

**“Mahikihiki mai ka Opae Oehaa a Hihia i ka Wai”
Pua does not always mean flower,
and this paper is not about shrimp.
-Bruce Ka‘imi Watson, PhD**

Like the ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a, some ‘Ōiwi reside in brackish water. Kanakademics (‘Ōiwi Academics) swim in the muliwai, a turbid estuary filled with both English and ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. Flicks of the tail disturb the surface of thought in this fertile place where ‘ike from the island flow into what ocean currents bring from afar. ‘Ōpae ‘oeha‘a benefit from applying the common reminder heard in mele interpretation, “pua does not always mean flower,” to all fields of study. This ‘ōpae on the pae of philosophy humbly seeks to mahiki i kahi mea ‘āpiki. Following the overthrow of the Aupuni Hawai‘i, genocide thrives in educational institutions as Americanization facilitated through linguicide and epistemicide. As a result, many ‘Ōiwi are seeking to (re)member themselves to a sovereign nation and not an aupuni noho kuokoa. This essay asks that we consider if pua does not always mean flower, then perhaps, nation does not always mean aupuni, and noho kuokoa may not mean sovereignty.

“I ka olelo no ke ola” documents ‘Ōiwi knowledge of the power of language. There is ola in meaning shared. Haole philosophy of language suggests that words themselves do not have meaning, instead, meaning is something that people do. In the doing of this work of meaning, Ludwig Wittgenstein tells us that, “Meaning is use” (1958, p. 20). If we accept these assertions then it is important for us to be cognizant of the ‘ōlelo we choose to utilize if we intend to breathe ola into what we mean. So it is here where we approach the ‘āpiki. Sharing meaning in the muliwai is a practice of aloha, walking along an edge the width of a blade of pili grass, as one must not forget that the other side of the ‘ōlelo no‘eau is “i ka olelo no ka make.” A careless ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a tangled in the hihiawai is shortly thereafter consumed. In seeking to imagine the multitude of possible meanings of “pua” including but not limited to flower, Gottlob Frege

reminds us of the difficulty faced in the transmission of ideas successfully between those who share a culture and language

...in the case of an idea one must, strictly speaking, add to whom it belongs and at what time. It might perhaps be said: Just as one man connects this idea, and another that idea, with the same word, so also one man can associate this sense and another that sense. But there still remains a difference in the mode of connexion. They are not prevented from grasping the same sense; but they cannot have the same idea. ...If two persons picture the same thing, each still has his own idea. It is indeed sometimes possible to establish differences in the ideas, or even in the sensations, of different men; but an exact comparison is not possible, because we cannot have both ideas together in the same consciousness. (1956 p. 60).

The distance from sameness is increased when communication partners are of different cultural and linguistic backgrounds utilizing multiple languages, as is the case for the ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a swimming in the muliwai. Perry further explains Frege by stating,

The real knowledge expressed by the sentence determines the cognitive value of the sentence. It is not knowledge about signs, but knowledge above and beyond that contained in the knowledge of the linguistic conventions (2001, p. 10).

So if exposed to the same words, the same sentence, “ke ‘au nei kāua i kēia muliwai,” we uniquely approach the sequence of sounds departing from a base of previous experiences arriving to the new knowledge presented by pulling from and adding to the cognitive value we each develop, attached to, around, and between words. Larry Kimura explains why it is imperative to attend faithfully to the original language of concepts such as “pua,” “nation,” and “aupuni.” Language unites base culture, which includes “daily lifestyle, values, and personality of a people,” (1983, p.181) to aesthetic culture which includes “ceremonies, philosophy, and literature” (1983, p. 181). ‘Ōlelo is therefore the medium through which the “base culture and aesthetic culture work together toward a cultural ideal” (1983, p. 181). The cognitive value, base culture, and aesthetic culture attached to words make communication complex and the already dangerous act of translating from one language to the next even more treacherous. Perhaps not

all ideas thrive in brackish environments, as hegemonic tides in the fertile muliwai are capable of producing interesting and tragic violences. Kimura expounds how processing ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i for an English-speaking/thinking public increases the turbidity of the muliwai,

English inevitably implies Anglo-American culture in direct proportion to the part of Hawaiian culture that is lost in the description. This has a negative impact on Hawaiians, not only in the impression gained by outsiders, but also in the self-impression gained by English-speaking Hawaiians using such descriptions...We see then that the replacement of Hawaiian with English can have (and has had) a tremendous negative impact on Hawaiian culture and thus the Hawaiian people (Kimura, 1983, p. 184).

Having successfully observed the patterns and tides of the estuary, let us carefully enter the muliwai at the shallow end of the problem we face and wash our feet with “akua.”

Akua while often translated as “god” or even “God,” Dear Reader, I remind us all that akua is an ‘Ōiwi word which was born on these “God-less” islands to carry and communicate a mana‘o Hawai‘i, an ‘Ōiwi concept. Traditionally, ‘Ōiwi utilize “akua” to describe an entire category of mea natural phenomena consisting of many individual akua each having unique names. American missionaries translated and transformed the entire category “akua” and all of its membership into “Ke Akua”, a bearded White man smiting people from His kingdom in the sky. White missionaries prosthetize “Aole ou akua e ae imua o ko‘u alo” (Baibala Hemolele, 1839 p.150) alaila Akua 2.0 left no room for the kini akua who had their identities stolen and names silenced. In order to survive persistent efforts to ho‘ohaole some akua were Christened as angels, ‘ānela. Paving a path over akua allowed Akua to travel throughout the islands unhindered, an epistemicide which continues to negatively impact the pilina between ‘Ōiwi and their home spaces. Ku‘u ‘Ōpae e, ‘Ōpae ho‘i, in addition to being cognizant of language choice, a conscious consideration of the cognitive value and cultures attached to words is vital as we move forward in our understanding of the ‘ōlelo whose power we live under, i ka ‘ōlelo no ka make.

“He Nation Heaha Ia?”

The Andrew’s Hawaiian language dictionary defines “nation” as “lahui kanaka, he aupuni” (1865, p. 538). One English word “nation” is given two words in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i, “lahui kanaka” and “aupuni.” This is a puzzle that maybe our racist analytic philosopher friend Frege can help us sort out. If $a=a$, $a=b$, and $a=c$ are all true, then $b=c$ should also be true. To examine this juicy morsel in our pincer grip, let us make the following substitutions: $a=nation$, $b=lahui\ kanaka$, and $c=aupuni$. We now have the following statements: $nation=nation$, $nation=lahui\ kanaka$, and $nation=aupuni$; therefore $lahui\ kanaka=aupuni$. For our friends that are new to the muliwai, $lahui\ kanaka \neq aupuni$, $b \neq c$.

That definition of “nation” we had in our claw turned out to be a tourist’s discarded cigarette butt, buggah is small but toxic. If $lahui\ kanaka \neq aupuni$ then one or all of the foundational assertions we relied upon must be false. So $lahui\ kanaka \neq nation$, and/or $aupuni \neq nation$, and/or $nation \neq nation$. Dear Reader, how are you doing? Perhaps you are thinking that we all know what a nation is. Agnotology is the study of ignorance and this essay you are reading contributes to the discussions in that field. What is a nation? Everyone in the world has to belong to one...right? Has this always been the case? What do we call those who do not have a nation? What are they missing? What have we gained? Who made up the concept of nations? Why are we conceived, born, die, and then buried within boundaries we may or may not have applied to ourselves? How is it that “citizens” of a nation are not quite clear of the contract that exists between us and some entity that made all of this so? On 05/28/21, the President of the United States announced, “But America is unique. From all nations in the world, we’re the only nation organized based on an idea. Every other nation you can define by their ethnicity, their geography, their religion, except America. America is born out of an idea.” So if even the leader

of a nation has no idea what a nation is and is completely ignorant of the history of the nation he leads (of course he could be purposefully spreading misinformation as that is an American cultural practice) we really should not feel bad about our ignorance. Instead let us turn to wonder and ask why this is so. What is gained by this ignorance? Who benefits from our not knowing? What do we lose in not knowing? Can you feel us getting deeper into the muliwai? I am right here with you and we will take it slow but buckle up and brace for danger, just in case.

Let us start by trying to mold our muliwai understanding of “nation” as close to nation as possible, attempting to make “nation” \approx nation. So, as this is being written by an ‘Ōiwi philosopher, I will begin with my friend I go to whenever I am trying to understand White thought, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Nenad Miscevic the author of the entry on nationalism describes two types of nation. The first is voluntaristic, “any group of people aspiring to a common political state-like organization” (2020, p.7). The second is a “non-voluntary community of common origin, language, tradition and culture, the classic ethno-nation” (2020, p. 8). A newer “socio-cultural definition” of nation widely accepted today “adds a political dimension to the purely cultural one: a nation is a cultural group, possibly but not necessarily united by a common descent, endowed with civic ties” (Seymour, 2000). Now we have a basic sense of nation, an idea constructed by the Haole of Europe. It is important that we know that the first two types of nation both voluntary and non-voluntary, civic and ethnic, were present at the time Andrews published his dictionary in 1865. In the same way that pua does not always mean flower and Akua led people away from akua, perhaps ‘Ōiwi understanding of a human collective may not have been a nation. To gain a better appreciation of the cognitive value and culture inherently tied to “nation” we turn to the work of Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben who enhances our understanding of nation by further explaining,

It is not possible to understand the “national” and biopolitical development and vocation of the modern state in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries if one forgets that what lies at its basis is not man as a free and conscious political subject but, above all, man’s bare life, the simple birth that as such is, in the passage from subject to citizen, invested with the principle of sovereignty (2018, loc. 2033).

Agamben states the inherent connection of “nation” to “state” to “bare life” and “sovereignty.”

Bare life? State? Sovereignty? In the words of Young Busco, “What are those?” E ku‘u mea kupa o ka muliwai, mai maka‘u. We got this. E ku‘u ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a just a little bit deeper, next stop sovereignty.

“Sovereignty Heaha ia?”

The muliwai is a large and complex ecosystem. It is easy for an ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a to get all switched around by unexpected tides. This journey began with the problem of ‘Ōiwi seeking to (re)member a sovereign nation as opposed to an aupuni noho kuokoa. Our journey is long and we will be making stops along the way. To survive ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a must only adventure out when ready and depart knowing that with a simple flick of a tail you will find safety again.

A safe space was established in a better understanding of “nation.” We learned that you do not need ‘āina to be a nation. Nation is a group of people...just people. If you are ready we now journey toward nation’s partner, sovereignty. Again we will be guided by our trusted hoa, the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Written by Daniel Philpott the entry on sovereignty tells us that at its most simple sovereignty is, “supreme authority within a territory.” To travel from understanding nation to understanding sovereignty will require a few short stops along the way. We have the following itinerary (Nation) (State) (Territoriality) (Nation-State) (Authority) (Supreme Authority within a Territory) = (Sovereignty). Philpott advises that sovereignty can be understood “more precisely only through its history.” (Philpott, 2020 p.7). For this history we will rely on the work of French philosopher Michel Foucault and Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben whose research and writings often inform discussions on sovereignty and bio-politics.

Having successfully and safely departed our station “nation” the next stop is “State.” Nation is a group of people and “the modern polity is known as the state” (Philpott, 2020, p. 2). State describes that the group of people is organized in some way. Remember that first definition of sovereignty we received from Philpott, “sovereignty is supreme authority within a territory.” Territoriality is the principle which states that membership is based on geographic location within a set of boundaries. A modern nation-state is “founded on the functional nexus between a

determinate localization and a determinate order and mediated by automatic rules for the inscription of life” (Agamben, 2018, loc 2775). A modern nation state has a geographical location, the humans living within are an organized society which in some way includes rules for belonging and thereby non-belonging. Within this state framework an organized society requires authority and “the fundamental characteristic of authority within it, sovereignty,” (Philpott, 2021 p. 2) a supreme authority. Authority is “the right (connoting legitimacy) to command and correlatively the right to be obeyed” (Wolff, 1990, 20). The possessor of supreme authority is then superior to all authorities under its purview. It is possible for many nations to live under a shared supreme authority. A sovereign is the possessor of sovereign power, which is the right to decide who lives and who dies and all the spaces of life between. Michel Foucault suggests that this sovereign power has derived

from the ancient *patria potestas* that granted the father of the Roman family the right to ‘dispose’ of the life of his children and his slaves; just as he had given them life, so he could take it away” (Foucault, 2012 loc 1736).

“Sovereignty is supreme authority within a territory” and that authority is possessed by humans.

“E Kū Mai ‘o Hawai‘i ‘Imiloa, e ‘Imi Pū i ka Pono o ka ‘Āina a me ke Ola o ka Lāhui”

E ku‘u ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a we are now more familiar with philosophical borders defined by the words “sovereign nation.” The sovereign nation is an understanding of communal existence constructed by humans for humans led by humans who have the authority over all of the humans existing within set geographical parameters. Cameroonian philosopher Achille Mbembe asks,

Is another politics of the world possible, a politics that no longer necessarily rests upon difference or alterity but instead on a certain idea of the kindred and the in-common? Are we not condemned to live in our exposure to one another, sometimes in the same space? (Mbembe, 2019 pg 40.)

Native American author Taiaiake Alfred also researches the negative impact of sovereignty on Native Americans. He explains,

Sovereignty, then, is a social creation. It is not an objective or natural phenomenon but the result of choices made by men and women, indicative of a mindset located in, rather than a natural force creative of, a social and political order. The reification of sovereignty in politics today is the result of a triumph of a particular set of ideas over others—no more natural to the world than any other man-made object (Alfred, 2005, pg 46-47).

Mbembe and Alfred point out that “sovereign nations” are a problem which went viral. To promote “peace” the United Nations uses its authority to ensure that all land on the planet is under the authority of a state they recognize. With the understanding that sovereign nation is a human created problem impacting different communities differently, Taiaiake asks, “Is there a Native philosophical alternative?” (2005, p.45).

The islands of Hawai‘i were united as an aupuni by Kana‘iaupuni, Kamehameha I in 1810. The Aupuni Hawai‘i established its first constitution in 1840. Kamehameha III sent emissaries abroad to seek recognition of his Aupuni by world powers for political reasons (Perkins, Sai, Williams). On 11/28/1843 Lā Kū‘oko‘a was established as a national holiday to commemorate and celebrate annually the date of success. The 1843 Anglo-French declaration

signed by the representatives of the Queen of England and the King of France officially recognized,

“the existence in the Sandwich Islands of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage, reciprocally, to consider the Sandwich Islands as an Independent State, and never to take possession, neither directly or under the title of Protectorate, or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed.”

While the original of this document written in English and French was easy to find in the archives, I was not able to find a complete version of the document in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. I was able to find this quote of the first line of the proclamation in a nūpepa article,

“Aia ma Hawaii ke aupuni makaukau i ka hana pu me ko na aina e” (Ka Elele 07/15/1845, p. 2)

It is interesting that both France and England used their words and thereby their worldviews to perceive Hawai‘i as an “Independent State” located on the “Sandwich Islands.” They did not see Hawai‘i as an aupuni and not by the name we call ourselves. They baptized Hawai‘i into their world through translation. Official recognition forced others to see Hawai‘i differently but that does not mean that Hawai‘i changed its view of itself.

“Ua ae akaka mai o Amerikahuipua, a me Beritania, a me Farani, a me na Belegiuma i ke kuokoa o keia aupuni” (05/29/1845 Ka Elele p. 1)

“Nolaila o ka hoomanao ana o na puuwai Hawaii mai ka Hikina a ke Komohana o keia Pae aina i keia la, aohe no ia he mea iki, aka he mea nui ia, a e paa kakou i ka olelo kumu o ko kakou nei Aupuni. “E mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono.” (12/01/1866 Ka Nupepa Kuokoa p. 3)

“Kupono ke Kuokoa, I imiia e Haalilio, Ua lilo ka la Kuokoa, La hauoli Aupuni, Ma na moku Hawaii nei.” (01/01/1862 Ka Nupepa Kuokoa p. 2)

While the world powers at the time saw Hawai‘i as a sovereign nation, as evidenced by these quotes from nūpepa we still referred to ourselves as an aupuni kuokoa. ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a this is when we ask, “but aren’t they the same things?” Let us go deeper and see.

“Ke Aupuni; Heaha ia?”

Dear ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a we now have a better familiarity with the saltier end of the muliwai, both “sovereign” and “nation” are human concepts that have washed in from afar. Just as those are haole words with cultural baggage and cognitive values not immediately apparent, aupuni is a word formed to identify a mea Hawai‘i, a mana‘o Hawai‘i, with a mo‘olelo Hawai‘i as well.

In the free space of my mind “aupuni” is understood as the interaction of two morphemes, “au” and “puni.” “Au” can mean an area or territory, especially places which sustain life. “Puni” indicates an intimate and defining relationship. The authority in an aupuni is possessed by place and not people. Liliuokalani, Mō‘ī of the Aupuni documented this pilina and the strain on the aupuni caused by Haole interference:

But will it also be thought strange that education and knowledge of the world have enabled us to perceive that as a race we have some special mental and physical requirements not shared by the other races which have come among us? That certain habits and modes of living are better for our health and happiness than others? And that a separate nationality, and a particular form of government, as well as special laws, are, at least for the present, best for us? And these things remained to us, until the pitiless and tireless "annexation policy" was effectively backed by the naval power of the United States (Queen Liliuokalani, 2011, loc 3943-3946).

Aupuni then can be understood as a “particular form of government,” one which depends upon space specific “education and knowledge of the world” to determine the habits and modes of living necessary to facilitate, support, and encourage the health and happiness of all within.

With an openness to understanding aupuni as “a particular form of government” grasped in our big pinchers e ku‘u ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a we turn to the writing of Iosepa Kahooluhi Nawahiokalaniopuu a kanaka of the aupuni. Born on Hawai‘i Island in the 19th century, Nawahi is Hawai‘i ‘Imiloa. He was a teacher, lawyer, artist, politician, political prisoner, editor, writer, patriot, rebel, and father. While imprisoned by the Provisional Government for his efforts to support the Aupuni, he was exposed to tuberculosis. It can be said that Americans caused his

death and further attempted to extinguish his voice through the occupational government's policies of language suppression. Ola ka inoa o Nawahi. Due to work performed by the 'ōpae who have come before us, 'Ōiwi in the muliwai are capable of hearing Nawahi as he provides a visceral description of the Aupuni he grew up in and fought so hard for. To better understand aupuni noho kuokoa let us drink of the words written in 1895 by Joseph Kahooluhi Nawahi. E ku'u 'Ōpae 'Oeha'a let us move toward the fresh water inlet of the muliwai by reading the question that Nawahi asked and answered, "ke aupuni heaha ia?"

Ke Aupuni; Heaha ia?

Oia ka Iwi, ka Io, na Olona a me ke Koko o ka Lahui i alakai ia e ka Lolo Noonoo o ka puniu poo.

Ma ka hoakaka maoli ana e like me ka mea maa mai ka manawa kinohi mai o ka noho ana o na Lahuikanaka, ua ike ia keia mau mahele kaawale eha i alakai ia e ka noonoo o ke Poo hookahi.

1. Ka Iwi oia ka Aina
2. Ka Io oia ka Lahui
3. Na Olona a me na Aa, Koko, oia na Kanawai
4. Ke Koko oia ka Waiwai

O keia mau mahele eha, ua hoomalulia lakou e ka mea hookahi oia ka Lolo Noonoo iloko o ka Puniu Poo e kau ana maluna loa iho o ke kino holookoa, oia no ka mea i kapaia - ka Moi (Nawahi, 05/25/1895, p. 7).

Aupuni; What is it?

It is the bones, the flesh, the sinew, and the blood organized into one body the Lāhui, guided by the thought center of the head.

This is an attempt to thoroughly communicate an 'Ōiwi understanding of Aupuni. Those accustomed to living as a part of the Lahuikanaka since the beginning of time know that these four distinct components are all guided by a unified philosophy embodied within the head.

1. The bones are the 'Āina
2. The flesh is the Lāhui
3. The sinew and the veins are the Kanawai
4. The blood is the Waiwai

These four mahele are guided by the head, the Mō'ī, placed atop the entirety of the body. The body functions within the malu of the unified Lolo Noonoo which is contained within the skull.

Aupuni are composed of multiple mahele which are intimately connected. Each is cognizant of their interdependence. Notice that 'āina is the mahele upon which waiwai, kānāwai,

and lāhui are built and that it is necessary for all of these mahele to support the Puniu Poo. It is the iwi which shapes the entire body, ‘āina functions as the skeletal structure necessary for the aupuni to kū pono. Also please take note that “Lahuikanaka” is a mahele of the aupuni providing further evidence that b≠c. E ku‘u ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a drink up this sweet water as we continue to dive deeper.

This first mahele, the iwi, the skeletal framework of the system is the ‘āina. ‘Āina is commonly translated as land. While a philosophical exploration of the difference between land and ‘āina is important, it is not within the scope of this paper but I ask that for now we consider ‘āina as the place and space which support life.

The second mahele of the aupuni is the flesh, lāhui is the collection of kanaka, humanity, the muscle which allows the aupuni to move forward. All humans are attached to and depend upon ‘āina. The Kumulipo reminds kanaka that we are the younger siblings to ‘āina. “Haku ai kama hanau mua” (Liliuokalani, 1897, line 704). As the youngest siblings, it is the kuleana of the lāhui kanaka to attend to and to be guided by ‘āina our elders, ‘Ōiwi are indeed shaped by the iwi.

The third mahele, the kānāwai, is the connective tissue, the sinew, and veins which hold the aupuni together and keep all the mahele in communication. Kānāwai is often translated as law but kānāwai can be better understood as lifeways. The word kānāwai is made up of morphemes which call to mind the imagery of water pathways. Kānāwai then are the lifeways which support continuing flow of fresh water. ‘Ōiwi water management was vital for sustaining life. Traditional farming techniques were developed to ensure that water continued to flow from their mountain sources to the ocean, feeding fields and then directed back into the stream bed filled with nutrients improving the quality of wai along the way. Kānāwai then are not restrictive,

but instead generative, in that by following kānāwai, the life of the ‘āina and all who live upon it are improved. Kānāwai facilitate the ability for the life giving wai to kahe mau. This value is critical to understanding how life of the aupuni body is sustained. ‘Ōiwi worked with the natural environment not just for individual consumption but instead the ideal was to actively contribute to sustaining a mā‘ona moku, striving for mutual mā‘ona, shared satiety amongst the entire aupuni body and not individual abundance or excess in one mahele.

The last mahele, the blood, is waiwai. Waiwai is now translated as valuable or wealth but once again, ku‘u ‘Ōpae ‘Oeha‘a, I remind us that wealth from an ‘Ōiwi perspective is not designer bags and luxury cars. The word waiwai captures a mana‘o Hawai‘i. The vital life blood of the aupuni, koko, which oxygenates, flows, sustains, and enriches is indeed valuable to an aupuni body. From this perspective waiwai then represent the variety of resources necessary for all to be satiated and healthy. Waiwai are the various mea consumed, used, and shared through the kānāwai which sustain, support, and encourage sufficient distribution.

Nawahi elaborates that the entirety of the body and its vital organs must work harmoniously together in accordance with the Lolo Noonoo in order for the Aupuni to be aupuni (in a state of peace and quietness). The Lolo Noonoo is the philosophy “iloko o ka Puniu Poo.” Mo‘olelo document the training and guidance received by potential Po‘o from childhood to instill within them the ‘Ōiwi philosophy of aloha ‘āina. Surrounded and advised by experts throughout their lives the philosophy of the aupuni is thereby embodied in its leader. So while the Puniu Poo is the “head” of the aupuni the leader is the knowledge and logic of the aupuni body, the Lolo Noonoo iloko iho. The Puniu Poo then is viscerally aware that all of these mahele are vital and the entire aupuni can not function if any of these are missing. The aupuni can not be healthy if one mahele is benefitting at the expense of others. If any of the mahele are

malnourished the aupuni suffers. Although the ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a walks crookedly with one pincher bigger than the other, the aupuni aims for symmetry, balance, pono. Guided by the Lolo Noonoo of aloha ‘āina, the po‘o then is not solely concerned with the life of its human members but with the mā‘ona of the entire aupuni body. It is the kuleana of each mahele to support themselves as well as the other mahele; each cognizant of the health of the other. The aupuni body can not move or survive if the blood (waiwai) and veins (kānāwai) do not nourish each and every part including the head (mō‘ī), the flesh (Lāhui kanaka), and the bones (‘āina). The aupuni is a healthy independent biosphere body which thrives when “alakai ia e ka noonoo o ke poo hookahi.”

“Ke Aloha Aina; Heaha Ia?”

The Pukui dictionary defines aloha aina as “patriotism” (Pukui, 1971) while the Andrews dictionary defines “patriotism” as “Ka imi ana i ka pono o ke aupuni” (Andrews 1865, p. 540). So without the help of Frege ku‘u ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a we already know that as Aupuni is not a nation; aloha ‘āina is not the same as patriotism. Aloha ‘Āina is more accurately the kuleana to actively pursue pono for the aupuni. It is this aloha for ‘āina which is the lolo no‘ono‘o, the guiding philosophy. Aloha ‘āina is based on a firm commitment to the pono of its iwi, the framework which defines and upholds the aupuni body. Hawai‘i ‘imiloa Nawahi explains the ‘Ōiwi importance of aloha ‘āina by using the metaphor of a magnetic field.

O ke Aloha Aina, oia ka Ume Mageneti iloko o ka puuwai o ka Lahui, e kaohi ana i ka noho Kuokoa Lanakila ana o kona one hanau ponoī. (Nawahi 05/25/1895, p. 7)

He mea pohihihi ka ike ana i kahi i loa ai ia mea he ume iloko o ka hao Mageneti, aka, eia ka mea maopopo loa, aia kela kui Mageneti ke hoomau la i kona kuhikuhi ana i ka hoku akau ma ka welau akau o honua nei. (Nawahi, 05/25/1895, p. 7)

Aloha ‘Āina is the magnetic field which can be found in the hearts of a nation of people; drawing them to successfully live free in the land they were born to.

Although we do not know what it is within the magnet which causes it to pull, there is one thing that is most definitely understood; it is that the magnetic needle will persist in its pointing to the North Star at the most northern edge of this earth.

Nawahi elaborates that without knowing how or why aloha ‘āina works, we recognize it by what it does, we know aloha ‘āina through observation of behaviors and recognition of propensities and patterns. Informed by an awareness of the aupuni and its mahele, when faced with a decision those who aloha i ka aina know what we should and should not do. Always completely cognizant that what is pono in Pālolo may be hewa in ‘Ewa. Nawahi cautions that when one does not have aloha for their ‘āina then they think only of themselves and not the needs of others. This is extremely shameful. In an article published on 10/31/1902 Nupepa Kuokoa the author explains

that true aloha ‘āina is to “Aloha i ka aina iho ame ka lahui iho ame ke aupuni iho oia ka piha pono o ka manao ‘Aloha Aina’” (p. 4). An aupuni noho kuokoa, “a separate nationality and a particular form of government” is what is necessary to make putting the ‘āina we occupy first.

“Ua Nui aku ke Aloha no ka Aina Hanau Mamua o na Mea e ae a Pau Loa.”

E ku‘u ‘ōpae ‘oeha‘a, our holoholo tour of the muliwai has come to an end. It seems clear that an aupuni noho kuokoa is not a sovereign nation. An aupuni finds strength in binding, working together to share ‘āina and keep the biosphere occupied, a happy healthy body, aupuni. A sovereign nation cultivates a human centric identity defined by land trod upon by subjects of a sovereign whose primary concern for national space seems to be seeking more of it by any means necessary. The Lahuikanaka have a relationship with ‘āina and a kuleana to actively seek mā‘ona for one’s aupuni. The pursuit of pono for an aupuni is not an individual or collective seeking of abundance but instead the efforts toward achieving systemic satisfaction, mā‘ona. Because of this, an aupuni can have neither citizens nor refugees. Ali‘i at least since Umi a Liloa have known that “he hookuli ka make. He hoolohe ke ola” (Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, 03/15/1862, p.1). The Po‘o can not ignore and separate from the mahele, nor exist detached and outside the ‘āina, lāhui, kānāwai, waiwai, and Lolo Noonoo of the aupuni. The aupuni then has no sovereign. Aupuni is not nation.

This understanding of a mā‘ona ‘āina as core of an aupuni contrasts my experiential understanding of nation based on living under United States occupation. While aupuni is comparable to a neighborhood mom and pop shop beholden to service an intimate community composed of the four mahele; the United States seems to be more like a multi-level marketing business, retail without a storefront, selling dreams of prosperity, democracy, and freedom without being invested, rooted, and grounded in ‘āina. In 1787, White slave owners formally established and codified a system of government ensuring that their ancestors and those that look like them will thrive at the expense of others in a stolen home. They established a democracy with a thorough understanding that democracy requires imbalance. Mbembe writes, “the capacity

to create unequal exchange relations became a decisive element of power” (p. 19). A sovereign nation state then is a human-centric entity where in the case of the United States the desires of people (especially White people) are prioritized to the detriment of all the mahele which could potentially comprise the formation of an aupuni (Fasching-Varner Et al., 2014). The Lolo No‘ono‘o of the aupuni, aloha ‘āina focuses on the distribution of waiwai through kanawai which ensure that we all participate in a viscerally connected, pono system. An aupuni walks smoothly toward the future when all are mutually mā‘ona.

Ho‘ohaole is to cause to be foreign. In the case of Hawai‘i the occupying government forcibly causes Hawai‘i to be foreign to itself. In the case of Hawai‘i then ho‘ohaole is to cause dissonance with this space, to disrupt the aupuni Hawai‘i by impeding the functions of its mahele and interrupting the ability to aloha this ‘āina in the way that brings joy for all. After Liliuokalani yielded under duress “to the superior force of the United States” (Liliuokalani, 1893) the system was changed to benefit a Haole minority. The usurper led government immediately created, enacted, and enforced violent laws and protocols to ho‘ohaole the populace and to purposely disrupt pono to cultivate imbalance and inequity like sugar cane, pineapple, and golf courses. Hawai‘i is no longer an Aupuni, but instead, an occupied nation.

Taiiaki Alfred tells us that sovereignty is a human constructed problem, ‘Ōiwi propose an ‘āina constructed solution. Ho‘oHawai‘i is not simply to “make Hawaiian” as one may try to do by adding pineapple pieces to a pizza. Instead, ho‘oHawai‘i is to adapt, adopt, and adjust propensities, properties, and behaviors in order to cause resonance with this space, to participate and abide by the tenets which create an aupuni Hawai‘i to live harmoniously with all of the other inhabitants of the biosphere. The aloha for ‘āina above anything else is what differentiates an aupuni from nation and aloha ‘āina from patriotism. Aupuni is the product of a world view which

prioritizes place and is therefore space specific. The philosophical tenets which form aupuni and aloha ʻāina while initially birthed in Hawaiʻi, can be universally applied. Decisions made in pursuit of māʻona would look differently when the mahele of the Aupuni are built upon a different ʻāina structure. This paper is an initial review and proposal for aupuni noho kuokoa to be considered as a philosophical alternative which will allow us to hoʻoHawaiʻi Hawaiʻi and improve the political and academic waters of others. Mahalo iā ʻoe, e kuʻu ʻŌpae ʻOehaʻa. Let us all continue to mahikihiki to and fro while always mindful of the pull of the waters. We all find strength through exercising in the muliwai.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, G., & Heller-Roazen, D. (2018). *The omnibus homo sacer*. Stanford University Press. (Kindle Version).
- Alfred, Taiaiake. (2005). Sovereignty. In *Sovereignty matters: locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination*.
<http://search.proquest.com/docview/38206749/>
- Andrews L. (1865). *A Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language*. Henry M. Whitney. Honolulu, HI
- Anglo-French Proclamation https://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/img/1843_UK_Archives1.jpg
https://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/img/1843_UK_Archives2.jpg
- Biden, J. (2021).
<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2021/05/28/remarks-by-president-biden-addressing-service-members-and-their-families/>
- Palapala Hemolele a Iehova ko Kakou Akua (1838).
<https://baibala.org/cgi-bin/bible?e=d-1off-01839-bible--00-1-0--01839v1-0-TX-4-Aole+ou+akua+e+ae-Sec---0--1en-Zz-1-other---20-frameset-browse-word---011-01994v1--210-Aole+ou+akua+e+ae-0-1-escapewin&a=p&p=frameset&c=bible&cl=&d=NULL.1&toc=3&exp=NULL.1>
- Fasching-Varner Et al. (2014). Beyond School-to-Prison Pipeline and Toward an Educational and Penal Realism. Massachusetts: *Equity & Excellence in Education*. 47(4), 410-429
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality: 1 An Introduction* (2012). Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group. Kindle Edition.
- Frege, G. (1956). The thought: A logical inquiry. *Mind a Quarterly Review of Psychology and Philosophy*. July Vol. LXV. No. 259
- Kimura, Larry. (1983). Native Hawaiians Study Commission. *Report on the culture, needs and concerns of Native Hawaiians. Volume II* (Claims of Conscience: A Dissenting Study of The culture, needs and concerns of Native Hawaiians), Submitted to the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.
- Liliuokalani. (1897). *An Account of the Creation of the World According to Hawaiian Tradition, Translated from Original Manuscripts Preserved Exclusively in Her Majesty's Family. Prayer of Dedication, The Creation, for Ka I i Mamao, from Him to His Daughter Alapai Wahine, Liliuokalani's Great-grandmother*. Boston: Lee and Shepard.
- Liliuokalani. (2011). *Hawaii's story by Hawaii's Queen*. Tuttle Publishing. Kindle Edition.

- Mbembe, A. (2019). *Necropolitics*. Duke University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9781478007227>
- Miscevic, Nenad, "Nationalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2020/entries/nationalism/>>.
- Perry, J. (2001). Frege on identity, cognitive value, and subject matter. *Building on Frege: New essays on sense, content, and concept*, 141-158.
- Philpott, Daniel, "Sovereignty", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL =
<<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2020/entries/sovereignty/>>.
- Pukui, M., & Elbert, Samuel H. (1971). *Hawaiian Dictionary Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.
- Seymour, M. 2000, "On Redefining the Nation", in Miscevic 2000: 25–56
- Wolff, R. P., 1990. *The Conflict Between Authority and Autonomy*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Wittgenstein, L. (1958). *Philosophical Investigations* (2nd edn)(tr. GEM Anscombe).

NŪPEPA

Ka Elele, 07/15/1845, pg. 2

Ka Elele, 05/29/1845, pg. 1

Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, 12/01/1866, pg. 3

Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, 01/01/1862, pg. 2

Nupepa Ku Okoa, 10/31/1902, pg. 4

Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, 03/15/1862, p.1, He Moolelo no Umi,

Ke Aloha Aina, Nawahi, J. K., May 25, 1895. Ke Aloha Aina; He Aha Ia? p. 7

Ke Aloha Aina, Nawahi, J. K., May 25, 1895. Ke Aupuni; He Aha Ia? p. 7