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The song “Aloha ‘Oe,” depicted in Figure 1, is celebrated throughout the Nation of Hawai’i as a representation of traditional Hawaiian culture. It was written over a century ago by the last reigning monarch of the islands, Queen Lili’uokalani (1838-1917). The song was composed and recorded at a time of political and cultural turmoil in Hawai’i; for this reason, it contains both implicit and explicit messages regarding power structures. Though the song was initially composed in 1878 as a mele ho’oipoipo (love song) between a man and a woman, over the years it has been socially, politically, and culturally redefined by Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiians) into a song of melancholic farewell between the Queen and her realm. Since its composition, “Aloha ‘Oe” has become one of the most popular and widely recognized Hawaiian songs. Following the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, as well as the illegal and illegitimate declaration of Hawai’i as the 50th state of the US, the song
skyrocketed in popularity, as evidenced by requests for sheet music and performances (Imada 37). The song’s usage has increased since these events with appearances in many mediums, from the film rendition by Tia Carrere in the popular Disney movie, Lilo and Stitch (2002), to performances in everyday local events such as graduations, luaus, and concerts.²

Because of the song’s prominence in contemporary culture, it may not be immediately apparent to those listening what the relationship is between “Aloha ‘Oe” and colonial power, at least when performed by Kanaka Maoli. Though initially composed as a love song, the intrinsic meaning of “Aloha ‘Oe” has been culturally transformed by past and contemporary island musicians into a dirge which laments the loss of a queen, her realm, and the intergenerational effects of these losses. The resignification of “Aloha ‘Oe” is a reaction against the colonial forces that erased the sovereign rights of Lili’uokalani in Hawai’i. Artists who perform “Aloha ‘Oe” (and many other songs in the Hawaiian language) resist the attempt to erase indigenous Hawaiian culture. I will use an interdisciplinary constructivist approach to demonstrate that the legacy of “Aloha ‘Oe,” which resonates today in performance art, represents the continuous resistance of US colonization by championing the sovereignty of Hawai’i.

The purpose of my work is multifaceted: I seek to explore the history of Native Hawaiian protest against colonial US forces and examine present-day resistance against ongoing settler colonialism. I will present this information within the framework of a close analysis of Queen Lili’uokalani’s composition, “Aloha ‘Oe.” Though resistance in this piece is demonstrated in multiple ways, I will be focusing specifically on Queen Lili’uokalani’s evocation of both the English and Hawaiian languages in the song. In discussing language I challenge the “myth of passivity” in mainstream Hawaiian history; the myth that the Kanaka Maoli passively accepted the erosion of their culture and the loss of their nation (Silva 1). This analysis, however, cannot be done without a brief historical exposition of the colonial forces which began to affect Hawai’i in the 1820s and continues to affect the native population today; an analysis of Lili’uokalani’s life through her autobiography, Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen; and a content analysis of Queen Lili’uokalani’s composition “Aloha ‘Oe.”

The most iconic lines of the queen’s song are in the chorus: “Aloha ‘Oe, Aloha ‘Oe” which Lili’uokalani herself translated into “Farewell to thee, farewell to thee” (Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen, ch. 46). Though nothing more than a combination of beautiful phonemes to the average listener, the colonial context from the perspective of Kanaka Maoli and Asian intergenerational settlers³ shapes the imparted farewell into one from the Queen to her beloved people. My paper historicizes both white and Asian colonialism as both communities have intentionally dispossessed Kanaka Maoli of their land, but my paper focuses on US colonialism. This history is crucial to understanding the significance of the queen’s song and the perseverance of the oral tradition. However, I would like to recognize that as an Asian American born in Hawai’i, my family has been active and I have been complicit in
the displacement of Kanaka Maoli. Our immigration to the islands in the 1980s and 1990s contributed to the ongoing gentrification of the islands. Asian settlers, like my family, have become the majority population on the islands by displacing Native Hawaiians during several waves of migration in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The brief historical overview, provided by this paper, of colonization and imperialism in Hawai‘i hardly captures the complexity of the atrocities that Kanaka Maoli faced and continue to face. In an effort to fight against the whitewashing of Hawai‘i’s history—which includes, but is not limited to, imposing the English language in all curricula and effacing Hawaiian Natives’ struggle for sovereignty—the historical information provided in this paper will be explicitly based on sources written by those with relations to Native Hawaiians or those with Native Hawaiian ancestry.

The first European contact with the sovereign nation of Hawai‘i was made in the year 1778, when Captain James Cook embarked with the Royal Navy of Britain upon a voyage to discover a theoretical Northwest Passage, but instead encountered the islands. Immigration of white Europeans and US Americans began immediately after initial contact discovered the economic potential of the islands. Between the 1770s and the 1850s, diseases brought from foreign lands caused a decline in the native population from 300,000 to a mere 60,000 (Cumings 201). By the early nineteenth century, Protestant missionaries and traders began to visit the islands on a regular basis, asserting Christian dominance and exploiting the generosity of the native people.

Hawai‘i was undergoing its own internal transformation at the time in regard to the kapu (sacred law) system. The kapu system was the set of laws and tabus which encompassed lifestyle, gender roles, politics, and religion. The kapu system divided Hawaiian society into four groups in hierarchical order: the ali‘i (chiefs), the kahuna (priests or skilled craftspeople), the maka‘ainana (commoners), and kauwa (servant cast) (Creager 35). Many of the kapus, according to David Malo and other historians, were derived solely from the desires of the ruling king or chief and were a means of maintaining the power of the priesthood (Malo 97). During King Kamehameha’s wars to unite the islands in the late eighteenth century, many people began to feel dissatisfaction with the kapu because it implied that the common people were subservient to higher authorities. The kapu system was upheld in Hawai‘i until the death of King Kamehameha I in 1819. Following Kamehameha I’s death, King Kamehameha II, his mother Keōpūolani, and another of his father’s Queens, Ka‘ahumanu, abolished the law by sharing a meal together, an action which broke the law of kapu’s statement that men were not allowed to dine with women (Kāwika 36). This symbolic act of abolishing the kapu system was one of the catalysts of the transition to Christianity in Hawai‘i.

Protestant missionaries who arrived in 1820 were at an optimal historical position to take advantage of and “reshape” the systems of Hawaiian society. During this time, missionaries began converting the powerful ali‘i wahine (women rulers) to Christianity,
specifically Queen Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani, who were the two most influential wives of King Kamehameha I. Missionaries, now having invested in high-ranking allies, had the authority to influence the structure of the Hawaiian government, society, and religion (Creager 41). In summation, the missionary’s authority allowed whites to infiltrate the local government. Queen Lili‘uokalani herself recognized these historical events as deliberate steps taken to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy:

Does it make nothing for us that we have always recognized our Christian teachers as worthy of authority in our councils, and repudiated those whose influence or character was vicious or irreligious? That while four-fifths of the population of our Islands was swept out of existence by the vices introduced by foreigners, the ruling class clung to Christian morality, and gave its unvarying support and service to the work of saving and civilizing the masses? Has not this class loyally clung to the brotherly alliance made with the better element of foreign settlers, giving freely of its authority and its substance, its sons and its daughters, to cement and to prosper it? (Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen, ch. 57)

These Protestants quickly became the new kahuna: spiritual and political advisors to the high chief.

During this time, Protestants made ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian language) into a written language, translated and distributed the Bible among the masses, and created missionary schools throughout the islands (Creager 41-43). This shift in religion, as well as the introduction of the English language, facilitated the process of internalizing white supremacy, a dangerous change in values that would later lead the US to overthrow the monarchy. By dispossessing Kanaka Maoli of their oral tradition and replacing it with a written language, Protestant missionaries eroded one of the most essential factors of shared culture. Therefore, a return to oral performance, such as through mele, is an act of resistance against the imposition of written language and, by extension, the colonial overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy.

Those who came to visit or settle on the islands often expressed their opposition to the Hawaiian monarchy, instead favoring a British-style constitutional monarchy, which limited the power of the monarch (“Hawaiian Monarchy Overthrown,” 2012). US powers began establishing plantations to cultivate native crops, exploiting the labor of the Japanese, Chinese, and Filipino immigrants. At the same time, white settlers began to infiltrate the kingdom’s government and insidiously force the implementation the Bayonet Constitution. The Bayonet Constitution heavily diminished the power of the monarch—at that time King Kalākaua (1836-1891)—while also eliminating the right of Kanaka Maoli and Asian citizens to vote, giving those rights to wealthy white sugar plantation owners instead (“The 1887 Bayonet Constitution,”
When King Kalākaua died, his sister Liliʻuokalani took over as Queen. During her short reign, Queen Liliʻuokalani attempted to draft a constitution that would restore the power of the traditional monarchy as well as the voting rights of those previously disenfranchised; however, by this time, many colonizers had infiltrated the local governments and offices, urging more insistently for American annexation and pushing back against the Queen’s suggestions (“Hawaiian Monarchy Overthrown,” 2012). The tension between the Kanaka Maoli’s fight for sovereignty and the colonial population’s fight for exploitation of native resources culminated during the 1890s.

In 1896, the Hawaiian language was banned by Sanford B. Dole, the wealthy plantation owner who was a core member of the group that overthrew Queen Liliʻuokalani and established the Republic of Hawaiʻi (Pitzer). The English language forcefully attacked pedagogy at the elementary school level by becoming the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools, radically reducing the number of native speakers of Hawaiian. Children who spoke Hawaiian at school, including on the playground, were disciplined in order to discourage them from speaking Hawaiian at home, where most interaction in Hawaiian would be taking place. Moreover, the law stated that if children were to learn a second language, it would be “in addition to the English language,” reducing Hawaiian to the status of a foreign language (Pukui). To this day, Hawaiʻi is the only “state” to have two officially recognized languages: English and Hawaiian. By continuing to embrace the Hawaiian language today, especially in the form of song, as Liliʻuokalani did during her incarceration, Kanaka Maoli are continuing the long-standing resistance against US assimilation.

Now that the significance of oral performance in the Hawaiian language has been established, understanding the context in which “Aloha ʻOe” was produced becomes important, as does its reception and resignification among both the Hawaiian people and their colonizers. Liliʻuokalani composed “Aloha ʻOe” in either 1877 or 1878, while she was still an heir to the throne. She was already a prolific and established composer at the time, as well as an author and musician. Liliʻuokalani initially wrote “Aloha ʻOe” as a mele hoʻoipoipo (love song) after observing a young Hawaiian woman giving her male lover a flower lei during their parting at Maunawili Ranch (Imada 35). She was struck with inspiration on the horseback ride back to Honolulu and the story claims that she began humming a tune which would later become the melody of “Aloha ʻOe.” By the time she reached her personal residence, Washington Place, her riding party had assisted her with the completion of the song. However, this narrative is not the one that is often repeated in Hawaiian reproductions of the story today. The often-repeated, fictitious origin story of “Aloha ʻOe” states that the song was written years after Liliʻuokalani originally composed the song, while she was on house arrest in the royal palace, as a song of mourning after the US-backed overthrow. This fictitious origin story is why “Aloha ʻOe” has become identified as a lament for a lost country and a spirit of
resistance (Imada 36). The disparity between these two stories is resolved by Lili‘uokalani’s autobiography, in which she states that she transcribed the song again while under house arrest, and it was then published in America:

Though I was still not allowed to have newspapers or general literature to read, writing-paper and lead-pencils were not denied; and I was thereby able to write music, after drawing for myself the lines of the staff. At first I had no instrument and had to transcribe the notes by voice alone; but I found, not withstanding disadvantages, great consolation in composing, and transcribed a number of songs. Three found their way from my prison to the city of Chicago, where they were printed, among them the “Aloha ‘Oe” or “Farewell to Thee,” which became a very popular song (Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen, ch. 46).

This quote demonstrates that Lili‘uokalani transcribed “Aloha ‘Oe” while under house arrest; however the excerpt does not state that the song was originally composed during her arrest. Both origin stories are valid interpretations of the truth; while the song was initially intended to be a love song, because of its transcription and printing during Lili‘uokalani’s house arrest, the song is infused with her lamentation. When “Aloha ‘Oe” is performed today, many people do not realize that it was written by the last queen of Hawai‘i: the song’s native history is left unacknowledged beneath America’s whitewashed versions of history.

Indeed, the whitewashing of “Aloha ‘Oe” and its narrative perpetuates racial erasure and US imperialism to this day. The first result if you search on Google for the song is a cover by Johnny Cash, whose album Blue Hawaii appropriated and profited by Hawaiian meles. Therefore, resistance to cultural erasure adds another layer to the complexities of this song when performed by Kanaka Maoli. King Kalākaua, known as the “Merrie Monarch” due to his love of music, parties, and fine dining, revitalized the traditional Hawaiian culture of performance art as a resistance strategy. A celebration called the “Merrie Monarch Festival” continues annually across the islands. More importantly, however, he is remembered as the king who brought back a sense of pride to the Hawaiian people. Prior to his reign, many traditional practices were suppressed and banned by Protestant missionary teachings; examples of banned practices include mele, dancing hula, and lapa‘au (native healing practices). Hula was a form of communication for ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i before written language, expressing shared meanings, histories, religions, and other stories through visual dance and song from one generation to the next. Hula has historically been performed in tandem with Hawaiian chants or meles; it endures today in part due to King Kalākaua. During his reign, he reestablished and preserved the ancient traditions of public performance (Silva 88).
Hawaiian mele remains a highly evolved form of oral and performative literacy: vital cultural information is commemorated in sung poetry that is in turn visualized through hula. Among the many important cultural facets of performance art in general are identity and protest. Thus, the continuation of mele performance today is an act of resistance against colonialism and of preservation of indigenous culture.

After Kalākaua’s death in 1891, his sister was to rule for only two short years. On January 17, 1893, a group of pro-American forces on the island of O’ahu joined with armed US Marines and marched to ‘Iolani Palace with the intent of overthrowing Queen Lili‘uokalani in order to establish the “Republic of Hawai‘i” as a territory of the US. The insurrection was led by a group of approximately 160 men, most of whom were Americans by birth or heritage. Upon their arrival at the palace, Queen Lili‘uokalani peacefully abdicated her throne, though under protest, in order to avoid bloodshed. The queen surrendered Hawai‘i’s sovereignty to the “superior force of the United States of America.” The queen believed that the surrender would be temporary; she was confident that the American government would restore her to the throne:

We had allowed them virtually to give us a constitution, and control the offices of state. Not without protest, indeed; for the usurpation was unrighteous, and cost us much humiliation and distress. But we did not resist it by force. It had not entered into our hearts to believe that these friends and allies from the United States, even with all their foreign affinities, would ever go so far as to absolutely overthrow our form of government, seize our nation by the throat, and pass it over to an alien power. (Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen, ch. 57)

Though President Cleveland did demand that the queen be reinstated to her power, the provisional government that had been established on the islands by Sanford B. Dole and Lorrin Thurston refused. Cleveland attempted to place the matter in the hands of Congress; however, in the end, Congress took no action to restore the monarchy, despite the protests and petitions of thousands of Hawaiian people. One petition was signed by over 21,000 people, a majority of the native population at the time (Silva 6). Resistance movements filled the following months and years after the overthrow, as Kanaka Maoli and other royalists attempted to accumulate and take up arms against the American powers, which consisted of both soldiers and government officials. However, because such stockpiling was considered “treason,” Dole’s forces captured and imprisoned Queen Lili‘uokalani for her alleged role in the coup, along with many of her followers. On January 1, 1896, all royalist prisoners were freed except for Lili‘uokalani, who remained under house arrest until late 1896. During this time, she composed many songs and chants in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, a native tactic of resistance.
Contemporary renditions of “Aloha ‘Oe” adhere to the original lyrics written by Lili‘uokalani, thus preserving the beauty and spirit of a culture despite all efforts to quash them. Through its resignification by the Kanaka Maoli who perform the song, the character roles become transformed from male and female lovers into Hawai‘i and the Kanaka Maoli—the latter of which must forcefully depart from its love, the ‘āina (land). The first verse of the song describes the beauty of Hawai‘i: “Haaheo ka ua inā pali/Ke nihi aela keanahele/E hahai ana ika liko/Pua āhihi lehua uka.” The first line of the song translates into “proudly swept the rain cloud by the cliff” (“Aloha Oe: Farewell to Thee” 2). The first word “proudly” serves to celebrate the ‘āina, but also sets the tone for the remainder of the song. The use of the word “proudly” at the beginning of the song is a subtle demonstration of resistance because the dominant powers on the island wanted to eliminate celebration of the original Hawaiian language, yet Lili‘uokalani celebrates it proudly with her first line. Each line provides a description of the natural beauty of the landscape of Hawai‘i, from the cliffs of the mountains that form the terrain to the flower buds and trees that inhabit the land. In describing as wild and natural a land that had already been manipulated by Europeans and Americans to create plantations and factories, the song reclaims the Hawaiian scene from its colonial infiltrators.

The significance of embracing nature in “Aloha ‘Oe” is seen again in last line of the first verse through Lili‘uokalani’s reference to the āhihi lehua, also known as the ‘ōhia lehua (Metrosideros tremuloides): a shrub that grows near sea level locations and produces bright red flowers. The decision of invoking the imagery of the āhihi lehua is symbolic not only because it is endemic to the Hawaiian Islands, but also because of the legend of the flower. In Hawaiian legend, according to Krauss, a man named Ohia fell for a woman named Lehua who reciprocated his love. However, the goddess Pele was also in love with Ohia and, out of anger, turned Ohia into a tree. Lehua, devastated, begged the gods to intervene. Finally, they all compromised and decided to forever unite the two lovers by transforming Lehua into the flower that adorns the Ohia tree. The story claims that there is even a relationship between the lehua blossoms and the rain: when a flower is picked, and therefore separated from the tree, the sky will rain, symbolizing the tears of two lovers who are forced to part. The symbolism of specifically the āhihi lehua therefore embodies both the sentiment of longing and separation while also celebrating Hawaiian storytelling (Krauss 77).

Though the chorus’ opening line “Aloha oe, aloha oe” is the most recognizable part of this song, the entire chorus deserves our attention: it contains clues to a potentially hidden agenda, or even a threat. After the repetition of “Aloha Oe,” the lyrics go on, “E ke onaona noho ika lipo/A fond embrace a hoi ae au/Until [sic] we meet again” (“Aloha Oe: Farewell to Thee” 3). Notice that there are two lines in English in the chorus—the only times that English is used in the song. I would argue that Lili‘uokalani chose these two lines so that the colonizers would understand them in their own language. The line in between the English phrases,
“a hoi ae au” (here I part), is spoken in Hawaiian, almost as if it is a hushed message to the islands; Lili‘uokalani seems to be saying, “I must leave you now, but I will be back to reclaim you.” Here we see the Queen’s strategy come into play: by making those two specific lines in English, a white auditor might gather that the song is about love rather than resistance. By making the purpose of these two lines ambiguous enough for selective interpretation, Queen Lili‘uokalani was able to protect herself from any further repercussions via state-sanctioned violence.

The second verse carries on the sentiments associated with a forced departure, acknowledging that a bitter separation has occurred. The first line begins “sweet memories come back to me/dearest one, yes, you are mine own” (“Aloha Oe: Farewell to Thee” 3). These lines demonstrate Queen Lili‘uokalani’s resistance to colonial powers which continued to claim that Hawaiian land belonged to the US. The final line of this verse states “a loko e hana nei,” which translates into the declaration that “from you, true love shall never depart” (“Aloha Oe: Farewell to Thee” 3). Adhering to the recast roles of Hawai‘i and Kanaka Maoli as lovers, this line symbolizes the intrinsic relationship of native people with the land: though “legally” separated, they are one and the same.

There is a theme of melancholy throughout “Aloha ‘Oe” and the melancholic attachment present in the song is another form of resistance. The yearning for one’s lost nation goes beyond mere physical separation and extends into emotional separation. The longing reinforces that the lost object, the realm, is incorporated into one’s own being as a state of melancholic attachment, which in this case, is between the indigenous peoples and their land. By drawing attention to how they have been colonized, the Kanaka Maoli are also drawing attention to their self-rule, precisely as the US has taken it away.

“Aloha ‘Oe,” at all stages of its production, publication, and performance, serves as means of resistance against US American imperialism still alive in Hawaiian culture. Renditions of the song as it continues to be covered by local artists in the Hawaiian language, with the simultaneous performance of hula, demonstrate the creative and poetic resistance of the Kanaka Maoli outside of their historically colonized and prohibited culture.

In the year 1898, the US annexed Hawai‘i, but administered the sovereign nation as though it were a US territory until 1959, when it was illegally and illegitimately declared the fiftieth state. By this time, the identified population of native Hawaiians had dropped to 25,000. It was not until 1993 that the US Congress issued an official apology to the people of Hawai‘i for the US government’s role in the overthrow of the monarch, a role which had not been acknowledged until that moment: “the native Hawaiian people never directly relinquished to the United States their claims to their inherent sovereignty” (Public Law). Though Hawai‘i continues to be an ongoing settler colonial site today, as long as “Aloha ‘Oe” continues to be performed, transcribed, or listened to on iTunes or YouTube, as long as the
song continues to exist, there will be a living rejection of colonial power. Though the chorus is mournful, it does end with the repetition of the line “until we meet again” and this connotes a message of the eventual reuniting of the Kanaka Maoli and their land. The reunification can be seen in many organizing efforts to return sovereignty to contemporary Hawai‘i. Resistance comes in many forms; it can be seen in the subtle ways that Kanaka Maoli reclaim their oral tradition through performance, and in a language that has survived centuries of theft. In this case, resistance did not end when the Kanaka Maoli were robbed of their land: it merely transformed into something as seemingly small as the repeated performance of a song.
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Notes
1 Throughout this paper all Hawaiian words will be italicized, whether they are “naturalized” English words or not. This decision has been made in order to emphasize that simply because a word is in the English dictionary does not mean it belongs to us.
2 This is a link to a rendition of Aloha ‘Oe by prominent Hawaiian performers Israel “Iz” Kamakawiwoole, Henry Kapono, Cyril Pahinui and Roland Cazimero. This performance took place on a Hawaiian homestead as part of a larger television special about the Hawaiian sovereignty movement in the 90s and captures the resilience of the aloha spirit. YouTube link: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zXOzNiKceps (Kapono).
3 While Asians and Asian Americans have contributed to the colonization of Hawai‘i and the whitewashing of the Hawaiian culture, intergenerational families tend to adopt some Hawaiian cultural values and begin identifying with Kanaka Maoli. Once people start identifying with Kanaka Maoli, many become allies.
4 In the Hawaiian monarchy, a King had multiple wives. Keōpūolani was Kamehameha I’s “Sacred wife,” who gave birth to heirs to the throne. Ka‘ahumanu was another one of Kamehameha I’s wives, known as the “Favorite Wife.” Because all wives were close with the king, they had a fair amount of influence over the decisions the king made and over elections to positions of power.