DE GRUYTER MOUTON
DOI 10.1515/ijsl-2012-0063 — IJSL 2012; 218: 167–193

Andrew Cowell

The Hawaiian model of language revitalization: problems of extension to mainland native America

Abstract: This paper offers an analysis of why the Hawaiian model of language revitalization, while quite successful so far in Hawaii, has not extended well to the mainland US and Native America, despite extensive contact between the two communities and assistance from Hawaiians. After a brief summary of the Hawaiian model, it first offers an analysis of socio-economic and demographic factors that make the extension difficult. It then suggests more profound reasons for the Hawaiian success, rooted in the particular history and socio-cultural conditions of Hawaii: in particular in the nineteenth-century independent monarchy, the twentieth-century multi-ethnic territorial experience, and the resultant "political" and "dispersed" nature of Hawaiian identity, across multiple practices and a large part of the population of Hawaii. The conclusion situates events in Hawaii within larger trends in the Pacific, suggesting that the "dispersed cultural" rather than "ethnic" form of Hawaiian-ness currently dominant is both a result of Hawaii's unique history, and a crucial factor for the current success of language and cultural revitalization there, while being largely absent in Native America.

Keywords: language revitalization; cultural revitalization; Hawaii; Native America; immersion education; identity; cultural identity; ethnic identity; tribal identity

Andrew Cowell: University of Colorado, Boulder. E-mail: cowellj@colorado.edu

Arapaho Commentary #1

'Oh wonoo- wonoo3ee3i', noosouwoo3ee3i' nuhu' nii- niinono'eiti3i'.
'But there are a lot of them, there are still a lot of these [people] who speak Arapaho.'

'Oh huut hooyei, hooyei, 'oh wootii, hoowu- hoowu hoowunehtiiheihino'.
'But here most, most, it seems they're not recognized [as knowledgeable].'

huut ne'-, huut ne'-, ne'niisi3ecoonoo. hiibeexneyeibebii3- bebii3eneihiinoo, niit-,
'Here that's . . . here that's . . . that's what I think. They should try to fix it right, where. . . .'

Hiino3oon, Howoo hinee beebei'on hii3e', toh-, hinee heetbixouute' . . .
'Instead. . . . You know that [place] way away over there, that . . . that [Hawaiian] island. . . .'

wootii no'oteihi3i', 'oh hoowu- hoowu- hoowuunono'eitiitoon . . .
'I guess they are real smart, but people there don't speak Arapaho . . .'

Hiikoot, 'oh ne'niis- nii- nii3ou3eibee3i' beebei'on niine'etii3i', neeni'iini,
'What's more, how they teach way over there [where] they live, it's good,'

heetbixouute'. 'oh hoow- hoowentoono' huut. . . .
'In Hawaii. But they are not present here . . .'

'Oh kooheet-, "Kookon hetneyei3eihoobe heteenetiitooninoo," nuhu' hinono'eino'.
'And are [we] going to . . . "This is just how you will teach your language", the Arapahos [will say to the Hawaiians]?'

Arapaho Commentary #2

Woniini neyeinoko3towoo3oono' hinee hoonoo3oo'o'uu, neenei- neeneistoo3i'.
'We go and try to follow the example of what other [Indigenous groups] are doing.'

'oh ceneecei'soo'. Cei'soo' niisiine'etiino'.
'But [the way it is here] is very different. Our culture is different.'

Neene'eeno' hinee, howoo hinee, hinee nihii, hinee huu3e' nee- heeteci'.
'There are those, also those, those uhm, those [people] over there in the ocean.'

Neeyou heetbixouute', Wootii nii- niico'oniini nihii3i' . . .
'There where those [Hawaiian] islands are, it's like they are always saying . . .'

'oh ne'bis . . . hitiine'etiitooninoo, bisiini noo'oeniihi'. 'oh huutiino,
'But then all . . . their life is all around them. But here,'

nuhu' heetiine'etiino', 'oh beebeet hoowoo'oo' nuhu', beebeet hoowoo'oo' nuhu'.
'where we live, there is only the ceremonial [life], only the ceremonies.'

1 Introduction

The preceding commentaries are from conversations between Arapaho speakers at Wind River Reservation, Wyoming. Over many hours of video-taping for a grant, the topic of language came up often, since Arapaho is endangered. A number of Arapaho have visited Hawaiian immersion programs, and the same is true for other reservations. Efforts at immersion education have been made at Wind River, but despite localized success no fluent speakers have been produced. The first commentary questions whether the Hawaiian model can be extended to Wind River. The second offers an analysis of the difficulty of extension, pointing specifically to a perceived linkage between the Hawaiian language and diverse, ongoing, everyday cultural activities which are lacking for Arapaho.

There is much to be gained from a further consideration of these comments. In this article, I draw on experience at Wind River and elsewhere in Native Amer-

ica, as well as in Hawaii, to further explore why the Hawaiian language model has not been extended as successfully as one would hope. In so doing, I attempt to bridge gaps of knowledge and awareness between Native Hawaiians and Native Americans.

A first wave of indigenous language revitalization efforts occurred in the 1970s and 1980s, largely relying on efforts to apply existing "foreign language" learning models to indigenous languages, with little success. A second wave in the 1990s increasingly recognized that responses to language shift need to be much more nuanced in terms of local contexts and cultures, resulting in the birth of the specialized field of "language revitalization".[1] My first point here is to offer a clearer understanding of the socio-political, socio-cultural, economic and demographic factors in much of Native America that potentially limit the use of the Hawaiian model of language revitalization.

The third wave, just now fully emerging and heavily influenced by anthropology,[2] has begun to confront the fact that language shift is a secondary symptom of deeper socio-cultural changes, and that the ecology within which language is embedded must change if shift is to be reversed. It is born out of the failures of the last 30–40 years to produce critical masses (or even double digits) of fluent young speakers among the vast majority of groups involved in language revitalization, with a few notable exceptions such as the Mohawk and Blackfoot immersion programs.[3] My second focus in this article will be an examination of the unique socio-cultural and historical conditions within Hawaii, surrounding the issue of Hawaiian identity, which help account for the very possibility of the

1 Extremely important in the second wave was Hinton and Hale (2001). Among recent articles that I would call "second wave" reconsiderations of language revitalization are White (2006); May (2006); and McCarty (2008).

2 "Third wave" perspectives include Mühlhauser (2002); St. Clair and Bush (2002); Edwards (2007) and Meek (2010). Wilson and Kawai'ae'a (2007: 39) combine both perspectives in their caution about efforts to use a Canadian model of immersion, since that model does not focus on remodeling cultural identity, but only on language.

3 Articles on the at least partial frustrations and failures of specific revitalization efforts were initially rare, but have begun to be more frequent. See Peter (2007) on earlier Cherokee efforts; Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer (1998) on Tlingit; Williams and Rearden (2006) on earlier Yup'ik efforts; and Breinig (2006) on Haida; as well as St.-Hilaire (2005) on the partially similar case of Louisiana French. Frustratingly, the field still tends to be dominated by cherry-picking of the good news and ignoring the bad, not to mention outright misrepresentations of the facts on the ground. To cite one egregious example, Johansen (2004) paints an incredibly rosy picture, even claiming that Navajo was endangered prior to World War II, experienced a renaissance due to the code talkers, and is now a healthy language (2004: 568). See House (2002) for a much more realistic depiction of the situation. See Walsh (2005) for many references to the broader field and the competing perspectives on the possibilities of revitalization.

Hawaiian language revitalization movement, and a comparative survey of the differences found in much of Native America with regards to these issues. I conclude by emphasizing the point that the Hawaiian movement should not be considered as a "language revitalization" movement, but rather a movement about reformulating identities, in which knowledge of the language is not the principal goal.

Before beginning the main analysis, I should clarify my own position in relation to Hawaiian, since I have not "officially" done research on Hawaiian. Rather, I have been married for nearly twenty-five years into an ethnic Hawaiian family, several of whose members have learned Hawaiian in school or attended the immersion programs. I have benefitted from two periods residing in Hawaii and at least annual visits. I have also visited immersion schools, and talked with a variety of individuals involved with the immersion movement, from *Pūnana Leo* personnel to professors at the universities. My family uses Hawaiian as a home language, along with English, and my wife and I have taught community language classes in Colorado for Hawaiians living here. Thus part of the inspiration for this article is to use my status as at least a "semi-insider" in two different communities to point out gaps in understanding between the communities. Hopefully this can contribute to more realistic assessments of both obstacles and potentials on both sides of the divide.

2 The Hawaiian model of language revitalization

With apologies to numerous more knowledgeable Hawaiian language activists, I first offer a brief, synthesized description of the Hawaiian revitalization model, intended as descriptive lessons from the Hawaiian model specifically:[4]

1. Build as broad a range of public support as possible for language revitalization efforts. Revitalization almost always involves political action, at least on a tribal level, and often on a state level, to obtain stable economic resources.
2. Overcome legal barriers to the language (see Warner 2001; Wilson and Kamanā 2001).
3. Do it yourself. Hawaiian programs have been run by those actually involved in learning the language themselves – often as volunteers, later in paid

4 Warner (2001) and Wilson and Kamanā (2001) offer much more extensive descriptions of the background and organization of the Hawaiian process. Hartwell (1996: 65–85) also offers a useful narrative of the process described here, prior to its full development, from the perspective of a single family. The discussion highlights especially points (1), (2), (3), (5a), (5b), (5c), (5d), (6a) and (9), while touching tangentially on others, and also illustrates the struggles faced by Hawaiians in accomplishing each of these steps, as do Warner (2001) and Wilson and Kamanā (2001).

positions. Today the infrastructure is fundamentally Hawaiian, not necessarily in an ethnic sense, but in a "language-commitment" sense.

4. But . . . learn carefully from qualified and experienced others in a similar situation. The Hawaiian program learned crucial lessons from the Maori language revitalization experience, for example, and continues to do so today.

5a. Begin immersion programs, and gradually expand to multiple levels. Immersion schools are the best way to produce critical masses of fluent speakers, and the best way to create (new) social domains where the use of the indigenous language is actually beneficial and necessary. These schools were started for preschoolers (*Pūnana Leo*). This allows language acquisition prior to formal "schooling". The schools were then extended year by year eventually through 12th grade, since short-term immersion programs (K-3 for example) do not allow adequate language retention to occur.

5b. Offer effective classes for parental learning of the language, and demand parental involvement on some level. This step allows reinforcement of the language at home, as well as producing another social domain where the language can actually be used (see Peter [2007] and Lopez and Zepeda [1998] for contrastive situations).

5c. Run immersion programs through the public school system. Public schools have built-in resources and funding models, and specific amounts of dollars they must spend on each student. The marginal cost of educating the student in Hawaiian rather than English is not negligible, but it is still a marginal cost. Private schools are unable to tap into this public funding source.

5d. Take advantage of existing "exceptional" bodies of native speakers to staff the immersion schools. Hawaiian has remained the native language of the island of Ni'ihau until very recently. Thus a number of energetic, younger individuals were available to serve in the immersion schools. The Blackfoot immersion school in Montana took the same approach, importing teachers from Alberta.

6a. Develop university-level language training programs that can produce teachers to eventually staff the immersion schools (Wilson and Kawai'ae'a 2007). The two main campuses of the University of Hawaii developed programs that were able to produce very good young speakers of the language. This is a crucial pipeline, since older and elderly native speakers obviously cannot be relied upon indefinitely.

6b. Create a curriculum-development infrastructure separate from individual teachers and schools. The curriculum-development component of *'Aha Pūnana Leo*, as well as similar university programs (Hale Kuamo'o at

UH-Hilo) has allowed for curriculum and language experts to produce curriculum, while teachers teach.

7. Use universities and linguists for support, not essential roles. The Hawaiian model in no way depends on professional (especially outsider, non-Hawaiian-speaking) linguists to run immersion programs. Note however departments and/or colleges of Hawaiian language and studies have been developed at the UH campuses, which function differently from typical, theory-oriented academic departments.[5]
8. Make use of extensive existing documentation to create new learning and reading materials. The history of newspaper publishing in the Hawaiian language is extensive. Recently, the newspapers are being placed online in searchable format.[6]
9. Eventually develop second-language-speaker families who will raise their children as first-language speakers, so that the immersion program can begin shifting from a language-acquisition site to a language maintenance site. This process is now in its incipient stages, with one estimate being 50 families doing this (Larry Kimura, p.c.).
10. Develop a rich web infrastructure and other digital technologies in Hawaiian language (Warschauer and Donaghy 1997).[7] This promotes interaction among students across islands and effectively enhances the (still relatively small) community of Hawaiian speakers. It also provides yet another new domain for Hawaiian language usage, and effectively ideologizes the language as modern and youth-oriented.
11. Develop a language committee to oversee development of new lexicon (*Kōmikē Hua'olelo* [Hawaiian Lexicon Committee]). Such a committee enhances the possibility of uniform curriculum production, while the centralized production itself serves to promote the spread of the official new terms.
12. Open immersion programs to all individuals of all backgrounds. This greatly increases the population from which potential attendees can be drawn, thus

---

5 See http://hilo.hawaii.edu/academics/hawn/, the website of the College of Hawaiian Language at the University of Hawaii-Hilo, which described the variety of activities of the College.

6 See http://www.bishopmuseum.org/special/hawnnewspapers.html and http://libweb.hawaii.edu/digicoll/newspapers.htm.

7 Numerous websites could be listed here. See for example the Ulukau website, an online digital library, at http://ulukau.org, and the Kualono website of UH-Hilo's Ka Haka 'Ula o Ke'elikōlani College of Hawaiian Language (http://www.olelo.hawaii.edu/), which features extensive technological information and advice concerning Hawaiian on the web (in Hawaiian of course!) among many other topics.

allowing for more schools and larger schools, with more extra-curricular and social opportunities available to the students, and more general political support.

13. Base immersion schools in living indigenous cultural practices (such as hula, chant, fishing, taro farming, canoeing and voyaging, etc.).
14. But . . . at the same time, fully integrate modern sports, arts, etc. into the schools – thus one high school has a football team, which uses traditional voyaging terminology for play-calling.

In summary, the Hawaiian Model can be described as based on a richly supported immersion school environment, heavily embedded in a more generalized living Hawaiian cultural milieu, but actively embracing ongoing evolutions in technology and society. The Hawaiian Model is largely the model with which Native Americans and language workers (academic or otherwise) in the rest of the US are familiar. In some cases, local efforts in the US at least approximate the Hawaiian model, though typically at a much smaller scale and at a more incipient stage – notably programs among the Eastern and Western Cherokee. There is often an incomplete conceptualization or understanding of the full Hawaiian Model and its requirements and implications. In particular, points (1), (3), (5c), (5d), (6a), (6b), (7), (8), (10), (12) and even (13) are often not explicitly confronted or addressed in immersion/revitalization planning and activities in Native America.

3 Socio-economic and demographic limitations on extending the model

In the following section, I discuss a few socio-political and socio-economic, demographic, and cultural features that occur in Native America, which cause significant difficulties in extending the above model. This section also serves as a further exploration of the full details and implications of the points above. The section is informed by reading about a number of immersion or partial-immersion programs of which I have no direct knowledge.[8]

8 Descriptions of Native American immersion programs include Johnson and Legato (2006) on Navajo; LaPier and Farr (2006) and Kipp (2000) on Blackfoot; Williams and Rearden (2006) on Yup'ik; Aguilera and Lecompte (2007) on Navajo and Yup'ik; and Arviso and Holm (2001) on Navajo. Note I am focusing on K-12 immersion. For pre-school programs, see Johnston and Johnson (2002).

Point (1) above is about political power, and secondarily, the access to resources that political power brings. Point (2) is also a direct result of political power. As James Crawford has argued (1995), politics and scarce resources may be the decisive factor in language survival. Native Hawaiians constitute 20% or more of the population in the state of Hawaii, and thus form a significant voting block of indigenous people. The state Office of Hawaiian Affairs is relatively powerful and well-funded. In contrast, most states in the US have multiple indigenous populations, and those populations – even the Navajo or Cherokee – are small relative to the overall population of the states in question. Moreover, the reservation model means that voting power is limited to local areas in many cases, and does not extend statewide as it does in Hawaii. Thus there is a lack of political power in Native America compared to Hawaii. This situation affects several other of the points indirectly, most notably (5c) and (6a). Blackfoot and Mohawk immersion programs would be very difficult to run through public schools in part because state school boards are not supportive of such ventures, and even basic Cheyenne language lessons must be run after school in Oklahoma due to disinterest from white-majority schools. Few Native American languages are taught at the post-secondary level, and far fewer still are taught in programs that can actually produce competent speakers. This can be a crippling problem for producing immersion school teachers who have adequate education training. This political situation is exacerbated by the multi-reservation language communities found in many cases, such as the Dakhota, Lakhota, Ojibway and Cree situations, where language groups are scattered on many separate, politically-independent reservations, often in multiple states or provinces (thus making point [11] much more problematic).[9]

Small populations affect not only political power, but economies of scale. Textbooks require the same input of resources, yet the profit potential for ones in English is hugely greater than for indigenous languages. There is little or no incentive to produce any curriculum or electronic media in most indigenous languages, whereas many Hawaiian-language children's books are currently produced at least semi-commercially in Hawaii. This problem of economy of scale is a major impact for points (3), (6a), (6b), (10) and (11) among others.

9 Even traditionally smaller and more unified communities experience this same parcellation of population and resources. For one extreme example, see Wetzel (2006) on the Potawatomi, who once occupied a fairly compact area, but now consist of nine separate communities across several states. The article documents both the diversity of approaches to language revitalization across the communities, as well as efforts at joint planning. See also Warner et al. (2009) on Mutsun.

With the exception of the Cherokee, Hawaii is the only indigenous community in the US to have developed a long-running and socially-pervasive tradition of literacy. Not only is much material already available for re-use, but it is in a popularly approved orthography still in use today (vs. linguists transcriptions), and was done by native speakers themselves, thus reflecting their own interests and concerns (as opposed to academically-driven documentation projects), including the expression of Hawaiian resistance to colonizing forces and influences (Silva 2004: 54–55), the publication of numerous examples of traditional oral poetry and performance (Silva 2004: 72–79), and an explicit consciousness of preservation of this material for future generations (Silva 2004: 76). Clearly, this makes point (8) unique to the Hawaiians (and Cherokee).

In relation to points (5a) and (5d), Hawaii is one of the few cases where an exceptional reservoir of speakers is available.

In addition, there is a second "special population" which was available to Hawaiians – more "traditional" populations living in remote areas of the islands. These are populations which Hawaiian scholar Davianna McGregor calls cultural "*kipuka*" – that is, isolated areas bypassed by development and non-Hawaiian settlement, and maintaining traditional indigenous knowledge and practice (and language in some cases) for many years after other Hawaiians and areas of Hawaii had become more urbanized and developed (McGregor 2007: 1–48). This major diversity in the rate of linguistic and cultural shift is the product of large population size and geographic area occupied, and geographical diversity on the islands. In contrast, most Native American communities are not large and geographically diverse enough to maintain such *kipuka*.[10]

The issue of tribal identity (see point [12]) is another major difference between Hawaii and the rest of Native America. Formally, in fact, there is no federally-recognized Hawaiian political entity, or even the legal possibility of one, although the Akaka Bill (S.1011) currently before Congress seeks to alter that. But more generally, the idea of tribal ownership of language or unique tribal rights to a language is absent from Hawaii, but fairly common in many areas of the US (notably the Southwest), where in some cases even other Native Americans are excluded from access to a tribal language (Cochiti, Taos, Arizona Tewa and Jemez pueblos would be examples).

Finally, although local conditions are variable, many Native American reservation communities are less well integrated in terms of education and socio-economic prosperity with larger local (and often more prosperous) communities.

10 Two good accounts of these "kipuka" areas by insider Native Hawaiians themselves (in addition to the chapters of McGregor's book) are Kauhi (1996) and Maunupau (1998).

For example, individuals with a BA or graduate degree are uncommon on many reservations, whereas such attainment is relatively unremarkable in the Hawaiian community. And whereas few individuals on many reservations work off-reservation in professional-level jobs, many Native Hawaiians are well-integrated into the general American Middle Class. More generally, Native Hawaiians are better integrated educationally and socio-economically into the surrounding (relatively prosperous) non-Native communities than is the case for most reservation communities.[11] This last point is partly also a matter of scale and absolute population size, in terms of the diversity of educational attainment within the community. But whatever the combination of factors, the relative shortage of higher education and socio-economic integration means that Native American communities often face difficulties with points (3), (6a), (6b) and (10). Moreover, socio-economic instability and the associated social factors can be crippling for efforts to implement parental language learning, as in (5b) (not to mention [9]), and more generally, members of higher socio-economic classes are more willing to support language revitalization programs than those in a more stressed position.[12]

As a result of the factors discussed above, which impact almost every one of points (1–14), what one sees most often in Native America, when the immersion-school model of language revitalization is implemented, is not richly supported schools, heavily embedded in living indigenous practices while also fully integrating modern technologies and practices, but poorly-supported schools, often language-heavy but culturally light (though the reverse also occurs), using large numbers of Euro-American-derived texts and images, and a conspicuous lack of modern technological integration, as well as a lack of opportunities for children to use the language they're learning outside the schools.

I could certainly be accused of caricature here. However, the record of success on the mainland is not good. Certainly I do not say that this is the model one must follow. But if one is at the revitalization stage, and especially past the point where parent speakers are available to transmit the language to children, then

11 At least part of this could be explained by the presence of Kamehameha Schools/Bishop Estates (/www.ksbe.edu/), which has existed for many decades, and provides quality education specifically for Native Hawaiians, graduating hundreds of students each year. I know of nothing comparable among a specific Native American community. This is only a small part of the answer, however, as many Native Hawaiians with high levels of achievement have come out of the public school systems as well.

12 See St.-Hilaire (2005) for Louisiana French as well as Peter (2007: 333) for Cherokee, where she discusses the imperatives of housing and health care which could undermine language funding efforts. Peter also discusses lack of parental involvement in the Cherokee immersion programs, in part related to just the factors under discussion here.

clearly the Hawaiian Model can work, and has worked well so far in Hawaii, and worked (if only in isolated cases or for short times) in Native America too. In some cases, it may however simply be impossible to apply the model at the present time in a local context, and this needs to be better appreciated before money is wasted, morale is destroyed, and the hope of additional chances is diminished. In other cases, it would be possible to apply the model, but it needs to be fully understood in the context of broader immersion approaches (Linn et al. 2002), with all its implications and in the context of the actual socio-economic conditions and constraints present in the local Native American setting. In such cases, the model could of course be adopted to local circumstances. Not all of the points above are equally necessary: multiple solutions are possible with points (4), (5c), (8), (10) and (12). On the other hand, points (3), (5a), probably (5b), (9), (13) and probably (14) seem basically "non-negotiable" for successful revitalization, while several others seem quite crucial for true, long-term, demographically-meaningful success (6a, 6b).

4 Socio-cultural issues: from potential to actual success in revitalization

The above discussion suggests some reasons why the Hawaiian revitalization model has good potential in Hawaii, but less so in Native America. An even more important question concerns how potential becomes reality. As much as Hawaiians seem to have benefited from certain socio-economic and demographic advantages, those factors are not sufficient to understand the relative degree of success attained in Hawaii so far. Rather, deeper and less obvious socio-cultural factors grounded in the identity of Hawaiian itself, and the language ideology associated with Hawaiian must be examined to understand the full strength and resources of the Hawaiian revitalization movement. It is here that the greatest difference is found between Hawaii and much of Native America.

Behind identity and language ideology is history. The Hawaiian language revitalization movement owes a great deal to the nineteenth century history of the Hawaiian monarchy. The nearly century-long existence of an independent Hawaiian political entity in the nineteenth century has everything to do with current conditions.[13]

13 Wilson (1998) makes points very similar to mine concerning both the importance of the nineteenth century independent kingdom and the multi-ethnic nature of Hawaiian society (my second key point in this section), though not specifically in the framework of identity issues.

With the partial exception of the so-called "Five Civilized Tribes", Native Americans generally lack a past model of a literate, self-governing entity based in a political identity rather than a traditional lifestyle identity. The Native Hawaiian Kingdom of the nineteenth century was a constitutional monarchy, with political institutions that looked largely familiar to western countries of the time, and would still look familiar today. The Kingdom was run primarily in Hawaiian, and provided an educational system which produced literacy rates exceeding those in many western countries. Social debate and consensus building were mediatized to an important extent, and heavily dependent on literacy – in particular a robust tradition of newspaper publishing (Silva 2004: 45–86). In other words, Native Hawaiians today have as part of their culture heritage and memory a model of successful self-government based upon an institutionalized, bureaucratized, mediatized foundation – and in the indigenous language – not unlike state and national governments of the present. The kind of government they would like to have now existed in the past. And, for nearly two hundred years, the identity of Hawaiian included citizenship in a mediatized, legally-formalized democracy.

In contrast, the cultural heritage and memory of most Native American groups retains a model of successful self-governance, prior to reservation times, but one based in a traditional tribal identity, traditional subsistence economy, and less bureaucratic, often ceremonially-based forms of self-governance. Many Native American tribes are still in the process of working out effective forms of self-governance in the "western" model of today (see Snell [2011], for example), and more importantly, many individuals within those tribes and nations do not easily equate the new models with use of the indigenous language. In other words, many Native Americans have difficulty fully conceptualizing their language and language-based identity as coherent with "techno-political contemporaneity."

Balanced against this advantage for Hawaiian are a number of other factors related to nineteenth-century Hawaiian society which seem less obviously advantageous. First, comparing Hawaii to much of Native America, one is struck by the greater degree of respect status accorded to elders in much of Native America. Certainly Hawaiians honor and cherish their elders. But in many areas of Native America (especially where the languages are still most widely spoken), there is a strong sense of deference related to age-gradedness and elder knowledge (Meek 2007; Anderson 2009; Neely and Palmer 2009; Moore and Hennessy 2006). The discourse of "respect for the elders", which carries with it a strong component of deference, obedience, and even reverence, is pervasive in ways that I think would be hard for many Hawaiians to imagine. The most obvious reason for this is the loss of traditional Hawaiian religious and political structures after the arrival of the missionaries in the 1820s, and their replacement by democratic election

processes and western religious denominations. This is not to say that religious practice did not continue, especially in cultural *kipuka* areas, but the formalized, hierarchical power relationships of the pre-contact religion were largely lost, replaced by individualized folk practice. Similarly, while the nobles continued to exist and played an important role in the monarchy, that role was greatly attenuated by legal and bureaucratic constraints (Dougherty 1992; Osorio 2002). In contrast, traditional leadership structures lasted much longer in Native America, and are still partially present even today, and traditional religious ceremony has remained strong, with dominant positions typically held by elders.

Another language ideology that is widespread in Native America, but largely absent in Hawaii, is the idea that "the language is sacred" (Anderson 2009; McCarty 2008; Gomez de Garcia et al. 2009; Watahomigie 1998). While one can certainly hear statements of this type in Hawaii, they are comparatively rare. It is important to distinguish between statements such as "hula is sacred" or the idea that the language of hula is sacred, and the statement that "the language" itself is sacred. The rarity of the latter type of statement and ideology in Hawaii could be linked to the early loss of much traditional religious structure, and thus of the sacred/ritual component it lent to Hawaiian language.

The Hawaiian language has also never been considered as "closed" to outsiders by Hawaiians, or even, in the nineteenth century, as necessarily an automatic identity marker of Hawaiian-ness. Citizenship in the Hawaiian Kingdom was gradually detached from racial criteria in the 1840s and 1850s, meaning that being "Hawaiian" was available to those not having Hawaiian blood (McGregor 2007: 32–34). This process was largely driven by Euro-American desires to disenfranchise and disinherit native Hawaiians, culminating in a so-called "Bayonet" constitution forced on the next-to-last monarch, King Kalakaua, and finally in the overthrow of the monarchy itself (Kame'eleihiwa 1987; Dougherty 1992; Osorio 2002). Yet, the fact remains that those without Hawaiian blood were naturalized citizens of the kingdom, and even served in the legislature. It was the Euro-Americans who eventually fully racialized identity, through the Bayonet Constitution (Osorio 2002: 243–244; Silva 2004: 126–127) and as part of the larger ideology of colonialism (Merry 2000: 20–21, 141–44; Kauanui 2008). Prior to this point, nineteenth century immigrants and later indentured laborers could acquire an identity as citizens of Hawaii, and learn Hawaiian (Wilson 1998). Thus the link between speaking the language fluently and being "Hawaiian" in the ethnic sense was less strong than it has been in Native American contexts. Related to this is the fact that in Hawaii one rarely hears "if you don't speak Hawaiian, you're not (truly) Hawaiian", whereas this kind of statement can commonly be heard in Native American communities (Adley-Santa Maria 1999; Bunte 2009). Many Native American communities consider their language as "closed" to out-

siders, and to be a form of intellectual property over which they retain unique ownership.

As a related development, the ideology that the culture is "in" the language has been far less powerful in Hawaii than in much of Native America, where one often finds a more powerful and absolute ideology: quite literally, that if one simply learns the language, one will automatically acquire the culture as well. The language is seen as the (often unique) *via regia* to and carrier of the culture. In contrast, twentieth-century Hawaii has offered several routes "into" the culture, including traditional agricultural and fishing, hula, material arts and traditional navigation (Hartwell 1996; Harden 1999; McGregor 2007).

Thus the litany of reasons continues for why Hawaiian should be at a disadvantage in terms of potential language revitalization. The combined legacy of radical nineteenth-century cultural shift after 1820, followed by political revolution (1893–1898), then cultural and demographic swamping of the remaining Hawaiian speech communities in the earlier twentieth century, culminating in the near-total loss of the language outside Ni'ihau by the 1980s, led to a relatively weak connection between Hawaiian identity and Hawaiian language, with accompanying language ideologies that de-emphasized the sacredness of the language and of eldership, and the connection between fluent speech and the broader culture.

Despite these seeming obstacles, the political situation of the nineteenth century, and the continued widespread practice of numerous (partially-)nonlinguistic "Hawaiian" activities in the twentieth century, has been crucial to the revival. In particular, the extent to which a "dispersed" model of Hawaiian identity, combined with a number of activities and settings where the language has remained salient in non-fluent forms, are central for an understanding of the individual motivations that underlie the success of the Hawaiian Model. This dispersion takes two forms: a very broad variety of practices through which Hawaiian-ness can be symbolically expressed; and a broad segment of the population engaged in or with at least some of these practices.

The nineteenth century witnessed a massive immigration influx to Hawaii, from China, Japan, the Philippines and Portugal. Many of these individuals acquired either the Hawaiian language or a pidginized version of it, which developed first into a Hawaiian-based creole (Roberts 1995) and later an English-based creole (Carr 1972; Sakoda and Siegel 2003). They also shared many cultural practices with the indigenous Hawaiians (McGregor 2007: 44–45). Along with the Native Hawaiians, these people form the majority of the current Hawaiian population (which is only roughly one-fifth White). These people have a heritage of speaking either Hawaiian or Hawaiian Creole English, as well as a shared history of public schooling (vs. the white elite), and they are the members of the "Local"

identity in Hawaii, which basically encompasses non-ethnic Hawaiians and non-Whites, though in the heavily racially- and ethnically-mixed society of Hawaii, clear distinctions between Hawaiian, Local and *Haole* (White) are tenuous.[14]

Not only do all of these modern Local people make up the demographic majority of Hawaii, but they also share a heritage of colonial domination by a White/Haole elite which lasted from the 1893 overthrow of the monarchy roughly until the statehood era (Silva 2004: 126–127; McGregor 2007: 44–45). They also share a widespread and more-or-less intense orientation towards Hawaiian activities which include everything from hula, chant, music, material cultural arts ("crafts/Hawaiiana"), to lu'au, surfing, aloha wear clothing, "local" food, pig-hunting, wearing leis, etc. Kauanui (2008: 12–16) argues that Hawaiian identity was earlier seen in terms of "expansive inclusivity", and Linnekin (1990) points out that "Hawaiian" has been the "encompassing" identity in Hawaii for mixed-race/ethnicity individuals. That identity was behavior- and performance-based and understood in terms of kinship, rather than in terms of blood quantums or race (Kauanui 2008: 3).

Many non-Hawaiians and non-Locals engage in these same activities, even though they are iconically associated with Hawaii and Hawaiian-ness.[15] Thus due to a combination of ethnic and racial mixing and intermarriage, a historically political rather than purely ethnic or tribal model of citizenship and community, and a huge variety of indigenous activities associated with Hawaiian-ness, the identity of Hawaiian is extremely dispersed in character, and extremely dispersed across the population in Hawaii.

This means two things. First, there is a huge demographic component of the Hawaiian electorate who share a heritage of Hawaiian language,[16] of common citizenship and/or community, of colonial domination, and of shared interests and activities related to Hawaiian-ness. There is thus a great deal of sympathy

14 See Hualalani (2002) for general discussion of Hawaiian identities. See also Lum (2008), which focuses in particular on ethnicity, HCE, and schooling, and Wilson (1998) on shared linguistic patterns.

15 Hartwell (1996) provides an interesting exposition of the way various practices – traditional agriculture, music, dance, canoe paddling, surfing, tapa-cloth-making, traditional medicine and continued religious practice – are related to Hawaiian-ness, with more or (sometimes much) less strong connections to the language. See also Harden (1999), which similarly divides its focus into roughly similar categories.

16 See Iokepa et al. (1998), in particular the language autobiography of Jason Cabral. It was the use of Hawaiian Pidgin (i.e. HCE) by him and his family which eventually led him to the Hawaiian language, despite a lack of any Hawaiian ethnic heritage (he is of Portuguese descent), and reinforced that learning as well, as he listened to the amount of Hawaiian in his father's Pidgin.

towards the Hawaiian identity, at least in its dispersed sense(s). Perhaps even more importantly, these hundreds of thousands of people provide an economic basis which can support more core Hawaiian practitioners of these components of Hawaiian identity. The dispersed nature of Hawaiian identity has provided the demographic weight necessary for much of the political and legal success of the Hawaiian revitalization movement, as well as the economic resource base for the continued practice of Hawaiian activities notably, hula and music.

The second important thing about this dispersed identity is its impact on Native Hawaiians themselves. Seeing important activities related to one's identity widely practiced, admired and economically remunerated across one's society, provides a huge psychological boost to the identity itself, as a "prestige identity" (Wilson and Kamanā 2009). Many people in Hawaii want to act or "be" Hawaiian at least some of the time, if often only on somewhat superficial levels. The Hawaiian identity, or at least important components of it, is "cool", is desirable, is sought after by non-Hawaiians, sometimes in its quite dispersed "local" form (*Local Motion* surfboard and swimwear company, *Local Kine Grinds* food, etc.), sometimes in ways more specifically connected to Hawaiian-ness.[17] I do not deny the neglect, disrespect and outright racism directed at Native Hawaiians over many years. But this has been much less the case in relation to many specific Hawaiian practices and people who identity as "local" or "part-Hawaiian" than in relation to the core identity of Hawaiian-ness.

Let us now turn to the experience of Native Americans and those who have worked in this area. I will take Wind River Reservation and Wyoming as an example, home to the Northern Arapaho and Eastern Shoshone. There are only 10,000 Arapahos in the state. But imagine if 75% of the people in the state had a heritage involving having once been citizens of an Arapaho nation; if the majority of those people had relatives who had spoken Arapaho in the past; if those people still today spoke a variety of English heavily based on Arapaho syntax and including dozens of common Arapaho words; if they had all shared an experience of being colonized by some outsider group who suppressed the Arapaho; if thousands of people around the state were involved in pow-wow dancing groups, or drum groups; if several radio stations around the state played Arapaho-language music all day; if there were Arapaho-cuisine restaurants around the state; if "Arapaho" was a sought-after label for products and businesses in the way "Local" is in Hawaii; if beaded clothing was the standard thing to wear to work

17 The aptly named and very popular Hawaiian music group *Hapa* ('half') is so named because one of its two lead members is a white New Jersey-ite, to cite just a single example of the draw of Hawaiian practices.

every Friday; and if dozens of books on Arapaho language and culture were available in any corner bookstore.

Clearly, this is an unlikely scenario around rez country in the West (or the East, no doubt). The political power necessary to establish and adequately fund richly-supported K-12 immersion programs would be available. How might young Arapaho people view Arapaho-ness in such a context? How much more desirable might it seem and how much less ambivalent might they be towards it? The problem of (at a minimum) ambivalence about identity among many Native American youths is a common issue, and this ambivalence often appears specifically around the issues of indigenous language (House 2002; McCarty et al. 2006).

Native American identities are not remotely as dispersed across populations in the mainland US as the Hawaiian identity is. This is not to say that extensive intermarriage does not occur, and among part-Native American individuals, there is a good deal of fuzziness. But that fuzziness usually comes to an abrupt halt in the broader population, and the distinction between White and Arapaho is much stronger and more clear-cut than similar identities in Hawaii are.[18] While a number of Whites may be interested in the Arapahos, extremely few of them actually practice any component of Arapaho-ness.

Of course, identity is one thing, language is potentially something else. To complete our picture of Wyoming, we would have to imagine a place where not only is Arapaho-language music on the radio, and Arapaho words used for all the pow-wow songs, but Arapaho dictionaries, grammars, and learning materials would be widely available, all the street names would be in Arapaho, all the place names would be in Arapaho, there would be books available explaining the meaning of all those place names. If we return to Hawaii, it is crucial to note that although Hawaiian identity has been dispersed across many different practices other than the language per se, many of these practices have a strong language component (even if sometimes only memorized). Indigenous place names were retained. Though the practice of Hawaiian-ness is dispersed across many living activities and contexts today, that very dispersal has served to disperse the language as well, keeping it visible and salient, even if not fluently spoken. This is the insight of the second Arapaho commentary above, and indeed, the speaker (who has visited Hawaii) says not that Hawaiians "have all their culture" but that

18 Ironically, as many Native Americans will testify, the farther one gets from the reservation, the more people are in fact willing to claim part-Indian identity (though typically of a quite shallow sort) and even engage in "Indian" activities such as sweat lodge ceremonies, whereas the closer ones gets to the reservation, the more the racism intensifies. It is the specifically local attitude that matters here, I want to argue, not what upper-middle-class Whites far removed in Boulder CO or New York City think about the Arapaho, to take one example.

it is "all around" (*noo'oeniihi'*) them, capturing a sense of the broader Local "incubator" that surrounds Hawaiian culture.

Of course, the Locals are not the heroes of Hawaiian language revitalization – the core, committed Native Hawaiian activists are. But the latter have benefited from the incubation of dispersed Hawaiian identity, which incubated the language through several decades of very difficult times.[19] This incubation has its origins in the history of the Hawaiian monarchy and territory. Not only did that monarchy provide a cultural heritage and memory which continues to legitimate images of Hawaiian-ness in the eyes of native Hawaiians,[20] but the identity was first fundamentally political and based on citizenship, rather than tribal and based on ethnicity and blood, and then evolved to a socio-economic and socio-cultural identity rooted in a shared experience of exploitation and colonialism.

5 Revitalization: the issue of youth and desire

Let us return to the core activists – especially to the many young people who were so instrumental to the initial stages of Hawaiian revitalization in the 1970s and 1980s, and to the many young people now in high school and college immersion programs who are carrying the movement forward. No matter how many socio-economic advantages a potential language revitalization movement might enjoy, or how attractive an identity may be, reconnected the language to that identity is an enormous endeavor of will (see Edwards 2007) initiated by a small set of committed and talented, younger individuals. But the Hawaiian revitalization movement has succeeded so far due to its ability to attract commitment from

19 Here I cannot resist adding a personal reference. My own step-father-in-law, Arthur Wong, was ethnically Chinese, but raised by a Chinese mother who had learned fluent Hawaiian. Surrounded by Hawaiian language and music as he grew up in the territorial years, he eventually became a passionate supporter of Hawaiian music and wrote several song books for 'ukulele in his later years. He taught both 'ukulele and the songs to many people, but most notably to a group called Club 100, which was made up of Japanese-American Hawaiians who had been members of the 100th Combat Team of the 442nd Regiment, a famous World War II Japanese-American unit from Hawaii. Those ethnically Japanese veterans spent their twilight years learning Hawaiian music from an ethnically Chinese man (who spent the war in army laundry rooms!). They were all "local" *to da max*, as one would say in Hawaiian pidgin.

20 It is certainly no accident that Kamehameha Schools Press has made sure that Hawaiian-language biographies of all the important royal figures of the nineteenth century are available for use in schools. The schools themselves were founded by a royal family member (Bernice Pauahi Bishop), so this of course explains part of the motivation. But more fundamentally, the Hawaiian Monarchy plays an enormous role in the iconography of Hawaiian-ness in contemporary Hawaii.

a much larger, second layer of participants: young people, one-by-one, must make the decision to stay in immersion schools after sixth grade (when parental decision can no longer dictate), continue speaking the language, and then finally raise children in it. If a movement cannot attract the necessary levels of personal commitment and personal resources, then no amount of money or perfect teaching techniques, curricular materials, grammars, dictionaries and documentation will allow it to succeed. In many Native American communities, the core individuals are present, but the second layer of participants who can constitute a critical mass are not. Revitalization is finally a socio-cultural question, not a technical, pedagogical, demographic or even linguistic one. It is not about just learning and knowing a language, but using it and living in it (Wilson and Kamanā 2009), and doing so in meaningful numbers.

If we return one more time to some of the consequences of the nineteenth-century Hawaiian experience for language and socio-cultural ideology, we see again that Hawaiian has been conceptualized as an "open" (Kauanui 2008: 9) identity, without heavy dominance and control by elders whose authority often lies in privileged access to the sacred. It has been a "democratic" identity where for the most part access to knowledge has been publicly available in books and archives. All of these features appeal to many younger people. Moreover, many of the iconic cultural activities have strong elements of appeal to youth.[21] So yet again, I would argue that the nineteenth-century legacy of the Hawaiian state left a political, social, cultural and linguistic ideology which makes Hawaiian identity quite appealing to a broad spectrum of youth.[22] This is a crucial difference from much of Native America, where control of and access to resources, authority and knowledge is much more heavily associated with elders in a more hierarchical framework. This is most especially true in one of the areas where the language remains most vital and widely used – ceremonial contexts – and tends to be more

21 To get a sense of this dynamic, I suggest looking at the official video for the song "*Pi'i mai ka nalu*" [The surf is up] by Robi Kahakalau, on YouTube. The video combines Hawaiian Creole English commentary integrated into the music, a Hawaiian-language song about surfing (by a woman), images of big-wave surfing and walking along the beach in beach clothing while playing the guitar, and a hip-hop style intervention by a separate (male) artist. (Uploaded by Mountain Apple Company 27 July, 2010.)

22 Wilson and Kamanā (2009) is an excellent discussion of the ways in which Hawaiian immersion schooling is fundamentally a form of (re)acculturation rather than language learning, and in particular, one oriented towards what I am calling "modern traditionalism". They state for example that ritual and cultural metaphor are made available to Hawaiian youth in the immersion programs in order to allow them to make deep connections with the traditional subsistence world, but not necessarily to live in it.

true of the language specifically than of other aspects of Native American cultures, such as music, dance or sports (see Vera [1998] for just one example).

6 Revitalization: language or culture?

The preceding suggests reasons why Hawaiian identity might be broadly appealing, especially to younger people, but why the need for the language? I suggest that the question of dispersed identity is again central. The language revitalization effort can be seen as a reaction to what might be identified as excessive dispersion of identity. When seemingly everyone shared in Hawaiian identity, and it became too dispersed, the very identity of Hawaiian became more and more tenuous. One way to authenticate Hawaiian identity, as a form of resistance to this ever-increasing dispersion, was to return to the language. It has become the vehicle for intensifying the identity and focalizing it around a narrower set of practices in which linguistic access to the past (of nineteenth-century documentation and thought) and linguistic creation of new, Hawaiian-specific conceptualizations of modern traditionalism go hand-in-hand. High school students adapting traditional navigation terms to football is an example. Traditional navigation, beginning with the voyages of the Hōkūle'a in the 1970s, has been a key aspect of Hawaiian cultural revitalization (Kane 1976). But that revitalization initially lacked a significant linguistic component. Similarly, football (especially the University of Hawaii team) has undergone a Hawaiianization and Polynesianization as part of the same cultural revival. In extending Hawaiian-language navigation terminology to football, students are re-assimilating both practices to a core Hawaiian identity through a process of revernacularization which also reconceptualizes the relationship between the "traditional" and "modern", "indigenous" and "foreign" practices. In other words, the rise of linguistic Hawaiian-ness can be understood as a reaction to Localness, and a way of "taking back" Hawaiianness itself for a dedicated core of Native Hawaiians.

7 Conclusions

None of what I have said is intended to be an argument against tribal models of identity per se, which are in any event a response to quite different historical and political conditions than those present in Hawaii. But these differences are precisely the point: *if* one is contemplating following the Hawaiian model, then these differences are crucial to consider. The Hawaiian model is really not a language revitalization model, but a cultural re-conceptualization model. Considering lan-

guage in the abstract, the techniques of revitalization might seem quite transferrable. But once one recognizes that cultural revitalization is the central issue, the possibilities of direct transference become particularly complex. The Hawaiian schools are programs of socio-cultural assimilation to a remodeled Hawaiian identity, which use language as an iconic element (as well as the practical vehicle) of that assimilation (Wilson and Kamanā 2009). From my experience with Native America, this is the issue that has not been "ideologically clarified" (Dauenhauer and Dauenhauer 1998) by Native American communities. Is the goal simply to "know" the (typically) "traditional" language and culture "fluently"? Or is it to re-frame the identity (linguistic components as well as non-linguistic ones) such that it becomes on object of attraction, and then to assimilate students to that identity, which will be based in and provide social and conceptual mechanisms for actually using and living through the indigenous language in a fully contemporary present? In much of Native America, there remains profound ambivalence about whether the indigenous language specifically will be an active part of processes of cultural revitalization and reformulated identities, to be actually used for living on a daily basis. Only the re-engineering of cultural ecology around language is likely to produce critical masses of young speakers who will begin raising their children as new first-language speakers.[23]

8 A look to the future in Hawaii and Native America

The irony of this situation is that the earlier (1800s–1970s/1980s) dispersed framing of Hawaiian identity both helped enable the originations of the Hawaiian programs, and continues to reinforce them, even as the programs in their most advanced goals work against that earlier, non-linguistic and dispersed framing of

23 See in particular Hermes (2007), where she notes the tendency for indigenous languages and traditional cultures to be taught (in "culture-based" schools) separately from the rest of the curriculum, such that indigenous culture becomes "institutionalized" rather than just "what we do" (Hermes 2007: 57), and a stark dichotomy (and choice) is set up between contemporary and indigenous culture. To the extent that immersion schools are just second-wave centers for learning traditional language and culture, they replicate the same dichotomy and choice, but simply on a higher level: the choice will just be between schools, rather than between classes. See also Wilson and Kawai'ae'a (2007: 38–39) on the need to create Hawaiian-medium structures as opposed to just content, since "structures create identity and the interaction of human beings". This is a good example of what I mean by "social and conceptual mechanisms for actually living in and through the language".

identity. As long as the new linguistic identity is seen as the new focal prototype of a dispersed model of Hawaiian-ness, this dynamic seems likely to continue to function productively. On the other hand, too radical a discontinuity between dispersed and language-specific identity might risk actually weakening the Hawaiian program (Osorio 2010), as some have argued has occurred with Maori efforts recently due to their emphasis on tribalism (Rata 2007). Strongly "ethnic" forms of identity linked to racial heritage, of the type which are arising more generally in the parts of the Pacific (Linnekin 1990), could threaten the dispersed cultural identity. Certainly some elements of the Hawaiian movement point in that direction.[24] But given the historical particularity of Hawaii, this seems unlikely, and graduates of the immersion program now include full non-ethnic-Hawaiians (Iokepa et al. 1998).

Additional work is needed both to better understand the particularities of the Hawaiian case, and also to consider how some of the same features and benefits of dispersed models of identity could be drawn on, cultivated, activated and refigured in Native America in order to enhance support both internally and externally to tribes for continued language revitalization. Some key points are: (1) while language teaching is a "technique" that is generally extensible across languages, language revitalization fits this model far less well, and the existence of such a label and practice conceived as a unified field may be a dangerous illusion; (2) as a number of other have noted, language-based approaches to revitalization, including attempts at re-ideologizing languages alone, are highly unlikely to

24 An unaddressed theoretical issue here is the distinction between "dispersed" identity I use here and Linnekin's concept of multiple "nested" identities, which can be activated in different political contexts. My analysis allows for nested identities, but Linnekin's notion of identity seems to include a notion of a single prototype for each identity. My concept of dispersion recognizes multiple prototypes for "Hawaiian" identity, and it is the existence of these multiple prototypes which in part has made possible the maintenance of an open, "cultural" type of identity attractive and flexible enough to be "dispersed" among a very large, diverse society of over a million people. But in the Native Hawaiian journal *'Ōiwi*, one can certainly find many instances of a competing vision, where the Hawaiian language is posited not as just a or the key conceptual and performative element of a "cultural" type of identity, but as an exclusive and genealogically-rooted element of "ethnic" identity. To take just a single example, see *'Ōiwi* (volume 3, 120–121), where poems by Lufi A. Matā'afa Luteru speak of "etching ancestry . . . prayers are sent to your kūpuna [elders] . . . embrace your destiny . . . eternal is the mark that carries the seed . . . a perpetuation of the bones" and "*'ōlelo haole* [English language] eradicated!" Competing visions of dispersed, cultural identity versus more exclusive, ethnic forms of identity are perhaps an important and necessary source of productive tension in the contemporary Hawaiian revitalization movement. But for the moment, the narrowed and focalized prototype identity based in Hawaiian language remains an open, performance-based identity, and indeed, still remains one prototype among several.

work without broader socio-cultural shifts and support – cultural revitalization is the more appropriate goal;[25] (3) to the extent that language is a key focus, learning must be in expectation of daily language usage and living with the language, not simply "knowledge" (even fluent) of the language; (4) while revitalization movements must have core activists and leaders, unless there is a near-simultaneous development of a critical-mass of committed secondary participants, the chances of long-term success are low; (5) in order to attract this critical mass of younger secondary participants, the revitalization cannot be purely elder-led or elder-focused – more generally, since more traditional forms of identity are specifically what are not seen as sufficiently appealing in endangerment situations, the revitalization must consist of a reconceptualization of identity; (6) "open" and "dispersed" identities draw more political support; and finally, a point that goes against the vast majority of the literature on endangered languages, (7) tight(er) bonds between language and identity may be as much the product of revitalization efforts as the necessary preconditions for such efforts; indeed, extremely tight language/identity bonds may even act as inhibitors of large-scale revitalization efforts in that they lessen the broad appeal of an identity and its potential for reconceptualization.

References

Adley-Santa Maria, Bernadette. 1999. Interrupting White Mountain Apache language shift: an insider's view. *Practicing Anthropology* 21. 16–19.

Aguilera, Dorothy & Margaret D. Lecompte. 2007. Resiliency in native languages: the tale of three indigenous communities' experiences with language immersion. *Journal of American Indian Education* 46. 11–36.

Anderson, Jeffrey D. 2009. Contradictions across space-time and language ideologies in northern Arapaho language shift. In Paul V. Kroskrity & Margaret C. Field (eds.), *Native American language ideologies: beliefs, practices and struggles in Indian country*, 48–76. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Arviso, Marie & Wayne Holm. 2001. Tséhootsooídi Olta'gi Diné Bizaad Bíhoo'aah: a Navajo immersion program at Fort Defiance, Arizona. In Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale (eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, 203–215. San Diego: Academic Press.

Breinig, Jeane. 2006. Alaskan Haida stories of language growth and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly* 30. 110–118.

Bunte, Pamela. 2009. "You keep not listening with your ears!" language ideologies, language socialization, and Paiute identity. In Paul V. Kroskrity & Margaret C. Field (eds.), *Native*

25 See Mühlhäusler (2002) and the Introduction to Grenoble and Whaley (1998).

American language ideologies: beliefs, practices and struggles in Indian country, 172–189. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Carr, Elizabeth Ball. 1972. *Da kine talk: from pidgin to standard english in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Crawford, James. 1995. Endangered Native American languages: what is to be done, and why? *The Bilingual Research Journal* 19. 17–38.

Dauenhauer, Nora Marks & Richard Dauenhauer. 1998. Technical, emotional and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from Southeast Alaska. In Lenore A. Grenoble & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.), *endangered languages: current issues and future prospects*, 57–98. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dougherty, Michael. 1992. *To steal a kingdom: probing Hawaiian history*. Waimanalo, HI: Island Press.

Edwards, John. 2007. Language revitalization and its discontents. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10. 101–120.

Gómez de García, Jule, Melissa Axelrod & Jordan Lachler. 2009. English is the dead language: native perspectives on bilingualism. In Paul V. Kroskrity & Margaret C. Field (eds.), *Native American language ideologies: beliefs, practices and struggles in Indian country*, 99–122. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Grenoble, Lenore & Lindsay J. Whaley (eds.). 1998. *Endangered languages: current issues and future prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harden, M. J. 1999. *Voices of wisdom: Hawaiian elders speak*. Kula, HI: Aka Press.

Hartwell, Jay. 1996. *Nā Mamo: Hawaiian people today*. Honolulu: 'Ai Pōhaku Press.

Hermes, Mary. 2007. Moving toward the language: reflections on teaching in an immersion school. *Journal of American Indian Education* 46. 54–71.

Hinton, Leanne & Ken Hale (eds.). *The green book of language revitalization in practice*. San Diego: Academic Press.

House, Deborah. 2002. *Langauge shift among the Navajos: identity politics and cultural continuity*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Hualalani, Rona Tamiko. 2002. *In the name of Hawaiians: native identities and cultural politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Iokepa, Maka'ai, Kaleiokalani Shintami Jr., Jason Cabral & Keli'ihoalani Kamanā Wilson. 1998. Four Hawaiian language autobiographies. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 115–121.

Johansen, Bruce E. 2004. Back from the (nearly) dead: reviving indigenous languages across North America. *American Indian Quarterly* 28. 566–582.

Johnston, Bill & Kimberly A. Johnson. 2002. Pre-school immersion education for indigenous languages: a survey of resources. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 26. 107–123.

Johnson, Florian Tom & Jennifer Legato. 2006. Tséhootsooí Diné Bi'ólta'. *Journal of American Indian Education* 45. 26–33.

Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikalā. 1987. *Native lands and foreign desires. Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Kane, Herb Kawainui. 1976. A canoe helps Hawaii recapture her past. *National Geographic* 149. 468–489.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani. 2008. *Hawaiian blood: colonialism and the politics of sovereignty and indigeneity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kauhi, Emma Kapūnohu'ulaokalani. 1996. *He Mo'olelo no Kapa'ahu* [Story of Kapa'ahu]. English translation by Charles M. Langlas. Hilo, HI: Pilo Productions.

Kipp, Darrell R. 2000. *Encouragement, guidance, insights, and lessons learned for native language activists developing their own tribal language programs*. Browning, MT: Piegan Institute. www.grottofoundation.org/upload/store/peigan.pdf (accessed 8 May 2012).

LaPier, Rosalyn & William Farr. 2006. An important gift: Blackfoot language and history. *Journal of American Indian Education* 45. 34–36.

Linn, Mary S., Tessie Naranjo, Sheilah Nicholas, Inée Slaughter, Akira Yamamoto & Ofelia Zepeda. 2002. Awakening the languages. challenges of enduring language projects: field reports from 15 programs from Arizona, New Mexico and Oklahoma. In Jon Allen Reyhner & Barbara Jane Burnaby (eds.), *Indigenous languages across the community: proceedings of the Annual Conference on Stabilizing Indigenous Languages (7th, Toronto, May 2000)*, 105–126. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1990. The politics of culture in the Pacific. In Jocelyn Linnekin & Lin Poyer (eds.), *Cultural identity and ethnicity in the Pacific*, 149–173. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Lopez, Daniel & Ofelia Zepeda. 1998. The parents have to do their part: a Tohono O'odham language autobiography. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 43–45.

Lum, Darrell H. Y. 2008. What school you went? Local culture, local identity, and local language: stories of schooling in Hawai'i. *Educational Perspectives* 41. 6–16.

McCarty, Teresa L. 2008. Native American languages as heritage mother tongues. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 21. 201–228.

McCarty, T. L., Mary Eunice Romero & Ofelia Zependa. 2006. Reclaiming the gift: indigenous youth counter-narratives on native language loss and revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly* 30. 28–48.

McGregor, Davianna Pōmaika'I. 2007. *Nā Kua'āina: living Hawaiian culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Maunupau, Thomas K. 1998. *Huakai Makaikai a Kaupo, Maui* [A visit to Kaupō, Maui]. English translation by Mary Kawena Pukui & Malcolm Naea Chun. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

May, Stephen. 2006. Addressing the context and complexity of indigenous language revitalization. *Journal of Language, Education and Identity* 5. 301–308.

Meek, Barbra. 2007. Respecting the language of elders: ideological shift and linguistic discontinuity in a Northern Athapascan community. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 17. 23–43.

Meek, Barbra. 2010. *We Are our language: an ethnography of language revitalization in a Northern Athapascan community*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Merry, Sally Engle. 2000. *Colonizing Hawai'i: the cultural power of law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Moore, Patrick & Kate Hennessy. 2006. New technologies and contested ideologies: the Tagish First Voices Project. *American Indian Quarterly* 30. 119–137.

Mühlhauser, Peter. 2002. Why one cannot preserve languages (but can preserve language ecologies). In David & Maya Bradley (eds.), *Language endangerment and language maintenance*, 34–39. Curzon, NY: Routledge.

Neely, Amber A. & Gus Palmer, Jr. 2009. Which way is the Kiowa way? Orthography choices, ideologies, and language renewal. In Paul V. Kroskrity & Margaret C. Field (eds.), *Native American language ideologies: beliefs, practices and struggles in Indian country*, 271–297. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

'Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal. http://www.hawaii.edu/oiwi (accessed 19 September 2012).
Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole. 2002. *Dismembering Lāhui: a history of the Hawaiian nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole. 2010. Hawaiian issues. In Craig Howes & Jon Osorio (eds.), *The value of Hawaii: knowing the past, shaping the future*, 15–21. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
Peter, Lizette. 2007. "Our beloved Cherokee": a naturalistic study of Cherokee preschool language immersion. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 38. 323–342.
Rata, Elizabeth. 2007. Maori language survival and New Zealand education. In Katherine Schuster & David Witkosky (eds.), *Language of the land: policy, politics, identity*, 79–95. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Roberts, Julian M. 1995. Pidgin Hawaiian: a sociohistorical study. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10. 1–56.
St. Clair, Robert N. & John A. Bush. 2002. The need for an ecological community. In Barbara Jane Burnaby & Jon Allen Reyhner (eds.), *Indigenous languages across the community: proceedings of the Annual Conference on Stabilizing Indigenous Languages (7th, Toronto, May 2000)*, 63–76. Flagstaff: University of Northern Arizona.
St.-Hilaire, Aonghas. 2005. Louisiana French immersion education: cultural identity and grassroots community development. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 26. 158–172.
Sakoda, Kent & Jeff Siegel. 2003. *Pidgin grammar: an introduction to the Creole language of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Bess Press.
Silva, Noenoe K. 2004. *Aloha betrayed: native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Snell, Marilyn Berlin. 2011. Navajo monster slayers: a tribe struggles to fight corruption. *High Country News*. 22 August.
Vera, Agnes. 1998. Why have i not forgotten my language? A Yowlumne language autobiography. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 79–81.
Walsh, Michael. 2005. Will indigenous languages survive? *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34. 293–315.
Warner, Natasha, Quirina Luna, Lynnika Butler & Heather van Volkinburg. 2009. Revitalization in a scattered language community: problems and methods from the perspective of Mutsun language revitalization. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 198. 135–148.
Warner, Sam No'eau. 2001. The movement to revitalize Hawaiian language and culture. In Leanne Hinton & Alan Hale (eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, 133–144. San Diego: Academic Press.
Warschauer, Mark & Keola Donaghy. 1997. Leokī: a powerful voice of Hawaiian language revitalization. *Computer Assisted Language Learning* 10. 349–362.
Watahomigie, Lucille J. 1998. The native language is a gift: a Hualapai language autobiography. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 5–7.
Wetzel, Christopher. 2006. Neshnabemwen renaissance: local and national Potawatomi language revitalization efforts. *American Indian Quarterly* 30. 61–86.
White, Frederick. 2006. Rethinking Native American language revitalization. *American Indian Quarterly* 30. 91–109.
Williams, Bev & Nita Rearden. 2006. Yup'ik language programs at lower Kuskokwim school district, Bethel, Alaska. *Journal of American Indian Education* 45. 37–41.

Wilson, William H. 1998. I ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i ke ola [Life is found in the Hawaiian language]. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 132. 123–137.

Wilson, William H. & Kauanoe Kamanā. 2001. Mai loko mai o ka 'i'ini. Proceeding from a dream: the 'Aha Pūnana Leo connection in Hawaiian language revitalization. In Leanne Hinton & Ken Hale (eds.), *The green book of language revitalization in practice*, 146–176. San Diego: Academic Press.

Wilson, William H. & Kauanoe Kamanā. 2009. Indigenous youth bilingualism from a Hawaiian activist perspective. *Journal of Language, Identity and Education* 8. 369–375.

Wilson, William H. & Keiki Kawai'ae'a. 2007. I kumu, i lala 'Let there be sources, let there be branches': teacher education in the College of Hawaiian Language. *Journal of American Indian Education* 46. 39–53.