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Introduction

“The theatre ‘performing history’ seeks to overcome both the separation and the exclusion from the past, striving to create a community where the events from this past will matter again.” —Freddie Rokem, Performing History.¹

“Drama, more than any other literary form, seems to be associated in all cultures with the retelling again and again of stories that bear a particular religious, social, or political significance for their public. There clearly seems to be something in the nature of dramatic presentation that makes it a particularly attractive repository for the storage and mechanism for the continued recirculation of cultural memory.”

—Marvin Carlson, The Haunted Stage²

On the bright morning of January 16, 1993 at the arbor behind ‘Iolani Palace in Honolulu, Hawai‘i, an audience gathered to see a play. This was no ordinary play, but a free outdoor pageant advertised in the local newspapers. The audience anticipated the performance of Act III, Scene 1 of January 1893 by Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl. This was the scene when Queen Lili‘uokalani met with her subjects and they reaffirmed their support for her, the monarchy, and the sovereign Kingdom of Hawai‘i. ‘Iolani Palace is like an island of the nineteenth century in the middle of downtown Honolulu. Tall trees border much of the palace grounds to create an area of calm separating ‘Iolani Palace from the surrounding fast-paced twenty-first century Honolulu. ‘Iolani Palace, the historic home to the Hawaiian Monarchy, is an imposing pillared rectangular structure. The light-colored stone material combines with the structure of the building to project a sense of solidity and strength. The audience applauded warmly and loudly when the actor playing the queen entered from the back of the palace. As she descended the palace steps slowly, poised and with a regal bearing, the audience quieted and a gentle silence drifted

¹Freddie Rokem, Performing History: theatrical representation of the past in contemporary theatre. (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2000), xi.
through the palace lawn. The queen, dressed in a high-collared Victorian gown, passed her guards and crossed the space between the stairs and the arbor. Then something amazing and unplanned happened. Seemingly caught up in the moment some of the standing audience dropped to one knee in front of the actor playing the queen. It was not until the actor sat that the audience kneeling before her rose. What drove the audience to enter into the performance as if they were nineteenth century citizens and this was their queen? What is the audience experiencing that causes them to want to physically engage with the performance of the past?

I am interested in the moments in which members of Kneubuhl’s audience choose (consciously or subconsciously) to enter into a performance of the past by performing an action. This action can be verbal or physical ranging from booing, cheering, kneeling, or any other movement or vocal response to the performance. I am not concerned so much with the standard theatrical actions of an audience applauding at the completion of a scene; however the choice not to applaud bears examination. Within these moments the audience members’ actions appear to be spontaneous and not a preplanned action in order to “play along,” but are instead actions that may reflect an immersion in the historical moment being performed. In these moments the division between the past and the present appears to cease to exist, and instead time may be experienced as malleable and audience members may traverse between the historical moment being performed and the present of performance. I am interested in specifically examining these moments in the work of Victoria Kneubuhl because of her commitment to exploring history. Kneubuhl’s work revolves around Native Hawaiian issues and I am interested in how the techniques she uses to create these moments might be used by other marginalized groups.

The opening anecdote is one of several examples of spontaneous audience action in January 1893 and the performance of the play is entwined with the political sovereignty movement of the early 1990’s.

---

3 January 1893, VHS Tape 2.
The connection to politics is necessary as I examine the uses for the techniques Kneubuhl uses to create these experiences. In order to understand whether or not the audience’s reaction to *January 1893* is unique it may be helpful to see if the audience responded in a similar way in another play by Kneubuhl. I will also explore the possibility of these moments from the script of *Ola Nā Iwi* because I believe the narrative balance of the past and the present, the internalized negotiation between the past and the present in the character Nanea, and the power of the past in the present narrative indicate that the play has a strong potential to generate these moments within performance. A fundamental difference between *January 1893* and *Ola Nā Iwi* is that the former was a free outdoor pageant staged as a part of a larger event whereas the latter was a play performed within a theatre attended by a paying audience. *Ola Nā Iwi* has a strong connection to a clear political issue, Native graves protection and repatriation, linking it to *January 1893* in that both plays are strongly tied to the political context from which they emerged. *January 1893* could fall under the umbrella of living history discourse. That discourse has yet to discuss Hawaiian performance and thus this study can connect Hawai‘i to the greater dialogue of living history. Kneubuhl’s work is particularly interesting because it brings living history discourse into dialogue with a number of other strands of theory that touch upon the audience such as the work of Freddie Rokem on performing history, Marvin Carlson’s notion of “ghosting,” and Phenomenology.

Playwright Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl (1949– ) has made a prolific career from working with historical documents and creating ways for people of the present to interact with the ideas and lives of people of the past. Kneubuhl, who is of Hawaiian, Samoan and European ancestry, earned her Bachelor of Arts in Hawaiian Cultural Studies, Art and Psychology from Antioch University in 1982. Kneubuhl earned her Master of Arts in Drama and Theatre from the University of Hawaii.

---

at Manoa in 1987. From 1987-1990 Kneubuhl was the Coordinator of Educational Programs, then Curator of Education at the Hawai'i Mission Houses Museum. In 1990 Kneubuhl developed a living history project, In Our Own Words, a compilation of letters and journals of nineteenth century Hawaiian and missionary women. From 1990-1993 Kneubuhl was the Educational Specialist at the Judiciary History Center of Hawaii. Later, Kneubuhl used court transcripts to create dramatic recreations of trials. Two such dramas were Duncan v. Kahanamoku (1995) and Trial of a Queen (1995) the latter of which was for the one hundredth anniversary of the military trial of Queen Lili'uokalani for treason. Kneubuhl has also developed and performed several living history walking tours in Honolulu; she performed a walking tour about the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy with historian/actor/teacher Glen Grant.

Kneubuhl’s work has been published in several anthologies and Hawai‘i Nei: Island Plays is a collection of three of her plays: The Conversion of Ka‘ahumanu (1988), Emmalehua (1996), and Ola Nā Iwi (1994). Considering Kneubuhl’s work as a whole, Dennis Carroll, one of Kneubuhl’s mentors, said about Kneubuhl, “The majority of Kneubuhl's plays are historical, exploring the roots of cultural dispossession and loss.” Kneubuhl’s work at the Hawai‘i Mission Houses Museum and the Judiciary History Center of Hawai‘i from 1987 to 1993 gave her the opportunity to explore history and cultural dispossession through living history interpretations. Her work in living history seems to have informed the pageant January 1893, which was called a “living history pageant” in much of the newspaper advertisement. January 1893 is connected to Kneubuhl’s living history plays through her playwriting technique of researching historical documents to craft her works. In Ola Nā Iwi the character Nanea

7 Emmalehua has undergone several revisions since first written in 1984; the 1996 revision is printed in Hawai‘i Nei. The Story of Susanna (1996) is printed in Seventh Generation; Ka Wai Ola (The Living Waters) (1997) is printed in He Leo Hou: A New Voice – Hawaiian Playwrights.
8 Dennis Carroll, “Hawai‘i’s “Local” Theatre” TDR 44.2 (2000), 134.
performs as a living history interpreter in several scenes and perhaps Kneubuhl’s past work in living history performance influenced that decision. Kneubuhl continued her work in living history performances after writing January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi and the two types of performance, living history and theatre, are irrevocably linked in her work as a whole and their influence on each other can be seen in the text and performance.

Scholarship about January 1893 is limited however there are a few first-hand accounts published. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs published a book 'Onipa’a: Five Days in the History of the Hawaiian Nation. The book contextualizes January 1893 within the whole event of the centennial observance and is filled with photographs and descriptions of the events of the observance including January 1893. There was several newspaper articles about the performance of January 1893 published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin during January of 1993. The newspaper articles are beneficial because of their inclusion of audience response. Kneubuhl and Marie Strazar wrote an article “January 1893: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy Relived in History” which provides an overview of the evolution of the January 1893 pageant. Kneubuhl also speaks about the pageant and the observance in an interview published in Performing Worlds into Being: Native American Women’s Theater. In that interview Kneubuhl provides her own perspective on the creation and performance of January 1893. January 1893 is briefly discussed in Dennis Carroll’s article “Hawai‘i’s ‘Local’ Theatre” during his focus on the “local” theatre of Hawai‘i, theatre written by, for, and about residents of Hawai‘i.

There are also a few sources about some of Kneubuhl’s other plays. In “The Bones Perform: Ola Nā Iwi and the Viability of Memory,” Sammie Choy approaches that play dramaturgically, exploring the convergence of the past and the present in the structure and narratives of the play. However, Choy does not discuss the audience. In an introduction to Hawai‘i Nei, Craig Howes briefly discusses issues in Ola Nā Iwi, Emmalehua, and The Conversion of Ka‘ahumanu. An interview with Kneubuhl was published in the spring 1996 Native
Playwrights’ Newsletter about her work as a playwright and specifically about the current revival of her play Emmalehua. Christy Stanlake used The Story of Susanna in her book Native American Drama.

Within these publications about Kneubuhl and her work there is not a discussion of either the audience generally or its perception of time specifically. There is limited scholarship on Kneubuhl and her work so any new writing is beneficial and welcomed, however my interests in the audience and their perception of time is not dealt with at all in the current discourse so it is doubly warranted. Since current Kneubuhl scholarship cannot explain these moments of audience action, it is necessary to look to wider theoretical discourses that may illuminate the causes.

Can living history discourse explain or help to explain what happened in the performance of January 1893? Much of living history discourse focuses on first- or third-person narrative styles adopted by the performers (the performer using “I” or “they” when speaking about historical persons). Scott Magelssen engages with the rising trend in second-person interpretation in his book Living History Museums and in his article “Making History in the Second Person: Post touristic Considerations for Living History Interpretation.”

Magelssen identifies current second-person interpretation at living history museums as heavily structured performances in which the second-person interpreter (a visitor to the museum and not an employee; in other words, an audience member) must conform to the proscribed role the museum assigns them. This institutional dictation causes several problems according to Magelssen, first the interpreters/audiences are limited to operating within the established historical record; and second, they perform as generalized amalgamations of historical persons instead of historically specific characters. Magelssen proposes a model for what he feels second-person interpretation should and could be. Magelssen asserts that the visitors should shape the narrative of the performance along with the staff thus enabling the audience to act as protagonists.
Magelssen identifies several goals of this type of second-person interpretation. First, he sees the “restorative potential” of this type of connection with the negative moments or events of the past that are often glossed over at living history museums. With second-person interpretation in which the interpreter is free to make choices they can confront and deal with the negative past and its present-day repercussions. Most importantly, this type of interpretation will generate discussion about the choices, the past, and the present. I believe that Kneubuhl also wishes to generate discussion with her plays.

Magelssen’s ideas for second-person interpretation intersect with the performance of *January 1893* in part because of the ability for the interpreter or audience to accept or critique the performance and history. The boundaries that are set in most current second-person interpretation that limit the actions of the interpreters were not present in *January 1893*. In that performance the audience was able to respond in the moment by expressing their feelings of encouragement or dissent. In some ways *January 1893* is an example of what Magelssen calls for in second-person interpretation. However, it is important to point out that in *January 1893* the audience was encouraged to take on the role of a historical audience instead of historical decision makers. The historical events of the Hawaiian overthrow were public events with an audience. The audience of *January 1893* was encouraged to take on the role of a historical audience.

Magelssen does not explore how that interpretation operates within the moment of performance, nor does he seek to explain how that moment functions for the interpreter/audience member. Magelssen does not discuss how the audience experiences time or how space affects the experience as well. *January 1893* does not fulfill his ideas of second-person interpretation because the audience could not perform as the protagonists. Also, he is not dealing with the perception of time within performance; he appears to be assuming that the interpreters/audience members and their perceptions of their actions remain in the present.
Marvin Carlson in his book *The Haunted Stage* examines the reappearance of stories, bodies, things in theatre, how they intersect with cultural memory and how those things and memories influence reception. Carlson names this repetition or reappearance of something that has come again as “ghosting” which he suggests “presents the identical thing they [the audience] have encountered before, although now in a somewhat different context.” Carlson’s ghosting is present in all aspects of theatrical production, from the text to the bodies of the actors, the design elements and the theatre house itself. Carlson asserts that the recycling and reappearance in theatre influences the audience’s reception in-so-much as they are able to recognize the repetition. This idea will become key when I examine, in particular, casting choices, but Carlson’s concept of ghosting may also be helpful in understanding the audience’s perception and reception in January 1893 because, as a history play, the audience is being presented with something that has happened before and the story of the overthrow may be a story they have heard before. The re-experience of emotions Carlson mentions becomes a moment of more than just experiencing emotions; I believe it also becomes a moment to confront those feelings and their cause. Although Carlson discusses potential effects of ghosting on the audience’s perception and reception he does not discuss how the audience experiences time within these hauntings. To Carlson, the audience can only interact with the past as it is manifest in the present. However, this bridging of the past to the present, in so much as the audience can recognize it and interact with it is central to my interests.

Richard Schechner’s concept of transportation might be useful in understanding the motivation for these moments of spontaneous audience action. Schechner explains that within the experience of transportation the performer is temporarily transported to the realm of performance and then returned to themselves at the conclusion of the performance. Schechner focuses on the experience of the performer and not on the audience however I think that this idea can be expanded.

---

upon for my purposes. First, it can expand to the audience when they become performers. Secondly, in Kneubuhl’s plays, the realm of performance to which the audience as performers are transported to is the past. I will return to this concept of transportation in particular in future chapters when I discuss scenes which provoke strong emotional responses.

Phenomenology is also appealing to my interests in understanding these moments because of its valuing of the subjective experience of the audience members. Phenomenology is refreshing since all too often subjective experience is dismissed in favor of more abstracted knowledge. There is an individual subjective experience in these moments I analyze and phenomenology perhaps could aid in the discussion of those moments. I find phenomenology’s focus on sensory information to be a powerful vehicle with which to understand the moments. Mark Fortier explains, “Theatre appears to the spectator’s senses as something to be seen and heard, and, less often, as something to be touched, tasted and smelled. The sensory effects of theatre are central to phenomenological concerns.”

The sensory information the audience is experiencing connects to the emotionality experienced in the moments I examine. Within these moments the sensory input may be cueing spontaneous audience action. For instance, in the opening anecdote, the Victorian gown costume, the actor’s body position and movement for the queen cues the audience to view the actor as the historical queen and by doing so to cast themselves as her historical subjects and kneel before her.

Unfortunately, phenomenology cannot fully account for these moments because phenomenology operates in the here and now it does not help me examine how time is operating in these moments or how the audience might feel themselves to be in a different time. Phenomenology cannot help me to explain how the moment is both the past and the present. However, phenomenology is ultimately useful because I think that there is something greater or a larger experience of which the sensory information is a part. Therefore the attention

10Mark Fortier. 39.
to sensory information is crucial to my examination of these moments of spontaneous audience action.

Both Magelssen and Carlson turn to Freddie Rokem’s *Performing History*. Potentially useful to my exploration of these moments of spontaneous audience action is Rokem’s concept of the actor as a “hyper-historian.” For Rokem, the actor functions as a link between the past and the present by embodying, in the present, the past, he explains, “the actors serve as a connecting link between the historical past and the ‘fictional’ performed here and now of the theatrical event; they become a kind of historian, what I call a ‘hyper-historian’.”¹¹ In the living history pageant of January 1893 the actors as “hyper-historians” bring to life the historical persons and events of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy so that the past is alive again, so to speak. What I am interested in are moments in which audience members perform and become hyper-historians as well. In his work Rokem does not consider the audience as performers but perhaps my present work may be a useful extension of his ideas. Although Rokem does not discuss possible audience action or how they may feel able to physically interact with the past, some of Rokem’s discussions on the performance of history may help in the examination of how the audience may see time as history in performance. Freddie Rokem’s work on performing history has long fascinated me because of his discussions on why history is performed and what comes of the performing:

…theatrical performances of and about history reflect complex ideological issues concerning deeply rooted national identities and subjectivities and power structures and can in some cases be seen as a willful resistance to and critique of the established or hegemonic, sometimes even stereotypical, perceptions of the past. They can also provide a direct critique of certain historical figures and their actions.¹²

¹¹ Rokem, 13.
¹² Rokem, 8.
Rokem and his ideas are useful to me as I attempt to understand why theatre and specifically the performance of history are used by Kneubuhl and used effectively for Hawaiian, particularly Native Hawaiian, audiences to renegotiate their relationship to history and their identity.13

Using these theorists I will explore two of Kneubuhl’s plays, January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi. Many of these moments of audience action seem to emerge as a result of the characters or the space of performance. I have therefore grouped the moments I observed in January 1893 and the potential moments I have identified in the script of Ola Nā Iwi.

Central to these moments and their examination is the interplay of the past and the present, how time is perceived and interacted with. The audience action may emerge from a blurring of the past and the present in the minds of audience members. In that blurring the audience can rewrite or change the past because it is physically in the present again and preset actions are not restricted by the historical record, instead the events are again taking place and those present become the decision makers in shaping the narrative of the event. Thus the past becomes almost touchable in that history is malleable in the hands of the audience member as performer; they can shape history and in that shaping more clearly discover their relationship to the events of history. I want to understand how these moments can be created, how to blur the past and the present and how this experience can be used.

In chapter one I contextualize January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi in the political and social life of Hawai‘i in the 1990’s. I also provide a dramaturgical summary of the two plays. In chapter two I examine how the actor-character relationship may facilitate or encourage the

13 Susan Bennett’s Theatre Audiences, a germinal piece of audience reception theory tends to treat the audience collectively and is thus not particularly well suited to my attempt to theorize the individual audience experience. In that work, Bennett briefly touches on individual audience experience using Christian Metz and psychoanalytic film criticism. In his exploration, Metz asserts that the audience’s impetus to physical action – actions such as the kneeling of January 1893 audience members – pulls the audience out of the dream state of the film. Although I will not resort to psychoanalytic theory, perhaps this work can indicate possible places for Metz to be expanded upon.
audience to act upon their feelings of being able to touch the past. With regard to character, my discussion of January 1893 begins with my examination of the actor-character relationship of Leo Anderson Akana and her character Queen Lili‘uokalani. The layering of the actor and the character and the corresponding visual simultaneity of the past and the present is also evident in The Players of Ola Nā Iwi. Also within the discussion of character is the fact that instead of leaving the audience to negotiate the relationship between the past and the present alone, January 1893 used a narrator character to bridge 1893 with 1993. Finally, Kneubuhl internalizes the duality of times within the character of Nanea in Ola Nā Iwi.

In chapter three I examine moments in January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi when the moments of spontaneous audience action may have been facilitated by or in response to spatial choices in location and staging. January 1893 was staged at the historical locations where the actual events took place in 1893 with few exceptions. How might these historic locations, ‘Iolani Palace and Ali‘iolani Hale, be part of the audience perceiving the past and the present simultaneously? What influence may witnessing the performance of the historical event in the same physical space it took place originally have on audience perception of their relationship to the past? I explore staging choices made for the pageant and how those choices contribute to an audience member’s perception of time and their relationship to the historical actions. To see if these or other spatial/setting choices in outdoor living history pageants function similarly in an indoor performance I will also examine spatial/staging choices in Ola Nā Iwi.

In my conclusion I will discuss the techniques that Kneubuhl used to facilitate the audience to feel that they could touch the past through their actions. By identifying and evaluating those techniques I will explore if they are transferable to other Native American groups or other marginalized groups outside of the political and social context within which Kneubuhl works.
Chapter 1

Summary and Context

January 1893 was a living history pageant dramatizing events leading up to and including Queen Lili‘uokalani’s abdication of the Hawaiian monarchy to the United States’ government. Kneubuhl’s play was developed after extensive research and is sympathetic to the monarchy. Kneubuhl’s approach to January 1893 connects to Gilbert and Tompkins theory about post-colonial histories:

post-colonial histories attempt to tell the other sides of a story and to accommodate not only the key events experienced by a community (or individual) but also the cultural context through which these events are interpreted and recorded. Reconstructing the past in this way usually heralds the emergence of new voices and new tools for understanding that past.¹⁴

January 1893 as a post-colonial history pageant shared a story of the overthrow that had been lacking. Kneubuhl’s treatment of the historical past did well to immerse the actions of the overthrow into the cultural contexts of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in the late nineteenth century. The term “pageant” is often used in reference to this performance because it contained nineteen scenes in five act performed over three days with the government buildings of Honolulu as its backdrop. This was a onetime performance commissioned to be a part of the 'Onipa'a Centennial Observance of the overthrow.¹⁵

The context for the performance of January 1893 is highly important. The performance of January 1893 was a major event within the ‘Onipa’a Centennial Observance created by Governor Waihee of Hawaii and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. The Committee was put in charge of organizing the five-day observance of the overthrow of the


¹⁵ ‘Onipa’a means “steadfast” in Hawaiian and was the motto of Queen Lili‘uokalani. This became the name and motto of the official observance of the one hundredth anniversary of the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani and the Hawaiian monarchy.
Kingdom of Hawai‘i by the Provisional Government. The observance was
to be filled with speeches, ceremonies, and activities. The
newspapers created the contextual framework for the audience’s
perception and reception of January 1893. This framework began with
Governor Waihee setting the tone for the observance in a newspaper
article he wrote on the issue of sovereignty for the 3 January 1993
dition of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin:

The overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy on January 17, 1893, was a
hostile act against a native people who were organized as a
sovereign nation and recognized by the United States of America.
It was an international act of aggression conducted, if not with
the tacit agreement of the U.S. government, then at least with
the United States turning to look the other way. It was an act
that, 100 years later, still needs to be recognized for what it
was. The 100th anniversary of the overthrow belatedly focuses
attention on those wrongs, as well as the longstanding demands of
native Hawaiians for the U.S. government to admit those
wrongdoings, make reparations, and allow Hawaiians to move toward
self-determinations.\(^\text{16}\)

Waihee's last three points, the United States admitting the injustice,
making reparations, and Hawaiian sovereignty, are discussed more fully
in a special supplement to the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that was written
by the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. These three issues were focal
points for groups demonstrating at the centennial observance. Becky
Ashlzawa, a writer for the Honolulu Star-Bulletin wrote a series of
articles throughout January 1993 about Hawaiian sovereignty and public
opinion surrounding the issue.\(^\text{17}\)

Another decision made by Governor Waihee became a focal point for
much discussion throughout the month of January 1993. Governor Waihee
decided that the Hawaiian flag would be flown alone in the Capital

\(^{16}\) Waihee, John. “Sovereignty: Hawaiians must find its meaning for 21st century” Honolulu Star-Bulletin, January 3, 1993. B1. Governor Waihee was the Hawaii’s first governor of Native Hawaiian ancestry. Waihee was
elected in 1986 and reelected in 1990.

District in Honolulu for the five days of the Centennial Observance. This meant the removal of the United States' flag from those same buildings. This decision caused a controversy that dominated the Honolulu Star-Bulletin throughout January. The Letters section was entirely devoted to the issue until the 20 January with letters from the public on both sides of the issue. The tension this issue created was another contextual component for understanding the audience of January 1893. Petitions in support of Waihee’s decision and peaceful protestors carrying the United States flag circulated through the audience during the performance thus bringing this issue within the scope of their reception.

One of the Centennial Committee's choices for the commemoration was to fund an educational program for the observance. Hui Na'auao, an umbrella group for diverse Hawaiian organizations, was given this task by the committee. Dallas Voegler, Hui Na'auao member, approached playwright Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl to write a play for the centennial pageant that Voegler would direct.

The parallels between the past and the present were being highlighted by the centennial observance and by staging events on the days that they had originally occurred one hundred years previously. One such similarity between 1893 and 1993 was the issue of Hawaiian sovereignty. The Hawaiian sovereignty movement is highly complex as it contains many organizations with a wide range of views on what Hawaiian sovereignty should be and how it should be obtained. By the 1990’s the sovereignty movement had gained momentum from the cultural revival and the institutions it spawned, such as immersion schools and programs within schools that reclaimed the Hawaiian language, and the Hawaiian Studies programs at the University of Hawai’i’s Manoa and Hilo campuses. 1990 saw the ending of US Navy test bombing on the island of Kaho’olawe. The island had been the site of multiple

---


19 The United States Navy was given control over the island of Kaho’olawe on December 8, 1941 to be used for target practice. Kaho’olawe is located eight miles off the coast of Māui.
protests by illegal occupation since 1976. The island was returned to the State of Hawai‘i along with $400 million for the recovery of the island in 1994. 20 There is much disagreement about who should control access to the island. In the summer of 1993 an international tribunal "took testimony throughout the islands, documenting many aspects of the US-Hawai‘i relationship as violations of international law." 21 In addition, on November 23, 1993, President Clinton signed Public Law 103-150, more widely known as the "Apology Resolution" which acknowledged the anniversary of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and contained an apology to the Native Hawaiians. The acknowledgement of the illegality of the overthrow and the highlighting of the annexation of Hawai‘i not by treaty but instead by congressional resolution added legal backing to the positioning of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement. Also importantly, this resolution raised the question of what comes after apologizing. To many the answer is Hawaiian sovereignty.

The final scene of *January 1893* presented the Hawaiians of 1993 with a glimpse of the final moments of Hawaiian sovereignty and in the performance the history of the overthrow could be restored and revised to include more than the whitewashed version propagated by the United States. This connection of the past to the present brings to mind an argument Rokem has about the construction of collective identity:

> Collective identities, whether they are cultural/ethnic, national, or even transnational, grow from a sense of the past; the theatre very forcefully participates in the ongoing representations and debates about these pasts, sometimes contesting the hegemonic understanding of the historical heritage on the basis of which these identities have been constructed, sometimes reinforcing them. 22

With the performance of history, Hawaiians could explore the construction of their present identity as it related to the events of their history. *January 1893* offered Hawaiians the opportunity to

---

21 Ibid., 17.
22 Rokem, 3.
actively engage with and present a pivotal moment in their history and through that engagement call into question the current constructions of their identity.

The pageant performed chronologically the historic moments of the overthrow from January 14, 1893 to January 17, 1893 on the corresponding days in 1993. As a part of the observance as a whole, the pageant was one of many options and activities throughout the five days for people to choose from. January 1893 was the only theatrical performance for the observance. Other events included quilt-making, a crafts fair, hula, lei, and 'awa ceremonies.23 There were also many speeches given during the observance such as a formal apology from the United Church of Christ for the role the church served in the overthrow.

At 12 noon on 13 January 1993 the opening ceremony of the 'Onipa'a Centennial Observance was held. On 14 January 1993 the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, one of two daily newspapers in Honolulu, put out their special issue “Overthrow Centennial.” This issue detailed the historic overthrow with a timeline of events and numerous articles of the events including large passages from the speeches given in 1893. As a part of the centennial observance, but not part of Kneubuhl’s play, actress Leo Anderson Akana gave a dramatic reading of Queen Lili'uokalani's last address to the legislature at Ali'iolani Hale as a part of the focus on the last legislative session of the monarchy which was held on 14 January 1893.24

The reenactment began in the morning of 15 January on the palace grounds. At the palace burial grounds Elizabeth Nalani Ellis as a Hawaiian elder told the story of the overthrow of the Queen. After that, actors as citizens of 1893 discussed the political events of the moment and speculated on what may be to come. Actress Leo Anderson Akana, as Queen Lili'uokalani, entered 'Iolani Palace grounds in a carriage with the Royal Guard as escort. Akana-as-Queen Lili'uokalani addressed the crowd, saying that she would be delayed in presenting

---

24Carroll, 141.
her new constitution. Staged later that afternoon at the coronation band stand on the palace lawn was the Committee of Public Safety's meeting to solicit support from U.S. Minister John L. Stevens in their intended overthrow of the monarchy.\textsuperscript{25}

The audience for the pageant scenes was in constant flux. One reason the audience changed was because the performance was outside at several locations within a small area. A second reason was because the pageant was only one aspect of the entire observance. The performance of the first scene was witnessed by an estimated 1,000 people and the final scene of the pageant was attended by an estimated 20,000 people. The size of the audience steadily swelled throughout the day. The audience was composed of Native Hawaiians, Hawaiian residents of Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Samoan, European and multiethnic decent, as well as visitors from across the globe. The audience was individuals of all age groups and class structures. There was a large presence of school-age children and adolescents.\textsuperscript{26}

The scenes on 16 January began with a speech by Leo Anderson Akana as Queen Lili'uokalani. This scene was followed by a meeting of the Committee for Public Safety to name an executive council for their Provisional Government. Speeches followed by the annexationists and Royalists in public rallies. Some of the living history actors were also interviewed in character for Hawai'i Public Radio, which was broadcast live from across the island of O'ahu. Later that afternoon, the gathered audience of thousands could hear the sounds of troops from the U.S.S. Boston marching in invasion of Honolulu. This invasion was reenacted only through sound however the next day a small group of uniformed actors stationed themselves in front of the Post Office. The evening wound down with the Royal Hawaiian Band performing a concert at the 'Iolani Palace, as they had a century before.

Dramatizations of the overthrow did not end with the pageant: on the evening of the seventeenth, Hawai'i Public Television aired the

\begin{footnotesize}
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docu-drama Betrayal featuring Marlene Sai as Queen Lili‘uokalani.\footnote{Onipa‘a, 144.} This dramatization of the events leading to the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy is sympathetic to the deposed Queen and also offers its audience a chance to reexamine the events of the overthrow. As mentioned earlier, in 1995 Kneubuhl developed a living history program Trial of a Queen for the centennial anniversary of the treason trial of Lili‘uokalani.

Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl’s play \textit{Ola Nā Iwi (The Bones Live)} (1994) was commissioned and produced by Kumu Kahua Theatre. Kumu Kahua Theatre is dedicated to producing “Plays about life in Hawaii. Plays by Hawaii’s playwrights. Plays for Hawaii’s people.”\footnote{On Kumu Kahua’s Website are the phrases, under their name, \url{http://www.kumukahua.org/}. Kumu Kahua Theatre on Market Street is a 100 seat theatre. Kumu Kahua is a not-for-profit community theatre.} Carroll, founder of Kumu Kahua defines ‘local’ Hawaiians as:

specifically for residents rather than tourists, written mostly by residents, usually set in Hawai‘i, frequently employing pidgin and some Hawaiian language, and often exploring different resident ethnic groups’ traditions and their adaptation to Hawai‘i.\footnote{Carroll, 123.}

The play debuted at the Merchant Street Theatre in Honolulu, Hawaii on November 11, 1994.\footnote{Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl \textit{Hawai‘i Nei: Island Plays}. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2002), 144.} The perceptible layering of the past and the present starts with the script and not really from the environment of performance as was the case with \textit{January 1893}. Beyond the first production, \textit{Ola Nā Iwi} was performed as a staged reading at the Pan Asian Repertory Theatre in New York City in 1998 and full productions were mounted as a part of the 1999-2000 season at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo and a revival at Kumu Kahua in its 2007-2008 season.

The conflict of the present-day narrative surrounds a set of human remains belonging to a Native Hawaiian woman Liliha. The main character Kawehi is introduced as she goes through customs upon her return to Hawai‘i from Germany. Kawehi declares to the Customs Inspector that the bones she carries are a theatrical prop set that
was created for a production of Hamlet. However the audience learns a few scenes later that they are in fact the skeletal remains of a Hawaiian elder kept in a German museum and that Kawehi stole the remains. Gustav, a German investigator, is sent to Hawaii to locate the remains to return them to Germany. In a carefully weaved mystery plot, the skeletal remains are replaced with the prop set so many times that no one knows for sure which set explodes in a car late in the second act. All is skillfully resolved, the remains put to rest, and Gustav leaves for Germany empty-handed.

Interwoven into this plot are two other narratives. The first is a series of historical vignettes of nineteenth-century characters. The historical vignettes in the play have two types: monologue and dialogue. The dialogues contain more developed characters with individual names whereas the monologue characters are defined by their occupation and not given names (with the exception of Dr. Pinchbottom and Miss Ida). There is not a developed narrative in the vignettes. Instead the vignettes serve to contextualize the human remains trafficking of the nineteenth-century. The final narrative is that of nineteenth-century Hawaiian woman Liliha, who the audience discovers is the woman whose remains Kawehi removed from the German museum. The character Nanea works as a living history performer and over the course of three scenes, tells the story of Liliha and how she was tricked and killed out of fear. These three narratives are woven together and work to create a holistic exploration of the treatment of Hawaiian remains.

The narratives of the historical vignettes and Nanea’s story of Liliha serve to contextualize the events of the present-day narrative. According to a post-colonial argument:

By establishing counter-narratives and counter-contexts which refute, or at least de centre, orthodox versions of history, marginalized cultures insist on a more equitable and representative starting point from which to negotiate a postcolonial identity.31

31 Gilbert and Tompkins, 111.
Nanea’s presentation of the story of Liliha provides a counter-narrative to the conversion of Hawai‘i to Christianity as well as a counter-narrative to the historical vignettes. This allows the audience to reexamine the effects of Christianity on Hawai‘i. The present-day narrative provides a new context for the grave robbing for scientific research presented in the vignettes. The new context highlights the present-day repercussions of those historical actions thus providing Hawaiians with a platform from which to renegotiate their identity.

Ola Nā Iwi centers on Kawehi’s self repatriation of Native Hawaiian remains from a German museum, however the politics surrounding the repatriation of human remains from any country is present. This play, in relationship to repatriation, calls into focus the lack of repatriation legislation in other countries that hold human remains and cultural artifacts:

I needed to write this play to express my personal feelings about the human right for all those people to be buried with decency and respect in their native land and for those resting places to be forever sacred. It is still our individual committed action to do right for ourselves and our people that makes a difference.32

In Ola Nā Iwi the individual responsibility for change is central. Kawehi takes it upon herself to return the remains of her cultural ancestor to Hawai‘i to be properly buried. Throughout the play individuals operate with strength of purpose to keep the remains safe and see them cared for.

Legislation in the United States exists in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) that was passed in 1990 and set new rules for the treatment of Native American remains. NAGPRA calls for the repatriation of Native American remains held in museums and universities across the nation. All the remains and

associated artifact have to be catalogued and turned over to the proper Native nation for repatriation.

NAGPRA applies to Native American burials on federal and tribal lands. Also, NAGPRA gives the treatment of unmarked graves to the indigenous nation and leave it to them to decide whether or not a grave can be excavated. This gives Native Americans the legal backing to protect their ancestors. NAGPRA does not apply to private collections but instead focuses on wherever the federal government is involved with the land or institution. Another aspect of this act is the protection of newly unearthed remains. If an archaeologist uncovers a Native American burial, he or she must stop all excavation and contact the government and local Native American nations to find out if the excavation is to proceed or not.

With Ola Nā Iwi, Kneubuhl is highlighting the inhumane treatment of human remains and cultural objects both in the past and present while activating the audience to take personal responsibility upon themselves to help affect change. To be clear, Kneubuhl is not proposing that the audience should self-repatriate remains or artifacts illegally. Instead, there is a motivation for the audience to see the present day humanity of the remains with Nanea/Liliha. Also, the audience might be motivated to do what is right for the remains in order to see them returned home and buried with the care and respect they deserve. The NAGPRA context is important to know in order to understand possible influence on the audience’s perception and reception of Ola Nā Iwi in addition to NAGPRA being one path through which the audience can effect change.
Chapter 2

Actor/Character

“The retelling of stories already told, the reenactment of events already enacted, the reexperience of emotions already experienced, these are and have always been central concerns of the theatre in all times and places, but closely allied to those concerns are the particular production dynamics of theatre: the stories it chooses to tell, the bodies and other physical materials it utilizes to tell them, and the places in which they are told.”

-Marvin Carlson

Actor-Character

Leo Anderson Akana is a known celebrity in Hawai‘i and in 1992 she acted with Kneubuhl in Aldyth Morris' play Lili‘uokalani. Morris' play premiered at Manoa Valley Theatre, Honolulu's Off-Broadway theatre. Akana also played Queen Lili‘uokalani in Kneubuhl's January 1893. The repetition of Akana as Lili‘uokalani is an example of the “ghosting” that Marvin Carlson discusses in his book The Haunted Stage. Specific to the actor's body, Carlson explains this “ghosting” of past characters the actor has played:

The recycled body of an actor, already a complex bearer of semiotic messages, will almost inevitably in a new role evoke the ghost or ghosts or previous roles if they have made any impression whatever on the audience, a phenomenon that often colors and indeed may dominate the reception process.

Following Carlson’s line of thought, if an audience member of January 1893 saw Akana as Lili‘uokalani in Morris’ play they could associate their reception of Akana in Morris’ play with their reception of her in January 1893.
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33 Carlson, 3.
34 Leo Anderson Akana has most recently appeared as Queen Lili‘uokalani in the feature film Barbarian Princess (2009). The film centers on the life of Princess Kaiulani, niece to Queen Lili‘uokalani.
36 Carlson, 8.
The actor's body itself can become a point of merger for the past and the present in performance. Leo Anderson Akana as a recognizable actor and living entity of the present is clearly distinguishable from her character, an individual of the past. If a less recognizable actor had played Queen Lili’uokalani in January 1893, the audience might still have recognized that a living actor of the present was performing the queen however they might also have more easily lost themselves in the fiction of representation thus perceiving the past stronger than the present. This may sound like an appealing situation, however, the perceptibility of the present in performance gives the audience an entrance point to the past. However, the casting of Akana, and the audience’s ability to perceive her clearly as a citizen of the present, acts as a balance to the perceivable past in the embodiment of the character.

For the audience to feel capable of physically entering into the past the presence of the actor must be balanced by an equally strong or stronger representation of the past. The audience was encouraged to view Akana as Queen Lili’uokalani and to see/feel the past as alive through her embodiment. On 15 January 1993 the pageant reenacted Queen Lili’uokalani’s carriage ride to ‘Iolani Palace. A large audience gathered on either side on the King Street entrance to ‘Iolani Palace in anticipation of the arrival of Akana as Queen Lili’uokalani. Before the scene started, the audience was sitting and standing behind the barriers of yellow ribbon on either side of the cement pathway. Narrator Glen Grant walked along the barrier and told the audience “all citizens are expected to remove their hats” and director Dallas Voegler asked the audience “Will everybody rise?” in anticipation of the entrance of the Queen’s carriage. The Queen’s carriage entered the King Street gate led by the Royal Guard. Actors playing nineteenth-century citizens followed the carriage in a silent procession and a chain of green-shirted peacekeepers separated them from the audience. The atmosphere of this scene encouraged the audience to experience the moment as a glimpse into the past and to
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37 January 1893 [video recording]: the overthrow in five acts, Tape 1.
see/interact with Akana as Queen Lili‘uokalani. For the audience members who removed their hats and rose at the entrance of Akana-as-Lili‘uokalani their bodies were being involved in their perception and reception.

Another example of the audience being conditioned to see Queen Lili‘uokalani manifest in the present through Leo Anderson Akana was in the performance of Act III, Scene 1. This example is the opening anecdote from the introduction of this work. This was the scene when Queen Lili‘uokalani met with the nineteenth-century citizens and they reaffirmed their support for her. The audience applauded warmly and loudly when Akana-Lili‘uokalani entered from the back of the palace and made her way to the arbor on the palace grounds. Although a few of the other actors signaled to the audience closest to them to kneel, there were many other audience members who were not near the actors who knelt. I am interested in those audience members who knelt before the queen on their own volition. Once the queen was seated at the arbor, the kneeling audience rose. In this moment of the character’s entrance, the audience put into their bodies the proper historical response to their ancestors’ sovereign. The audience is putting into their own bodies an action that is not their own; instead it is an action of their ancestors who were the subjects of Lili‘uokalani. The audience performed an action within the past as it was manifest in the present. In this moment the audience appears to have felt they could perhaps touch the past through their action of kneeling.

In terms of audience response, the most powerful scene in January 1893 is almost certainly the Queen’s abdication speech from the steps of ‘Iolani Palace. This scene was staged as the sun was setting behind ‘Iolani Palace on 17 January 1993. The audience swelled to an estimated 10,000 people standing and seated in anticipation of the final scene. The familiar yellow ribbon that had designated acting spaces throughout the pageant created gentle barriers between the audience and the paved lane the actors would use from the King Street entrance. Green-shirted peacekeepers were stationed intermittently

38 January 1893, VHS Tape 2.
along the barrier. Silence fell as the procession of nineteenth century citizens walked from the King Street entrance to the palace steps. Kneubuhl described the moment: “You could have heard a pin drop. It was so quiet.” As the actors playing nineteenth-century citizens passed those from 1993, “the actors brought to life the last flickering moments of sovereignty enjoyed by Hawaii’s indigenous people.” In this powerful moment, the audience was directly confronted with the final moments of the independent Hawaiian nation. Certain audience members, perhaps especially Native Hawaiians, could emotionally connect to their feelings of loss and disenfranchisement and experience them in a space of community and healing.

The audience applauded loud and long at the entrance of Leo Anderson Akana as Queen Lili‘uokalani. Without a verbal reminder, some of the audience removed their hats. The sights and sounds of cameras flashing began emphatically at her entrance and continued throughout the scene. Leo Anderson Akana entered from behind the glass-paneled doors of the Palace, costumed in a black gown over a white high-collared Victorian shirt. The costume for Queen Lili‘uokalani looks identical in photographs from both Morris’ Lili‘uokalani and January 1893. This would have further encouraged the audience to connect the experience of Anderson Akana in Lili‘uokalani to January 1893. The recycling of Akana’s Queen Lili‘uokalani’s costume is at the heart of Carlson’s ghosting:

...ghosting presents the identical thing they [the audience] have encountered before, although now in a somewhat different context. Thus, a recognition not of similarity, as in genre, but of identity becomes a part of the reception process, with results that can complicate this process considerably.

39 Armstrong, 153.
41 January 1893, VHS Tape 3.
42 Morse, A7.
43 Images are printed in Morris’ Lili‘uokalani, 31-38 and ‘Onipa’a, 131.
44 Carlson, 7.
In line with what Carlson presents in this passage, Leo Anderson Akana’s body and costume are the “identical things” the audience had already experienced in Morris’ play. However, the costume itself was not enough to have the audience identify an “identical thing.” The actor’s body within the costume is the integral component and the costume added another layer of sameness enabling the audience to recall the characterization of Queen Liliʻuokalani from Morris’ play. Leo Anderson Akana is not similar to a previous representation of Queen Liliʻuokalani, she is the actor who represents the Queen.

The audience emotionally connected to this historical and theatrical moment as they stood or sat in silence throughout the speech, “Her words would move the audience to silence and tears.”\(^{45}\) The audience’s perception of both actor and character in this scene is also evident in Harold Morse’s newspaper account. In his article, Morse introduces the scene “as Leo Anderson Akana, portraying Hawaii’s only reigning queen, emerged from the palace.”\(^{46}\) In this sentence Morse acknowledges that Leo Anderson Akana is performing the action, however the rest of the article identifies Queen Liliʻuokalani as the active entity, “Facing the crowd, which stood in darkness, the queen read from her letter of abdication . . . then, looking at her subjects, Liliʻuokalani said . . . Liliʻuokalani turned and reentered the palace.”\(^{47}\) At the conclusion of the speech, Leo Anderson Akana—Queen Liliʻuokalani turned and reentered the dark palace. A single lamp was lit in the room of the palace in which the Queen had been confined as a prisoner.

The living history pageant of January 1893 was an opportunity for a nation and a people to heal. The physical representation of Queen Liliʻuokalani by Leo Anderson Akana arguably served to unite the citizens of 1993 with their ancestors of 1893 as they were once again in the presence of the Queen. The audience in 1993 was able to perhaps feel that they were a part of the past and could enter the past through physical actions. Any emotions the audience felt about

\(^{45}\) ‘Onipa’a, 136.  
\(^{46}\) Morse, A7  
\(^{47}\) Ibid, A7.
the events of the overthrow could finally be expressed through actively supporting a physical representation of the Queen instead of to a noncorporeal memory. The representation of Queen Lili‘uokalani, as the last monarch of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, can represent the former independent strength of Hawai‘i and can symbolize a national identity. The audience could give their love to the Queen in an active and interpersonal exchange because she was physically present in the performance. The same potential for actively engaging with the audience’s negative emotions was present and acted upon by the audience; however for now the focus is on their reception and perception of the representation of Leo Anderson Akana as Queen Lili‘uokalani.

So at the same time an audience member is capable of seeing both the actor Leo Anderson Akana and Queen Lili‘uokalani and there are ramifications for both. However, an audience member unfamiliar with Akana could be able to only see Queen Lili‘uokalani but there were moments within the performance to facilitate even those in the audience familiar with Akana to possibly see the historic queen. Audience members could negotiate their relationship with the past and the relationship between the past of the overthrow and the present repercussions of the events in part through their actions toward Akana-Lili‘uokalani. In other words, the audience’s ability to recognize Akana as an actor and as the actor who had performed as the Queen previously while simultaneously recognizing her as the character she embodies, Queen Lili‘uokalani, enables the audience to navigate the relationship between the past and the present of Hawai‘i. By seeing an actor in the present perform as a historic character, audience members may have been able to view her performance as an example of what they themselves could be: present day actors in the performance of the past. Characters were one aspect in which the audience could possibly see the simultaneity of the past and the present made manifest. This can be accomplished through the layering of the actor and the character they perform, or may be embodied within the character itself; either way, the audience is thus capable of
witnessing multiple times within the same body and space and can thereby interact with those times. In January 1893 the audience could perceive the past and the present simultaneously in the actor-character layering of Leo Anderson Akana as Queen Lili’uokalani.

**The Players: Ola Nā Iwi**

In *Ola Nā Iwi* the strongest perceivable actor-character duality is in the Players. In this case the actor becomes a more recognizable identity for the body in performance without the need for celebrity because of the multiple roles played sharing a perceptible sameness between them of the actor’s body. The three Players each act as five or six different characters over the course of the play. Gilbert and Tompkins discuss the effects of multiple roles:

> Other theatrical devices contribute to constructions of temporality: for instance, dual roles that span different times destabilize the sense of an unbroken historical record in much the same manner as story-tellers or narrators break the time frame of a play.⁴⁸

This implies that the multiple casting of the Players destabilizes the Hawaiian colonial historical canon. The historical vignettes allow the audience to enter into a dialogue with the historical ideas of craniology, phrenology and actions such as grave robbing. These interactions destabilize the historical record because of their structural placement within the present-day narrative and because of the multiple roles the actors play. The Players embody both the past and the present over the arc of the play because the characters they play belong to those two different times. This doubling enables the audience to perhaps see a renegotiation of the relationship between the past and the present through the interplay of characters within the same actor’s body.

Within the narrative of *Ola Nā Iwi* there are interspersed historical vignettes that are unrelated to the developmental arc of the narrative. The characters of the historical interludes are shared between three actors, one female and two male, named Player 1, 2 or 3.

---
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In the case of Player 1 and 2, any characters they play in the present-day narrative are performed before the historical ones they are responsible for appear onstage. In other words, once a player represents the nineteenth century, they remain there. Player 3 does not have a character in the present-day narrative. With the cases then of Player 1 and Player 2, when the present day character the actor plays ghosts the nineteenth-century characters they play the audience members might be able to view the ghosting as a present day person (akin to themselves) physically interacting with the past. The only exception in all three cases is the costume party in which the three players are clowns. The costume party is Act II Scene 6 and is set in the present-day however the clowns the Players play are in part separated from the present time. This is seen in the stage directions for the scene, “All are masked. They dance, and talk in small groups. The party members freeze as three PLAYERS enter, dressed as Elizabethan clowns.” The three Players share a page of dialogue between them and then the party resumes and the other characters unfreeze (199-200). This is the only freeze indicated within the play. Although the party takes place within the present-day narrative, the stage directions provide clues that perhaps the Players and their clowns do not wholly exist or operate within that time.

Glen Grant/Dan Logan
Whereas the actor-character relationship operates from the outside and inside of performance respectively, narrators remain within the performance and can serve as a guide for audience members who might feel the impetus to physically act within the past. A narrator became necessary in January 1893 once director Dallas Voegler made the decision to split the performance over three days. Grant’s narrator was also a device for continuity and consistency for the shifting audience of January 1893. Glen Grant was a local historian, professor, and actor. Grant and Kneubuhl collaborated together on an overthrow walking tour previously.

It was not until Act III, Scene 3 that Grant introduced the name of his character as journalist Dan Logan. Until that point he was an
unidentified narrator who interacted with the audience and not the other characters. Grant would introduce each scene with a summary of scenes that had occurred previously. Grant's role as narrator is one to explore in depth. Susan Bennett’s idea about creating moments for reflection is useful:

Occasionally the audience is asked to reflect on and review the action by means of an on-stage device. This might be achieved through a flashback, a scene in which many of the scenic elements mirror an earlier scene, or through a device such as a chorus or narrator. In the latter instance, the review process is necessarily complicated by the demand on the audience to hypothesize about (and invariably judge the accuracy/usefulness of) the character(s) presenting the commentary.49

Grant's narrator enables audience member to perhaps enter into a dialogue with both the past being performed and the narrator’s commentary about the past. The audience member’s role in this dialogue potentially can be an active engagement with the ideas or emotions the performance incites within them instead of just passive reflection. Reflection here might then be shifted to a more active and physical (or vocal) exercise within the moment and serves as a transition from the audience member passively watching the performance to those audience members who feel they are within it. Grant as narrator is able to address the audience as citizens of the past and the present and lead the audience in reflecting on the events.

In the case of Grant, the audience is witness to his ephemeral nature through the questions he asks that separate him from the historical time stream yet he continuously reminds the audience of the date, 1893. Also, Grant’s narrator is metatheatrical as is evident in his repeated reminders to the audience that the actors, especially the actors playing those responsible for the overthrow, are actors:

Citizens, the plotters are here [audience boos] Now my friends remember this, the words, the sentiments, the emotions you are
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about to witness took place on January 15, 1893. The people who are expressing them, underneath the costumes are not actually the people who expressed them in 1893 [audience laughs] So please, as I said earlier, any emotion of anger is quite appropriate; it should be directed at history not necessarily at the people who are playing the parts [audience: loud laughter] alright? [more audience laughter].

This speech is from Grant’s introduction to Act II and is similar to portions of his other introductions to scenes about the provisional government. The audience had little trouble showing their displeasure with those responsible for the overthrow by booing and not applauding the players. As a narrator outside of time, Grant dealt with the audience’s cold response in Act III Scene 3 by reminding the audience that the men are actors. The audience then laughed and clapped for the actors as they left the bandstand. The audience’s initial reaction to the actors was in contrast to the bright applause the audience bestowed upon the other actors, Leo Anderson Akana in particular was given applause upon each entrance and exit.

**Nanea/Liliha:**

In *Ola Nā Iwi*, the audience can negotiate the relationship between the past and the present within the character Nanea/Liliha. Instead of the actor-character relationship bringing the past and present into dialogue, in this case the past and the present are in dialogue within the play text through a character. The textual duality between the past and the present in Nanea enables the audience to assume a more passive role in traversing the connection between the past and the present because Nanea’s relationship to time and her identity are dealt with in the plot. Nanea is herself an example of the past and the present acting upon each other with equal power for change. The ability for theatre to bring the past and the present into the same space is exercised here in an ambiguous way because it is unclear where (when) Nanea fits into the temporal stream, thereby making the relationship between the past and the present unclear. This lack of

---
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clarity potentially aids audience members to feel that the past is not fixed and that the past and the present are able to act upon each other.

In Act I, Scene 4, the audience is first introduced to Nanea and is led to question her status. Does Nanea belong to the past or to the present? In that scene Kawehi is explaining to Erik how and why she self-repatriated the human remains from the German museum. The bones are safely stored under Kawehi’s bed until she can decide what to do next. After Erik retires to his upstairs apartment for the evening, Kawehi hears a voice outside calling “Please, let me in.”  The voice belongs to Nanea and Kawehi brings her inside; Nanea at her entrance is described in the stage directions as “shivering and cold, with torn clothes” (158). The audience’s first image of Nanea is of a woman who is not stable. Nanea’s lines continue the confusion Kawehi and the audience have about who this woman is, “Somehow I got back. I just came back. I don’t know, don’t know anyone” (158). Where has she come back from? Why was she gone? How long was she gone for? While Kawehi tries to learn who Nanea is, Nanea further confuses Kawehi and the audience by announcing that Kawehi has something, something under her bed that would cause Kawehi to not want the police to come over. Nanea’s knowledge of Kawehi’s secret makes both the character and the audience suspicious of Nanea. What is the origin of her knowledge? Is she otherworldly, or a spy? This is a mystery after all.

In Act I Scene 6 Nanea provides more clues about her temporal origins:

...once when I was a girl, this wild Englishman built this theatre set in—where I was living—and he made this forest and a castle out of kapa that was cut and dyed. He even made a bamboo cannon, and in one scene that was supposed to be a battle, he fired the little cannon but it missed its mark, and set the kapa castle and forest on fire. (165)

51 Kneubuhl *Ola Nā Iwi*, 158.
Kawehi asks where this was and Nanea replies, “Oh, it was so long ago” (166). Nanea brings home food to Kawehi and Erik and shares that a man gave the food to her after speaking with her for a long time in Hawaiian; Nanea shares that it has been so long since she has had someone to talk to. The information in this scene can lead the audience to believe that Nanea is not from the present and that, somehow, she has crossed over into the present from the past.

However, Nanea appears to be a person possibly from the present time. In Act I Scene 14, Kawehi and Nanea are making a ka‘ai for the bones and Kawehi binds the women together with ‘awa. “(slowly remembering) You, I saw you. You were in Berlin somewhere. I saw you there” (180). Where did Kawehi see Nanea? Perhaps they saw each other at the theatre festival or at the museum or anywhere in Berlin. Then in Act I Scene 17 Nanea is speaking to Erik about theatre and reveals that she used to watch rehearsals in Germany.

Later in that scene Nanea has convinced Erik to switch the bones under Kawehi’s bed with the prop set of bones from the theatre. Nanea goes with Erik into the bedroom so that he will not have to be alone and tells Erik, “But you, you have to carry them yourself.” (187).

The clearest moment for Kawehi about the truth of Nanea is in Act II Scene 5. The women are dressing for the costume party and Kawehi is worried about what to do. Nanea has Kawehi think back to the night when she removed the bones from the museum, and mentions details that only someone there would have known. While Kawehi is remembering the moments she recalls, “I look over at one shelf all by itself, with one and only one box on it, and there you are standing next to it, with your arms opened out to me, weeping.” Kawehi bluntly asks Nanea, “Who are you?” (199). Nanea whispers the answer in her ear. The stage directions are limited to the whispering and give no directions about Kawehi’s reaction.

To further compound the problem of identifying Nanea’s character clearly within the arc of the play, she gets a job as a living history performer. There are two scenes, Act I scene 11 and Act II scene 9, in which Nanea, as a living history performer tells the story of
Liliha. The layering of the past and the present within Nanea’s living history performances is complex and confusing. Nanea is the present-day embodiment of Liliha, a nineteenth-century woman whose skeletal remains Kawehi reclaimed from a German museum. Nanea/Liliha in the present-day narrative tells the nineteenth-century story of Liliha. Nanea is costumed in “nineteenth century [sic] dress” and tells the story of Liliha in the third person (173). These cues to the audience separate her scenes from the historical vignettes in which those characters are still dressed in nineteenth-century clothes, however they speak in first person.

Craig Howes in his introduction to Kneubuhl’s Hawai’i Nei: Island Plays reflects on the simultaneity of past and present, “This complex weaving of past and present is a hallmark of Kneubuhl’s plays, in which any given dramatic moment may reverberate with the echoes of voices long gone. But in Ola Nā Iwi, the past literally meets the present in ways that theatre is uniquely suited to realize.”

Nanea’s presentations within the present-day narrative move her voice from an echo of the past to a strong voice with agency in the present. Kneubuhl enables Nanea’s existence as both Nanea and Liliha, as past and present in the same moment, and makes it possible for the audience to view her as both simultaneously. An audience member’s ability to recognize the simultaneous presence of the past and the present might reinforce the active power the past and the present have on each other.

Sammie Choy in “The Bones Perform: Ola Nā Iwi and the Viability of Memory” identifies Kneubuhl’s thesis in Ola Nā Iwi as “the past has agency and can influence and guide the present—if allowed.” Nanea, as representative of the past, exercises this agency in several ways throughout the play. One such instance is in the effect her living history presentations have on Gustav. Gustav, as the representative of the German museum, is supposed to be reclaiming the stolen remains
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by any discrete means necessary. However, in his time in Hawai‘i Gustav attends Nanea’s living history presentations and in doing so learns about Hawaiian culture and begins to question what he is doing in Hawai‘i: “It’s those history walks. The way she [Nanea] has been explaining everything. I begin to feel very bad about things” (213). Nanea more actively guides Kawehi in the reclamation and repatriation of Liliha’s skeletal remains.

Nanea’s living history presentations embody the past within the present-day narrative. This is accomplished because Nanea’s presentations are integrated within the present-day narrative and flesh out that plot, unlike the nineteenth century historical monologues that are detached from the narrative. I label the historical vignettes as detached because the characters present individual experiences without a narrative arc. In a post colonial discussion of the role of story-tellers, Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins state “That the story-teller’s narrative is generally distinct from – but interactive with – the play’s dialogue reinforces the point that the past is always mediated through the present.”54 However, in the case of Nanea’s story-telling it is integrated with the play, not separated from it.

There are several ways Kneubuhl seems to have brought the past and present together within performance and through that connection audience members may have felt tied to the past as evident in their physical actions that directly intersect with the past. If the actor is a known/recognizable celebrity, audience members may recognize them while witnessing their characterization; thus the actor and their past roles ghost the current performance and characterization. This easily perceivable existence of multiple times existing in the same body and space simultaneously might stimulate audience members to see the past and the present acting upon each other. This perception, in turn, may encourage audience members to feel that they themselves can act within the past being performed. Actor-character doubling can also achieve a similar effect. In the case of Ola Nā Iwi, The Players perform
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several characters and with their bodies perform characters from multiple times. The audience does not have to be left to their own devices to navigate their experiences in the past, a narrator can be a useful tool to guide audience members to enter into the past emotionally and physically because the narrator himself bridges the past and the present as the audience might. Finally, the negotiation of the past and the present being performed can be enclosed within a single character, like Nanea, whom the audience can then bear witness to her struggle. However, the actors and their characters are always performing somewhere and that location and the staging within it are also tools the artists can use to facilitate an audience member to perhaps feel they are a part of the past and to physically act within the past.
Chapter 3

Space/Setting of Performance

“theatre has the potential to reconstitute the structural basis of historical conception, to make space/place a performer rather than the medium on and through which the pageant of history seems merely to unfold.”

-Helen Gilbert & Joanne Tompkins

“The site of a performance is patently important.”

-Susan Bennett, Theatre Audiences

Audience members can feel they are a part of the past through interactions with the characters and the physical space, location and staging, of performance are also capable of helping them connect emotionally and physically to the past. Within this focus on space and place, of most interest is the location of performance, the theatre or theatrical space, however also important is the environment of performance. What is going on around the performance? How might those sights, sounds, and activities interact with the theatrical experience of the audience? Bennett in Theatre Audiences states “each particular variety of playing space provides the audience with specific expectations and interpretive possibilities.” What expectations might the audiences of January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi have had due to the spaces of performance and how do those expectations intersect with audience member feelings and physical actions with the past within the space?

January 1893

The locations used for the performance of January 1893 were the ‘Iolani Palace burial grounds, the arbor behind ‘Iolani Palace, the front steps of ‘Iolani Palace, the Coronation Bandstand, the Post Office grounds, and Ali‘iolani Hale. ‘Iolani Palace was the home to
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the Hawaiian monarchy and is now a museum. The Post Office was built on the site of Arion Hall where the U.S.S. Boston soldiers were housed when they invaded the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1893.

Director Dallas Voegler staged the scenes to be performed at the locations where the historical moments took place with the exception of the Provisional Government’s office which was historically located at Judd and Merchant streets and staged at the 'Iolani Palace coronation bandstand. In an interview, playwright Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl explained:

Our backdrop for the pageant was the downtown area around 'Iolani Palace and Ali'iolani Hale. Many of the real events of the overthrow took place in this vicinity, and we tried as much as possible to do our scenes in the places where they actually occurred.  

Within the performance, whenever a scene was not going to be performed at the correct historical location, narrator Glen Grant would inform the audience of the historical location and that the scene was moved for the audience’s convenience.

What was the impact on the audience of witnessing the historical performance in the same location it occurred? In that same interview, Kneubuhl explained, “As a person who has worked a great deal at historic sites, I know how a sense of place is a large part of creating resonance. People respond to on an emotional and intuitive level to physical places and spaces.” The physical spaces and places surrounding 'Iolani Palace are imbued with the power of the past haunted by the events that have happened there.
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With this in mind, what would the audience have seen in witnessing the final scene of the pageant? The final scene of the pageant was the abdication speech by Queen Lili'uokalani delivered by Akana from the steps of the 'Iolani Palace at dusk. Before the advertised start time of 6:30pm, the audience on the grounds of 'Iolani Palace grew to 20,000 people in anticipation of the final scene of the living history performance. White ribbon was strung up as a dividing line on either side of the iron gate of the King Street entrance to the palace grounds. This divider, along with security peacekeepers dressed in green shirts, kept the audience back from the performers.

The audience stood until the procession of the actors began. Most of the audience sat down on the grass of the palace grounds once the scene began, but stood again at the entrance of the Queen. Actors costumed as citizens of 1893 entered the 'Iolani Palace grounds through the King Street entrance. The actors were in rows and held hands in their silent procession toward 'Iolani Palace which had been “draped in mournful black bunting” for the centennial observance.

Akana as Queen Lili‘uokalani entered from the front doors of 'Iolani Palace and faced the audience from the top step. Within this space, the Kingdom of Hawaii once again abdicated power to the United States. This moment of the Queen’s abdication speech at 'Iolani Palace is an example of a moment in which audience members may have felt they were a part of the past in part because of the spatial choices made that placed the audience within the historic space of abdication, and perhaps the past.

If Dallas Voegler had staged the abdication speech at another location, much of the effect would have been lost. The power of the moment was because of the space/location of performance. 'Iolani Palace was the one constant in this scene, the one true representative of the historical past of 1893. This moment of Akana, now not quite a citizen of the present because of her characterization of Queen Lili‘uokalani, has facilitated the perception of the past alive again and the physical space of the palace furthers this perception because it is a physical piece of the past being performed. There is power in watching the historical moments replayed in the same places they took place originally. The people have changed, the actors are not the historical characters, but the buildings are the same, they are the constant. In those spaces dwell the power of the historical moments of 1893 and all the time in between until the actors occupied it in 1993. With the historical buildings there is a kind of spatial doubling happening; the space as it is in the now of performance and at the same time it is the space that comes out of the past.
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building itself is a type of space of multiplicity because within it exists all the times from its construction to the present. However, for this performance the two most important times were 1893 and 1993. By perceiving the building as a physical bridge between the two times while belonging to both, audience members could possibly interact with, for instance, 'Iolani Palace as either the historical museum it is today (a public space of cultural memory) or as the home of Queen Lili’uokalani (a private space of Hawaiian authority). The past and the present are not two fixed moments in time, they are ephemeral like theatre, ever shifting and changing, a myriad of possibilities. The environment of January 1893 in the centennial observance made that myriad of possibilities “visible” and “tangible” for the audience. The audience could emotionally connect to the past and the present at one time and that emotional connection may have encouraged a feeling of being able perform actions within the past being performed.

When considering the space and location of performance it is also important to pay attention to what activities are going on within the space that are not under the control of the artists. These external activities contribute to the creation of the environment of performance and that environment affects the audience’s ability to perceive the past and the present developing through action within the same space. To clarify, the narrative developing past events was unfolding in time and space along side the less structured narrative development of daily life rooted in the present. A newspaper article published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on 16 January 1993 describes the environment of the day before:

'Iolani Palace resembled a school campus yesterday with hundreds of students converging on the historic landmark to witness the unfolding drama of the overthrow. Later in the afternoon, two men escalated the drama as they arrived at Iolani Palace, carrying the U.S. flag. Hawaii’s first passion play of events from 100 years ago turned the palace grounds into a living stage as students from schools such as Nanakuli High and Kailua
Intermediate mingled with downtown office workers, tourists and local families.\footnote{Ashizawa “Living Stage,” A1.}

The two men carrying the United States’ flag were not a part of the theatrical performance. The men carried the flag on a flag bearer’s pole and walked around through the audience in a peaceful protest of the Governor’s decision. These two men were a visible reminder of Governor Waihee’s decision to fly the Hawaiian flag alone in the Capitol District of Honolulu during the Centennial Observance. Also in this description, it becomes clear that the audience for the pageant was a greatly mixed cross section of Honolulu citizens and visitors all of whom may have had greatly differing opinions and reactions concerning the performance and the history being performed.

The protest of the flag bearers was one protest amongst many at the observance that created an environment of interaction with political issues for the audience to observe. Demonstrations in favor of Hawaiian sovereignty were in full swing while the scenes were being performed. The performance locations were on either side of King Street in downtown Honolulu amongst sovereignty demonstrations, “On one side of the Iolani Palace yesterday, about 50 people lined the sidewalks, shouting and holding sovereignty signs.”\footnote{Shannon Tangonan and Kris M. Tanahara “100 years ago, a people lost their nation.” Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Honolulu Advertiser, January 17, 1993, A1.} This atmosphere of demonstrations and peaceful protesting was further described by audience members interviewed by the newspaper:

On both sides of South King street fronting the palace, dozens of younger Hawaiians, members of a group called the Free Association of Hawaiians who arrived Friday from the Big Island, held signs and asked motorists to honk their horns in support of sovereignty. Traffic crawled in the area as hundreds slowed down and honked their horns. . . Group members on one side of the street chanted ‘‘Oni-’’ and those on the other side shouted back ‘-pa’-a’.\footnote{Ibid., A1.}
The sounds of their chanting and the horn honks they generated were background sounds the audience of January 1893 could hear while watching the scenes of the play. The sights and sounds of the protests potentially primed audience members to wrestle with the present-day repercussions of the overthrow. The pageant staged scenes on both sides of King Street making any protests within the holistic performance space. Thus within the space of performance, although not within the physical space of a given scene, the audience could witness other potential audience members actively engaging with issues of sovereignty that resulted from the overthrow. The protests along with other activities and events of the Centennial Observance were representatives of the present culture of Hawai‘i and might have served as a point of reference for the audience members. Other events happening at this time were “lei-making, basket-weaving, and Hawaiian quilt-making demonstrations” at the State Library next door. At the Municipal Building grounds down the street there was an all day music and dance concert. During some of the scenes the audience could hear music that was not associated with the pageant. Gilbert and Tompkins state that “outdoor theatre can lead to further social action and generate solutions unlikely to be canvassed were it staged in a metropolitan building.”\(^\text{67}\) In the case of January 1893 as an example of outdoor theatre, the ability for social action was supported by the atmosphere of the present demonstrations for Hawaiian sovereignty. One way for an audience member to be socially active in this performance may have been to physically interact with the performance of the past.

The staging choice that stood out most was the invasion of the troops of the U.S.S. Boston, Act III Scene 6. The audience was gathered at the ‘Iolani Palace Coronation Bandstand for a music performance by the Royal Hawaiian Band and what was only advertised as “Act III, Scene 6” when the sounds of marching boots and military marching calls filled the air.\(^\text{68}\) The nineteenth-century citizens and
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the two narrators looked down Richards Street at the approaching sound and interacted amongst themselves, in character, without drawing focus to themselves. Most of the audience followed the gaze of the actors/characters and watched with them as the sounds of boot heels on cobblestone and the cadence call of a march leader echoed through the area.

With no obvious signals to each other, the actors’ gazes traveled slowly down Richard Street to King Street as if following the marching detachment of soldiers. Throughout this five to ten minute scene, the only distinct sound for the audience was the marching; no one was explaining this representation of the invasion to the audience while it was happening. It was not until after the Royal Hawaiian Band’s
concert was underway that Glen Grant and narrator Dan Logan told the audience that the Kingdom of Hawai‘i had just been invaded by troops from the U.S.S. Boston.

This scene recreated the invasion of the United States soldiers from the U.S.S. Boston who were in Honolulu’s harbor in 1893. When the troops invaded Honolulu in 1893 they were encamped at Arion Hall, located next to Ali'iolani Hale (where the post office is now). The soldiers were not physically represented in this scene; instead the invasion was recreated through sound in front of the audience and the chorus of nineteenth-century citizens. The removal of the corporeal presence/representation of the invading troops was a staging choice that placed the emphasis on the physical space and sound instead of the bodies of actors. The shifted focus on the space of invasion might enlarge the space within which the audience sees the past because there is not a body on which to focus or anchor the past. Instead the dimensions of the past come from the location of Richard and King Street and the sound of the invasion that carried much further than the physical space of the scene. However, the choice of relying on space and sound to say more than bodies in space creates a different kind of experience for the audience. The use of prerecorded sound only allows for the audience to react to the multiple times and not necessarily interact with them. The dialogue with the past that is made possible by the corporeal bodies of actors was not present for this scene thereby limiting the interactive possibilities for the audience, however there was still plenty stimuli for emotional connection and responses. Also within this moment of performance, the audience could bear witness to the interplay between the past and the present because there was a perceptible simultaneity of the two times. The audience, following the line of sight of the actors, was looking down Richard and King Streets as they are in the present, seeing cars and buildings that belonged to 1993. However, the focus, both for the actors and the audience was on the sound of the past. The sounds of the invading troops primarily resonated on an emotional level for audience members because the audience was free to imagine the
corporeal dimensions of the troops since there was no artistically chosen corporeal representation.

The troops were physically represented by actors (community members who were military history enthusiasts) on the final day of performance. In the afternoon on 17 January 1993, a small group of costumed 1893 United States troops stood guard at the Post Office where Arion Hall once stood. These actors made manifest the sounds the audience heard the previous day during the auditory invasion. This physical embodiment of the United States’ troops was significantly smaller than both the historical presence and the implied force from the final scene of the day before. With the 1993 representation of the 1893 detachment ever present, the actors of the Committee for Public Safety, about to become the Provisional Government, were escorted through the crowds across to the steps of Ali'iōlani Hale to read their declaration ending the Kingdom of Hawaii and establishing the Provisional Government.

An effect of the facilitation of audience members feeling that they are a part of the past in performance is the empowering of the audience to interact directly with the past. The audiences of January 1893 were not expected to remain passive observers; in fact they were regularly encouraged to voice their thoughts and feelings through the questions asked by the narrators. Thus the audience as a whole was given the opportunity and support to perform. The artistic choice of directly addressing questions to the audience is a basic step in creating audience member interaction within the performance of the past. As stated earlier, the narrator acts as a guide for the audience in their interactions with the past. Directly asking the audience questions, and actually expecting an answer, are staging tools the artists can use to introduce the audience to the possibilities for action. The audience’s willingness to answer the narrator, who is a character of the past interacting with the present, encourages the skills of interacting with the past in other moments the audience feels they have a place within the performance.
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However, this was not the limit of the audience’s voicing of their opinions. The audience became increasingly active and demonstrative over the course of the performance. Starting early on in the performance the audience willingly answered questions posed by Glen Grant as narrator. At the end of Act I Scene 4 Grant asks the audience, “What are they up to?” To which audience members answer without hesitation, “Treason” and “No good.” The surprise on Grant’s face at these answers and the way he continues his scene infers that the intention of that question was for someone to summarize the action of the previous scene. The question was apparently intended to be a moment of reflection, not interpretation; however, the audience had become willing to express themselves because of the sharing environment created by the performance. As seen by this moment, within this performance, audience members performed actions (consider speech as a vocal action) which allowed them to almost touch the past and directly share their feelings. Within this moment, audience members were presented with an opportunity to, in the real time of performance, speak out against actions and events that so strongly shaped their present existence.

As the audience found their voice they became apparently more willing to express their feelings during the performance of a scene instead of waiting until either the end or until Grant’s narrations. Act IV Scenes 3 and 4 were the public rallies for the annexationists and then the Royalists. During the public rally of the annexationists there were several speeches. Most of the audience was seated on blankets or in chairs, disengaged with the scene being performed in front of them, with heads down, eyes averted and talking amongst themselves. However during the speech by one particular man, the audience not only began to pay attention but they engaged with him directly and began to boo and yell at him. The actor/character finished his speech saying, “Gentlemen, I am done” the audience cut off the end of his speech by applauding and laughing in celebration of
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him being finished. In this moment the question that begs to be asked is why did the audience feel the need to boo and yell during this speech? In that moment the audience perhaps may have felt that they had an opportunity to interject their feelings and negative reception of the historic speech into the time from which it emerged, as citizens of the present, to interact with the past of 1893.

This impetus to interact extended into Scene 4 in a positive response. When Kihei Soli Niheu as Robert Kalanihiapo Wilcox gave his speech the audience responded with loud applause and took to their feet in support of his words of solidarity, "Thousands in the audience responded with an outpouring of cheers." This again was a moment, similar to the audience’s negative response to the annexationist speeches, in which the audience was responding to history and interacting with it. Also with these two scenes the artists were intentionally manipulating space. The historic public rallies of 1893 did not take place at the band stand and did not immediately follow each other within the same space. The choices the artists made about staging these rallies at the same space as each other and for that location to be the coronation band stand were spatial/staging choices that affected the perception of the past. The choice to stage the rallies at the bandstand encouraged audience members to feel connected with the past because the geographical space surrounding 'Iolani Palace was much the same as it had been in 1893 bringing with it the power of place. Also, previous scenes from the pageant had been staged at the bandstand marking the place as a space of the past by the time the rallies were staged. The audience who has also attended scenes at the bandstand previously would have had an easier time feeling that they were a part of the past. The repetition of staging at the coronation bandstand made it easier for audience members to feel they had a place within the past with each repetition. This repetition of space is also what might have assisted the audience in maintaining their connection to the past from scene 3 to scene 4.
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because the scenes immediately followed each other within the same space.

Outside of those intentional exchanges, the audience took on a more active role by voicing their agreements with or dissent from the ideas presented by the characters. The audience’s reception of the ideas became manifest through standard theatrical exchange of applause. The audience would applaud after scenes supporting the Queen and a chose not to applaud at the conclusion of scenes with those responsible for the overthrow.

Ola Nā Iwi

The ability for space and the environment of performance to enable the audience to enter into feel emotionally and physically connected to the past being performed is not limited to outdoor performances; this phenomenon can be witnessed within a physical theatre building. Kneubuhl’s Ola Nā Iwi premiered at Kumu Kahua Theatre, located on the corner of Merchant Street and Bethel Street in Honolulu, Hawaii. The original production of Ola Nā Iwi at the Kumu Kahua Theatre was in 1994 and they staged a revival in 2007. Susan Bennett states that the architecture of a theatre “will impose ideologically on performances and the audience’s perception of them.”

What does the Kumu Kahua Theatre impose on the audience? The Kumu Kahua Theatre does not call particular attention to itself with marques or large signs identifying itself as a theatre. Instead, the theatre can be identified by a simple banner attached to the corner pillars reading “Kumu Kahua Theatre” in black letters on a white banner. The exterior of the theatre is a two story white building on the corner of Merchant and Bethel Street with a wrap-around porch with pillars.

Bennett broadens the influence of space beyond the physical theatre itself to the area surrounding the theatre, “The milieu which surrounds a theatre is always ideologically encoded and the presence of a theatre can be measured as typical or incongruous within it. That relationship further shapes a spectator's experience.” The Kumu Kahua Theatre is one block from the harbor (you can see the water from the corner of Bethel and Merchant) and diagonal from the theatre is the Honolulu Police Station. The other buildings around the theatre are non-descript and do not have the business-modern feel that the rest of downtown Honolulu has just a few blocks away.

Different than the audience of January 1893, the audience of Ola Nā Iwi occupied fixed theatre seats for the play and did not have control over the arrangement of the seats. Also, the audience for Ola Nā Iwi was constant in comparison to the potentially ever changing
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audience make up in January 1893. The performance of Ola Nā Iwi was solely located within the one hundred seat theatre, on one day and in an approximately two hour time frame. This condensed performance experience for the audience enabled them to be immersed into the constructions of time and place created by the performance without the interruptions experienced by the audience of January 1893 who experienced the performance over the course of three days in scene by scene segments.

Audience members can see past and present narratives unfolding within the same space within Ola Nā Iwi because of its setting. The set is described in the script as:

Kawehi’s House is a Polynesian-looking living room with a small rattan sofa, two chairs, and a coffee table. Two exits lead to a bedroom and to the outside. In a Playing Area Downstage are other locations, to be suggested by minimal, moveable furniture and props, and lighting.75

A staging choice made was that the downstage playing area used for staging the historical vignettes always appear with the set for Kawehi’s house behind it. Spatially, the past and the present coexist during the performance when the downstage playing area is in use by the historical interludes because of the ever present living room behind the space. The stage directions of the historical scenes (or vignettes) do not indicate the need for scenery, with the exception of Camilla and Mr. Moorehead’s scene which calls for a table. An example of the stage directions for the vignettes is “Two pools of light in the Playing Area. Two NINETEENTH CENTURY GENTLEMEN step out.” The audience would see two distinct pools of light defining a space for the past to act within the present. So without adding any scenery to these scenes, the present-day setting of Kawehi’s House is behind these nineteenth century characters. Spatially, the audience can see these two times simultaneously and be reminded of the power the past and the present have on each other from witnessing the interaction between the two times.
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The historical vignettes in *Ola Nā Iwi* are monologues or dialogues of nineteenth century characters that are staged in single pools of light in the downstage playing area. These vignettes do not develop the present-day plot of Kawehi and the bones; however they do create a contextual framework. Common to all the historical vignettes is the call for the collection of human remains for scientific study, most often with little regard to the humanity of the person whose remains they are. The historical vignettes appear to employ a direct address to the audience since most are monologues by the nineteenth century characters who speak in the first person. The direct address staging in the historical vignettes of *Ola Nā Iwi* is another component in enabling the audience to enter into a time different or external from their own.

Directly addressing the audience encourages audience members to feel they are a part of the past and interact with the time represented. This artistic technique can accomplish this because it shifts the audience from a passive spectator role to an active scene partner for the actor-character speaking on stage. Different than the interactions with the narrator in *January 1893*, the direct addresses in *Ola Nā Iwi* are more similar to the public rally scenes in that play. In the vignettes and the rally, the characters are proscribing the audience with an identity. In the historical vignettes the identity prescribed is sometimes not clear, yet the relative honesty and amicability of the character’s monologue provide hints. However, it is up to the audience member whether or not to accept the identity given or to create a new one. Either way, if the audience wishes to interact with the vignettes in either role, they can do so because of choices Kneubuhl made in the script.

To explain, in the historical vignette Act I, Scene 9 the character Reverend Dr. Pinchbottom, described as “A NINETEENTH CENTURY PHRENOLOGIST”, is speaking to the audience, whom he refers to as a group of “gentlemen.” He addresses the audience as a specific group and the nature of that group as complacent to his actions possibly implicates the audience as complacent with the phrenology arguments he
presents. Within the performance audience members have the choice to accept this identity or to refute it. There is a moment in the scene when Dr. Pinchbottom asks for a volunteer. There are not stage directions to indicate if an audience member is used but his lines infer that there is a third person present on stage, "Now sir, step up here for a moment, and let Miss Ida roll up your sleeve. That’s it, now would you be so kind as to flex that arm for Miss Ida. Now Miss Ida, I want you to feel those muscles on the gentleman’s arm.” If one specific audience member is not chosen in this moment to be the one Dr. Pinchbottom is speaking to, the audience as a whole may serve as the volunteer.

The content of the historical vignettes are drawn from arguments and disciplines of the nineteenth century. The beliefs and scientific theories therein are today discounted however their reemergence here calls for the audience to confront them. This confrontation can happen within the performance because with the way these moments are constructed the ideas exist anew and can more directly be dealt with than in the present. In the present it is difficult to engage with the ideas beyond dismissing them as ludicrous and wrong. Within the performance, an audience member can engage with the ideas and the characters (as representations of the historical people who actually believed them) on a more constructive level. Rokem states, "The theatre, by performing history, is thus redoing something which has already been done in the past, creating a secondary elaboration of this historical event." Instead of events being explored again, it is the historical scientific theories of craniology and phrenology being reexamined. It is this reexamination within the performance that is powerful. The audience can move beyond dismissal of the idea and explore where the idea came from and what its ramifications are/were. In addition, the connection of these theories to the racism and desecration of human remains they justified is being made clear.
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78 Phrenology is the study of cranial shape and texture. It was believed that the bumps of a person’s head could tell about the person’s personality and character. Phrenology was highly popularized in the nineteenth century.
Another staging choice that may facilitate audience members to feel connected to the past physically was the staging of multiple times within the downstage playing area throughout the play. The downstage playing area is used for several settings within the present-day narrative. Mina’s house, a restaurant, and a customs’ office are some of the other settings staged in the downstage playing area. The sharing of the same physical space enables the audience to perceive time as destabilized and swirling thus allowing them to enter into a relationship with time differently than the dominant linear time stream. Within the downstage playing area many times were possible and represented making the space itself an access point between the past and the present and allowing the times there to interact with each other at least thematically. An audience could look at the downstage playing area at any point in the play and see a spatial ghosting of the previous scenes of the play. Therefore any scene set in the present would be ghosted by the historical vignettes and vice-versa.

Nanea gives her living history performances from the downstage playing area. Nanea narrates a story about the nineteenth-century woman Liliha to an onstage audience of Gustav, Mina, and Fatu in Act I Scene 11 and Gustav and Deidre in Act II Scene 9. Nanea speaks from the downstage playing area which has already been established at this point in the play as the space where time is nonlinear. The destabilization of time in these scenes is not limited to the staging choice of the playing area but is furthered by the multiple audiences to Nanea’s performances. The conjunction of downstage playing area and the audience witnessing Nanea dressed in nineteenth century clothes while the present-day characters look on add up to a moment of multiple times. The audience is able to see manifest the spatial simultaneity of time in these staging practices. Within this space the audience could see the present interacting with the past through the characters witnessing Nanea’s storytelling. The audience’s own witnessing encourages them to engage with the performance as well. Within these moments the audience can feel able to enter into the past
and perhaps interact with the ideas presented from the past at the time of performance/intervention.

**Conclusion**

Spatial choices such as location, setting, and staging can facilitate audience members to feel that they are a part of the past being performed in Kneubuhl’s plays. Space can become a performer and its representation of the past provides manifest an anchor for the past in the present thus bridging the two so that those in the present might act within the past. A historic building can be that anchor because it is a physical representation of the past since it really existed both then and now instead of just being represented by artistic choices. This visible simultaneity of times might have helped audience members to feel they were a part of the past because it became accessible to them. In addition to the physical spaces of performance, the staging or use of space within a theatrical performance might also create the same effect in the audience if choices are made that stage markers of multiple times within the same space. The two most powerful spatial choices seem to be staging a historical performance at the historical location and directly addressing the audience. The power of the historical moment resonates from the historical locations and provides history with a solid foundation within the performance. Directly addressing the audience encourages their interaction with the past within performance and might help more of the audience to enter into the past than would on their own.
Conclusion

Results and Implications

“The creative energies of the theatre not only are central for the impact of a performance on its spectators, but are crucial for the ways in which such a performance confronts the issues of collective identity and transgression.”

-Freddie Rokem

“But the creative energies of the theatre can in some cases be seen as a force that becomes a dialectical antidote to the destructive energies of history and its painful failures.”

-Freddie Rokem

Why might Kneubuhl have wanted to make the audience feel that they could move between the past and the present? What can come from the audience interacting with the past? It makes sense to complete m examination of January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi with an exploration of this question. An audience born after the events being recreated in historical plays is given the opportunity in theatre to redefine their relationship to the past. In an interview, Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl spoke about one result of January 1893 being an audience motivated to learn more:

I think people were much more aware of the overthrow of the monarchy as a blatant act of injustice. I went to a really good private high school, and there was not one mention of this history. I think people who saw the performance were inspired to learn more about our history and the events that have brought us into the present.

To Kneubuhl the overthrow was not being taught either at all or insufficiently and the pageant encouraged the audience to fill in the void of their education. Perhaps from this, the audience could
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question why they had not been taught about the overthrow and question the politics in education and question written histories. Historical moments are often used in the creation of identity for a community of people as is the case of Native Hawaiians in relationship to the history of the overthrow. This can be the specific identity of Native Hawaiians as well as the identity of a Native Hawaiian under the United States government.

Kneubuhl effectively created moments in which audience members may have perceived the boundaries between the past and the present blurred so that they could so that they could interact with the past. This perception and action might have motivated Kneubuhl’s audience to political activism. Kneubuhl wrote about the aftermath of the pageant in an article with Marie Strazar and spoke of the effects in her interview with Armstrong. In the months following January 1893:

...one Hawai‘i state senator spoke to Hui Na‘auao about the large number of bills regarding Hawaiian issues that were introduced to the legislature after the pageant. They included a bill for sovereignty referendum and a bill that created tuition waivers for students of Hawaiian ancestry attending the University of Hawai‘i. The senator reported that he thought the introduction of these bills came in response to the overwhelming interest in the centennial activities and, in particular, the historical events that were portrayed during the course of the pageant.

The performance of January 1893 appeared to affect the audience in such a way that they were motivated into political activism to address the issues they saw performed. Instead of being relegated to passively learning about the overthrow and having to deal in the present with a noncorporeal past, this pageant provided the audience with a platform from which to interact with the historical past as present. January 1893 was recognized by The American Association for State and Local History in Hawai‘i and awarded the 1993 Award for Merit.
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82 Kneubuhl and Strazar, 12-14.
83 Armstrong, 156.
84 Kneubuhl and Strazar, 12.
However, introducing or attaining legislation does not mean that the issue is finished. Kneubuhl’s *Ola Nā Iwi* debuted in 1994, four years after legislation was passed in the United States about repatriation of indigenous remains. The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), passed in the United States in 1990, facilitates the return human of remains “as well as funerary objects, sacred items, and objects of cultural patrimony” to Native nations. The passing of NAGPRA was met with several issues including private collections, international museums, and the recognition status of Native nations. In December of 2004, there was a hearing before the Committee of Indian Affairs of the United States Senate concerning the issues surrounding the application of NAGPRA in Hawai‘i. The intention of this hearing was to propose amendments to NAGPRA by examining the current problems of the act. Some of these issues stem from the legal status of Native Hawaiians as an indigenous community. Senator Daniel Inouye presided over the hearing which focused on the redefinition of “Native Hawaiian organization” as it is used in NAGPRA and the issue of who has the right to decide how to care for the remains and cultural objects returned. This hearing demonstrates that the discussion over the repatriation has continued and that for Native Hawaiians there is still much to be done for their relationship with the United States government.

Kneubuhl’s plays can combat the “vanishing Native” and “Natives at European contact” myths in popular culture because the past and present of Native Hawaiians are being made manifest. Combating erasure holds the potential to fill the audience member with a sense of wholeness that is often denied in the teaching of and recording of history. The history of Native Hawaiians, in addition to all indigenous peoples, is often minimized or glossed over in general education (often in all education) or worse, is limited to the European contact period. One way to combat that erasure from history or the limitation to a particular historical period is to present
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living history performances along with present day representations or expressions of culture. For instance, in the ‘Onipa’a Centennial Observance the audience was immersed in Native Hawaiian cultural practices including hulas and chanting, lei making, quilt demonstrations, modern artists and craftsmen. All these activities were staged in the same spatial area as the pageant.

While Victoria Nalani Kneubuhl’s work may be useful to Native Hawaiians, can the creation of those moments to politically activate a community translate to communities outside of Native Hawaiians? The next step of this research is to look at the plays and performances of history by Native Americans on the mainland and then to non-Native communities within the United States. The relationship between Native Hawaiians and the United States government are different from the relationship between Native Americans and the United States government. Native Americans on the mainland and Alaska Inuits have the status of “nation within a nation” and the limited self-governance associated with it. Native Hawaiians do not have government-decreed land allotments to designate a geographical space as belonging solely to Native Hawaiians. Therefore, Native Hawaiians do not have the control over their land and people that Native Americans have on the mainland within their reservations. The lack of self governance is a main issue to Native Hawaiians who desire to have control over the propagation of their culture. One way to effect change is to politically motivate the community. The political demonstrations in favor of Hawaiian sovereignty at the ‘Onipa’a Centennial Observance are evidence of part of a community that was politically mobilized. The pageant of January 1893 served for some as an impetus to rally for change. I believe that within the performance of January 1893 the audience was able to perceive the boundaries between the past and the present as destabilized and perhaps through that perception audience members felt they could physically interact with the past. That new relationship between the past and the present may have encouraged the
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audience to actively seek change in their present by supporting new legislation in favor of Hawaiian issues to negotiate a new relationship between Hawai‘i and the United States.

In order to understand the profound impact the play may have had on the audience, one must first understand the audience’s feeling of immersion within the performance of the past. Studying the creation of these moments might possibly be beneficial to other groups who wish to politically activate their community. If the creation of these feelings of immersion and moments of action can be used by other groups it is necessary to generalize the techniques Kneubuhl used.

This is important because it is in the present where change can take place concerning the memory, teaching and repercussions of the historical moment. Artists might wish to intentionally facilitate audience member perception of being immersed in the past in order to help the audience interact with the past and the present within performance and to become politically motivated toward activism. There are already groups who use types of performance to commemorate or revisit pivotal historical moments. What might come of those efforts if the artists involved utilized techniques to help their audience feel immersed with the past and thus able to act?

Techniques that Kneubuhl employs that could be used by other artists include dual roles for actors, using a narrator, and creating a character that is themselves an example of temporal interplay. Spatial choices the artists should consider using are historical locations, direct address, and sound. Although I focused on character and space as two vehicles in the performances through which the audience is presented with moments of transgressing time boundaries there are artistic choices in other areas that might also create the conditions for the audience to feel able to act within the past.

Performing within the same location as the historical events first took place can be a powerful choice. January 1893 was staged at the historical locations where the actual events took place in 1893 with few exceptions. These historic locations, ‘Iolani Palace and Ali‘iolani Hale, were part of making audience members feel they were
immersed in the past because the audience witnessed the performance of the historical event in the same physical space it took place originally. Staging the performance at the historical locations draws on the power of the past that ghosts the location. The audience at a performance of history might have difficulty entering into the past because they want some sort of true marker of history to anchor them. The physical presence of a historical place provides the audience with such an anchor from which to engage with the past. This reuse of the historical space may enable audience members to feel lost in the performance as it destabilizes the audience’s perception of the boundaries of time. This destabilization might create the conditions that enable audience members to act within the past.

Sound itself can also bridge the past and the present in the perception of the audience through destabilizing temporal boundaries. Artistic choices can be made that highlight space to the point of becoming a performer itself. This can be accomplished by focusing on sound instead of the presence of actors’ bodies. In this case sound and space were the performers with which the audience could interact since there were not any actors’ bodies for the audience to interact with.

Fundamental to enabling moments of spontaneous audience action through the perception of being a part of the past is the creation of a shared space between the historical character(s) and the audience members. Narrators can create this shared space in part because they can blur the boundaries between the past and the present in the perception of the audience. The narrator is able to do this if the narrator is himself a nexus for several time streams. The actor’s body, in this case the narrator, serves as a physical link between the multiple times and thus invokes those two times in every moment. If the audience members feel immersed within the past being performed, the narrator can encourage them to act or perform. One way to do so is to directly address the audience in order to encourage audience members to perform by responding.
The historical characters can directly address the audience either by asking questions or by delivering their lines to the audience. This can be similar to the direct address a narrator uses to ask the audience questions that lead their engagement with the past. Or the direct address can be the character speaking to the audience without requesting or expecting verbal responses. In the latter case, the direct address can implicate the audience in the past, giving them (the audience) an active role in the past. The audience can be supported in performing because direct address invites the audience to directly interact with the ideas of the past in the present. Even though a direct address may ask a specific question, the audience is left to choose to respond or not as well as choose what that response might be. Using Kneubuhl’s January 1893 as a guide, this technique of direct address seems to be highly effective perhaps because asking the audience a question, and actually waiting for the answer, establishes the desired actor-audience relationship to be active. This might promote audience members to spontaneously perform throughout the play by establishing the desired activity level of the audience through these interactions.

Another way to destabilize the boundaries between the past and the present in the perception of the audience is doubling (an actor playing more than one role within the performance.) This technique is most useful if the characters being played by the same actor are from different times. This multiplicity destabilizes the idea of an unbroken historical record thereby challenging the established histories of an event or culture. The doubling (or tripling, quadrupling and so forth) of roles is one way the artists challenge the historical record and the audience viewing this challenge might perceive within the body of the actor the interplay of the past and the present. Also, the dual roles initiate a relationship between the past and present within the theatrical performance that allows for the present to engage with the past in a more immediate way than retrospective. With the audience perceiving the boundaries of time
blurred, audience members are thus able to feel immersed within the past.

One final way which Kneubuhl destabilized temporal boundaries, thus bridging the past and the present in the perception of the audience, is through an atemporal character. Nanea in Ola Nā Iwi is herself an atemporal character because the other characters and the audience are unsure of when she comes from. Throughout the course of the play the audience and the other characters have to negotiate when Nanea comes from as it is unclear until the end of the play whether Nanea is from the nineteenth century or the present. The character can actively engage with the different times and provide a different perspective on the issues of the play for the other characters. Similar to Nanea, the character should be able to use their past to engage with the characters of the present. This interaction across times is what might help the audience feel that they too can interact with the past.

Some of these techniques may call to mind the work of Bertolt Brecht and Kneubuhl acknowledges being influenced by his theories and techniques. A future step in the development of this analysis of Kneubuhl’s plays would be to explore her work through the lens of Brecht. It is possible to view some of the moments in Kneubuhl’s plays as using gestus or Verfremdung effect. These techniques of Brecht might seemingly be in conflict with the spontaneous audience action I am focusing on because Brecht would call those moments of identification which he avoided, however I do believe that an exploration of Kneubuhl with Brecht could be enriching. Most strongly, January 1893 and Ola Nā Iwi connect Kneubuhl and Brecht through his techniques of historicization. Meg Mumford is useful in this endeavor because she codifies Brecht’s historicization techniques into a list. There are several techniques Brecht would use, individually or in conjunction with each other, in an “aim to both provoke an inquiring attitude towards the present through the past, and challenge dominant versions of history.”
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that connect to Kneubuhl’s work is “presenting events as the product of historically specific conditions and choices.” In January 1893, the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy is presented not as an inevitable event but as the result of clear choices made because of the political and social conditions in 1893.

Also, Brecht and Kneubuhl make the audience aware of the changes that have occurred since the past by highlighting the differences between the two times. Highlighting what has changed between the past and the present is seen through the Narrator’s interaction with the audience in January 1893 and throughout Ola Nā Iwi. In the latter play, the most significant change is in the attitudes toward the treatment of Native remains. However, in that play there are some characters that retain the historical view denying the humanity of the remains. This sameness and the need to change the view connects to a concept of Brecht’s in which the artist highlights a similarity between the past and the present that needs to be changed and encouraging the change. Brecht and Kneubuhl also accentuate the well known adage that history is written by the winners of a conflict. In January 1893, the version of the history of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy is the one created by the United States government and businessmen who were/are the ruling/dominant class in this case. Likewise, in Ola Nā Iwi the historical vignettes present the history of scientific theories and practices enabled the theft and use of human remains. Lastly, both Brecht and Kneubuhl present versions of history alternative to that purported by the dominant class. This focus on alternative history is at the core of much of Kneubuhl’s work. For instance, January 1893 was the overthrow from a more Royalist perspective and the story of Liliha from Ola Nā Iwi is a more specific example of this historicization technique.

Where might these techniques be most useful? If the artist wishes to encourage their audience to act a combination of Brecht’s historicization and Kneubuhl’s techniques are appealing. Kneubuhl’s techniques to encourage spontaneous audience action seem to be most powerful in an outdoor play because of the actor-audience relationship.
established for that space of performance. There is an increased freedom for audience action and spontaneity because of the openness of an outdoor performance. These techniques also seem to be most powerful in scenes or performances about identity or historical injustice. In Kneubuhl’s plays those scenes seemed to elicit more audience members performing and the actions being performed were stronger. Perhaps a connection in which the playwright and audience are invested in issues of identity or historical injustice generate a stronger emotional response, heightening the audience’s need to act. I began this study in a search for the driving force behind an audience member to spontaneously enter into a performance through action and I feel that perhaps there are things a playwright can do, techniques they can use to enable these moments to happen. These moments within performance and the possible audience feelings that instigate them may not be chance happenings relying solely on the audience but there seems to be techniques a playwright could use to try and encourage the audience.
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