

He Hāwa‘e Kai Nui a Kau ma Kula

K. Laiana Wong

College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

Introduction

Dogs are barking, birds are squawking, insects are scurrying for safety. A low rumbling sound that has been building over the past two decades is now accompanied by a noticeable tremor rippling through the foundation of the earth. The impending crescendo forewarns the Hawaiian community of massive upheaval in the sociolinguistic status quo. No one will be excluded from the experience. The consequences will be monumental, and the ramifications for the status quo will be devastating. As we stand on the brink of change, a magnificent panorama unfolds before us. It beckons us to take the plunge and maximize the experience through involvement in this movement. But, alas! A white cloud appears, obscuring the view. An omen, perhaps?

The geological metaphor employed here to represent social change serves as a reminder that such change does not occur over night. Like geological change, social change takes ages. Its progress is hindered by obstinate and persistent conservative forces that work to maintain the status quo. It is often not realized within the lifetime of its agents.

The Hawaiian language revitalization movement can trace its origin to a general Hawaiian cultural revolution that began in the late 1960's (Warner, 2001). However, the renaissance of the language really began in the early 1980's when a group of educators established the Hawaiian language immersion pre-schools known as Pūnana Leo (Kapono, 1994; Warner, 2001; Wilson & Kamanā, 2001). The primary goal of the Pūnana Leo is to produce a new generation of Hawaiian language speakers, by using Hawaiian language as an educational medium. The inspiration for this endeavor was derived from the analogous efforts already underway in Aotearoa to revitalize the Maori language. Although the Hawaiian movement involved participants from many segments of the wider community, its epicenter can be traced to the efforts of several Hawaiian language professors at the University of Hawai‘i who provided the initial tremors that eventually rippled outward affecting the entire community. While some members of the academy have spurred the

movement to revitalize the Hawaiian language, the academy, itself, has been one of the most obstinate and persistent impediments to progress.

The ecology of the Hawaiian language has always been the focal point of this movement and serves as the primary focus of this article. Constant struggle has accompanied efforts to find a permanent home for Hawaiian at the University of Hawai‘i and the various domains encompassed by it. Moreover, the success of the movement is not necessarily achieved by the mere attainment of space in which Hawaiian might reside; such space must be recognized as equally valuable and of equal status to that of English. Over the years, the academy has been very reluctant to surrender such space to Hawaiian. In general, no space is ever surrendered without struggle, and the minimal space that has been gained by Hawaiian in the academy is space that is perceived to be of little or no cost to the ecology of English. In many of the examples I will be citing in this article, the space that has been yielded is still occupied by English and not solely available to Hawaiian. The surrender of space to Hawaiian has never been unconditional. It has always been handed over under the academy's terms and at considerable compromise on the part of advocates for Hawaiian.

Official Languages of the State

The Hawai‘i State Constitutional Convention of 1978 culminated, in part, with the inclusion of an amendment to the state constitution designating Hawaiian and English as the two official languages of the state. The official status that has been accorded the Hawaiian language has been invoked on numerous occasions to support arguments for the expansion of domains of use available to it. What is often excluded from such discourse is the codicil to the amendment that protects the hegemonic relationship that obtains between English and Hawaiian, insuring that any counter hegemonic movement can be stifled before gaining any real momentum. The codicil states, "Whenever there is found to exist any radical and irreconcilable difference

between the English and Hawaiian versions of any of the laws of the State, the English version shall be held binding.” (Hawai’i State Constitution, 1978). Many people intimately involved in the movement to revitalize the Hawaiian language are completely unaware of this fact. They do not realize that the state, by creating this escape clause, manages to appear to be a benevolent supporter of linguistic human rights at one level, while reserving, at another level, the right to escape any burdensome, language-related responsibility to the indigenous segment of the community.

Linguistic Human Rights

In many ways, this half-hearted *de jure* support of the Hawaiian language in the state constitution is symbolic of a bigger phenomenon. On December 18, 1992, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities. Article 4 of the declaration includes several sections that guide the policies of its member states with regard to minority languages:

- 4.2. States shall take measures to create favorable conditions to enable persons belonging to minorities to express their characteristics and to develop their culture, language, religion, traditions and customs, except where specific practices are in violation of national and contrary to international standards.
- 4.3. States should take appropriate measures so that, wherever possible, persons belonging to minorities have adequate opportunities to learn their mother tongue or to have instruction in their mother tongue.
- 4.4. States should, where appropriate, take measures in the field of education, in order to encourage knowledge of the history, traditions, language and culture of the minorities existing within their territory. Persons belonging to minorities should have adequate opportunities to gain knowledge of the society as a whole (United Nations General Assembly, 1992).

The wording in these sections of Article 4 is clearly riddled with opportunities for the various member states to escape their responsibilities to their minority citizenry.

Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995) raise several questions about the meanings of certain phrases such as “appropriate measures” and “adequate opportunities;” and about who determines what is “possible.” They also point out the ambiguity inherent in the phrasing concerning “instruction in the mother tongue” (i.e., whether this means that the mother tongue is to be the medium or the subject of instruction). Similar questions can be raised about the language in 4.2 and 4.4. But it is not surprising that the language is so loosely constructed. After all, how many of the representatives at the United Nations are members of minority groups of the states they represent? The only question here is whether the noncommittal nature of the wording derives from economic or logistic concerns, or from a hegemonic ideology that veils an underlying current of linguicism¹ (Skutnabb-Kangas, 1990).

Linguicism, Discrimination, and Merit

Skutnabb-Kangas (1990) suggests that ethnicism and linguicism are the new more subtle forms of racism that pervade society today. She defines these as “ideologies, structures and practices which are used to legitimate, effectuate, and reproduce an unequal division of power and resources (both material and non-material) between groups defined on the basis of race/ethnicity/language” (p. 77). With race no longer a tenable or viable criterion on which to base discriminatory practices, ethnicity and language have replaced it as more legitimate avenues for maintaining imbalances in the distribution of power and resources. These new avenues allow for the maintenance of the ideology of English with relative impunity. Dorian (1998) suggests something more than the mere dominance of English:

Europeans who came from polities with a history of standardizing and promoting just one high-prestige speech form carried their “ideology of contempt” for subordinate languages with them when they conquered far-flung territories, to the serious detriment of indigenous languages. (p. 9)

The use of language as a means to discriminate against certain groups of people is insidiously clever in that it is

¹ Skutnabb-Kangas (1988) argues that racism is being replaced by a more sophisticated form of discrimination, linguicism. This uses the languages of different groups as defining criteria for hierarchization.

clouded by so many other issues that the immorality of it is completely obscured. It is not, *a priori*, considered inappropriate to use language as a criterion for awarding people with the perquisites and benefits available to the members of society. In fact, the ability to use a certain type of linguistic code is viewed as a completely acceptable criterion for determining who should and should not receive such awards. It is deemed acceptable for the simple fact that linguistic ability is one of the prime determinants of merit, and merit has always been acceptable as a reason for awarding some and not others. Merit, insofar as language is concerned, is related to issues of relative ability and the effort expended in order to acquire that ability. A person who has acquired the ability to use a particular form of language proficiently is considered to be deserving of award based on merit. The insidious part of this practice is that the particular form of language that serves as the target of acquisition efforts is promoted by the dominant group to a position of superiority over all other languages in society. Not surprisingly, that form of language and the language used by the dominant group are one and the same. The dominant group is in the best position to promote its own language as superior to all other competing languages. In Wong (1999), I made a similar argument for the promotion of a particular version of a language as being superior to others based on authenticity.

The predisposition of the Hawaiian community (as well as many others) to accept binary standards as legitimate, has made it possible for the promoters with the greatest economic and political means to establish positions of authority from which to define authenticity and use that definition to promote their versions of language to be more authentic and therefore superior to others. The dominance of the promoter, therefore, is perpetuated, along with the authority to define his or her own superiority.

Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995) describe a new form of social Darwinism that predicts the survival of the fittest languages. This suggests that any language that can survive over time must have been able to do so because of some inherent fitness that protects it from obsolescence. A language lost is viewed as having been too weak to resist the natural process that ultimately leads to obsolescence. Thus, there is no one to blame for the demise of such languages. They simply succumb to this natural process. But Skutnabb-Kangas and Phillipson (1995, p. 104) point out that the

process is supported by the “hegemony of the dominant group” that deprives minority languages of “resources and a fair chance to survive.” The demise of minority languages under these conditions is thus a matter of course and the prophecy is fulfilled by the acts of the prophet. The various member states of the United Nations can claim to be supportive of linguistic human rights without actually providing real support.

Thus racism is succeeded by ethnicism and linguisticism, and the perpetuation of these, in turn, is rationalized as being part of the natural order that governs the ecology of “living” things. A language that is unable to maintain or attract users is viewed as weak and, therefore, deserving of its ultimate fate (i.e., being abandoned by its speakers in favor of a language that is perceived to offer more opportunities for a better life). Is there a place to cast blame here? Does non-support of minority languages constitute an act of racism? Is it linguisticism? A rationale for legitimate forms of discrimination can be constructed on the basis of merit and supported by policies that create a semblance of altruistic motives with regard to the recognition and acceptance of the linguistic human rights of minority groups. These strategies are designed to maintain the status quo, which clearly features the hierarchical organization of ethnic groups and, by the principle of transitivity, their languages. Complementing such strategies is the ruse of conceding a minimal amount of space here and there which is designed not so much to reconcile injustice, but to appease the marginalized group. Such concessions are perceived to be major victories by the marginalized groups but generally come at minimal cost to the dominant group.

Arguments in support of linguistic human rights are most compelling in situations involving indigenous minority languages. Devastated by colonialism, indigenous languages such as Hawaiian desperately seek any reprieve from annihilation. The Hawaiian language has no other homeland to which its speakers might return in search of their roots. Hawaiians cry out, thirsting for restitution, but are at the mercy of the dominant group; a direct descendant of their colonizer. Restitution, however, is doled out one drop at a time while Hawaiian throats grow increasingly parched, unable to produce indigenous sounds. Relief is nowhere in sight; even at a time that is labeled “post-colonial.” Smith (1999) points out that the label “post-colonial” is often misused to characterize a situation involving an ongoing process of decolonization.

The term “post-colonial” suggests that the colonizer has packed up and gone, or is no longer in control. This is clearly not the case in Hawai‘i. Efforts to decolonize are continuous and progress is slow:

Decolonization, once viewed as the formal process of handing over the instruments of government, is now recognized as a long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power. (p. 98)

Power, however, is not the kind of thing that is given up willingly. It does not have to be. Those who hold power determine what has to be.

The Institution as Contested Ground

The apparent advances the Hawaiian language has made into the domain of higher education have occurred only because they have been allowed to occur. Not unlike the United Nations Declaration and the Hawai‘i state statute concerning official languages, language that guides policy at the level of the academy has been crafted loosely with the possibility of wide latitude in interpretation. Could this be a case of racism, ethnicism, and/or linguisticism? What is the intent behind the noncommittal stance at this level? Although the academy as an institution cannot be thought of as having its own intention, it does, however, have a mission, along with objectives and goals. These are programmed into the system by its constituent faculty, which is a collection of individuals, each of whom comes equipped with intent. At the University of Hawai‘i, Hawaiians are glaringly underrepresented in that collection of individuals and, as such, have little input with regard to programming the system and influencing the direction its mission shall take. Moreover, where there is no specific written policy that guides decisions on issues such as the use of Hawaiian, individual members of the collective are imbued with ample latitude within which to interpret the mission of the institution as they see fit.² Administrative duties are often handled on a rotating basis, and depending on the individual currently occupying a particular decision making position, a wide ranging continuum of support and opposition can result. The fact that Hawaiians have been traditionally excluded from these positions magnifies the difficulty of the struggle over space for Hawaiian language in the academy. It is important to recognize that, while the system has no intent, it also has no compassion or fear. To point

an accusatory finger at the institution accomplishes little, as there is no way to condemn something that has no soul. It is the individual responsible for making certain decisions on and interpretations of institutional policy who has the intent and, presumably, the soul. It is also the individual who uses the soulless institution as a shield that provides immunity from accountability. It is the individual who must be held accountable. It is the individual who fears condemnation; assuming there is a soul to condemn.

Sites of Language Struggle in the Institution

The University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Strategic Plan

One of the more recent sites of struggle has been the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s strategic plan (University of Hawai‘i, 2002a), *Defining Our Destiny*. This plan was formulated to provide general guidance in all aspects and activities of the Mānoa campus. To some extent it reflects the University of Hawai‘i System Strategic Plan (University of Hawai‘i, 2002b), *Entering the University’s Second Century*, that extends beyond the Mānoa campus to encompass the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo and numerous community colleges throughout the state. The system-wide strategic plan includes language that is very supportive of Hawaiian language and Hawaiian cultural values.

The Mānoa strategic plan (University of Hawai‘i, 2002a) begins with the promise of similar support. The vision statement represents the “hopes and dreams of many of us at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa” (p. 2):

Mānoa is a leading research institution whose scholars are leaders in their disciplines and whose students are prepared for leadership roles in society. Mānoa strives for excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Mānoa is an innovative institution comfortable with change. Mānoa celebrates its diversity and uniqueness as a Hawaiian center of learning. We build on our strengths including our unparalleled natural environment and tradition of outstanding Asia-Pacific scholarship. (p. 3)

But this is where the similarity ends. In contrast to the system-wide strategic plan, the Mānoa plan, as it initially

² I am grateful to Michael L. Forman (Professor, Linguistics Department, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa) for pointing this out to me.

appeared in draft form, was virtually devoid of language celebrating the uniqueness of the Mānoa campus as a Hawaiian center of learning. Realizing the importance of including similar language in the Mānoa strategic plan before it was ever fleshed out, several members of the Hawaiian language faculty attended a session at which input from various segments of the campus community was solicited on significant issues; the assumption being that this input would be included in the final version of the strategic plan. A multitude of Hawaiian-related issues was raised at the time, but months later, when the revised version of the plan was sent to the Hawaiian language department with a request that it be translated into Hawaiian, there was nothing in the document calling for support of Hawaiian language. There was only one bullet relating to Hawaiian culture. It was contained in the section on culture, making it a strategic imperative of the University to “Celebrate the renaissance of Hawaiian culture” (p. 11). Apparently, the intention of having the document translated into Hawaiian was supposed to be part of the “celebration.” The real question is whether or not such an act constitutes real support.

In a meeting between Hawaiian language faculty members and Chancellor Peter Englert, the issue was raised concerning the divergence of the Mānoa plan from the system-wide plan with regard to support for Hawaiian language and culture. Chancellor Englert agreed that a couple of bullets could be added to the Mānoa strategic plan to reconcile it with the system-wide plan. The Hawaiian Language faculty was asked to create the new bullets and submit them to the office of the Vice Chancellor which had been charged with overseeing the project. We, of course, viewed this as an opportunity to craft powerful wording in support of our own perceived mission, and thus proceeded to take some latitude of our own by creating three bullets comprised of long sentences with everything we could think of to include. Not surprisingly, a counter proposal was returned to us in which our language had been pared down to the bone, leaving just two short sentences. They were as follows:

“Promote the study of Hawaiian language and culture.”

“Support advanced research and scholarship on Hawaiian language and culture.”³

It was, needless to say, disappointing to see our issues

reduced to such minimal coverage that might easily be lost in the larger document. This type of coverage was, however, in keeping with the rest of the document in that no other area had any more specific language attached to it. Understanding this, our only remaining major concern was with the exclusion of wording in support of Hawaiian education. After another round of negotiation, however, the word “education” was included in the first bullet to read “Promote the study of Hawaiian language, culture, and education.” Despite our request that the same adjustment be made to the second bullet, it remained unchanged (University of Hawai‘i, 2002a).⁴

Even though most of our issues were subsumed under these two bullets we remained concerned with the degree of latitude available for non-performance on the part of officials so inclined. Our initial petition stressed support for the use of Hawaiian throughout the campus and across the wider community. The language in the bullets falls short of this important category of support. It makes the Hawaiian language a topic for study and research only and not a medium within which study and research can be conducted. Also absent from these bullets is any support for the use of Hawaiian in domains outside the subjects of study and research.

To be fair, the Mānoa strategic plan is very new and is intended to be a living document that can be adapted easily to change in its environment. The fact that its vision includes a commitment to making the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa “a Hawaiian center of learning” (University of Hawai‘i, 2002a, p. 3) is encouraging. The celebration of Hawaiian knowledge at Mānoa was never part of the administration’s discourse before the arrival of President Evan Dohelle and Chancellor Englert; the very first chancellor ever appointed specifically to manage the Mānoa campus. One very noticeable result of this appointment is that, for the first time, a line of communication has been opened between Hawaiian entities on the Mānoa campus and the University administration. Under this type of leadership, there is new hope that Hawaiians will finally have a voice in defining our own destiny. In reality, however, the actual commitment that the institution makes to Hawaiian language, culture, and education remains to be seen. The institution is a classic bureaucracy consisting of many individuals each holding

³ This was received in an email from the office of the Vice Chancellor on October 29, 2002.

⁴ This information can be accessed at www.uhm.hawaii.edu/vision.

reign over a small domain. The efforts of a few highly ranked individuals to effect change, as in this new commitment to Hawaiian interests, can be stymied by an old guard that is loath to recognize the rights of the indigenous people of Hawai'i.

In hindsight, it appears that the specific language we had hoped to include in the bullets would have called too much attention to this radical change to the culture of the university. Those factions who do not support Hawaiian issues might have chosen to put up opposition to such change. It could be argued that the decision to submit language that promotes Hawaiian concerns in a more general way turns out to be astute, considering the wording encountered no opposition and is now a part of the document. Although the inherent latitude in the wording of the Mānoa strategic plan leaves open the possibility for non-support, it also opens an avenue for support that did not previously exist. Proponents of Hawaiian-related issues are able to invoke the vision statement and the strategic imperatives as mandates for support that have been validated by the university community as defining our destiny.

The University of Hawai'i Style Guide

In the struggle to gain space for Hawaiian, some sites are more strategically valuable than others. In recent years, the University of Hawai'i has adopted a policy encouraging the correct spelling of Hawaiian words appearing in University documents. The University of Hawai'i Style Guide (University of Hawai'i, 2002c) has deemed that "correct spelling" requires the inclusion of the symbols for glottal stops ('okina) and macrons (kahakō). Whether or not the inclusion of these marks is universally accepted in the Hawaiian speaking community as correct is debatable. Some people feel that the inclusion of these marks actually denigrates the "traditional" orthography and is anything but "correct." Although it is tempting to explore this line of thought, it is better left to another discussion. For now, it should suffice to say that this "space" that has been gained, although ostensibly supportive of Hawaiian language, is not a highly contested piece of ground that one would exert maximum effort to attain.

In what is shaping up to be the *modus operandi* of policy makers in the public arena, an escape clause has been attached to this policy as well. It states, "However, it is better to omit glottals and macrons than to sprinkle them like so

much salt and pepper in your publication" (p. 13). I take this to mean that an author is advised to use the marks consistently or not use them at all. Interestingly enough, the word *kahakō* is spelled without the macron (i.e., *kahako*) in the style guide, while the word *'okina* is spelled with the glottal stop. While the use of Hawaiian orthography is "encouraged," this inconsistency would appear to violate the policy as written. This instantiation is symbolic of the superficial nature of support for Hawaiian in the institution.

The Diplomacy of Diplomas

By the time spring commencement of the class of 1995 rolled around, another concession had been made allowing students the option of receiving their diplomas either in Hawaiian or English, or one of each. This privilege was not a simple matter of choice. An unforeseen problem had arisen on at least two occasions when students wished to opt solely for the Hawaiian version. It is not clear whether this was driven by political, social, or economic reasons, but it resulted in the establishment of an extra document⁵ that would accompany the application for diploma. This document, which has been used since then, is in essence a waiver releasing the University of Hawaii at Manoa Admissions and Records Office⁶ from the responsibility of verifying the language in the Hawaiian document. Obviously, no reciprocal waiver was required of students who wished to opt only for the English version. The ostensive rationale for this requirement was that the Hawaiian version of the diploma might not be honored at face value by potential employers. Moreover, the office staff would not be able to support the graduate by verifying his or her claim *vis-à-vis* the actual degree that had been conferred.

It would seem that any doubts as to the veracity of such a claim could have easily been resolved by a quick check of the student's file. The waiver solution does nothing to support the student, nor does it support Hawaiian language in any way. Other, more supportive, solutions were not considered. For example, a list of translations could be kept on file for the purposes of verification. It would also be possible to hire someone with proficiency in the Hawaiian language to serve on the staff. This particular scenario illustrates another

⁵ The form is called: "Statement to be Signed by Students Who Request Hawaiian Language Only Version of the Diploma" (University of Hawai'i).

⁶ In omitting the diacritical marks on the words "Hawaii" and "Manoa" in their official waiver release form, the Admissions and Records Office has apparently chosen to abstain from both salt and pepper.

form of challenge within the institution. On one level, the Hawaiian language is supported by the mere fact that the option is available. At the level of implementation, however, there are a range of possible courses of action to take and, to date, the most non-supportive of these choices has been executed.

Research Languages

There is one particular domain of the university from which Hawaiian is clearly excluded—the academic. For example, one of the requirements for attaining a doctoral degree in Linguistics is that each candidate must “demonstrate competence” in two languages other than his or her native language. One of these languages must be in the “research-tool” category. According to the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa Catalog (University of Hawai‘i, 2002d):

A “research-tool language” should be one of the major languages of the world in which there is ample published material on linguistic topics; Chinese, English, French, German, Japanese, Russian, or Spanish. Students should demonstrate their ability to read linguistic materials in one of these languages. (p. 137)

The policy, as written, clearly indicates this to be a closed list and, despite being the indigenous language of Hawai‘i and one of the state’s two official languages, Hawaiian does not make the list. It would be ironic if the ambiguity of the language in this policy were to benefit proponents of Hawaiian in this particular context. It is not clear, for example, what is meant by “major languages of the world.” Another point of contention centers around what can be considered as “linguistic topics,” and whether or not these are “ample.” It would be interesting to find out who took the time to read the plethora of materials written in Hawaiian to determine that not enough of these could be considered to cover “linguistic topics.”

Style & Policy Manual for Theses and Dissertations

Another policy illustrative of the superficial nature of the support offered to Hawaiian can be found in the Style & Policy Manual for Theses and Dissertations (University of Hawai‘i, 2002e) put out by the University of Hawai‘i Graduate Division. Section 1.2 under Procedures reads as follows:

The thesis or dissertation must be written in English or in Hawaiian. All Graduate Division requirements must be met. The thesis or dissertation must be read and approved by the committee. If the paper is written in Hawaiian, an abstract in English must also be provided. (p. 1)

Here again, what appears on the surface to be a policy that is highly supportive of the use of Hawaiian language at the academy, under closer examination, reveals that support to be vacuous and its enforcement escapable. The fact that so few tenured faculty at the University of Hawai‘i are able to read Hawaiian, even at an elementary level, can preclude a masters or doctoral candidate from writing a thesis or dissertation in Hawaiian for the obvious reason that he or she would be unable to field a committee capable of providing such support. Most departments have very specific requirements describing how a committee can be constituted. One member who is unable to read the Hawaiian could force the abandonment of any such project. Furthermore, and perhaps more revealing, this practice is evidence of the insidious forces that work to maintain the hegemony of English. The requirement of an abstract written in English to accompany the Hawaiian thesis or dissertation suggests symbolically that Hawaiian is not legitimate, unless it is connected to English in some way. As in the case of the diploma written in Hawaiian, there is no reciprocal requirement stating that a thesis or dissertation written in English be accompanied by an abstract written in Hawaiian.

Personnel Policies and Procedures

There are many other examples of superficial support for Hawaiian language, many of which deal more with Hawaiian “ways of speaking”⁷ than with the part of Hawaiian language that is recognized by vocabulary and grammatical rules. Rules for academic writing in English that hold writing styles that employ redundancy and extensive use of passive to be inappropriate or problematic, do not accord with Hawaiian ways of using language. The expectation that individuals promote themselves and their work in order to gain promotion or to obtain funding also violates Hawai-

⁷ Hymes (1996, p. 33) speaks of the “repertoire” of a group as comprising a set of “ways of speaking.” Ways of speaking, in turn, comprise speech styles, on the one hand, and contexts of discourse, on the other, together with relations of appropriateness obtaining between styles and contexts.”

ian ways of using language. For this reason, Hawaiians tend to have difficulties achieving success within the institution even when vying for positions to teach their own heritage language. For example, during a hiring procedure, it is considered discriminatory to invoke the phrase “native speaker” to highlight language competence. This practice serves to maintain the hegemony of English.⁸

The School Newspaper: *Ka Leo o Hawai‘i*

There is one final site of language struggle centrally related to this discussion. It involves the publication of Hawaiian language articles in the school newspaper, *Ka Leo o Hawai‘i*. This name is translated as “The Voice of Hawai‘i.” The primary issue germane to this discussion relates to the struggle over whether or not a translation must be provided along with an article written in Hawaiian. Again, and quite predictably, no reciprocal requirement has ever been discussed for articles written in English. The nature of the school paper is such that the longevity of its staff corresponds to the tenure of students at the university. The editor serves for a term of only one year before being replaced. Policies are not set with regard to the Hawaiian language issue but are decided on an ad hoc basis by the editor. In the struggle over this particular site, proponents of Hawaiian language have encountered a range of attitudes, from outright refusal to print articles written in Hawaiian, to various levels of acceptance of Hawaiian based on how much English is required to accompany it, to acceptance of articles written solely in Hawaiian. The current editor, for example, has been encouraging students to send in articles and letters written in Hawaiian without requiring translations. This most recent scenario promotes a certain amount of optimism for those who are pro-Hawaiian; at least until next year.

Conclusion

It should be noted that there is a consistency in the theme that connects the examples discussed. That is, policies ostensibly supportive of Hawaiian language and its inclusion in various domains of use at the academy are, in fact, superficial and in some cases, vacuous. Because they are loosely worded and ambiguous, they allow for wide latitude in interpretation and offer every opportunity for the evasion of support. Although these policies appear to make room for the inclusion of Hawaiian at the academy, Hawaiian is clearly

not accorded parity with English. Indeed, more insidiously, the collective membership of the academy can appear to be sensitive to, and supportive of, the right of the indigenous people of Hawai‘i to use and learn their language, while leaving ample room to evade the issue and retreat from any real support. Nonetheless, these policies are “on the books” and time will tell the amount of true support that can be derived from their existence. In English it is said that the proof is in the pudding. In Hawaiian, we say, “Hō a‘e ka ‘ike he‘enalua i ka hokua o ka ‘ale.”⁹ [Sorry, no translation available.]

References

- Dorian, N. C. (1998). Western language ideology and small-language prospects. In L. A. Grenoble & J. W. Lindsay (Eds.), *Endangered languages: Language loss and community response*, (pp. 3–210). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- State of Hawai‘i. (1978). *Hawai‘i State Constitution, Official Languages, Article XV, Section 4*, p.1. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. London, England: Taylor & Francis.
- Kapono, E. (1994). Hawaiian language revitalization and immersion education. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 112, 121–135.
- Pukui, M. K. (1983). *‘Ōlelo no‘eau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*. Honolulu, HI: Bishop Museum Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1988). Multilingualism and the education of minority children. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Minority education. From shame to struggle*, (pp. 9–44). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (1990). Legitimizing or delegitimizing new forms of racism - the role of researchers. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 11(1), 77–100.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T., & Phillipson, R. (1995). Linguistic human rights, past and present. In T. Skutnabb-Kangas & R. Phillipson (Eds.), *Linguistic human rights: Overcoming linguistic discrimination*, (pp. 71–110). New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. Dunedin, New Zealand: University of Otago Press.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1992). *Declaration on the rights of persons belonging to national or ethnic, religious and linguistic minorities. Article 4, Sections 2–4*. Geneva, Switzerland: Author.
- University of Hawai‘i. (2002a). *University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Defining our destiny: Strategic plan, 2002–2010*. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- University of Hawai‘i. (2002b). *University of Hawai‘i system strategic plan: Entering the university’s second century, 2002–2010*. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- University of Hawai‘i. (2002c). *University of Hawai‘i style guide*. Honolulu, HI: Author.

⁸ These examples, although supportive of the present discussion and deserving of elaboration, will simply be noted here as such in the interest of brevity.

⁹ This is an ‘ōlelo no‘eau, or proverbial saying (see Pukui, 1983, p. 108).

-
- University of Hawai'i. (2002d). *The University of Hawai'i at Mānoa catalog, 2003–2004*. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- University of Hawai'i. (2002e). *Style & policy manual for theses and dissertations*. Honolulu, HI: Author.
- Warner, S. L. (1999a). Hawaiian language regenesi: Planning for intergenerational use of Hawaiian beyond the school. In T. Huebner & K. A. Davis (Eds.), *Sociopolitical perspectives on language planning and policy in the USA*, pp 313–332. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Warner, S. L. (1999b). Kuleana: The right, responsibility, and authority of indigenous peoples to speak and make decisions for themselves in language and cultural revitalization. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 30(1), 68–93.
- Warner, S. L. (2001). The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, pp. 133–144. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wilson, W. H., & Kamanā, K. (2001). "Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini: Proceeding from a dream": The 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In L. Hinton & K. Hale (Eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, pp. 133–144. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Wong, K. L. (1999). Authenticity and the revitalization of Hawaiian. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 30(1), 68–93.

Laiana Wong is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Hawaiian and Indo-Pacific Languages and Literatures at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. His research on Hawaiian language revitalization represents his contribution to a more general effort to elevate the quality of life of the Hawaiian people. He is particularly interested in researching Hawaiian ways of speaking and thinking that diverge from those of English, and he seeks to promote these in an effort to curb the heavy influence English has on contemporary Hawaiian.
