep. Beckley protested the presence of Cooper as an infringement on the required separation of the distinct branches of government; he reminded Dole that the House already had a secretary who recorded everything and sent the transcripts to the governor. The presence of Cooper was particularly galling to many of the native legislators. (Williams Jr. 2015, 26)

Proceedings of the Territorial Senate published in Hawaiian language newspapers record the political lines through which the debate about translation occurred.

The question of the translator was raised. There was much argumentation from the Republicans about this request, and as the Home Rula members were the majority, it was decided to choose a translator.

Lawe ia mai ka noonoo ana i Mahele Olelo. He nui ka hoopaapaa o na Repubalika no keia noi, a oiai, o na Home Rula ka hapanui malaila, ua hooholoia e koho no i Mahele Olelo. (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1901)

There was much digression from the activities of the day because of the translation of language from English to Hawaiian and from Hawaiian to English. Some Senators were incensed due to the inaccurate translation of their requests and explanations.

He nui ka loloiahili o na hana mamuli o ka unuhiia o na olelo ma ka olelo Beritania a i ka Hawaii, a mai ka olelo Hawaii a i ka Beritania. Huhu no kahi mau Senatoa i ka unuhi pono ole ia o ka lakou noi me na hoakaka. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901b)

The lines dividing opinion on the role of an interpreter in congress, while at first glance seem to be procedural concerns about time wasted or issues of communication, are in fact concerns of political power and influence. Given Dole's mandate for English language use within the legislature, the presence or absence of a translator on the house floor had direct implications for the linguistic behavior to be authorized within the political establishment. Bourdieu further shows that "the structure of the space of expressive styles reproduces in its own terms the structure of the differences which objectively separate conditions of existence," meaning essentially that linguistic differences reflect social differences (1991, 57). The language legitimized in the legislature, therefore, directly affected the representative freedom afforded to certain social groups in Hawai'i by way of their differing linguistic competencies.

The Home Rula Party, a direct extension of the opposition political associations established during the Provisional Government and the Republic of Hawai'i, was the political embodiment of Hawaiian voters' continuing interest in independent Hawaiian nationalism. The Home Rula

majority in the House and the Senate made way for a “shaping of Hawai‘i’s future [that] could take a decided turn toward a native agenda” (Williams Jr. 2015). The unapologetic ideological sovereignty of the Home Rule party’s platform is reflected in their stance towards issues about language as well. Native Hawaiian voters, unburdened by the property requirements of the previous decade, could now empower a party that reflected their concerns, and their efforts to reinstate some of the Hawaiian language’s previous social status were invigorated by the political opportunities that the Territorial legislature offered. In the first six months of 1900, before the first territorial legislature was held, many Hawaiian language newspapers published articles explaining to the newly enfranchised voters what the implications of Hawai‘i’s new political structure were. In these articles we find that these renewed rights of representation that many native Hawaiians hadn’t known since 1887 translated into new opportunities for linguistic freedoms.

In that sense, within Hawai‘i’s new political constellation, the contours of many institutions’ linguistic boundaries were open anew for contestation. “Aole i Kaupale ia,” published April 14th, 1900, in *Ke Aloha Aina* takes part in the active debates as to whether the legislative appointees representing Hawaiian speakers could be monolingual Hawaiian speakers or if they should be bilingual. Responding derisively to those advocating for bilingual representatives, *Ke Aloha Aina* writes:

Auē! We had thought that there were no English language requirements [for legislators] in Cullom’s bill,<sup>46</sup> the same bill that enshrined voting rights for both English and Hawaiian-speaking people. Both languages have equal responsibility and rights. There is no place in which the admission of those who don’t speak English in the legislature is considered improper.

Auwe! Ke kuhi nei ka makou aohe wae ike namu a Amelika e hana mai la no ka poe

---

<sup>46</sup> Referring to American Senator Shelby M. Cullom, appointee to the committee formed under the Newlands Resolution to establish a territorial government for Hawai‘i.

Hawaii iloko o ka Bila Kanawai a Cullom, kai no hoi e haawi ia ana ka pono koho i ka poe ike namu olelo Beretania a me ka poe olelo Hawaii. Ua like a like ko laua kuleana. Aohe wahi e kaupale ana I ke kupono ole [sic] ke komo ana o ka poe ike namu ole iloko o ka Ahaolelo. (1900)

Interpretations of the Organic Act such as these, the new freedoms it offered previously disenfranchised Hawaiians, and the possible ways in which these freedoms could be capitalized upon and institutionalized were common occurrences in the newspapers in the first few years of the new century.<sup>47</sup> Re-empowering the Hawaiian language in politics and the education system were relevant concerns for the electorate and were reflected in the political platforms of the time (Williams Jr. 2015). The Republican Party, however, intent on consolidating control of Hawai‘i government along racial lines, also employed the power of language policy to inhibit the power and influence of Hawaiian language speakers. In that sense, debates around translation were much more than a question about bureaucratic procedure. What they represented, within the context of the field of politics, were the struggles between English speakers and Hawaiian speakers for a hegemonic historical narrative. To exclude Hawaiian language use in the legislature was to exclude certain historical narratives and certain ideological discourses from relevancy in a place of political decision making. With the power of section 44 of the Organic Act on the side of the Republicans, which did indeed require that all legislative proceedings be conducted in English, the use of English language in the legislature had an official institutional primacy. The use of Hawaiian language, which necessitated translation, would then be secondary, and could be construed as financially costly and a significant waste of time.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> See “Ke Alakai Koho Balota,” Joseph Poepoe’s letter published in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* explaining voting, citizenship, and other political concerns specifically for the benefit of Hawaiian language speakers (Poepoe 1900). See also “He Mau Olelo Hoakaka” for John Bush’s similar letter published in *Ke Aloha Aina* (Bush 1900). Moses Palau also had two letters published that discussed Hawai‘i’s new government and the implications of the new linguistic policy (Palau 1900a, b).

<sup>48</sup> See “Ke Kanawai Alakai o ka Panalaaui o Hawaii,” an analysis of the repercussions of the legislature being held in English (Ka Nupepa Kuokoa 1900b). See also “Ka Hana o ka Hale,” which contains criticisms of Hawaiian

Privileging English language use in the legislature was not, however, an entirely new phenomenon in 1900. From the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893 until the Organic Act, the political control obtained by Hawai‘i’s wealthy business owners afforded them the freedom to shift institutional language norms towards English language primacy. Control over translations was a major method through which this occurred. The year after the overthrow of the monarchy, The Republic of Hawai‘i held elections for legislative representatives, one stipulation of which was that voters were required to swear never to, “either directly or indirectly, encourage or assist in the restoration or establishment of a Monarchical form of Government in the Hawaiian Islands” (Lydecker 1918, 210, 223).<sup>49</sup> Later that year a gathering of the delegates was held. The changes in translational norms at this meeting were a topic of significant commentary in the Hawaiian language newspapers.

Because President Dole’s speech was left untranslated, such is the discrimination against Iosepa Kauhane and the other Hawaiian members.

Mamuli o ka unuhi ole ia ana o ka haiolelo a Peresiden Dole; [sic] ma ka olelo Hawaii, oia ka hoowahawaha mua loa ia o Iosepa Kauhane a me na hoa Hawaii e ae. (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894a).

Dole’s speech wasn’t translated into Hawaiian, and Joseph [~~and~~] Kauhane and some of the other Hawaiian members of the delegates meeting were blundering around, disappointed at their inability to understand the nature of his foreign speech”

Aole i unuhiia mai ma ka olelo Hawaii ka haiolelo a Dole, a o Iosepa a me Kauhane a me kekahi mau hoa Hawaii e ae o ka Aha Elele ke hoaa ana me ka hoka nui no ka maopopo ole o ke ano o kana haiolelo wai poha ia lakou (Ka Leo o ka Lahui 1894a).

At the very beginning, Kolekaaka [pejorative nickname for Dole] and his associates’ contempt for the Hawaiians in congress could be observed. His speech was read in English and not in Hawaiian, nor was there any attempt at translation at that time. Only much afterwards was a translation given, and that is how we obtained a copy. This is just as we have said for a long time, and we are clearly seeing it today. “You damned

---

language use in the legislature as well as a list of the legislative expenses, pertinently listing the costs of translation (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1901b).

<sup>49</sup> See “Ka Hoohiki Ana” for the English version of the voting pledge (*Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894c).

niggers” may end up being the common utterance in the future.

I kinohi no, ikeia ko ka Hawaii hoowahawahaia e Kolekaaka ma iloko o ka Ahaelele. Heluheluia mai ka haiolelo ma ka olelo Enelani, aole hoi ma ka olelo Hawaii, ole loa no hoi ka unuhiia ae ia wa. Aia nae a mahope loa iho, haawiia aku na kope i unuhiia a i paiia, a pela hoi i loa ai ia makou. O ka makou no ia i olelo kahiko ai, a ike lea ia ihola hoi la. “Iu dami niga!” Oia aku ana paha ka puana no keia mua aku. (Ka Makaainana 1894b).

Dole’s speech set the stage for the rest of the delegates’ gathering and began the official legislative process of the Republic of Hawai‘i. The content of Dole’s speech, published in the *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, aimed to provide a political narrative that justified the overthrow in 1893 and the legitimacy of the new provisional government, much of which was couched in political rhetoric expressly valuing “the civil progress of the state,” “the principle of representation by the people,” an American republican political structure in which the overthrow was caused by “the revolt of the deposed Queen against the organic law, whence [came] her sole authority” (*The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1894). However, the political reality that this rhetoric cloaked was the continued disenfranchisement of the native Hawaiian majority population, an obfuscation only possible because of a racial ideology that defined the Hawaiian society as a “nation which had made progress in civilization,” but progress made only because the part of the nation not responsible for that progress is barred from “drag[ging] the other part back to barbarism” (*The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1894).<sup>50</sup>

The commentary in the Hawaiian Language newspapers shows that the language in which the speech was communicated was as important and meaningful as the content of the speech itself. The choice to leave Dole’s speech untranslated revealed the hypocrisy of Dole’s subversion of democratic ideals and his disregard for Hawaiian people’s political agency, as it

---

<sup>50</sup> See “Weheia ka Ahaelele” for the Hawaiian language translation of Dole’s opening speech (*Ka Makaainana* 1894a).

immediately reflected the previously mentioned racial divide with a communicative divide in his audience. This division split the legislative representatives, and, symbolically, their constituents, between those whose linguistic knowledge afforded them a place of value and those whose linguistic knowledge disqualified them. The imbalance associated with one language receiving a privileged place of primacy over another language in a multilingual society was not at all lost on political actors of the time, as attested to by Congressman Hanuna's a poignant retort in the 1896 sitting of the Republic of Hawai'i Legislature.

Hanuna requested that the report [on the cholera outbreak] be translated into Hawaiian and printed. Bond and Rycroft objected to this request with the reason that there was nothing in the report of any value to Hawaiians. Hanuna responded, "How would it be if this report was in Hawaiian, and the members without Hawaiian language fluency wanted to translate this report into English?"

Noi o Hanuna e unuhiia ka hoike [ma'i kolela] ma ka olelo Hawaii a paia. Kue o Bona a me Raikarofa i keia noi, ma ke ano aole he mau mea ano nui iloko o ka hoike e waiwai ai na kanaka Hawaii. Olelo o Hanuna, Pehea la ina ma ka olelo Hawaii keia hoike, e makemake ana no anei na hoa ike ole i ka olelo Hawaii e unuhi ole ia keia hoike ma ka olelo Enelani? (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1896b)

What we are beginning to see is that translation fit into Hawai'i's political contestations for ideological and political hegemony in a very specific way. The primary and explicit goal of the Provisional Government and the Republic of Hawai'i was to bring about Hawai'i's annexation by America as soon as possible. Critical to this goal was the Republic of Hawai'i's appearance as a legitimate form of government, contiguous to some degree with the previous government, with political values and institutions compatible with American political sensibilities. With control over Hawai'i's economy and, after 1893, Hawai'i's government, Hawai'i's political leaders could certainly have instituted a more regimented, explicitly monolingual approach by, say, requiring English language fluency for legislators and by removing the position of the government translator. To do so, however, would shatter the illusion of democratic

representation, create significant public unrest, and would go directly against the historical/political narrative that had been perpetuated in which monarchical rule was despotic and backward, and democratic government was the path of equity and progress because of its commitment to popular representation. In the last decade of the 19th century, translation facilitated communication between people, ideas, and discourses in a society where historical and political truths were constantly being reshaped. Understanding its use, characteristics, and repression is critical to understanding the political and social dynamics of that time. Along with verbal translation, textual translation also played a fascinating and complicated role in Hawaiian social and political life.

#### *4.2.2 Translation in the Newspapers*

Given how ubiquitous translation was in many different venues of Hawaiian social life, it is no surprise that it was a prominent and unique aspect of the function of the press in Hawaiian society. Despite the fact that this study did not seek out translation as a specific topic of study, the results dictated its inclusion, as a significant portion of the articles surveyed in this study were translations of English language speeches, translations of English language newspaper articles, or were discussions and analyses of English or Hawaiian translations.<sup>51</sup> The intertextual nature of these articles about translation is extremely complex, and a full analysis of the role of translation in Hawaiian politics is far beyond the scope of this study.

In the first few years following the overthrow, many discussions were held between representatives of the American government and political interests in the Hawaiian islands, and the reports and policies generated therein had major political ramifications for Hawai‘i (Daws

---

<sup>51</sup> Of the roughly 500 articles deemed relevant from the sample, about 150, or one third, were related to translation in the ways mentioned above.

1974). The fact that these reports were always written solely in English created a scenario in which translation, non-translation, and the manipulation of translation were at the forefront of Hawai‘i’s political landscape. A series of translations and analyses published in late 1893 surrounding the arrival of Commissioner Willis, the envoy sent by American President Cleveland to obtain amnesty for the Provisional Government and to demand the restoration of the monarchy, exemplify the kind of sociolinguistic complexity that Hawai‘i’s multilingual society engendered. Responding to *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa*’s publication of a translation of Commissioner Willis’s report to President Dole, *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* published a full page critique, much of which focused on perceived inaccuracies in the translation.<sup>52</sup>

Why did you inaccurately translate the speech of Commissioner Willis before President Dole, hiding the important words that Willis spoke in English, ‘Island Realm,’<sup>53</sup> defined in Hawaiian as islands reigned by a monarch. [...] And why did you hide and leave untranslated these English words in Hawaiian, “equal and Sovereign nations”<sup>54</sup> in the fourth section[...]

No ke aha la oe i unuhi kapakahi ai i ka haiolela [sic] a ke kuhina Willis imua o Peresidena Dole, a huna oe i keia mau huaolelo koikoi a Willis i hoopuka ai ma ka olelo Enelani, oia keia: “Island realm,” ka mokupuni i noho moi ia, ma ka olelo Hawaii. [...] A no ke aha la hoi oe i hunakele loa ai a unuhi ole oe i keia mau huaolelo Enelani ma ka olelo Hawaii? Oia hoi keia: “equal and Sovereign nations” ma ka mahele 4. (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* 1893)

The author of this critique also provides his own translations of the relevant sections of Willis’s speech, which we can contrast with the translation published in *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa*. Indeed, the words “Island Realm” are reproduced in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*’s translation as “aupuni mokupuni,”<sup>55</sup> while *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*’s alternate translation “mokupuni i

---

<sup>52</sup> *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* and *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* were the daily publications of *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* and *Ke Aloha Aina* respectively.

<sup>53</sup> “Island Realm” is in English in the original.

<sup>54</sup> “Equal and Sovereign nations” is in English in the original.

<sup>55</sup> Literally, “island government”, or, “island nation”.

noho moi ia”<sup>56</sup> stresses the monarchical connotation of the word “realm” (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* 1893). Willis’s report was inaccessible in its original English form to the monolingual Hawaiian majority, as was the context and broader English language discourse through which the political connotations of the word “realm” could be interpreted. For the Hawaiian-speaking majority, the possibly enormous implications of Willis’s remarks for their nation, rights, and livelihood could only be grasped through translation.

Because of the “value” or socio-political relevance that Willis’s remarks held, the newspapers could use translation as a means to rework or represent them in a form conducive to achieving their political goal. In the case of *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa*, to persuade the Hawaiian language readers that annexation was inevitable and beneficial, and in the case of *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*, to assuage readers’ fears that their country’s independence was lost forever and to expose their manipulation. The “goals” of these translations were as related to political motivations as they were to the economic motivations of the newspapers. The second phrase, “equal and Sovereign nations” is, in fact, not found in any of the English language versions of Willis’s remarks, and the section being referred to instead reads “the great family of free nations” (DeWitt 1896, 179). *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*’s alternate translation of this phrase is “ka ohana nui o ka lanakila, ke kaulike o na lahuikanaka o ke aliiaimoku,” and seems to spring from a skewed reading of the word “sovereign” which the translator takes to refer to “royalty” or “aliiaimoku,” rather than independence and authority (*Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* 1893).<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Literally, “island ruled by a monarch”.

<sup>57</sup> The Hawaiian language translations for the English phrase “the great family of free nations” in both *Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina* and *Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa* which use the seemingly unrelated Hawaiian terms lanakila, kaulike, and kū’oko’a, may, in actuality, have been trying to capture the English political connotations of the word “free.”

To further complicate the matter, the version of Willis's remarks published in *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser (PCA)*, the English language newspaper aligned with the interests of Hawai'i's business elite, had its own interpretive changes. The *PCA* writes of Willis' exchange with Dole, "To 'your' government he says to President Dole, and adds, 'In doing this, I am directed by the President to give renewed assurances of the friendship [...]" (*The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1893). In actuality, Willis's remarks were directed to Dole himself, and not explicitly to Dole's government, and the single word "your" which the *PCA* quotes and attributes to Willis referring to Dole seems to be from an earlier sentence in which Willis announces his delivery of President Cleveland's letter into "your [Dole's] hands" (Willis n.d., emphasis my own).

Commissioner Willis's reports and mission in Hawai'i were of paramount importance to those invested in Hawaiian politics, and the many communications between Willis, U.S. President Cleveland, U.S. Secretary of State Walter Gresham, Dole, and Lili'uokalani reveal how tentative and contingent the sovereignty of the Hawaiian state was upon the communications of just a few people. For the tens of thousands of citizens whose country and rights hung in the balance, the information that these communications held was also extremely important. The newspapers, as the media through which this information was disseminated and contextualized, held significant power in shaping the social understanding of the nation, and did so in strategic ways. The English language primacy of the political correspondences and the financial support afforded to the English language newspapers gave English language publications a significant advantage in their efforts to sway public opinion. However, the association that Hawaiian language use had with nationalism gave Hawaiian language publications their own significant social relevance and power. In addition, the same linguistic

boundaries that were used to mitigate and diminish Hawaiian language speakers' political power could be used subversively by Hawaiian language speakers to hide important information.

By 1894 the Provisional Government had become the Republic of Hawai'i, but the ultimate fate of Hawai'i's sovereignty was far from sealed. In July of that year, Lili'uokalani secretly sent Samuel Parker, H. A. Widemann, John Adams Cummins, and Major William T. Seward to Washington D.C. in order to meet in person with Secretary of State Gresham and President Cleveland (*Ka Makaainana* 1894c). A telegram was received from the envoys in August 1894 and was published and commented on by multiple Hawaiian language newspapers.

THE RESPONSE RECEIVED BY TELEGRAPH OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

Washington, August 3rd; 1894

To \*\*\*\*\* Esq.

Honolulu

Endeavors have gone well. Gresham has been seen, tomorrow to see the President.

Yours, \*\*\*\*\*

These sentences above were originally sent in Hawaiian by telegraph in Washington. Thus, foreigners could not understand the meaning of the message from the far-reaching Hawaiians.

KA PANE MA KE TELEGARAPA MAI NEI A KE KOMISINA

Wasinetona Augate 3rd; 1894.

Ia \*\*\*\*\* Esq.

Honolulu

Holopono ka hana. Ua ike ia Gresham, apopo ike ia Peresidena.

Owau no \*\*\*\*\*

O keia mau hopuna olelo ma luna ae ua kakauia no e ke Teleagarapa [sic] ma Wasinetona ma ka olelo Hawaii pono. No laila, ike ole kau haole i ka manao o keia ano olelo o Hawaii imi loa. (*Ka Oiaio* 1894, *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* 1894b)

In *Ka Makaainana*, the same letter was published with the sender and recipient identified, along with further information about the surreptitious nature of their mission and message.

Washington, August 3rd; 1894

W. H. Rickard—

Honolulu

Endeavors have gone well. Gresham has been seen, tomorrow to see the President.

W. T. Seward

[...] The message was sent in Hawaiian, possibly so that people there couldn't understand the meaning. It has also been reported that a telegraph was received by the illegitimate government that [said] the envoys had not been seen by Commissioner Gresham [...] Those blundering, insignificant people were happy for no good reason. Yes, their blundering was for naught, for here is the correct message received as a blessing for the people.

Washington, August 3rd; 1894

W. H. Rickard—

Honolulu

Holopono ka hana. Ua ike ia Gresham. Apopo ike Pelekikena.

W. T. Seward

[...] Ma ka olelo Hawaii i hoounaia mai ai, i hiki ole ai paha hoi i ko o poe ke hoomaopopo i ke ano. Ua lono pu ia mai nei ua loa he telegarama i ke Aupuni o na oehaa aohe na Elele i ike ia mai e Kuhina Nui Geresehama [...] Ua hauoli makehewa ae na poe olalau a mailuilu haalele loa. Ae, makehewa loa io no ia olalau e ana, oiai, eia ae no ka lono pololei i loa mai no ka pomaikai o ka lahui. (*Ka Makaainana* 1894a)

While Lili'uokalani's envoys were ultimately unsuccessful in their attempts to secure assurances of the restoration of Hawai'i's sovereignty, their communications and the analyses they spawned in the Hawaiian newspapers show another level of sociolinguistic complexity at this pivotal moment in Hawaiian history. While the boundaries in communication that Hawaiian speakers encountered in the late 19th century presented difficulties and made the special knowledge of a translator a political necessity, those same communicative boundaries could be used strategically by Hawaiian speakers to their benefit. In addition to using these language boundaries subversively, Hawaiian language speakers also benefits in transgressing these boundaries strategically. In 1897, the Makaainana Printing House published "An Accurate Version of Historical Truths," which sought to detail the historical background and details of the

overthrow, and “to speak the truth from the side of those who suffered by the changes of 1887 and 1893” (Makaainana Printing House 1897). In a short news segment in *Ka Makaainana* in April of 1897, the newspaper responded to readers’ concerns about the language in which the book was published.

When we published the book “Historical Truths” in English, there were many people who said [“]why was this book not published in the native language of the land[?]” We answered, [“]Our hard work would not be justified, and the majority of people would not be benefited.[”] There are great inaccuracies in the English [narrative] that are being spread in other countries. Maybe [in this way] there will be some benefit, because here we are on the outside just waiting for some good news, if there is good news to be had. // However, given our hard work, we are glad to say that there is great desire for it in Washington [...] If it was translated into our native language, it would be akin to hiding some wealth with the idea that some benefit is to be had for those here in Hawai‘i, the place where the activities related to the overthrow of the original government are already known.

Ia makou i hoopuka ai i “Na Oiaio Moolelo” ma ka olelo namu, ua lehulehu na poe i olelo mai no keaha la hoi ka mea i hoopuka ole ia ai ma ka olelo oiwi o ka aina nei. Ua pane makou aohe e hoi ke poho a me ka luhi, a aole no hoi e pomaikai ana ka hapanui. He hewa ka ma ka olelo namu, hele nui aku i ko na aina e, malia o loaa mai he wahi pono iki, oiai, eia kakou i waho e nana aku nei no kahi pono e loaa mai ana, ke loaa io mai nae hoi. // O ka makou ae la nae hoi ia i hana ai, a ua haoli hoi makou e haike [sic] ae ua nui ka makemake ia ma Wasinetona [...] A ina hoi i unuhi ia ma ka olelo oiwi, ua like no ia me ka huna ana i ka waiwai a me ka pomaikai i manaio ia e loaa mai ana iloko nei o ka aina, kahi no hoi i maopopo lea ai o na mea a pau i hanaia a kahulihia ke aupuni kumu. (*Ka Makaainana* 1897b)

In this case we observe Hawaiian language speakers’ careful understanding and strategic manipulation of the linguistic landscape to influence opinion over language boundaries. These strategic moves indicate a keen understanding of the power of historical narratives, and the role that language boundaries played in insulating certain powerful ideological discourses from each other.

It is important to mention that while these language boundaries were important sociolinguistic features of 19th century Hawai‘i and certainly influenced the contours of the

power inequities that still persist in Hawai‘i today, they were not the be-all and end-all separator of peoples. Relationships of community, fealty, and respect surpassed these boundaries in everyday life when circumstances arose that necessitated it, as is illustrated by a striking story reported in March of 1897. At that time, Lili‘uokalani had been released from her imprisonment in ‘Iolani Palace and was living in Massachusetts with her husband’s family and Julius A. Palmer, her personal secretary and longtime friend. In March of that year, newspapers reported on a plot to assassinate the queen using poison.<sup>58</sup> According to reports in the Hawaiian language newspapers corroborated by their own anonymous sources, Palmer had received a frantic phone call from someone speaking Hawaiian, and not being a Hawaiian speaker, he transcribed the words spoken onto a piece of paper and brought it to the queen. The queen immediately recognized the meaning and connected it with other letters she had received in the previous weeks that Lorrin Thurston was traveling by steamer to Washington to assassinate her (*Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a). No other mention in any work on Hawaiian history could be found about these rumors of an attempt at the queen’s assassination, and no claims about their veracity can be made here.<sup>59</sup> What can be said is that the linguistic boundaries that so impactfully shaped Hawaiian society could be passed through so easily by Palmer because of the individual choices and interpersonal relationships of respect and fealty he had made. The linguistic boundaries discussed herein are first and foremost a social hermeneutic tool, and while we can certainly say that they impacted individuals’ lives, the power to transgress, perpetuate, and leverage these boundaries also rested solely in those individuals.

---

<sup>58</sup> See “E Powa i Ke Alii” and “He Lono Puuwai Eleele” for the Hawaiian language reporting (*Ka Makaainana* 1897a, *Ke Aloha Aina* 1897a). See also “Ex Queen Gets Exited Over Telephone Messages” for the English language report (*The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1897a).

<sup>59</sup> *The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* ridiculed and debased the rumors in their opinion columns “Jule Was Roasted” and “Red Handed Assasination” (*The Pacific Commercial Advertiser* 1897b, 1897c).



## 5. CONCLUSION

The battle for control over Hawai‘i, while punctuated by events of physical violence such as the Bayonet Constitution of 1887, the overthrow of 1893, and the counter revolution of 1895, was primarily a battle for ideological supremacy to be achieved through a hegemonic historical narrative. The changes that took place in Hawai‘i in the century after Captain Cook’s arrival were so cataclysmic as to require historical narratives that could subsume and interpret the extremely complex and ever unfolding social upheaval. These narratives were extraordinarily powerful and were always invested in political projects aimed at shaping Hawai‘i’s future. This battle was waged for decades in the legislature and in the courts, but took place especially through newspapers, the medium by which the public could be most pervasively affected. The issue of linguistic difference in Hawai‘i, its capacity to bound ideology or to subversively perpetuate it, represents an essential, constitutive, and understudied aspect of Hawaiian social and political history. From a broader perspective, the social, political, and linguistic history of Hawai‘i offers a unique and fascinating chance to explore further questions about the nature of language, ideology, and political power, the conclusions of which may illuminate complex sociolinguistic situations around the world.

This project has aimed to elucidate the power of language discourses and linguistic ideologies in Hawai‘i and the ways in which they were perpetuated and criticized. We find that the missionary and business elite were able to, through their ownership of Hawaiian language newspapers, disseminate a language discourse in which English was associated with a natural and inevitable historical ‘progress’. The social capital that English language use could create for its speakers could then be interpreted through that framework. In reality, the social capital to be found through English language use was engendered by a campaign of “linguicide,” wherein the

Hawaiian language was systematically deinstitutionalized from the domains of education, government, law, and the media (Day 1985). That the missionary elite required Hawaiian language newspapers, however, highlights the fact that the Hawaiian language held its own social relevance and power. Native Hawaiians were able to use this power strategically to criticize, deconstruct, and subvert the political power and ideological formations of the elite.

As is evident from the Hawaiian histories of Kuykendall, Daws, and Shutz, the powerful historical narratives of the missionary descendants that found hegemony at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and crystallized in the early 20<sup>th</sup> were perpetuated throughout the remainder of the century, and only at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century did these narratives come to find meaningful criticism in the university. As the genesis of the Hawaiian language revitalization movement in the 1970s was coeval with this critical analysis of dominant historical discourses, we may begin to intimate, based on the interplay of linguistic difference and historical narratives expounded upon in this project, that these two trends were inherently connected. This perspective, which emphasizes the historical and political implications of the Hawaiian language revitalization movements aligns itself well with the conclusions drawn from this study: that languages present themselves as boundaries to communication, and thereby boundaries to ideology, and that those boundaries can be manipulated strategically to extend, perpetuate, or subvert political power.

The sociolinguistic boundaries described in this study and the language discourses and ideologies that framed them were powerful political tools, and they shaped the contours of power in Hawaiian society throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. This study focused only on a short nine-year span in Hawaiian history and can therefore only make certain narrow conclusions about the ways in which language and politics were intertwined during this time. However, what can be more broadly extrapolated is to say that language has been an issue integrated with the processes of

power in Hawai‘i from the level of the broadest political campaigns down to the most granular of political action. It would be shortsighted then to conceptualize contemporary Hawaiian language revitalization merely as an academic experiment or an attempt at cultural preservation. Hawaiian language revitalization, and, indeed, any language revitalization movement must be viewed with reference to the political landscape from which it emerged.

“Ho‘ōla ‘ōlelo,” commonly translated as “language revitalization” was a topic of discussion in Hawaiian language newspapers as late as 1936 and was always mentioned with reference to the political climate of the time. In these Hawaiian language newspaper articles, we can find the nascent political sentiment from which the unlicensed Hawaiian immersion preschools that birthed the modern Hawaiian revitalization movement emerged almost 50 years later:

If we cannot get assistance from the government, who then will provide that assistance? There is but one answer, we must take it upon ourselves, the Hawaiian people, to do these things. We will be the ones to build these schools, and we will be the ones to pay the teachers. [...] We cannot delay on this issue, for the people who are capable of teaching are all dying. Before all the capable people disappear, this work must be done. (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1922)

Ina aole e loa ana mai ke aupuni mai na kokua ana, a laila na wai e kokua mai? Hookahi no pane, na kakou pono no, e ka lahui Hawaii, e hana i keia mau mea; na kakou no e kukulu i na hale kula, a na kakou no e uku i na kumu kula. [...] Aole e hiki e hoopanee ia keia kumuhana, no ke kumu ke pau aku nei na kanaka kupono i ke ao i ka make. Ma mua o ka hele pau loa ana o na kanaka kupono, e hana koke ia keia hana.

While Hawaiian immersion education and certain aspects of the revitalization movement can now find some support from the state government, this support was gained gradually and through significant political conflict and compromise (Kawai‘ae‘a et al. 2006). Efforts to further Hawaiian language revitalization still face criticism and significant economic and bureaucratic bottlenecks. Both the institutional encumbrances that revitalization efforts face, as well as the rhetoric that characterize the movement as contrived, futile, or disruptive find their antecedents

in the political manipulation of language as described in this study. The long and complex political history of the Hawaiian language must be taken into account when discussing the Hawaiian language revitalization movement and its future.

## 6. WORKS CITED

- Alexander, Willam DeWitt.. *History of Later Years of the Hawaiian Monarchy*. Public Domain. 1896. [https://issuu.com/helpscommunications/docs/history\\_later\\_years\\_monarchy](https://issuu.com/helpscommunications/docs/history_later_years_monarchy).
- An Accurate Version of Historical Truths..* Honolulu: Makaanana Printing House. 1897. <http://www.punawaiola.org/es6/index.html?path=/Collections/Kahn/HISTR1897001.pdf>
- Arista, Noelani. *The Kingdom and the Republic: Sovereign Hawai'i and the Early United States*. America in the Nineteenth Century. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019.
- Balutski, Brandi Jean Nalani. "The Colonial Campaign for English Medium Education." MA Thesis. University of Hawai'i. 2011.
- Beamer, Kamanamaikalani. "Na Wai ka Mana? 'Ōiwi Agency and European Imperialism in the Hawaiian Kingdom" PhD Diss. University of Hawai'i. 2008.
- Bickerton, Derek, and William H. Wilson. "Pidgin Hawaiian." In *Pidgin and Creole Languages: Essays in Memory of John E. Reinecke*, edited by Glenn G. Gilbert. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1987.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1991.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc Wacquant, eds. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Repr. Cambridge: Polity Pr, 1992.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. 1. publ. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge u.a: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2012.
- Bush, John. "He Mau Olelo Hoakaka." *Ke Aloha Aina*, September 8, 1900.
- Cabral, Jason. "He Kālailaina i nā Kāhulu pepeke Pike Ki'a a Waila ho'i o ka 'Ōlelo Hawai'i a me ka Ili 'ana o ia mau Kāhulu Pepeke i loko o ka Moololo 'o Kalapana." PhD Diss. University of Hawai'i. 2016.
- . "He Kālailaina o ke Kāhulu Pepeke Painu me ke Kāhulu Pepeke Kālele 'Ākena a me ka Ili 'ana o ia mau Kāhulu Pepeke i loko o nā Mo'olelo 'o Kalapana a me Kaluaiko'olau." MA Thesis. University of Hawai'i. 2004.
- Chapin, Helen. *Shaping History: The Role of Newspapers in Hawai'i*. University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.
- Conboy, Martin. *The Language of Newspapers: Socio-Historical Perspectives*. Advances in Sociolinguistics. London: Continuum, 2010.

- Damas, Frank E. "Pale 'o Luna, Pale 'o Lalo: He Kālalaina i nā Hi'ohi'ona Ho'opāpā i Pa'a ma ka Mo'olelo Hawai'i o Kalapana a me nā Mana Mo'olelo e Pili pū ana." MA Thesis. University of Hawai'i. 2017.
- Daws, Gavan. *Shoal of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii press, 1974.
- Day, Richard R. "The Ultimate Inequality: Linguistic Genocide," in *Language of Inequality*, edited by Nessa Wolfson and Joan Manes. De Gruyter Mouton. 1985.
- Fairclough, Norman, ed. *Critical Language Awareness*. Real Language Series. London ; New York: Longman. 1992.
- . *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. 2. ed., [Nachdr.]. London: Routledge. 2013.
- Frear, W. "The Evolution of the Hawaiian Judiciary." *The Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society*. No. 7. June 29, 1894.
- Gorter, Durk.. "Introduction: The Study of the Linguistic Landscape as a New Approach to Multilingualism." *International Journal of Multilingualism*. 3, 2006
- Hawaii Holomua*. "Makemake Au e Ike i Hawaii Oiwī Ma Kou Noho." December 17, 1892.
- . "Hopu Hewa i Keohulu," May 25, 1893.
- . "I Aha Ai La?," June 17, 1893.
- . "Pehea Hoi Keia," June 17, 1893.
- Hawaii Oiaio [pseud.]. "Ka Olelo Hawaii a Me Ka Olelo Enelani." *Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*, April 24, 1894.
- Home Rula Repubalika*. "Ka Wahaolelo Lahui," November 2, 1901.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland, eds. 2006. *The Discourse Reader*. 2. ed. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, Micah Kamalani. 2024. "Mele Malama: A Socio-Historical Political Analysis of Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Climate Chants as Kanaka Maoli Literary Resurgence in the 'Ke Kaao Hooniua Puuwai no Ka-Miki' literature in the Ka Hoku o Hawaii newspaper from 1914-1917." *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*. Honolulu, Kamehameha Publishing.
- Ka Lei Momi*. "Ko Makou Manao," September 7, 1893.
- Ka Leo o Ka Lahui*. "He Apuepue a He Lili," January 3, 1893.
- . "Ka Hoohiki Ana," July 10, 1894.

———. “Ka Pane Ma Ke Telegarapa Mai Nei a Ke Komisina,” August 13, 1894.

———. “Nu Hou Kuloko,” June 1, 1894.

———. “Nu Hou Kuloko,” June 7, 1894.

*Ka Loea Kalaiaina*. 1898. “Ke Holomua Nei Ka Oihana Naauao,” October 22, 1898.

*Ka Makaainana*. “Mai Na Elele Alii Mai,” August 13, 1894.

———. “Mau Elele No Ke Alii,” July 16, 1894.

———. “Weheia Ka Ahaolelo,” June 4, 1894.

———. June 4, 1894.

———. “Waihona Puke Hawaii.” October 28, 1895

———. March 16, 1896.

———. “E Powa i Ke Alii,” March 8, 1897.

———. “Ke ‘Ale‘ale Nei Ka Wai,” April 5, 1897.

*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. “Luna Hooiaio Palapala.” 24 June 1893.

———. “Halawai Nui a Na Pake,” February 17, 1894.

———. “Kumukanawai,” June 9, 1894.

———. “He Hale Pai Hou o ‘Ke Kilohana Pookela o Ka Lahui Hawaii.,” December 28, 1895.

———. “Ka Nupepa Makua,” November 9, 1895.

———. “Ahaolelo o 1896,” February 28, 1896.

———. “Ke Ao Piliiolelo Enelani,” September 11, 1896.

———. “Ke Kumu o Na Kumukanawai o Hawaii,” February 14, 1896.

———. “Ka Oihana Hoolaha Nupepa Hawaii,” June 4, 1897.

———. “Halawai Makaainana Oni i ka lu!” October 8, 1897.

———. “Ke Kanawai Alakai o Ka Panalaaui o Hawaii,” June 22, 1900.

———. “Ko Kakou Kulana Aupuni Hou,” February 9, 1900.

———. “Hale o Na Makaainana,” February 22, 1901.

- . “Ka Senate,” March 1, 1901.
- . “Na Hana o Ka Hale,” May 3, 1901.
- . “Na Olelo Beritania,” October 25, 1901.
- . “Ka Olelo Hawaii a me ka Ninau Hoopulapula,” November 4, 1921
- . “E Ae Anei Kakou e Make ka Olelo Hawaii?” January 6, 1922.
- Ka Nupepa Puka La Aloha Aina*. “Mahuahua na Hana Kalepa o Honolulu.” June 28, 1893.
- . “Ha’uopi Ka Waha i Ka Makani, e Uhi Wale No Oe Aole e Nalo, He Imu Puhi,” November 9, 1893.
- Ka Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa*. “Ka Ike Ana o Ka Elele Kuhina Amerika Hou i Ke Aupuni Kuikawa,” November 8, 1893.
- . “Na Wai e Hoomalu Mai,” February 20, 1893.
- . “Nupepa Puka La Kuokoa,” February 13, 1893.
- Ka Oiaio*. “Ke Koho Balota Elele,” March 30, 1894.
- . “Ke Komisina Alii Ma Wasinetona,” August 17, 1894.
- . “Nu Hou Kuloko,” July 26, 1895.
- Ka Puuhonua o Na Hawaii*. “Olelo Hawaii,” January 26, 1917.
- Kaanapono. “Ka Aha Kaapuni o Maui.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, December 17, 1897.
- Kaiana. “Lawe Ia Ka Oihana.” *Hawaii Holomua*, May 30, 1893.
- Kalawaiapuna, S. H. P. “Hoiike i Ka Oiaio No Ka Nupepa Kuokoa.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, October 23, 1896.
- Kawai‘ae‘a, Keiki K. C., Alohalani Kaluhiokalani Housman, Makalapua Alencastre, Kini Ka‘awa, Kananinohea Kawai‘ae‘a Māka‘imoku, and Kau‘iwelaniikapōmahinala‘ila‘i Kaina Lauano. 2007. “Pū‘ā i ka ‘Ōlelo, Ola ka ‘Ohana: Three Generations of Hawaiian Language Revitalization,” in *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being*. Vol. 4 No. 1. Kamehameha Schools.
- Ke Aloha Aina*. “Halawai Makaainana Lahui Nui,” October 16, 1897.
- . “He Lono Puuwai Elele,” March 6, 1897.
- . “Ka Olelo Hooholo Kue i Ka Hoohui Aina,” September 11, 1897.

———. “Mai Pihoihoi Ka Manao,” January 14, 1899.

———. “Aole i Kaupale Ia,” April 14, 1900.

———. “Wehe ’ia Ka Ahaolelo Mua o Ke Teritori Hawaii,” February 23, 1901.

———. “Ke Pokaka’a Wale Mai Nei i ka Pali o Kalalau,” June 29, 1912.

*Ko Hawaii Pae Aina*. April 10, 1880.

Kroskirty, P.V. “Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives,” in *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. 1–34. School of American Research Press. 2000.

Kuwada, Bryan Kamaoli. “Ka Mana Unuhi: An Examination of Hawaiian Translation.” PhD. Diss. University of Hawai‘i. December 2018.

———. *The Mana of Translation*. University of Hawai‘i Press. 2025.

Kuykendall, Ralph Simpson. *The History of Hawaii*. Macmillan Company. New York. 1926.

Lono, Kāhealani. “He Mana Ko Ka ‘Ōlelo Makuahine: Nā Leo O Nā Kūpuna I Ka Wā E Ho’okolonoia ‘Ia Ana ‘O Hawai‘i.” MA Thesis. University of Hawai‘i. 2014.

Lucas, Paul F. Nahoa. “E Ola Mau Kākou I Ka ‘Ōlelo Makuahine: Hawaiian Language Policy and the Courts.” *The Hawaiian Journal of History*. 2000.

Lydecker, Robert. *Roster Legislatures of Hawaii 1841-1918*. The Hawaiian Gazette Co. 1918.

Monsarrat, James. “James M Monsarrat.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, January 10, 1896.

Nogelmeier, Marvin Puakea. “Mai Pa’a i ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back.” PhD Diss. University of Hawai‘i. 2003.

Opio Hawaii Makee Holomua [pseud.] “Na Poe Kupono e Koho Ai.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, November 2, 1900.

Palau, Moses. “I Poe Ike Olelo Haole Ke Lilo i Senatoa.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 17, 1900.

Palau Moses. “Ua Like No a Like.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, August 24, 1900.

Perreira, Hiapokeikikāne. “Ke Kālailai Mo’omeheu ‘Ana i ka Mo’olelo Hiwahiwa o Kawelo, Ka Hiapa’i’ole a ka Ikaika, Ka mea Nāna i Ho’oha’aha’a ke ‘O’ole’a o Kauahoa, "Ka U’i o Hanalei." ‘O Ka Mea Nāna ka Lā’au Kaulana o Ku’ika’a, a Nāna ka Wahine Ho’olei ‘Īkoi ‘o Kānewahineikiaoha.” MA Thesis. University of Hawai‘i. 2002.

Poepoe, Joseph. “Ke Alakai Koho Balota.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, September 14, 1900.

- Reinecke, John E. *Language and Dialect in Hawaii: A Sociolinguistic History to 1935*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 1969.
- Reisigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)." 2015.
- Schütz, Albert J. *The Voices of Eden: A History of Hawaiian Language Studies*. Linguistics Hawai'i History. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press. 1994.
- Tannen, Deborah, Heidi Ehernberger Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin, eds. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Second edition. Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell. 2015.
- The Pacific Commercial Advertiser*. November 8, 1893.
- . "Meeting of the Convention," May 31, 1894.
- . "Ex Queen Gets Exited Over Telephone Messages," March 3, 1897.
- . "Jule Was Roasted," March 3, 1897.
- . "Red Handed Assassination," March 16, 1897.
- . "Fourty Years a Native Pastor," June 5, 1907.
- Twain, Mark. *Mark Twain's Letters from Hawaii*. Edited by A. Grove Day. Honolulu: Univ. Pr. of Hawaii. 2007.
- Van Dijk, A. Teun. "Critical Discourse Analysis" in *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Edited by Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin. 2015.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*. Routledge Library Editions: Translation Ser, v. 2. Milton: Routledge. 2018.
- Williams Jr., Ronald. "Race, Power, and the Dilemma of Democracy: Hawai'i's First Territorial Legislature, 1901." *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 49. 2015.
- . "Ike Mōakaaka, Seeing a Path Forward: Historiography in Hawai'i." *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* Vol. 7. 2011
- . "'Onipa'a i ka 'Oia'i'o. Hearing Voices: Long Ignored Indigenous-language Testimony Challenges the Current Historiography of Hawai'i Nei." MA Thesis. University of Hawai'i. 2008.
- Willis, Albert S. "Remarks of Mr. Willis to Mr. Dole"  
[https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/SERIALSET-03269\\_00\\_00-072-0243-0000/pdf/SERIALSET-03269\\_00\\_00-072-0243-0000.pdf](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/SERIALSET-03269_00_00-072-0243-0000/pdf/SERIALSET-03269_00_00-072-0243-0000.pdf)