

Preface

EDUCATION PERMEATES THE whole of Hawaiian culture. All learning and experience are part of the great search, *ka 'imi loa*: probing backward in time to the origins, entering intensely into the current experience, and looking forward in time both to estimate the consequences of past and present and also to innovate and create. Ideally Hawaiians study the past thoroughly, live the present to its fullest, and observe and mold the new. Hawaiian education must therefore be studied globally in its many forms and connections to life, action, and thought.¹

Hawaiian education can be compared to the Greek *paideia*: it is no less than 'the formation of the Greek human being' and thus, as an object of study, a means of rethinking Greek culture as a whole.² The classical German idea of *Bildung*—the formation or cultivation of human talents towards a cultural ideal—was influenced by that of *paideia* and is similarly broad. The esthetic sense is given the role of joining all human capacities in this quest, which includes the study of world cultures, historical and living, and should result in a harmony of the human being with the cosmos.³ This German educational ideal, just like the Hawaiian, inspired works of literature such as the *Bildungsroman* 'novel of cultivation'.

The importance of studying education in order to understand a particular culture is recognized. Jane and James Ritchie discuss the new emphasis on ethnopsychology and indigenous theories of knowledge (1989: 115):

To know what is worth knowing is to understand matters that lie at the very core of a culture, and this can be studied by examining what the young are taught and how they are taught it. Thus the content of learning, as well as learning styles, has become an important focus.

Indeed education in general and pedagogy in particular are recognized as prerequisites of human culture itself.⁴ Education is used to enculturate or socialize people in their own culture; it can be used also to acculturate or adapt them to a foreign one, a process that can end in assimilation. Complicated cultures cannot be transmitted merely by language learning, observation, nonverbal instruction, or informal teaching, though these have attracted more theoretical and ethnographic attention than formal education itself. In Hawai'i in particular, the emphasis on words, even in technical or skill training, imbues to an extraordinary degree all fields of knowledge with cultural perceptions and values (compare Premack 1984:16, 29–34). Finally the esthetic dimension of education, explicit in Hawaiian culture, is now seen as central to all pedagogical efforts, whether recognized or unconscious.⁵ In his study of classical Greece, Werner Jaeger writes (1959:2), 'all education is the immediate outflow of a human community's living consciousness of a norm.'

The broad range of Hawaiian education can be seen in its concerns. As have apparently all human beings, Hawaiians felt the need for a general view of the world and the meaning of life. Their very survival depended on their knowledge of their environment and their ability to use it for their own purposes. Their relations with others demanded a view of society, character, and proper conduct or morality. The intellectuality of Hawaiian culture has been neglected in the secondary literature, although apparent in such varied phenomena as the abstraction in the design of petroglyphs and feathered cloaks, the geometric designs in tattooing and on household objects, the stylization of statues, and

the ease with which abstract ideas are expressed in the Hawaiian language.

The Hawaiian emphasis on learning is a characteristic of Polynesian cultures (Luomala 1955: 43–60). Indeed the great similarities among the traditions of the different Polynesian groups demonstrate that a major effort was made to preserve their intellectual heritage in their migrations. Nevertheless, all of the above areas of study were developed with unusual fullness and complexity by Hawaiians, a result, I will argue, of their cultural and educational ideals. The ideal of completeness motivated them to accumulate an enormous amount of material; the ideal of perfection, to develop an extraordinarily large number of specializations. Knowledge and expertise were themselves ideals and conferred prestige. The methods and ideals of education influenced strongly both literature and behavior.

Because of the importance of education in Hawaiian culture, intellect, cultivation, education, expertise, and training are explicitly and frequently emphasized in various forms of Hawaiian literature. As a result, a broad basis of documentary evidence exists on which to study the subject today.

For the classical period, a vocabulary was canonized to express the ideals and the process of education. Proverbial sayings and expressions transmitted the Hawaiian view on the subject from generation to generation. Tales exalted the intelligent and poured scorn on the foolish. Short and very extended narratives were composed about experts in riddling and the contest of wits. The traditions of Pāka‘a and his son Kūapāka‘a are lengthy and popular descriptions of education and its uses (Charlot recently completed). Pāka‘a is the learned counselor of the major Hawai‘i chief Keawenuia‘umi but loses his position through the intrigue of his enemies. He moves to Moloka‘i and educates his son, Kūapāka‘a, in order to revenge himself and regain his place at court. By tricks and displays of knowledge and service, they succeed. In the traditions of Kalapana or Kapalaoa/Kaipalaoa, a Kaua‘i chief becomes

famous at the *ho'opāpā* 'contest of wits', during which the contestants bet their lives. Kalapana's father is killed after losing to the chief, and the son is educated in order to revenge his father, which he succeeds in doing after a long and brilliant contest.

Historical traditions of chiefs like Kawelo and Lonoikamakahiki devote much attention to their early upbringing and education. As the chiefs learn one profession after another, information is provided about the particular forms of education in each field. Reports of the achievements and famous deeds of experts in various fields were transmitted. Families and organized schools passed on their histories and the stories of their famous experts. The literary works associated with the different professions were memorized, transmitted, and finally recorded in writing.

Indeed, once the Hawaiian language had been officially reduced to writing in the mid-1820s, Hawaiians were quick to transcribe their oral traditions and memorized materials. Great numbers of manuscripts were produced, and the Hawaiian-language newspapers regularly published articles and series dealing with historical and ethnographic subjects. The major nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language authors will be used extensively in this study.

The first and in many ways foremost among these authors was David Malo (February 18, 1795–October 21, 1853).⁶ From an early age, Malo was employed at court because of his intellectual capacities (A. November 5, 1853):

He was a great favorite when young, with the chiefs, on account of his smartness, his acquaintance with their songs, dances and other amusements, and hence able to administer largely to their love of pleasure.

He received a classical education from the chief 'Auwae of Wailuku, Maui. As a court intellectual, he was one of the first to hear of Christianity and to be charged with the task of obtaining a

Western education.⁷ At thirty-six years of age, he was a member of the first class of the high school established at Lahainaluna, Maui. He later served as a teacher and educational administrator, including Superintendent of Schools for the Kingdom from 1841 to 1845.⁸ He was an avid reader and lifelong supporter of education: “As soon as books were to be had in his own language, he seized each successive volume with the avidity of one actuated by a passion to learn” (A. November 5, 1853). He collected Hawaiian books, read them constantly, and bound his newspapers for further use. He was converted to Christianity, served as a preacher, and in 1852 became the third Hawaiian to be ordained.⁹ He had for some time been an essential aid to the missionaries in the translation and composition of Christian works in Hawaiian. He was an effective preacher and wrote works in support of Christianity.¹⁰ He served in the first House of Representatives, protested against the growing influence of foreigners in the Hawaiian government, and worked in many different ways for the good of his people. To give just one example, as “a man of business, and of industry and enterprise,” he supported a brief and unsuccessful movement to render Hawai‘i independent in the production of cloth by planting cotton and processing it until he had produced a complete suit for himself: “When asked where he got that strange-looking cloth (it was rather coarse) he would point to the dirt under his feet, saying ‘it came thence’” (A. November 5, 1853).

Malo’s greatest achievement was his manuscript *Ka Moolelo Hawaii*, the earliest book-length account of Hawaiian culture (Malo n.d.; 1951; 1987). That manuscript was often used as the foundation of the effort of nineteenth-century Hawaiian writers to preserve their past. Malo’s work was at the time not only the most complete written record of traditional knowledge, but presented that knowledge according to the traditional organization. The book was therefore the product of centuries of Hawaiian educational theory and practice and was treated with extraordi-

nary reverence. James Bicknell repeats what was perhaps only a rumor about Kalākaua (n.d.: 3):

The King, it is reported, is striving to bring the system of fetich worship into a concise form of which he shall be the acknowledged head. In the palace is a small room the only furniture in which is a table with a book lying upon it. The book is David Malo's history of Hawaiian traditions and legends, which after his death came into his daughter's possession; the King obtained it through her husband, John Kapena.

Usually, before reading, a circuit of the table is made seven times, after which the book is opened with a show of reverence, and then the credulous owner of the sanctum holds converse, in imagination, with the gods and demi-gods. This book is the basis of the present Hale Naua.

One of those who profited from Malo's work was the younger writer Samuel Mānaiakalani Kamakau (October 29, 1815–September 5, 1876).¹¹ From a family of priestly intellectuals who converted to Christianity—*he poe mikiāla i ke akamai* 'a people prompt at intelligence' (Kamakau August 25, 1866)—Kamakau entered Lahainaluna in 1833. He worked as a teacher and translator and became the most prolific nineteenth-century writer and controversialist on Hawaiian history and culture, often using his own family members as informants. He was also involved in various speculations placing Hawai'i in relation to world and biblical history. He was active in politics and became a Roman Catholic in 1860.

Like Malo and Kamakau, S. N. Hale'ole (ca. 1819–October 22, 1866) received both a Hawaiian and a Western education.¹² He did extensive research in Hawaiian history and culture, little of which was published in his lifetime but was used by Kamakau after Hale'ole's untimely death. He is best known as the author of the world-class novel *Laieikawai* (Beckwith 1919).

Writing independently of Malo, John Papa 'Īī (August 3,

1800–May 1870) was one of the most important Hawaiian government officials of the nineteenth century, serving in education, administration, the judiciary, and the legislature.¹³ He was educated by his mother to be a court functionary, an occupation he assumed at the age of ten. Like Malo, he was sent early to receive a Western education and performed valuable services for the missionaries. His writings contain much information on both classical and early Western education in Hawai‘i.

Kepelino Kahoali‘i Keauokalani (ca. 1830–1878) was born into a priestly family, and his father was known and recorded as a cultural expert (Kepelino 1932: 3 ff. [Beckwith]). He and his family were converted to Roman Catholicism in 1840, and Kepelino was educated by Catholic priests to be a teacher, learning English, French, Latin, and Greek. He worked briefly in his youth as an assistant missionary in Tahiti and wrote for the Catholic side in religious controversies. His writings on Hawaiian culture seem independent of those of Malo and his followers, and he is considered one of the greatest stylists of Hawaiian prose.

Moses Kuaea Nākuina (July 12, 1867–August 3, 1911) was also from a family with important priestly traditions (Charlot recently completed). His uncle Moses Kuaea was a famous pastor, and his father was a teacher in an English-language school. Nākuina began work as a government bureaucrat but left in a dispute with his boss, Thomas George Thrum, the editor of the *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual*, in which Nākuina published several translations. In 1902, he published two of the finest Hawaiian-language novels, *Moolelo Hawaii o Pakaa a me Ku-a-Pakaa* (1902a) and *Moolelo Hawaii no Kalapana* (1902b), which emphasized the educational and intellectual traditions of Hawai‘i. The latter novel was left unfinished when Nākuina began the church work on which he concentrated until his early death.

The tradition of receiving both a Hawaiian and a Western education was a prominent feature of the life of Mary Kawena Pukui (1895–1986).¹⁴ Raised in the district of Ka‘ū on the island of

Hawai'i, Pukui was the chosen member of her generation to carry on her family's traditions. She became an invaluable resource for a number of scholars with whom she collaborated on books that are essential reading for all students of Hawaiian culture. To her contribution is largely due the fact that so much more information exists on Hawaiian family life than on that of other Polynesian groups.

I will cite many more authors about whom little biographical information is available. For instance, J. H. Kānepu'u's charming memoir about growing up on Moloka'i in the 1820s and 1830s (February 20–April 2, 1868) is an important source of information that would be otherwise unavailable. Kānepu'u wrote for the newspapers and was a sufficiently public personality to be recognized behind his disguises. Molokainuiahina (April 2, 1868) identified him under his pseudonym and gave the real names of family members and places behind those that Kānepu'u had invented. Yet Kānepu'u, like so many nineteenth-century Hawaiian authors, remains a subject for future research.

The great deposit of Hawaiian documents, published and unpublished, provides the basis on which detailed study can be done, especially on subjects that no longer admit of field research. Certain Hawaiian educational practices can in fact still be observed or have been described in the writings of near contemporaries, like Pukui. Many families, hula academies, and individual experts perpetuate into the present day practices that can be documented from the earlier literature. But many other practices must be identified or reconstructed from texts. In doing this, certain problems arise.

Since any study such as this must depend on postcontact written sources, questions of accuracy and continuity arise. This is especially true because change and creativity are as much a part of Polynesian culture as conservatism, resulting in a "persistence of pattern in a changing world" (Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 8 f.; also 26). To ignore the historical process of Hawaiian culture is to fall

into the error of anthropologists who have “amputated our sense of time in human life” (Carrithers 1990:190; also 191 ff., 199–203). Rather than generalizing broadly on cultural change in Hawai‘i, I prefer to investigate individual cases and subjects. For instance, in literature, less difference is now seen by scholars between oral and written. Hawaiians perpetuated many classical genres, techniques, and even composition and performance practices, as well as transmitting a good deal of literature that shows no trace of foreign or postcontact influence. On the other hand, Hawaiians adopted foreign genres, such as songs and serial novels, and exploited many of the possibilities of print, such as editorial notes, references to previous publications, and the omission of previously published materials to which they could refer. In religion, some fields and practitioners adopted new practices and views, others remained free of them, and mixed forms were created.

In educational practices, the continuity seems remarkable. For instance, the literary forms used in education, such as lists, are found very widely and over a long time period. Moreover, the education and training of young children can be followed through postcontact literature: the reminiscences of John Papa ‘Ī‘i of his childhood at the beginning of the nineteenth century (especially February 6, 1869–May 14, 1870); the accounts of J. H. Kānepu‘u of his early life in the 1820s and 1830s, disguised by the pseudonym of Kānewailani (February 20–April 2, 1868); and the writings of Mary Kawena Pukui, based on her own upbringing in the early twentieth century and also on her reading of Hawaiian literature. Interestingly as a kind of tease, Kānepu‘u regularly (and anachronistically) antedates his narrative by one hundred years; the point seems to be that growing up in the country had not changed much.¹⁵ These childhood reminiscences are among the liveliest and most interesting in any literature. More recent Hawaiian accounts can therefore be checked against earlier records.

Moreover, parallels and variants in other Polynesian cultures provide a means of control. For instance, the Tahitian *tataorero*

can be compared to the Hawaiian *kā kā'ōlelo*, and both Tahitians and Hawaiians emphasize place knowledge. The same use of genealogies with stories to preserve and formulate historical accounts is found in Sāmoa as well as Hawai'i.

Most important sources for the subject of Hawaiian education are the writings of the missionary teachers who established a Western school system in the islands, starting in the 1820s. In 1831, the high school at Lahainaluna was founded and attracted some of the best Hawaiian minds of the time, such as Malo, Kamakau, and Hale'ole. Their principal teacher, Lorrin Andrews, was one of the most culturally sensitive and perceptive of the missionaries, and his reports convey a vivid picture of the intense cultural encounter experienced at the school. They also provide details that might more easily be expected of a contemporary cross-cultural psychologist. Indeed many of the intellectual differences between the cultures were openly discussed; Andrews writes (December 2, 1835:2), "The scholars have frequently said to me, 'we can't think as you do'[".]” Significantly many of the observations made by missionary teachers in the early nineteenth century have been repeated by contemporary researchers and educational specialists.¹⁶

The influence of this Western schooling can be identified, for instance, by examining the schoolbooks used up through the 1840s and comparing them with Hawaiian writings (Appendix IV). Missionary reports are also important for identifying educational activities and processes prior to Western schooling. For instance, training in memorization was a standard part of the Western schooling of the time, but missionaries found that Hawaiians were already so adept at it that it created problems, such as identifying which students could read a text and which had simply memorized it. The missionaries' surprise that Hawaiians were most interested in the genealogical passages in the Bible confirms the premissionary character of that interest.

In sum, a remarkable unity can be found in Hawaiian and

foreign sources on education, from the earliest to those of today. On the other hand, systematizing must be avoided, and the variations in the sources respected. Those variations provide indeed much of the richness of Hawaiian and Polynesian materials. Variations can be purely personal. 'Ī'ī was a good boy, so his parents did not instruct him with physical punishment: *O ka laua ao ana iaia, aole me ka hoopai* 'Their teaching him was not done with slaps' ('Ī'ī July 31, 1869). Kānepu'u was a bad boy, so he was scolded more often. 'Ī'ī lived at political and cultural centers; Kānepu'u was a backcountry boy. Lydia Delacerna stated that her famous hula master Pua Ha'aheo was *'olu'olu* 'pleasant, polite' rather than *huhū* 'angry, irritable' like some other teachers (personal communication, November 8, 1990).

An individual took pride in his or her own traditions and personal knowledge; *'o ka'u hula no keia* 'this is *my* hula' (Pukui 1983: number 2571). Inventors and innovators would keep their advantages to themselves, their families, and perhaps their students. The chants composed by Pāka'a and his brother should have been known only by them and their students, not by this strange boy who is in fact Pāka'a's son (Nākuina 1902a:63). The teacher would generally hold something back from his students until death, retaining the prestige of knowing something others did not.

The extended Hawaiian family perpetuated its own distinctive culture, its own special traditions and practices.¹⁷ This was true also of places, which could vary even in vocabulary, pronunciation, the calendar, the ranking and social position of nobility, and the division of labor by gender.¹⁸ Places were famous for certain products, such as tapa and *'awa*, and activities, such as forms of the martial arts; places also competed with each other in various events.¹⁹ Some proverbial sayings had a purely local reference and currency (Luomala 1985:289). Considerable local literatures were developed (Charlot 1983a:55–78). In Nākuina's novel of a riddling contest, the hero Kalapana learns a crucial bit of place

knowledge only because he has traveled to study under his aunt in Hilo (1902b: 7, 9 f., 17). Even with his intensive preparation, Kalapana finds that he must learn special Kaua‘i rules for riddling and needs the help of a local person or *kama‘āina* ‘child of the land’, as well as good judgement (1902b: 27–30).

Throughout Hawaiian—and indeed Polynesian culture—individual differences are emphasized and prized. Most often, however, these can be seen as variations within a pattern. Accordingly each teacher has his or her own methods,²⁰ but these can be placed within a similar educational context. ‘Ī‘i (October 16, 1869) describes three schools of martial arts, each with its own master, rules, and style. But each school has those three elements, and each operates inside a stone enclosure (characteristically, Kamehameha I seems to amalgamate different schools within his own in order to be comprehensive). Pukui describes the differing teaching methods of two hula masters, but both operate within a specially built enclosure, use terms and rules, and have the same teacher-student relationship.²¹ Hoakalei Kamau‘u stated at a dance concert (May 18, 1991) that her famous hula master ‘Iolani Luahine did not teach chants from written sheets, as other teachers did, but told the students “to watch her mouth” as she chanted. Similarly Western education is organized into levels and courses, but content and method vary.

Such a continuity during a time of intense change argues for the firm foundation of Hawaiian education in culture and society. That education is in fact rooted in fundamental ideas—such as the power of words and names—many of which continue to be influential today. Indeed Hawaiian culture offers a particularly clear example of the unexpected capacity of small native cultures to survive intensive contact with world cultures and modernization. Moreover, the first and most basic educational institution was the extended family, which proved one of the most stable elements of Hawaiian society. Through the nineteenth century and into the present day, the Hawaiian family has continued to

offer a traditional education of varying degrees of formality as an alternative to the official system introduced from the West (e.g., Hale'ole in Fornander 1919–1920:67 ff.). The educational experience of most Hawaiians has therefore been bicultural as have their lives in general.

In view of the complexity of Hawaiian continuity and change, the separation of Hawaiian history and culture into precontact and postcontact is too simple for the purposes of this book. This is true also of the nineteenth-century division into two periods separated by the Christianization of the 1820s. I will use the following three categories for culture:

1. *Classical*—cultural elements that originated in the precontact period and were perpetuated with changes or developments, including genealogies, hula, and certain Hawaiian religious practices and values. The word *classical* is used as in the phrase “classical music,” implying a developing but continuous history. I use *classic* in the sense of a famous or recognized exemplar of a type.
2. *Traditional*—both classical cultural elements and those that originated in the postcontact period and were transmitted. For instance, it is classical practice to use sayings and historical references; it has become traditional to use the Bible and other foreign texts in the same way (e.g., Luomala 1985: 285 f., 291). *Traditional* can be used as the umbrella term for both types of transmitted practices and materials.
3. *Foreign*—cultural elements that originated outside of the Hawaiian community, many of which were adopted, usually with modifications, by Hawaiians.

Other than pre- and postcontact, there is no commonly accepted periodization of Hawaiian history, although several have been proposed for prehistory.²²

Hawaiian education is clearly an important subject of academic research, both in itself and as a basis for understanding Hawaiian and Polynesian history and culture. A study of Hawaiian education is also important for the self-awareness and self-image of contemporary Hawaiians. Due mainly, I would argue, to the nearly total loss of Hawaiian language facility in the course of the twentieth century, Hawaiians have been severed from much of their intellectual heritage, which is enshrined largely in literary sources that have not been translated or that lose much in the process. As a result, many Hawaiians have come to believe the hostile stereotype that they are unintellectual, and some have even adopted it as a mark of cultural identity. Among the only too numerous expressions of this view is the often-heard statement that Hawaiians are all heart and *haoles*—‘foreigners’ and particularly whites—are all head. I have in fact heard Hawaiians deny that there was any extended intellectual life in precontact Hawai‘i. One student was told by his family that his ancestors had been simple people so completely occupied by their farming and fishing that they had no time for intellectual inquiry. He could not therefore understand how the great chant of the origin of the universe, the *Kumulipo*, had been produced. Such attitudes can be found in secondary literature. For example, Kelly writes (1982: 4), “before 1778, the skills people needed were basically those which brought about successful harvests of crops from the land and fish from the sea, and good health for the people.” Similarly Hawaiian cultural achievements tend to be classified as “folk arts” even when clearly products of a higher cultural level. Hawaiian teachers in the University of Hawai‘i system have confirmed to me that they have had to address this anti-intellectual stereotype. The response to the stereotype of the “big, dumb Hawaiian” is sometimes to play the role, a defense found also among Samoans in Hawai‘i, who have found that their culture and intellectual heritage are not recognized, much less respected.²³

Such attitudes contribute to the very real problems faced by

Hawaiians in the Western educational system.²⁴ Indeed, intellectual and academic success can be considered a betrayal of one's origins and a cause of alienation from the community.²⁵ The college experience can be distorted from one of personal growth and intellectual expansion to one of political maneuver to obtain a degree valuable only for its usefulness in a society that the student considers hostile. A recognition of Hawaiian intellectual and educational achievements would help reduce the inner conflict felt by some Hawaiians today. Moreover, certain aspects of classical Hawaiian education might prove attractive and useful, just as education by *kūpuna* 'elders' and *hālau hula* 'hula academies' has succeeded with students who were uncomfortable with the Western school system.

The study of classical Hawaiian education is important also for the subject of a specifically Hawaiian way of thinking, which is currently much discussed. All human beings have the same intellectual capacities or fixed capabilities, but different cultures encourage different mental dispositions or learned tendencies in thinking; this pattern can be expressed in and supported by such activities as child-rearing and social expectations, recognition, and acclaim.²⁶ The wide spectrum of human possibilities cannot be covered by one method of learning and teaching or by one psychological theory. Missionary teachers of Hawaiians emphasized strongly the intellectual capacity of their pupils: "the native children are not inferior to those of other lands in point of intellect."²⁷ This attitude accorded with the explicit antiracism of the mission.²⁸ The educational task, as the teachers saw it, was both to introduce their students to new information and to train them in new ways of thinking. In modern terms, the meeting between the two cultures was that of two different sets of means of thought and communication.²⁹ A culture provides devices such as vocabulary, concepts, images, and modes of reasoning, by means of which individual members can perceive and understand themselves in their world, can respond emotionally, seek intel-

lectually, and articulate creatively their individual views. To fail to recognize these activities in another culture is to rob its members of their full humanity and to deny ourselves a source of knowledge and insight as well as valuable companions and collaborators in our common human intellectual quest.

Means of thought and communication are also used on the most practical level of problem solving, and a study of such use in other cultures is valuable for understanding their complexity and creativity.³⁰ Such a study is valuable also for appreciating the practicality of other cultures, the ways their members could use the means of thought and communication provided to achieve their particular and general goals. At a conference, after a non-Hawaiian gave a highly poetic and mystical description of Hawaiian religion, a Hawaiian responded, "But they still had to catch the fish." The Hawaiian medical practitioner had to heal the patient. The chanter had to deliver the chant. How did and do Hawaiian ideas of power, balance, beauty, and the cosmos help them to accomplish those tasks? I argue that Hawaiian ideas are unreal to us unless we can answer that question, unless we can see the connection between the ideational and the practical. In the same way, we cannot understand the Hawaiian intellectual quest unless we see its connection to the Hawaiian experience of reality.

To acknowledge the success of the Hawaiian means of thought and communication at the practical level and their value at the philosophical is to accept their challenge; a challenge among others to our impractical notions of religion, the arts, and speculation. Hawaiian education is therefore of general interest. Hawaiian education should not be understood in the sense of mere enculturation, of encapsulation within a society or culture. Hawaiian education directs the student towards observation and creativity, towards a greater appreciation of living in the universe, understanding oneself in that context, and acting accordingly—the Great Search. An overemphasis on historical and cultural limitations, however important and worthy of respect, distorts

the basic human experience of confronting life as a reality to be explored through involvement, study, individual insight, debate, and creativity—a process that enables historical and cultural achievements to challenge us today. The goal of creating sensitive, well-rounded, moral, and searching human beings has inspired many cultures, each of which can help us in our own efforts.

This book is a general mapping of the large subject of classical Hawaiian education, each particular area of which merits an exhaustive study. I have tried to provide sufficient references to begin such particular investigations. Certain points—such as the application of knowledge to particular situations and the uses of experience—may seem not to require references, as they appear to be normal human behavior. However, the specific ways Hawaiians acted are important, and I want to avoid making assumptions and imposing foreign concepts or behavior. Moreover an object of this essay is to demonstrate—as best I am able through my own, admittedly limited reading—the wealth of materials available in the largely unused Hawaiian texts and the amount of information they can provide for a study of this type. Indeed, although indigenous texts cannot be understood without a basis in ethnography, that ethnography itself must be refined on the evidence of the texts. As Kenneth Emory stated in the case of the Tuamotus, “The ethnology is inextricably tied in with the chants and prayers, and largely depends on them for its authenticity” (Krauss 1988:241). I have usually chosen to quote at length sources that are either unpublished or untranslated.

I have used the original Hawaiian texts wherever possible. Besides the usual problems of translation, modern publications of Hawaiian works often suffer from the absence of the original language text and editorial omissions and displacements, often as particular as parts of sentences. These editorial practices have destroyed the original organization and forms of presentation, which are essential for this study.

Texts will be reproduced as published unless otherwise

noted. The texts vary considerably in spelling, word separation, and punctuation. I will use *sic* only in cases of possible confusion. The occasional apostrophes used for the glottal stop in some Hawaiian texts have been silently changed to the modern inverted apostrophe. My translations and simple glosses will be placed in single quotation marks; those of others in double (glosses in double quotation marks are from Pukui and Elbert [1986]). I have alphabetized the Hawaiian entries in the bibliography by the first word, whether it is an article or not, in order to facilitate use by those who do not know the language.

In the text, I have added macrons and glottal stops to often-used names, the pronunciation of which is reasonably certain. In the bibliography, I have retained the name as originally published. Long titles will be shortened for citation. When the title of a series varies, I will use a composite title for reference. If a Hawaiian article is unsigned but can be attributed with sufficient security, the author's name is given in brackets in the bibliography, but not in the text references. Unless otherwise noted, all references to Andrews are to Lorrin Andrews; Kānepu'u, to J. H. Kānepu'u; Johnson, to Rubellite K. Johnson; Judd, to Henry P. Judd; and Stewart, to C. S. Stewart. Since the date of the reference will be provided as well, there should be no confusion. For clarity in the references, I have included the month and day in the dates of newspaper articles and letters. To save space, I have not repeated the name of the month in references: I write "September 10, 12, 1898" instead of "September 10, 1898; September 12, 1898." I have numbered unnumbered pages except when they precede the first page; I then use the section title. I have regularized the citations from Malo n.d. to chapter numbers in roman numerals and section numbers in arabic. I have also followed the correct sequence of chapter numbers as corrected by another hand on the manuscript; the original numbers are of course important for a study of the composition of the work, but that is not the subject of this book. I use the original manuscript numbering xxxviii 56, 56 [bis], 57, 58, 59, 61, rather than the correction of Malo 1951 and Chun in Malo 1987: 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61 (Charlot 1992b: 176).

No translation can convey the richness of the original texts. The reader should be particularly attentive to the repetition of key Hawaiian words, the result of the canonization of the vocabulary on education. I have not attempted a Hawaiian-to-English correspondence of individual words in my translations; the differences in my glosses reflect the range of possibilities of each term when placed in different contexts.

The nature of my subject has forced me to enter fields in which I am untrained, such as general psychology, educational psychology, cross-cultural cognition studies, and behavior modification. I can only hope again that I have indicated the amount of material available in Hawaiian sources to experts in those fields and sketched a historically accurate framework in which particular studies can be made. Indeed, I have not included many interesting sources, both primary and secondary; although I regret several, my book is already sufficiently charged. Finally I have largely, but not completely, avoided the more abstract theoretical issues that can be raised in connection with this subject. A close description of the evidence provided by the sources is necessary in almost all areas of Polynesian studies before larger theoretical concerns can be adequately addressed.

NOTES

1. Charlot 1983a:115–126. The only extended discussions I have found of classical Hawaiian education are in Townsend 1900:32–36; Beckwith 1919: Introduction; Wist 1940:5–12; Handy and Pukui 1972; Handy 1965; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972, 1979; Johnson 1981; Kelly 1981.

2. Jaeger 1959: *Vorwort*; 1, 'Education is the principle that is used by the human community to preserve and propagate its bodily and spiritual type'. Compare Premack 1984:15–18; Carrithers 1990:191 ff. Later work on Greek *paideia*, such as that of Kevin Robb, offers many more parallels to the material presented in this book.

3. For example, Bruford 1962:432–440. Sweet 1978:50–53, 112 f., 126 f., 162 f., 188 f., 282.

4. Premack 1984:16, 18 (“By *pedagogy*, I mean that social process in which one individual observes another, judges him or her according to some standard, and intervenes to bring the novice’s behavior into conformity with the standard”), 29. Carrithers 1990:197. D’Amato and Tharp, n.d.:8, in social reproduction theory, society uses schooling to reproduce itself; 15, “the two constant challenges” of education are “*language development* and *contextualization* of instruction”; four variables are: “*sociolinguistics, motivation, cognitive styles, and social organization.*”

5. Premack 1984:18, 20–25. Carrithers 1990:198 f.

6. A. November 5, 1853. Malo 1987:vii–xxv (Chun). Chun 1993:1–10, is the most complete treatment. Malo is often mentioned in the literature. Stewart 1831:163, “Maaro” is working as the secretary of the chief “Hoapiri” (Hoapili). Andrews 1835:139, “David Malo, one of the wisest of them.” Further references for the biographies of Malo and the writers mentioned below will be given throughout this book.

7. Dibble 1838:97. Kamakau March 21, 1868a.

8. For example, Wilkes 1845: 250. A. November 5, 1853. Kuykendall 1947:351. Chun 1993:5.

9. Richards, Andrews, Spaulding, and Chapin 1833:262 f., Malo and Kauwa are superintendants of meetings “and may be considered as a kind of licensed preachers. They are unquestionably useful, and are esteemed so by the people.” Kuykendall 1947:339. Chun 1993:8.

10. For example, Malo 1837. “He Mau Hana Pono Ole Maanei” November 12, 1845:91, urges Malo to write against hula, chant, and so on. A. November 5, 1853, Malo’s preaching was “more original, comprehensive, and instructive” than that of other native preachers.

11. Kamakau 1988:11–22 (Chun). Chun 1993:17–26. Further biographical and autobiographical information from Kamakau will be provided below.

12. Chun 1993:11–15. Compare Sterling and Summers 1978:307, on Kamehameha IV.

13. Ii 1959:vii f. (Barrère). Dibble 1839:85.

14. For example, Handy and Pukui 1972:xvii. Kaeppler 1993:147. Pukui preferred that her name be written without the modern macron and glottal stop: Pūku’i.

15. Kānepu’u February 20 (1724, 1728); February 27 (1731); March 5 (1731, 1733); March 19, 1868 (1737). Molokainuahina April 2, 1868, recognized this ploy. This bit of humor can be explained from two of the author’s themes. He

regularly contrasts his modern, realistic, and true narrative to the fabulous stories of the past that usually appear in the newspapers, and he emphasizes that his experiences were in all likelihood common to Hawaiian children. The antedating spoofs the fables and stresses the continuity with the past.

16. Appendix I. See also the reports of the Kamehameha Early Education Project (KEEP), Tharp and Gallimore 1988: 115–129 and throughout; Tharp 1989: 350; Vogt, Jordan, and Tharp 1987; *Educational Perspectives*, Volume 20, Number 1, Spring, 1981.

17. The Hawaiian extended family has been described at length in such works as Handy and Pukui 1972; and Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 and 1979. I will give my views on the family throughout this work and in Appendix III.

18. Vocabulary: e.g., Fornander 1919–1920: 169. Pronunciation: Barratt 1988: 226. Nobility: e.g., “Na Wahi Pana o Ewa” July 8, 1899. Gender: Kamakau December 14, 1867.

19. Tapa and martial arts: see chapter V. *‘Awa*: Titcomb 1948: 111.

20. Luomala 1989: 307. Compare differences in storytelling, Johnson 1957: 31.

21. Pukui 1980: 77. See also Kaeppler 1993: 107 f., 111.

22. I would argue very generally for the following major periods: (a) the early contact period through the major conquests of Kamehameha I, (b) his reign, (c) from his death to missionization, (d) from the accession of Kamehameha III until that of Kalākaua, subdivided by reigns, (e) the reign of Kalākaua, and (f) from the accession of Lili‘uokalani until Annexation. Statehood and the beginning of the Hawaiian Renaissance of the 1970s could serve as divisions after Annexation.

23. Similarly the stereotype of lazy Hawaiians (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1979: 306 f.) can be adopted as a group characteristic. I experienced a curious variant in my first class in Hawaiian religion at the University of Hawai‘i in 1974. A number of the younger students continually arrived late. When I asked about this, I was told that they felt it was un-Hawaiian to be punctual. I have never experienced such problems with older Hawaiians, who tend to be punctilious in religious, intellectual, and educational matters.

24. These problems have been studied in some detail in precollege education, e.g., Gallimore and Howard 1968; Gallimore, Boggs, and Jordan 1974: 58 ff. See also Appendix I. On Polynesians in general, see Keesing 1947; Ritchie and Ritchie 1979: 129 ff.

25. Several Hawaiian students at the University of Hawai‘i told me during the 1970s and early 1980s that they were making a tremendous effort to complete their education so that they could serve their community. They

were finding, however, that their very presence at the university was estranging them from other Hawaiians. Similarly in the planning sessions for a mid-1980s conference on college-level Hawaiian studies, the majority of Hawaiians did not want their academic degrees listed so as not to alienate the nonacademics being invited. Recently, however, I have noticed some change in these attitudes.

26. The terminology is from Baron 1988: 118 f., 120 ff., 466 f.; also 114–117 (culture and education shape emotions), 135 (cultures provide certain ways of human development among the many possible in nature), 134, 138. See also Cole and Scribner 1974: 95 f. (the activities of a culture influence perception and problem solving), 49 f., 55–58, 193. Cultural differences in thinking can also be described in terms of focus, range, and emphasis.

27. Wilkes 1845: 73, the opinion of Alexander; also 77. Bingham 1981: 115, “evidence of the capacity of the natives”; 524, “minds had been unaccustomed to reason correctly”; 526, “The human mind, the human heart, the human soul, may safely be regarded as essentially the same in all ages and countries.” In a very critical report on missionary education in Hawai‘i, Andrews 1834a: 160 refuses to blame the problems on a supposed intellectual inferiority of Hawaiians. McLoughlin 1986: 360, missionaries made the same positive assessment of young Cherokee students. Blackburn 1808: 85, “In the course of the first week we had twenty-one children who all gave flattering evidences of promising geniuses.”

28. For example, Andrews 1829: 5. Whitney and Richards 1832: 8. Martin, Lyman, Bond, and Damon 1979: 148. Hutchison 1987: 47, all human beings have the same original parents, so a universal religion is justified. This Enlightenment view accorded with the Hawaiian tradition of human beings being descended from the original parents Papa and Wākea.

29. For a brief discussion and references, see Charlot 1970: 144–168. Bruner 1986: 72–78.

30. Cole and Scribner 1974: 173, 193–196. This aspect of culture is currently emphasized by anthropological practice theory.