

“Native Hawaiian Self-Governance, Sovereignty & the ‘Haole’: Positioning Whites as Antagonist or Ally”

Laurel Servies

Fall 2011

In 2005, my brother was accepted into a new and well-funded summer program for under-privileged students within the district of Honolulu public school system. There were financial and educational requirements for admission and my brother ended up being only one of a couple of white students in the program. As the program continued through the student's intermediate and high school years, the group became very close. The program offered specialized courses each summer, his junior year being Drama and Theater Performance.

I sat in the audience with my family to watch my brother's final performance that his class had created with the help from their *kupuna* (teacher). They came up with the idea of a variety talent show of sorts and gladly shared their diverse cultural, musical, and artistic talent. At a particular moment in the show, one young woman passionately performed a thoughtful and provoking poem. It centered on the heartbreak that Native Hawaiians felt upon the arrival and betrayal by the *haole* (foreigner, now popularly understood as white). She spoke on the bloodshed and loss of her ancestors and vented her frustration and anger at the white man; the audience received her message with much vigor. After the show, she approached my brother to sincerely validate that he was in fact *not* one of the *haoles* that she wrote about; that instead, he was one of the "coolest" *haoles* that she had met.

My brother and I are *haole*, and as I sat in the audience feeling uncomfortable for the indirect accusation for the destruction of the Hawaiian race, culture and island writ large, I was not surprised—this situation is not new to the local *haole*. But, my goal is not to draw pity for the *haoles* "stationed" in the islands rather it is to further investigate the rhetoric of the conflicting tensions between Native Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governing groups and the *haole*. This young woman's poem was one centered on advocacy for Hawaiian rights and sovereignty. But, where is the line between advocating for sovereignty and advocating against the *haole*? Due to

the historical tensions of the white man's colonization, how do Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governing groups view the *haole*; as friend and ally or as enemy and oppressor? In this paper, I will unpack these tensions; beginning with the historical rigidities between Native Hawaiians and *haoles* which will then lead into the Native Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governing group *Kau Inoa*. Next, I will introduce my theoretical framework of Identity Field Constructions and begin to analyze the official and unofficial rhetoric of *Kau Inoa* and conclude with investigating whether or not through the perspective of *Kau Inoa*, *haole* is constructed as ally or antagonist. Ultimately, I argue that the rhetorical processes that Native Hawaiians use towards the *haole* will have an effect on either the failure or success of sovereignty and self-governing advocacy groups.

Putting Things into Perspective: A Brief Look at Hawaiian-*Haole* History¹

Haole: The Etymology behind the Word

In Rohrer's (2010) book, *Haoles in Hawai'i*, the author discusses in detail the formulation of the word *haole* and the various discourses surrounding it. The origin is unknown and highly debated; but most agree that the denotation of the word *haole* in Hawaiian means foreigner and now has been, in most cases, come to be known as white or Caucasian. She argues that *haole* is a fluid, dynamic and ever changing social construction that is constantly debated in the media and every day contexts. Much of the tension in this debate is whether or not *haole* itself is a derogatory word. Most of the cases arise when a *haole* has been verbally (and in rare cases physically) abused in some way and seek to reach justice. However, on the other side of the coin, the argument can be rightfully justified because of the historical and inerasable legacy that *haoles* have left like a scar on the islands. So that, in essence, the word *haole* is inevitable

and justifiably used in the islands. In a similar vein, some argue that the word is not derogatory and can be seen as ‘neutral’ (Moon, as cited in Rohrer, 2010). Undeniably, the word has seen its share of the limelight throughout the decades. But, the word itself drags years and years of history behind it that must be understood in order to understand *haole*.

A Historical Overview of *Haoles* in Hawai’i

Haoles first came to Hawai’i in 1778 (Trask, 1999). They claimed to have ‘discovered’ the islands and then went on ‘saving’ things; such as ‘saving underutilized’ agricultural production, ‘primitive’ religious beliefs, and generally attempting to correct ‘incivility’ (Rohrer, 2010). Trask (1999) argues that the forced introduction of the Western ideas of cutthroat individualism, capitalism, and religion was inevitably incompatible with the Hawaiian ways of life. Inevitably, this story remains familiar with the various indigenous groups that the white man has committed crimes against. This story houses similar tragedy. Rohrer (2010) writes that “scholars estimate that by the end of the nineteenth century the thriving population that inhabited the island at Cook’s landing had decreased by 95 percent”. She continues to argue how that this event can “powerfully demonstrate...how colonialism can be seen as a form of genocide in Hawai’i” (pg. 17). Trask (1999) continues with this premise, writing:

“In less than a hundred years after Cook’s arrival, my people had been dispossessed of our religion, our moral order, our form of chiefly government, many of our cultural practices, and our lands and waters. Introduced diseases, from syphilis and gonorrhea to tuberculosis, small pox, measles, leprosy, and typhoid fever killed Hawaiians by the hundreds of thousands, reducing our Native population...to less than 40,000 by 1890” (pg. 7).

Merely by these standards one could justify a valid argument for Native Hawaiians to feel a certain level of aggression towards their white counterparts. But, sadly, it does not end here.

Haoles began taking over economic endeavors (i.e.: sandalwood trade, whaling, sugar, etc.) and

by 1888, had federally weaseled their way to domination of the *'aina* (land). At this time, *haoles* owned and controlled “three-quarters of all arable land” (Trask, 1999, pg. 8). Through continuing political, economic, and military interests, America further gripped its hold on the islands; eventually stripping power from the monarchy for good. The Hawaiian government was overthrown in 1893. Queen Lili’uokalani was attempting to reinforce a Hawaiian voice in her own land and had gathered thousands of signatures to “request a new constitution” (Trask, 1999, pg. 16). Before this came to any sort of fruition, the Queen was “confronted by the American-recognized provisional government” and troops of American Marine forces. Without much choice, she yielded her authority to the United States of America in order “to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life” (pg. 17). She was imprisoned in her own palace for around five months, and as Grover Cleveland left office, William McKinley stepped in. And with this, in 1898, Hawai’i was annexed to the United States by a “resolution (which only required a simple majority) rather than by treaty (which required a two-thirds majority) (Trask, 1999, pg. 21).

This brief tragic story stands in stark contrast to the discourse seen in popular historical texts and narratives, especially circulating local school systems. The history books overwhelmingly ‘begin’ the historical account of Hawai’i with Cook’s landing in 1778, ultimately illegitimizing, ignoring and erasing Hawai’i’s past *before* the *haoles* ‘discovered’ the islands (Rohrer, 2010). Also, in popular discourse and media, the annexation of the state is hardly read as illegal or illegitimate. That aspect is never discussedⁱⁱ. However, this narrative described above (mostly through the perspective of Haunani Kay-Trask) is one that fuels the fire for such Native Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governing advocacy groups as *Kau Inoa* (see official analysis of rhetoric on the *Kau Inoa* website, discussed below).

Overall, it can be understood as to why, historically, Hawaiians may feel some animosity towards the *haole*. Trask (1999) goes as far to say that “we [Native Hawaiians] are by every measure the most oppressed of all groups living in Hawai’i, our ancestral land” (pg. 22). She argues that this all stems from historical *haole* colonization resulting in embedded and present *haole* colonization. This is seen through various disadvantages that Native Hawaiians face as well as the constant encroaching waves of tourists and *haoles* who want to ‘experience’ Hawai’i.

This historical overview is not to suggest that only Native Hawaiians and *haoles* occupy the islands; the ‘local’ population of Hawai’i is a large and proud one. As Rohrer (2008) writes, “‘locals’ are more than just residents. Local identity and culture emerged primarily from the experience of labourers on sugar and pineapple plantations and is an amalgamation of Asian-Pacific immigrant cultures and native Hawaiian culture” (pg. 1111). This ‘local’ identity is seen through the everyday use of the Hawaiian Creole English dialect or ‘pidgin’. As Ohnuma (2002) writes, the way that ‘local’ emerged was through the plantation laborers’ “shared experience of oppression on the plantations” against the white man (pg. 274). However, much has changed since then. Leong (1997) discovered through various interviews of ‘locals’ on the island that the ‘local’ identity was fluid and changing by constant shifts of meaning; similar to the etymological phenomenon that the term *haole* endures. In these interviews Leong wrote that “almost everyone...concluded that ‘local’ is above all an ‘attitude’ (as quoted in Ohnuma, 2002, pg. 277) and that overall, the majority of the interviewees agreed that some *haoles* can be considered ‘local’, too.

With all of this historical background to initialize and fuel the self-governance fire for Native Hawaiians; it seems reasonable to expect advocacy for Hawaiian sovereignty and a Native Hawaiian government in Hawai’i. One such group is *Kau Inoa: “To Build a Nation”*.

An Introduction to *Kau Inoa*: To Build a Nation

There are various Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governing advocacy groups across the islands some reaching past state or national boundaries; one of the most popular is *Kau Inoa*: “*To Build a Nation*”. *Kau Inoa* is translated from Hawaiian to mean “place your name”. This group was especially popular less than a decade ago, in the early 2000’s, encouraging Native Hawaiians to identify with their native roots and place their names on a large list register of fellow Hawaiians that support the idea of a sovereign and self-governing Native Hawaiian ‘nation’. The movement is funded and supported primarily by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) and Hawai’i Maoli. OHA is a state agency, while Hawai’i Maoli is “a nonprofit organization operated by the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs” (www.kauinoa.org/faq), which is also a government agency. In order to take an introductory glance at what the movement is about; their official website lays out something similar to a mission statement stating:

Much has been accomplished over the past 30 years in developing the Hawaiian community’s ideas and perspectives on Native Hawaiian sovereignty and self-governance. Today, the establishment of a new Native Hawaiian government is on the horizon and can be achieved with the will and support of the Hawaiian people.

The first step in building a Native Hawaiian governing body is to gather a list of people of Hawaiian ancestry who are willing to participate in the process. This enrollment process has now begun, and you can use the registration form available here to *kau inoa* — place your name — on the list of those who will build the new Hawaiian nation. (kauinoa.org/info)

Kau Inoa’s subtitle is “to build a nation”. In the “Frequently Asked Questions” section, a question is put forth, “how do we build a nation?” Therefore, *Kau Inoa* justifies the major tenants of their movement as follows:

The following are steps in the process to build a Native Hawaiian government developed by the Hawaiian community.

1. **Kau Inoa** - the Native Hawaiian Registration: To participate in forming a Native Hawaiian Governing Entity every Native Hawaiian should register in Kau Inoa.
2. **Apportionment:** To develop an apportionment plan of representative districts based on the eligible voter population.
3. **Elections:** To hold an election of representative delegates to participate in a constitutional convention.
4. **Convention:** To convene a constitutional convention to create organic documents of the Native Hawaiian Governing Entity and explore the rights, responsibilities, and immunities of the governing entity.
5. **To ratify** the organic documents and all of its articles as developed by the Native Hawaiian Convention delegates.
6. **To convene** the Native Hawaiian Governing Entity by implementing the provisions of the Native Hawaiian Constitution.
7. **To receive** recognition of the Governing Entity by the Executive and Legislative Branches of the State of Hawai'i and to negotiate the transfer of the assets of programs benefiting Native Hawaiians to the Native Hawaiian governing entity.

The above is a quick snippet of what *Kau Inoa's* purpose and goals are for Native Hawaiians and the "state" of Hawai'i. I will be examining the official rhetoric on *Kau Inoa's* website, through the above described historical lens that this group utilizes to power their initiative. Following, I will analyze the unofficial rhetoric surrounding *Kau Inoa* through various blogs, forums, news articles and also, looking at a specific counter-movement that fishes from a similar member pool as *Kau Inoa*. By discussing the current political situations that have fueled these tensions, the *haole* shall be problematized and examined through the perspective of *Kau Inoa* and Native Hawaiians in general. But, in order to gain steady theoretical grounding before delving into these matters, I will explain the sociological concept of Identity Fields in social movements.

Theoretical Framework: Identity Fields and Framing Processes

The theoretical lens I am using in order to discover the relationship between *Kau Inoa* and the *haole* is the identity construction principle (Hunt, Benford and Snow, 1994) developed through Goffman's frame theory. According to Hunt, Benford and Snow (1994), "identity constructions, whether intended or not, are inherent in all social movement framing activities" (pg. 185). The authors perceive Identity Fields through a synthesis in theory with Goffman's (1974) *Frame Analysis*. They write that "a frame is 'an interpretive schemata that simplifies and condenses the 'world out there' by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one's present or past environments". The authors argue that identity fields thus coincide directly with this theory in terms of how movements perceive the "other". Hunt, Benford and Snow write that there are three Identity Field constructions: the protagonist group, antagonist group and the audience group. While the movement itself usually holds the status of protagonist, the group of "other" gets separated into either antagonist or audience groups.

The protagonist group is defined by Hunt, Benford and Snow as "those individuals and collectivities...that...advocate or sympathize with movement values, beliefs, goals, and practices, or are the beneficiaries of movement action" (pg. 186). Put simply, in their perspective, they are interpreted as the "good guys"; the heroes and heroines. They participate in this action by "making in-group/outgroup distinctions and assigning other organizations to ideological, geographical, and tactical 'turfs'" (pg. 193) also known as boundary framing. This certain act of framing "[is] conditioned and constrained by [social movement] actors' interpretations of world, local, movement and organizational histories" (pg. 195). The authors go onto claim that a "central feature of [this]...framing is the embellishment and reconstitution of

relevant aspects of the past” (pg. 195). And thus, helps the member’s justification of their movement. During this framing process, the protagonist group also must situate themselves in terms of goals, values, beliefs, etc.; generally making “collective identity claims about ‘the movement’” (pg. 193). This includes identifying and defining what they are *not*. What they are *not* then becomes the antagonist—the enemy.

Antagonists are framed through the protagonist’s perspective as “irrational, immoral, and devoid of compassion and feeling” (pg. 192) and could be framed as having ‘caused’ the problems the protagonists are fighting against. They are “imputed to be opponents of movement causes. These include claims about countermovements, countermovement organizations, hostile institutions, inimical publics, and social control agents” (pg. 197). While protagonists identity attributions are centered on the discourses of “innocent victims, aggrieved populations or the silent majority” (pg. 193), examples of the identity attributions given to antagonists groups are “big business, closet bigots, cultural elites” (pg. 198). Ultimately, the movement member’s (protagonist) can frame antagonist identities “by identifying and defining individuals, collectivities, beliefs, values, and practices as being in conflict with protagonist identities and causes” (pg. 198).

The final group in the theory is the audience. However, the authors do not spend as much time wrestling with the concept of audience as they do with the protagonist identity field. They define the audience group as “individuals and collectivities imputed to be neutral or uncommitted observers who may react to or report on movement activities. For example, allied SMOs [social movement organizations], the media, powerful elites, marginal supporters, sympathizers, and bystander publics can be the subjects of audience identity claims” (pg. 199-200). One of the only characteristics that they firmly define is that these audience actors “are

capable of receiving and evaluating protagonist messages in a favorable light” (pg. 200) and therefore could be seen as an ally (in some cases). One example the author’s utilize to illustrate this grouping, is a movement member explaining her membership in a pro-peace/anti-racism group related the cause to African-Americans. She discussed how African-Americans understand and have lived through harsh times of injustice and therefore would be a “potential audience” for her movement; ultimately, “they share a general diagnostic frame with [her movement]” (pg. 200).

Upon discussing the three Identity Field constructions and thus, placing *Kau Inoa* in the protagonist grouping, the question then becomes, how does *Kau Inoa* frame the *haole*? As depicted in the narrative written above, this seems to be a contradicting and difficult case to unpack. Through the lens of the protagonists’, is *haole* seen as an antagonist group? And thus, everything that *Kau Inoa* is fighting against? Or are *haoles* constructed as an audience group; thus, a potential ally for *Kau Inoa* members to receive assistance and support from. In the next section, I will pull apart and analyze the official rhetoric found on *Kau Inoa*’s website as well as the unofficial rhetoric spotted throughout the internet; all while problematizing and considering how *haole* is being framed.

The Official Rhetoric of *Kau Inoa*

Upon examining the rhetoric on *Kau Inoa*’s official website; a few rhetorical groupings can be made. The groupings found through analysis of this dataⁱⁱⁱ were (1) attempting to incorporate Non-Hawaiians, as well as (2) an anti-Western^{iv} sentiment, (3) addressing issues of trust for skeptics, (4) a demonstrated *need* for Hawaiians to come together or *lokahi* and to share

a voice. Other rhetorical patterns were found (such as a trend of immediacy), but will not be discussed here due to the lack of framing of the *haole*.

Rhetoric of Inclusion for Non-Native Hawaiians

The first grouping of the explicit incorporation of Non-Native Hawaiians is found mostly in the “Frequently Asked Questions” section of the official website. This is seen through certain acts and deeds that Non-Native Hawaiians can participate in in order to support the movement; mostly by community standards. This rhetoric is seen through words and phrases such as: “members of the Hawaiian *and non-Hawaiian community* who are interested in serving on...committees should contact OHA”; “after forming a nation, [Hawaiians in the movement] may choose *to include non-Hawaiians* the way other native nations have”; and “*Kau Inoa* appreciates all of the *support from the many non-Hawaiians* who have stepped forward. The best way to help Hawaiians is to continue to step forward and be counted by speaking up, writing letters to the editor, and talking to your 'ohana and friends about Hawaiian history. Remind others how important the preservation of Hawaiian culture and values is to keeping Hawai'i this very unique place that *we* call home” (<http://www.kauinoa.org/faq>, emphasis added). And finally, another is under the “Event Sponsorship” section claiming that they can come to one’s hālau (hula group) or family reunion (<http://www.kauinoa.org/sponsorships>); these activities by no means stress a Native Hawaiians-only event.

As seen in this rhetoric placed throughout the website, Non-Native Hawaiians (therefore, including *haoles*) are allowed to participate and support Native Hawaiians in their quest towards a self-governing entity. This rhetoric would then support the claim that *haoles* are in fact framed as an audience group by members of *Kau Inoa*. *Haoles* and other Non-Natives who are willing to

“step forward” and speak up in support for Hawaiians are “appreciated” by *Kau Inoa* members. In one of examples shown above, the group calls “Hawai’i [a] very unique place that *we* call home”. This rhetoric of “*we*” implies that Non-Native Hawaiians who would like to help further the movement can be (almost) included into the group and may also call Hawai’i their home.

Anti-Western Rhetoric

However, the second rhetorical grouping is found hidden a little deeper than this explicit rhetoric expressed in the former grouping; the rhetoric of an anti-Western sentiment. The interwoven and interrelated sub-categories of this grouping include (1) historical reasoning and (2) political reasoning. The first sub-category thus displays the movement’s value/belief that Hawai’i was historically taken advantage of and was not rightfully annexed to the United States *by the haole* (see historical section above). Throughout the website, this rhetoric is found; in words and phrases such as: “since the *illegal* Overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893”; “Native Hawaiians have been *disenfranchised by the western governments* which have *controlled* them”; “this disenfranchisement is demonstrated by *Native Hawaiians’ lack of success in western forms* of education, health, home ownership, financial stability, economic growth, and general welfare” (<http://www.kauinoa.org/faq>, emphasis added). In *Kau Inoa*’s radio ads that have since grown less popular on the airwaves since the mid 2000’s, also utilize this rhetoric. The radio ads are done by the Native Hawaiian celebrities that support *Kau Inoa* and may have a tendency to echo this historical conviction. For example, Auntie Malia Craver in her radio ad states: “Hawaiians were living here way before *Western people* came. How come *they* all came here and *never took care* of the Hawaiians on Hawaiian land?” and also from Vicky Holt Takamine, “*we’ve been colonized* to the point of nearly extinction of our Hawaiian language. Every other people that come here to these islands have an ancestral homeland that

they can go back to. There's no place for *us* to go" (<http://www.kauinoha.org/radio>, emphasis added). The pattern seems clear. Whether consciously intended or not, the historical implications of Western/*haole* oppression of Native Hawaiians is apparent; woven throughout the rhetoric used both on the website and through movement members. Also, the use of "us", "we", and "they" will be discussed further below.

The second sub-category is political reasoning. I make the argument that, in most cases, when addressing federal or governmental issues in this context, we are in fact, discussing issues of hegemonic and systematic whiteness within the establishment. The rhetoric found on the website includes: "though *federal* funds to "rehabilitate" Hawaiians have been available since 1921, the programs have met with *limited success*"; "since 2000, Native Hawaiians have been under *legal attack by plaintiffs who file lawsuits to discontinue programs benefiting Native Hawaiians*"; "*they* are increasing *their* attempts *at the national level* to erode rights, natural resources, and assets of indigenous native peoples across the U.S."; "in order to protect their sovereign interests in deliberations with *governments* at the local, state, national, and international levels"

The second quote in the paragraph above addresses the legal attacks that Native Hawaiians have had to endure. Two of the most popular ones being the *Rice v Cayetano* and *John Doe v Kamehameha Schools* cases. Both of these cases in particular had *haole* plaintiffs fighting for their (American) constitutional right that the privileges given to Native Hawaiians are discriminatory. The *Rice v Cayetano* case centered the issue of *only* allowing Native Hawaiians to vote for positions held in the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA). The *John Doe v Kamehameha Schools* case dealt with the Kamehameha School system *only* admitting students with Native Hawaiian blood. Both of the plaintiffs' main argument is that these acts are

explicitly discriminatory to other races^v (see Okamura, 2008 and Altonn & Donnelly, 2000). In both of these cases, the *haoles* won. While these are just two examples, they do at least shed some light on some of the opposition that Native Hawaiians and Native Hawaiian advocacy groups are facing in governmental systems and trials. Also, as seen in both sub-categories explained above, rhetoric of in-group/out-group systems is used through the use of “us” and “them”. While in the first rhetorical grouping, the “we” used seemed to friendly embrace all races and peoples of Hawai’i, the second rhetorical grouping seems to differ. Through the use of “they” and “them” when referring to the historical and political oppression, *Kau Inoa* is drawing the group boundary “turfs” that Hunt, Benford and Snow address. They are drawing an out-group boundary that divides the historical and political oppressors and “cultural elites” (the majority being *haole*) from the in-group of the implicit and explicit discourses of “innocent victims, aggrieved populations or the silent majority” (Hunt, Benford, and Snow, 1994, pg. 193 & 198).

Therefore, the rhetoric seen above would seem to lead us to the conclusion that members of *Kau Inoa* frame Westerners (*haoles*) as antagonists. Thus, by *haoles* representing everything that *Kau Inoa* is not and through the constant fight with the white hegemonic system, it seems that *haoles* could be the very reason that Native Hawaiians are currently in the disadvantaged state that they are in.

Rhetoric of Building Trust

The third grouping is the rhetoric found in politely addressing issues of rumors or falsehoods that have been claimed about the movement and its motives. Surprisingly, these skeptics seem, for the most part, Native Hawaiian. I would like to address these claims in order to provide a sharper political background for groups such as *Kau Inoa*. These trust issues include

Kau Inoa's tie to the state agency, OHA and powerful rumors of the *Kau Inoa* register of names being used for the Akaka Bill. Okamura (2008) writes that the Akaka Bill is one that "US Senator Daniel Akaka introduced [formally known as]...the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act. This bill establishes that Congress finds Native Hawaiians to be an indigenous people and authorizes a process by which they can form a 'native Hawaiian governing entity' for self-governance. It provides federal recognition of Native Hawaiians comparable to that accorded to more than five hundred Native American and Alaska Native groups. Among other reasons, the bill was introduced to protect Native Hawaiian rights and programs, such as OHA, from further lawsuits such as the *Rice* case" (pg. 106).

Some of the rhetoric seen on the website includes concerns such as: addressing OHA's role as a state agency, Hawai'i Maoli's role, legality issues, and familial concerns. A few examples include, "when OHA is spending State general fund revenues, it needs to operate as a state agency and, as such, must comply with various state laws and regulations. However, when OHA operates as a trust, its allegiance is to its beneficiaries. OHA believes that a Native Hawaiian Governing Entity will help to improve the conditions of all Hawaiians"; "the Office of Hawaiian Affairs' role in this process is as a facilitator only, providing funding and logistical help for this community-driven effort. OHA does not house or control the input of information for the *Kau Inoa* database"; denying any connection to the Akaka Bill, "the *Kau Inoa* process and the formation of a Native Hawaiian governing entity is being undertaken as a Native Hawaiian community initiative completely independent of the Hawaiian federal recognition bill currently before the U.S. Congress"; addressing Hawai'i Maoli's ownership and maintenance of the database of registered names, "all *Kau Inoa* registration forms are sent to [Hawai'i Maoli] where the registrant's information is entered and held in a secured database"; issues surrounding

the ‘discriminatory’ nature of a Native-Hawaiians *only* movement/member-base and its legality; “under the U.S. Constitution and federal law, America's indigenous native people are recognized not because of their race or ethnicity, but because their ancestors exercised sovereignty over the lands and areas that subsequently became part of the U.S.; concerns addressing American *and* Native Hawaiian citizenship and whether or not the movement will make members become ‘Indians’, stating that, instead: “the only changes you may feel will be the additional benefits you may receive as a member of the new Native Hawaiian governing entity”. And finally, a question regarding division of mixed race families: “*Kau Inoa* does not support a process which would divide families...for now, the process must be done by Native Hawaiians”.

Overall, the rhetoric listed above focuses on swaying mostly Native Hawaiian concerns on where their information will be going after registration, state/governmental funding and identity issues and personal issues regarding explicit division among friends and family. I argue that potential reasons for such distrust are the powerful and popular rumors circulating the media and various websites, as well as a general distrust of the United States government. Much of the rhetoric found in the anti-*Kau Inoa* initiatives (discussed in the following section) center around passionate animosity towards being federally recognized; and therefore federally controlled under the United States government, with hardly a chance for sovereignty claims.

Rhetoric of *Lokahi*

The fifth rhetorical grouping has two sub-categories that strongly interrelate. The first is one of togetherness, unity or *lokahi* and the second is voice. One often goes along with the other in the official rhetoric found. This is the majority of the rhetoric used throughout the website. This act is normal in most movement groups. Statements such as these are ones that attempt to

bring in new members as well as solidify the common bond shared by present movement members. This rhetorical tool is seen in statements such as: “it is urgent and critical for Native Hawaiians to have a *unified, single voice* that represents the Native Hawaiian electorate in order to protect their sovereign interests”; “the creation of a Native Hawaiian governing entity will provide Native Hawaiians with a *voice* that will be difficult to ignore when it comes to advocating for Native Hawaiians. The *voices* of 400,000 Native Hawaiians will help to make a difference in improving their social conditions and opportunities for success”; “*we* must protect Native Hawaiian assets and entitlements in order to build a better future for Native Hawaiians – forming a Native Hawaiian Governing Entity will help *us* defend against legal attacks”; “Kau Inoa is the first broad, concerted effort of this kind with sufficient resources to *include* Native Hawaiians from all walks of life”; “the establishment of a new Native Hawaiian government is on the horizon and *can be achieved with the will and support* of the Native Hawaiian people”; “Hawai’i is the *homeland* of all Hawaiians”. The concept of *lokahi* is on the group’s homepage stating “*lokahi* and unity as one: that is the Hawaiian philosophy”; the celebrity radio ads have statements including: “being Hawaiian allows me to look at the world through a different perspective than others that aren’t”; “Before anything, be proud to be Hawaiian”; “Kau Inoa means we all get together and speak up”. Other sentiments include that while the Hawaiian people are disunited and spread all over the globe—there is one element that connects and holds Native Hawaiians together as one—their bloodline, ancestry, and heritage.

These are only a few examples of *lokahi*, unity and voice found on the official website. As stated above, this is a common occurrence in movement groups to solidify membership. However, with any act solidifying membership come in-group/out-group distinctions. While members of *Kau Inoa* may resonate with these messages and feel proud of their ancestry, *all*

other groups are basically excluded from experiencing this affect. As mentioned above, it is a similar line that is drawn when using the rhetoric of inclusion (“we”, “us”) and exclusion (“they”, “them”).

In sum, the official rhetoric found on *Kau Inoa*'s website provides us with some insight regarding the group goals, values, beliefs as well as the underlying rhetorical issues just beneath the surface. This includes attempts of inclusion and framing *haole* as ally; as well as implicit rhetorical tones of exclusion—framing *haole* as antagonist. Other rhetorical patterns support common tendencies as well as powerful tools that most movement groups house and utilize in order to strengthen their cause and membership identity.

Unofficial Rhetoric: *Un-Kau Inoa* & Other Movement-Doubts

Upon a simple Google search of “*Kau Inoa*”^{vi}, thousands of results will be found; but, the message and intent will vary drastically. While the official site and its sponsors (OHA and Hawai'i Maoli) come up first in the search, it is followed by active sites such as *UnKau Inoa*, *Free Hawai'i*, and *Justice for Hawaiians*; as well as forum topics entitled “*Kau Inoa...uggghhhhh*”, youtube videos such as “*Kau Inoa Exposed*” and news articles. These sources of information, methods for conversation and community as well as direct accusations against *Kau Inoa* and OHA are but a few of the hundreds of thousands of search results that come up. I will investigate the most popular ones; these include blogs, forums, articles, etc. that come up within the first 4-5 pages of the “*Kau Inoa*” Google search. However, before delving into the rhetorical patterns that have been found, allow me to explain the guiding assumptions and initiatives of the popular anti-*Kau Inoa* group *UnKau Inoa*

UnKau Inoa: To Save a Nation

UnKau Inoa is the source at the pinnacle of the unofficial rhetoric surrounding *Kau Inoa*. It is a part of *Free Hawaii TV* as well as the *Koani Foundation*, both focus on the historical vein discussed above, but take it a step further than *Kau Inoa* does. This group wants no recognition from the government whatsoever; they believe that this will only legitimize the illegal takeover of the Hawaiian nation and will further oppress Native Hawaiians and their land and thus, the chances for sovereignty will dwindle further and further out of sight. Due to the amount of rhetorical data within this site, first I will explain their initiative and then move on into the rhetorical groupings.

In the perspective of social media, currently *UnKau Inoa* is more active than *Kau Inoa*. While the *Kau Inoa* official blog has not been updated since January of 2010, the *UnKau Inoa* facebook page was updated on Monday, December 12th, 2011. Upon visiting their official website, one will be greeted with a home page banner in same style and font of *Kau Inoa*: To Build a Nation, instead saying “*UnKau Inoa* : To Save a Nation”. There are many pictures of members wearing *UnKau Inoa* shirts, along with a host of informative youtube videos by their main spokesperson, ‘Ehu Kekahu Cardwell. Cardwell dons either an *UnKau Inoa* t-shirt or an aloha shirt in each of his videos, along with a lei. Cardwell, however, is *haole*^{vii}; but, seems to stand as a strong supporter of Native Hawaiian sovereignty and rights.

UnKau Inoa’s claim is one that stands in direct opposition to *Kau Inoa* and OHA. Ultimately, OHA claimed that they will never use the names on the *Kau Inoa* register in support of the Akaka Bill (seen in rhetorical analysis in the prior section), but that in fact, OHA is granted full and complete access to the names. This counter-group claims that OHA “has paid Hawai’i Maoli hundreds of thousands of dollars to get people to sign up for *Kau Inoa*” (www.unkauinoa.org/UnKau_Inoa_Videos) for the mere purpose of gathering names in support

of the Akaka Bill. The group claims that most of the *Kau Inoa* members do not approve of the Akaka Bill at all (www.unkauinoa.org/UnKau_Inoa_Videos). *UnKau Inoa* “supports” these claims with various discourses on what specific grants have stated and personal testimonies. Besides that, much of the evidence is not backed up with sufficient or clear proof, links, etc.

Now that *UnKau Inoa*’s story has been heard, the rhetorical groupings found throughout the unofficial rhetoric that frame the *haole* will be listed. These were the patterns that were discovered. The first rhetorical pattern is (1) the urging of Native Hawaiians to take their name off of the *Kau Inoa* registry because of the unwarranted use of support for the Akaka Bill and a general anti-establishment/governmental perspective, (2) rhetoric of inclusion for other native/racial groups, juxtaposed with (3) a strong anti-*haole* and/or foreigner sentiment, and finally, (4) a powerful push towards sovereignty instead of a federal self-governance, while demarcating the historical vein detailed above. As in the previous section, other rhetorical patterns were found (such as individual confusion regarding what to believe, frustration at the movement’s commodifying strategies, etc.), but will not be discussed due to the lack of framing of the *haole*.

Anti-Governmental Rhetoric

The first rhetorical grouping of an anti-*Kau Inoa* stance and general distrust or animosity of the government is the prominent form of rhetoric found on the *UnKau Inoa* website as well as other sites. This rhetoric includes statements such as: claiming that OHA is “a puppet of the illegal occupiers of Hawai’i—the US federal government”; “the Akaka bill...would legitimize the takeover of the Hawaiian Kingdom and reclassify Hawaiians as wards of the US federal government”; and that “despite repeated denials, OHA’s plan from the beginning has been to use

the *Kau Inoa* registry to claim support for the Akaka Bill...as a basis for a new captive native nation” (<http://unkauinoa.org/FAQ.html>); “OHA, which manages *Kau Inoa* registration, isn’t independent enough from the state to benefit Native Hawaiians” (UH Today, 2008); “*Kau Inoa* is just a marketing tool for OHA and doesn't serve the interests of the kanaka maoli [Native Hawaiians]”; “OHA wishes to take us down that [same] route [as the native americans]”; “as state agencies they should acquire access to that richly-detailed database and then they will know *everything* about both me and my husband, from genealogy, pedigree, income, you name it” (Hawai’i Threads, 2005)

This rhetoric is obviously a popular one. The unofficial rhetoric seen here shares a similar framing of the *haole* with the official rhetoric; the basic distrust of governmental agencies and hegemonic “whiteness” or “the man”. Thus, this view would then frame *haole* as antagonist.

Rhetoric of Inclusion

However, with this harsh and critical rhetoric used against the federal government, there is some explicit rhetoric of inclusion. In one of the videos, Cardwell states that: “now everyone, whether you signed the *Kau Inoa* registry or not, or whether you are Hawaiian or not, can support UnKau Inoa.org. Anyone can order and wear an *UnKau Inoa* shirt” (www.unkauinoa.org/UnKau_Inoa_Videos). This act of commodifying a movement through t-shirts is one that *Kau Inoa* has received guilt from (for example, see Cataluna, 2007); and *UnKau Inoa* plays the same game, *however*, utilizes the rhetoric of inclusion. No longer does the movement explicitly need to be Native-Hawaiians only—this tactic is a clever way to make other racial groups, who have felt ignored by *Kau Inoa*, find their place in support of a Native Hawaiian sovereign nation.

Rhetoric of Exclusion

As would be expected, the internet is riddled with exclusionary rhetoric; in this case, oriented towards *haole* and other Non-Hawaiian groups. This includes rhetoric such as: “I got Koko [Hawaiian blood], that is what it means to at least claim to "be Hawaiian". You can be what you want, local or tourist or resident or whatever, but you cannot be Hawaiian”; “if you live in Hawaii and have no Hawaiian blood, you can leave. If every 'non-Hawaiian' left, Hawaii would have a Hawaiian government by default” (Hawai'i Threads, 2005); and also animosity towards Cardwell, the general spokesperson for *UnKau Inoa*, “I am sure that this mainland haole's given name is not 'Ehu Kekahu, but no matter. If he has decided to move here to "find himself" or be some new kind of missionary that's certainly ok. Hawaiians are used to 200 years of haoles coming here as the "great white hope" to save us; clearly this fellow thinks he is at the vanguard of some great independent future for Hawaii and he might get a beach house due to his service to the kingdom. Whatever.” (OHATruth, 2008). Clearly, there is certain animosity towards *haoles* thus could be framed as antagonist seen through this rhetoric.

Conclusion: Rhetorical Findings & the Conundrum of the “Local *Haole*”

Overall, it is apparent that the framing rhetoric surrounding *Kau Inoa* in both the official and unofficial discourse is complex and contradictory. The official rhetoric framed the *haole* as both audience and antagonist. The antagonist framing was mostly seen through the movement's historical tensions between Native Hawaiians and the *haole* and how that can problematize relationships today. However, the audience framing was seen through the rhetoric as well. We can see this through the unambiguous and open inclusion for Non-Native Hawaiians to

participate in; but I argue that because the movement is one based on nationality, even rhetoric used to unify Native Hawaiians draw in-group/out-group distinctions.

In the unofficial rhetoric, similar findings were made. An antagonistic framing was found through anti-governmental or anti-“whiteness” rhetoric as well as explicit anti-foreigner or anti-*haole* rhetoric. However, also similar to the official rhetorical analysis, an audience framing was found through the attempts at inclusion, no matter what race or nationality.

While in this paper I focused on how *Kau Inoa* frames the *haole*, through the rhetoric discussed above, it could be argued that *Kau Inoa*'s “true antagonist” is *UnKau Inoa*. Hunt, Benford, and Snow (1994) write that antagonist groups can “include claims about countermovements, countermovement organizations”, etc. (pg. 197) also that antagonist group countermovements stand in direct opposition to what the protagonist is. Therefore, we can clearly claim that *UnKau Inoa* is an explicit antagonist group potentially framed so by *Kau Inoa*. The authors write, however, that these identity frames are ever shifting and changing. As quoted in the previous sections this is also true for the terms of *haole* and ‘local’ in Hawai’i; the meaning these words have today, will not be the same meaning they hold tomorrow.

We can then conclude that *haoles* are framed in an ever complex and shifting relationship to their ‘framers’. Most of the rhetoric involving anti-*haole* or antagonistic framing was directed toward “whiteness” as an establishment or “Western” ideologies that do not serve Native Hawaiians successfully. Through the narrative shared in the beginning of this paper, we can argue that perhaps it takes the individual conundrum of the ‘local *haole*’ to share an audience or ally framing. For example, if a *haole* is born and raised in Hawai’i, adopts the culture as his/her own and identifies with the ‘aina [land], where then do they belong? How then are they framed?

To some, this term ‘local *haole*’ is an impossible and a contradictory term (Ohnmura, 2002), others, however, have come to except and respect the distinction. ‘Local *haoles*’ will probably have to forever endure association with the historical bonds that their skin color carry (as in the narrative above), but they may stand a chance just yet. ‘Local *haoles*’ can, in *Kau Inoa*’s terms, help and support Native Hawaiians through a healthy respect of the Native Hawaiian people and the rights they deserve. Through this act of humbleness, perhaps *haoles* may be seen as friend and ally. Perhaps the words of King Kamehameha IV will sum it up the best:

To be kind and generous to the foreigner, to trust and confide in him, is no new thing in the history of our race. It is an inheritance transmitted to us from our forefathers. The founder of our dynasty was ever glad to receive assistance and advice from foreigners...I cannot fail to heed the example of my ancestors. I therefore say to the foreigner that he is welcome. He is welcome to our shores—welcome so long as he comes with laudable motive of promoting his own interests at the same time respecting those of his neighbors. But if he comes here with no more exalted motive than that of building up his own interests, at the expense of the native—to seek out confidence only to betray it—with no higher ambition than that of overthrowing our government, and introducing anarchy, confusion and bloodshed—then he is most unwelcome. (Kanahele, 1999, pg.56).

ⁱ In this section, the historical tensions will be lightly drawn out, but by no means discussed in full detail. This section merely scratches the surface in hopes of providing some context to understand the *haole*-Hawaiian relationship.

ⁱⁱ This is usually the case, unless you are lucky enough to have a teacher advocating for such a perspective or friends and family who discuss the premise.

ⁱⁱⁱ The majority of the information is in the “Frequently Asked Questions” section of the website, therefore were most of the data came from for analysis.

^{iv} Anti-Western will be used in this paper to also mean anti-white or anti-*haole*

^v Notice how the argument is framing Native Hawaiians as ‘just another *race*’, not a Native or indigenous group: “Native Hawaiians have become racialized and viewed not as a native people but as a racial minority comparable to African Americans or Latinos” (Okamura, 2008, pg. 106)

^{vi} Done on 12/14/2011; <http://www.google.com/search?gcx=w&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8&q=kau+inoa>

^{vii} I do not know the extent of his ethnicity, whether he is part Hawaiian or not, but is at least externally, *haole*.

References

- Altom, H. & Donnelly, C. (2000, Feb 23). Top court backs Rice in OHA vote challenge. *Star Bulletin*. Retrieved from <http://archives.starbulletin.com/2000/02/23/news/story1.html>
- Cataluna, L. (2007, Aug 16). T-shirts aren't what Hawaiians are all about. *Honolulu Advertiser*. Retrieved from <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2007/Aug/16/ln/hawaii708160308.html?print=on>
- HawaiiThreads.com (2005, May 20). Kau Inoa. Message archived to <http://www.hawaiiithreads.com/archive/index.php/t-7186.html>
- Hunt, S., Benford, R. & Snow, D. (1994). Identity Fields: Framing Processes and the Social Construction of Movement Identities. In Larana, E., Johnston, H. & Gusfield, J (Eds.), *New social movements: from ideology to identity* (185-208). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hutchins. (Spring 2008). "Tacky" Commercials. *UH Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.soc.hawaii.edu/uhtoday/spring2008/J402/Hutchins/nextpage.html>
- Kanahele, G. (1999). *Emma, Hawai'i's Remarkable Queen*. USA: The Queen Emma Foundation
- Kau Inoa: To Build a Nation. (2011). Retrieved from www.kauinoa.org
- OHA Truth (2008, May 8). "Ehu" Cardwell...another key liar about OHA (Blog). Retrieved from <http://ohatruth.blogspot.com/2008/05/ehu-cardwellanother-key-liar-about-oha.html>
- Ohnuma, K. (2002). Local *Haole* – A Contradiction in Terms? The dilemma of being white, born and raised in Hawai'i. *Cultural Values*, 6(3), 273-285.
- Okamura, J. (2008). *Ethnicity and inequality in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Rohrer, J. (2008). Disrupting the 'melting pot': racial discourse in Hawai'i and the naturalization of haole. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 31(6), 1110-1125.
- Rohrer, J. (2010). *Haoles in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Trask, H. (1999). *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- UnKau Inoa: To Save a Nation (2011). Retrieved from www.unkauinoa.org