HE MĀKAʻIKAʻI NO MĀEAEA:

BECOMING KAMAʻĀINA O KA ʻEHU KAI

A DISSERATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

MAY 2024

By

Donna “Kona” Au

Dissertation Committee:

Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller, Chariperson
Noenoe K. Silva
Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua
Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio
Karen Kosasa

Dedicated to

my grandfather, William Yat-Sun "Grandpa Bill" Au,
who taught me binaries are not always what they seem,

and

my kupuna, Elizabeth Kawohiokalani "Aunty Betty" Ellis Jenkins,
who showed me new ways to become and belong.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A lot of time, energy, and work went into producing this dissertation, and I could not have done any of it alone. These pages could never fully express my grattitude to the many hands that helped shape me, and thus this dissertation. If I somehow fail to include anyone, naʻu ka hewa.

The work that follows would not have been possible without the ʻāina of Waialua, the lands, waters, and beings of this wahi pana that raised me, nurtured me, and helped me grow into a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai who loves and sustains this place. Mahalo to the kūpuna who worked to perpetuate the moʻolelo aloha ʻāina I draw on, who passed these moʻolelo down orally and through the nūpepa. Mahalo to the akua and ʻaumākua of Waialua who continue to hold these moʻolelo and share them with those who are willing to sit and take the time. Mahalo to the kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, the families who have helped shape how my ʻohana has become kamaʻāina to this wahi pana and those families to whom my only pilina is our shared love for this ʻāina. Mahalo for loving this place, protecting this place, and showing myself and others how to love this place in return. Mahalo to the Jenkins, ʻAwai, and Leong ʻohana for becoming some of the most cherished knots in my ʻupena of pilina. Mahalo to the kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai who participated in interviews for this dissertation, and who have accompanied me on various mākaʻikaʻi. It is an honor to hold your stories.

Mahalo to the ʻāina of Mānoa, for holding my grandfather, and for holding me while I was at the university. Mahalo to the professors and kumu I have had the privilege of learning from while at UH. To the professors on my committee, Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio, and Karen Kosasa, mahalo for agreeing to go on this journey with me. Thank you for your time, your manaʻo, and your guidance. To Jon Goldberg-Hiller, my chair, and Noenoe Silva, my second reader and mini-chair, thank you—for everything. For pushing me

to produce the best dissertation I possibly could, for believing in me when I wasn't sure of myself, and for all of the wonderful conversations, laughs, and huakaʻi. I could not have picked a better duo to help lead me down this path. Mahalo to Laurie Onizuka, for your time, patience, and willingness to always answer my questions and re-send emails throughout my time in the department.

To my ʻohana, in Arizona and in Hawaiʻi, mahalo for your support, for allowing me to share our story, for inspiring me to imagine all the beautful things we can become. To my sisters, Rebecca Barone (aka Becks, P-Bar, and too many other nicknames to type here), and Aya Jeffers-Fabro (Yaya J-Fabs), mahalo for coming into my life and sticking around, for all the belly-aching laughs, wild memories, and experiences. To my kuaʻana, Jane and Julie, mahalo for making me the luckiest pōkiʻi there ever was. Mahalo for all the meals you have fed me, for all the lessons you have taught me, for helping me grow into who I am today. Mahalo for helping me with translations, for providing new insights into my discussions, and for brainstorming ideas with me. To Keʻalohiahina, mahalo for being you. For showing me how wonderful and exciting the future will be. For letting me be part of your introduction to our ʻāina.

To my father, my kumu, my adventure buddy, mahalo for this life you have created for us, that you have sacrificed for, that you worked so hard everyday to provide for us. Mahalo for being the best parent I could ask for, for your steadfast love and support, for your unwavering belief in everything that I do. Mahalo for making me hike up that mountain to cut pili grass (I guess I can finally look back and say I am glad that I did it), mahalo for keeping me home when I wanted to move halfway across the world for college, mahalo for grounding us in ʻike Hawaiʻi and emersing us in culture in every way you knew how. Mahalo for sharing those stories with us, all those years ago, and for continuing to make new moʻolelo with us today.

To my ipo, my kōkoʻolua, Christopher—mahalo for being the pōhaku that holds me steady through every storm, every up and down. Mahalo for you support, your belief, your distractions. Mahalo for celebrating my wins with me and being the shoulder I cried when I reached my limits. Mahalo for inviting me into your family and building this life with me.

ABSTRACT

Before the shores between Puaʻena and Kaʻena were lined with invasive ironwood trees; before the kula leading to the uplands were covered in multi-story homes and crowded neighborhoods; before roads and highways cut through vital connections between mauka and makai, the ʻehu kai churned up by the waves in Waialua traveled freely between the shores and hills. Drifting from kahakai, over the kula, and towards the kuahiwi, the ʻehu kai covered the kamaʻāina and all who passed through Waialua in a salty mist, connecting sea with land, kanaka with ʻāina. People of Waialua were ancestrally known as poʻe and kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, and before settler colonial relations of power began to take-hold in Hawaiʻi, the ʻehu kai and our pilina to it was a primary way for the community of Waialua to know ourselves, our ʻāina, and one another. This dissertation uses archival and ethnographic research to ask what it means to become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai today, and investigate how emergent subjectivities grounded in ʻŌiwi relationality can begin to enact new ways of belonging to place. Using moʻolelo about Waialua and the practice of mākaʻikaʻi, I analyze how pilina and kuleana to ʻāina can begin to produce new subjectivities and relations of power that are not defined and confined by settler colonial encounters with ʻāina. Mākaʻikaʻi, as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building, allows ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to encounter ʻāina in ways that cannot be co-opted or defined by settler colonial power, and reveals that (re)turning to practices rooted in our ʻike kupuna and routed through our ancestral and contemporary moʻolelo has the potential to create new realities and practices of home-making where our abundance of pilina can thrive.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

ABSTRACT v

Chapter One: Discovering the ʻEhu Kai of Waialua 1

  Methodology 11

  Overview of Chapters 16

  Conclusion 19

Chapter 2: (Re)membering Kaiaka as an Aliʻi and Wahi Pana 22

  Settler Colonial Theory 26

  The Settler-Indigenous Binary and Identity Politics 30

  The Settler-Indigenous Binary as a Pharmakon 34

  Biopower and an Analytic of Biopolitics 41

  ʻŌiwi Theory and Resurgence 53

  Kaiaka: Kuʻu Ipo i ka ʻEhu Kai 58

Chapter 3: Mākaʻikaʻi, He Aha Kēia? 61

  Mākaʻikaʻi 67

  "He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" 72

  "Mākaʻikaʻi" with Kamaʻāina o ka ʻEhu Kai 86

  Conclusion 94

Chapter Four: He Mākaʻikaʻi no Kahakakaukanaka and Mauna a Wākea 97

  Kuleana and Pilina to the Mauna 102

  Mākaʻikaʻi on the Mauna 108

  The Ethics of Mākaʻikaʻi 116

  (Re)mapping Pilina and Kuleana to ʻĀina 121

  (Re)turning to the Mauna 126

Conclusion: Mākaʻikaʻi as World-Making 128

  Transactional Realities and the Production of New Ways of Being 138

  Conclusion 142

Works Cited 147

List of Figures

Figure 1: Pa‘akai collecting along the shore of Ka‘ena 5

Figure 2: The shore of Ka‘ena 6

Figure 3: The view of Kaiaka from where the Paukauila and Ki‘iki‘i streams meet 22

Figure 4: Pōhaku Lāna‘i 24

Figure 5: View of Pua‘ena from the shore of Kaiaka 59

Figure 6: The Kaiaka side of Māeaea 62

Figure 7: Keaomelemele travelling past Māeaea 62

Figure 8: View of Ka‘ena and the ‘ehu kai from ke one loa o Māeaea 98

Figure 9: Kahakakaukanaka (left) and Pua‘ena (right) 98

Figure 10: Picture of the Mauna and Ala Hulu Kūpuna taken in 2019 106

Figure 11: Morning view from the Pu‘uhonua o Pu‘uhuluhulu 114

Figure 12: Loko Ea Fishpond 129

Figure 13: View of ‘Uko‘a near Kawailoa Transfer Station 131

Figure 14: View of the sun setting from ke one loa o Māeaea 146

Chapter One: Discovering the ʻEhu Kai of Waialua

Featured in movies and television series, the North Shore of Oʻahu is recognized around the world for its iconic surf, beautiful beaches, and quaint little towns. Every year, thousands of tourists flock to these shores to bask in the sun or attempt to ride the massive waves that have made this area famous. When I moved to Haleʻiwa as a child with my ʻohana[1], this is how I first encountered the place I would make my home—as a surfer's paradise, as a town whose main purpose is to accommodate visitors. My grandfather was born near Chinatown in Honolulu and raised in Mānoa, but he joined the U.S. military as a young man and never moved back to Hawaiʻi once he left. My father and his siblings were born in Minnesota and later moved to Arizona, where my sisters and I were born, along with our cousins. My father and his sisters used to go on family trips to Hawaiʻi to visit the family that adopted my grandfather, and it was during those trips that my father started to develop a love for this ʻāina that made him want to stay, forever. Although he was treated as just another brown man in Arizona, he knew that he was Hawaiian, that he belonged to a genealogy that connected him to this island that he would visit as a child. My grandfather did not raise his kids with a cultural grounding—in large part because he did not have a cultural grounding of his own—and my father was determined to change that. He decided that when he had kids of his own, he wanted to raise them here, where they could grow up as Hawaiians without ever feeling the need to question who they are or where they belong, just as our ancestors did.

[1] Rather than providing direct translations for Hawaiian words, I follow Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio's (2021, 35) method of rigorous paraphrasing, wherein scholars engage directly with Hawaiian-laguage materials and vocabulary without supplying a translation that can pull readers away from the source material or language. For those unfamiliar with ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi, wehewehe.org is a reliable online Hawaiian dictionary.

I wish I could say that my father's dream came true, that I grew up without feeling the same kind of unbelonging and alienation he and my grandfather felt throughout their lives, but that would be ignoring the settler colonial structure of processes we have been encountering for generations. Like many other ʻŌiwi, I have often struggled with whether or not I am Hawaiian "enough"—whether or not I have the right ancestry, whether or not I fit the part of what it means to be Hawaiian. Do I speak the language well enough? Do I engage with enough Hawaiian ʻike on a regular basis? Do I do enough Hawaiian practices—do I do them authentically enough? This question of being enough, of doing enough, plagues ʻŌiwi struggling to understand what it means to be Hawaiian in a world that simultaneously commodifies, degrades, and appropriates our ancestry, culture, and ʻike. This situation is not unique to ʻŌiwi, and can be linked to larger processes of settler colonialism that affect populations across the globe. These processes have drastically altered the ways that ʻŌiwi understand who we are, how we belong, and with whom we are in relation. Growing up, I did not recognize myself through my ʻupena of pilina—my complex net of intimate relations with kanaka and ʻāina (Osorio 2021, 10). Instead of understanding who I am through my actions, relations, and connections to place, racialized and naturalized notions of what a Hawaiian really looks and sounds like came to influence how I navigated where I belonged, and where I did not.

I spent years chasing this image—this idea of a pure, authentic, *real* Hawaiian, one untouched by the violences of colonialism and racialization. If I could make myself look as close as possible to that image, if I could live as closely as possible to that distant, pristine past, I thought I would finally be recognized as a Hawaiian without the follow-up interrogation over how much blood quantum I have, and "is your grandfather *really* Hawaiian or are you just saying that?" I'm not sure when I stopped chasing that image, and sometimes part of me still feels like it

is in pursuit. I feel intimidated by those who speak the language better than I do, by those who do more cultural practices than I do. I feel guilty that I do not spend more time studying our language, learning our culture, and better understanding our ʻike kupuna. Sometimes I worry my efforts are still not enough. But then I remember the ʻike and experiences that my father and kūpuna have provided for me; I remember my kupuna Elizabeth Kawohiokalani "Aunty Betty" Ellis Jenkins, and all of her teachings, including her 4 B's.

Aunty Betty's 4 B's shaped and were present at nearly every cultural workshop or event I helped my ʻohana host throughout my adolescent years. These 4 B's are: Believe, Behave, Become, Belong. Belong was not originally part of the grouping, but she added it on later in life. In an essay on the importance of familial practices, she writes, "[f]or when we Believe we Behave in a certain way, allowing us then to Become. That I believe is the beginning on being pono" (Jenkins 2002). A couple years ago I began thinking more about these B's and what they mean in terms of community, and personal becoming and belonging to place. I have since adapted these B's to reflect the importance of place in shaping who we are and how we become in Waialua: If you believe in the moʻolelo of Waialua and the kuleana they inform, then you will behave according to those kuleana, allowing you to become a kamaʻāina[2] o ka ʻehu kai o Puaʻena and belong to this ʻāina and community. When I reflect on the moʻolelo about Waialua that I have learned from my kūpuna, from kamaʻāina, and from my research, moʻolelo I will share throughout this dissertation, the mirror I recognize myself through shifts from one produced by settler colonial encounters to one lovingly woven by my ancestors and experiences with this ʻāina. I see and understand myself not through the stories that tell me that this is a place

[2] I use "kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai…" here since that was a name used to describe the people who lived in Waialua ancestrally. While I explore ideas of kamaʻāina later in this chapter, an in-depth discusison on these terms as they function linguistically is outside the scope of my dissertation and ʻike.

where tourists can marvel at big waves, where Native Hawaiians are few and disappearing, but through moʻolelo that teach me about my pilina to this ʻāina, my kuleana to this ʻāina as an ʻŌiwi and kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai.

Moʻolelo about Waialua and the wahi pana it holds typically feature the ocean, or at least make mention of its thunderous leo and the thick ʻehu kai it creates. These moʻolelo teach us about the intimate pilina that ʻŌiwi of this area have with this ʻāina and the beings within it, and provide insight into how one can attend to their kuleana to this place in ways that perpetuate pono and reciprocal relations. Articles published in Hawaiian-language newspapers of the 19th century often referred to the people of Waialua and what is now known as Haleʻiwa as poʻe o ka ʻehu kai (Kamokualiiole 1866, Luhiau 1865), people of the sea mist, demonstrating the centrality of ʻāina in our ancestral ways of knowing and recognizing ourselves (Figure 1). As I show in this dissertation, how we encounter ʻāina matters, and shapes the pilina and kuleana we form with ʻāina and the beings that nurture and sustain it. Settler colonial productions of place attempt to create encounters with ʻāina that alienate ʻŌiwi from our intimate pilina, that create ʻāina as nonlife (Povinelli 2016) rather than intimate relations that helps us become and belong to place in pono ways. When we first moved in Waialua, my father made sure to create opportunities for us to experience this new place we would call home in ways grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo. He was still learning these things himself, and he made it a point to include us in this learning journey so that we would all have a strong foundation to grow upon.

Figure 1: Pa'akai collecting along the shore of Ka'ena

During the evenings we would often go to Waimea Bay, or Kaʻena point (Figure 1) to watch the sun set and the stars rise. We did not know it then, but these two locations mark the boundaries of the Waialua ahupuaʻa, whose shore runs from Kaʻena in the west, over to Waimea. I remember some nights we used to get donuts and chocolate milk from the store and then drive to the parking lot of Kaʻena to listen to the waves, gaze at the stars, and watch the moon make its way across the sky. In an interview about making Waialua our home, one of my sisters reflected about our time at Kaʻena:

> One night I remember him [our father] explaining to us that Kaʻena was sacred because of the leina. He described it as a leaping place for the soul upon death, but I didn't know what that meant. Just that it had to do with death, but also life. And your ancestors, who were there waiting. But I didn't know what ancestors were supposed to be there for me—I couldn't picture their faces. I remember imagining it all, trying to understand. I'd think of myself jumping into the water off a high cliff at night, plunging into the ocean. It

> scared me. But there's something about the water along our shore. It's warm and really salty. I'd always remind myself that as long as I was leaping here, I wouldn't have to be afraid.

Although we were not born in Hawaiʻi, although he was not born in Hawaiʻi, my father taught us about our pilina to this ʻāina, showed us our kuleana to this place, and worked with community members and kūpuna to ground us in ʻike kupuna and ʻŌiwi moʻolelo about ʻāina. In every way that he could he tried to create the conditions where we could live more Hawaiian lives than he had the chance to, where we could know ourselves beyond what settler colonial encounters attempt to limit us to.

Figure 2: The shore of Kaʻena

A big part of this was introducing us to ʻāina in ways that disrupted the other narratives about place we were learning. We were quickly corrected when we came home calling Turtle

Island the "mainland," and as soon as he learned an ancestral place name, we were expected to incorporate that inoa ʻāina into our everyday vocabulary. As we sat in the parking lot of Kaʻena (Figure 2) he would encourage us to question why this place, so sacred to our ancestors and vital to our ability to thrive as kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, is considered a state park, produced as a place where military and others are given access and accommodations to four-wheel drive, making ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and practices secondary. Some years ago, I learned that a National Geodetic Survey (NGS) marker, used by the federal government as a tool for transportation, mapping, and charting, was once located on the leina. Rather than recognizing the leina as an ancestor, a being with which ʻŌiwi have an intimate relationship, this marker positioned the leina as a part of the environment that the settler state has control over. Ignoring the moʻolelo of this leina and its intimate position in ʻŌiwi ʻupena of pilina, this marker created the conditions where the leina was encountered as nonlife, as property that allows the settler colonial encounter to last by helping to demarcate and map settler colonial territory and jurisdiction. After discovering the marker in the early 2000's, an ʻohana from Waialua hiked to the leina in the middle of the night to remove it. Long after the state "park" had officially closed, they hiked in the moonlight and listened while the silence of night was broken by the sounds of chisel on metal and cement.

Removing the marker did not change how the state officially sees the leina, did not change the ʻāina's designation as a state park. What is significant about this act is not its effect on the state, which was arguably minimal. After all, two decades later it is unclear whether or not the state has even noticed that the NGS is gone. While the state seems to have lost little through this act, what was gained is the ability to (re)create alternative encounters between kanaka and ʻāina, ones that remind us of our intimate and interwoven pilina as kamaʻāina to Waialua, ones that challenge colonial narratives depicting ʻāina as "nature" or nonlife. As I will demonstrate in

the next chapter, the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi has been perpetuating the conditions of possibility that attempt to violently sever ʻŌiwi connections to our human and non-human ancestors for generations. Through discourses and politics of recognition that frame some of our ancestors as less than, or not enough, to those that position non-human kin to the realm of "nature," the settler colonial encounter has worked to create the conditions where many of us today cannot imagine our ancestors, cannot picture their faces and call upon their names to hold us strong and catch us when we fall. As I argue in this dissertation, however, our experiences with ʻāina today allow us to (re)create the conditions where we not only recognize our non-human ancestors, but are recognized by them in return. Mākaʻikaʻi, which I explore in chapter three, aids in this recognition by creating encounters with ʻāina that are grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and ʻike about place. Within this politics of recognition, state sovereignty and authority are eschewed in favor of individual and communal knowledge about a place, as informed by pilina, moʻolelo aloha ʻāina, and kuleana. While settler colonial encounters attempt to produce our ʻāina as state property and nonlife, mākaʻikaʻi (re)create the conditions of possibility for kamaʻāina and ʻŌiwi to challenge these productions not only by refusing to recognize them, but also by enacting alternative relations and ways of beloning to place.

As I will demonstrate throughout the dissertation, being kamaʻāina with a place and the beings in that place is a continuous process, a relationship that is built over time and requires maintenance to last. Our kūpuna recognized that becoming kamaʻāina to a place is a transformative process, one that brings about new kuleana and allows for the renewal and creation of pilina with people and ʻāina—the lands, waters, and beings that nurture and are nurtured by us. While many of us have become malihini to our ʻāina through generations of colonial violence, as ʻŌiwi we have the kuleana to build better pilina with our ʻāina and

communities, and create the conditions where we can not only become kamaʻāina once again, but also guide malihini who wish to build better pilina with us and our ʻāina. This means taking seriously our kuleana to place and one another, and engaging with forms of politics and relations of power that work towards mutual interdependence rather than domination and exploitation. Importantly, as I discuss in chapters two and three, malihini and kamaʻāina demonstrate specific relationships to place, and I do not use these terms to replace “settler” and “Indigenous.” Instead, these terms provide a framework for thinking through our particular pilina to place, how we attend to those pilina, and how those actions shape who we are and how we become. Instead of understanding settler, indigenous, kamaʻāina, and malihini as identities, then, this dissertation argues that these terms signal specific relations to place that can change as we navigate our endless becoming. When we as kamaʻāina share moʻolelo aloha ʻāina, and use kuleana and pilina to shape how we understand place, we work to create the conditions where ʻŌiwi (re)gain some measure of control over the home-making projects that newcomers engage with, and the subjectivities these encounters inform.

In this dissertation I thus reject the notion of always already native or Indigenous ʻŌiwi identities and subjectivities, and instead argue that our kūpuna engaged in processes and practices that kept them intimately connected to one another and ʻāina to continuously become kamaʻāina to the places and people they were in pilina with. In a similar vein, I reject the notion of always already settler identities and subjectivities, and argue that practices of aloha ʻāina such as mākaʻikaʻi allow ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike to unpack and engage with their relationalities, or ʻupena of pilina, to understand their kuleana and take steps to find where, how, and if they belong in a certain space. Rather than continuing to engage with forms of recognition and politics of identity that allow members of our lāhui and ʻohana to feel less than, or not enough, I

argue that ʻŌiwi have the kuleana to enact processes of becoming and remaining kamaʻāina to our communities and ʻāina so as to create new ways of knowing and acknowledging our ʻupena of pilina and mutual interdependence. As I will demonstrate in the later chapters, mākaʻikaʻi create the space for malihini and kamaʻāina to come together and build or renew pilina to one another and place. These pilina come to inform our kuleana to and aloha for ʻāina, and create the conditions to disrupt settler colonial encounters through continuous struggles for ea, wherein our abundance of pilina are made to flourish in reciprocal ways. This dissertation therefore investigates what possibilities are revealed when ʻŌiwi use ʻŌiwi-controlled practices that cannot be defined or co-opted by settler powers to know ourselves, our ʻāina, and our pilina. How can mākaʻikaʻi function as a form of knowledge-production and pilina-building that allows ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to become more than malihini to the ʻāina we call home in ways grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo? More generally, what flight-paths out of settler colonialism can theorizing the taking-hold of settler-indigenous subjectivities and relationalities inform?

My focus on mākaʻikaʻi and relationality add to the current scholarship on settler colonialism and ʻike Hawaiʻi by providing a potential method for becoming in place in ways that do not replicate settler colonial formations of power and politics of extraction and domination. Through an emphasis on fluid relationality rather than binary identities, mākaʻikaʻi can inform endless processes of becoming that produce poʻe aloha ʻāina and kamaʻāina who are grounded in place and their particular pilina to ʻāina, and who struggle to create the conditions where our various and multiple pilina can thrive. This dissertation therefore provides a new route through which we can (re)weave our ʻupena of pilina and struggle over ea as kamaʻāina and ʻŌiwi grounded in our various moʻolelo about, and kuleana and pilina to ʻāina.

Methodology

Throughout the dissertation I engage in Michel Foucault's genealogical method, as well as Louis Althusser's philosophy of encounter. Foucault's genealogical method is central to his theorizing on biopolitics, and it is no coincidence that he opens his first lecture series on the topic with a discussion of this method. Largely a discursive method, Foucault (2003, 8) asserts that the coupling together of scholarly knowledge and knowledges that have been disqualified or subjugated gives this discursive critique its essential strength. Genealogies, he writes, are anti-sciences and demonstrate an insurrection of knowledges against the centralizing power effects bound up with the institutionalization and workings of scientific discourses (Foucault 2003, 9). Opposed to universalizing claims and pre-given assumptions, Foucault's theories and genealogical method seek to uncover the contingencies of power relations. The transformative power of using genealogy as method lies in its capacity to reveal that the basic knowledge structures of our existence are historically contingent (Mills 2018, 137). Recognizing the contingency and conjuncture of power, scientific discourses, and knowledges, Foucault's work allows us to trace how current forms of power came to be, and opens the possibility for retrieving subjugated knowledges that can produce new relations of power. In this way, Foucault's work reflects Althusser's method of thinking with the void.

Althusser introduces thinking with the void in his later writings on the philosophy of the encounter. Rather than continuing with the mainstream philosophical traditions of using philosophy as a metaphysical statement on the reason or origin of things, Althusser (2006, 170) argues that philosophy is no more than an observation. With this assumption, philosophy becomes a way of theorizing the contingency of reason and origin, as well as a way of recognizing the "fact" of contingency (Althusser 2006, 170). Necessity becomes subordinated

under contingency within the philosophy of encounter, and questions of origin are rejected (Althusser 2006, 170). Althusser draws on Epicurus's notion of the fall and the swerve to develop this philosophy. According to Epicurus, and subsequently Althusser (2006, 168), before there was "life" or the world, there was a void in which an infinity of atoms were falling, and it is through an inexplicable swerve of a single atom, and the consequent encounter between it and another, that the contingencies of life and the world are created. The origin of the world, therefore, is not based in reason or cause, but in the aleatory nature of the swerve and its potential to result in lasting encounters. Althusser's philosophy of encounter sets out from this assumption, and similar to Foucault's genealogical method this philosophy attempts to understand and unpack the "becoming-necessary" of contingency (Althusser 2006, 194). This philosophy revolves around what Althusser calls the "materialism of the encounter," which is opposed to rationalist and teleological materialisms and sets out from the premise that relations of power are born from an aleatory encounter between two or more elements that have their own distinct histories (Althusser 2006, 167). The philosophy of the void does not question why or for what reason an encounter happens, rather it tries to trace the contingencies that force encounters to last.

Starting from the premise that nothing about the world we live in has to be the way it is, thinking with the void allows a critical inquiry into the contingencies that allow current forms of power to persist and adapt. This method encourages us to explore conditions of possibility and conduct elemental analyses in addition to theorizing about larger structures or processes of power and domination. Because the philosophy of the void demonstrates that each encounter is aleatory, accidental, and adapts to perpetuate the conditions of its possibility, Althusser (2006, 197) argues that the "whole" that results from the aleatory swerve and taking-hold of contingencies follows

the taking, it does not precede it. As such, the materialism of encounter rejects the philosophical materialism of essence by theorizing the taking-hold instead of the laws of necessity that result from the taking (Althusser 2006, 196). Theorizing the taking-hold rather than the whole that results from the taking allows us to theorize the aleatory nature of the encounter. Althusser (2006, 193) asserts that every encounter is aleatory in its origins and effects—nothing guarantees that an encounter will occur or last, and nothing in the elements of the encounter prefigures the being, structure, or relationship that will emerge from an encounter. Applying this method of thinking with the void to settler colonial situations allows for an investigation into the contingencies that force settler colonial relations of power to persist in Hawaiʻi. In other words, what are the conditions of possibility that make settler colonialism a lasting encounter? I am not attempting to trace the origins or reveal the reasons behind these formations of power. Instead, by analyzing the contingencies upon which these relations of power rest, I argue that settler colonialism is a fact-to-be-accomplished rather than an accomplished fact that we must learn to live with.

Treating settler colonialism as a fact-to-be-accomplished requires a rejection of settler and Indigenous subjectivities as always already existing, and instead pushes us to critically interrogate the contingencies that produce these positionalities as static identities. I argue that the intersection between biopolitics and settler colonial studies, as well as an engagement with the philosophy of encounter, creates space to take micropowers and their contingent relationships as an analytical focus while remaining attentive to large-scale processes of power. Settler colonialism, as with all forms of power, presents itself as an accomplished fact—something that happened and is here to stay, albeit in new and different forms. Thinking with the void and conducting a biopolitical analysis on the production of settler and Indigenous subjectivities

reveals that settler colonialism is actually a fact-to-be-accomplished—it is constantly refiguring itself to adapt to new contexts and perpetuate its conditions of possibility for being. This creates space for ʻŌiwi to maneuver and generate alternative relationalities and processes of becoming that are routed through new relations of power and encounters with ʻāina. The goal here is not to resurge or revitalize an ideal image or pristine past, nor is this politics all about opposing or refusing the settler state and its processes. Rather, ʻŌiwi politics work to (re)create the conditions of possibility that allowed our kūpuna to struggle over ea and maintain diverse ʻupena of pilina so that we can continue to live on, protect, and nurture our ʻāina just as it nurtures us.

Importantly, the parenthetical "re" in "(re)create" is meant to disrupt settler colonial logics of time and place, and serves as a portal, holding space for alternative ways of being and relating while refusing settler temporality (Brown 2021, 39). Rather than signaling a return, this "(re)" signifies the various articulations of our ancestral practices, beliefs, and customs throughout time, place, and context—both historically and those yet to come. This call to (re)create conditions of possibility, therefore, is a call to carry our ancestral practices into our current realities, negotiating which practices and beliefs we want to use and build our futures around instead of attempting to bring a pure past into our current realities. This method of (re)creating ancestral conditions of possibility also builds on Mishuana Goeman's (2013) method of (re)mapping, which I explore further in chapter four.

My positionality gives me a specific kuleana towards the processes of being and becoming that I have chosen to analyze and study in the dissertation that follows. I am an ʻŌiwi writing about and drawing from my own histories and experiences of being ʻŌiwi, as well as the histories and experiences of those who have come before me. As an ʻŌiwi living in the 21st century, English is my first and primary language. I have taken ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi classes and am

still learning the language, but I am far from fluent. In fact, English is the only language I am fluent in. It is the language I grew up with and the language through which I understand the world around me, however it is not the only ontology informing my worldview. Recognizing that a large portion of the Hawaiian materials I have engaged with have gone through the violence of translation (Osorio 2021), these materials, as well as my experiences with kūpuna and other community members, have provided me with some kind of understanding of the philosophies and teachings of my ancestors. I thus find myself in a position occupied by a large number of ʻŌiwi scholars today, having to live and theorize in the world I am in while building a better one. My engagement with Western theories and philosophies reflects my own particular position of being an ʻŌiwi living in the 21st century. Far from this "cross-fertilization" (Coulthard 2020, 388) representing an attempt to assimilate ʻŌiwi theories within Euro-American philosophical traditions, my use of an analytic of biopolitics and philosophy of encounter to understand the intricacies of the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi reflects the selective promiscuity that ʻŌiwi have always engaged in.

Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2016) explores this idea of selective promiscuity in her chapter in *Kanaka ʻŌiwi Methodologies: Moʻolelo and Metaphor*, "Reproducing Ropes of Resistance: Hawaiian Studies Methodologies." Here she explores the methodological foundations laid by 20th century scholars to argue that selective promiscuity is an approach to survivance, wherein one draws heavily from their own lineage while also selectively incorporating outside thinkers (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2016, 9). Drawing on Gerald Vizenor, Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2016, 8) demonstrates that survivance is about a community or lāhui's renewal and continuity into the future through an embrace of cultural reorientation. This reorientation recognizes the fluidity of cultural practices and the ways these practices change as

they are articulated over time and throughout multiple generations. Partaking in the diversity of these cultural practices and intellectual traditions is both a pleasurable and powerful way to (re)claim and (re)assert the conditions of possibility that allow our lāhui to thrive in mutually interdependent ways. In this way, my use of an analytic of biopolitics and philosophy of encounter represent my selective incorporation of outside theories and knowledges to shed light on specifically Euro-American colonial relations of power and domination within the pae ʻāina of Hawaiʻi. Putting these theories in conversation with ʻŌiwi intellectual traditions, far from an indigenizing move, is therefore a way to better understand, unpack, and challenge formations of power that replicate relations of colonial domination and extraction so as to lay a foundation to enact and engage with politics that allow all of our lāhui to thrive.

Overview of Chapters

The following chapters analyze mākaʻikaʻi as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo, and explores how mākaʻikaʻi can create encounters with ʻāina that begin to produce new subjectivities and relations of power. Chapter two, "(Re)membering Kaiaka as an Aliʻi and Wahi Pana," lays the theoretical foundation for the rest of the dissertation. In this chapter I investigate the encounters and relations of power that have worked to produce the ʻāina of Waialua as nonlife, rather than aliʻi and ancestors. I provide an analysis of settler colonial theory, particularly as it pertains to Hawaiʻi, and demonstrate the ways the ʻāina and ʻŌiwi have been produced in ways shaped by and reproductive of settler colonial relations of power. Using an analytic of biopolitics and relational analysis, I explore a paradox in settler colonial studies. While current theorizing on settler colonialism positions it as a structure, not a past event, this field of studies also treats settler and Indigenous as always already existing subjectivities, often failing to provide space for Indigenous ways of knowing

and becoming beyond these limitations. Returning to Haunani-Kay Trask's scholarship, I demonstrate that her use of a settler-indigenous binary is grounded in a relational analysis, and her writing makes clear that these are pedagogies rather than static identities. I also show that an analytic of biopolitics reveals how these identities and subjectivities are (re)produced to replicate and maintain settler colonial relations of power. Māka‘ika‘i and the resurgence of ‘Ōiwi ways of knowing and recognizing one another, however, create encounters that can produce new subjectivities, ones that are routed through practices that cannot be controlled by settlers to maintain current relations of power.

In chapter three, "Māka‘ika‘i, He Aha Kēia?" I use William Henry Uaua's (1870-1871) telling of "He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" serialized in *Ke Au Okoa*, as well as my own experiences with the practice to articulate māka‘ika‘i and interrogate what kinds of encounters with ‘āina they can create. Through archival and ethnographic research, I demonstrate that māka‘ika‘i can create the conditions of possibility for ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi to become more than malihini to our ‘āina. Māka‘ika‘i provide a route through which malihini with the right intentions can develop deep, intimate relationships with the ‘āina that they encounter, and can therefore function as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building that informs the creation of po‘e aloha ‘āina and kama‘āina—kanaka, ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi alike, who are so in love with ‘āina and the ‘Ōiwi of that ‘āina that they work to build new pilina with people and place, perform according to kuleana grounded in those pilina, and are accountable to the ‘Ōiwi and knots that make up the ‘upena of pilina connecting them to place. Rather than continuing to engage in an identity politics and politics of recognition that privilege a settler-indigenous binary, this chapter demonstrates that practices such as māka‘ika‘i create encounters with ‘āina and ‘Ōiwi wherein ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi can work through, unpack, and become according to our

specific relationalities and kuleana. In this way, mākaʻikaʻi provide a way for us to create new pilina with ʻāina, new understandings of kuleana, grounded in our mutual love for place but routed through ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and pilina. This allows ʻŌiwi to reconnect to our ʻāina in ways that are not limited to a settler colonial structure of processes attempting to confine and eliminate those pilina, and it allows non-ʻŌiwi to connect to ʻāina in ways that are grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and ʻike while remaining cognizant of current relations of power.

Chapter Four, "He Mākaʻikaʻi no Kahakakaukanaka and Mauna a Wākea," takes us to Hawaiʻi island where I analyze the 2019 stand against the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) through the lens of mākaʻikaʻi. Using my own experience at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu, as well as accounts written by kiaʻi who were on the Mauna, I argue that the Puʻuhonua created the possibility for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to mākaʻikaʻi with the Mauna and kamaʻāina of the area by actively producing a space grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike, moʻolelo, and pilina to ʻāina, akua, and ʻaumākua. Through protocols and actions established by kiaʻi and kūpuna, ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi were able to know and develop pilina to the Mauna through a grounded ʻŌiwi relationality that informed how each individual contributed to the movement and performed their aloha ʻāina. This chapter concludes by analyzing an ʻŌiwi ethic of alterity demonstrated by mākaʻikaʻi and enacted on the Mauna. This ethic of alterity rejects singular authority and normativities, instead recognizing an abundance of knowledge sources and pilina that inform context-specific kuleana. Rooted in ancestral practices of hoʻopāpā, this ethic requires that one perform their kuleana in ways that remain accountable to their ʻupena of pilina, but also allows room for new interpretations, new pilina, new ways of being and becoming. This was demonstrated on the Mauna, where a multiplicity of ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi were able to find meaningful ways to contribute while remaining accountable to their specific pilina and positionality.

I conclude the dissertation by analyzing the ways that māka‘ika‘i create the conditions of possibility for ‘Ōiwi to begin to produce new realities where recognition and authority are routed through ancestral and contemporary mo‘olelo aloha ‘āina, and rooted in pilina to ‘āina. “Māka‘ika‘i as World-Making” explores māka‘ika‘i as a form of mo‘okū‘auhau consciousness (Silva 2017) that (re)produces the contingencies that create kama‘āina and po‘e aloha ‘āina. In this way, māka‘ika‘i create everyday acts of resurgence that begin to create a new milieu, a new transactional reality that exists outside of the settler colonial structure of processes. This will not alleviate the broader violences that ‘Ōiwi and our ‘āina face, but it can change the ways we recognize ourselves, our ‘āina, and our pilina in ways that start to heal settler colonial attempts to eliminate, define, and confine our becoming and belonging. This chapter invites further research into the practice of māka‘ika‘i, and what kinds of realities we can create through practices grounded in ‘Ōiwi ‘ike, pilina, and mo‘olelo.

Conclusion

My grandfather passed away in October of 2018, in Tucson, Arizona. My family had a strained relationship with him; as a child my father and his siblings were subjected to a lot of the same trauma that was inflicted on my grandfather. Having grown up without the loving embrace of his family, of his ‘āina, my grandfather replicated what he knew about being a parent with his own children, which resulted in a lot of pained memories and experiences. This kind of intergenerational trauma is not unique to my ‘ohana, and is something experienced in a lot of ‘Ōiwi households. Being torn away from your ‘āina and ‘upena of pilina is a violent experience, one that disrupts our processes of becoming and influences how we find belonging. For a long time, I resented the fact that my grandfather did not do more to learn and perpetuate our culture. I felt like I was less-than, or not Hawaiian enough, because I was not born into a family that

already knew what it meant to be Hawaiian. While I respected and honored by father's decision to move home, I was insecure about what our journey of becoming meant for our belonging to this ʻāina and lāhui.

After my grandfather's passing, I began to look at his story with fresh eyes. Here was a man, like so many other ʻŌiwi, who was told throughout his life that he was not enough—not Hawaiian enough to belong to a Hawaiian family, not Chinese enough to belong to the Au's, not American enough to assimilate into white, mainstream society. In a world where our culture, language, religion, and overall ways of being are consumed, degraded, and misappropriated, the desire to hold closely that which we can still cling to makes sense. As Simpson (2017, 176-78) argues, however, encoding this fear of disappearance into our policies and modes of recognition allows settler colonialism to frame the issue –our vibrant and abundant relationalities become constrained by recognition and discourses of authenticity, all in an attempt to preserve that which has been biopolitically-produced as Indigenous. Simpson (2017, 177) thus prompts us to instead organize around the root of that fear, and allow it to generate what I will later term grounded and disruptive relationalities, rather than letting that fear contain our radical becoming within the confines of settler colonial politics of recognition. In other words, when we recognize the fear of disappearance as a product of the settler colonial politics of recognition, wherein Indigenous life is strategically produced in ways that expose defiant indigeneity to death, refusal becomes less about opposition and more focused on endless creation and abundant relationality. Rather than allowing the fear and pain of settler colonial attempts of erasure to limit ʻŌiwi forms of being and becoming to that which is deemed authentic or officially recognized, Simpson's discussion of fear allows us to recognize that our continued and diverse processes of being, becoming, and belonging pose the greatest threat to the maintenance of the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi.

In many ways, then, this dissertation is a theoretical intervention into the discourses we use to describe and understand who we are, and how we can relate as ʻŌiwi, to argue that when we refuse to limit our processes of becoming and belonging to those recognized by settler colonial relations of power, we create the conditions of possibility to build a reality inspired by our ancestors, informed by our presents, and which envisions a future wherein we thrive in mutual interdependence, or ea. ʻŌiwi have been allowing these processes to inform their being, becoming, and belonging for generations, and this dissertation should in no way be read in a way that discredits or disregards these various efforts. When it comes to translating these diverse ways of being into academic and legal discourses, however, they often go through the violence of translation, wherein the fullness and fluidity of these processes are lost or confined. Blood quantum discourse and legislation are one example that I explore in the pages that follow, and I also argue that reducing a settler-indigenous binary from a pedagogical tool to a set of identity politics reflects a similar violence of translation. Whereas our current identity politics and politics of recognition continue to encode fear into our membership, an understanding of fluid subjectivities informed by ʻŌiwi encounters with ʻāina creates the conditions of possibility for us to allow that fear to inspire endless becoming and relationality grounded in place. With this new becoming, we can stand firm in our positionalities and relationalities, protecting and perpetuating that which is in our ʻupena of pilina, while simultaneously allowing us to belong and grow with our ʻāina in new and emergent ways.

Chapter 2: (Re)membering Kaiaka as an Aliʻi and Wahi Pana

When I first learned that Kaiaka translates into shadowy sea I found it fitting, given its dark, murky appearance. Located in the Kamananui ahupuaʻa of the moku of Waialua, Kaiaka Bay is fed by the Kiʻikiʻi and Paukauila streams. Standing on the bridge overlooking the area where the two streams converge before flowing into Kaiaka, one sees an overgrowth of invasive species atop large mud flats where silt and sediment have covered what were once salt beds (Figure 3). The streams are flanked by clusters of mangroves and tall, dense stalks of California grass. The size of the streams themselves have changed over the years because of water being diverted for sugar cane crops that have long since disappeared. I am not sure where the water goes today, only that the dams stop the streams from flowing the way they used to. The brown water flows from the streams into Kaiaka, resulting in what I thought was its trademark shadowy sea. But these are not the shadows Kaiaka is named after.

Figure 3: The view of Kaiaka from where the Paukauila and Kiʻikiʻi streams meet

Generations before I came to know Kaiaka as a muddy bay in Waialua, lawaiʻa and kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai knew Kaiaka as a clear inlet where one could watch schools of fish create large, swift shadows that jutted back and forth under the water. Standing on Pōhaku Lānaʻi, kilo iʻa would watch for these shadows and, upon seeing them enter the bay, they would signal nearby kamaʻāina by banging the side of the pōhaku with a club. Together, kamaʻāina would either holoholo or hukilau, pulling those famous shadows from Kaiaka's embrace so that the community could be nourished. Looking out at the brown waters today, it would be impossible to see these large shadows of fish swarm the bay, assuming they still make their way into Kaiaka's waters like they used to.

There are other moʻolelo about Kaiaka, ones that tell us this wahi pana is so much more than what we see today. On the east end of the bay once stood Kapukapuākea, a large wooden heiau where Māʻilikūkahi and other mōʻī of Oʻahu were consecrated. This heiau is said to be connected to Taputapuātea in Tahiti, another large heiau situated in a similar location on Raʻiātea. Pōhaku Lānaʻi (Figure 4) also connects Kaiaka to broader Oceania. Made of a type of stone found nowhere else along the shore of Waialua, moʻolelo from kūpuna o ka ʻehu kai tell us that these pōhaku floated here from Kahiki. Samuel Manaiākalani Kamakau (1991, 81), a historian and scholar from nearby Mokulēʻia, Waialua, tells us that there is also a large hole in the reef of Kaiaka where devotees of Kamohoaliʻi used to commune with manō. His accounts show us that the pilina between kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai and the ocean was reciprocal—we harvested fish from the sea to nourish ourselves, and we had deep pilina with the sea and the beings within it that instructed us on how to respect and nourish the kai in return. These moʻolelo, passed down by Kamakau and other kūpuna o ka ʻehu kai, demonstrate that Kaiaka holds and signifies many pilina. Additionally, the moʻolelo of Hāmanalau, serialized by Joseph

Kānepuʻu in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* informs us of the specific pilina that Kaiaka has with Puaʻena, and sheds light on other wahi pana in Waialua.

Figure 4: Pōhaku Lānaʻi

In "He Moolelo no Hamanalau" (Kānepuʻu 1867-68) we learn about Kaiaka and Puaʻena as aliʻi, and Kaupakuhale as a wahi pana. Kānepuʻu (December 28, 1867, 1) tells us that Kaiaka was an aliʻi nui of Waialua whose parents were Hāwea, a wahine, and Kualele, a kane. Rather than living in the kula of Waialua, Hāwea and Kualele lived in seclusion at their home, Hale Kaupaku (Kānepuʻu December 28, 1867, 1). According to the information compiled in *Sites of Oʻahu* (Sterling and Summers 1978, 103-105), Kaupakuhale is a puʻu along the Waialua side of Kaʻala. Near Kaupakuhale is Onehana heiau, which is said to be associated with human sacrifice (Sterling and Summers 1978, 104). Kānepuʻu (December 28, 1867, 1) explains that Hāwea and

Kualele lived in solitude because of their “hana eepa, ano kilokilo, a wahawaha no hoi paha,” and later in the moʻolelo we learn that Hāwea and Kualele speak with ʻuhane and have practices that connect them to spirits and other beings. Although I do not know the exact nature of Onehana heiau or the hana ʻeʻepa and ʻano kilokilo that Hāwea and Kualele practiced, it is clear that Kaupakuhale is where their hale was, and that this wahi pana is a place where ʻuhane and spirits reside. More than just a puʻu along Kaʻala, Kaupakuhale is a place where poʻe o ka ʻehu kai could commune with those beings who visit us from the pō. “He Moolelo no Hamanalau” also teaches us that Puaʻena was “he kaikamahine maikai,” and that her coupling with Kaiaka was celebrated throughout Waialua (Kānepuʻu December 28, 1867, 1). Kaiaka and Puaʻena had two keiki, Hāmanalau, a kaikamahine, and Kaukanapōkiʻi, a keiki kāne, who were taken as hānai by Hāwea and go to live with her at Hale Kaupaku (Kānepuʻu December 28, 1867, 1). The moʻolelo goes on to describe the adventures of this ʻohana in both Waialua and Hawaiʻi island.

From this moʻolelo we learn that the sands between Puaʻena and Kaiaka are representative of their long and lasting love story, and that these sands were once called ke one loa o Māeaea (Kānepuʻu December 28, 1867, 1). Ke one loa o Māeaea keep Kaiaka and Puaʻena connected both to each other and this ʻāina long after they have passed, and these various moʻolelo remind us that Kaiaka is so much more than muddy water in the bay of a dry park. Kaiaka is the wahi pana where Māʻilikūkahi was made Mōʻī of Oʻahu; it is where lawaiʻa o ka ʻehu kai pulled shadows of fish from the sea to feed the poʻe of Waialua; it is the place where those with pilina to Kamohoaliʻi could connect with their akua and ʻaumākua; it is an aliʻi, whose pilina to Waialua is as old as Waialua itself.

This chapter examines how Kaiaka has been produced as a bay and park within Waialua instead of a wahi pana and aliʻi of this ʻāina, and its implications for settler colonial theory. How

have Kaiaka's identity and subjectivity changed over the years? What powers, processes, and encounters have altered the way that we interact with Kaiaka, and how does this impact how we engage with and build community with one another today as po'e o ka 'ehu kai? How did ancestral kama'āina o ka 'ehu kai recognize Kaiaka, and one another? What practices did our ancestors use to recognize one another and our specific pilina to 'āina, and how can these practices reveal places of weakness in the settler colonial structure that allow potential to shine through?

Settler Colonial Theory

For decades the transformation of the 'āina of Hawai'i and the separation of 'Ōiwi from 'āina have been analyzed using the lens of settler colonialism. From Haunani-Kay Trask's (1999) ground-breaking theorizing in *From a Native Daughter* to more recent iterations of settler colonial theory in Hawai'i by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura (2008), J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2008, 2018), Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua (2013), Stephanie Nohelani Teves (2018), Dean Itsuji Saranillio (2018a, 2018b), Leon No'eau Peralto (2018), and Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio (2021), scholars and activists have produced numerous articles and books dedicated to tracing and analyzing the various settler colonial processes and structures that continue to plague Hawai'i and those who have familial links to this pae 'āina, 'Ōiwi. Recognizing the similarities in processes of domination and occupation across Oceania, North America, and other settler colonial nation-states, Trask (1999, 25) writes that "[m]odern Hawai'i, like its colonial parent the United States, is a settler society; that is, Hawai'i is a society in which the indigenous culture and people have been murdered, suppressed, or marginalized for the benefit of settlers who now dominate our islands." This logic of elimination, as Patrick Wolfe

(2006) would later term it, manifests in a myriad of ways across Hawaiʻi and other settler colonial spaces. Today we see the attempted elimination of ʻŌiwi pilina and ways of becoming in blood quantum policies, compulsory education, land management, and forms of relationality and intimacy to name a few. Due to the exhaustive efforts of scholars who have come before me, the goal of this chapter is not to demonstrate the settler colonial processes at work in Hawaiʻi today. For a fuller account of these processes one can turn to the scholars listed above. This chapter investigates the conditions of possibility that (re)produce the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi, and begins to question what it means for ʻŌiwi to use an ʻŌiwi-defined and controlled practice to understand our pilina to ʻāina and one another in a colonial context. As I will demonstrate further below, there is a paradox in settler colonial scholarship that theorizes settler colonialism as an ongoing structure of processes, rather than a past event, yet frames settler and Indigenous subjectivities and identities as fact. Instead of viewing settler colonialism as an accomplished fact and utilizing settler colonial theory as a stand-alone analytic, I argue that biopolitical and Indigenous theory demonstrate where the settler colonial encounter is weak, and therefore less inevitable and controlling of who and what we can become.

Settler colonialism is generally theorized as an ongoing form of colonialism wherein Indigenous populations are eliminated—through outright death as well as metaphorical death via assimilation and dissolution of legal and territorial claims—and replaced by settler populations (Trask 1999, Wolfe 2006, Tuck and Yang 2012). While the overall structure of settler colonialism is geared towards elimination, I want to emphasize that its processes are dynamic and adapt to perpetuate the conditions of possibility that force it to persist. This home-making project is thus a structure of processes, rather than an event or accomplished fact, where land is encountered not as an ancestor, or a complex set of reciprocal relationships, but as a source of capital and

extraction that can be dominated for the benefit of settler populations. Alongside the production of land as nonlife (Povinelli 2016), ʻŌiwi processes of being and becoming in pilina with one another and ʻāina are reduced to static identities and subjectivities that, as I will demonstrate later in the chapter, work to (re)produce settler colonial relations rather than dismantle them.

One of the main contingencies for settler colonialism is land. Trask (2008, 6) demonstrates this throughout her scholarship on settler colonialism, and argues that "the citizenship of our Native people and the territory of our nation, that is, the land base of our archipelago, are the contested ground. *The struggle is not for a personal or group identity but for land, government, and international status as a recognized nation*" (emphasis my own). Wolfe (2006, 388) also demonstrates this in his scholarship, and argues that "[t]erritoriality is settler colonialism's specific, irreducible element." Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012, 5) elaborate on this when they argue that land is the most important concern for settler colonialism because "settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence." Adding to these scholars, I argue that transforming how we encounter ʻāina, like Kaiaka, from ancestor and aliʻi to public park and camp ground, is part of the violence caused by the disruption of ʻŌiwi pilina to place and is both a consequence of, and contingency for, the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi. I also demonstrate that the structure of process forcing the settler colonial encounter is not closed, nor is it overdetermined by structural imperatives to only control land. Rather, this fluid structure of processes adapts to maintain settler colonial relations of power and domination.

Scholars such as Trask (1999, 2008), Sally Engle Merry (2000), Fujikane and Okamura (2008), Kauanui (2008, 2018), Saranillio (2018), and Osorio (2021) have demonstrated that for

settler sovereignty and power to take hold in Hawaiʻi, ʻŌiwi pilina to ʻāina, including the political systems those pilina informed, had to be destroyed. This taking hold is perpetuated, in part, through the continued subjugation of these intimate and political pilina to ʻāina as invalid and/or outdated nature-worship. The settler colonial encounter does not allow for the deep pilina that ʻŌiwi have with ʻāina because it prevents ʻŌiwi from partaking in the colonial use of our ancestors and aliʻi as resources for capital extraction and territory to privatize. As Trask's (1999, 43) scholarship demonstrates, through processes of colonization questions of who defines what Native is, and who counts as Native, are taken away from Native peoples and instead placed into the realms of Western law and anthropology. Her analyses demonstrate that the occupation of Indigenous lands and waters is predicated on systematic and deliberate attempts to destroy Indigenous cultures and networks of relationality that connect Indigenous peoples to the land and produce understandings of identity and national belonging. Trask's work shows that a first and crucial step in processes of settler colonialism is diminishing the conditions that not only tie people to land, but which also produce grounded networks of kinship that inform Indigenous forms of becoming and belonging. When these grounded networks of kinship are eliminated or diminished, Kaiaka becomes a camp ground and beach park instead of an aliʻi and wahi pana.

Around 2005 or 2006 there was a group that wanted to turn Kaiaka into a dog park. My ʻohana and I have nothing against dog parks, and we love dogs. To this day I will take my dog on walks through Kaiaka. But when my father and a few other community members heard that a group wanted to designate and fence a large portion of what has already been dubbed a beach park into a place for dogs to run and kiʻo freely, they knew they had the kuleana to work with the broader community and share the moʻolelo of Kaiaka. When the group learned about Kaiaka (alongside a petition with over a thousand community signatures opposing them), they agreed

that it was not an appropriate location for a dog park and withdrew their plans. I wish stories like this were more common, but across Hawai‘i today we see rampant development over wahi pana and ancestors whose mo‘olelo are either unshared or unheard. This larger structure of eliminating Indigenous forms of relationality in an attempt to turn land into private property and capital, however, is not an accomplished fact. As I will demonstrate further in this chapter and throughout this dissertation, recognizing that the transformation of kanaka and ‘Ōiwi pilina to ‘āina is a contingency for the settler colonial encounter gives us the ability to disrupt settler colonial processes by producing a new encounter. This new encounter, I argue, has the potential to produce subjectivities that take us beyond the settler-Indigenous binary and the identities they inform.

The Settler-Indigenous Binary and Identity Politics

Trask uses the terms Native and Indigenous throughout her scholarship as a way of differentiating sovereignty claims in Hawai‘i while asserting historical and genealogical connections to ‘āina that exist in contrast to settler claims to sovereignty and “local” claims to place. Within the context of liberal multicultural discourses that position the state of Hawai‘i as a harmonious melting pot that engages in power sharing, Trask (2008, 47) demonstrates the importance of understanding the distinction between Indigenous and settler claims to place. While there are many populations in Hawai‘i who have faced the violence of white supremacy and U.S. imperialism, Trask (2008, 4) argues that “the ‘local’ identity tag blurs the history of Hawai‘i’s only indigenous people while staking a settler claim,” and that these populations need to recognize the ways they benefit from the structure and processes of settler colonialism in Hawai‘i as settlers of color. For Trask, “indigenous,” “settler” and “settler of color” thus become ways of distinguishing specific relationships to place and claims to land in Hawai‘i. Within

settler colonial studies, however, these terms are often deployed along a binary. Wolfe's (2006, 2013, 2016) scholarship, in particular, argues for the need to use a settler-indigenous binary in distinguishing claims to land and highlighting the logic of elimination aimed at Indigenous peoples.

Throughout Wolfe's (2006, 2016a, 2016b) writing on settler colonialism we see the use of a settler-indigenous binary. Wolfe describes settler colonialism as a structure, rather than an event, and this theorizing is useful in helping us understand settler colonialism as an ongoing phenomenon instead of a historical event that exists in the past. His insistence on the structural bifurcation between settlers and Natives, however, has the effect of positioning the settler colonial structure as an accomplished fact we must live with rather than a structure of processes that can be disrupted. Drawing on Beenash Jafri, Wolfe (2016b, 2) writes that "colonial subjectivities are inescapably bound up in the wider field of identity politics, ultimately in the intense classificatory contestation over positionality: who are the settlers, and where does that leave everyone else?" Wolfe (2016a, 2) names this as the "primary battleground for post frontier settler social relations" and argues that being Native is "structural and site-specific" (Wolfe 2016a, 3), therefore creating the conditions where colonized Natives can become settlers in different areas. While I agree that these larger structures of power are not easily escapable, I argue that investing too heavily in theorizing the structure of settler colonialism and the identity politics bound up with colonial subjectivities has the effect of framing the settler colonial structure as an accomplished fact. Herein lies a paradox of settler colonial studies: settler colonialism is theorized as a current reality, rather than a past event, but relies on a binary that structures static identities and subjectivities that perpetuate this current reality instead of building a different one. As I will explain in the next section, settler, Native, and Indigenous identities

and subjectivities can, and do, help us work through the complex relations of power and domination that affect our communities and ʻāina today. When these identities and subjectivities are put in a static binary, however, they start to reinforce the very structure of settler colonial processes they were meant to reveal and unravel.

Understanding one's positionality and relationships to power within a settler colonial encounter is crucial, and as I will argue further below, the settler-indigenous binary can help distinguish different positionalities and claims to place and power. But these subjectivities are not static. They are fluid, and grounded in place and complex relationality, which is why Trask frames and developed the settler-indigenous binary through a relational analysis. Erasing or subjugating these webs of relationality into settler and Indigenous identities limits the radical possibilities of becoming in place that allowed our kūpuna to thrive with one another, and which hold the potential to disrupt the settler colonial encounter. In this way, my critique of an identity politics predicated on the settler-indigenous binary is similar to critiques in Indigenous queer theory on the education of desire, and the role of colonial-produced subjectivities in shaping how Indigenous peoples recognize themselves and one another.

In response to the ways that dominant ideologies like heteropatriarchy, heteropaternalism, capitalism, and settler homonationalism work to interpellate Indigenous peoples as settler colonial subjects who perform colonial gender and sexual expressions, scholars such as Qwo-li Driskill (2010), Andrea Smith (2011), and Teves (2018) put forth the idea of disidentification. Recognizing the way queer counterhegemonic discourses and movements can be co-opted by the nation-state to maintain processes of settler colonialism and oppression over Indigenous bodies and lands, Driskill (2010, 79) argues that Indigenous peoples need to disidentify from these interventions and instead create and rework movements that are viable for Indigenous

communities. In this way, Indigenous and two-spirit people and communities become centralized through disidentification, thus pointing towards the need for decolonization (Driskill 2010, 79). Smith (2011, 56) adds to these ideas by asserting that disidentification and decolonization together provide a theoretical apparatus through which Indigenous peoples can engage with multiple strategies and solidarities across and against the nation-state. Engaging with multiple and varied solidarities and strategies against the nation-state forces us to recognize how we have all been marked by colonialism, and in that vein, how we are all entangled through colonialism (Smith 2011, 56). Recognizing this entanglement allows for flexibility and multiplicity in alliance work, while also challenging the idea that settler colonialism always already hails individuals as colonial subjects. Teves' (2018, 81) work demonstrates that disidentification is an example of when interpellation fails, thus making possible the creation of something else. Interpellation fails when individuals do not recognize the hail and therefore do not perform as ideological subjects. In this way, Teves (2018, 81) asserts that disidentification works against dominant ideologies by failing to perpetuate them through performance. Without the limits of heteropatriarchal and heteropaternal ideologies, performances can function as a process of world-making, wherein performances create knowledge and subjectivities through action rather than searching for subjects that exist a priori (Teves 2018, 15). Here we can see that one of the main critiques being put forth in these discussions on disidentification is a rejection of current identification politics and the processes of normalization they carry.

Tim Dean (2009, 21) explains throughout his work that identification politics are grounded in recognition, i.e. the recognition of an ideal image. Identification politics work to produce a normative, ideal image of what a subject looks like and how they perform. Dean (2009, 21) argues that this creates an imaginary dialectic which "locks us into a struggle over

identification, a perpetual fight to distinguish desirable images with which one wishes to identify from those in which one refuses to recognize him-or herself." Scott Lauria Morgensen (2010) explains that these images and the willingness to recognize oneself in them is a product of the education of desire used to regulate and discipline individuals into colonial subjects. For Indigenous peoples, these images usually place Indigenous bodies and sovereignties in some kind of culturally authentic past, while images of progress depict a white, heteropatriarchal citizen subject embedded in the nuclear family and nation-state. Through these images and ideologies, Indigenous peoples are called to desire a culturally pure past and a white settler futurity.

Queer Indigenous studies challenge these colonial desires and the images they are based on by instead providing queer and two-spirit critiques of homonationalism and heteronormativity that allow for fluid and dynamic becoming rather than a static or pre-defined alignment with an ideal image of self. Similarly, this dissertation takes seriously the production of subjectivities and identities, and the fluidity of their performances, and rejects attempts to contain these processes of becoming into pre-defined identities that work to maintain settler colonial futurity in Hawaiʻi. Allowing the settler-indigenous binary to confine how we perform and who we can become to static settler and Indigenous identities and subjectivities ensures that settler and Indigenous relations of power persist into the future, and attempts to eliminate the relational analysis Trask used to contextualize and explain the settler-indigenous binary in her theorizing.

The Settler-Indigenous Binary as a Pharmakon

While Trask, at times, engages with this binary, she also recognizes that colonial domination relies on a myriad of binary oppositions and modes of domination. The settler-indigenous binary, in this context, emerges as a way of differentiating not only sovereignty

claims, but also relations to power so as to better understand history and form solidarities based on dismantling oppression (Trask 2004, 9). Without naturalizing what it means to be Indigenous or Hawaiian, Trask uses these terms to bring forth the blunt reality that colonialism produces subjectivities in strategic ways that mask overlapping oppressions and replicate colonial power. To ignore these competing productions of subjectivity in favor of asserting a singular, unified human race or nation neglects various histories of dispossession and domination in favor of racially and biologically produced forms of subjectivity used to maintain relations of domination (Trask 2004, 15). As Saranillio (2018, 16) explains, Trask's use of a settler-indigenous binary, as well as her scholarship on Asian settler colonialism and settlers of color, pushes us to think of identities and subjectivities as pedagogies that offer insight into the histories, places, and processes which have shaped our becoming thus far. Indeed, Saranillio (2018b, 37) argues that this demonstrates not a binary analysis by Trask, but instead a relational analysis that requires us to examine processes of settler colonialism that maintain various forms of oppression on Indigenous lands. Within this frame, Saranillio (2018, 37) argues that "Trask's use of the term *settlers of color*, in fact, challenges an either/or analysis where one is either oppressed or oppressive, revealing how such framings allow for what Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang critique as an ever constant 'settler move to innocence.'" I agree with Saranillio and argue that within settler colonial studies, some scholars have transformed Trask's theorizing into what Achille Mbembe (2019, 2) calls a pharmakon—a medicine that acts as both a remedy and a poison at the same time.

As a kind of theoretical remedy to settler colonial scholarship, Trask's relational analysis provides a way of unpacking entangled positionalities and oppressions to make room for ʻŌiwi to assert specific, genealogical claims to Hawaiʻi as both a nation-state and an ancestor. Working

through these entanglements does not result in static identities and subjectivities that exist within a binary. Rather, the pedagogies embedded in these subjectivities and identities are meant to spur a reflection on one's everyday actions and the systems of power and oppression we complicitly and explicitly uphold. Trask (2008, 21) states clearly that for "non-Natives, the question that needs to be answered every day is simply the one posed in the old union song, 'which side are you on?'" Instead of asking positivist questions about who is or is not a settler, Trask's relational analysis of settler colonialism pushes us to think through the processes and conditions of possibility that maintain the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi. Within this theorizing is the radical possibility of becoming something more than a settler. This is not about becoming Indigenous, or Hawaiian at heart, but about becoming what I term poʻe aloha ʻāina—people deeply in love with the ʻāina and ʻŌiwi of Hawaiʻi, people who are dedicated to and protect this place not because it is their property, or source of capital or sovereignty, but because they have a profound aloha for this ʻāina and all the webs of relationality it nurtures. Settler colonial studies and its use of a settler-indigenous binary seem to foreclose these possibilities of becoming by engaging in identity politics and treating settler colonialism as an accomplished fact rather than a fact-to-be-accomplished. In this way, Trask's theorizing becomes a sort of pharmakon—the relational analysis that once shed light on processes of settler colonialism and the possibilities of becoming something more is reduced to a binary that confines this becoming to an identity politics and facilitates moves to innocence that perpetuate the structure of settler colonialism as something we cannot escape.

Fujikane's (2021) recent work in *Mapping Abundance for a Planetary Future: Kanaka Maoli and Critical Settler Cartographies in Hawaiʻi*, as well as the response she received for her use of the term "settler aloha ʻāina," demonstrate the limits of the settler-indigenous binary, as

well as moments where the colonial structure is still shaping and influencing what is meant to be a more fluid and decolonial politics. In *Mapping Abundance,* Fujikane explores the ways that mapping ʻāina through huakaʻi and experiences on ʻāina can change how we relate to, understand, and protect the lands and waters that we live on today. Through her analysis and alongside dialogue with ʻŌiwi scholar and activist Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, she coins the term "settler aloha ʻāina" to acknowledge that settlers can also practice aloha ʻāina, but that "aloha ʻāina for settlers must be informed by an understanding of settler positionalities and access to privilege under the operations of both occupation and settler colonialism" (Fujikane 2021, 12). Settler aloha ʻāina, therefore, recognizes settler agency in processes that maintain the settler colonial encounter, and attempts to offer a route through which settlers dedicated to the lāhui can identify in ways that recognize their unique positionality. This leads Fujikane (2021, 14) to call herself a "Japanese settler ally or settler aloha ʻāina" as a way to ground her identity and work in the ever-present reality that she is a settler in Hawaiʻi, albeit one who is working on cultivating a decolonial future. As she argues, the "descriptor 'settler' roots us in the settler colonialism that we seek to dismantle so that we never lose sight of those conditions or the privileges we derive from them" (Fujikane 2021, 14).

In response to this term, Fujikane faced criticism from ʻŌiwi, some claiming that this term comes from a settler desire to co-opt ʻŌiwi culture and attempts to appropriate a distinctly ʻŌiwi ethic and practice (personal communication, 2023). Fujikane has since stopped identifying as a settler aloha ʻāina, and instead refers to herself as a settler ally. Fujikane's use of the term settler aloha ʻāina, as well as the response she received for theorizing this subjectivity, strikes me for two reasons. First, it demonstrates the extent to which a settler-indigenous binary has confined our understandings of who we can become and how we can belong within pre-

determined notions of settler and Indigenous identities and subjectivities. Second, ʻŌiwi resistance to this term, specifically allegations that striving to become something more than a settler is always already rooted in settler desires to appropriate culture and make moves to innocence, reveals the ways that the colonial structure attempts to shape and infiltrate Indigenous politics that claim to be fluid and decolonial. Indeed, if we look at the settler-indigenous binary and the identities and subjectivities it produces through the practice of mākaʻikaʻi, these seemingly static identities and relations of power are actually fluid, and dependent upon one's particular pilina, kuleana, and genealogy.

As I will demonstrate in this dissertation, acting according to our kuleana to ʻāina and community, as informed by our pilina and aloha for ʻāina, is a transformative process that has the potential to produce subjects that exist outside of the settler-indigenous binary. The pilina and kuleana that come with embracing aloha ʻāina allow ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike to become kamaʻāina and poʻe aloha ʻāina, and Fujikane's embodiment of aloha ʻāina through her scholarship and activism makes her, in my theorizing, something other than a settler, something more than an ally. She is someone who has committed her time to learning ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi and the moʻolelo of these pae ʻāina; her activist work and scholarship have been dedicated to protecting ʻāina and ensuring ʻŌiwi have access to our ʻāina, and this work has been shaped through dialogue and pilina with ʻŌiwi scholars and activists, including Trask. She is, by all means, an aloha ʻāina. Of course, positionality matters, and while I understand her reasoning for maintaining a settler identity, I think settler aloha ʻāina does not allow us to take seriously the potential that aloha ʻāina has to create new subjectivities and relations of power, to take us beyond the settler-indigenous binary and the pre-defined identities and performances it coerces. As I will demonstrate in the following chapters, the practice of mākaʻikaʻi shows that this binary

and the identities it produces attempt to contain fluid subjectivities produced by pilina to ʻāina and community. I argue that if settlers can be made, as an analytic of biopolitics demonstrates, then they can be unmade as well, and I posit that aloha ʻāina informed by mākaʻikaʻi has the power to facilitate that process. Allowing ourselves and our pilina to be shaped by our encounters with ʻāina reveals a weak spot in the structure of settler colonialism, and opens a door for us to imagine, and enact, what our relations and subjectivities might look like outside of settler colonial modes of domination.

If settler colonialism is a structure of processes where settlers encounter land as private capital and attempt to eliminate Indigenous bodies, politics, and pilina to replace them with settler sovereignty, then there are "no good settlers; there are no good colonizers" (Snelgrove, Dhamoon, and Corntassel 2014, 5). But the settler colonial encounter is not the only way newcomers have encountered land, not the only way newcomers *can* encounter land, and a binary analysis of settler colonialism that positions one as either settler or Indigenous does not leave room for those who encounter ʻāina differently. Mākaʻikaʻi, as I will demonstrate further in the next chapter, help to facilitate these different kinds of encounters with ʻāina by enacting a form of knowledge-production and pilina building that are not grounded in colonial ideologies and desires regarding land, humanity, and subjectivity. Rather than confining who we can become and how we can belong within the binary of settler and Indigenous, mākaʻikaʻi create the space for us to think through these subjectivities, how they encourage us to perform, what structures they coerce us to maintain, and what possibilities might await us if we take seriously the transformative power of aloha ʻāina. This is not a way for settlers to fulfill their desires to become Native, nor do mākaʻikaʻi present a way for settlers to co-opt ʻŌiwi culture and practices. Rather, mākaʻikaʻi are a distinctly ʻŌiwi way of thinking through difference and

forming pilina with others to enact a type of becoming that is grounded in ʻāina, kuleana, and genealogy—a becoming that cannot be circumscribed by settler or Indigenous identities. The rest of the dissertation therefore asks, what does it mean to use an ʻŌiwi-defined practice that settlers cannot control to understand, recognize, and act according to our relations to place and one another? What happens when we think through this in the colonial context, where settler and Indigenous relations and identities are produced to maintain colonial power?

Again, the goal here is not to create "good" settlers, or provide settlers with moves to innocence (Tuck and Yang 2012). I want to transform settlers in Hawaiʻi into poʻe aloha ʻāina—those who cannot fathom privatizing or extracting capital from someone's ancestors; those who learn from and are in reciprocal pilina with the ʻŌiwi of the places they call home; those who see and recognize Kaiaka as an aliʻi rather than a dog park. Moving away from positivist questions over identity, Saranillio (2018a, 2018b) and scholars such as Corey Snelgrove, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel (2014) argue that questions over action and relationality are more fruitful than questions over who is or is not a settler. As Saranillio (2018b, 4) asserts, "positivist discussions over who is and is not a 'settler' often dissolve into arguments where one cites one's oppression like a badge of honor to shield oneself from having to contend with settler colonialism." Engaging in identity politics and understanding settler colonialism through a binary analysis that creates Indigenous and settler subjectivities as always already existing thus creates more entanglement and prevents alternative forms of relationality from taking hold. Understanding settler colonialism through a philosophy of materialism and analytic of biopolitics, however, reduces the risk of what Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein (2016, 2017) call "colonial unknowing" by encouraging us to investigate the specific conditions of possibility and complex entanglements of people and power that force

settler colonial encounters to persist in certain places. Mākaʻikaʻi, as I will demonstrate throughout this dissertation, help facilitate a different kind of encounter with ʻāina—an encounter predicated on learning and thinking critically about one's pilina and kuleana to place, and that takes seriously the production of subjectivities and relations of power. Putting settler colonial studies in conversation with an analytic of biopolitics highlights the production of settler and native subjectivities, relations of power, and the norms used to coerce and maintain settler colonial domination. By focusing on the production of settler and Indigenous subjectivities and norms, an analytic of biopolitics allows us to interrogate how these subjectivities are produced, and where there are areas of weakness in the settler colonial structure.

Biopower and an Analytic of Biopolitics

Michel Foucault's method for theorizing biopolitics, as well as his various writings on the subject, are central to developing my understanding of biopolitics as an analytic more than just a concept, and demonstrate a focus on contingencies and conditions of possibility, which are necessitated by the philosophy of encounter. In its most basic description, biopower is the power to make live and let die—an adaptation of the sovereign power to kill, or produce death (Foucault 2003, 241). Foucault's theorizing on biopolitics and biopower traces the ways "life" emerged as a center of political strategies, and analyzes how historically situated political practices continue to shape our understandings of life today (Morar and Koopman 2012). That is not to say that biopower replaces juridical, disciplinary, or sovereign power. Rather, life and subjectivity are created and governed within these various dispositifs of power. This has led scholars such as Thomas Lemke (2011), Nicolae Morar (2012), Colin Koopman and Tomas Matza (2013), and Catherine Mills (2018) to argue against understanding biopower and biopolitics as a totalizing or universal theory of power. Relying on Foucault's work and

analyzing his method, these scholars argue that biopolitics is a field of inquiry (Morar and Koopman 2012), and that inquiries based on Foucault's work must attend to questions of emergence, particularity, and historicity (Koopman and Matza 2013, 821). Understanding life, and the governance of that life, through a dispositif of biopolitics conceptualized as emergent necessitates a grounded analysis of biopolitics rather than universal applications of biopower. These grounded analyses on the specific and strategic productions of life reveal the ways that a dispositif of biopower works to perpetuate the conditions of possibility for settler colonial relations of domination that maintain the settler colonial encounter. Using an analytic of biopolitics reveals that settler and Indigenous life and subjectivities are key elements and contingencies that allow for the continuous taking-hold of settler colonialism.

Foucault deploys a genealogical method to demonstrate the ways that seemingly accomplished structures, like the state, are in fact born from and contingent upon racialized subjectivities and relations of power. The philosophy of encounter maintains that encounters are aleatory yet can be forced to last due a constancy of external constraints (Althusser 2006, 185). Foucault's analysis shows us that biopolitically-produced and racialized populations are key elements that allow the state to force its encounter and mask not only its violent relationships of domination, but also the ways that the subjectivities that perpetuate these relationships are actively and strategically produced. The continued productions of these populations, as well as their governance, creates the conditions where these forms of life and subjectivity are understood as always already present, rather than created by, acted upon, and able to act upon the state. Similarly, the continued representation of settler and Indigenous subjectivities as always already existing in an accomplished settler colonial structure obscures the ways they are actively created by, and able to act upon, settler colonial encounters and processes.

The utility of Foucault and his analysis of biopolitics thus lies in its ability to help us think through the taking-hold of life and related subjectivities as conditions of possibility for maintaining relations of power, including settler colonial domination. Lemke's (2011) theorizing of biopolitics as an analytic, as well as Mill's (2018) use of biopower as an analytic of power, further illustrate the ways that theorizing the taking-hold of life and subjectivity can disrupt the contingencies that force the settler colonial encounter to last. Lemke (2011, 125) introduces his analytic of biopower as a problematizing and creative task that destabilizes "natural" and self-evident modes of practice and thought, and invites us to live differently. This analytic offers a way of perceiving and investigating the network of relations among power processes, knowledge practices, and modes of subjectivation (Lemke 2011, 119). Lemke (2011, 122) argues that biopolitical phenomena must be grounded in social practices and decision-making, and that biopolitical processes do not follow a necessary logic but instead are subject to specific and contingent relationalities and incorporate institutional preferences and normative choices. Lemke's call for grounded investigations into the contingencies and relationships that inform and influence biopolitical productions of life and subjectivity demonstrate that an analytic of biopolitics investigates life and subjectivity as facts in formation rather than treating them as accomplished facts to which a politics of life is applied.

Instead of starting with the whole, or the accomplished fact of *bios,* an analytic of biopolitics conducts a critical inquiry into the relationships of power and forms of knowledge influencing the production, politicization, and management of life and subjectivity in specific contexts. In the settler colonial context, for example, an analytic of biopolitics does not start with the accomplished fact of settler colonialism, but rather necessitates a critical inquiry into the relations of power and forms of knowledge producing, politicizing, and managing settler and

Indigenous subjectivities. Better understanding the production of these subjectivities and the way they force the settler colonial encounter to continue allows for the possibility of creating new subjectivities produced from different encounters with ʻāina. These subjectivities demonstrate a weakness in the structure of settler colonialism. Rather than always already having settler and Indigenous subjectivities to maintain settler domination and relations of power, an analytic of biopolitics demonstrates that settler colonialism relies on subjects performing according to prescribed norms, and as I will demonstrate in chapter four, not following these norms has the potential to weaken the state, even if momentarily.

Similarly, Mills (2018, 22) suggests that biopower is best understood as offering an analytic of power. This analytic makes clear that power is positive and productive, and that power is always relational (Mills 2018, 24-25). Theorizing power as positive and productive necessitates that we question the means by which subjects are brought into existence as a counterpart of power, rather than presuming their existence as subjects with natural rights in relations of domination (Mills 2018, 24). Mills (2018, 25) writes that, "[p]ower does not repress subjects, it produces them," thus revealing that the subject does not always already exist as a political form of life—it is actively and strategically produced within a power relation. This leads us back to the aleatory nature of the encounter that Althusser introduces us to. Subjects do not exist a priori—they are created by relations of power that reflect a lasting aleatory encounter. Althusser (2006, 200) asserts that the whole that results from the taking continuously reproduces its own elements to perpetuate its conditions of possibility. Power—or dispositifs of power such as biopower—therefore produce subjectivities who are coerced and formed in strategic ways to (re)produce power's conditions of possibility. Thus, subjects are produced through relations of power in ways that maintain and perpetuate the forms of power that influence subject formation

in the first place. The taking-hold of the subject, including the ethics and norms through which subjects regulate themselves and others, influences which relations of power are maintained. In the settler colonial context, settler and Indigenous subjectivities do not exist a priori—rather, they are created through relations of power and domination instantiated by settler colonial encounters with land as a resource for extraction, privatization, and capital. A key part of what an analytic of biopolitics reveals, therefore, is that the production and governance of "life" and subjectivities are conditions of possibility that contribute to the maintenance of seemingly accomplished structures like the state, and the settler colonial encounter.

In addition to land, I argue, the settler colonial encounter is contingent upon the continued production and management of settler and Indigenous subjectivities. If settler colonial relations of power are premised on the domination of Indigenous sovereignties and subjectivities by settler sovereignties and subjectivities, as I have been demonstrating, then one contingency of the settler colonial encounter is the continued production of settler and Indigenous subjects. As Merry (2000), Kauanui (2008, 2018), Marjo Lindroth and Heidi Sinevaara-Niskanen (2014, 2016), and Teves (2018) demonstrate, settler colonial processes can, and do, foster certain forms of Native and Indigenous subjectivity so long as they are (re)produced in ways that allow for the continuation of settler colonialism. Merry (2000) and Kauanui's (2008, 2018) works trace the ways that ʻŌiwi first became moral Christian subjects, and then civilized Native subjects defined by blood quantum and governed by settler colonial governmentality. In both cases, complex and fluid ʻŌiwi webs of relationality were translated into subjectivities that fulfilled foreign ambitions and expectations. Blood quantum, in particular, proved especially effective in creating a form of Native subjectivity that aids in perpetuating the settler colonial encounter by producing

a quantifiable and dilutable subject whose elimination allows for the continued acquisition of land for settler home-making.

A core element in blood quantum logic is the belief, and wish, that indigeneity will be diminished over time, eventually creating the conditions where ʻŌiwi subject formations and claims to lands are eliminated completely. This logic helps to maintain the legitimacy of the settler colonial encounter, and in the context of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA) of 1921, blood quantum was created alongside wealthy sugar plantation owners' attempts to retain leases over agricultural lands that were set to expire (Kauanui 2008, 69). These competing desires for land—lands for homesteading by dispossessed ʻŌiwi, and lands for the continued profitable production of agriculture—were intertwined in the HHCA and created the conditions for ʻŌiwi to be discursively positioned as a dying-out, endangered subjectivity whose becoming is confined and whose being is premised on the continuation of the settler colonial encounter. At the same time, a separate subjectivity was produced that was figured as assimilable and not in need of rehabilitation, thus creating conditions where majority of the ʻŌiwi lāhui at the time were biopolitically produced in ways that let their claims to Native subjectivity die. This was not a literal death of course, but the metaphorical death of claims to sovereignty and Native belonging that manifests in material ways through the dissolution of land claims.

Through an analytic of biopolitics we see that subjects are produced within relations of power in ways that may tend to maintain those relations of power. The HHCA, as well as the colonization of Hawaiʻi, produced Native subjects recognizable through Euro-American, Christian ethics and norms concerning civilized life and society. A Native Hawaiian subjectivity defined by blood quantum, therefore, maintains settler colonial relations of power by running around what Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017, 178) calls a "hamsterwheel of settler

colonial recognition" wherein the Native subject is defined by and seeks recognition from settler colonial powers. In the process of seeking recognition from these powers, the Native subject reaffirms and perpetuates the structure of processes that produces the Native subject as one defined by blood quantum. This not only positions the structure of settler colonialism as an accomplished fact, it also discursively produces the Native as something that always already exists, masking the subject's ability to act upon and disrupt the very structure that informs it. This production of Native subjectivity also creates the conditions for settlers to acquire more Native land by limiting who, and what, can be considered Native. Through the HHCA, we see how Native subjectivities are produced alongside foreign attempts to acquire land and perpetuate the settler colonial encounter. Rather than allowing for the continuation of ʻŌiwi flourishing and becoming, the settler colonial encounter is contingent upon producing a Native subjectivity that conforms to Euro-American norms and ethics, and does not disrupt the conditions of possibility forcing the encounter to last. This is not meant to be a critique of those living on lands acquired through the HHCA, nor should this line of thinking be used to dismiss ʻŌiwi today as too removed from our ancestral dispositifs to engage in and perpetuate our practices, beliefs, language, and attachments to ʻāina. Rather, this shows how biopolitical productions of Native subjectivity in Hawaiʻi attempt to translate complex webs of relationality into fixed, racialized subjectivities that can be captured, contained, and controlled according to relations of power that perpetuate the settler colonial encounter.

Lindroth and Sinevaara-Niskanen (2014, 2016) argue along similar lines when they theorize the intricate ways that biopolitics exerts its "loving embrace" on specific productions of Indigenous subjectivity to perpetuate settler colonial relations of domination at the level of international politics. While early colonial encounters rely on the biopolitical production of

populations to aid in the exertion of colonial discipline over specific bodies, current forms of biopower operate in more intricate and subtle ways (Lindroth and Sinevaara-Niskanen 2016, 131). These scholars argue that the right to participate in international forums and politics is premised on specific expectations of Indigenous subjectivity. This creates the conditions wherein certain features of indigeneity are valorized and used to grant entry into the milieu of colonial rule while other aspects of Indigenous subjectivity that are considered counterproductive are suppressed or neutralized so as to no longer threaten the project of nation-state sovereignty (Lindroth & Sinevaara-Niskanen 2014, 183). In this way, indigeneity and Indigenous participation in international politics are premised on the production and regulation of Indigenous subjectivities in ways that do not challenge the contingencies of the settler colonial encounter. These subjectivities are lovingly embraced by the state and fostered to be cared to death through vigilant state control and manipulation, while failure to perform according to these expectations results in exposure to death through discourses of assimilation and authenticity.

These legal definitions and discourses about Indigenous subjectivity create norms and ethics that influence how this subjectivity can perform, and this performance is constrained in ways that perpetuate the continuation of the settler colonial encounter. Teves (2018) theorizes along these lines in *Defiant Indigeneity: The Politics of Hawaiian Performance*, where she argues that ideological state apparatuses hail ʻŌiwi to perform in specific ways in order to be seen as authentically Hawaiian. Teves (2018, 26) argues that Hawaiʻi, the "Aloha State," relies on a specific conception of aloha to interpellate Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian residents into becoming subjects who perform in kind, loving, non-confrontational ways. For ʻŌiwi, this interpellation and performance of aloha is mandated for our Indigenous subjectivity to be recognized as authentic, and through repetition over time this performance becomes naturalized

as the norm. I agree with Teves when she critiques naturalized performances of indigeneity by asserting that what we code as Indigenous is created under the violences of the colonial encounter, and argue that, in addition to being able to produce defiant forms of indigeneity that disrupt "pure" Indigenous subjectivities, grounded pilina to people and place can produce subjectivities that disrupt always already settler subjectivities.

Defiant indigeneity can be understood as an amorphous performance that challenges settler colonialism and settler colonial recognition, while also defying the elimination of the Native (Teves 2018, 11). Defiant indigeneity, therefore, allows ʻŌiwi performances to "create, modify, alter, and revive practices or to make completely new ones out of a reverence for … culture while also critiquing the need to perform a pure indigeneity" (Teves 2018, 10). Teves demonstrates that radical avenues of being, becoming, and belonging are opened when the focus shifts from static, pre-determined Indigenous identities to analyses of, and struggles over, performances that create Indigenous being and belonging through action. Teves provides an understanding of the subject as always already in the process of becoming through its constant actions and doings, i.e., performances. This focus on action rather than identity allows for more fluidity in our becoming, and I argue that settler subjects also have the ability to become and belong in ways that defy and disrupt the settler colonial encounter. This is not to say that settlers can magically shed their unique privileges and positions in a settler colonial structure, and therein lie the limits of this theorizing. Settlers changing their everyday actions and relations to ʻŌiwi and ʻāina will not immediately change the larger structures of power that perpetuate violent relations of exploitation and extraction in Hawaiʻi. They can, however, use their agency to work with the genealogical descendants of the places they call home to create alternative encounters with ʻāina and culture that inform and are informed by relations of power that do not

mimic or perpetuate settler colonial domination. Focusing on action and relationality allows us to shift the temporality of settler colonialism, understanding it not as an accomplished structure but one that is contingent upon specific processes and relations of power that can be disrupted.

Our kūpuna recognized that action and relationality produce radical forms of becoming and belonging, which is why they continued to share moʻolelo aloha ʻāina and deploy what Noenoe Silva (2017) calls moʻokūʻauhau consciousness when the settler colonial encounter was first taking hold in Hawaiʻi. Silva (2017) demonstrates in *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History*, that ʻŌiwi of the 19th and 20th century were committed to passing down knowledge about places, histories, stories, peoples, and more through moʻolelo that were submitted to the newspapers. She names this forethought and commitment to future generations moʻokūʻauhau consciousness, and argues that ʻŌiwi who wrote these moʻolelo for the newspapers were drawing on and recording ancestral knowledge so that present and future generations could have access to and benefit from this ʻike (Silva 2017, 6). These authors did the meticulous work of recording moʻolelo in detail because they understood that our subjectivities as ʻŌiwi and poʻe aloha ʻāina are fluid, yet grounded in our aloha for and pilina to place. The moʻolelo passed down in the nūpepa and through the mouths of kūpuna emphasized not only our diverse and intimate pilina with ʻāina, but also the specific kuleana that gives us as ʻŌiwi and poʻe aloha ʻāina of these wahi pana. Peralto (2018, 111) calls moʻolelo aloha ʻāina the seeds that grow grounded normativities and ʻŌiwi relationalities. These seeds also grow poʻe aloha ʻāina and inform ʻŌiwi becoming in ways that disrupt the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi.

Glen Coulthard and Simpson develop the idea of grounded normativity in their respective theorizing on the politics of recognition within the settler colonial nation-state. Coulthard (2014,

60) explains that grounded normativity is an ethical framework provided by place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge, and Simpson (2017, 23) builds on this when she writes that, "[g]rounded normativity isn't a thing; it is generated structure born and maintained from deep engagement with Indigenous processes that are inherently physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual." These generated structures give us alternative ways of recognizing and producing subjectivity and relationality that are routed through and rooted in place. Rather than continuing to conduct ourselves as subject produced through and productive of the settler colonial encounter, grounded normativity asks us to generate place-based processes of becoming that reflect our diverse, abundant relationalities and kuleana therein. Drawing on queer theory, Jodi Byrd (2020, 117) adds to this discussion by questioning what happens to queerness when normativity is no longer something to be critiqued, but something to be championed as it is through theories of grounded normativity.

Within queer theory, the normative is shorthand for the hegemonic power and biopolitics embedded in structures of white supremacist heteropatriarchy that draw lines of distinction between what is normal or natural, and what is deviant or aberrant (Byrd 2020, 114). Similarly, within biopolitical theory, law and legality are increasingly entangled with norms that regulate and distinguish between productions of subjects that should be made to live and those forms of abnormal subjectivity that can be exposed to death. Indeed, Foucault (2003, 256) asserts that when you have a normalizing society, you have biopower. Byrd (2020, 119) recognizes that norms, as statistical categories that work towards leveling differences towards a mean, rely on assuming and forcing into relation connections that might not otherwise exist, and instead argues for the development of grounded *relationality* as a framework that provides space for queerness without attempting to incorporate it into a norm. Building on Coulthard and Simpson, Byrd

(2020, 119) argues that definitions of grounded normativity resonate with and draw from existing definitions of relationality, and asserts that grounded relationality opens broader possibilities for decolonial theorizing than the continued use of norms and normativities that risk reproducing the conditions of possibility that have led to current biopolitical productions of subjectivity. In this way, Byrd (2020, 118) calls on Indigenous studies scholars to avoid subsuming queerness into the always already normal of Indigenous life and being, and asks what possibilities emerge when the normative is resisted and refused. I agree with Byrd's analysis on the normative and argue that this attention to normativity is necessitated not only by queer theory, but also an analytic of biopolitics. In this dissertation I aim to demonstrate that grounded and disruptive relationalities resist normativity and disrupt the contingencies that force the settler colonial encounter by producing fluid subjectivities informed by specific, intimate pilina with the places and people we call home.

Rene Dietrich (2017, 2018) develops his theory of disruptive relationality through an analysis of the ways that the colonial biopolitical order excludes land from the sphere of political life. As I have been arguing, within settler colonial contexts biopolitical logics work to delegitimize place-based politics of relationality by positioning intimate connections and relations with non-human others as illegible to a nation-state politics of recognition. Indeed, Dietrich (2018, 3) demonstrates throughout his scholarship that a key part of biopolitics in settler colonial contexts is establishing the Euro-American political order and its productions of life as intimately linked to a natural and inherent course of humanity. Disruptive relationalities challenge the transactional reality that positions political life as reserved for a subjectivity that is separated from nature by providing a framework for acknowledging and centering an abundance of relationships within a politics of relationality that positions distinctions between *bios* and *zoe*

as irrelevant (Dietrich 2017, 71). Using Dietrich's analysis on disruptive relationalities, we can see that centering and grounding our pilina with ʻāina and the descendants of those ʻāina in our processes of becoming disrupts the conditions of possibility that force the settler colonial encounter by producing alternative, fluid subjectivities that do not conform to settler colonial norms or replicate settler colonial relations of power. The cultivation of these relationships is not just a one-off, nor can it be abstracted from place and universalized. Simpson's (2017, 19-23) scholarship emphasizes that the gift is in the making—Indigenous world-making is a continuous process and constant struggle. There is no end-goal, no ideal image we are attempting to conform to. Grounded, disruptive relationalities remind us that we become poʻe aloha ʻāina through our actions, that the possibility and diversity held within our relations is our greatest treasure (Osorio 2021, xxiii). For ʻŌiwi, then, grounded and disruptive relationalities ask us to attend to our ʻupena of pilina and the various kuleana they hold. Mākaʻikaʻi, as I will show in the next chapter, help make the knots of our ʻupena known while creating the space to tie in new pilina, and work through our understandings of the kuleana our ʻupena hold.

ʻŌiwi Theory and Resurgence

Osorio (2021) reveals the ea and abundance that comes from (re)membering and attending to our ʻupena of pilina in her book *Remembering Our Intimacies: Moʻolelo, Aloha ʻĀina, and Ea.* Osorio's analysis of various mana of the moʻolelo o Hiʻiaka demonstrates the particular and embodied nature of kuleana that informs and is informed by our ʻupena of pilina. These pilina and kuleana produce grounded yet fluid subjectivities that are better understood as relationships than identities, as I explore in more depth in the next chapter. Understanding our various positionalities as relationships rather than identities creates space for more radical changes in our structures and relations of power while remaining grounded in the particularities

of our ʻupena of pilina. It also demonstrates the power of returning to our ancestral ways of knowing, recognizing, and becoming through our ʻupena of pilina. Recent resurgent theorizing in Hawaiʻi has demonstrated the need to nānā i ke kumu—look towards the source—and turn towards ka wā ma mua—the time before—to (re)weave our ʻupena of pilina, gather our stories of belonging, and negotiate the various and emergent ways that we become, perform, and belong as ʻŌiwi (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2014, 2015, Archer 2016, Teves 2018, Osorio 2021). This starts with what we call ourselves and ʻāina, as well as how we recognize one another and our ʻāina. The (re)emergence of ancestral ways of describing and knowing ourselves and our relations using our own language and epistemologies disrupts racialized, legal definitions of native and Indigenous that do not emerge from Hawaiian culture and do not reflect our worldviews and processes of becoming and belonging (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2014, 2). When ʻŌiwi look at how our ancestors referred to themselves, we see that our names link us in intimate ways to the ʻāina we have pilina with. Newspaper articles and moʻolelo about Waialua reveal that the term "ʻehu kai o Puaʻena" was predominately used to locate and refer to kanaka of this area. Indeed, as I explained in the first chapter, we were often referred to as keiki and kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, as well as ka ʻehu kai itself (Kamokualiiole 1866, Luhiau 1865).

The centrality of ʻāina to our understandings of self, community, and relationality demonstrates a need for ʻŌiwi to (re)create the conditions where we can live on, nurture, know, and aloha our ʻāina just as it nurtures, knows, and has aloha for us. Osorio (2021, 140-41) eloquently captures this sentiment when she writes, "… if I want to be remembered by Waikīkī, then I must remember Waikīkī back, and if I do not want to be refused or forgotten, then I must not refuse her." ʻŌiwi names and ways of knowing ourselves not only highlight our pilina to ʻāina, they also center ʻŌiwi agency and kuleana in maintaining and nurturing those pilina.

Similarly, in "Unsettling Settler Colonialism," Snelgrove et al. (2014) argue for the use of Indigenous terms to describe the specific relationships that settlers have with Indigenous lands, waters, and peoples. "If this is not the relationship one wants to embody, whether as yonega or hwunitum or any number of Indigenous terms for settler, then the impetus is on the settler to change the nature of the relationship by taking direction from Indigenous nations themselves. The ultimate goal is to create the need for a new word or phrase to describe positive features of a settler-Indigenous relationship" (Snelgrove et al. 2014, 17). Resurging Indigenous terms shifts the temporality of settler colonialism and highlights settler, and Indigenous, agency and positionality in changing the conditions of possibility that force the settler colonial encounter to persist. It is not the goal of this dissertation to propose terms in ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi that speak to the particular relationships settlers have with ʻāina in Hawaiʻi, although I do think researching and reviving such terms is a necessary project. Rather, in this dissertation I explore what it means for ʻŌiwi to (re)turn to the kuleana to know and set the terms for how non-ʻŌiwi encounter our communities and ʻāina—to use our practices and ethics to understand not only our own entangled relationships with non-ʻŌiwi, but also non-ʻŌiwi relationships with our ʻāina. If ʻŌiwi and kamaʻāina can change how non-ʻŌiwi encounter, know, and relate to ʻāina, we can create new subjectivities that demonstrate not only a weakness in the settler colonial structure of processes, but also the potential to create something outside of that structure.

Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2013) explores the potential of performing kuleana as a way to challenge settler colonial relations of power in her book *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School.* In this work, Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2013, 150) asserts that kuleana allows for becoming, and that land and place should be at the center of understanding self and kuleana rather than identity or blood quantum. Rather than tying kuleana to a static

identity or subjectivity, Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2013, 150) names three key aspects to consider when understanding one's kuleana: genealogical connection to place; active commitment and contribution to community; and self-reflexivity and the desire to learn. Goodyear-Kaʻōpua's emphasis on relationality, action, and constant learning demonstrates that kuleana and grounded pilina to ʻāina can inform processes of becoming something other than a settler. In the context of on the ground community work, one's actions and commitments to place and community often come to mean more than one's familial or biological connections, and one can become part a genealogy of caretakers for a place through these sustained actions and performances of kuleana (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2013, 151). This must be accompanied with a critical self-reflexivity, however, as well as an openness and willingness to learn. Becoming part of a genealogy of caretakers does not allow one to become ʻŌiwi, nor can one begin to claim a moʻokūʻauhau to place where this is not an actual familial connection. Rather, these questions about genealogy and kuleana demonstrate the possibility for moving beyond static notions of settler and Indigenous identities towards grounded understandings of positionality and responsibility that do not collapse difference (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2013, 155).

Throughout Goodyear-Kaʻōpua's (2014, 2015, 2017, 2020a) scholarship she argues for emergent independent futures for Hawaiʻi, and theorizes the need to enact Indigenous futurities to challenge relations to lands and peoples structured by settler colonial powers. Although she does not rely on an analytic of biopolitics or philosophy of materialism, her theorizing, similar to Trask's, highlights ʻŌiwi agency and explores the possibilities of becoming through grounded pilina to people and place. Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020a, 8) demonstrates that an independent Hawaiian future is not in the service of only ʻŌiwi. Rather, Indigenous futurities emphasize interdependence and require a drastic change in the conditions of possibility that perpetuate not

only relations of domination over Indigenous peoples, but all forms of domination. In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and increasing climate catastrophes she writes that, "imagining new possibilities can be the best consequence of this undeniable phase of massive disruption and overturning of the assumed normal" (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2020a, 8). Goodyear-Kaʻōpua's use of Indigenous futurity allows us to view settler colonial structures as highly contingent, and with areas where Indigenous peoples can maneuver and create new encounters that challenge what have been so carefully crafted as totalizing structures of domination.

The editors and contributors to *Detours: A Decolonial Guide to Hawaiʻi* (2019) take up this idea of creating a new encounter with Hawaiʻi, and their guide aims to transform the ways tourists view and visit these islands. In the introduction to the guide, editors Hōkūlani Aikau and Vernadette Vicuña Gonzalez (2019, 2) explain that the guide does not put tourist desires at the forefront, and instead redirects away from the fantasy of Hawaiʻi and towards pono engagement. The book consists of visual and written works that shift conceptions and perceptions of Hawaiʻi to demonstrate the different ways of moving through and relating to these places. The editors and contributors argue that non-ʻŌiwi can, and should, participate in decolonial work, and that this reflects the reality of Hawaiʻi today as a place where not only ʻŌiwi live. The editors argue that "ea must be cultivated by Kanaka and non-Kanaka alike if it is going to persist into the future," and this guide functions to show a multiplicity of subjectivities how to live ethically and justly in Hawaiʻi (Aikau et al. 2019, 4-6). *Detours* ultimately offers a necessary alternative to tour guides that imagine Hawaiʻi as a paradise and playground for foreigners. The contents provide ʻike and moʻolelo about Hawaiʻi that create the conditions for visitors to encounter this ʻāina as something more than just a tourist on vacation. Taking this theorizing further, I investigate in this dissertation the potential for current settlers to encounter and engage with alternative forms of

knowledge production and pilina-building to produce alternative subjectivities that account for the fluid ways we become in the places we call home. How can we create encounters with ʻāina that spur alternative home-making projects, ones that do not replicate settler colonial domination and relations of power? What kinds of subjectivities might these encounters produce? What happens when we (re)member and (re)weave alternative forms of pilina and subjectivity into our ʻupena of pilina? This dissertation will engage these questions by analyzing the practice of mākaʻikaʻi in a historical and contemporary context.

Kaiaka: Kuʻu Ipo i ka ʻEhu Kai

Towards the end of 2019 I began to regularly walk through Kaiaka. I had recently moved back into my father's house, and Kaiaka's proximity made it a convenient running and walking route when I needed some space and alone time. As I would move across the dry, red earth, feeling the strong ocean breeze on my skin as it carried the ʻehu kai into my lungs, I would think about the moʻolelo of Kaiaka that I had been rediscovering around the same time. Standing at the east end of Kaiaka, his pilina to Puaʻena becomes strikingly apparent (Figure 5). The winds blowing towards Kaʻena come directly from Puaʻena, caressing Kaiaka like a loved one who trails their fingers along your back as they pass by. Indeed, all the beauty and leʻaleʻa of Puaʻena can easily be admired from the vantage point of Kaiaka. During low tide, large reef shelfs are exposed, revealing an abundance of silt-covered limu, eels, crabs, and urchins that speak to the abundance of life still in these waters, even though we cannot always see them. When I began dating my kōkoʻolua we used to walk around Kaiaka together. As we walked, I would share moʻolelo about Kaiaka, Puaʻena, and my beloved Waialua, and he would share how he sees this ʻāina, how it relates to the ʻāina of Paumalū where he grew up, just a few shores down. I could never see Kaiaka as just a beach park, campground, or dryfield after these encounters. The

murky water that once seemed gross now looks like the distinct lepo ʻula of Waialua, and when I look at this shady sea today I long to find a way to fix our streams and create the conditions where shadows of iʻa once again float through this wahi pana.

Figure 5: View of Puaʻena from the shore of Kaiaka

I was able to build a new relationship with Kaiaka through mākaʻikaʻi, through the act of being in place and sharing moʻolelo about this place. (Re)discovering the moʻolelo about the ʻāina I call home, and understanding these moʻolelo through my own experiences with this place, has helped me develop a deeper, more intimate pilina with the ʻāina of Waialua. Through this pilina I understand myself, my relations, and my kuleana in ways that a settler-indigenous binary and identity politics cannot adequately represent without trying to capture and contain it. As I have argued in this chapter, colonial unknowing that masks our complex entanglements in various relations of power and domination is aided by scholarship that treats settler colonialism as a stand-alone analytic and that relies on a binary understanding of settler and Indigenous identities. Understanding settler colonialism through a philosophy of materialism, and putting

these theories in conversation with an analytic of biopolitics that takes seriously the production of subjectivity and power, reduces colonial unknowing and reveals that Indigenous and settler subjectivities are contingencies that attempt to force the settler colonial encounter and settler colonial power relations to last.

Producing new subjectivities by centering pilina with and kuleana to ʻāina and ʻŌiwi will not result in immediate structural changes, and herein lies the limits of my theorizing. Rather than attempting to dismantle this larger structure, I theorize settler colonialism as a structure of processes that can be weakened by deep ʻupena of pilina and everyday actions that produce fluid subjectivities grounded in pilina and kuleana. This theorizing allows us to enact changes on the individual, familial, and community level that allow for new subjectivities and relations with power and ʻāina to take hold, and show us what a world outside of settler colonialism might look like. In the next chapter, I expand on this by introducing the practice of mākaʻikaʻi as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building that produces fluid subjectivities through a different kind of encounter with ʻāina. Through an analysis of a moʻolelo serialized in *Ke Au Okoa* by William Henry Uaua between 1870 and 1871, I argue that huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi provide a route through which malihini can become kamaʻāina to places they have, and develop, pilina with. What kuleana comes with calling a place home? How can mākaʻikaʻi inform a home-making project that emphasizes grounded relationality and produces alternative relations of power with the peoples and places in our ʻupena of pilina?

Chapter 3: Mākaʻikaʻi, He Aha Kēia?

My favorite beach in the world is nestled between Kaiaka and Kūpaoa point (Figure 6). While it may be a contentious statement, I would argue that this is the best beach on Oʻahu—the best beach in the world, really. The sand is soft, and comfortable to lay on, but not so soft that it feels artificial. The water is surprisingly deep, especially on a high tide, making it cool and refreshing to dive into. The shoreline is protected by a reef that breaks the surf and keeps the interior calm, even on days when the waves pick up. I know there are many people who would say this beach doesn't compare to those in Tahiti, or other places in Oceania. There are those who would argue that this isn't even the best beach on the North Shore of Oʻahu. The water is not as deep and cold as Waimea Bay, the waves are not as big as ʻEhukai and the stretch of sand doesn't compare to that of Paumalū. I have no doubt that these other beaches are lovely, and I have been lucky enough to experience some of these wahi pana and their beauty. But these other ʻāina have not held me like the shore of Māeaea has. I have spent countless hours on this beach, basking in the sun and playing in the water until Keaomelemele makes her journey from Puaʻena to Kaʻena to mark the end of the day (Figure 7). This shore has been the host of several bonfires and long nights spent with friends watching the stars, sharing stories, and listening to the waves crash against the sand. This is where my ʻohana and I have celebrated birthdays, weddings, accomplishments, and anniversaries. It is also where I have gone to mourn loved ones and heal from heartbreak. My pilina and experiences along this kahakai and in these waters have shaped not only how I view this beach, but also how I understand myself as a part of the larger ʻupena of pilina held by Māeaea. Other beaches and waters may catch my eye, but they could never make my heart flutter like this one.

Figure 6: The Kaiaka side of Māeaea

Figure 7: Keaomelemele travelling past Māeaea

A lot of people know this beach as "Fresh Airs." Decades ago, boy scout troops from town used to have campouts along this beach, giving them a chance to get some fresh air outside of the city, and over time this nickname stuck. Growing up, Fresh Airs was the only name I knew for this shore. It was only more recently that I learned that these sands are part of ke one loa o Māeaea, the long stretch of sand connecting Puaʻena and Kaiaka. Ironically, the name Māeaea denotes the stench of rotting bodies that used to be somewhat common in this area thanks to Kahakakaukanaka, a moʻolelo I will share more of in the next chapter. Far from fresh air, kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai were accustomed to smelling the māea associated with corpses while standing along this shore. In addition to the name and scents of Māeaea changing, I learned a couple of years ago that the waters of this area were not always the enchanting shades of blue I have come to know and love. While talking with another kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, they told me that their grandmother remembers the waters along this shore looking black because of all the limu that used to grow here. It is hard for me to imagine such an abundance of limu in this area. Sometimes I wonder if the kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai I read about in the nūpepa would be able to recognize this ʻāina as Waialua today. Would they be able to find the streams and loʻi that once fed them? Would they still feel that deep sense of aloha ʻāina for this wahi pana that raised them? It is during these moments that I remind myself that falling in love is an action; kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai actively fell in love with their ʻāina every day, with every change brought about by winds, rains, temperatures, and even colonial encounters. Indeed, as I will demonstrate further in the next section, this desire for and active commitment to the ʻāina we call home is part of what forms a kamaʻāina relationship between beings and ʻāina.

My love for this kahakai runs deep, and I understand my relationship to this ʻāina as an integral part of the ʻupena of pilina that shapes me, but Puaʻena and Kaiaka do not appear in my

moʻokūʻauhau. My family's ties to Oʻahu come through Waimalu, a good 11 miles from Māeaea and Waialua. I do not know if my ancestors loved these waters like I do. I am not sure if they ever watched Keaomelemele make her journey west while thick ʻehu kai coated their skin. Perhaps they never felt the intimate caress of these cold waters, were never cradled by the waves, and lulled into a state of bliss by the current. Through a series of all too familiar processes brought about by the settler colonial encounter, my ʻohana largely left Waimalu in the late 1800's, instead taking up residence in Chinatown and, later, Mānoa. My grandfather was never told ʻŌiwi moʻolelo about Waimalu, or any of the ʻāina that he lived on. As a Japanese-Hawaiian boy adopted by a Chinese-Hawaiian family that completely denied any ʻŌiwi ancestry well into the 2000's, my grandfather had a complicated relationship with the ʻāina of Hawaiʻi. He was taught to be ashamed of the pilina that connect him to these wahi pana, to forget about and discard the intimate relations that I so dearly treasure today. As I stand along the shore and feel the embrace of this kahakai, I reflect on the fact that my grandfather might not have felt this kind of love. If he did, it was likely fleeting, and something he kept to himself and did not share with his kids or grandkids. Listening to my father's stories of visiting Hawaiʻi as a child, it is clear that his desire to be in this place did not come from his experiences with my grandfather, but more so the lack thereof.

As a dark-skinned man in Arizona, my father was often misidentified as Hispanic growing up. He joked that in Arizona and the southwest he was Mexican, in the northeast he was Puerto Rican, and in the southeast he was Cuban. Hawaiʻi was the first place where he was recognized as Hawaiian. He told me that as a child, when he and his siblings would come here for vacations, he used to imagine himself as Tarzan swinging among all the trees. He knew that he wanted to raise his children here, surrounded by the culture he did not get to grow up with, so

when the time was right, we moved to Hawaiʻi Kai where some family friends had a rental available for us. My first memories with the beach are along this south shore. We would go to Awāwāmalu, or as we knew it then, Sandy's, and spend the day swimming in the large shore break and playing in the sand. During the early evening, when we would be winding down, my father would tell us stories about a kahuna that used to live in that area and walk along the ridgeline visible from the shore. Years later I found out that my father made up these stories. He wanted us to feel connected to this new home, and while no one had told him any stories about this ʻāina, he knew that sharing stories about place is a Hawaiian thing to do, and so that's what he did. When we moved to Haleʻiwa from Hawaiʻi Kai my father quickly enrolled us in Nā Lei Nani o Waialua, a hālau hula in the community that was highly recommended to us. Through this hālau we met community members and kūpuna who took us in and taught us about a culture my father grew up longing for. Over 20 years have passed since we first moved to Waialua and began learning stories about this ʻāina. Now a kupuna himself, my father has a bounty of moʻolelo aloha ʻāina that he shares with his moʻopuna.

My one hānau is not along the shores of Māeaea, and my ʻohana has longer genealogical ties to Waimalu than Waialua, but the ʻāina that has shaped me and informed my becoming is, without a doubt, the ʻāina of Waialua. From Kaʻena point to Waimea Valley, the ʻili ʻāina in this ahupuaʻa have been the foundation upon which I have grown, and the waters of Māeaea are the ones that have held me the closest. My pilina to this place was not inherited, it was fostered through my experiences with this ʻāina and the moʻolelo I have learned about it. Growing up, and during my early years in college, I felt somewhat ashamed that I did not have a direct genealogical tie to Waialua. Learning about different definitions of Native and Indigenous made me realize that I know little to nothing about the ʻāina that fostered my ʻohana for generations. I

do not know exactly where in Waimalu they lived, or how long they lived there. I do not know the names of the streams they drank from and bathed in. I do not know which shore embraced them and made them feel the deep sense of aloha that I feel in Māeaea. Combined with the fact that my one hānau are in Arizona rather than Hawaiʻi, I started to feel less-than, like I was an imposter. My ʻiewe is not buried in this ʻāina, and I do not know which ʻili ʻāina hold the ʻiewe of the ancestors who came before me. And yet Waialua is my piko. It is the ʻāina I know, love, and cherish the most, and it is the ʻāina that knows the most intimate, vulnerable parts of myself. I was not born to Waialua, but through my experiences with this ʻāina and the kamaʻāina of this place, I continue to become a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, and it is this becoming that I seek to unpack in this dissertation.

For generations, settler colonial processes in Hawaiʻi have been attempting to distort and eliminate ʻŌiwi relations with land to perpetuate the settler colonial encounter in these islands. As I argued in the last chapter, eliminating ʻŌiwi pilina to ʻāina is a key contingency that allows the settler colonial encounter to persist. Definitions of Native and Indigenous tend to emphasize a continued connection to and inhabitance on one's ancestral homelands, but the settler colonial encounter makes it difficult to remain on one's homelands, and for many families, finding the exact ʻili ʻāina upon which their ʻohana lived is nearly impossible. For my own ʻohana, we can trace our moʻokūʻauhau through Kamanaoualani to Waimalu, but due to a lack of documentation we cannot find anyone beyond him. Additionally, since my ʻohana moved out of the area so long ago, I do not know any moʻolelo about our family on that ʻāina. Today, my biggest connection to Waimalu are the memories I have of going to the nearby mall as a teenager. So where does that leave us, those ʻŌiwi who do not have one hānau in Hawaiʻi, who do not know the ʻāina that raised and nurtured our ʻohana? How can we *become* kamaʻāina to these places once again? How

can we *become* kamaʻāina to new places? How can settlers participate in this becoming to *transform* into poʻe aloha ʻāina? In this chapter I explore these questions using my own experiences and place-based research, as well as a moʻolelo serialized by Willam Henry Uaua between 1870 and 1871. Building on these experiences and Uaua, I will show that mākaʻikaʻi is a distinctly ʻŌiwi practice that can function as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building that facilitates a new home-making project for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to engage with.

Mākaʻikaʻi

My process of becoming a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai is intimately informed by my ʻupena of pilina, including my connections to ʻāina. As I have been demonstrating, however, my pilina to Waialua is not a natural connection that always already existed. Rather, it was fostered through my experiences with ʻāina and other kamaʻāina of this place. By living in Waialua, learning moʻolelo about this wahi pana, and forming connections with the people and various beings of this place, I developed a deep aloha for this ʻāina. Instead of an abstract sentiment, scholars such as Noenoe Silva (2004, 2017), Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2013), Leon Noʻeau Peralto (2018), and Jamaica Heolimeleikalani Osorio (2021) have demonstrated that aloha ʻāina involves a sustained and active commitment to protecting and perpetuating the places we are in relationship with and have kuleana to. Silva (2017, 5) writes that "[a]loha ʻāina is a concept that must be taught. Just as our ancestors felt that ʻōpio… of their day needed to be taught aloha ʻāina, we must continue to teach it. It is neither an instinctive knowledge nor an essentialist quality." Similarly, Stephanie Nohelani Teves (2018, 91) argues through her theorizing on performativity that the doer does not come before the doing—there are no poʻe aloha ʻāina without acts of aloha ʻāina. This is also demonstrated through an analytic of biopolitics, which

rejects the idea of always already subjectivities and reveals that power is both productive and relational—subjects are strategically and actively produced through relations of power (Mills 2018, 25). It is thus through sustained action that ʻŌiwi *become* poʻe aloha ʻāina, rather than aloha ʻāina being a sentiment always already embedded in ʻŌiwi. Likewise, I am arguing that it is through sustained acts of aloha ʻāina, informed by our pilina and kuleana to place, that we *become* kamaʻāina to the ʻāina that sustains us and is sustained by us.

Far from static identities, kamaʻāina and malihini signify specific relationships to ʻāina that have the power to shift over time. Osorio (2021) demonstrates this in her book, *Remembering Our Intimacies: Moʻolelo, Aloha ʻĀina, and Ea,* by analyzing multiple iterations of the moʻolelo o Hiʻiakaikapoliopele. Here, she argues that malihini is typically used to designate people who are strangers or foreigners to a particular place—they are people without a specific pilina to the lands, peoples, and cultures they are surrounded by (Osorio 2021, 130). On the other spectrum of this relationship are kamaʻāina, those who actively sustain their pilina to people and place through the cultivation of knowledges, experiences, and aloha for the ʻāina they are a part of (Osorio 2021, 131). Kamaʻāina and malihini both have kuleana to the ʻāina they encounter, however these kuleana are informed by their pilina to place, or lack thereof in the case of malihini. As Osorio (2021, 128) asserts, kuleana is positionality and relationality articulated and practiced. In many ways, then, kuleana can be understood as an "interlocking authority and accountability" to ʻāina (Osorio 2021, 129). Within this understanding, one can move from malihini to kamaʻāina over time and through the cultivation of ʻike and pilina with ʻāina. Here I would like to emphasize, along with Osorio (2021, 135), that kamaʻāina reflects a *familiar* pilina to ʻāina, but does not imply a *familial* connection. While one can become part of a particular genealogy of caretakers or kamaʻāina to place, they cannot create a genealogical connection that

positions them as descendants of these pae ʻāina. Malihini and kamaʻāina, I argue, provide understandings of being and becoming that remain attentive to one's positionality and attuned to one's one hānau while also allowing for deep and intimate pilina to form between newcomers and the ʻāina they encounter.

But how do we know what our kuleana to place is? Osorio (2021, 137) puts forth the idea of kuleana malihini, wherein malihini have the responsibility of unpacking and understanding their specific pilina and kuleana to place so as to actively become kamaʻāina to the places and communities we are in relation with. Importantly, Osorio (2021, 136) notes that a kuleana malihini applies to ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike, and therefore should not be interpreted as a settler responsibility. I agree with Osorio, and will demonstrate that the practice of mākaʻikaʻi is one route through which we can understand our specific pilina with and kuleana to place to become kamaʻāina to the ʻāina we call home today. While there are different definitions of mākaʻikaʻi, such as "sight-seeing tours taken as occasions to view, remember, and teach the moʻolelo of the akua, the kupua…, the aliʻi…, and the people of these places" (Fujikane 2021, 63), I am basing my understanding of mākaʻikaʻi on the experiences I have with sharing stories about place in place, as well as Uaua's (1870-1871) descriptions of mākaʻikaʻi throughout "He Moolelo Kaau no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa." Mākaʻikaʻi can take many forms, and my goal for this dissertation is not to provide a singular definition of this practice. Rather, I offer an articulation of mākaʻikaʻi and analyze the ways this practice relies on pilina, kuleana, and aloha ʻāina to inform our becoming and belonging.

During my early years in graduate school, my ʻohana took members of our community on a mākaʻikaʻi across Māeaea. We invited kūpuna, hula practitioners, lawaiʻa, and those with pilina to Waialua to sit with us, listen to the stories we had learned about this ʻāina, and share

their own moʻolelo about this place. Those who joined us on our mākaʻikaʻi demonstrated a desire to become more intimately connected with the ʻāina of Waialua, to know more about this area and actively attend to their pilina to this place. My ʻohana and I shared stories about Puaʻena and Kaiaka, and explained why the sands we stood on were once known as ke one loa o Māeaea. We also told moʻolelo about Kahakakaukanaka, and remembered the abundance of fish that Laniwahine brought to Loko Ea and ʻUkoʻa. Sitting along the sands of Māeaea and seeing the waves crash into the shore while the ʻehu kai drifted from Puaʻena, past Kaiaka, and towards Kaʻena, we began to understand ourselves through our intimate pilina to and shared experiences with ʻāina. In between and during moʻolelo, kupuna and community members would speak up and add their own moʻolelo, memories, and experiences to the mākaʻikaʻi.

Throughout the course of the mākaʻikaʻi, I found out that some of the kūpuna and community members I associated with Waialua were born in other places, and moved to the area years ago when they were younger. Even though Māeaea is not their one hānau, these folks are undoubtedly kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai who have dedicated their lives and work to caring for the ʻāina of Waialua. While they still had love for the ʻāina they were born to, Waialua became their piko, and is the ʻāina that creates that magnetic pull to place described by Joseph Nāwahī as aloha ʻāina (Osorio 2021, 12). Through the various moʻolelo that we shared while basking in the beauty of the ʻāina we call home, we were able to begin unpacking—as a community—our specific communal and individual relationships and kuleana to place without ever using the terms settler or Indigenous. By the end of the day, we had (re)discovered and woven intimate knots of connection among our various ʻupena of pilina. The lawaiʻa shared moʻolelo about the kai and fishing practices, and taught us about the current state of our reefs; those who knew mele, oli, and hula drew on this ʻike to make connections between the moʻolelo shared and the

music, movements, and beats about Waialua that they know. Rather than relying on blood quantum logics, or notions of Indigenous or settler identities, this mākaʻikaʻi created the conditions for us to recognize one another through our ʻupena of pilina and diverse connections to and kuleana towards the ʻāina that we all love and sustain, just as it loves and sustains us.

If aloha ʻāina is a learned ethic, and if we become poʻe aloha ʻāina and kamaʻāina through our sustained action, commitment, and aloha for ʻāina, then we as ʻŌiwi need to (re)create the conditions of possibility that allow for these endless processes of becoming. ʻŌiwi are not born into an always already subjectivity that informs how we act and perform our being and belonging; we become kamaʻāina and poʻe aloha ʻāina through our actions and sustained commitments to, and relations with, the ʻāina that nurtures us. It is therefore our kuleana as ʻŌiwi to ensure that malihini learn about and understand their positionalities and relations to place. A fundamental part of this kuleana entails ʻŌiwi becoming more kamaʻāina to the ʻāina that hold us, and mākaʻikaʻi provide an opportunity for ʻŌiwi to engage with this kuleana while also creating the opportunity for malihini to become something more than settlers or allies. Mākaʻikaʻi create the space for kamaʻāina and malihini alike to share moʻolelo and have conversations about what it means to be in pilina with particular ʻāina and communities. These conversations shape the practices we participate in, the relations that we recognize, and the overall ways that we demonstrate our belonging to place and one another through our everyday actions. Many of the community members who participated in our mākaʻikaʻi expressed a renewed desire to learn more about the moʻolelo we shared, dig deeper into their own family's moʻolelo, or even start engaging in some of the practices that were once prevalent among kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. Other community members, during one-on-one interviews, expressed that their aloha for and pilina to ʻāina is the foundation upon which they understand their kuleana

and act as kamaʻāina of Waialua. Analyzing a moʻolelo serialized by Uaua in *Ke Au Okoa* between 1870 and 1871, I will further investigate mākaʻikaʻi and what it means for ʻŌiwi to become and belong according to a practice rooted in our history and culture.

"He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa"

Uaua (1870-71) describes huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi in "He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" as distinct from other kinds of huakaʻi, and demonstrates that mākaʻikaʻi work to unpack, build, and (re)member pilina to ʻāina and one another. Uaua ends this moʻolelo by emphasizing that although he titles it a moʻolelo kaʻao, the events in the moʻolelo really did happen. Throughout the moʻolelo, manō speak, embrace, conduct ceremony, and huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi in distinctly human ways. Rather than understanding this as an anthropomorphizing narrative tool, Uaua's (January 5, 1871, 4) explanation at the end of this moʻolelo demonstrates that the boundary between kanaka and our environment in an ʻŌiwi worldview is fluid, and does not conform to the enlightenment logics of the colonial encounter. As Jonathan Goldberg-Hiller and Silva (2011, 431) note, there is no precolonial word for the category of "animal" in ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi. Instead of the "human/animal distinction so prominent in Western self-understanding," ʻŌiwi conceptualizations of self embrace our intimate pilina with ʻāina, including animals (Goldberg-Hiller and Silva 2011, 431). Thus, although titled a kaʻao, we can understand this moʻolelo as an example and articulation of mākaʻikaʻi based on real experiences, events, places, and even people that can shed light on how these types of huakaʻi were practiced ancestrally, as well as what this practice can teach us about being and becoming kamaʻāina today.

"He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" tells the moʻolelo of a young manō, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, who was born to human parents, Kapukapu and Holei, in Pānau, Puna on

the island of Hawaiʻi. Shortly after their birth, they ask their father through a dream for their parents' permission to go on a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi. After receiving their permission and blessings, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa is ready to leave for their huakaʻi. Before they leave, however, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa visits their father once more to ask him for the names of all the aliʻi manō of Hawaiʻi island, as these will be Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's travelling companions. After reciting the names and moku of the aliʻi manō, Kapukapu asks Kaehuikimanoopuuloa the benefit of travelling with these manō. Kaehuikimanoopuuloa replies, "o ka ike i na wahi a pau, aia no ka waiwai mamua kahi i waiho ai i na kamaaina o ke alanui" (Uaua November 24, 1870). Through this conversation we learn that, "concerning the knowledge of all places, their value is deposited with the kamaʻāina of the paths [that I will travel]" (Au 2022). This desire and necessity to seek out kamaʻāina to facilitate the mākaʻikaʻi becomes a key aspect of the huakaʻi that follows. Uaua shows us in this moʻolelo that sharing experiences with ʻāina and kamaʻāina on ʻāina, such as pāʻina and huakaʻi, are important features of mākaʻikaʻi that help shape our pilina and kuleana to the places we visit and call home. In this section, I draw on Uaua's telling of this moʻolelo to analyze the ways mākaʻikaʻi can inform how we become and belong with the ʻāina and kamaʻāina we encounter.

Throughout the moʻolelo there is a recurring encounter between Kaehuikimanoopuuloa as a malihini, and the manō they encounter as kamaʻāina:

> U! haunauna kanaka mai nei hoi koʻu wahi, ae; he kanaka owau, o Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, ke keiki a Kapukapu ma laua o Holei, o kiai pali au o Panau i Puna. Pane mai ke kamaaina, e lealea auanei me ka malihini, wahi a ka malihini, aole kaʻu he huakai lealea, he huakai makaikai kaʻu i kipa mai la i kahi ou e kuu haku, no ia mau olelo oluolu aia nei, ua oluolu mai la ke'lii kamaaina, a komo aku la iloko, a aloha mai la i ka opio malihini, a kuhikuhi ae la ka opio i ke kamaaina, e aloha ae ao i ke'lii o Hilo o Kepanila, a aloha ae la ke kamaaina i ke'lii o Hilo me ka olelo aku, ua lohe wale no au ia oe e Kepanila, akahi no a ikemaka. Pane aku o Kepanila i ke kamaaina, i hele mai nei au na ia nei ka huakai o ka hiki ana ae i koʻu wahi, a hiki loa mai nei i ou la e ke'lii.

> Ia wa i kena koke ia ae ai na mea ai a ke kamaaina, a pau ka ai ana a lakou nei, luana iho la lakou nei me na kamailio ana no na mea e pili ana no ka huakai makaikai (Uaua November 24, 1870, 4).
>
> "Whew! My place suddenly has the unpleasant odor of human."
> "Yes, I am a human. I am Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, the child of Kapukapu and Holei. I am the cliff guardian of Pānau in Puna." The kamaʻāina replied, "The malihini is probably just here to have a good time." The malihini said, "Mine is not a journey for fun, it is a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi to visit your place." These amiable words made the native chief pleasant and they invited them in. The malihini youth gave their aloha and the youth directed the chief to give their aloha to the chief of Hilo, Kepanila. The kamaʻāina gave their aloha to the chief of Hilo saying, "I have only ever heard of you, Kepanila. This is the first time I have seen you with my own eyes." Kepanila responded to the kamaʻāina, "I have come for this journey, arriving from my place all the way here before you, chief." At this time they were immediately satisfied with food from the kamaʻāina and when they were done eating they relaxed while conversing about the details of the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi (Au, 2024).

Starting in Hilo and then working their way around Hawaiʻi island, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa enters the cave of each aliʻi manō to invite them on the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi. Upon Kaehuikimanoopuuloa entering the caves, the aliʻi manō exclaim in disgust that it reeks of human, which prompts Kaehuikimanoopuuloa to introduce themselves as a kanaka before introducing their parents, their ʻāina, and their reason for entering the manō's home. Skeptical at first, the aliʻi manō dismiss Kaehuikimanoopuuloa as someone who is on a huakaʻi to have fun. Kaehuikimanoopuuloa explains that they are on a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, and upon hearing these intentions and Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's insistence that they must be accompanied by the kamaʻāina before moving forward, the aliʻi manō inevitably change their minds and agree to accompany them. Food is then prepared, and the kamaʻāina and malihini pāʻina together before continuing their huakaʻi. This conversation and sequence of events is repeated multiple times throughout the moʻolelo, and highlights some of the significant aspects of what huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi involve.

The poetic refrain of Kaehuikimanoopuuloa sharing food with each aliʻi manō after explaining that they are on a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi and wish to journey with them indicates the importance of pāʻina in mākaʻikaʻi. Before the commercialization, exploitation, and globalization of our food networks, the food that one shared with another in their home reflected the specificities of that ʻāina. To share food with a malihini on a mākaʻikaʻi was therefore one way for kamaʻāina to "show" malihini their ʻāina—the lands and waters that produce the foods that nourish them, and are nourished by them. We can imagine that these manō were not putting out chips and salsa from Costco; they were providing Kaehuikimanoopuuloa with the mea ʻono of their ʻāina, the foods nourished and loved by the ʻāina Kaehuikimanoopuuloa desires to mākaʻikaʻi. Pāʻina thus allow malihini to develop pilina to ʻāina through the intimate acts of consuming nourishment and sharing in the pleasures of food with a kamaʻāina. It is no wonder that one of the first steps in colonization has been the destruction of these food networks, and therefore the disruption of these ways of knowing and being in pilina with ʻāina.

Additionally, we learn from Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's conversations with each aliʻi manō of Hawaiʻi island that the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi cannot happen unless the malihini is accepted and accompanied by a kamaʻāina. Far from the kinds of tours we are used to in Hawaiʻi where floods of tourists are taken to popular destinations by people whose relationship to ʻāina is rooted in commercial gain, mākaʻikaʻi in this moʻolelo are sight-seeking tours where malihini experience ʻāina with the people who love and nurture these places. Having a kamaʻāina present helps ensure that malihini act respectfully in places they are unfamiliar with and do not overstep any boundaries they may not know about. As I will argue further below, the manō Kaehuikimanoopuuloa seeks out are not only kamaʻāina to these places, they are also kiaʻi who have the kuleana to care for and protect ʻāina. Mākaʻikaʻi do not entitle tourists to access ʻāina or

ʻike. Rather, they create huakaʻi grounded in aloha ʻāina where newcomers can learn about wahi pana and begin to develop or (re)discover pilina to place. Encountering ʻāina alongside a kamaʻāina also allows the malihini to be introduced to beloved family members rather than locations that can be exploited for the sake of enjoying one's vacation, which starts to build a pilina between the malihini and ʻāina that does not replicate settler colonial relations.

In the moʻolelo, when it becomes clear that the destination of the huakaʻi is Tahiti, some manō express concern about not having a kamaʻāina to accompany them:

> "A hea ka oukou huakai makaikai pale mai[?]" "A kukulu o Tahiti pale mai," wahi a na malihini. Pane mai ke kamaaina, "Owai ke kamaaina e hele ai a kukulu o Tahiti?" Hai mai la kahi Opio a kakou, "O Kua ke kamaaina o ia alanui, o kona wai auau ka muliwai o Muliwaiolena i ka pea kapu o Nuumealani." Akahi no a lohe kela mau alii he kamaaina o Kua no Tahiti, ia manawa i pane mai ai o Kua, "He oiaio ia olelo a Kaehuikimanoopuuloa i pane mai la o koʻu aina hanau o Tahiti, a mai laila mai nei au o koʻu hiki ana a noho ia Hawaii nei a ke manao mai nei paha oukou he kamaaina au no keia pae aina" ae mai la na'lii e ae o lakou (Uaua December 1, 1870, 4).
>
> "When will your folks' huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi reach its final destination?" "When we reach the border of Tahiti it will be finished," said the malihini. The kamaʻāina asked, "Who will be the kamaʻāina by which we go to the border of Tahiti?" Our youth states, "Kua is the kamaʻāina of this path, their bathing pool is the pool of Muliwaiʻōlena at the sacred border of Nuʻumealani." This was the first time that those chiefs heard that Kua was a kamaʻāina of Tahiti. At this time Kua responded, "The words that Kaehuikimanoopuuloa answered with are true, Tahiti is my birth land. I came from there and I arrived to live here in Hawaiʻi so you all might think that I am a kamaʻāina of this archipelago." The other chiefs agreed (Au, 2024).

It is here that we learn that Kua, the aliʻi manō of Kona, comes from Tahiti and still has genealogical ties there, as well as Nuʻumealani, another wahi pana they mākaʻikaʻi to. When the manō learn that Kua is a kamaʻāina to these distant places the group plans to mākaʻikaʻi, they agree to continue on the huakaʻi. Here we see the aliʻi manō being cognizant of their positionalities and relationships to ʻāina, and the role this plays in a mākaʻikaʻi. Rather than feeling entitled to huakaʻi wherever they please, they know that to go on a mākaʻikaʻi means being accompanied by someone with a deep relationship to that place, and they will not continue

the journey if these conditions are not met. Kaehuikimanoopuuloa is also aware of this, which is part of the reason why he sought out Kua on this huakaʻi. Despite having one hānau outside of Hawaiʻi, Kua is considered not only a kamaʻāina to Kona, but an aliʻi as well. Becoming a kamaʻāina and aliʻi does not change their one hānau, or replace one set of intimate pilina with another. Rather, Kua was able to develop a deep pilina to multiple ʻāina, which in turn expanded their ʻupena of pilina and the ʻāina they have the kuleana to learn from, mālama, and aloha.

Kua demonstrates in this moʻolelo that while our one hānau matter, they are not the only sands with which we can develop intimate pilina and aloha. As an ʻŌiwi whose one hānau is hundreds of miles away from Hawaiʻi, Kua's journey of leaving his one hānau and becoming in deep relation with the ʻāina of Kona resonates with my own process of falling in love with Waialua. While this moʻolelo does not shed light on why Kua came to Hawaiʻi or how he became a kamaʻāina and aliʻi of Kona, it does demonstrate the fluidity of kamaʻāina relationships and the ability to weave new ʻāina into our ʻupena of pilina. In a time where many ʻŌiwi have been pushed into the diaspora, this line of thinking opens the possibility of returning to the ʻāina of Hawaiʻi and renewing one's pilina and kuleana to place. It also affirms that ʻŌiwi can develop new pilina with and aloha for ʻāina outside of Hawaiʻi alongside the kamaʻāina of those places. Mākaʻikaʻi can facilitate this renewal by creating encounters with ʻāina and kamaʻāina that are meant to help malihini find where and how they belong in a bigger ʻupena of pilina. Sometimes this belonging is familial, as is the case with members of my ʻohana and other ʻŌiwi who are not born in Hawaiʻi. Other times this belonging takes different forms, such as non-ʻŌiwi who dedicate themselves to protecting and nourishing ʻāina and the ability of ʻŌiwi to live on and in pilina with ʻāina. While ʻŌiwi recognize kinship with all of Oceania, Kua becoming not only a kamaʻāina to Kona, but an aliʻi and kiaʻi, troubles settler and Indigenous

identities and demonstrates the possibilities of becoming that aloha ʻāina and pilina to place inform. Indeed, throughout the moʻolelo the manō are constantly shifting from kamaʻāina to malihini, demonstrating the fluidity of these relations and the kuleana they bring.

As the aliʻi manō of Hawaiʻi island agree to go with Kaehuikimanoopuuloa on the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, we see them go from kamaʻāina to the ʻāina where Kaehuikimanoopuuloa meets them, to malihini to the next aliʻi manō's ʻāina. For example, when Kaehuikimanoopuuloa first meets Kepanila in Hilo, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa is the malihini and Kepanila is the kamaʻāina. Upon travelling to Kaʻū, however, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa and Kepanila are both malihini, and Kaneilehia is the kamaʻāina. While malihini in a new ʻāina, the kuleana of the manō change. They are still ʻŌiwi to the pae ʻāina of Hawaiʻi, but their kuleana to place is dependent on their specific relationships to that ʻāina rather than a static identity. We see this most clearly through Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's relationship to ʻEwa and his kuleana to that ʻāina and its kamaʻāina.

On their way to Tahiti, the group spends the longest amount of time in ʻEwa visiting with Kaahupahau and learning about that ʻāina. Through this huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi we also learn about Kaahupahau and Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's pilina. Indeed, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa's very name is an homage to Kaahupahau and the moʻokūʻauhau they share. On their way back from Tahiti, the group once again stops in ʻEwa, but their planned stay is short. Kaahupahau describes this act as "aloha ole," and explains that her familial connection to Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, alongside the pilina to ʻEwa that the group developed during their stay, gives them the kuleana to spend more time in that wahi pana:

> manao nui iho la na malihini e hoi i Hawaii, kahea ia mai la o Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, e komo aku ma kahi a Kaahupahau, a komo aku la keia iloko, ninau mai la ke'lii. E manao ana no anei na'lii e hoi oukou i keia la? Ae aku la ka Opio a kakou, ia wa, kaohi mai la ke kamaaina, aole hoi e noho iki mai, a hala kekahi mau la, aloha ole no hoi oe iaʻu e na

> wahi keiki, o ka‘u ike ana aku no paha keia ia oe, no keia mau olelo kaukau a kona Haku iaia, ua ae aku la no ua Opio nei (Uaua December 29, 1870, 4).
>
> …the malihini intended to return to Hawai‘i. Kaehuikimanoopuuloa was called to enter Kaahupahau's vicinity and when they went inside the chief asked, "Are the chiefs intending for you all to return today?" Our youth confirmed and at this time the kama‘āina detained them, "Do not return, stay for a little while until a few days have passed. You are being ungrateful to me, child. This will perhaps be my time to see you." Due to these warning words from his Ali‘i, the youth consented (Au, 2024).

The group decides to stay longer, and they spend more time with their host and the ‘āina of ‘Ewa. Here we see that the familial connection discovered by Kaehuikimanoopuuloa during the group's māka‘ika‘i in ‘Ewa changes the kuleana that Kaehuikimanoopuuloa has to that ‘āina and its kia‘i, Kaahupahau. Upon their departure, they encounter manō from Maui plotting to eat kanaka surfing along the beach in Waikīkī:

> ... e alakai kakou i keia mano e make, he ai kanaka ka kana mea e kali hoomakakiu nei maanei, aole e pono ke ola keia mano ino pepehi kanaka, a e hai aku oe ia lakou la mahope, e puana kakou a hiki i kahi kohola papau e kipaku i uka a make ia, pela e lohe aku ai o Kaahupahau i ka kakou hana maikai ana, oia ka uku i kana mau hookipa ana a nui (Uaua December 29, 1870, 4).
>
> "…let us lead this shark to death. Eating people is its reason for lying in wait to do evil here. This evil murderer shark should not live, and you will sacrifice them afterwards. Let us surround it until it reaches the shallow bare reef flats, drive it inland and it will die." That is what Kaahupahau would hear regarding their good deeds, and this was their tribute for her generous hospitality (Au, 2024).

We know from other mo‘olelo that Kaahupahau protects kanaka from human-eating sharks, and that she does not allow manō to eat or harm kanaka in the waters of O‘ahu (Goldberg-Hiller and Silva 2011, 437). The group's pilina to Kaahupahau and the ‘āina of this moku compels them to ensure that other malihini respect the customs of this place, thus resulting in the group stepping in to make sure the visiting manō do not attack the surfers. Uaua (January 5, 1871, 4) describes this act as "uku," as a form of repayment or compensation for the group's time with Kaahupahau and the ‘āina of ‘Ewa. This demonstrates that the group's obligations to place have changed.

While they may not be kamaʻāina to ʻEwa and Oʻahu, their time spent here during their huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi means they are also no longer malihini, and thus have the kuleana to uku or repay Kaahupahau and the ʻāina that hosted and nourished them. Part of this reciprocation is upholding the customs set forth by Kaahupahau, including the edict that no kanaka be harmed by manō in the waters of Oʻahu.

These shifting relations and kuleana trouble static and abstract identities, and demonstrate the value of revitalizing and even reconstructing ʻŌiwi ways of knowing and naming our pilina to ʻāina. As an ʻŌiwi I have kuleana to the pae ʻāina of Hawaiʻi, but more specifically as a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai I have kuleana to the ʻāina of Waialua. During the latest stand against the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea, I had the kuleana to protest and make my voice heard, but I also had the kuleana to listen to the kamaʻāina of that wahi pana and take guidance from them, especially while I was in the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu. For me and my ʻohana, that meant helping those in the donations tent organize and distribute resources. For others, such as Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020, 527), that meant physically barring construction vehicles by chaining themself to others on the cattle gate. This is not to say that our collective belonging as ʻŌiwi is not valuable. As we heal from the various violences and trauma brought about by the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi, having a common identity through which we can recognize one another and take pride in is important. But it is also crucial for us to research and resurge our ancestral ways of knowing and belonging with one another and the ʻāina with which we are in pilina. Mākaʻikaʻi help in these necessary processes of ʻŌiwi—and non-ʻŌiwi—becoming more than malihini, settlers, or allies to the ʻāina we call home.

While non-ʻŌiwi cannot *become* ʻŌiwi to this pae ʻāina, they can build pilina with ʻāina that tie them into broader ʻupena of pilina that hold ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike accountable to our

various relations and kuleana. This is not the same as becoming “Hawaiian at heart,” or simply declaring a love for Hawaiʻi as one’s favorite vacation paradise. Through practices such as mākaʻikaʻi, which create the space for kamaʻāina and malihini to work through one another’s moʻokūʻauhau, aloha ʻāina, and kuleana, non-ʻŌiwi can begin to develop pilina to ʻāina, kamaʻāina, and ʻŌiwi. These pilina inform the production of kanaka, not along the lines of a settler-indigenous binary, but as knots in an ʻupena of pilina that ties them to the ʻāina and kamaʻāina they are in community with. It is important to note here that our kuleana are informed not only by our pilina, but also by our moʻokūʻauhau. Our familial connection to ʻāina therefore gives ʻŌiwi some kuleana that non-ʻŌiwi do not carry. Thus, while remaining attentive to moʻokūʻauhau, this line of theorizing opens up the possibility to build deeply grounded and disruptive relationalities that struggle to thrive in mutual interdependence with one another and ʻāina. This is about more than building allyship; it is about developing pilina that inspire an unwavering love for ʻāina that calls on kanaka to (re)create the conditions of possibility that allow kamaʻāina and ʻŌiwi to live on, nurture, and protect the lands, waters, and beings who sustain us. Rather than relying on identity politics to inform allyship and positionality, mākaʻikaʻi create encounters with people and place that allow malihini to understand one’s kuleana and pilina, and what those mean for their process of becoming. Through this practice, we build more than settler-allies; we weave strong and resilient ʻupena of pilina made up of poʻe aloha ʻāina whose aloha for one another and ʻāina keeps us committed to (re)producing ea.

It is noteworthy that Kaehuikimanoopuuloa is particular about which kamaʻāina they approach to take them on a mākaʻikaʻi, and then join them on their huakaʻi. Many of the manō they interact with are not just kamaʻāina or aliʻi to a place, they are also considered kiaʻi of those places. This tells us that some kamaʻāina have more kuleana than others to take malihini on

mākaʻikaʻi. In a Hawaiʻi where newcomers and residents are eager to give themselves the title of kamaʻāina, this becomes especially pertinent. The kamaʻāina Kaehuikimanoopuuloa seeks out are aliʻi, as well as kiaʻi. They are not only knowledgeable about their places, they also have genealogical ties to place (either through moʻokūʻauhau kinship, or in the case of Kua, genealogies of care and being in place), and thus have particular kuleana to protect the ʻāina they kiaʻi. This shows us that who we mākaʻikaʻi with matters. Malihini who want to develop new or stronger relationships to place need to also develop pilina with the ʻŌiwi and kūpuna of that place, to those grounded in the moʻolelo of that ʻāina. As I demonstrated earlier, to mākaʻikaʻi with a kamaʻāina is to encounter ʻāina as someone's family, as something cherished and loved. Encountering ʻāina in this way shapes how we see place; it helps us start to fall in love with ʻāina, and gives malihini the opportunity to develop pilina not only with the lands and water of a place, but also the ʻŌiwi and poʻe aloha ʻāina who sustain and are sustained by ʻāina.

Uaua's description of the manō the group encounters as kamaʻāina and kiaʻi also sheds light on what it means to be a kiaʻi ʻāina. While being a kiaʻi ʻāina of course involves physically guarding and protecting ʻāina, it also means educating those who come to a place with the intention of learning and developing or renewing pilina to ʻāina and kamaʻāina. Uaua (December 1, 1870, 4) demonstrates that guarding a place by prohibiting anyone from accessing it, passing through, or learning about it, even by way of a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, is not a pono way to kiaʻi ʻāina. While travelling towards Oʻahu, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa mā encounter two giant kiaʻi manō of Maui, who tell the group they cannot pass through those channels. After explaining that they are on a huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, not a huakaʻi kaua or a huakaʻi ikaika, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa is forced to fight, and ultimately kill, Kaianuilalawalu and Kauhuhu. Upon their death, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa offers their bodies to Kamohoaliʻi, a deity and "kupunakane akua" to

Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, by way of ceremony, and then temporarily appoints Honuiki as the new kiaʻi of the channels (Uaua, December 1, 1870, 4). The group continues on their huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, and upon their return to the kai of Maui they see that the multiplicity of beings living on and visiting the ʻāina are thriving in mutual interdependence with Honuiki as the new kiaʻi:

> Poalua na malihini ma Kahoolawe, a huli hoi nui aku la a hiki ma Kipahulu, e noho ana ke kiai o Honuiki ma kona noho alii ana no ia okana o Maui Hikina, e me ka hoonoho ana aku a ka Opio iaia, ua maluhia maikai ka aina ma kana hoomalu ana me ka oluolu, a malaila na malihini i hooluolu ai a i kekahi la ae, ua kuahaua ia na mano a pau e akoakoa ai no ka hoolilo ia ana o Honuiki i alii ma kahi o Kauhuhu i make, a i ka akoakoa ana mai o na mano a pau. Olelo mai la ka Opio imua o ka lehulehu, "Ua kahea aku nei au ia oukou ma kahi o Kauhuhu i haule aku nei, a ke hoike aku nei au ma ke akea ua hookohu pono ia aku o Honuiki i alii, a i kiai no keia aoao o ka moana, a e noho oukou e na mea a pau ma kana hoomalu ana mai keia manawa aku, oiai e ana kana hoomalu ana."
> Kaehuikimanoopuuloa
> Pukaua Nui o na kai o Hawaii nei (Uaua January 5, 1871, 4).
>
> On the second day that the malihini were at Kahoʻolawe they turned and arrived at Kīpahulu where the kiaʻi Honuiki was residing as reigning chief for this district of East Maui, just as the Youth appointed them. The ʻāina was beautiful and peaceful under their protection and was pleasant and here the malihini rested until another day. Then it was announced to all of the sharks that they should gather for Honuiki to be assigned chief in place of Kauhuhu who is deceased. When all of the sharks assembled the Youth spoke in front of the crowd, "I have called on all of you here where Kauhuhu was defeated, and I am telling the public that Honuiki is rightfully appointed as chief and as kiaʻi for this boundary of the sea. All of you shall live under their protection from this moment forward while their control is pono."
> Kaehuikimanoopuuloa
> Leader of the kiaʻi o Hawaiʻi (Au, 2024).

As a kiaʻi, Honuiki was able to (re)create the conditions where malihini could encounter ʻāina and begin to form intimate pilina with it, while also ensuring that the ʻāina was nurtured and protected so as to keep nurturing and protecting those who live and rely on it. This portion of the moʻolelo therefore emphasizes the kuleana that kamaʻāina and kiaʻi ʻāina have to protect and nurture our ʻāina in ways that expand beyond notions of security that exist through the settler colonial encounter. In the face of rampant development and tourism, the need and desire to protect our ʻāina is becoming more and more prevalent. "He Moolelo Kaao no

Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" demonstrates that how we choose to protect our ʻāina matters. Kaianuilalawalu and Kauhuhu took protection to mean preventing newcomers from accessing their ʻāina, and it led them to act aggressively towards all who passed. Honuiki, under the guidance of Kaehuikimanoopuuloa, enacted a different way to kiaʻi ʻāina, one that involved feeding malihini and allowing them to encounter ʻāina in ways that help them develop intimate pilina with it. While not everyone is entitled to knowledge or access to ʻāina, as kiaʻi ʻāina we cannot bar newcomers from these things simply because they originate from elsewhere. In other words, we need to distinguish between settlers, those who come to place only to extract and consume, and malihini who wish to develop a new pilina to place. As I will demonstrate further in the next chapter, the kiaʻi of Mauna a Wākea took on this kuleana when they created a system wherein they could not only protect the Mauna, but also educate others and help them find where—and if—they belong in the movement.

"He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa" gives us an understanding of huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi as occurring specifically between malihini and kamaʻāina (Uaua 1870-71), and demonstrates the fluidity of kamaʻāina and malihini as relationships to place rather than static identities. This moʻolelo and the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi it follows teaches us that malihini and kamaʻāina are shifting relationships to ʻāina, kamaʻāina do not have to be born to the ʻāina they are pili to, and one can go from a malihini to a kamaʻāina depending on how they cultivate and attend to their relationship and kuleana to place. We also learn that kamaʻāina and malihini are not strictly limited to expressing kanaka relations. Throughout the moʻolelo very few, if any, kanaka are described as kamaʻāina and malihini, and thus demonstrates that to avoid violently translating non-human beings out of these relationships we need to remain attuned to the ways that humans and non-humans alike form and maintain intimate relationships with place. More

than expanding our ʻupena of pilina and who, or what, we see ourselves in relation with, this also expands our understanding of who we can mākaʻikaʻi with.

Amidst ongoing processes of colonial displacement, many ʻŌiwi have become malihini to the ʻāina that nurtured and sustained their ʻohana for generations. Our pilina to place have been disrupted by the violent processes brought about by the settler colonial encounter, and I argue that mākaʻikaʻi offer a way for ʻŌiwi to (re)new these pilina using a practice that comes from us, rather than processes forced upon us by the settler colonial encounter. For ʻŌiwi to mākaʻikaʻi *with* our ʻāina, to spend time listening to, watching, feeling, experiencing the lands, waters, and beings who sustain us and are sustained by us helps us (re)connect to our ʻāina in ways that allow for the cultivation of ea and flourishing of lifeways. These intimate experiences also create the conditions to produce knowledges and pilina that are not premised on the settler colonial encounter. Far from property or nonlife (Povinelli 2016), ʻāina functions as a web of connections and deep relations that inform how we as ʻŌiwi become kamaʻāina with the places we love, live with, and sustain. Again, who we mākaʻikaʻi with matters. This is not to say that anyone can spend time at the beach and call themselves a kamaʻāina. Rather, we know who we are as kamaʻāina ʻŌiwi o ka ʻehu kai through the moʻolelo of this place and our experiences with the ʻehu kai, with the kula of Waialua, with the kuahiwi of Kaʻala and the wai flowing from ʻŌpaeʻula and Kawailoa. It is from this place of grounded relationality, which I explained in the last chapter, that we as kamaʻāina ʻŌiwi o ka ʻehu kai can mākaʻikaʻi with malihini who have the right intentions, and help them develop pilina to ʻāina in ways that allow us to mutually flourish.

While displacement from ʻāina through colonial and settler colonial processes are relatively new to ʻŌiwi, we have always recognized that ʻŌiwi can, and have, formed pilina with

new ʻāina while maintaining and even renewing pilina to ʻāina that we have been away from (Chang 2016). Here we see that huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi provide an opportunity for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike to become more than malihini to our ʻāina, to (re)connect with those places that nurtured our ancestors while also forming new pilina to the ʻāina that hold us today. Throughout the moʻolelo, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa learns about pilina they have with other ʻāina and manō, and they also reveal intimate pilina between Kua and ʻāina outside of Hawaiʻi. During the huakaʻi mākaʻikaʻi, Kaehuikimanoopuuloa and Kua are both reacquainted with relatives and ʻāina, and are given an opportunity to actively renew these pilina and the kuleana that come with them. Sharing the pleasure of one's ʻāina with a malihini therefore helps to create a relationship between the newcomer and ʻāina, and also works to strengthen the aloha that a kamaʻāina has for the ʻāina they have pilina to. This demonstrates that one goal of mākaʻikaʻi is to build relationships between malihini and ʻāina, and strengthen pilina between kamaʻāina and ʻāina. These pilina inform our kuleana, and create the conditions for us to become more than malihini when appropriate. Rather than (re)creating the conditions of possibility that force the settler colonial encounter to last, mākaʻikaʻi set the stage for encounters with ʻāina to produce subjectivities grounded in one's particular pilina, moʻokūʻauhau, and kuleana. As I will demonstrate in the next section, the pilina and aloha produced through encounters with ʻāina inform how the kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai I interviewed understand their belonging to Waialua and the kuleana it gives them.

"Mākaʻikaʻi" with Kamaʻāina o ka ʻEhu Kai

Across interviews with community members, cultural practitioners, educators, and farmers in Waialua, shared and personal experiences with ʻāina appeared as a recurring theme

shaping how these kamaʻāina understand and act upon their kuleana to this place, including the multiple and various beings therein. I had originally planned on conducting mākaʻikaʻi with ʻŌiwi, kamaʻāina, and malihini to Waialua to research the potential that mākaʻikaʻi have to inform processes of becoming grounded in pilina to ʻāina and one another. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, however, my research plans had to be altered. Instead of going on mākaʻikaʻi, I interviewed 12 ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi community members, including cultural practitioners, environmental conservationists and educators, ocean recreation specialists, and farmers. Some of the participants played crucial parts in shaping how I understand and relate to this ʻāina, and others I met through mutual acquaintances. I met with men and women, with ages ranging from those in their 20's to those in their 60's. The goal was to talk to those who had longstanding and/or genealogical ties to Waialua, as well as those whose work is based in Waialua and geared toward cultivating and protecting this ʻāina. Due to health and safety precautions, some of these interviews took place online via email correspondence, while others took place in locations significant to the interviewee. For example, I met one participant in their front lawn where we were able to look out at the shoreline with which they described an intimate relationship that shaped their understanding of who they are as an ʻŌiwi. With other participants, I met with them at the sites in Waialua where they are growing food, restoring ʻāina to make loʻi kalo, or educating youth of the area.

All these interviews started with a simple prompt: tell me a story about how you came to call Waialua home, or—for those who have lived in Waialua their whole lives—tell me a story about growing up in Waialua. Since we could not share stories about place while walking among ʻāina together like other mākaʻikaʻi I had done, I wanted to hear what stories they chose to describe their experiences of being and becoming in Waialua. More than anything, I was

interested in uncovering how each participant developed a pilina to Waialua; how that pilina changed over time and across experiences; and how one's particular pilina to place informs their kuleana to this ʻāina, and the beings who rely on and sustain it. Throughout these conversations, the most recurring themes and topics were aloha for ʻāina, moʻokūʻauhau and one's particular pilina to place, kuleana, and the need to ensure that future generations and newcomers to Waialua have the opportunity to connect with ʻāina and build intimate, grounded relations with this place.

Many participants started their stories by reflecting on their experiences with ʻāina, and how they developed a deep and abiding aloha for this ʻāina. One participant began with a "multi-sensory" reflection on falling asleep during the 1970's in their childhood home in Haleʻiwa: "I hear the wind causing a rhythmic clatter of metal striking the mast of a nearby sailboat resting peacefully at its dock. The sound of the occasional progress and egress of a cane haul truck from the Waialua Sugar Mill along its way envelopes me. I also embrace the smell of salt in the air as the symbiotic relationship between the crashing waves and the onshore winds off Ali'i Beach Park announce their presence, proclaim their time-honored existence." These descriptions about their aloha for the ʻāina of Waialua were not framed as a naturalized, always already love for place. Rather, participants—ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike—described falling in love with this ʻāina through their experiences with this place. As one ʻŌiwi explained, they had a desire to "[n]ot just say I'm connected to Haleʻiwa but… connect in a manner of being able to read the seasons, read the oceans, read the winds, read the rain." Their longing to know these kahakai and kula on a deeper level is reminiscent of falling in love with someone—the desire to soak everything in, learn everything there is to know about them. Through their daily kilo practice of walking the beach and observing changes in the currents, waves, winds, and scents, this ʻŌiwi was able to

find belonging in Waialua, on the ʻāina that fostered their ʻohana, but upon which they did not grow.

Throughout the interviews I conducted it was clear that the ʻāina of Waialua and Hawaiʻi shaped these ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi in ways that influence how they understand their place among the ʻehu kai of Puaʻena today. When discussing kuleana, in particular, every participant began by thinking through their connection to ʻāina. For some, this is a moʻokūʻauhau connection to ʻāina, while others formed pilina with ʻāina through genealogies of care and acts of aloha ʻāina, such as food production and land restoration. Regardless, everyone articulated a profound aloha for ʻāina, as well as a recognition of our mutual interdependence with the ʻāina of Waialua. One participant described the shared love and aloha for this place and one another as a bonding connection, one they feel is diminishing as people move to Waialua and choose to remain malihini to this ʻāina. Indeed, these changes to our community and ʻāina were a common concern across the interviews, and many participants expressed the need for there to be more opportunities for kamaʻāina and malihini alike to *be* with ʻāina. For those interviewed, it was through their pilina with this ʻāina and other poʻe o ka ʻehu kai that they began to experience their belonging to place and understand more fully the ways we are mutually interdependent.

As Haleʻiwa and Waialua become more and more commercialized and developed, opportunities for malihini and kamaʻāina alike to engage in place-based education and cultural practices is dwindling. Interview participants explained that this makes it more difficult to be on the ʻāina and develop pilina to it in non-commercialized ways. Driving along ke one loa o Māeaea makes this clear. Whereas these shorelines were once filled with lawaiʻa and kamaʻāina playing in the kai, it is now almost impossible to drive through these areas without getting stopped behind tour buses, surf schools, and dive groups. Additionally, wetlands and other

agricultural lands are increasingly re-zoned for commercial and residential development. One kamaʻāina shared a moʻolelo about the abundance of loʻi that used to be where there are now neighborhoods, roads, and a McDonald's. Their grandmother used to play in and work loʻi kalo that spanned miles, using them as sources of nourishment as well as pathways to go from the kula to the kai. Now these patches are few and far between. Today you are more likely to encounter nourishment in the form of fast food and food trucks in this area instead of the mea ʻono that these loʻi and ʻāina once produced.

How we encounter ʻāina matters. If we only give malihini and our youth commercialized and exploitative experiences with our ʻāina, those are the relationships they are most likely to form with Waialua. Mākaʻikaʻi can create opportunities for different encounters with our ʻāina, ones that are rooted in grounded relationalities and routed through a profound aloha for place. Far from the tours we are used to, mākaʻikaʻi are meant to be transformative, to give newcomers the opportunity to learn about and start to fall in love with the ʻāina that we adore. It is from this place of pilina and love that newcomers can *become* something more than settlers, and ʻŌiwi can become more kamaʻāina to our places, by embracing our various kuleana and acting as poʻe aloha ʻāina. Across the board, participants agreed that there need to be more spaces in our community for people to learn about this ʻāina, to know more moʻolelo about this place and begin to understand and build their particular pilina and kuleana to it. These intimate encounters with ʻāina help to begin to establish and deepen one's relationship with Waialua and the multiplicity of beings who consider this place home. One participant directly expressed a kuleana to educate newcomers, and ensure that they are grounded in the moʻolelo of this place, "I feel like that's also become a kuleana, to share with people who are visiting here. And I get a little protective at some points, like how much do I want to share with people?" Once again,

moʻokūʻauhau matter. Going on a mākaʻikaʻi and wanting to transform one's relationship to ʻāina and the kamaʻāina of a place does not entitle newcomers to knowledge or pilina. Much like the aliʻi manō that Kaehuikimanoopuuloa encounters, kamaʻāina and kiaʻi ʻāina have the kuleana of determining a newcomer's intentions, and how much ʻike should, and can, be given to help them along their journey of becoming acquainted with and building pilina with place.

Participants also recognized, however, that there is diversity in these moʻolelo, and that there is no singular or authoritative way to be kamaʻāina to this place and attend to the kuleana therein. One ʻŌiwi explained, "[t]he moʻolelo of our ancestors is important. It's also different, depending on who's telling it. So everybody has a different memory, and some people have different perceptions. But that's the beauty of being able to sit and listen to all of it. And I still feel like there are so many more stories that I haven't heard, but that's another key component, I think, of being able to connect to place and share that with others, whether they are from here or not." Rather than searching for one true, or authentic way to be kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, mākaʻikaʻi come with the kuleana to listen to and engage with multiple moʻolelo about place to unpack and understand our ʻupena of pilina and the diverse relationalities held within them. I take great pride in having been raised and nurtured by the ʻāina of Waialua; I take pride in the fact that I know this ʻāina in a deeply intimate way, and that this ʻāina also knows me. This also comes with the modesty of knowing that I am not the only person that knows and loves this ʻāina, and there are others who know and love this place in ways I do not, maybe ways I cannot. Many interviewees thus stated a kuleana to remain open, to be willing to learn with the goal of better understanding difference. As this interview participant explained, there are so many moʻolelo about Waialua that they have not heard, so much ʻike that has yet to resurface. Instead of fitting these moʻolelo and ways of being in pilina with this ʻāina into predefined identities or

subjectivities, mākaʻikaʻi push us to become in ways that are grounded in aloha and moʻokūʻauhau yet fluid enough for us to find belonging, no matter how we perform our being. This kuleana to educate malihini while remaining open and willing to learn thus requires a degree of humility, an ethic of alterity—that I decribe in the next chapter—that positions one's moʻolelo aloha ʻāina as one among many. This is not to say that malihini can replace our moʻolelo with their own. Rather, malihini can learn how to weave their stories into the ʻupena of pilina they have been invited to become a part of to find their kuleana to ʻāina and kamaʻāina.

This fluidity of kuleana was another common theme among interview participants. Many explained that their kuleana has changed over time, as they have gotten older and established new and deeper connections with the people and ʻāina of this place. For non-ʻŌiwi cultural practitioners and ʻāina workers, the dynamism of kuleana allows them to step back when necessary, or step forward when the time calls for it. One participant without a moʻokūʻauhau connecting them to ʻāina explained that, "here in Hawaiʻi it is not my kuleana to be a thought-leader, but I can feed people" and work to make sure that our leaders and communities are full and healthy. This is how many of the participants framed their kuleana—each of us has a gift, a passion. For some this is growing food, and restoring waterways and food networks. For others this is a deep pilina to the kai, and all the beings and activities therein. Others have the ability to dance, and sing, and oli. The particular pilina created through these gifts, through the actions of cultivating food, being in the ocean, or dancing hula, helped develop a sense of privilege and responsibility in these participants. One ʻŌiwi explained that the foundation for their kuleana and passion for education is informed by "the ocean… learning about the ocean, my grandfather teaching me about the ocean, how to share, how to teach people to be safe… all of that is imbedded with being culturally responsible too. Being in touch with the ocean is where it all

started. It nurtured me as a person and kept me in touch with the community." This deep pilina to the kai thus comes with the responsibility to not only indulge in the leʻaleʻa of it, but to also teach others how to enjoy the kai without commercializing it, or over-extracting. The ocean nurtured this ʻŌiwi as a person, it helped them find their passion and direction, which in turn informs their kuleana towards both the ocean and those who come to it. These kuleana have little to do with prescribed performances of indigeneity, or pseudo-scientific notions of blood quantum, and everything to do with the participants' aloha for ʻāina, as established through moʻokūʻauhau, genealogies of being in place, and experiences living on and with ʻāina.

Mākaʻikaʻi will not immediately stop the development and commercialization of our ʻāina; they will not halt the influx of tourists who flood our shores and communities daily, but they can begin to (re)create the conditions of possibility for malihini and kamaʻāina alike to learn about, engage with, and develop pilina with ʻāina in ways that are rooted in our ʻike and cannot be coopted by the settler colonial encounter. These pilina help inform one's particular kuleana to the ʻāina they encounter. While discussing the importance and kuleana of learning about the culture and moʻolelo of a place, one participant pointed out that "people, when they move really far to a new place, assimilate into that place, and sometimes it's because of massively inequitable power structures, and sometimes it's because you're trying to be a good neighbor to your neighbor." There is thus a difference in being forced to assimilate to cultural hegemony under powers of domination, and acclimating to a place so as to be in community with those that surround us. Mākaʻikaʻi, as described by Uaua and as practiced by my ʻohana, give malihini and newcomers a way to learn about place and the ways they can be a good neighbor to the ʻāina and community they encounter, whether in passing or while making a home. Throughout the interviews participants drew on experiences with ʻāina and conversations with people that helped

inform how they became kamaʻāina to this place. Even those who have longstanding moʻokūʻauhau to this ʻāina emphasized that it was through learning about these pilina, through living with and loving ʻāina that they began to really understand their kuleana to this place. The moʻolelo and conversations that mākaʻikaʻi spur create the conditions for kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai to be better neighbors to one another and our ʻāina, to be in better pilina with the multiple and various human and non-human beings that nurture and sustain us. Embracing these kuleana allows ʻŌiwi to enact new home-making projects, new ways of becoming and belonging to place that create the conditions for alternative relations of power and subjectivities to be born from intimate encounters and pilina with ʻāina. Rather than reproducing static settler and Indigenous identities, these fluid subjectivities are informed by and help (re)produce grounded relationalities that nurture and sustain ʻāina.

Conclusion

Although I have only more recently started to research and formally practice mākaʻikaʻi, looking at my family's process of becoming and belonging in Waialua reveals that we, along with other ʻŌiwi, have been engaging in these alternative forms of knowledge production and pilina-building since moving to this ʻāina. When my ʻohana first moved to Waialua, my father sought out recommendations for hālau hula to enroll me and my sisters in, knowing that a hālau would be a good place for us to learn more about culture and establish relationships with the community. Through this hālau we met kamaʻāina such as Aunty Coco Leong, and kūpuna, like Aunty Kanani and Aunty Honey ʻAwai, and Aunty Betty and Uncle Jack Jenkins. It was through our experiences in Waialua with these and other kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai that we as an ʻohana started to become more than malihini to this ʻāina. Over the years, this ʻāina and the kamaʻāina

who sustain it have been woven into our ʻupena of pilina, extending our family and becoming some of the dearest knots of connection that we hold. A couple of years ago we had the task of cleaning out Aunty Betty's home in Mokulēʻia. While going through stacks of books that seemed to never end, I found "tūtū mama" Elizabeth Nālani Mersberg Spencer MacMillan Ellis's copy of *Sites of Oʻahu* circa 1981. As I gently paged through this book, I found hand-written notes about the wahi pana of Waialua. She marked her daughter Aunty Betty's house on the map, and wrote additional notes throughout the section on Waialua. I had known that both tūtū mama and Aunty Betty were born on Hawaiʻi island and moved to Oʻahu later in life, but I had never thought about how they became kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. Flipping through the pages of this book, I realized that when they were still malihini to this place tūtū mama and Aunty Betty took the time to learn more about this ʻāina, to work through and unpack how they connect to it and what their kuleana to Waialua is. Through their own acts of aloha ʻāina, genealogies of care, and attention to these kuleana, they became kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, and as educators, scholars, and activists they helped others in the community (re)weave our connections to one another and this ʻāina.

There is no singular, authoritative, predetermined process of becoming kamaʻāina, nor is there a predefined image of what being kamaʻāina looks like. For tūtū mama, Aunty Betty, and my ʻohana, this required delving into moʻolelo about Waialua—moʻolelo that taught us how to weave this ʻāina into our ʻupena of pilina. Like many ʻŌiwi today, the ʻāina that I call home is not the same ʻāina that nurtured and sustained my ancestors. While my great-great-great-grandmother's one hānau are in Waimalu, Waialua is the ʻāina that holds and nurtures me today, and it is this ʻāina that I aloha and strive to sustain. Various settler colonial processes of dispossession and extraction have created the conditions where ʻŌiwi no longer inhabit the ʻāina that their ʻohana held kuleana to before the settler colonial encounter in Hawaiʻi took hold. This

is not to say that ʻŌiwi no longer have familial pilina and kuleana to ʻāina, or that the moʻokūʻauhau connecting us to ʻāina are irrelevant. Instead, I have shown in this chapter that practices such as mākaʻikaʻi push us to unpack and cultivate our specific pilina with and kuleana to ʻāina, rather than relying on an identity politics and binary that help perpetuate the settler colonial encounter. I demonstrate that I am a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai by attending to my kuleana to mālama this ʻāina and remain in reciprocal recognition with these lands, waters, and beings, and mākaʻikaʻi help create the conditions where I am recognized using a practice grounded in ʻŌiwi culture and history instead of an identity politics routed through settler colonial processes. Far from recreating the conditions that give rise to settler colonial forms of power, mākaʻikaʻi allow ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to cultivate pilina to place grounded in one's particular genealogies and acts of aloha ʻāina. Through mākaʻikaʻi malihini can begin to learn how they relate to ʻāina, and what kuleana come with these relations. Being mindful of one's pilina and attending to the kuleana they bring creates the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to become something more than Indigenous, settlers, or allies. It allows us to relate to specific ʻāina in more intimate ways, to develop deep aloha for ʻāina that spurs us to protect and mālama these places and the ability of ʻŌiwi to nurture and sustain them. Resurging mākaʻikaʻi also gives ʻŌiwi the opportunity to understand ourselves, our pilina, and our differences using an ʻŌiwi-defined and controlled practice that does not privilege or prioritize the settler colonial encounter. In the next chapter, I use the lens of mākaʻikaʻi to analyze the latest stand against the Thirty-Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea and demonstrate the power and potential that occurs when ʻŌiwi use our own processes and practices to recognize one another and attend to our various kuleana.

Chapter Four: He Mākaʻikaʻi no Kahakakaukanaka and Mauna a Wākea

The view from the shore of what is now known as Haleʻiwa Beach Park looks different depending on what season it is. In the winter, when the waves are big and the ʻehu kai is thick, one can barely see the way Kaʻala slopes into Kaʻena to the west (Figure 8). As the sun rises higher in the sky it begins to warm the sand, never so much to make it hot though. Surfers crowd the water while spectators line ke one loa o Māeaea to watch as the giant walls of water come crashing down. One of my favorite smells in the world is the scent of this ʻehu kai on a cold, winter day. The summer and warmer weather bring about different smells, different sights. Instead of surfers crowding the waters, the kai is filled with waʻa, kayaks, stand-up paddle boards, snorkelers, divers, and swimmers. The sands are filled with people laying out, basking in the sun, and soaking up its warmth. By the time the sun reaches its peak the sands are scorching, yet still inviting enough to jump into after spending hours in the water. Burying my cold body, chilled by the ocean, in these warm sands and feeling the heat radiate around me is like falling into the embrace of a loved one. Throughout the seasons, regardless of the size of the waves or the amount of people in the water, Kahakakaukanaka remains visible and prominent from this shoreline (Figure 9).

Figure 8: View of Kaʻena and the ʻehu kai from ke one loa o Māeaea

Figure 9: Kahakakaukanaka (left) and Puaʻena (right)

Situated to the west of Puaʻena, this large coral head sticks out of the kai, standing alone beneath the sunlight and ʻehu kai of Waialua. Despite the abundance of people who frequent these waters, one rarely finds people near this pōhaku. Surfers tells stories about seeing sharks around Puaʻena in general, but especially near Kahakakaukanaka. Following this pōhaku three miles out towards open ocean leads to a drop-off in the reef where nutrients from the nearby streams converge, attracting an abundance of sharks who sometimes swim closer to shore looking for fish and other sources of nourishment. Growing up I always noticed this pōhaku, but never thought much of it. Similar to Pōhaku Lānaʻi in Kaiaka, this pōhaku was always there—just another feature of the ʻāina that surrounded me. It wasn't until my later years as an undergraduate student in college that I learned that this pōhaku was actually part of how Māeaea got its name. More than just a rock in the ocean, this pōhaku signifies the deep pilina that kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai have with the kai of Waialua, even in death.

Translating to "the platform to place people," Kahakakaukanaka served as a resting place for poʻe o ka ʻehu kai ancestrally. Caring for a dead body is a great responsibility, and not an easy task. For those with pilina to Waialua who did not have someone to take on the kuleana of handling their body after passing, their kino would be placed on Kahakakaukanaka to be returned to the kai. Under the warmth of the sun, accompanied by the caress of the currents and drifting ʻehu kai, these bodies would decompose until their flesh and bones were carried off by the kai. The most famous body to be left at Kahakakaukanaka was that of ʻElani, a beloved aliʻi nui of Oʻahu who was killed by Kahekili, an aliʻi nui of Maui, during a period of war between the two islands (Sterling and Summers 1978, 117). ʻElani was killed in the moku of ʻEwa during a violent night-attack which stained the sands of that area red with blood. All of ʻElani's followers

and human kin were killed prior to and during this attack. Since there was no one left to care for his bones, his body was brought several miles to Waialua to be placed at Kahakakaukanaka.

The particular scent, the māea, created by this process is how ke one loa o Māeaea got its name. As the bodies broke down, an oily film would coat the surface of the ocean, drifting along the currents and carrying the smell from Puaʻena towards Kaiaka, where it would eventually begin to dissipate. This film would attract large fish, especially manō, who would make their way to the pōhaku for a meal. When kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai needed to hunt manō, they would stand upon Kahakakaukanaka, waiting for the right manō to swim by before jumping on its backs and striking. One kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai today recalls hearing their grandfather tell stories about seeing people do this when he was young. Gazing towards Kahakakaukanaka today, I see so much more than a pōhaku. Although this perch does not still hold us in our death, it reminds me of the intimate pilina I, as a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, have with the kai. It reminds me that the ocean is more than a resource, or place to play. It reminds me that the kai will hold me, care for me, even in death, and that kind of love means that I have the kuleana to nourish, care for, and sustain the kai until the day comes that it holds me forever.

Going on my own kind of mākaʻikaʻi with Kahakakaukanaka, as well as taking others on mākaʻikaʻi featuring Kahakakaukanaka, has transformed the way I see this ʻāina, relate to this ʻāina, and understand my kuleana to it. If I want to be loved, held, and remembered by Kahakakaukanaka and this kai, then I have the kuleana to love, nourish, and protect this ʻāina in the best ways that I can. As a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, this means sharing these moʻolelo and working to ensure that other poʻe o ka ʻehu kai and malihini to the area know the significance of this wahi pana, creating the opportunity for them to encounter this ʻāina differently and share their own moʻolelo about this place. This kuleana does not come from a prescribed or pre-

defined notion of indigeneity or how to perform aloha (Teves 2018). Rather, this kuleana is rooted in my particular moʻokūʻauhau and pilina connecting me to place, and routed through my aloha for this ʻāina.

As I explored in chapter two, understanding one's self and pilina through an analytic of biopolitics and lens of grounded relationality reveals a weakness in the settler colonial structure of processes that attempts to position settler and Indigenous as always already identities and subjectivities. In chapter three I built on these ideas by analyzing mākaʻikaʻi as a form of knowledge production and pilina-building that functions as an ʻŌiwi-defined and controlled process of establishing grounded relationality and producing subjectivities that trouble static notions of settler and Indigenous. Through this analysis I demonstrated that the practice of mākaʻikaʻi further exposes this weakness in the settler colonial structure by showing the potential that this practice has in creating new and different subjectivities and relations of power that are not grounded in settler colonial relations of power. Operating from a place of grounded relationality pushes ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to think critically about all of our various relations, to one another and to place, and then act in ways that keep us in reciprocal relation with these beings and ʻāina. In this chapter, I use the lens of mākaʻikaʻi to analyze the 2019 struggle against the Thirty-Meter Telescope on Maunakea. Drawing on my own experience, as well as what others have written about their experiences at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu, I use mākaʻikaʻi to interrogate how various pilina and kuleana were established on the Mauna, and how these pilina and kuleana began to produce subjectivizes and relations of power that resist the settler colonial encounter and its prescribed notions of settler and Indigenous subjectivity.

Kuleana and Pilina to the Mauna

I have never been on a mākaʻikaʻi to Mauna a Wākea, but for over a decade Kūkauakahi Ching has led Huakaʻi i Nā ʻĀina Mauna across the wahi pana (Fujikane 2021, 109). Employing what Candace Fujikane (2021, 109-110) calls kaʻapuni mākaʻikaʻi, Ching leads malihini and kamaʻāina to the sacred springs on the Mauna, as recounted in the moʻolelo of Kamiki authored by J. W. H. I. Kihe and serialized in *Ka Hoku o Hawaii* between 1914 and 1917. These huakaʻi are meant to be transformative, to help (re)map the ʻāina of Maunakea in ways that reflect ʻŌiwi moʻolelo about and pilina to place. This mākaʻikaʻi and the moʻolelo of Kamiki show that the springs on the Mauna are connected to the underground waterways across the Pōhakuloa plains, and demonstrates the interconnectedness of kanaka with ʻāina and wai (Fujikane 2021, 112). Those who do not attend Ching's huakaʻi are likely to encounter the Mauna solely as a place for Western science—a pristine location with minimal light pollution to gaze at the stars and search for other inhabitable planets. Similar to the mākaʻikaʻi I have been analyzing in Waialua, this huakaʻi reminds participants of the moʻolelo, beings, and pilina that make Mauna a Wākea sacred and significant to ʻŌiwi, and provides a different narrative and map of place than those promoted by the settler state.

The first time I went to Maunakea was in December of 2016 as part of the University of Hawaiʻi Indigenous Politics (UHIP) program's exchange with the University of Victoria's Indigenous Governance (IGOV) program. A cohort of students from Canada flew to Hawaiʻi, where we spent a week on Oʻahu taking seminars together before flying as a group to Hawaiʻi island. Although this was not presented as a mākaʻikaʻi, those of us in the cohort were provided an encounter with the Mauna grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and relationality, similar to the experience that Ching creates through his huakaʻi. Our group was introduced to the Mauna and

the struggle to protect the Mauna by Luana Busby-Neff and Onaona Trask, two kamaʻāina and kiaʻi ʻāina of Hawaiʻi island who ensured that we encountered the ʻāina of Maunakea in a way that privileged ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and protocol over those presented in the visitor's center and produced through the settler state. Busby-Neff and Trask shared with us various moʻolelo about the ʻāina we stood upon, ranging from ancestral moʻolelo about the akua and beings of this wahi pana, to contemporary stories of fighting to protect the Mauna from further development. As a group we learned about the various ways the University of Hawaiʻi (UH) has failed to be proper stewards of the Mauna while holding onto the lease given to them by the Board of Land and Natural Resources (BLNR) in the 1960's. For decades the University and BLNR have mismanaged the summit of Mauna a Wākea, as documented in a report by the Hawaiʻi state auditor and an Environmental Impact Assessment that determined the astronomy activity has caused significant harm to the ʻāina (Osorio 2021, 149-50). Today there are 13 observatories on the Mauna, as well as multiple facilities to maintain the observatories. In the early 2000's, plans began to construct a thirty-meter telescope on the Mauna, which would make it the largest in the world. ʻŌiwi and allies have been resisting and fighting this construction since the beginning, citing the extreme environmental and cultural harms that such construction would cause.[3] Through the lens of mākaʻikaʻi, we also see that the construction of observatories on Maunakea gives power to the State, UH, and corporations to prevent ʻŌiwi from encountering this wahi pana in ways that are grounded in our moʻolelo, pilina, and practices.

The first thing that struck me about the Mauna was how different it looked from mauna on Oʻahu. Whereas Kaʻala has multiple ridges and deep valleys, Maunakea is sloping, and much

[3] The goal of this chapter is not to provide a detailed account on the history of Mauna a Wākea. For more detailed information, see Iokepa Casumbal-Salazar. 2017. "A Fictive Kinship: Making 'Modernity,' 'Ancient Hawaiians,' and the Telescopes on Mauna Kea." *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 4, no. 2: 1, or visit: https://kanaeokana.net/aole/

smoother than I am accustomed to. As we drove to the visitor's center it dawned on me just how high we were ascending. I had been to the top of Ka‘ala before, where I stood among the clouds, but here we were driving so high that I could see the tops of some clouds. When we reached our destination and I got out of the van, I was shocked by the cold—I had never felt air that crisp in Hawai‘i before, certainly not in the kula of Waialua. On that first visit I was captivated by the sights and sounds around me, sights and sounds I knew would continue to change with more construction, more occupation of ‘āina. The observatories already sitting atop the Mauna create the conditions where ‘Ōiwi engagement and encounters with this wahi pana are regulated and monitored so as to protect the multi-billion-dollar investments made by the state and different universities and corporations. In addition to destroying important places that ‘Ōiwi would māka‘ika‘i with, therefore, these observatories also prevent ‘Ōiwi from accessing and encountering our ‘āina using protocols and practices grounded in our mo‘olelo and ‘ike kupuna.

There were between 20 and 30 of us on this huaka‘i to the Mauna, about half of whom were from Canada while the other half were a mix of ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi from UH. As one of the ‘Ōiwi, I felt I had a kuleana in that wahi pana. I wasn't exactly sure what that kuleana was, but as an ‘Ōiwi I knew that I had a strong pilina to this ‘āina, this Mauna that shows up in so many of our mo‘okū‘auhau. Standing on this sacred Mauna, listening to mo‘olelo about this ‘āina, I began to recognize that my ‘upena of pilina extends beyond the shores of Māeaea, connecting me to ‘āina near and far, and providing me with new kuleana. I was able to further explore and unpack this kuleana and pilina three years later, when I spent a couple days at the Pu‘uhonua o Pu‘uhuluhulu standing in protest against the TMT. During the stand against the TMT that began in July of 2019, ‘Ōiwi established a pu‘uhonua, or place of refuge, at Pu‘uhuluhulu located at the base of the access road to Mauna a Wākea (Osorio 2021, 151). ‘Ōiwi

and allies alike gathered in opposition to the State of Hawaiʻi building yet another telescope on the Mauna, and in doing so we began to cultivate what Osorio (2021, 151) refers to as a living alternative to settler society that was grounded in aloha for and pilina to ʻāina. Using the lens of mākaʻikaʻi, I analyze in this chapter the ways that this grounded relationality helped ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi understand their kuleana in this struggle and act as kiaʻi and protectors of ʻāina. This lens demonstrates the potential for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to become and belong in ways that are routed through our pilina and moʻolelo aloha ʻāina, and reveals the power of moʻolelo in shaping subjectivities that resist the settler colonial encounter in its various forms.

My second trip to the Mauna was much different from the first. Whereas three years prior I had arrived to learn about the struggle against the further desecration of Maunakea, this time I was there to actively participate in protesting and preventing the construction of the TMT. My father, one of my sisters, and I arrived mid-day in a rental car full of supplies, both to donate to the Puʻuhonua and to get us through the next couple of days. In stark contrast to the almost empty road we drove down in 2016, this time as we approached the Ala Hulu Kūpuna, also known as the access road, we saw hundreds of cars lined up along the side of the road—a preview of the mass of people we would find at the Puʻuhonua (Figure 10). Throughout the months-long blockage there ranged anywhere from 30 to 7,000 people at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu. When we arrived, there were hundreds of people holding space and preventing the construction of the TMT. We sought out our friends and ʻohana, some of whom had been there since the beginning of the protest, and took advice from them on where we should camp and how we should kōkua. After situating our belongings, we offered ʻawa and oli to the ahu at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu and quickly got to work at the Hale Hoʻolako, helping to sort

through, organize, and distribute donated blankets, jackets, beanies, and other goods to keep people warm, dry, and comfortable.

Figure 10: Picture of the Mauna and Ala Hulu Kūpuna taken in 2019

The ea cultivated and struggled over at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu prioritized pilina to and reciprocal recognition with ʻāina instead of attempting to engage with and alter the subjectivities and relations of power created through the settler colonial encounter. This Puʻuhonua was actively created and established, every day, through protocols and guidelines set by ʻŌiwi and informed by ʻŌiwi practices, customs, and beliefs. Rather than asserting an always already present sovereignty, these protocols worked to acknowledge our pilina with the

multiplicity of ʻāina and beings around us as the source of authority and responsibility for occupying the Puʻuhonua and protecting Mauna a Wākea. Collectively we (re)created these conditions of possibility three times a day through oli, pule, and hula. These protocols were met with hōʻailona from our ʻāina and various akua that we were seen, heard, and welcomed in that space. The feeling of mist and rain on our skin while cool winds blew through our hair and carried our voices over the Mauna informed our struggle. Seeing Lilinoe caressing various puʻu while watching Kānehoalani appear over the horizon reminded us of the importance of our presence there, of the responsibilities and privileges we held while being in pilina with our ʻāina and akua. Individually we worked to perpetuate and recognize these pilina and the kuleana they carry by acting according to kapu aloha. Luana Busby-Neff explains that, far from passivity, kapu aloha is a firm commitment to pono (Osorio 2021, 160). As an ethic, it kept us accountable to one another and the ʻāina we were there to kiaʻi. It was a constant reminder that, as kiaʻi, we had the kuleana of perpetuating the conditions of possibility that allowed us to struggle for ea in that space.

Similar to mākaʻikaʻi, then, the Puʻuhonua worked to (re)create the conditions of possibility where ʻŌiwi could kiaʻi ʻāina according to protocols, customs, and beliefs grounded in our ʻāina and pilina to ʻāina. When I first arrived on the Mauna I was not sure where my place was. As an ʻŌiwi, I have a familial connection to Mauna a Wākea, however I cannot say I am kamaʻāina to that wahi pana. Admittedly, I was nervous upon arriving to the Puʻuhonua. I wanted to help, to lend a hand wherever I could, but I was also cognizant of not wanting to overstep, not wanting to put myself where I do not belong. These nerves quickly faded. Through protocol, dialogue, and the abundance of kiaʻi throughout the Puʻuhonua, it became easy to understand my kuleana to the movement at that particular time, in that particular space. In a special issue of

Biography titled "We Are Maunakea: Aloha ʻĀina Narratives of Protest, Protection, and Place," Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020), Ryan "Gonzo" Gonzalez (2020), Marie Eriel Hobro (2020), and Kawena Kapahua (2020) similarly reflect on their experience with finding their place and kuleana in the movement.

Mākaʻikaʻi on the Mauna

Although I had been there once before, when I arrived to the Mauna in 2019 I was still malihini to that wahi pana. Indeed, I would say I am still malihini to that ʻāina, but through my time at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu I have started to build a deeper pilina to the Mauna and all that it holds. Like Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020), Gonzalez (2020), and Kapahua (2020), I was cognizant that being ʻŌiwi gave me a kuleana to the Mauna and the movement, but I was not sure what my role was or how I could attend to that kuleana—whatever it may be. When Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020, 527) arrived on the Mauna, she was asked by kūpuna if she would take on the kuleana of offering her body to the Mauna. She writes that her "only doubt [was] whether someone who just arrived from Oʻahu should take such bold action on an island that is not her home" (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua 2020, 527). It was through remembering her moʻokūʻauhau, remembering that she is this ʻāina, that Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020, 527) was able to resolve that she is of this moku, this Mauna is her piko too, and she has the kuleana through that pilina to kiaʻi Maunakea. Alongside her partner, a total of eight kiaʻi chained themselves to the cattle gate that crosses the Maunakea access road, effectively preventing any construction vehicles from making their way to the top of the Mauna. Goodyear-Kaʻōpua's moʻokūʻauhau and longstanding activism gave her the kuleana to protect the Mauna on the front line. Not every ʻŌiwi who came to the Mauna held that kuleana, and similar to Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, those who came to the Mauna

had the kuleana of finding where their role was, and respecting that moʻokūʻauhau and pilina to place played a large part in determining those roles.

Gonzalez (2020, 638) explains that as the head of network engagement for Kanaeokana, his kuleana was "filling in puka wherever there were puka" regarding communications that needed to go out. Malihini to the Mauna as well, Gonzalez (2020, 639) began developing his pilina with Maunakea by learning about the State's history of mistreating the ʻāina, as well as the lāhui's efforts to protect it. Physically being on the Mauna heightened this pilina for Gonzalez (2020, 640), who reflects that on "the Mauna, there was connection to place, there was connection to culture, there was connection to people." This abundance of pilina allowed Gonzalez to further build his own relationship to the Mauna and the lāhui, which in turn encouraged him to step into his kuleana as part of Nā Leo Kākoʻo, the kiaʻi media team that documented the struggle. Kapahua also came to the Mauna as an ʻŌiwi with a malihini relationship to the wahi pana, and found his kuleana through this media team.

In his essay titled, "Stories from the Mauna, Kuʻu One Hānau," Kapahua (2020, 579) reflects on finding the courage to huakaʻi to Maunakea in early July of 2019, a huakaʻi that would lead to the start of his activism journey. The day after Kapahua arrived, 38 kūpuna were arrested by the State of Hawaiʻi for blocking construction vehicles from accessing the Mauna. Kapahua (2020, 579), along with others, frantically documented everything they could via their social media platforms, ensuring that the rest of the pae ʻāina and the world would be able to see what was happening. Knowing that he would be desperate to stay updated on what was going on if he was not on the Mauna, Kapahua (2020, 580) quit his job to dedicate his time to the media team to help create counternarratives that showed the world what our lāhui was fighting for, and how we were fighting for it. In response to the State's assertions that the Puʻuhonua was

descending into a place of lawlessness, Kapahua (2020, 580) and the media team created videos to show the "beautiful scenes of a well-organized puʻuhonua." Stepping into this kuleana helped Kapahua (2020, 580) change his relationship to the Mauna. It allowed him, as an ʻŌiwi, to act from a place of grounded relationality and work to control the narrative about the Mauna and the kiaʻi protecting it. Hobro (2020, 650) was also inspired to huakaʻi to the Mauna by the stories she heard about the ʻŌiwi struggle to protect our wahi pana, but she came as a non-ʻŌiwi ally to the Mauna.

Hobro (2020, 650) was invited to be a part of Nā Leo Kākoʻo as a documentary photographer, filmmaker, writer, and educator. She describes herself as "as settler who grew up on Native Hawaiian land," and recognizes that her relationship to Hawaiʻi and ʻŌiwi gives her the kuleana to use her work in storytelling to fight against government leaders and corporations in Hawaiʻi prioritizing profit over land, people, and culture (Hobro 2020, 650). When the movement against the TMT started up again in 2019, Hobro (2020, 650) explains that she initially wanted to book a ticket to Hawaiʻi island right away, however, after talking to some people, she realized it "wasn't [her] story to tell, so [she] wanted to wait until [she] was invited so [she] could fully contribute in a respectful way." Ever cognizant of her pilina and kuleana to place, Hobro (2020, 652) took lead from ʻŌiwi and other kiaʻi, and acknowledged that it wasn't her place to document or say whatever she wanted; she was a volunteer, there to "uplift the community through visuals and media." Hobro (2020, 653) reflects that, before going to the Mauna, she took time to question her motives, and upon arriving she spent her first day getting situated with the place and beginning to build relationships instead of jumping into documenting. Hobro's intentions, as well as her attention towards her kuleana, allowed her to enter the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu and aid the movement to block the TMT in ways that trouble her

settler identity. Her actions and performance, shaped by her pilina to ʻŌiwi and ʻāina, helped her function as a valued part of Nā Leo Kākoʻo, and it is worth considering what new subjectivities might be born from these prolonged encounters and connections with ʻāina and ʻŌiwi.

The Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu was established to protect the Mauna, however the kiaʻi did more than block the construction of the TMT. Under the guidance of kūpuna, ʻāina, akua, and ʻaumākua, the kiaʻi on the Mauna created a space for ʻŌiwi to become more than malihini to our Mauna, to know that ʻāina in a more intimate way. Through ʻŌiwi protocol, moʻolelo, and pilina to ʻāina, ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi were able to encounter the Mauna as more than a mountain, more than a piece of land to either develop or defend. Kiaʻi ensured that our collective presence on the Mauna was grounded in ʻŌiwi relationality, demonstrating to those who came to the Puʻuhonua that they were entering a space where ʻŌiwi pilina to our ʻāina, akua, and one another was more important than settler colonial narratives and depictions of place. Indeed, by successfully preventing the construction of the TMT without violent interference by the State, kiaʻi showed us the power of grounding not only our movements, but our ways of being and becoming in place through our moʻolelo, our pilina, our protocols. I assert that this grounded place of ʻŌiwi relationality created the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to mākaʻikaʻi with ʻŌiwi and ʻāina at the Puʻuhonua.

While the kiaʻi did not name these encounters with ʻāina and ʻŌiwi at the Puʻuhonua as mākaʻikaʻi, this type of knowledge production and pilina-building was able to take place because kiaʻi worked to produce a different kind of milieu for us to be in; an environment where ʻŌiwi familial pilina with and kuleana to ʻāina took precedence over state law, where our moʻolelo aloha ʻāina held more weight than colonial narratives about land and resources. The State did arrest 38 kūpuna, and while I do not want to dismiss that violent act, it is remarkable that those

were some of the only arrests made. When the kūpuna were being taken away and the front line was thinning, wahine linked arms and took their place. As Osorio (2021, 146) says, "again, our people controlled the road, controlled our destiny, and continued to protect our ʻāina." Standing face to face with police officers backed by the settler State, our lāhui demonstrated the limits of the State's power. These kiaʻi showed the State that it can continue to throw itself at us, but we will continue to rise like a mighty wave (Osorio 2021, 143-145), propelled by our kuleana to aloha and mālama ʻāina, a kuleana that holds more authority than the State. When the Governor at the time, David Ige, and other state officials came to the Mauna, they greeted kūpuna and alakaʻi on our terms, entered the space according to our protocols. While some of this was political posturing, it was also a moment that forced State actors to engage with our politics, to enter our wahi pana according to our protocols. I cannot say what the long-term results of this stand-off would have been had it not been interrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic; there is no guarantee that the State's power would have continued to bend to the power of our lāhui grounding ourselves in our ʻāina, our moʻolelo, our pilina. But this encounter, between the State and our lāhui, between our lāhui and our ʻāina, demonstrates not only a weakness in the settler colonial structure that presents itself as an always already overwhelming force, it also allowed us to see the potential of resurging and relying on practices that cannot be co-opted or defined by the settler state because they are rooted in and routed through our moʻolelo, our ʻike, our unwavering aloha for ʻāina.

Within this space, grounded in the pilina of our ʻāina, Goodyear-Kaʻōpua (2020, 528) was reminded of her ancestors and future descendants while laying prostrate in the malu of the Mauna, deepening her pilina not only to her kanaka kin, but to the ʻāina that has held and loved them for generations as well. Gonzalez (2020, 640) was held in pilina while on the Mauna,

surrounded by new and old connections, making it difficult for him to leave and return to Oʻahu. Similar to Kaahupahau's desire for Kaehuikimanoopuuloa to remain just a little while longer in ʻEwa after (re)discovering their pilina, Gonzalez did not want to leave the caring embrace of pilina that he found on the Mauna. Kapahua's (2020, 580) time on the Mauna taught him about ea, about the power of moʻolelo when they are grounded in ʻŌiwi culture and beliefs, and Hobro (2020, 653) arguably took her first day on the Mauna to mākaʻikaʻi, to acquaint herself with the ʻāina and beings of the Mauna under the guidance of ʻŌiwi, kūpuna, and kamaʻāina before taking on her kuleana. Writing of this incredible experience, Osorio (2021, 146) reflects on the fact that:

> In fewer than three months, our movement brought thousands of people to the mauna… Most of these kiaʻi had never stood in the malu of Mauna a Wākea before. That's thousands of people who had never had the opportunity to develop an intimate pilina to one of our most sacred ʻāina. Through our collective ea, and our commitment to aloha ʻāina, we brought these Kānaka home. And in doing so, we have cultivated in our people an intimacy with a part of our ʻāina we had been strategically estranged from.

For myself and other ʻŌiwi, being in the Puʻuhonua allowed me to spend time with Lilinoe in the early hours of the morning, while she slowly drifted across the base of the Mauna (Figure 11). I was able to oli to Kānehoalani and greet the sun every morning as it rose above the horizon, able to acknowledge the presence of our akua again at the sun's peak, able to say goodnight to them as the sun set. I walked that ʻāina, slept on that ʻāina, and listened to its leo while embracing the onaona carried on the makani. Under the guidance of ʻŌiwi educators and practitioners, ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike learned moʻolelo about the Mauna and the ʻāina we inhabited. Through the Puʻuhuluhulu University, ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi were able to access an education about Maunakea and the surrounding ʻāina grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo, beliefs, and practices. ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi were also held to the same standards of kapu aloha, an ethic of nonviolence that required everyone at the Puʻuhonua to remain attentive to the reason we were

there and the way we conducted ourselves—a standard established by kūpuna and kamaʻāina of the Mauna and its surrounding ʻāina.

Figure 11: Morning view from the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu

Although occasioned by the settler state, and in many ways shaped by what the settler state might do, being in the Puʻuhonua gave ʻŌiwi an opportunity to reveal weaknesses in the settler colonial structure, and—more importantly—begin to imagine and enact alternative ways of being and belonging that were grounded in our moʻolelo, our culture, our practices, our protocols. This created the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike to encounter ea, to begin to struggle for ea not as state sovereignty, but as our mutual interdependence fostered through our

protection, presence, pilina, and aloha for ʻāina. And for many ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi this was a profoundly transformative experience. There are members of my own ʻohana who were originally pro-TMT, and bought into the narrative that ʻŌiwi were always scientists and should therefore support and stand on the forefront of scientific innovation. After spending time on the Mauna, engaging with kiaʻi, kūpuna, and educators, they came home with a fierce commitment to protecting the Mauna and establishing responsible stewardship of the wahi pana. Maunakea showed ʻŌiwi what was possible when we ground our struggles for ea in processes that are controlled and defined by ʻŌiwi, and non-ʻŌiwi learned that with the right intentions and attention to kuleana they can become integral knots in the ʻupena of pilina informed by this ʻŌiwi grounded relationality.

Being surrounded by our lāhui, cradled by the Mauna, and enveloped in aloha ʻāina, allowed me to recognize myself as ʻŌiwi through my pilina, my moʻokūʻauhau, and my actions instead of through a static identity or blood quantum logic. In her poem "Ask me about the Mauna," Osorio (2021, 145) writes:

> Ask me
> And I will tell you
> I have been transformed here
> But I won't have the words to quite explain
> I will say:
> I don't know exactly who I will be when this ends
> I don't know exactly who *we* will be when this ends
> But at the very least
> I'll know
> This ʻāina
> Did everything it could to feed me
> And that will be enough to keep me standing

Engaging with and being within a Puʻuhonua established, defined, and controlled by ʻŌiwi began to cultivate ea and build a grounded relationality that gave ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi a different

way to know, see, and relate to ourselves and one another. This did not result in a new definition of Native Hawaiian or ‘Ōiwi; it did not set the standards for a new way of performing Hawaiian indigeneity. Instead, it gave us a new mirror to look into, one grounded in our ‘ike and that shows us the beauty and abundance of our pilina. As Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017, 188) asserts, “[r]ight now to a great degree in Indigenous life, we are looking into the colonizer’s mirror, and that mirror is reflecting back that we are shameful, that we are not good enough, that we are not smart, or successful, or rich enough, or white enough… or together enough to organize… But why is the colonizer our mirror?” Rather than continuing to gaze into the colonizer’s mirror, māka‘ika‘i create encounters with ‘āina and ‘Ōiwi that reflect how we belong and who we can become in our ‘upena of pilina, and I assert that the Pu‘uhonua o Pu‘uhuluhulu facilitated a space for ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi to engage with this process and start to become something more than what settler and Indigenous identities and subjectivities limit us to.

The Ethics of Māka‘ika‘i

The Pu‘uhonua o Pu‘uhuluhulu was an ‘Ōiwi-established and controlled space that helped many ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi build and (re)new their pilina and kuleana not only to the Mauna, but to the broader pae ‘āina and lāhui as well. This is not to say that the Pu‘uhonua was without its problems. Of course, conflicts arose, and differences were revealed, but as Gonzalez (2020, 640) writes, “what was beautiful about it was that we were in control of trying to find the solutions for that. It wasn’t anybody else telling us what we could and what we couldn’t do. We were just actualizing it, which was really beautiful.” Kia‘i created a space through the Pu‘uhonua where ‘Ōiwi and non-‘Ōiwi could struggle together and think through what it means to live and be in deep pilina with one another and the ‘āina in that time and context. This struggle was

guided by kūpuna and grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo, and similar to mākaʻikaʻi, establishing and maintaining the Puʻuhonua was as an ʻŌiwi-controlled process that settlers could not co-opt. What does it mean for ʻŌiwi, and non-ʻŌiwi, to become in place according to moʻolelo and practices grounded in ʻŌiwi history and culture? What can mākaʻikaʻi and other ʻŌiwi practices teach us about an ethic of alterity that celebrates difference? In this section, I explore these questions by analyzing mākaʻikaʻi as a practice of sharing diverse moʻolelo aloha ʻāina and finding points of connection, as well as the practice of hoʻopāpā as demonstrated by Osorio (2021) and Noenoe Silva (2017).

Mākaʻikaʻi and a (re)turn to other practices that are routed through ʻŌiwi moʻolelo, culture, and ʻāina create the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to engage in the (re)creation of ʻŌiwi ethics concerning pilina and kuleana to ʻāina and one another. As I demonstrated in the last chapter, mākaʻikaʻi require us to work to understand the particularity of one's kuleana and our ʻupena of pilina. Working through these particularities creates the conditions for a different kind of politics and ethics, where singular authority and universality is replaced with fluid kuleana based on context and pilina. As one kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai explained in the last chapter, everyone with pilina to Waialua holds their own stories, own memories, own understandings of what this wahi pana is. I could live a lifetime and still not know every moʻolelo there is about the ʻāina that I love and strive to sustain. This does not mean our moʻolelo are not valuable, or that we should not try to learn and engage with as many as we can. Rather, this demonstrates the magnitude and abundance within the ʻupena of pilina that Waialua holds. Instead of confining the possibility and diversity held within these various moʻolelo and ways of being in pilina with Waialua into predefined, static identities and subjectivities, ʻŌiwi ethics—demonstrated through

mākaʻikaʻi, hoʻopāpā, and ʻōlelo noʻeau—push us to find points of relationality and connection in the midst of alterity.

While I was dancing with kumu hula Keith ʻAwai, it was part of our protocol to stand together and recite the ʻōlelo noʻeau, ʻaʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokahi—not all knowledge is taught in one school (Pukui 1983, 24)—before practice. He explained that there is not a "correct" way to hula. Five different dancers from different hālau can perform the same song and all do completely different things, and therein lies part of the beauty not only of hula, but of our ʻike. Within this diversity, however, one still has to be accountable to their hālau—the place from which they gain their ʻike, which I understand as also including one's pilina and moʻokūʻauhau. I have gone into every mākaʻikaʻi I have ever hosted with this ʻōlelo noʻeau and its ethic in mind. As I said in chapter three, I love Waialua, and I am immensely proud of the moʻolelo and ʻike I hold about this ʻāina, but I cannot let myself become so arrogant as to believe that I know everything there is to know about this place. Nor do I let myself believe that the moʻolelo I know are the only true, authentic, or real ones out there. The moʻolelo I know are simply that—the moʻolelo that have been taught to me or that I have discovered through my research. Other moʻolelo, even ones that do not align with the ones I carry, are not wrong, or any less important because they are different from what I know; they just come from another knowledge source, another set of pilina, another place of aloha. This ethic of acknowledging diversity instead of asserting a universal or singular authority resists both the settler colonial production of settler and Indigenous identities and subjectivities, as well as the biopolitical production of norms used to regulate how these subjectivities perform and perpetuate relations of power. This ethic therefore opposes not only the production of populations and territories, it also challenges the

idea that there can only be one authoritative set of knowledges concerning people, place, and pilina.

A diverse range of knowledges and performances is celebrated within this ethic; however, one still needs to be accountable to and grounded in their relationalities and kuleana. This ethic does not allow malihini or settlers to overwrite ʻŌiwi moʻolelo, or use their stories and connections to place to lay claim to this ʻāina. Instead, this ethic, as played out through mākaʻikaʻi, allows malihini and kamaʻāina to both share their moʻolelo, and within that sharing find points of connection that inform how they can—or perhaps cannot—be in pilina with one another and the ʻāina they are on. Moʻokūʻauhau matter, and our ancestors recognized that moʻolelo have moʻokūʻauhau of their own that influence the ʻike they hold (hoʻomanawanui 2014, xxxii). Osorio (2021) and Silva (2017) reveal through their scholarship that how one tells a moʻolelo is reflective, in part, of their positionality. The ʻāina they emphasize, the events they dive into, and the characters they play up are all informed by the teller's kuleana and experiences. While there are no singular, authoritative versions of a moʻolelo, one is still expected to ground their mana within their ʻupena of pilina. Osorio (2021, 50-51) explores this through her discussion on hoʻopāpā, where authors in the newspapers would challenge one another and attempt to tease out one another's kuleana in an effort to determine if someone was overstepping or acting from a place that did not reflect their ʻupena of pilina.

Osorio (2021) and Silva (2017) both demonstrate through their research instances in the Hawaiian language newspapers where authors would comment on one another's mana and inquire as to who they were to tell this story, and where they got their ʻike from. If it was revealed that a person did not have the pilina and kuleana to back up their ʻike, readers were informed and left to make their own decisions on how to use, or dismiss, the ʻike that was being

discussed. Given the importance of kuleana and relationality in knowledge production, it would be in bad form to continue to rely on someone who was proven to be speaking out of bounds. Osorio's (2021, 128) assertion that kuleana are a dynamic set of authorities, responsibilities, and privileges that shift within our various ʻupena of pilina becomes especially useful here in understanding power within this kind of ethics. Rather than replicating binaries or relations of domination, power becomes a fluid relationship that shifts based on time, place, and one's positionality and relationality. This ethics requires a degree of humility, where one can recognize the limits of their kuleana and ʻike while remaining open and accepting of what others have to offer. Osorio (2021, 50) writes that this kind of humility allowed authors in the twentieth century to not only coexist, but thrive in pilina with one another. Silva's (2017, 44-46) scholarship demonstrates instances where this humility was not always already present, and where these practices of hoʻopāpā did not create the conditions for authors to thrive in pilina together. Indeed, some writers of the 19th and 20th century used kuleana in their attempt to dominate others and position the ʻike of others as sub-par. An ethic of humility thus becomes key here, and while it was not always present ancestrally, it is something we as a lāhui need to work to cultivate today to allow the abundance and diversity of our ʻupena of pilina thrive.

As I have been demonstrating, mākaʻikaʻi create encounters with ʻāina that allow ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to produce knowledge and pilina to place that trouble static settler and Indigenous identities and subjectivities. This practice, as well as the ethic of aloha ʻāina discussed in the last chapter, show us that ʻŌiwi ethics conceptualize the self as what Osorio (2021) terms ʻupena of pilina—nets comprised of various knots of connection that inform how we perform our kuleana and who we are accountable to. Far from always already subjectivities, ʻŌiwi become and belong according to our pilina to place and people, and the kuleana that comes with those pilina. Within

this ethic, the moʻolelo we carry about place influence how we understand our pilina to ʻāina, and therefore how we perform our kuleana and aloha ʻāina. In other words, stories matter. I demonstrated this in chapters two and three through mākaʻikaʻi, and show the importance of moʻolelo in this chapter as well concerning narratives about the Mauna. As Gonzalez (2020), Kapahua (2020), and Hobro (2020) demonstrated through their writings on the Mauna, their knowledge and pilina to the Mauna was shaped by the stories they heard about the wahi pana, and it was important for them to take on the kuleana of sharing moʻolelo about the Mauna that demonstrated the beauty and power of the Puʻuhonua. Kapahua (2020, 580-581) shares, "[t]he representation of Maunakea allowed Kiaʻi and lāhui to redefine themselves… The recreation of our image and our own passionate use of moʻolelo build upon and continue our ancestors' recognition of the power of story from time immemorial." In the next section I explore mākaʻikaʻi as a way for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to (re)map their pilina and kuleana to place using ʻike and moʻolelo grounded in our ʻāina.

(Re)mapping Pilina and Kuleana to ʻĀina

Throughout the dissertation I have been demonstrating the importance of moʻolelo in shaping not only our pilina to place and one another, but also how we recognize ourselves and understand what we can become. When we prioritize moʻolelo aloha ʻāina and moʻolelo passed down by our kūpuna, ʻŌiwi engage in producing knowledges and pilina grounded in our history and culture. Privileging ʻŌiwi moʻolelo reveals Kaiaka as an aliʻi as well as a wahi pana; we see that Māeaea and Kahakakaukanaka represent a profound pilina between kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai and the kai itself; and the Mauna becomes so much more than a mountain, it becomes a space to connect with our ʻāina and akua while imagining and enacting ea. Mākaʻikaʻi gives us the

opportunity to (re)map our ʻāina using moʻolelo that center around ʻŌiwi pilina, experiences, and understandings of place while leaving room to incorporate new and different moʻolelo.

Mishuana Goeman (2013, 11) uses the concept of (re)mapping in her book, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* as a method of spatial decolonization, a form of decolonization that acknowledges colonial spatialities as in-process and imbued with power struggles. Through an exploration of Native women's writing, Goeman (2013, 2) demonstrates the ways that literature can work to reorganize colonial spatialities as fluid, rather than settled, or fixed. Colonial spatialities attempt to eliminate the Native physically by removing Indigenous bodies from land, while simultaneously imposing borders and boundaries to create the spatialities and maps we know today (Goeman 2013, 30). These constructions of space, both physically on maps and cognitively through discourse, attempt to eliminate or assimilate all forms of Native presence on lands outside the reservation, thereby continuing the violence of removal through what Goeman (2013, 20) terms spatial identities.

Spatial identities confine Native being and becoming to designated spaces by discursively producing Native identities and subjectivities as those that exist solely on reservations (Goeman 2013, 20). Similarly, as I demonstrated in chapter two, an analytic of biopolitics reveals that Indigenous and Native identities and subjectivities are produced through the settler colonial encounter in ways that limit their becoming to their ability to maintain a blood quantum level or remain on their ancestral homelands and perform according to prescribed understandings of indigeneity. Mākaʻikaʻi demonstrate that our ancestors had more fluid ways of being and belonging in place, and resurging the practice of mākaʻikaʻi creates the opportunity for kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai to (re)map our physical and cognitive maps to Waialua. Indeed, Goeman (2013, 5) herself asserts that Native peoples have been and will continue to carve out Native

space wherever we go, and we do this not only through physical presence, but through storytelling as well. As Goeman explains, (re)mapping is not a recovery project, nor is it an attempt to write over our present colonial spatialities using Indigenous epistemologies. Rather, we have the "responsibility to interrogate our ever-changing Native epistemologies that frame our understanding of land and our relationships to it and to other peoples" (Goeman 2013, 3). (Re)mapping thus requires a critical examination of our current contexts and an understanding of the processes that have led to the colonial spatialities in which we find ourselves in order to acknowledge the power of Native epistemologies to move us towards spatial decolonization (Goeman 2013, 4).

At the core of (re)mapping, therefore, is an understanding of place as more than a locale on a graph, or something we travel across, but rather as something which carries new ways of "being-in-the-world" (Goeman 2013, 9). The radical potential that place holds for becoming helps us move towards alternative spatialities of belonging "that do not bind, contain, or fix our relationship to land and each other in ways that limit our definitions of self and community" (Goeman 2013, 11). These alternative spatialities of belonging inform multiple processes of becoming that allow for a variety of ways to perform our kuleana to place, and I assert that mākaʻikaʻi function as a way for ʻŌiwi to (re)map our places and (re)create cognitive maps that tie us in intimate ways to the ʻāina that nurtures and sustains us using a process that settler power cannot co-opt or control. Rather than trying to map ʻŌiwi places over colonial spatialities, (re)mapping requires communities to learn and think critically about the various ancestral and contemporary histories and experiences informing the places they are connected to. (Re)mapping stories across Hawaiʻi, therefore, holds the potential to disrupt colonial spatialities and put us on track towards creating spatialities of belonging that acknowledge the fluid nature of place and

constantly work to negotiate the differing power dynamics and narratives at play in its construction.

This link between place, identity, and memories/stories has also been theorized as "re-presencing," as Lisa Strelein (2018) has explored. Strelein (2018, 69) explains that re-presencing changes the way a landscape is understood, and is accomplished not only through ancestral place names but how people stand in and feel their skin every day. Mākaʻikaʻi demonstrates that we come to understand our skin, the particularities of our embodiment, through our pilina to place and the (hi)stories that inform where we belong within these ʻupena of pilina. As Goeman (2013, 28) asserts, a relationship to land is not encoded in Native American DNA, and cannot be thought of as a naturalized part of Indigenous identity and community. Indigenous connections to land are not given to us through the blood in our veins or the structure of our DNA, they are lovingly handed to us through our stories and the people and places who share them with us. For ʻŌiwi, our moʻolelo have been lovingly handed to us through our ancestors and their moʻokūʻauhau consciousness, discussed in chapter two. They did the meticulous work of recording moʻolelo in detail because they knew future generations would need these moʻolelo to help (re)discover processes of becoming and (re)map our spatialities of belonging; belonging to ʻāina, to community, and to a broader lāhui. It is through these moʻolelo of aloha ʻāina, these fine baskets of resilience, that we foster an aloha for ʻāina that spurs us to become poʻe aloha ʻāina and attend to our kuleana. When we attend to our kuleana and act as poʻe aloha ʻāina, we come to re-presence the land with an embodiment of aloha and mālama ʻāina that persists and becomes through enacting our kuleana and maintaining our pilina. As John E. Bush wrote over a century ago:

> Aole he loihi o ka noho ana o ka lahui a nalo aku mai ke ao, ke hoomaloka a hoopoina lakou i ka hiipoi ana me na ohohia nui i na moolelo a me na mele o na ano a pau, a

> kamailio mau imua o ka poe opio i kumu e mau ai na hooipo a me na liʻa ana o ka naau o ke kanaka i ke aloha aina mamuli o ka hooni ana o na moolelo a me na mele e pili ana i kona one hanau, na wahi pana, a me na hana kaulana a kona mau kupuna.
>
> It is not long before a people will disappear from sight should they disbelieve and forget to cherish with enthusiasm the moʻolelo and mele of every kind, and discuss them in the presence of young people as a foundation to perpetuate the love and desire of people for aloha ʻāina based on the stirring nature of the moʻolelo and mele about their birth sands, the storied places, and the famous deeds of their ancestors (Silva 2017, 5).

Bush's quote demonstrates the connections among identity, place, and memory/stories, and emphasizes the need to actively perpetuate moʻolelo and mele to foster aloha ʻāina in future generations.

(Re)mapping requires us to haku both ancestral and contemporary moʻolelo so as to understand the various histories and power dynamics shaping the places we are in. For Māeaea, this involves working through the various layers of histories that have brought communities and families to call this area home, and a mākaʻikaʻi provides a method through which a community can do just that. By (re)presencing bodies and moʻolelo on the land, mākaʻikaʻi seek to share moʻolelo aloha ʻāina with those present as a way to work through colonial spatialities and discover knots of connection and disconnection that inform processes of becoming and allow us to continuously form spatialities of belonging. Rather than a one and done activity, mākaʻikaʻi stem from a motive of curiosity that continuously seeks to unpack and negotiate alternative spatialities, so that the process of becoming in place, of becoming kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, remains fluid yet grounded, and never singular. Whereas Goeman (2013) uses Native women's literature to explore the ways these texts and their authors (re)map North America as fluid and dynamic alternative spatialities that run counter to colonial spatialities, mākaʻikaʻi rely on oral narratives and memories of place in addition to ancestral and archival written narratives. The emphasis mākaʻikaʻi places on putting bodies and stories on land points to the importance of

these two aspects to the creation of place. It also allows (re)mapping to become a community process of storytelling and sharing, thereby ensuring that conceptions of place are always understood as various and in process, rather than settled or singular.

(Re)turning to the Mauna

Two years after leaving the Puʻuhonua I returned to the Mauna with my ipo. It was his first time on Maunakea, the last time I was held by that wahi pana. Although the Puʻuhonua had largely been dismantled during the COVID-19 pandemic, a few kiaʻi remained along the Ala Hulu Kūpuna, ever wary of the settler state's attempts to construct the TMT despite staunch ʻŌiwi opposition. We brought warm food to the remaining kiaʻi and listened as they shared about their experience staying on the Mauna. We eventually made our way up to the visitor's center, barely able to see through the thick clouds that cover the Mauna in mid-March. While we drove, we wondered what it would be like to have hiked this Mauna, like our ancestors did. How long did it take them to walk to the peaks? What must they have heard, seen, felt, as they made their huakaʻi to this wahi pana? After parking the car, we walked to the same ahu that I made offerings to during my first time on the Mauna in 2016. We offered oli, and in response we heard an ʻio calling out to us before making our way out of the cold and rain. While we drove down the Mauna, I shared stories about my previous huakaʻi here. As I reflected on my time with this ʻāina, I thought of all the stories I had learned and created through my own experiences, and I realized that every time I encountered this wahi pana I saw it with new eyes.

On my first trip to the Mauna I was awestruck by my surroundings, by the ʻāina that I was somehow a part of but that looked entirely foreign to me. My second huakaʻi gave me the opportunity to spend more time with this ʻāina, to mālama this ʻāina and strengthen my pilina not

only to this place, but to the lāhui as well. During this trip I saw Maunakea not as a mauna, per se, but as a point of connection, a pilina so strong and shared by so many that it could resist and defy the settler state and its relations of power. On my last huakaʻi I was also able to see the Mauna through the eyes of my ipo, experience it for the first time again alongside him while reflecting on everything this ʻāina signifies for our lāhui. This last huakaʻi showed me how much I had grown as an ʻŌiwi in the past two years since last visiting the Mauna, the past two decades since moving back to this pae ʻāina. I am still malihini to many wahi pana across these islands, but I have also developed deep pilina to ʻāina, pilina that shape my being and becoming. If I look into the colonizer's mirror (Simpson 2017, 188) or rely on blood quantum logics and static notions of Indigenous identity I do not see this growth, this becoming. But this mirror and these forms of recognition were not designed for ʻŌiwi, do not come from our ethics or practices.

Mākaʻikaʻi give ʻŌiwi the opportunity to encounter our ʻāina and become in ways that are grounded in *our* moʻolelo and ways of belonging, not those that perpetuate a settler futurity. The Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu and successful blockage of the TMT's construction demonstrates the power and potential of ʻŌiwi (re)turning to our ancestral practices and moʻolelo. Through the Puʻuhonua and practices like mākaʻikaʻi, ʻŌiwi create the conditions for our grounded relationalities to not only thrive, but for these pilina to inform who we become and how we belong with others, both ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi. In my concluding chapter, I further reflect on the practice of mākaʻikaʻi and the power that comes with ʻŌiwi (re)turning to a practice that is rooted in our moʻolelo and routed through our diverse experiences.

Conclusion: Māka‘ika‘i as World-Making

Across from Pua‘ena point and Kahakakaukanaka is Loko Ea (Figure 12), a loko i‘a or fishpond that once fed not only Waialua, but ali‘i from around O‘ahu as well. The loko i‘a uses a mākāhā, or sluice gate, to allow small fish from the reef of Pua‘ena to enter the pond, where they feast on the nutrients within, fatten up, and then are prevented from swimming back through the cracks in the gate into the kai. Ancestrally, fish lived and thrived in the pond, and once they were big enough, they would be harvested by po‘e o ka ‘ehu kai. In this way, our loko i‘a provided consistent and sustainable sources of sustenance for kama‘āina of the area. Loko Ea is fed brackish water from a river that connects it to ‘Uko‘a pond, approximately a mile east of the loko i‘a. In addition to feeding the po‘e o ka ‘ehu kai, ali‘i such as Kākuhihewa and Ka‘ahumanu used to send runners from the South side of the island to these loko i‘a to get fish for them (Wyban 1992, 4). Loko Ea and ‘Uko‘a were also known for having strange fish. Accounts describe fish that were half kūmū and half ‘anae, while others were silver and white on the outside, but striped and variegated when scaled (Kamakau 1991, 84). Kama‘āina of the area knew these fish belonged to Laniwahine, the mo‘o who resides in ‘Uko‘a and is the kia‘i of the two ponds.

Figure 12: Loko Ea Fishpond

Moʻo are shape-shifting gods who often move between seductive, female bodies and large, lizard-like forms (Bacchilega and Brown 2019, 245). They are guardians of people and places, and are typically associated with wet environments. Samuel Manaiākalani Kamakau (1991, 85), a historian and kamaʻāina of nearby Mokulēʻia, notes that some moʻo are human ancestors and aliʻi who have been transfigured into deities, while other moʻo have different, cosmogonic beginnings. In the moʻolelo of Keaomelemele, Moses Manu (1885) explains how Laniwahine made ʻUkoʻa and Waialua her home. According to his version of the moʻolelo, Moʻoinanea brought her moʻo family to the islands of Hawaiʻi by calling them, pair by pair, to Puaʻena and the Lauhulu plains. Laniwahine and Alamuki were the last moʻo to descend from their cloud home, and rather than traveling the approximately 20 miles to Kapūkakī like the other moʻo did, Laniwahine made ʻUkoʻa pond her home. Kemoʻo and Kemoʻoloa are said to be moʻo who served under Laniwahine, and Puhiʻula is often said to be either a shark or eel relative of Laniwahine who swims in the kai by the ponds.

Laniwahine resides at ʻUkoʻa pond, swimming between the ponds and using a subterranean tunnel to access the ocean (Sterling and Summers 1978, 119). One popular moʻolelo about this tunnel is recounted by Andrew Mark, a kamaʻāina lawaiʻa, who once used a large net to try and trap ulua at the mouth of the makai entrance of ʻUkoʻa (Wyban 1992, 6). This net was supposedly strong enough to catch 250-pound sharks, but when the man returned the next day to gather his catch, the net was shredded to pieces. Ultimately the net was no match for Laniwahine, who did not appreciate the barrier placed between her and the sea. During a mākaʻikaʻi I hosted with my ʻohana a few years ago we recounted this moʻolelo, and a kamaʻāina joining us eagerly raised her hand to inform us that Mark is her grandfather, and she remembers hearing him talk about this encounter. She recalls how proud of the net he was, how strong it had proven to be, and how shaken up he was when it was shredded to pieces. He used the moʻolelo to caution his keiki and moʻopuna to be respectful of the area and the various beings who reside in it. Fishermen of Waialua claim to have seen the moʻo in her human form sitting on rocks along the coast, with her long ehu hair blowing in the wind (Wyban 1992, 7). More commonly, however, seeing Laniwahine in her human form was a sign that danger, or chaos was about to ensue (Kamakau 1991, 83).

As the kiaʻi of the loko iʻa, the overall health of the ponds depended on poʻe o ka ʻehu kai maintaining pono relations with Laniwahine. Moʻo reflect the life-giving and death-dealing qualities of water, and as such can be both beneficent and malevolent (Bacchilega and Brown 2019, 245). When ka poʻe o ka ʻehu kai failed to honor Laniwahine, the fish in Loko Ea and ʻUkoʻa would grow scarce, but when kamaʻāina attended to their relationship with Laniwahine, the fish would crowd the ponds (Kamakau 1991, 84). Today, contemporary kiaʻi of Loko Ea dedicate their time to restoring the loko iʻa, clearing weeds and dredging sediment build-up, with

the hope of regenerating the abundance of life that once thrived here. Due to decades of mismanagement, Loko Ea is currently only about 3 feet at its deepest. Kiaʻi have pulled car engines, tires, and household appliances from the pond, and are currently working on dredging the sediment that has built up in the pond to create the space for fish to once again thrive and nourish the poʻe of Waialua. ʻUkoʻa pond and the river that connects it to the loko iʻa are covered in invasive plants, leaving only a narrow waterway where there was once a vibrant, flowing pilina between the two ponds. Adjacent to ʻUkoʻa lies Kawailoa Transfer Station, a waste drop off facility that further obscures the pond and the abundance it once held. Today, one gets small glimpses of this waterway while driving to the dump (Figure 13). While the Mālama Loko Ea Foundation is doing tremendous work in revitalizing this wahi pana, they are also hindered by settler colonial narratives that paint ʻUkoʻa and Loko Ea as marshes and wetlands protected by Federal regulations that limit what they can and cannot do to restore the loko iʻa.

Figure 13: View of ʻUkoʻa near Kawailoa Transfer Station

Similar to the leina at Kaʻena, the ʻāina of Kaiaka, the sands of Māeaea, and Kahakakaukanaka at Puaʻena, Loko Ea and ʻUkoʻa have been produced through settler colonial encounters and relations of power as features of a landscape; as interesting, and perhaps unique, aspects of the natural world around us. These various narratives attempt to depict Waialua as a place of fun and a piece of paradise for all to enjoy, while obscuring the responsibilities and relations of those who encounter this ʻāina. Throughout this dissertation, however, I have taken you on a form of mākaʻikaʻi across these wahi pana with the goal of not only challenging these narratives, but disrupting these stories and the subjectivities they work to produce. Together we have traveled from Kaʻena, the westernmost edge of Waialua, past Kaiaka and ke one loa o Māeaea towards Kahakakaukanaka and Puaʻena, ending at Loko Ea and ʻUkoʻa Pond. The moʻolelo and wahi pana I chose to share with you are those that reflect some of the dearest and most transformative knots in my ʻupena of pilina. They are the places and stories that I heard as a child and that continue to shape and inform my being and becoming as a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. Were a different kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai to take you on a mākaʻikaʻi through Waialua they would have told you different moʻolelo, shown you other wahi pana, maybe ones I myself do not even know about yet. Such is the bounty and beauty not only of this ʻāina, but this practice as well.

Unlike other mākaʻikaʻi I analyzed throughout this dissertation, the type of mākaʻikaʻi I deployed here does not allow for you, the malihini, to share your own moʻolelo about place, about what occasioned you to encounter this ʻāina. You did not get to hear the sound of the waves crashing into the shoreline, did not feel the sun on your skin while the ʻehu kai floated by, filling your nose, your lungs, your heart. I hope one day you get to experience these sensations; that you will carry these moʻolelo that you now hold about my beloved ʻāina and one day be

encouraged to encounter it, maybe for the first time, or maybe just in a different way. As I have been demonstrating, that is the goal of mākaʻikaʻi—to provide an opportunity for kamaʻāina to shape how malihini encounter our ʻāina, to create a space for kamaʻāina and malihini alike to reflect on their respective kuleana and pilina to place, to begin to think critically about how we belong to place, and to imagine who, or what, that can lead us to become. Similar to moʻolelo aloha ʻāina submitted to the Hawaiian-language newspapers throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, therefore, the kind of mākaʻikaʻi I use throughout this dissertation is routed through a moʻokūʻauhau consciousness (Silva 2017)—an effort to perpetuate some of the moʻolelo and conditions of possibility that allowed me to develop a deep pilina to and aloha for this ʻāina, that continue to allow me to become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, and that might help future generations in their process of becoming as well. This act of (re)turning to a practice that is rooted in ʻŌiwi ethics and routed through our moʻolelo allows ʻŌiwi to create encounters with ʻāina that cannot be controlled or co-opted by settler colonial relations of power. It shows us the potential of what we can become and how we can belong outside of a settler colonial structure of processes that attempts to be overwhelming.

In chapter two I demonstrated that Indigenous theory and an analytic of biopolitics reveal weaknesses in the settler colonial structure of processes, allowing the potential of new subjectivities and relations of power to shine through. Within settler colonial studies there is a paradox wherein settler colonialism is theorized as a structure of processes, not a past event, yet the settler and Indigenous subjectivities produced through these processes are treated as inescapable, or always already existing. Haunani-Kay Trask's scholarship demonstrates that this paradox goes away through a relational analysis that treats settler and indigenous subjectivities as pedagogies rather than static identities with pre-defined performances. Similarly, an analytic

of biopolitics understands power as productive and relational, and necessitates an investigation into the contingencies that produce subjects and power. Instead of understanding power as something that acts upon subjects, an analytic of biopolitics shows the ways power produces subjects who perform according to societal norms that work to reinforce and reproduce relations of power and domination. Relational and biopolitical analyses thus demonstrate that new and alternative subjectivities and relations of power can be produced under the right circumstances, just as the settler colonial encounter produces settler colonial subjectivities and relations of power. Māka‘ika‘i, as a practice grounded in ‘Ōiwi relationality and routed through ancestral and contemporary ‘Ōiwi mo‘olelo, allow kama‘āina to create encounters with ‘āina that are not defined or regulated by settlers, and that start to produce new relations of power and ways of performing according to one's pilina and kuleana.

Rather than confining māka‘ika‘i to a single definition, in this dissertation I have used my own experiences with the practice, as well as William Henry Uaua's (1870-1871) serialized version of "He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa," which centers around māka‘ika‘i, to articulate some of the fundamental aspects of this type of knowledge production and pilina-building. In chapter three I demonstrated that a māka‘ika‘i cannot occur unless a kama‘āina or kia‘i ‘āina agrees to host and share mo‘olelo about their place. The malihini who wants to go on a māka‘ika‘i is not entitled to this huaka‘i. Going on a māka‘ika‘i is a kuleana, a privilege that comes with the responsibility of being open to learning about ‘āina, one's pilina to ‘āina, and how to be in pono pilina with ‘āina and kama‘āina. Because māka‘ika‘i are hosted by kama‘āina and kia‘i ‘āina, malihini encounter ‘āina as a beloved family member. Māka‘ika‘i are thus distinct from the types of tours that we commonly see in Hawai‘i today. Instead of ‘āina being sold and portrayed as a tourist's paradise, māka‘ika‘i create the conditions for malihini to

encounter ʻāina in ways grounded in ʻŌiwi relationality, moʻolelo, and ʻike. I also demonstrated in chapter three that mākaʻikaʻi create encounters that strengthen kamaʻāina pilina to ʻāina, and allow ʻŌiwi to build and renew pilina to ʻāina. This line of theorizing is useful for thinking through the ways that ʻŌiwi who live in the diaspora can (re)connect or grow pilina to the ʻāina of Hawaiʻi. Far from static identities with fixed performances, mākaʻikaʻi produce grounded subjectivities who act according to their pilina and kuleana, pilina and kuleana that change depending on the context in which one finds themselves. These subjectivities disrupt settler colonial productions of settler and Indigenous identities used to perpetuate settler colonial relations of power by creating the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to become and belong in new, emergent ways grounded in pilina and kuleana to ʻāina and one another.

Mākaʻikaʻi create encounters where malihini can learn about new ʻāina and think through their pilina and kuleana to these places and beings. While kamaʻāina share moʻolelo about place, malihini are encouraged to reflect on these moʻolelo and share any connections they may have to the ʻāina or stories they are experiencing. In this way, mākaʻikaʻi create the conditions where newcomers can become more than malihini to ʻāina through a process rooted in and defined by ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo. This is not about becoming "Hawaiian at heart" or fulfilling a settler desire to play Indian. Mākaʻikaʻi demonstrate the transformative power of aloha ʻāina as well as the radical potential of a politics that accounts for fluid subjectivities produced through ʻŌiwi-defined practices. As I showed in chapter four, this kind of ʻŌiwi politics relies on an ethic of alterity that celebrates difference and diversity, while recognizing the importance of grounding ʻike in pilina and kuleana. This ethic thus renounces the idea of singular authority and normative productions of subjectivities, creating the space for grounded relationality to inform ever evolving performances of aloha ʻāina and struggles for ea. There are hundreds, probably

thousands, of moʻolelo aloha ʻāina about and pilina to Waialua. Thus, there are hundreds, probably thousands, of different ways to perform one's aloha for this ʻāina, to perform as a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. Mākaʻikaʻi do not try to confine these performances or force them to fit into a specific box. They create the conditions for kamaʻāina and malihini to negotiate what these performances might look like, how one can perform their aloha for ʻāina in ways that remain accountable to their specific pilina and kuleana.

My ipo's youngest keiki lives on Turtle Island and spends their summers and school breaks in Hawaiʻi with us. For the past four years I have been able to introduce this keiki to Waialua and share with them a lot of the moʻolelo I have shared in this dissertation. Together we have hiked the sands of Kaʻena, swum in the waters off ke one loa o Māeaea, walked along the rocky shore of Kaiaka. I never know what to expect when I share these moʻolelo with them. They usually pick up on a piece of the story I had taken for granted, asking questions I hadn't thought of. Through our mākaʻikaʻi they have created the space for me to learn new things about this ʻāina just as much as I have created that space for them. I emphasize the lessons that my kūpuna taught me from these moʻolelo, ground them in the ʻike of our ancestors, all the while allowing them to experiment and play with how these moʻolelo inform and transform how they perform their growing aloha for this ʻāina. For years they have seen me oli before entering the kai. When they first asked me, I explained it was a way to ask permission to enter the ocean and acknowledge our connection to the ocean, the same way my father first explained it to me. As they have gotten older, I have shared more moʻolelo about the kai of Waialua, the shores of ke one loa o Māeaea, and they now understand this oli as a way to respect our pilina and kuleana to this ʻāina and the various beings who nurture and sustain it. This summer we will work on them

learning the oli, but the last time they were here they did not go in to the kai of Waialua without asking me to oli.

It is not my goal in sharing these moʻolelo with them, with you, to determine or attempt to control how one performs their aloha for the ʻāina of Waialua. Rather, the moʻolelo shared through a mākaʻikaʻi give malihini a grounding—an ʻŌiwi grounding—from which they can reflect upon and develop their particular pilina and kuleana to place. Writing of Nishnaabeg society, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017, 120-121) explains that "[w]e all have the responsibility to figure out how to become contributing members of our society while honoring our deepest truths, our gifts and skills… Self-actualization is a relationship between ourselves and the spirit world, and it is supposed to take place in the context of family and community." As I demonstrated in chapter three, being grounded in moʻolelo and practices concerning the kai helped one ʻŌiwi o ka ʻehu kai find their kuleana not only to the ocean, but to the community as well. Other poʻe o ka ʻehu kai were able to use their specific skills to find meaningful pilina in Waialua that shaped how they attend to their kuleana to place. I also demonstrated this in chapter four, where I used the lens of mākaʻikaʻi to analyze the way that kiaʻi used moʻolelo about and pilina to Mauna a Wākea to find appropriate ways to contribute to the movement. For some this was using their kino to block the TMT's access to the Mauna, for others this was contributing to the media team or helping to maintain the facilities at the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu. There was no one correct way to kiaʻi the Mauna, just as there is no one correct way to become a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. In both cases, one is expected and encouraged to develop their pilina to place and find their specific gift, their particular way of honoring their kuleana to ʻāina and the ʻŌiwi and community that nurture and sustain that ʻāina. I argue that creating the conditions of possibility where one can build pilina to ʻāina and discover their kuleana in ways grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike

and mo‘olelo begins to produce a new milieu wherein we can imagine and work towards a reality outside of the settler colonial structure of processes.

Transactional Realities and the Production of New Ways of Being

As I explored in chapter two, Michel Foucault uses his theorizing on biopower to demonstrate that “life” and subjectivity are in fact produced by and governed in ways that perpetuate relations of power and domination. This biopolitical production and form of governmentality takes place in what Foucault (2007, 21) calls the milieu, the space where the “natural” environment and artificial human-made space conjoin—it is the illusory world in which specifically constructed human populations and subjectivities live and develop according to a “naturalness” of the species within an environment that perpetuates itself regardless of human activity. Within this milieu, subjectivities such as settler and Indigenous are produced as always already existing and are regulated according to the norms that result from their prescribed performances, thus contributing to the paradox of settler colonial studies that I described earlier. Foucault’s (2008, 297) theorizing on biopolitical productions of life and subjectivity, as well as the milieu, thus demonstrate that settler and Indigenous identities and the norms through which they are governed are actually transactional realities—they do not exist a priori, nor can they be considered primary realities.

Transactional realities are born from the interplay of relations of power and everything which eludes them; they have not always existed but they are nonetheless real (Foucault 2008, 297). Thinking back to Foucault’s discussion the production of “life” discussed in chapter two, we see that these racialized notions of life did not always already exist. Rather, they were strategically produced discourses that informed and influenced real practices, thereby giving them real effects that began to impact the beings subject to sovereign control and power.

Similarly, as I have been demonstrating throughout this dissertation, settler colonialism strategically produces discourses about ʻāina and kanaka subjectivity that influence the practices and beliefs that perpetuate settler colonial domination in Hawaiʻi. Settler and Indigenous subjectivities have not always already existed, and continuing to privilege and perpetuate these subjectivities contributes to a transactional reality wherein there will always be settlers, and there will always be the conditions for settler colonialism. This understanding of transactional realities allows us to investigate the discursive production of settler and Indigenous subjectivities while remaining attuned to the ways that these discursively produced notions have real effects. This line of theorizing helps us understand the emergent and context-specific functions of power, which gives us more potential and control over power's effects and future formations. Focusing on the contingencies and conditions of possibility that perpetuate and maintain power gives us the tools to begin to change what futures are possible, as well as the ability to start creating those futures in the present.

For ʻŌiwi in the diaspora, for ʻŌiwi like me who were born abroad and later moved to Hawaiʻi, for any ʻŌiwi who does not feel they fit the mold of what an Indigenous Hawaiian is supposed to look like, sound like, act like, this production of new ways of being with and belonging to ʻāina that are grounded in ancestral ʻike and moʻolelo create the space for us to be in control of who we become, how we recognize one another, and how we struggle together to cultivate ea with the ʻāina we love. The settler state will continue to try to regulate these productions, and they will use their real force and power to discipline those performances that fall out of their demarcations, but the Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu reminded us that our pilina, our moʻolelo, our ʻike has power too. And while this power cannot immediately alleviate the violences we as ʻŌiwi face at the hands of the settler state, it creates the conditions for us to build

something better, to invest in a reality beyond our current limits, to disrupt the continued production of subjectivities that perpetuate settler colonial relations of power and domination. While I cannot say what these new subjectivities look like for anyone, ʻŌiwi or non-ʻŌiwi, I can say that for non-ʻŌiwi this will be more complicated. Shedding one's position of power is not as easy as declaring one's love for ʻāina and asserting a commitment to fighting for ʻŌiwi to live on, nurture, and protect our ʻāina, but these actions can begin to produce new subjectivities, new relations of power that disrupt the (re)production of settler colonial encounters.

Aloha ʻāina and the pilina one can develop to ʻāina are transformative, and this dissertation takes seriously the ability for encounters with ʻāina to influence the production and performance of subjectivities, however I also recognize that these transformations will not easily translate into our current reality. A non-ʻŌiwi dedicating themselves to the ʻāina and ʻŌiwi of Waialua and putting in the work to become kamaʻāina to this ʻehu kai does not alter how they are governed and regulated within the milieu of settler colonialism. Herein lie the limits of this dissertation. While mākaʻikaʻi and a (re)turn to ʻŌiwi-defined and controlled practices of becoming and belonging with ʻāina begin to produce new subjectivities, new performances of aloha ʻāina, they do not eliminate state definitions of blood quantum or indigeneity, they do not take away settler privileges from the state. In many ways, then, this dissertation puts the state and its power to the side, creating the space to imagine a different future, envision what tools we might need to get us there, and investigate weaknesses within a structure that attempts to insert itself into almost every facet of our lives. The Puʻuhonua o Puʻuhuluhulu showed us the power that comes with using ʻŌiwi pilina, ʻike, moʻolelo to recognize one another and act upon our kuleana to ʻāina. We stood at the base of our Mauna as kiaʻi, as aloha ʻāina, as ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi. We did not need state discourses or subjectivities to know our pilina, to attend to our

kuleana, to protect our ʻāina. This dissertation argues that mākaʻikaʻi and a (re)turn to practices rooted in and routed through ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo, as was done at the Puʻuhonua, creates the conditions for ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi alike to know ourselves, our pilina, and our kuleana in ways that begin to envision and enact a reality outside of settler colonialism.

Changing what we call ourselves and how we recognize one another is not going to change the settler colonial encounter overnight, nor will it immediately alleviate the broader structural violence that ʻŌiwi currently face. But allowing our pilina and the kuleana they inform to transform us, to change how we see and know ourselves and our relations, holds the potential to disrupt settler colonial encounters with ʻāina and some of micropolitical and daily harms they cause. Shifting the lens through which we recognize ourselves and our pilina from one produced through the settler colonial encounter to one rooted in our ancestral ways of knowing and becoming creates the conditions for ʻŌiwi to see ourselves outside of a blood quantum framework, to know who we are outside of legal definitions of Native or Indigenous. These everyday acts of resurgence (Corntassel 2012, Corntassel et. al 2018) begin to produce a different milieu, one that is not tied to biopolitical productions of "life" and "humanity," one where ʻŌiwi recognize the abundance of our relations—kanaka and non-kanaka, ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi—through our ʻupena of pilina rather than subjectivities and identities produced through settler colonial relations of power.

The current milieu relies on the construction and separation of "nature" from "humanity" to create an environment in which the human species functions according to norms produced to maintain power, but as I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation, this distinction was introduced to ʻŌiwi ethics and politics, it did not always already exist for our kūpuna. So what does it mean to return to the practices that informed these ethics, that facilitated these politics,

that produced kamaʻāina and poʻe o ka ʻehu kai? I suggest that this begins to create a new milieu, a new reality, a new world even, where ʻŌiwi pilina and politics thrive and struggle to constantly reproduce the conditions of possibility for ea. There is likely a word in ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi that is more appropriate than milieu, but that research is beyond the scope of this dissertation and is a possible future project. Regardless of the word, mākaʻikaʻi demonstrate the world-making potential of ʻŌiwi returning to practices rooted in our ʻike kupuna and routed through our ancestral and contemporary moʻolelo. Centuries of colonial and settler colonial encounters with ʻāina have created the conditions for our current reality, a reality in which the power to recognize and become as ʻŌiwi has been co-opted by the settler state. A philosophy of materialism and analytic of biopolitics remind us that these encounters are not accomplished facts, they are strategically created and (re)produced. Mākaʻikaʻi, and the pilina and ʻike they produce, have the potential to create a swerve in these encounters, to disrupt the taking hold of settler colonialism, by allowing ourselves to become and belong using practices and moʻolelo handed down to us from our kūpuna. This is also a way to show that we are still here, still living, breathing, becoming ʻŌiwi, even after centuries of colonial attempts to eliminate us.

Conclusion

The goal of this dissertation was not to provide a step-by-step guide on how to become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai; it was not meant to define how one performs as a kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, nor was the goal to provide a definitive answer as to what a mākaʻikaʻi is. I am sure there are moʻolelo about mākaʻikaʻi I have not heard or read yet, and I am eager for future research on mākaʻikaʻi to expand upon, and maybe even contest, what I have articulated here. This dissertation set off from my desire to think beyond a settler-indigenous binary, to question what it means to become and belong to ʻāina, to find new ways to recognize and relate to one another

and ʻāina. Through archival and ethnographic research, I was able to (re)discover the practice of mākaʻikaʻi, and use this practice as a method to interrogate how myself and others have become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai. Mākaʻikaʻi demonstrate that kamaʻāina and malihini are relationships that reflect one's particular kuleana to ʻāina in a specific time and context; they show that settler and Indigenous relationships and pedagogies are more fluid than the static identities produced through a settler-Indigenous binary. Mākaʻikaʻi invite ʻŌiwi and non-ʻŌiwi to encounter ʻāina and imagine how one can live and thrive with ʻāina in ways grounded in ʻŌiwi moʻolelo and ʻike, in ways that cannot be co-opted by settler narratives or settler colonial home-making. This practice thus reveals the limits of settler colonial power. While this structure of processes works and adapts to produce subjectivities that perpetuate its existence, this form of governmentality cannot account for the production of emergent subjectivities grounded in ʻŌiwi ʻike and moʻolelo. Settler colonial apparatuses will continue to try to hail these subjectivities into prescribed performances, but routing the production of these subjectivities through ʻŌiwi-controlled practices gives us the power allow our abundance and multiplicity to thrive, and perhaps even elude this hailing.

Since starting this dissertation one of my sisters has given birth to the first keiki in our ʻohana's next generation. It brings me great joy to know that this keiki will encounter the ʻāina of Waialua through our ʻohana's moʻolelo aloha ʻāina, through the moʻolelo I have shared here, and through those we will continue to find and create. While settler colonial structures and processes may continue to remain around them, they will know themselves, this ʻāina, and their pilina to this ʻāina first and foremost through the ʻike of their kūpuna, through the aloha and care they see us perform every day. I cannot wait to learn what they have to teach me about this ʻāina, to know this ʻāina in deeper and more intimate ways because I am encountering it anew with this keiki. I

do not know how they will become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, how they will understand their ʻupena of pilina and the abundance it holds, but I am excited to see how they perform these kuleana and pilina, excited to see how they challenge what I thought I knew about what it means to belong to thus ʻāina. Regardless of how they become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai, I am confident that they will be able to belong to this ʻāina in ways that cannot be defined or controlled by settler colonial relations of power because of the encounters with this ʻāina that we create for them.

Centuries of colonial encounters have created the conditions where ʻŌiwi are struggling to live more like our ancestors, to reconnect to and resurge the practices and relations that allowed us to live on, nurture, be nurtured by, and protect our ʻāina in pono, generative ways. Mākaʻikaʻi create the space for ʻŌiwi and kamaʻāina to continuously reflect on these struggles, to ask what it means to be in pilina with ʻāina and one another today, in this context, and what kuleana those pilina come with. They also encourage us to keep learning about and becoming with our ʻāina. As we mākaʻikaʻi with new generations, new people, we experience ʻāina in new ways, learn more about the moʻolelo we thought we already knew. Embracing this alterity can be scary, especially in the context of settler colonial processes attempting to create stories and encounters with place that eliminate ʻŌiwi pilina and presence. For far too long moʻolelo about Waialua have been disappearing, covered over by other narratives and imaginations of what this land can be, how it can be privatized and turned into a profit. Mākaʻikaʻi disrupt those narratives and create new encounters with ʻāina where ʻŌiwi moʻolelo, ʻike, and pilina can shine through and inform one's belonging and kuleana to this wahi pana. The multiplicity of these moʻolelo, ʻike, and pilina cannot be contained, or confined for the sake of asserting a singular authority.

Rather, this abundance is what allows us to thrive, to grow, to become and belong in new ways, all while remaining grounded in our pilina and kuleana to ʻāina.

If you are ever lucky enough to be in Waialua as the sun sets, I suggest you make your way to the shore. During the winter months the sun will set behind Kaʻena, so you will not see it sink below the horizon, but you will be treated to the sound of the ocean while thick ʻehu kai blows past you, propelled by the force of the waves crashing into the shore. Starting around March, the sun once again sets on the Waialua side of Kaʻena, casting bright pinks, oranges, and yellows across the sky and water. The waves are much calmer, the ʻehu kai less noticeable but still present, always present. No matter what time of year, you will be able to see Keaomelemele make her way from Puaʻena, past ke one loa o Māeaea and Kaiaka, towards Kaʻena, her final destination and resting spot for the night (Figure 14). Keaomelemele's journey across the sky signals the end of the day, and for us her journey signals the conclusion of this mākaʻikaʻi. Mahalo for taking in these moʻolelo I have shared, for creating the space to encounter this ʻāina in new and different ways. I hope to one day to find you on the shores of Māeaea, basking in the beauty of Kaiaka and Puaʻena, feeling the warmth of ke one loa, admiring the bounty of Loko Ea. Perhaps we will go on another mākaʻikaʻi, have another opportunity to think through and discover what it means to become kamaʻāina o ka ʻehu kai.

Figure 14: View of the sun setting from ke one loa o Māeaea

Works Cited

Aikau, Hokulani K., and Vernadette Vicuna Gonzalez, eds. 2019. *Detours: A Decolonial Guide to Hawai'i*. Duke University Press: Duke University Press Books.

– – –. 2019. "Introduction." In *Detours: A Decolonial Guide to Hawai'i* edited by Hokulani K. Aikau, and Vernadette Vicuna Gonzalez, 1-13. Duke University Press: Duke University Press Books.

Althusser, Louis. 2006. *Philosophy of the Encounter: Later Writings, 1978-87*. London: Verso.

Archer, Luʻukia. 2016. "He Pou Heʻe i ka Wawā: Slipping into the Tumult of Life and Politics." PhD diss., University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Honolulu. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Au, J. Uʻilani. 2022. Unpublished manuscript in author's possession.

– – –. 2024. Unpublished manuscript in author's possession.

Bacchilega, Cristina and Marie Alohalani Brown. 2019. *The Penguin Book of Mermaids*. New York: Penguin Books.

Brown, Michelle Lee. 2021. "(Re)coding Survivance: Relation-Oriented Ontologies of Indigenous Media." Phd diss., University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Honolulu. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Byrd, Jodi A. 2020. "What's Normative Got to Do with It?" *Social Text* 38 (4): 105–23. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-8680466.

Chang, David. 2016. *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

– – –. 2020. "Once Were Maoists." In *Routledge Handbook of Critical Indigenous Studies*, edited by Brendan Hokowhitu, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, Linda Tuhiwai-Smith, Chris Andersen, and Steve Larkin, 378–91. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429440229-33.

Dean, Tim. 2009. *Unlimited Intimacy: Reflections on the Subculture of Barebacking*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dietrich, René. 2017. “The Biopolitical Logics of Settler Colonialism and Disruptive Relationality.” *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 17, no. 1 (February): 67–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708616638696.

– – –. 2018. “Introduction: Settler Colonial Biopolitics and Indigenous Lifeways.” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 42, no. 2 (January): 1 – 10.

Driskill, Qwo-Li. 2010. "Doubleweaving Two-Spirit Critiques: Building Alliances between Native and Queer Studies." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16, no. 1: 69-92. muse.jhu.edu/article/372445.

Engle, Merry, Sally. 2000. *Colonizing Hawai'i: The Cultural Power of Law*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. *The Care of the Self.* Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Random House.

– – – . 2003. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the College de France 1975 – 1976.* Translated by David Macey. New York: Picador.

– – – . 2007. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France 1977 – 1978.* Translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Picador.

– – – . 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978 – 1979.* Translated by Graham Burchell. New York: Picador.

Fujikane, Candace., and Jonathan Y. Okamura. 2008. *Asian Settler Colonialism: from Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Fujikane, Candace. 2021. *Mapping Abundance for a Planetary Future: Kanaka Maoli and Critical Settler Cartographies in Hawai'i*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Goeman, Mishuana. 2013. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Goldberg-Hiller, Jonathan, and Noenoe K. Silva. 2011. “Sharks and Pigs: Animating Hawaiian Sovereignty against the Anthropological Machine.” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 110, no. 2 (Spring): 429–46. https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-1162525.

Gonzalez, Ryan, Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada, and No'u Revilla. 2020. “‘Filling in Puka’: Interview with Ryan ‘Gonzo’ Gonzalez,” *Biography* 43, no. 3: 638–49, https://doi.org/10.1353/bio.2020.0070.

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani. 2013. *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 2014. "Introduction." In *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, edited by Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaikaʻala Wright, 1-33. Durham: Duke University Press.

———. 2015. "Independent Hawaiian Futures: Bring on the Ea-rator." *Ke Kaupu Hehiale*, August 15. Accessed July 2, 2022. https://hehiale.com/2015/08/17/independent-hawaiian-futures-bring-on-the-ea-rator/.

———. 2016. "Reproducing the Ropes of Resistance: Hawaiian Studies Methodologies." In *Kanaka ʻŌiwi Methodologies: Moʻolelo and Metaphor,* edited by Katrina-Ann R. Kapāʻanaokalāokeola Nākoa Oliveira and Erin Kahunawaikaʻala Wright, 1-29. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

———. 2017. "Protectors of the Future, Not Protestors of the Past: Indigenous Pacific Activism and Mauna a Wākea." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 116, no. 1 (January): 184–94, https://doi.org/10.1215/00382876-3749603.

———. 2020a. "Kūʻokoʻa: Independence." In *The Value of Hawaiʻi 3: Hulihia, the Turning*, edited by Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, Craig Howes, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoʻole Osorio, and Aiko Yamashiro, 4–8. University of Hawai'i Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1pncr2m.5.

———. 2020b. "On the Cattle Guard," *Biography* 43, no. 3: 527–29, https://doi.org/10.1353/bio.2020.0055.

Hobro, Marie Eriel, Bryan Kamaoli Kuwada, and No'u Revilla. 2020. "'I Wanted to Show the Joy': Interview with Marie Eriel Hobro," *Biography* 43, no. 3: 650–54, https://doi.org/10.1353/bio.2020.0071.

ho'omanawanui, ku'ualoha. 2014. *Voices of Fire Reweaving the Literary Lei of Pele and Hi'iaka*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jenkins, Elizabeth Kawohiokalani Ellis. 2002. "Pule ʻOhana." Paper presented at HOʻOMAKA: A Presentation of Hawaiian Awareness and Awakening, Honolulu, HI, October 2002.

Kamakau, Samuel Manaiākalani. 1991. *Ka Poʻe Kahiko: The People of Old*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Kamokualiiole, J. 1866. "He Ninau Baibala." *Ke Au Okoa* (Honolulu)*,* November 19, 1866, 3.

Kānepuʻu, Joseph H. 1867-68. "He Moolelo no Hamanalau, Hanai a Hawea: I Laweia mailoko mai o na Kaao Kahiko o Hawaii Nei." *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa,* December 28, 1867 – August 29, 1868.

Kapahua, Kawena. 2020. “Stories from the Mauna, Ku’u One Hānau,” *Biography* 43, no. 3: 575–81, https://doi.org/10.1353/bio.2020.0062.

Kauanui, J. Kehaulani. 2008. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham: Duke University Press.

– – – . 2018. *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Koopman, Colin, and Tomas Matza. 2013. “Putting Foucault to Work: Analytic and Concept in Foucaultian Inquiry.” *Critical Inquiry* 39, no. 4 (Summer): 817–40. https://doi.org/10.1086/671357.

Lemke, Thomas. 2011. *Biopolitics: An Advanced Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.

Lindroth, Marjo, and Heidi Sinevaara-Niskanen. 2014. “Adapt or Die? The Biopolitics of Indigeneity—From the Civilising Mission to the Need for Adaptation.” *Global Society* 28, no. 2 (March): 180–94. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2014.887557.

– – – . 2016. “The Biopolitics of Resilient Indigeneity and the Radical Gamble of Resistance.” *Resilience* 4, no. 2 (October): 130–45. https://doi.org/10.1080/21693293.2015.1094243.

Luhiau, S. C. 1865. “No ka Ike Malihini ana ia Waialua.” *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (Honolulu), October 28, 1865, 3.

Manu, Moses. 2002. “He Moolelo Kaao no Keaomelemele.” Translated by Mary Kawena Pukui. Honolulu: Native Books.

Mbembe, Achille. 2019. *Necropolitics*. Translated by Steve Corcoran. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mills, Catherine. 2018. *Biopolitics*. New York: Routledge. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uhm/detail.action?docID=5089143.

Morar, Nicolae, and Colin Koopman. 2012. "The Birth of the Concept of Biopolitics – A Critical Notice of Lemke’s *Biopolitics*." *Theory & Event* 15, no. 4. muse.jhu.edu/article/491206.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. 2010. “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16 (1–2): 105-31. https://doi.org/10.1215/10642684-2009-015.

Osorio, Jamaica Heolimeleikalani. 2021. *Remembering Our Intimacies: Mo’olelo, Aloha ‘Āina, and Ea*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Peralto, Leon. 2018. "Kokolo Mai Ka Mole Uaua O 'ī: The Resilience and Resurgence of Aloha 'Āina in Hāmākua Hikina, Hawai'i." Phd diss., University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Povinelli, Elizabeth. 2016. *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Pukui, Mary Kawena. 1983. *'Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs & Poetical Sayings*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Saranillio, Dean Itsuji. 2018a. *Unsustainable Empire: Alternative Histories of Hawai'i Statehood*. Durham: Duke University Press. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uhm/detail.action?docID=5574881.

– – – . 2018b. "Haunani-Kay Trask and Settler Colonial and Relational Critique: Alternatives to Binary Analyses of Power." *Verge: Studies in Global Asias* 4, no. 2 (Fall): 36–44. https://doi.org/10.5749/vergstudglobasia.4.2.0036.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. 2011. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-creation, Resurgence and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.

– – – . 2017. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*. 3rd ed. edition. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Silva, Noenoe K. 2004. *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism.* Durham: Duke University Press.

– – – . 2017. *The Power of the Steel-Tipped Pen: Reconstructing Native Hawaiian Intellectual History.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Smith, Andrea. 2011. "Queer Theory and Native Studies: The Heteronormativity of Settler Colonialism." In *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature*, edited by Qwo-Li Driskill, Chris Finley, Brian Joseph Gilley, and Scott Lauria Morgensen, 43-65. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. 2014. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3, no. 2: 1-32.

Sterling, Elspeth P., and Catherine C. Summers. 1978. *Sites of Oahu*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Strelein, Lisa. 2018. "Represencing Indigenoud Peoples in the Landscape." In *Everyday Acts of Resurgence: People, Places, Practices*, edited by Jeff Corntassel, Taiaiake Alfred, Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noenoe K Silva, Hokulani K Aikau, and Devi Mucina, 68-73. Olympia: Daykeeper Press.

Teves, Stephanie Nohelani. 2018. *Defiant Indigeneity: The Politics of Hawaiian Performance*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1999. *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii*. Revised. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

– – – . 2004. “The Color of Violence.” *Social Justice* 31, no. 4 (98): 8-16. http://www.jstor.org/stable/29768270.

– – – . 2008. “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony.” In *Asian Settler Colonialism*, edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, 45–65. University of Hawai’i Press. https://doi.org/10.21313/hawaii/9780824830151.003.0001.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1: 1 – 40.

Uaua, William Henry. 1870-1871. “He Moolelo Kaao no Kaehuikimanoopuuloa.” *Ke Au Okoa* (Honolulu), November 24, 1870 – January 5, 1871.

Vimalassery, Manu, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein. 2016. “Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing.” *Theory & event* 19, no. 4: N.A.

– – – . 2017. “Colonial Unknowing and Relations of Study.” *Theory & event* 20, no. 4: 1042–1054.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240.

– – – . 2013. “The Settler Complex: An Introduction.” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 37, no. 2: 1 – 22.

– – – . 2016a. *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race.* London: Verso.

Wolfe, Patrick, ed. 2016b. *The Settler Complex: Recuperating Binarism in Colonial Studies*. Los Angeles: UCLA American Indian Studies Center.

Wyban, Carol Araki. *Tide and Current: Fishponds of Hawai‘i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1992.