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Abstract

This thesis is a twofold project - at once, *Mōhala Nā Pua Kahiki* is the cultivation of a research methodology centering Kanaka Maoli epistemology and ontology and the application of this methodology to understand the Kanaka Maoli diaspora in California through a multidisciplinary lens. Firstly, this thesis investigates personal contradictions in the discipline of history that conflict with Kanaka Maoli epistemes of relationship and multiplicity. From there, using the Hawaiian ethnolinguistic orientation to time, where ka wā mua (the time before) is the past and ka wā hope (the time behind) is the future, a philosophical foundation for research is constructed that allows researchers to apply to the past the same theories of knowledge used to produce beliefs about the natural world. This thesis constructs a methodology using foundations of research proffered by Hawaiian scholars in history, Hawaiian studies, ecology, and culture studies that incorporates methods from a number of disciplines and sets forth principles using Hawaiian cultural values. By exploring a personal relationship in relation to research subjects, kilo mua serves to allow Hawaiians to procure and articulate a stronger proximity to Hawaiianness through the attainment of ‘ike about the past. The second component of this thesis is an application of kilo mua to the Hawaiian diaspora. Three research sites, dubbed wāhi, which combines the Hawaiian words for time and place, are explored: a traditional moʻolelo called “Ka Ipumakani a Laamaomao”, a brief study of William Heath Mahi Davis, and ethnographic interviews conducted with diaspora Hawaiians. Through these wāhi, the Hawaiian cultural motifs of moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy), kuleana (responsibility), and ʻike (knowledge) are explored reflexively both in regards to the wāhi as well as the author’s personal journey, which is investigated through autoethnographic asides that bookend each chapter.
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A Note on Language

In accordance with the precedent set by a multitude of Hawaiian scholars, I will not be italicizing words in the Hawaiian language, or ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. The custom of italicizing non-English words denotes them as foreign. Rather, ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i is the only appropriate language capable of describing certain concepts featured in this thesis. Following the example of Kumu Jamaica Osorio, this thesis will employ rigorous paraphrasing to facilitate the translation of knowledge. Accordingly, so as not to distract from the flow of the paper, I will refrain from in-text translations, but will include a glossary of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i words at the end for those who may need them using definitions on wehewehe.com. Additionally, while modern Hawaiian language speakers use the diacritics ‘okina and kahakō, prior to the standardization of the early 1900s, ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i writers abstained from diacritics. As such, while quoting these sources, diacritics will not be added. Indeed, I hope to encourage the primacy of ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, despite the majority of this work existing in English in its current state. Hopefully there is a potential for my own ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i proficiency to develop so as to facilitate a complete version of this work in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i.
Hoʻolauna Moʻokūʻauhau: A Introduction of Genealogy

ʻO Aiai he kāne ʻo Anuani he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Ianuali Aiai he wahine.

ʻO Ohuleha he kāne ʻo Poleiwa he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Hanohano Kaohulehao he kāne.

ʻO Kaukua he kāne ʻo Kauhoe Kaupaoi he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Pauʻula Kaleiwhinehelelani Kaukua he wahine.

ʻO Naoi Kamalenui he kāne ʻo Opuahua Kauakahi he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Laioa Kumukamaliʻi he kāne.

ʻO Hanohano Kaohulehao he kāne ʻo Ianuali Aiai he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Hanohano Kaohulehao he wahine.

ʻO Naoi Kamalenui he kāne ʻo Opuahua Kauakahi he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Laioa Kumukamaliʻi he kāne.

ʻO Kaukua he kāne ʻo Kauhoe Kaupaoi he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Pauʻula Kaleiwhinehelelani Kaukua he wahine.

ʻO Laioa Kumukamaliʻi he kāne ʻo Pauʻula Kaleiwhinehelelani Kaukua he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo John Kumukamaliʻi Pālama he kāne.

ʻO Kainoa he kāne ʻo Kahili he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Jackson Kainoa Kawelu he kāne.

ʻO Jackson Kainoa Kawelu he kāne ʻo Maria Kaohu he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Lele Mia Kainoa he kāne.

ʻO John Kumukamaliʻi Pālama he kāne ʻo Kaluaipuuloa Kaohulehao he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Annie Palama he wahine.

ʻO Lele Mia Kainoa he kāne ʻo Annie Palama he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Alexander Kainoa Palama he kāne.

ʻO Wung Lin he kāne ʻo Annie Pouli Kukui he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Lydia See Moi Wun he wahine.

ʻO Alexander Kainoa Palama he kāne ʻo Lydia See Moi Wun he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Leonard Kainoa Palama he kāne.

ʻO Leonard Kainoa Palama he kāne ʻo Lucinda Cid Mui Quon he wahine. 
Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Laryna Kam On Palama Herolaga he wahine.
ʻO John Carlo Ube Rodriguez he kāne ʻo Laryna Kam On Palama Herolaga he wahine. Noho pū lāua a hānau ʻia ʻo Josiah Josef Keoni Quon Rodriguez he māhū.

Here I offer a selection of genealogy to introduce myself as a culmination of those that came before me.

**Wading the Waters**

My name is Josiah Josef Keoni Quon Rodriguez. I am the eldest child of John Carlo Ube Rodriguez and Laryna Kam On Palama Herolaga. Memories of my first forays into exploring my Hawaiian heritage lap at the shore of my mind often. I remember being barely 11 years old, sitting on a cool linoleum floor with a few dozen other young Hawaiians, anxiously awaiting the promise of cultural enrichment through a week of adventures. This was my first year in the Explorations series, a multi-year set of programs offered by Kamehameha Schools for Hawaiian kids who were not lucky enough to attend the school as students. I sat alone as the other kids mingled, thinking about the piece of paper that carried my genealogy sitting in my duffel bag that felt much more like a weight than any luggage. My mom had made a big fuss about ensuring I carried this on my flight from San Diego as she stuffed it into my backpack. She implored me to memorize it completely. I did.

I would come to know the names of my parents and grandparents and ancestors as moʻokūʻauhau. Moʻokūʻauhau is a Hawaiian word most often glossed as genealogy, though it denotes an even more complex matrix of relationship than a simple pedigree. As I would learn at Explorations, discussions of moʻokūʻauhau extended beyond rudimentary acknowledgments of past generations. Within the context of moʻokūʻauhau, we were gifted with another understanding of our positionality within the world - kuleana. Kuleana, another word often glossed in English, takes on the meaning of “responsibility”. It is a fundamental aspect of
Hawaiian life that encompasses one’s obligation relationship towards and with something, which can be a physical space, people, mo‘okū‘auhau, or oftentimes all of those at once and more. The Explorations participants were brought deeper and deeper into the meaning of kuleana as we learned more about our individual and collective mo‘okū‘auhau as we were taught mo‘olelo, worked on the ‘āina, and built relationships with each other. When I first arrived at Ho‘omāka‘ikaʻi, the first year of Explorations, I felt shame about not having a concrete grasp of my personal mo‘okū‘auhau. However, by the end of the fourth year of the program, though I could not claim to have a comprehensive understanding of my family history, I felt like I had been put on the right track to making more substantial discoveries. My desire to fulfill my kuleana had become animated. This work is the culmination of my attempts to fulfill my kuleana that I have accumulated during my relatively few years in this life.

Ke Kahua

This was not my first experience introspecting my family history. My elementary school years were spent in a neighborhood populated primarily by first-generation immigrants and their children. We all spent many hours discussing the “somewhere else” our parents came from: Vietnam, the Philippines, Costa Rica, Mexico. The salience of our respective identities mediated the ways we consciously and subconsciously formed bonds with each other. We would marvel at the similarities between us: idiosyncrasies in our speech, things our parents would say, foods we ate, and cultural values in our families.

Accordingly, I had asked my parents where their ‘somewhere else’ might be so I could bring something to this multicultural potluck. I vividly remember racing to my parents room on a lazy weekend morning, waking them up, and bombarding them with my questions about where we came from. My mom responded by taking up a notepad and pen and conversing with my dad
about specifics - I was unaware I would also be getting my first lesson on fractions. With eager eyes, I received this lesson, “Well Keoni, you are X/X Filipino, X/X Chinese, although the Chinese you get from me is different from what you get from Dad, and you are X/X Hawaiian. Oh and also X/X Spanish. Get it?!” Feeling that this was a satisfactory answer to present to my peers back in school, I let them fall back asleep, for the time being. While these were merely cursory attempts at establishing links to my cultural heritage, they have formed an indelible foundation for my developing cultural self-concept and I look with fondness to my younger self stumbling my way through the world, looking for the places my family calls home.

Ke Kulāiwi

Many years later, I would find myself in a cohort of Stanford students in Hawai‘i studying earth systems. Though I could claim faint allegiances to the discipline of environmental science, my primary motivator for attending this field program was to reconnect with the place I had been told was the piko, or center, of my being. To ensure I could properly enter into a location I felt I belonged to, yet felt unequipped to grapple with on emotional terms, I asked my mom if she knew anything about the places our kūpuna had lived. She did not have much information for me, besides that our family had once resided in Kona. Though meager, I took this grain of information and held onto it tight.

The cohort had been based in the moku of Kohala on the north of Hawai‘i island, but eventually our itinerary took us in the hinterlands of Hualalai in the ahuapua‘a of Kaloko-Honokohau - we were in Kona. Scheduled for that day was a few hours of invasive plant clearing alongside community members at the loko i‘a, simple enough. As the alaka‘i herded us into a circle by the loko i‘a, we were asked to introduce ourselves. As the round of voices approached me, I waited nervously rehearsing my ho’olauna. Shakily, I delivered my standard

1 Actual numbers are omitted so as to disrupt the primacy of blood quantum.
introduction in ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i, but my voice stumbled back into English unconsciously. Choking back the urge to sob, I blurted out that I knew that my kūpuna had lived in this place, yet I did not know them. I tried desperately to compose myself and passed it on to the person beside me. The circle carried on and the work started.

We pulled, sliced, piled, and gathered as a team, malihini and kama‘āina alike. Under the collective banner of wanting to restore Hawaiian plants to the loko iʻa, we labored for hours. In my head, I thought about the different kuleana that resided in each of us there that day. Some of us would go back to Stanford, likely to never see Kaloko ever again. Others would finish the work day and drive home to the land of their ancestors, knowing that their work was not finished. I wondered which one I was. I suppose I knew which one I wanted to be - I hoped to be recognized by the kama‘āina as someone who belonged there, maybe not as much as them, but I hoped nonetheless to be recognized. I knew in the back of my head that my family had left Kona long ago, leaving that ʻāina until I came that day. Could I still come back?

These thoughts churned in my head and my naʻau, while I listened as attentively as I could to Ruth Aloua, the primary steward of the loko iʻa, tell the story of their work at Kaloko-Honokohau. When she finished, we adjourned to enjoy food brought by community members, greeting each of them one by one. As I got to the end of the line, I was welcomed into a big, bear hug by one of the uncles. As he pulled me into embrace, he looked at me intently. With the full strength of the ocean we had just immersed ourselves in, he uttered words I had been waiting to hear my whole life: “Welcome home.”
Hoʻomākaʻikaʻi ʻIke: Establishing A Framework

“We face the past, confidently interpreting the present, cautiously backing into the future, guided by what our ancestors knew and did.”

- Jonathan Osorio, *Dismembering Lāhui*

When I came to Stanford, I would often be asked by peers, parents, family friends, etc. about what I was planning to study. I eagerly answered “history” to all of them. I would subsequently declare my major as early as I could during my sophomore winter quarter. The field of history had captivated me from a young age. Not just Hawaiian history, but all kinds of stories from the world’s past helped me to understand the world around me in a way I could appreciate. I competed in history competitions in high school, read through countless Barnes and Nobles purchases, and devoured history documentaries on Netflix. The progression from being the annoying, precocious kid in my AP World History classroom to seeing my name on the wall of history majors in Stanford’s department was a natural one.

Despite my early obsession with the discipline of capital “H” history, I have since become disillusioned with some of the underlying philosophies ingrained in the practice. In my instruction, the prevailing analytical theory of history has largely been a positivist approach to understanding the past in which research is carried out in an attempt to seek out an “objective truth” of history. Historical positivists reject knowledge procured through processes of intuition and demand a distance of personal involvement with research subjects. During this never-ending quest into archives to reveal a pristine and objective picture of what the past was, I yearned for compatibility with my cultural understanding of the world, yet found none.

---


After all, an understanding of the past rooted in Hawaiian epistemology features principles that contradict the preconditions of objectivity, one of them being the allowance of multiple mana of different stories. Many Hawaiian moʻolelo can possess dozens of different versions that all interlock and cooperate rather than contradict. Jamaica Osorio discusses this in *Remembering Our Intimacies*: “Instead of being frozen in time and ink, moʻolelo move and shape-shift. Like our akua, moʻolelo have many kino. Within the context of occupation, when often only one truth, one version of history and justice can be allowed to survive, moʻolelo offers many truths and many versions, refusing to be reduced to a single authoritative fact or mana.”

Her study of the moʻolelo of Hiʻiakaikapiopele utilizes a multitude of versions of the story that, rather than contradicting each other, bring layers of meaning to each other. The willful inclusion of multiple, opposing versions of past events is ill-fitting to the framework of Western historical practice, which led me to search for another methodology to conduct research with.

Additionally, the drive in history to eliminate personal bias demands an alienation of the researcher from their research topic, which for many scholars of marginalized communities entails abandoning their identity within the context of their academic pursuits. I struggled with the idea that I could not write about the areas of interest that brought me to Stanford in the first place. After all, I had come to Stanford to research and learn about solutions to the complex social issues that plague my communities, yet was constantly told to leave behind my own proximity to these subjects if I wished to write about them rigorously.

These experiences have pushed me to consider what elements of Hawaiian epistemology and ontology might necessarily be considered in the creation of a historical methodology that is both rigorous and culturally relevant. What techniques and frameworks embedded in Hawaiian

---

culture are meaningful when evaluating the past? Using aspects of Hawaiian philosophy, this work will construct an operational methodology for engaging with the past in conjunction with my own personal proximity to the subject.

**Hawaiianizing Methodologies**

To do so, the methodologies I have been trained in will be insufficient in capturing the depth of these stories I hope to tell. Consistent with Indigenous scholarly practice, I will draw upon the wisdom of Indigenous scholars who have come before me in working to decolonize the practice of research. A foundational piece for this work comes from Linda Tuhiwai Smith, a Māori researcher. In her seminal book, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, she skillfully articulates the foundations of Western research and explains how they are not only insufficient to conduct Indigenous-centered research, but diametrically opposed to traditional knowledge production. The book uncovers the ways in which these Western research practices dovetailed with colonization projects and served to form the discursive foundation upon which those projects were carried out. Her work discusses Kaupapa Māori, which represents a crucial juncture in the world of research towards Indigenous-centered research methods. As such, Tuhiwai Smith urges Indigenous researchers to consider the power of an Indigenous research agenda (Fig 1.), which features four layers with self-determination at the center. Emanating from this central goal, Indigenous research should be intimately concerned with development, recovery, and survival of community, culture, and future. The Indigenous researcher is imminently preoccupied by their own positionality within their community as they conduct research. The relationships between researcher and community are essentially bound to the research process, inseparable from the content of the research itself.

---

Tuhiwai Smith set a foundation for Indigenous studies, which is furthered by the storywork methodology of Jo-Ann Archibald. Storywork is composed of seven core principles, precisely chosen to incorporate Indigenous theoretical frameworks into research: respect, responsibility, reverence, reciprocity, holism, interrelatedness, and synergy.\(^6\) In *Decolonizing Research*, Archibald reminds readers, “A critical tool of colonization was research, of which Indigenous story-taking and story-making was a vital part.”\(^7\) At once, the kuleana I hold as an Indigenous researcher in the Western academy is not only to recognize the colonial roots of my own intellectual undertaking, but to embed my work within an ethics of Indigeneity: “Decolonizing research is not merely ethical research in terms of the requirements of the academy or institutions; more importantly it meets the criteria set by our own communities, who will often sanction the integrity and credibility of the story using their own measures.”\(^8\) An ethics

---


\(^7\) Ibid.

\(^8\) Ibid.
of Indigeneity drives me to situate my knowledge production within a community-based desire to create positive social change and to enact cultural protocol during the research process.

Taking with me these contributions from Indigenous Studies methodology scholarship, I venture on to the Hawaiian methodologies that have been sculpted by Kānaka Maoli scholars. Kū Kahakalau’s methodology of māʻawe pono provides an eight-step process to conduct research in a specifically Hawaiian context and from a Hawaiian foundation. Its core ideal that I wish to emulate is cultural congruence, in which all parts of the research process are mediated by Hawaiian customs, values, and beliefs. Proper protocol is observed at all times when researchers are interacting with subjects. In particular, māʻawe pono emphasizes operating outside of prescribed, Western structures for relationships with participants. For example, the interview process is informal rather than overseen by a strict interview guide. Kahakalau’s methodology offers an opportunity to craft a Hawaiian-centric way of gathering knowledge when conducting interview-based research.

Additionally, I will draw upon David Chang’s discussion of moʻokūʻauhau as a vehicle for evading settler colonial boundaries. As Chang notes, “Moʻokūʻauhau places the individual in a long-term narrative of succession, and within a network of kinship.” By applying a moʻokūʻauhau methodology to the study of past events, one can locate historical actors within a network of relationship, allowing for a robust analysis of connection that extends not only through the past, but toward the present through to the future. Additionally, I would like to emulate Chang’s philosophy of selection: “Moʻokūʻauhau is not merely unearthing the true names of ancestors, but selecting the ancestral lines we will trace in order to get at some

---

10 Ibid, 98.
Indeed, the methodology I construct will involve a process of selection based on my own personal positionality for the purposes of demonstration as my methodology calls for a proximity between researcher and research topic. However, as I will discuss later, this should serve merely as a template, in which other Hawaiians are able to undergo a similar process of selection in order to apply a moʻokūʻauhau methodology to their own lives and subjectivities. These methodologies orient me towards the broad goal of conducting Indigenous and Hawaiian centered research. Using these frameworks as a foundation, I also look towards existing Hawaiian historical scholarship to understand Hawaiian historical methods as they have been used and developed by my intellectual predecessors.

A foremost example of a decolonial historical analysis is Kamanamaikalani Beamer’s *No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation* in which he employs a self-constructed methodology of ʻŌiwi optics. Throughout the work, Beamer recounts a history of the Hawaiian Kingdom with the specific aim of centering the agency of Hawaiians. The book provides a countervailing force to the dominant narratives about the Hawaiian Kingdom that center colonialism, framing Hawaiʻi as a place and Hawaiians as a people that history happens to, rather than a community of historical actors. He explains, “*No Mākou Ka Mana* is not concerned with what missionaries did for or to ʻŌiwi, but what ʻŌiwi did *for themselves*, in the midst of depopulation and constant threat of colonialism.”\(^{12}\) This deliberate shift of the mantle of study from colonizer to colonized will be a centerpiece of my methodology.

Another work of historical analysis that I draw inspiration from is Sydney Iaukea’s *The Queen and I: A Story of Dispossessions and Reconnections in Hawai’i*, a sprawling, potent analysis of the author’s own ancestor, Curtis P. Iaukea. At its core, the book serves to cultivate a

---

\(^{11}\) Ibid, 100.
profound and personal connection between author and subject, a relationship that would
otherwise be severed in more traditional, Western historical enterprises. Iaukea constantly
reaffirms her relational ties to the historical subject she is pursuing:

As I’ve written this book, I’ve personally felt this heartbreak, from the past and the
present that arises from the deception and fraud that accompany the institutionalization of
land, private property, and inheritance. My emotional reactions have in turn guided “what
I talk about” as much as “why I talk about it.” To ignore this heartbreak, whether
perpetrated by ourselves as Hawaiians upon ourselves, or by outsiders upon us, is to
ignore a vital part of our collective narrative. (Iaukea)\textsuperscript{13}

Iaukea does not shy away from the intuitive, emotional impulse that arises from her connection
to her kūpuna but lets it drive the process itself, even allowing it to determine the content of the
book. Further, Iaukea cites kuleana as a primary motivating factor for her work. The ancestral
responsibility that flows throughout moʻokūʻauhau sets the foundation for the scholarship in a
meaningful way. This thesis will inherit a similar knack for taking on genealogical kuleana borne
of intimate kinship relationship with the subject topics.

Beamer and Iaukea and the books mentioned are merely two standout examples of
modern Hawaiian history conducted from a Kānaka Maoli perspective, but many others remain,
not to mention Hawaiian historical research conducted during the Hawaiian Kingdom period. A
significant portion of the Hawaiian studies canon is comprised of notable Hawaiian historians,
including Kepelino, Samuel Kamakau, John Papa ʻĪʻī, and Davida Malo. These scholars all
comprise a looming presence in the field of Hawaiian history even over a century after their
works were written, yet my work will differ greatly in practice from theirs. Eminent Hawaiian
language practitioner and scholar Puakea Nogelmeier discusses each of these historians at length,
as well as their training in the missionary schools of 19th century Hawaiʻi.\textsuperscript{14} Each of these


scholars and their works differ considerably from each other in style and practice, which I am unable to delve into within this thesis. Nonetheless, their work in crafting the Hawaiian historiography is worth mentioning in regards to the formation of my own historical methodology.

**Kilo Mua**

Indeed, this thesis hopes not only to subvert hegemonic narratives about Hawai‘i, but also to unsettle the very epistemological foundations of the practice of western research. To do so requires a proficient grounding in Hawaiian epistemology writ large. In 2018, Manulani Aluli Meyer published *Ho’oulu: Our Time of Becoming: Hawaiian Epistemology and Early Writings*, an anthology of her research on Hawaiian epistemology, particularly as they relate to pedagogy. The latter half of the work contains her thesis, a project devoted to the question, “What are critical aspects of Hawaiian ways of knowing and understanding?”15 In the literature review, she articulates seven epistemological themes that compose Hawaiian epistemology as she perceives it: (1) spirituality and knowledge (2) that which feeds (ʻāina) (3) cultural nature of the senses (4) relationship and knowledge (5) utility and knowledge (6) words and knowledge (7) the body/mind question.16 Her work will serve as a foundational text for the development of my methodology due to its nominative role in the field of Hawaiian epistemology. Meyer navigates skillfully the immense ocean of ‘ike contained within Hawaiian culture, bringing her readers to a firm understanding of how to approach knowledge production from a Kānaka Maoli perspective.

Her foremost contention is the primacy of spirituality as the “foundation upon which all epistemological categories stand.” She discusses the role of ‘aumākua, or ancestor gods, and expands the methods from which knowledge can be sourced: “ʻIke makes it clear that knowledge

---

16 Ibid.
was gained from a large variety of sources, both spiritual and temporal, both sensory and extrasensory.”  

This contention is supported by the work of Mary Kawena Puku‘i in *Nānā I Ke Kumu*. Puku‘i describes spirituality not only as an avenue for the flow of ‘ike, but partaking in spirituality as a necessary foundation for Hawaiian cultural life: “For the Hawaiian of the past, all times and every time were indeed occasions for prayer.” Accordingly, this methodology necessitates the active practice of Hawaiian prayer in conjunction with an attunement to the ontological underpinnings of the world as inherently spiritual.

At once, a Hawaiian methodology for studying the past necessitates the honing of what Meyer refers to as sensory empiricism while also acknowledging the spiritual. This sensory empiricism is typically employed to ʻāina, or that which feeds, as the natural world holds a crucial place in Hawaiian culture as a site of sustenance. However, the attentiveness to ʻāina stems not only from a survival necessity, but, “The first ‘ontological premise‘ of empiricism is the fact that the world, to a Hawaiian, was alive and filled with meaning and metaphor.”

Meaning permeates the natural world providing a motivating factor for the quest for knowledge, along with a desire to cultivate relationships. As Renee Pualani Louis notes in her book on Hawaiian cartographical methods, this combination of metaphor and the rational mind allows for “cultural lenses that are simultaneously objectively subjective and subjectively objective because of the balance.” Meyer goes on to explain, “Relationship, feeling one’s family presence, knowing their names - all became a part of how a child learned. As they matured Hawaiian children internalized this kind of relationship. It guided them and connected them to life.
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Furthermore, they made sense of the world from these historical cues.” For my own methodology, this relationship-based approach to knowledge production dovetails with Meyer’s next epistemological thread in which utility guides all knowledge. The Hawaiian must avoid frivolous obsessions with knowledge for knowledge’s sake. Rather, relationships drive the Hawaiian researcher to fulfill kuleana through the accumulation of ʻike. These epistemological threads figure highly in the principles of my methodology and provide an overall picture of Hawaiian epistemology to base my knowledge production framework on.

In beginning to articulate this framework, I look to another of Meyer’s threads: words and knowledge. Hawaiians interested in cultural revitalization often point to the central importance of language as a vehicle for cultural shifting. As such, I direct you to the epigram at the beginning of this section, which expresses a key linguistic dissonance regarding time between Hawaiian and Western epistemologies in profoundly spatial terms. In English, we look “forward” to events in the future, while we imagine the past “behind” us which, when contrasted with Osorio’s explanation of Hawaiian words for time, reveals a vast opportunity for interrogation of the past. It is notable that the colloquial Hawaiian word phrases for time are ka wā mua and ka wā hope. Mua and hope are directional markers, indicating “in front” and “behind”, respectively. As such, Hawaiian language prompts its speakers to articulate time within a spatial-ontological framework, resulting in an understanding of time not as a mere abstract concept divorced from space, as it is in western contexts. Rather, the Hawaiian language speaker can understand time in a locational sense, in which they are constant observers of “the time in front”, the past.

21 Meyer, Hoʻoulu, 108.
22 Osorio, Dismembering Lāhui, 7.
Through this understanding of time, a foundation appears from which an analysis of Hawaiian historical research can be formulated in a uniquely Hawaiian fashion. For many years, the dominant producers of history were researchers foreign to Hawai‘i, conducting research from a western lens. This is not to say that Kānaka Maoli society was devoid of storytellers. A cursory glance at shelves of Hawaiian historians and Hawaiian-language newspapers proves otherwise. However, the dominant historiography in specific was commanded primarily by those who sought to depict Hawai‘i as an exotic, benighted landscape, effectively casting Kānaka Maoli as savage and in need of Anglo-Saxon civilization. Narratives such as Shoal of Time or The Hawaiian Kingdom by Daws and Kuykendall, respectively, depict the Hawaiian as a tragic figure to be inevitably wiped out by the passage of time, who only bursts into the realm of history after their “discovery” by Europeans. Additionally, the large corpus of knowledge about Hawaiian history and culture written by Hawaiians was subject to processes of changing through translation, editing, and re-ordering. Further, as Puakea Nogelmeier points out, the discourse of sufficiency functioned to limit the discursive landscape to sources that were either written in English or were translated in English. Not only were the Hawaiian people themselves consigned to a fading antiquity, but their language and culture along with it. Sources that encapsulated Hawaiian views about the past were foregone due to non-Hawaiians’ inability to speak ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. As such, the avenues for understanding Hawaiian perspectives about ourselves were ignored (or acknowledged and cast aside) and Euro-American researchers resigned themselves to the false notion that these sources were lost forever, tragically engulfed by the passage of time and modernity itself.

25 Nogelmeier, Mai Pa’a i Ka Leo.
As Mark Rifkin’s *Beyond Settler Time* notes, “Native peoples occupy a double bind within dominant settler reckonings of time. Either they are consigned to the past, or they are inserted into a present defined on non-native terms. From this perspective, Native people(s) do not so much exist within the flow of time as erupt from it as an anomaly, one usually understood as emanating from a bygone era.”

This double bind has constrained Kānaka Maoli within the discipline of history not only because the terms on which they are researched are not their own, but also through the explicit erasure of the Hawaiian production of knowledge about past events. Because time is envisioned as physical space, the Hawaiian language speaker, by examining this space as they would the natural world, is able to make conclusions about the past within a multiplicitous timescape contrary to the positivist theories of history that adhere themselves to a linear view of time. By doing this, my methodology unsettles these adherences to settler time through a practice of research that directly questions linear, positivist historical practice by looking towards sensory knowledge production techniques usually applied to land and applying them to the past.

In Hawaiian epistemology, the method by which one procures knowledge about the physical world is called kilo ʻāina, or observation of the land. Kilo ʻāina is a painstaking process of gleaning knowledge about a specific place through a high level of concentration and sensory evaluation. Kilo is a multisensory experience in which the participant immerses themselves in the natural environment and assumes a contemplative state to grasp knowledge about the location they are occupying, concordant with the sensory empiricism discussed by Meyer. To kilo ʻāina is not simply passively existing in the current of the natural world, letting sensory
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27 The ‘Ōlelo no’eau “Nānā ka maka, hoʻolohe ka pepeiao, paʻa ka waha, hana ka lima” encapsulates the essence of this method of knowledge creation. While typically used in the realm of pedagogy, it also applies to the general technique of Kānaka Maoli knowledge production.
knowledge accumulate unthinkingly, but is a rigorous process that produces falsifiable knowledge. Meyer and others have pointed out that the Hawaiian word ʻike can denote both the act of seeing and knowing. This linguistic equivalence demonstrates the importance of empirical knowledge derived from experience. All things that occur in the site of study are absorbed by the person attempting to kilo ʻāina and through that, relationships are built with a place in a way that allows those who have honed this skill to engage with the ʻāina in a reciprocal manner. In acknowledging the importance of kilo ʻāina in producing the relational linkages between Hawaiians and ʻāina, these relational linkages are part and parcel to the act of locating oneselfs within a broad sociocultural (as well as physical) landscape. For Kānaka Maoli, to know one’s place in the world permits one to ascertain their kuleana, a central organizing principle of Hawaiian society that connotes responsibility and obligation. I hope to nurture a similar relationship to wā through the development of an original methodology.

Thus, I propose a new methodology in which the Hawaiian past is understood through the lens of careful observation - kilo mua, the act of observing the time which is forward. This practice will apply the observational practices Kānaka Maoli use to cultivate relationships with ʻāina and apply it to ka wā mua. Western historical methodologies center around the question of ascertaining the veracity of a piece of information to contribute to an objective “truth”. However, kilo ʻāina is not burdened by the same positivist goals. Kilo ʻāina allows for multiple perspectives about the same site of study due to the way it acknowledges and honors place-specific observations, while still relying primarily on empiricism through the senses. For kilo ʻāina practitioners, the inherent vitality of knowledge is preserved by its specificity to place. As such, kilo mua necessarily prompts the participant to give credence to the multiplicity of knowledge gained from a multiplicity of sources, while honoring the empirical production
techniques it utilizes. As the ʻolelo noʻeau goes, “Aʻohe pau ka ʻike i ka hālau hoʻokahi.” This proverbial saying encourages us to seek out knowledge from many different sources. This is not to say that kilo mua practitioners uncritically accept all sources as conclusive truths, but rather take into account factors such as the mana each source carries and the things each source says about the site of study.

At the core of this practice is the dedication to a Hawaiian-centered vantage point. By embedding moʻokūʻauhau methodology into kilo mua, Kānaka Maoli can re-present themselves into the historiography, combatting the eliminatory logic of settler-colonialism. Kilo mua pushes researchers to make their research legible to and useful for the lāhui Kānaka Maoli as a fulfillment of their kuleana. As with the other Indigenous methodologies described previously, kilo mua is not merely a way for researchers to self-congratulate themselves on token inclusion within the academy, but should push Kānaka Maoli to elucidate the past before us to guide our footsteps into the future for the purpose of fulfilling an Indigenous research agenda, with self-determination at its core.

Following in the scholarship and epistemologies mentioned above, I have delineated the following principles and components that practitioners of kilo mua (mea haku mua30) should attend to in their pursuit of exploring the past:

**Na Kahua Kilo Mua**

1. Kilo mua is eminently concerned with the sovereignty and autonomy of Kānaka Maoli. Increasing ea is the central motivating factor for research.
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29 Mana is a Hawaiian concept that denotes a level of spiritual essence that flows through all things, including knowledge, stories, and people. Additionally mana can refer to a specific version of a moʻŌlelo, which inherently influences the perceived mana a story may have.
30 Mea haku mua can be loosely translated as “one who weaves the past like a lei”.
2. Hawaiian epistemology/ontology concerning wā and ʻāina requires mea haku mua to understand them as interwoven concepts, treating the past as an ever-present landscape to be actively observed, rather than excavated.
3. Kilo mua is attentive to Hawaiian epistemological groundings and prioritizes Hawaiian methods of knowledge production and expression.
4. Mea haku mua maintain a reciprocal pilina with their subject topics, whether they be people, lands, or non-human living beings. To ensure this, mea haku mua choose to research topics they already have relational proximity to.
5. Kilo mua is not predisposed towards finding an ultimate or objective truth. Per Hawaiian moʻolelo, kilo mua acknowledges the multiplicity of Hawaiian stories.
6. Mea haku mua understand the kuleana imbued in moʻokūʻauhau and do their utmost to fulfill their kuleana. Responsibility to pilina supersedes any academic goal.
7. Sacred knowledge is always paid mind to and never shared carelessly or without permission.
8. Kilo mua involves the recognition of a multitude of sources and rejects the disciplinary siloing of sources and analysis. Archival sources, moʻolelo, kaʻao, interviews, autoethnography, dreams, and personal journals all contribute to a fuller, richer understanding than any single one alone.
9. Mea haku mua privilege the open flow of knowledge to the lāhui, creating access points, when appropriate, to Kānaka Maoli.
10. Kilo mua is undergirded by the inherent spirituality of Kānaka Maoli ontology.
11. The production of superfluous knowledge is incongruent with Hawaiian value and belief systems. Kilo mua necessarily works towards and contributes to movements to the improvement of the life and culture of Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi.
12. Kilo mua is undertaken with the overall goal of advancing the self-determination and social change goals of Kānaka Maoli.

Using these general principles to undergird the practice of kilo mua, I will describe what the active practice of kilo mua may look like in a practical sense. As mentioned before, kilo mua must look beyond the disciplinary siloing of the western academy, bringing together a myriad of source types and knowledges. Kilo mua is attentive to the compounding power of clarity and mana granted by honoring the many roads by which ‘ike comes from.
Nupepa

Much recent Hawaiian scholarship has been devoted to the over 100,000 pages of Hawaiian language newspapers that were produced in the 19th and 20th centuries after the advent of written Hawaiian languages. Puakea Nogelmeier has urged scholars of Hawai‘i to rupture the “discourse of sufficiency” that deems either English-language sources or canonical Hawaiian sources to be the entirety of sources used in the study of Hawaiian history. Mea haku mua must be dedicated to the use of Hawaiian and English language newspapers produced during the Hawaiian Kingdom era to hold fast to the vast amounts of ʻike produced by our kūpuna.

Interviews/Oral History

Structured interviews are the cornerstone of ethnographic research and a key way to connect the past with the present through living keepers of knowledge. There are many ways to conduct interviews, but mea haku mua should be especially vigilant of Hawaiian cultural protocols when interviewing, such as pule, offering makana, etc. Interviewees should be viewed as co-producers of knowledge, rather than subjects of study.

Moʻolelo a me Kaʻao

Moʻolelo (or moʻo ʻōlelo) refers to any narrative told in any manner, whether by word of mouth, through print, video, etc. Moʻolelo encompasses both traditional stories concerning akua or firsthand accounts of personal happenings. Kaʻao is sometimes used interchangeably with moʻolelo, but are more often understood to have fanciful or glorified elements.31 A Hawaiian epistemological orientation to research demands that moʻolelo and kaʻao be upheld in equal regard, despite western tendencies to separate them as discrete categories of story.

Walaʻau

Talking story is a mode of interface that is distinct from structured interview in that it is loosely structured, may or may not be recorded, and can take place in an informal setting. Talking story, or walaʻau, is a Hawaiian framing of Jo-ann Archibald’s Indigenous storywork process in which oral narratives are a central part of data collection. Walaʻau does not require an interview outline or pre-written questions, but is dictated purely by the whims of the storytellers. Walaʻau should be prioritized over interviews within kilo mua so as to make the research process as congruent to Hawaiian cultural norms to the furthest extent possible.

Moʻokūʻauhau

Moʻokūʻauhau is composed of two words: moʻo + kūʻauhau, where moʻo refers to a series and kūʻauhau is a genealogy. The practice of recording genealogies is a rigorous practice that Hawaiians of both past and present devote many hours to. Moʻokūʻauhau denotes a critical linkage for Hawaiians of the present to connect with the past, in which moʻokūʻauhau implies bonds of kinship and thus kuleana. Moʻokūʻauhau is a key ontological element for Hawaiian society, which bypasses impositions of western kinship, blood quantum, and linear time. Mea haku mua should bear in mind the myriad ways in which the word moʻokūʻauhau can be interpreted.

Kilo ʻĀina

As kilo mua derives its philosophical thrust from the practice of kilo ʻāina, mea haku mua should be aware of the ʻike that can be cultivated from the observation of ʻāina. As Kānaka Maoli ontology intentionally weaves all knowledge systems together, one should be prudent in their recognition of how these knowledge systems manifest. For example, when one looks out at the
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32 Robust debates about moʻokūʻauhau featured heavily in Hawaiian-language newspapers. Puakea Nogelmeier noted one instance in which two Hawaiian historians publicly argued the lineage of a chief. This episode demonstrates the foremost role genealogy played in the Hawaiian societal framework, but also the importance of those charged with the task of keeping them.
smooth lava fields of Laupāhoehoe, they may know from their study of nā moʻolelo o Pele that they are viewing the results of a hōlua race between the akua Pele and Poliʻahu. Here, an understanding of moʻolelo and kilo ‘āina converge to grant the observer a deeper ‘ike about wahi pana than a single one alone.

**Akakū, Hihiʻo, Ulaleo**

Lastly, as Mary Kawena Pukuʻi notes in the first volume of *Nana I Ke Kumu*, Kānaka Maoli derived ‘ike from a variety of psychological and psychosomatic sensations known as akakū, hihiʻo, and ulaleo. This collection of sensations are translated variously as visions, trance, and supernatural voices. While Pukuʻi primarily mentions these things in an attempt to elucidate how Hawaiian cultural understandings inform psychiatry, they also provide insights into Hawaiian knowledge systems as they can relate to research. As such, a rejection of positivist historiography and recognition of ‘ike Hawaiʻi necessarily includes the use of akakū, hihiʻo, and ulaleo into the collective knowledge framework of the study of the past.

While this is by no means an exhaustive list of the source types that a mea haku mua should use to broaden their knowledge of the past, it serves as a reminder of the vastness of Hawaiian epistemological units. A research framework that is inclusive of intuitive thoughts, emotion, sensory data, written records, and interviews allows for a broad site of study that mea haku mua are responsible for honoring and weaving together. Rather than imposing the typical limitations on source types found in western research methodologies, kilo mua seeks to open up the scope of knowledge. Sources in kilo mua are viewed as tributaries to a river, contributing their own unique flow and components to produce a deep, robust ecosystem of ‘ike. Like a river, its richness comes from its capacity to provide sustenance, facilitate movement toward a goal, and the intrinsic natural beauty it possesses.
Kahiki Mua: Theories and Research Design

Now that I have discussed the components of a Hawaiian-centered approach to the past, I push forward to the wā and ʻāina I hope to observe in this thesis project - the history of Hawaiians in California. In maintaining kahua kilo mua 4, I will focus on the specific parts of California that I have inhabited and formed pilina with. In doing so, I hope to procure a stronger sense of the trans-Indigenous kuleana my occupation in these places entails as well as generate a keen sense of Hawaiian identity away from Hawaiʻi. I will proceed by first describing the theoretical foundations upon which my analysis of Hawaiian diaspora is formulated on and end the chapter by describing the sources for this example of kilo mua that I will utilize.

While kilo mua is not meant to serve as a replacement for the relationship with land that kilo ʻāina brings about, it exists to highlight the potential for the Kānaka Maoli in the diaspora to come to a relationship with their Hawaiianness through an understanding of their locationality within a timespace matrix. Although Kānaka Maoli ontology centers primarily around ʻāina and kuleana to it, kilo mua agitates for a similar importance to be granted to knowledge of the past. After all, with the majority of Kānaka Maoli living outside of the Hawaiian Islands, the absence of ʻāina in their lives can result in a cultural identity vacuum, leaving them feeling as if they are unable to access their cultural identity. However, the expansive nature granted by the kilo mua framework allows for a similarly expansive idea of Hawaiianness and what Hawaiian cultural belonging looks like.

First, I look to Hawaiian scholars for guidance on the theoretical components to keep in mind while studying the Hawaiian diaspora before initiating my own process of observation. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui has written two articles on the Hawaiian diaspora, among her other work investigating blood quantum and gender/sexuality: “Off-Island Hawaiians ‘Making’ Ourselves at
‘Home’: A [Gendered] Contradictions in Terms?” and “Diasporic Deracination and “Off-Island” Hawaiians”. “Diasporic Deracination” constructs three mechanisms by which diasporic Hawaiians are “deracinated”, that is, “to displace a people from their own territory, place, or environment - literally, to uproot”: (1) the invisibility of diasporic Hawaiians to others (2) the appropriation of Hawaiian identity, and (3) narratives about Hawai‘i that prioritize a racial harmony as a product of intermarriage. Her multi-pronged analysis is enhanced by a critical feminist acknowledgment of Hawaiian women within Hawaiian nationalist movements and accompanying rhetoric about diasporic Hawaiians in “Off-Island Hawaiians”. She skillfully reconfigures the ways in which Hawaiian womanhood is articulated and re-articulated to produce a gendered examination of Kānaka Maoli cultural connection in the diaspora: “In the on-island invocations of the Hawaiian diaspora, Hawai‘i is feminized in the calls to “come home”; Hawaiian land and nation are feminized, but not domesticated.” Indeed, one of her crucial assertions lies in a metaphor of kalo she offers to describe the place of Hawaiians in the diaspora:

Huli transplants might be a good metaphor for Hawaiians that migrate to new shores while ‘oha best describes those born outside of Hawai‘i because the ‘oha grows underground, and in this case, under new soil, unlike the stalk of the huli. This way, the diaspora does not simply get reduced to the role of the reproducer of the lāhui but might also be recognized for cultivating something else, perhaps new. (Kauanui)

This thesis is borne from the same desire to promote the cultivation of “something new”, a fresh understanding of the Hawaiian diaspora, not only in the assemblages of identity with orientation to our kulāiwi, but also to locate our position within the lands and peoples we have come to know.

Hawaiian Studies has been enhanced by such novel articulations of Hawaiian diasporic identity in the past 10 years. Emalani Case’s *Everything Ancient Was Once New: Indigenous Persistence from Hawaiʻi to Kahiki* does so by tracing the word Kahiki from its origins as a toponym for the legendary homelands of Kānaka Maoli to its late modern usage as a general reference to the wider world outside Hawaiʻi. Armed with this understanding of Kahiki, researchers of the Hawaiian diaspora can imbricate Kānaka Maoli identity writ large with analyses of settler colonialism and empire through a Hawaiian lens. Like Kauanui, Case also points to the study of Kahiki as a wellspring of opportunity to examine new understandings of Hawaiian identity, particularly with how it requires confronting difficult histories: “Thus it is both imperative that any examination of Kahiki not get lost in romanticized remembrances of the past but dig into the complexities of the present so that we can repair strained relationships and nurture renewed ones.”

As this thesis has a geographic focus in the ancestral lands of California Native tribes, it will require a substantial probing of the relationship Kānaka Maoli have with the settler colonial apparatuses that work to dominate and oppress Native peoples. Such an investigation is meant to heed Case’s urging to see that, “Kahiki can be both a sanctuary for finding strength and hope as well as sanctuary for deep, critical reflection, for forgiveness, and for readying oneself to reenter society.”

Case’s urging to utilize historical knowledge of Kahiki to constitute reconciliations of difficult historical moments that complicate narratives of Oceanic unity is inflected by the work of Kealani Cook. His *Return to Kahiki: Native Hawaiians in Oceania* portrays several historical flash points of Kānaka Maoli interactions with other Pacific Islanders, which broadly approaches several important historical threads, including missionary work conducted by Kānaka Maoli and

---

37 Ibid, 8.
diplomacy between the Hawaiian Kingdom and Samoa. In particular, Cook dissects the nuances of Hawaiian adoption of the Christian evangelizing mission and serving as a colonial wedge to bolster racist ideas about Melanesians. Hawaiians entangled themselves in a series of internal politics in places they hoped to missionize, while implicating themselves in the Western project of Christianizing the South Pacific. Cook brings this analysis forward into the present-day within an analysis of Hawaiian hostility towards Oceanic migrants forced to seek refuge in Hawai‘i. He remains hopeful, however, for the capacity for positive relationships to be nurtured: “While the histories of Oceanic connections provide some clear warnings regarding the pitfalls of allowing imperial discourses to shape relationships with other islanders, they also provide equally clear examples of the potential benefits of creating such relationships based on a mutual recognition of a shared past and shared contemporary interests.”

Similarly, a kilo mua analysis of the Hawaiian diaspora in California must be concerned with drawing out the “shared past and shared contemporary interests” of California Native peoples. The cruciality of locating the Hawaiian diaspora within a matrix of kuleana, diaspora, and discursive geography looms large on the horizon of Hawaiian studies.

This locating power is emphasized in David Chang’s *The World and All The Things upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*. Chang’s foremost goal is to illuminate histories of Kahiki, analyzing historical moments and traditional mo‘olelo. He begins with a description of Hawaiian geographical knowledge: “The distinctive knowledge of the world was matched by a distinctive way of understanding space: a consistently perspectival way of looking at the
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Hawaiian geography is accompanied by a rigorous sense of positionality, one where ʻike is used to determine and explain one’s place in the world, their kuleana.

Indeed, this thesis, as a kilo mua analysis of the Hawaiian diaspora, seeks to produce generative conclusions about the past, present, and future of the diaspora for the sake of illuminating relationships between Hawaiians and Kahiki. The title of this thesis is “Mohala Nā Pua Kahiki”, or “the flowers of Kahiki bloom”, alluding to the orientation towards Kahiki as a site of great importance. Diaspora Hawaiians are seen by this thesis as the “pua kaulana” mentioned in “Kaulana Nā Pua”, a famous Hawaiian national song, while this thesis also acknowledges our roots in Kahiki.

The objective of this thesis is not to comprehensively survey the history of the Hawaiian diaspora, but rather to asymptotically approach an understanding of the discursive, ontological position that diaspora Hawaiians occupy in relation to Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi in pursuit of a greater understanding of the kuleana that our community is bound to. I use the word ‘asymptotically’ as a reminder that Hawaiian knowledge production perpetually leaves room for additive material, never closing the door on development and sharpening. In this quest for honing kilo mua, ʻike of ka wā mua and the process of building ʻike becomes a form of literacy.

I choose to employ kilo mua in this study due to its ability to bring in wā as a layered component of understanding Hawaiian identity in a state of displacement, physically divorced from ʻāina. The concept of piko in Hawaiian ontology refers to the one’s spiritual or cultural center, a point of grounding. Modernity and recent histories of outmigration complicate notions of piko for diaspora Hawaiians, though Karen Ingersoll potentially describe a solution in her ‘seascape epistemology’: “Seascape epistemology organizes events and thoughts according to
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how they move and interact, while emphasizing the importance of knowing one’s roots, one’s center, and where one is located inside this constant movement.”

Though her seascape epistemology primarily concerns itself with relationship to ʻāina, there is an inherent flexibility in an epistemological framework derived from the sea that can help us gain purchase in locating ourselves within a similarly fluid sense of time: “The power of seascape epistemology lies in its organic nature, its inability to be mapped, and its required interaction with the intangible sea.”

She views the ocean, not only as a primary avenue by which Hawaiians procured relationships and resources, but also as pathways for movement, which within the scope of seascape epistemology, present valuable opportunities for knowledge production. For the diaspora, the sea functions as both the physical connection to Hawai‘i as well as a metaphorical and spiritual pathway to homeland. A crucial component of ‘seascape epistemology‘ is that of ‘oceanic literacy’, in which the sensory empiricism that Hawaiians use to gain ‘ike about the world culminates in a sense of proficiency. Thus a proficiency in kilo ʻāina and oceanic literacy permits its practitioners to cultivate intimate relationships with Hawaiian cultural and historical identity.

Mea haku mua, thus, must also be concerned with a sense of proficiency. Like other Hawaiian arts or skills, a profound desire for excellence should permeate the practice. The more literate a mea haku mua is in their observations of wā, the greater their ability to locate themselves within the matrix of Hawaiian past, present, and future. Enfolded in this matrix is the acknowledgment of kuleana, which is determined in large part by the Kānaka Maoli’s location within that matrix. Thus, they are able to obtain a deeper sense of cultural self-esteem, in which they feel connected to their fellow Hawaiians. Kilo mua, woven in with kilo ʻāina, synthesizes to foster a whole sense of temporal/spatial/ontological belonging within Hawaiʻi.

41 Ibid.
Nā Wā-hi ‘Ike

With Kahiki as a spatial-metaphorical basis from which to understand Hawaiian history and identity from, I look to California, or Kaleponi, as my site of study due to its personal proximity to my own experience, per kahua 4 of kilo mua. To demonstrate the interdisciplinary potential of kilo mua, I choose to kilo 3 temporally and geographically distinct moments. By combining the Hawaiian word wā (time) with the word wahi (place), I dub these sites of study wā-hi to indicate their importance both as discrete moments in the temporal-spatial landscape of wā and as places of interest where/when stories are encoded. These wāhi ‘ike, or place-times where ‘ike resides or is derived from, have been chosen to prompt a diversity of temporal breadth, discrete disciplinary methods, and personal proximity.

First, we will look to traditional moʻolelo to understand the foundational basis for Hawaiian identity as the Hawaiian finds themselves in transit, specifically “The Wind Gourd of Laʻamaomao”. The most prominent version of this moʻolelo is one collected and published by Moses Kuaea Nakuina called Moolelo Hawaii o Pakaa a me Ku-a-Pakaa, na Kahu Iwikuamoo o Keawenuiaumi, Ke Alii o Hawaii, a o na Moopuna hoi a Laamaomao. The moʻolelo discusses the passing down of a gourd that contains all the winds of Hawaiʻi and fleshes out complex notions of moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and status. The main characters are crucial sites of analysis as they move around the paeʻāina and form different pilina, resulting in the negotiation of ancestral kuleana throughout their journeys. Each character is forced to reckon with the responsibility imbued in them through their genealogy. It provides important insight on the maintenance of kuleana and moʻokūʻauhau while engaging in the act of movement, which is also supplemented by moments of homegoing. This maintenance is channeled through the attainment of ‘ike, where knowledge demonstration is the verification process for recognition of and fulfillment of
kuleana. Because moʻolelo, or traditional stories, represent core thematic values for Hawaiians, kilo mua must be attentive to those values.

By absorbing this foundation of moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ʻike into my analytical framework, we will travel to Kaleponi (California) to kilo the life William Heath Davis Jr., the grandson of an Oʻahu high chiefess and founder of “New San Diego”. Davis was a merchant who was pivotal to the development of what is now known as the San Francisco Bay Area and San Diego through a series of business ventures. The analysis of Davis’ life serves a series of purposes: to explore the wāhi of a place of geographical proximity to my own life, to fulfill a further direction pointed out by an intellectual predecessor (J. Kēhaulani Kauanui), and to more precisely locate the history of Hawaiians within the 19th century settler colonial process that took place in Kaleponi. To do so, I will conduct archival source analysis using key sources from his life. Foremost are the two autobiographies he wrote in 1889 and 1929, titled *Sixty Years in California* and *Seventy-Five Years in California*, respectively. Additionally, Andrew Rolle’s 1956 biography and various other California historical secondary sources will be observed in conjunction with Davis’ own accounts. Davis represents a keystone moment in the history of not only Hawaiʻi as it negotiated its position within the world, but also of American notions of Manifest Destiny and westward expansion that brought California into its imperial grasp. As a demonstration of kilo mua, this thesis will seek to historicize Davis within the settler colonial context of early California, while also providing a touchstone from the past to link present-day Hawaiian in California within a larger historical context. Through the resurrection of historical memory, the trans-Indigenous kuleana between Kanaka Maoli settlers and California Native people will also emerge.
Finally, the last component of this thesis will be an ethnographic analysis of Hawaiians in California that identify as members of the diaspora, using walaʻau sessions conducted through Zoom. Kilo mua, though primarily concerned with ka wā mua, the past, should not relinquish the ability to glean observations of the past from people living in the present-day. Though some of these sessions were conducted with use of a pre-interview question sheet, most of them took the form of non-structured conversation, emulating traditional Hawaiian forums of information sharing. Though all of these sessions began with the same starting question, “How would you introduce yourself?” Each question following was based off of the unique information each participant chose to share in response to that one. These walaʻau sessions were intimately preoccupied with topics of Hawaiian identity as it relates to diaspora, specifically as it relates to these diaspora Hawaiians’ experience with cultural belonging as it relates to recognition of moʻokūʻauhau, understanding of kuleana, and attainment of ‘ike. These walaʻau sessions serve not only as wāhi ‘ike from which to understand and observe, but also as discrete, potent moments of building pilina, or relationships. In combating notions of the Hawaiian diaspora as inherently alienated from community, the act of conversing provides a forum for that isolation to be slowly diminished, even if on the person-to-person level.

All of these chapters are bookended by autoethnographic vignettes, which act as anchors that tether my own cultural identity to the wāhi ‘ike I aim to kilo. At its core, kilo mua is essentially a practice of Indigenous autoethnography for Hawaiians, a framework discussed by Paul Whitinui in the context of Māori identity:

The “truth about stories” (King 2003) is so much more than merely talking about being Māori, “Native,” or indigenous; but rather it is a journey of (re)connecting with specific cultural sites, spaces, and struggles that relate to our fluid past, present, and hopes for the future. Indigenous autoethnography from this perspective is therefore about reclaiming
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42 Manulani Meyer comments on the expansive nature of interview settings she used for her thesis, which appears in Hoʻolulu.
our indigenous voice, visibility, and vision (Battiste 2000; Smith 2005) as indigenous peoples in the research agenda. This can only be achieved successfully by understanding that learning about “self” as an indigenous person relates to valuing relationships with the people and the environment. (Whitinui)

With an emphasis on acknowledging the fluidity of time that Whitinui indicates, kilo mua enfolds the Hawaiian orientation towards time and knowledge production to bring together disparate methodologies from a multitude of disciplines. The vignettes are then not merely a way to investigate the cultural self, but also serve as a form of relationship building between researcher and research topic.

As we move through these chapters of analysis, keep in mind that kilo mua may manifest itself in many ways, but at its core lies a desire to bring together diverse tools of description, exploration, and precision so as to provide a methodological instrument for Kānaka Maoli to come to greater relationships with the Hawaiian past. Alongside these methodological components, its cultural orientation towards a temporal-spatial ontology borne from Hawaiian epistemology prioritizes an understanding of the past as a space that can be observed, not extracted from. Within this specifically Hawaiian worldview, kilo mua operates firstly in the world of traditional Hawaiian protocol and its fruits should be in pursuit of the advancement of Hawaiian cultural, political, and social aims. This thesis hopes to understand three wāhi important to the Hawaiian diaspora so as to bring forth a greater sense of belonging for the community I belong to, Hawaiians in California. I commit to this journey as a child of Kahiki, one of many flowers of my ancestral homeland, Hawai‘i, who venture forth from our kulāwi. E ho‘omaka kākou i ka huaka‘i loa. Ma mua ka ‘ike Hawai‘i. E pule kākou.
As mentioned above, kilo mua is steeped in the underlying spirituality of Hawaiian ontology. Thus pule, or prayers, are a major component of the methodology.

Pule Kilo Mua

Hū nā makani na ka hikina,
E lawe mai ka ‘ike pāpālua.
I ho‘okahi ka wā kahiko
   A me ka ‘āina.
Haʻawi au i kēia
   Hana i koʻu mau kūpuna.

43 As mentioned above, kilo mua is steeped in the underlying spirituality of Hawaiian ontology. Thus pule, or prayers, are a major component of the methodology.
Ka Ipumakani a Laʻaomaomao: The transitory nature of pilina and kuleana

Kuleana. First introduced to my cultural vocabulary as a participant in a summer camp for Hawaiian children, kuleana shapeshifted in meaning constantly, but is often glossed in English as responsibility. Since then, other words have been subsumed into my working definition. "Obligation, privilege, grounding" all ring in and out of each other, but the most crucial element of kuleana was that it described one’s orientation to land in a place-specific manner. In an effort to instill in us a sense of care for the ʻāina, the Explorations summer camps taught that kuleana referred primarily to the relationship between us as Kānaka Maoli children and Hawai‘i. However, for me, after voyaging back to my hometown, San Diego, my sense of kuleana faded into dormancy, waiting for my next journey back to Hawai‘i to awaken again. After all, kuleana was conferred through genealogy and, as Hawaiians, we held the moʻokūʻauhau that traced our ancestry to the Hawaiian Islands themselves. Thus the sense of responsibility to care for these places was specific to Hawai‘i. For nearly a decade, I carried this sense of kuleana as being restricted to Hawai‘i. While there remained a general imperative to care for the Earth when I was in California, there was no sense that genealogy was the mediator of this obligation.

The biggest shift in my understanding of the genealogical responsibility encapsulated by kuleana was initiated in the summer of 2019 during a crucial moment of action for the Hawaiian community. In July 2019, the State of Hawai‘i approved the start of construction of an extremely large class telescope called the Thirty-Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea, the most sacred temple in the Hawaiian Islands. As the Lāhui Hawai‘i surged forward to protect one the great piko of our community, I found myself on Stanford campus working at a summer camp, wanting to reawaken my kuleana by going to Hawai‘i, but feeling stuck in California. Around the time that
Kānaka Maoli began setting up a protective barrier to defend Mauna Kea from desecration and I was asked by Kumu Kauʻi, my Hawaiian language professor, to take on organizing work from the mantle of our Stanford student group, Hui O Nā Moku. My mind and body leaned forward into the work, contacting comrades to join our coalition, power mapping the relevant stakeholders in California, and organizing rallies and protests.

Throughout all of this, the foremost concern in my head was how I was conducting myself within an already established network of movement builders, elders, and land defenders. Not only was I the youngest in the group of community leaders I had been welcomed into, I was the most inexperienced. As such, I observed before I spoke. I followed before I led as I was taught to do. One of the leaders in the group was Corrina Gould, the spokeswoman of the Lisjan Ohlone tribe. She became one of my primary mentors, who counseled me on the intricacies of Indigenous activism and embraced me like an aunty. One day, she invited me to represent Stanford and speak at a prayer ceremony for Mauna Kea at the West Berkeley Shellmound, the most sacred site of the Lisjan Ohlone.

When I arrived at the Shellmound, I was embraced by Aunty Corrina and the many other Indigenous people who had gathered in solidarity to offer prayers in solidarity with Mauna Kea. As representatives of all of the groups invited went up to say their piece, I thought quietly, yet intently, about how I might articulate my kuleana. At the bottom of my stomach, however, sat a heavy sense of guilt. Shouldn’t I be over in Hawai‘i rather than here? Other kānaka quit their jobs and dipped into savings just to be present at Mauna Kea, so why did I not do the same? Despite my hesitations, I walked up to the mic and began to speak. I had told myself I would write out beforehand what I wanted to say, but I had neglected to do so. Instead, I dove spontaneously into the most salient word I could muster: piko. I talked about how my mom
taught us the name of our piko from a young age, resulting in embarrassing realizations much later that others called it a belly button. I talked about how I learned later that Hawaiians believe in three bodily piko that indicate places of spiritual importance. Finally, I landed on how Mauna Kea is described as the piko of the Hawaiian people, the place where our moʻokūʻauhau tells us Wākea meets Papahānaumoku.

Embedded into this moment of articulation was my personal realization that, in fact, my kuleana was enacted at that moment. After all, piko conjures up the genealogical kinship between child and mother. Almost 3,000 miles away from home, I had just affirmed my genealogical obligation to protect a sacred place I claimed kinship to. Indeed, my kuleana was bound up in the linkages from my sacred place as a Hawaiian to the sacred place of the Lisjan Ohlone. No matter the time or place, my kuleana is firmly lodged in my being and can be embodied through both actions to protect the sacredness of ʻāina Hawaiʻi, but my epiphany was couched in the relationships in a physical place very far from Hawaiʻi. Significant to this realization was the commitment made in that moment to not only work to protect Mauna Kea, but also in turn to work to restore the West Berkeley Shellmound. Though I lacked a genealogical connection to that place, the sacred obligation of kuleana emerged.
Moʻolelo and Meaning

In Hawaiian culture, moʻolelo take up meaning similar to parables, guides for how Kānaka Maoli should construct their ethics, morality, and worldview. Through this understanding, a study of moʻolelo can be revealing of the ways that Kānaka Maoli used story as metaphor to construct value systems, as Ty Tengan points out: “Kānaka ʻŌiwi Maoli have always made and remade their identities through the re-membering and retelling of their moʻolelo, especially in times of rapid change that threaten their continued existence as a people”.44 In their article examining the moʻolelo of Pele and Hiʻiaka, Brandy Nālani McDougall and Georganne Nordstrom couch their study of Hawaiian moʻolelo within Malea Powell’s “rhetorics of survivance” and Scott Richard Lyons’s “rhetorical sovereignty” to demonstrate the power of moʻolelo to enact forms of resistance through literary devices, such as kaona: “Kaona, often described as a Hawaiian poetic device implying ‘hidden meaning,’ provides a vehicle through which Hawaiians employ the aesthetic so as to make rhetorical appeals.”45 kuʻualoha hoʻomanawanui emphasizes the crucial role moʻolelo plays in contemporary Hawaiian cultural identity: “Kanaka Maoli today are sustained, fed, and empowered by our ʻōlelo, by the moʻolelo of our ancestors, by the literary ropes of resistance we weave for future generations who will, in turn, continue to travel the path of our ancestors i ka wā pono, when the time is right”.46

Kilo mua must be attentive to the ways that moʻolelo inform cultural identity through their function as foundational elements of Hawaiianness. As such this analysis will begin with an examination of one of the most prominent moʻolelo of recent Hawaiian times - “Ka Ipumakani a Laʻamaomao”, “The Wind Gourd of Laʻamaomao”. Like all moʻolelo, this one contains different

mana as the story traveled to different places in Hawai‘i. In this particular analysis, Moses Naea Nakuina’s compilation published in 1902 will be the primary source, though Esther T. Mo‘okini’s and Sarah Nākoa’s English translation will also be consulted.

Embedded in this story are crucial elements of kuleana as they are molded and determined by one’s mo‘okū‘auhau and how proficiency in skills are needed to enact kuleana. This chapter will explore three cycles of separation from pilina, recognition of one’s kuleana, and physical movement to restore pilina. Mo‘okū‘auhau also plays a foremost role in the establishment of these kuleana/pilina, in which the figures in the mo‘olelo derive their obligations through their kinship ties. The events in the cycle are linked as they concern the lives of three generations of kāne bound to each other through kinship, demonstrating a facet of time and observation that urges Hawaiian readers to interrogate the ways their own mo‘okū‘auhau can illuminate their kuleana.

Kūanu‘uanu - Establishing Kuleana

Nakuina’s version of the mo‘olelo begins with a desire to voyage - Kūanu‘uanu, a kahu iwikuamo‘o of a renowned ali‘i Keawenuia‘umi, asks if he can travel on a tour around the islands. From the outset, the pilina between Kūanu‘uanu is expressed outright: “Ua noho aloha ‘o Kūanu‘uanu me Keawenuia‘umi kāna hānai”. Nakuina describes the relationship between the two as hānai, a Hawaiian term of kinship typically denoting a form of adoption. In addition to being hānai, Kūanu‘uanu serves as the kahu iwikuamo‘o of the ali‘i, or the “backbone attendant”, connoting a sense of proximity and favored status as well as kuleana. Despite, or possibly due to, Kūanu‘uanu’s favored status, Keawenuia‘umi grants him permission to go sightseeing, resulting in his arrival on the island of Kaua‘i where he marries a woman named La‘amaomao, the daughter of two kahuna of Kaua‘i, thereby extending his pilina from Hawai‘i
Island to Kauaʻi. When Kūanuʻuanu is called back to Hawaiʻi, he is forced to reckon between these two relationships, ultimately choosing to obey the kauoha of his aliʻi and returning to Hawaiʻi, in fulfillment of his kuleana as kahu.

As he tells Laʻamaomao of his departure, he instructs her to name their child Pāka’a after the dry skin of his aliʻi:

ʻKe hoʻi nei au i Hawaiʻi ma muli o ke kauoha a kuʻu haku, a Keawenuiaʻumi, ma ka waha o ka ʻelele āna i hoʻouna mai nei, no laila, iā ʻoe e noho iho ai i Kauaʻi nei, a i hānau mai he kaikamahine, e kapa iho nō ʻoe i ka inoa ma kou ʻaoʻao o Kauaʻi nei47, a inā naʻe hoʻi e hānau mai he keiki ʻāne, e kapa iho ʻoe i kona inoa ʻo Pākaʻa, i loaʻa ka inoa o kuʻu aliʻi, no ka pākaʻa, a nakaka, a maea, a māhuna, a puahilohilo o ka ʻili o kuʻu haku o Keawenuiaʻumi i ka inu i ka ʻawa kau lāʻau o Panaʻewa.ʻ (Nakuina)

Kūanuʻuanu describes his pilina with Keawenuiaʻumi with the possessive “kuʻu”, a first-person possessive which indicates that the noun is of beloved status, typically used for cherished pilina. This usage indicates that not only does Keawenuiaʻumi hold the pilina in high regard, but Kūanuʻuanu does as well. This admiration is furthered by the kauoha given to name their child after Keawenuiaʻumi’s dry, cracked skin if it is a boy. The naming of the child after the skin of an aliʻi expands the kuleana from father to son, the flow of obligation passing through the current of kinship. Though Kūanuʻuanu physically returns to Hawaiʻi, he leaves a memento of his pilina with Keawenuiaʻumi on Kauaʻi through this inoa.

This action of homegoing is a crucial marker of how kuleana is determined and how one identifies how one sits within a matrix of pilina. After all, Kūanuʻuanu had become a pilina to Laʻamaomao through hōʻao, but also through the keiki that was born between them. It was not until a messenger delivered the command for Kūanuʻuanu to return to Hawaiʻi that his kuleana as kahu iwikuamoʻo reemerged. Kūanuʻuanu is brought to bear the physical distance between the

---

47 Though the child born was a boy, Kūanuʻuanu instructs Laʻamaomao to name the child in the ways of Kauaʻi if it is a girl, indicating perhaps a gendered determination of kuleana.
pilina he has enmeshed himself in, but he recognizes, through this kauoha, that he must return to Keawenuiaʻumi. This negotiation of responsibility between all parties involved in pilina is crucial to this moʻolelo as recognition becomes a catalyst for the enactment of kuleana and actions of homegoing.

**Pākaʻa - Prodigal Pilina**

Kūanuʻuanu’s child, Pākaʻa also undergoes the cycle of taking on his genealogical obligation in which his kuleana is revealed through a process of recognition. As he is being raised, Pākaʻa is ignorant of his lineage because Laʻamaomao raises him alongside her brother Maʻilou. Pākaʻa becomes curious about his father’s identity and reveals it to be a deception by pestering Laʻaomaomao about his parentage. Out of frustration, Laʻamaomao reveals to him that his real father is somewhere else:

ʻKā, ‘akahi kā hoʻi kou koikoi, kai nō hoʻi ua haʻi mua aku nō hoʻi au iā ‘oe i ka mea ‘oiaʻiʻo, ‘o Mailou nō kou makua kāne, ka mea nāna ‘oe i mālama a hānai, a ‘o koʻu kaikunāne ponoʻi nō hoʻi ia, akā, ‘o kou makua kāne ponoʻi naʻe nāna ‘oe i ‘imi iho, ‘aʻohe ‘oe i ‘ike, a no kou pākela koi hoʻi, no laila, ke haʻi aku nei au iā ‘oe, e nānā aku ‘oe i ka hikina i kahi a ka lā e puka mai ai, a ‘o kahi hoʻi a ka makani kamaʻāina e pā maila, aia kā hoʻi i laila kou makua kāne.ʻ (Nakuina)

Laʻamaomao informs him that his father resides in the east where “ka makani kamaʻāina e pa maila”, where a local wind blows. However, before revealing that Maʻilou is her brother, she reminds Pākaʻa that Maʻilou has also worked to provide and nurture him. Indeed, though there is no direct father-son pilina at play, the pilina between Pākaʻa and Maʻilou is still emphasized due to Maʻilou’s commitment to the child. The term ʻāina in Hawaiian is derived from the word ʻai, meaning food. Thus, ʻāina is that which nourishes, which in many cases refers to physical land, but at other times can refer to pilina relationships. Though Pākaʻa is separated from his father
and the ʻāina from which his father hails from, Maʻilou and Laʻamaomao have provided fertile ground by which Pākaʻa has been nourished.

Pākaʻa does not immediately go out in search of his father, however, due to his lack of ability to sail in the sea to other islands. Rather, Pākaʻa remains in Kauaʻi, until an aliʻi decides to go on a journey to all the islands, prompting Pākaʻa to join the aloaliʻi. First Paiʻea journeys around his home island Kauaʻi, where Pākaʻa becomes the hoʻopili wale of one of the retainers of the aliʻi:

> Ua nui kona pākīkē ʻia a leo nui ʻia, a ʻaʻohe hoʻi he hoʻomaopopo mai o ka poʻe nāna ʻo ia i hoʻounaouna i wahi mea ʻai nāna, a i ka wā e puʻunaue ʻia ai ka waiwai hoʻokupu a ke aliʻi, ʻaʻohe loaʻa mai o kā ia nei wahi haʻawina, akā, i loko o kēia mau ʻiʻino a pau, ua hoʻomanawanui ʻo ia me ke ahonui, hoʻokahi mea nui iā ia ʻo ka ʻike aku i ia wahi aku i ia wahi aku, a ʻo ka lua, ʻo ia kona ʻike a maopopo i ke ʻano o ka noho ʻana o ke aloaliʻi,i, a me ka mākaukau hoʻi i nā hana, ʻoiai, ua koho ʻo ia i nā e holo pū ana ke aliʻi i Hawaiʻi, e hele pū ana ʻo ia, a inā ke ola ala nō kona makua kāne, a laila, e noho pū ana ʻo ia i ke aloaliʻi, a e lilo ana kēia mau ʻiʻike mua i loaʻa iā ia i mea e mākaukau a e hōʻoluʻolu ʻia ai ka manaʻo o Keawenuiaʻumi, ke aliʻi, ke ʻike mai i kona mākaukau, a maliʻa paha, lilo ʻo ia i mea nui iā ia. (Nakuina)

During his time in serving under the ʻōhua of Paʻiea, Pākaʻa is treated cruelly and left with none of the traditional gifts distributed to the aloaliʻi after a tour. Despite this, he remains grateful for the opportunity to learn skills which might bring him closer to his father. Without knowing that his father serves in the aloaliʻi of Keawenuiaʻumi already, his desire to do so to find his father indicates a strong message that the moʻolelo induces readers to follow - the fulfillment of genealogical kuleana should be actively sought out, rather than passively accepted. Not only that, but as Pākaʻa is instructed by his mother on how to find his father, he is told to “hele nō naʻe ‘oe me ka haʻahaʻa” and walk humbly. Laʻamaomao says this to ensure that Pākaʻa understands his role within the aloaliʻi, though he has already experienced this due to his time with Paiʻea. To ensure that Pākaʻa is able to become recognized through kuleana, her insistence that he maintain
haʻahaʻa is an important qualifying factor. In fact, the directive to be humble is part and parcel of the kuleana.

As Laʻamaomao sends Pākaʻa off, she gifts him with the titular object of the moʻolelo, Ka Ipumakani, which contains all the winds of Hawaiʻi. Wind is a crucial component as a facilitator of travel throughout the story, in which the Kūanuʻuanu, Pākaʻa, and Kūapākaʻa utilize the wind at various times to propel their canoes. Indeed, their ability to command the Ipumakani is intertwined with the technical ʻike it represents: “Ma mua o kona holo ʻana, ua aʻo mua akula ʻo Laʻamaomao iā Pākaʻa i ka inoa o nā makani a pau, nā pule a me nā mele a me nā paha, ua pau ia mau mea i ka paʻa iā Pākaʻa.” As Pākaʻa departs, Laʻamaomao demonstrates and transfers her proficiency in the ʻike of winds by bestowing the name of every wind of Hawaiʻi to her son, along with various chants and prayers that describe them. Again, through the transfer of ʻike and sacred object, kuleana is transmitted through the undercurrent of moʻokūʻauhau. Thus, kuleana is demanded by the connection of ancestry, recognized explicitly through epiphany, and enacted through the proficiency of skill.

Paiʻea continues on in his tour of the other islands and eventually arrives at Hawaiʻi, where his aholiʻi is welcomed into the court of Keawenuiaʻumi, though according to custom, they are left to find their own sustenance. The ‘ōhua and kānaka of Paiʻea remain starving until Pākaʻa reveals that he, through his father, will be able to procure food not only for himself, but for all the ‘ōhua. The ‘ōhua refuse to believe that a mere kanaka hoʻopili wale like Pākaʻa could approach the aliʻi, yet he remains adamant that he can. Undaunted, he approaches Keawenuiaʻumi and sits in Kūanuʻuanu’s lap signifying his position as his son: “Ma nā kānāwai kākau ʻole ʻia o Hawaiʻi nei, ʻo ke keiki ponoʻi wale nō ka mea hiki ke noho i luna o ka ʻūhā o ka makua kāne”. In Hawaiʻi, an unwritten law mandates that only people who were children of an
aliʻi could sit on their lap. Upon this, he is questioned about why he made such a brazen move and who he is: “ʻNa wai ke kama ʻo ʻoe?” ‘Na Kūanuʻuanu a me Laʻamaomao! ʻO Pākaʻa anei ʻoe?” ‘Ae, ʻo wau nō ʻo Pākaʻa! ʻO wai kou Pākaʻa? ‘No Keawenuiaʻumi” Kūanuʻuanu asks the child if he is Pākaʻa, knowing that he instructed Laʻamaomao to name their child Pākaʻa if they were a boy. After confirming this fact, Kūanuʻuanu further presses, asking if Pākaʻa knows who he is named for, testing to see if the boy can recognize his kuleana to his namesake. Pākaʻa answers correctly, resulting in Keawenuiaʻumi directing Kūanuʻuanu to teach Pākaʻa how to fulfill this kuleana as kahu iwikuamoʻo as he claims him as a new kahu.

The cycle moves on from the affirmation of kuleana through a recognition of moʻokūʻauhau and continues to the process of Pākaʻa developing the proficiency to enact it. Pākaʻa grows older and gains ʻike about his responsibilities as kahu:

A i ka piʻi ʻana aʻe o ko Pākaʻa nui, ua piʻi pū aʻe me kona kanaka uʻi, a ua piʻi pū aʻe hoʻi me kona ʻike, akamai, a me ka maiau i nā hana a pau o ke alo aliʻi o Keawenuiaʻumi; ua pau iā ia nā loina o ka lani a me nā ʻano o ka honua, ʻo ia hoʻi i ka mahiʻai ʻana a me nā mea a pau e pili ana i laila, ke kilo hōkū a me ka holo moana ʻana, ka hoʻokele waʻa, ka noho ʻana o uka nei o ka ʻāina, ka lawaiʻa, a me nā ʻano hana ʻē aʻe nō a pau; a ma muli o kēia mākaukau o Pākaʻa, ua hoʻolilo aʻela ke aliʻi ʻo Keawenuiaʻumi iā ia i mea nui i mua o kona alo aliʻi, ma lalo aku nō naʻe o kona makua kāne ʻo Kūanuʻuanu. (Nakuina)

Pākaʻa becomes proficient in a number of Hawaiians skills, including navigation, astronomy, farming, fishing, and more, leading Keawenuiaʻumi to bestow upon him a position in his court directly below Kūanuʻuanu. Pākaʻa also is given lands which he uses to settle in Hawaiʻi along with others that were brought from Kauaʻi. Keawenuiaʻumi in the pilina between himself and Pākaʻa assesses his ability to fulfill his genealogical obligation and finds him to be worthy.

48 Mary Kawena Pukui, E. W Haertig, and Catherine A Lee, Nānā i ke kumu = Look to the source, 2014, http://www.ulukau.org/elib/cgi-bin/library?c=qlcc1
Further, at the passing of Kūanuʻuanu, there is a direct imparting of ‘ike, parallel to Laʻamaomao reciting the names of the winds to Pākaʻa:

ʻKe kokoke mai nei koʻu mau lā, no laila, eia kaʻu kauoha iā ʻoe: E mālama pono ʻoe i ke aliʻi e like me kaʻu mālama ʻana āu i ʻike iho nei, e hoʻo alohe i ka ʻōlelo ʻiki a me ka ʻōlelo nui a ke aliʻi, e mālama i kahi ʻai a hakina ia a ke aliʻi, a pelekunu, a inā i nīnau koke ʻole ʻia mai, e kaulaʻi aku i ka lā a maloʻo a e hoʻō i loko o ka hōkeo a waihona pāpaʻa ʻē aʻe paha e mālama i nā iʻa hou, nā iʻa ola, ka ʻawa ulu a me ka ʻawa maloʻo. E mālama i ke kanaka ʻiki a me ke kanaka nui, ke kanaka kiʻekiʻe a me ke kanaka haʻahaʻa. ʻO nā ʻāina ponoʻi oʻu iā ʻoe nō ia, a nāu nō e ʻike aku i ko hakau.ʻ (Nakuina)

On his deathbed, Kūanuʻuanu transmits explicit directives for Pākaʻa to follow so as to enable him to fulfill his kuleana as kahu iwikuamoʻo of Keawenuiaʻumi. He also gives him specific directions on the particulars of Keawenuiaʻumi’s preferences. As mentioned in the introduction, Hawaiian ‘ike is couched in place-specific observations, a fact emphasized by the personalized ‘ike transmitted here from father to son.

The inherent goodness of kuleana borne through moʻokūʻauhau and enacted through skill is confirmed when the malfeasance of two newcomer navigators ruptures the pilina between Pākaʻa and Keawenuiaʻumi. Hoʻokeleihilo and Hoʻokeleipuna enter the aloaliʻi of Keawenuiaʻumi and proceed to spread lies about Pākaʻa prompting Keawenuiaʻumi to rescind the lands he had given to Pākaʻa. Upon this, Pākaʻa leaves the aloaliʻi entirely by absconding to Molokaʻi. In his absence, Keawenuiaʻumi begins to notice a lack of skill in his hoʻokele:

Hoʻomaka maila lāua e hoʻokiʻekiʻe, ʻaʻohe hoʻokō koke ʻia mai ʻo ka makemake o ke aliʻi. ʻO nā mea a pau i hoʻouina ʻia mai na ke aliʻi Keawenuiaʻumi, pau ʻē aʻe laʻa lāua lā a me ko lāua poʻe a ʻo ke koena aku ʻo ia ke hāʻawi ʻia aku i ke aliʻi. Inā e hoʻohalahala mai ke aliʻi i ka ʻuʻuku, hoʻopunipuni akula no ka ʻuʻuku nō o ka mea i loaʻa mai. (Nakuina)

At first Keawenuiaʻumi was unable to recognize their inferiority as Pākaʻa would compensate for their lack of skill by completing their tasks. However, due to Pākaʻa’s departure, Keawenuiaʻumi
becomes disgruntled with their performance. The incompetence of the newcomers is emphasized and they are unable to live up to their kuleana in the aloaliʻi. This is the second occurrence of separation, this time initiated not by adventurous curiosity, but by insidious court intrigue and intentional foul play committed by rivals.

Revealed here is also the two-way nature of kuleana where the person serving in the kahu iwikuamoʻo position makes a conscious decision to abandon their aliʻi. Indeed, this occurs after this kuleana is forsaken by Keawenuiaʻumi. Keawenuiaʻumi rescinds the lands he had bestowed onto Pākaʻa, severing the ties between them. Thus, the kuleana involved in the pilina not only concerns Pākaʻa and his ability to serve his aliʻi, but also concerns Keawenuiaʻumi's obligation to reward his kahu for his work. Once this kuleana is severed, the pilina changes drastically, allowing Pākaʻa to leave in good conscience.

**Kūapākaʻa - The Avenger**

The potency of kuleana is not diminished, only altered, however, as the cycle continues with Pākaʻa’s son, which he names Kūapākaʻa. Though Keawenuiaʻumi had essentially relieved Pākaʻa of his service, Pākaʻa continues to impart the importance of kuleana in Kūapākaʻa by invoking their kin relation status: “ʻE aʻo kāua i nā hana a ko haku a loaʻa iā ʻoe, maliʻa, o noho mai a hū aʻe ke aloha, ʻimi mai iā kāua, ua mākaukau ʻoe.” Physical separation is unable to stem the sense of obligation constituted by moʻokūʻauhau, prompting Pākaʻa to ensure that his son is prepared to take on the kuleana. The usage of the phrase “ko haku” in reference to Keawenuiaʻumi connotes a shared pilina with the aliʻi, which has been established by the kinship between father and son. In the meantime, Keawenuiaʻumi is told through a dream that Pākaʻa is
on Kaʻula at the eastern extent of the Hawaiian Islands and goes off in search of his beloved kahu.

As Keawenuiaʻumi and his retinue approach the island of Molokaʻi, Pākaʻa and Kūpākaʻa wait on the beach in a canoe, hoping to see whether or not Hoʻokeleihilo and Hoʻokeleipuna are still with the aloaliʻi without the aloaliʻi recognizing Pākaʻa. Pākaʻa’s plan is to ensure that Kūpākaʻa can rid the aloaliʻi of his enemies such that it is safe for him to return. During this episode, Kūapākaʻa is told by the crew of Keawenuiaʻumi that Pākaʻa is a kauwā, which confuses him as he had been told that his father was an aliʻi with lands while he was in the court of Keawenuiaʻumi. This is a crucial moment that aids in distinguishing the nature of the kuleana that Pākaʻa carries: “ʻAʻole he kauā maoli," wahi a lākou lā. "He paʻa kāhili he lawe ipu kākele, he hoa hāʻule uku nō ia nei.ʻʻAliʻi nō hoʻi hā, ke kau ala ka lima ma luna o ke poʻo o Keawenuiaʻumi,ʻ wahi a Kūapākaʻa.” The crew clarifies that Pākaʻa was not a real kauwā, but one that serves the aliʻi. The word kauwā is striking because it can both be translated as servant or outcast, but can also refer to the lesser aliʻi that served the high chief. Kūpākaʻa remarks at the high status his father inhabits, though in the moment of questioning, he assures himself that his mother is an aliʻi of Molokaʻi. In the case that his father was not an aliʻi, the status of his mother would have superseded the kauwā status passed on by his father, still allowing him to serve in the aloaliʻi of Keawenuiaʻumi. This is an important juncture in which the process of recognition is fraught with the need to negotiate clarity of kuleana.

Nonetheless, Kūapākaʻa proceeds into the process of recognition/enactment of his kuleana through a series of back and forth interchanges between him and the aloaliʻi of Keawenuiaʻumi. Kūapākaʻa is told by his father to beckon the canoes towards them by lifting his paddle upright and they comply, though Hoʻokeleipuna and Hoʻokeleihilo protest at first. They
are ignored by Keawenuiaʻumi who explains that Pākaʻa would navigate his canoe towards those with upright paddles in case they might have something to offer. As they come closer, Kūapākaʻa warns them of a coming storm. Kahikuokamoku, an ʻaikāne of Keawenuiaʻumi questions this: “ʻAʻole au ma kā lāua nei ʻōlelo, he nīnau naʻe kaʻu. Pehea auaneʻi e inu ai kēia lā mālie, ua kalae ka lani, ua ahuwale nā kualono a ke ʻikea aku nei hoʻi nā ʻōpua kikiʻi?”. The moʻolelo explains that Kūapākaʻa’s status as kamaʻāina to Molokaʻi ensures that his knowledge of the local winds is sound. He goes on to name all of the winds of Hawaiʻi as an example of his rigorous knowledge. Of course, this knowledge also serves as a marker of his moʻokūʻauhau as the grandson of Laʻamaomao who carried the knowledge of the winds and bestowed it onto her son, Pākaʻa. By chanting the names of the winds of Hawaiʻi, Kūapākaʻa not only affirms his connection to his father and grandmother, but enacts his kuleana through proficiency in chanting, memorization, and ʻike Hawaiʻi. To be sure, his knowledge of the winds represents a crucial solution in a life or death situation as he urges Keawenuiaʻumi to come to shore.
This process of recognition is halted, however, by the doubts planted by Pāka’a’s enemies as well as a small mistake he makes in a chant. A vigorous back-and-forth ensues in which Kūapāka’a is able to name all of the crew in the canoes and the names of all the winds in the Hawaiian Islands. Despite this, Kūapāka’a is only able to convince his ali‘i to come to shore after using Ka Ipumakani a La’amaomao, the gourd of winds, which he opens, causing a storm which drives them to shore. Upon seeing this, Keawenuia‘umi scolds his navigators for forsaking the warnings of Kūapāka’a: “Kā! Mea kau a hala ka ʻōlelo a ke keiki, ua ʻōlelo mai no ke keiki ‘he lā ʻinoʻ”. While Keawenuia‘umi had already observed the inferiority of Ho‘okeleipuna and Ho‘okeleihilo to Pāka’a, the ipu itself combined with his superior ‘ike symbolically represents the ascendancy of his genealogical kuleana over their lack of kuleana.

Once the storm overtakes the canoes, Keawenuia‘umi orders his kānaka to go towards Kūapāka’a to wait out the inclement weather. While there, Pāka’a informs Kūapāka’a of the ways that Keawenuia‘umi likes to be served by his kahu, which is soon confirmed by Keawenuia‘umi wistfully wishing for his former kahu. When the ali‘i asks Kūapāka’a to chew the ‘awa for him to consume, Kūapāka’a has a chance to enact his kuleana such that his ali‘i will not only recognize him as worthy, but also implicitly and unknowingly recognize the ‘ike of his father:

Hali’u koke a’ela ua keiki lā ma ke kuono a kapa a’ela i ua pū’awa lā, ninini ihola ia i ka wai i ke kanoa, a ho’okomo ihola i nā mana ‘awa a Pāka’a i nau mua loa ai a wali, hoka ihola a kahe’e ihola a pau i loko o ka apu, a laila, hā’awi akula i ke ali‘i, a holo akula ‘o ia i kahakai a ho‘i maila me nā hina mea ‘elua ma kona mau lima, a ʻo ia kapalili nō ia a kau ana i ke pā a waiho ana i mua o ke ali‘i.

A ‘ike maila ‘o Keawenuia‘umi i kāna i’a ‘ono, lālau ihola ia a ‘ai a’ela me ka hoīhoi, a mahalo maila i ke keiki no ka hana kanaka makua, me he mea la ua noho i kahi ali‘i, no ka mākaukau maoli o ke keiki. (Nakuina)
When Kūapākaʻa is able to execute the particulars of the ‘awa ceremony that Keawenuiaʻumi is fond of, the aliʻi remarks at his skill and ‘ike. This serves to acknowledge the aliʻi and his fondness towards his beloved kahu Pākaʻa, who had earlier been taught the same ‘ike from his father Kūanuʻuanu.

This instance of recognition, however, does not complete the cycle as Pākaʻa’s homegoing is obstructed by the presence of his enemies, who usurped his position in the aloaliʻi. In another episode, Kūapākaʻa enacts his kuleana to his father by carrying out a plan given to him by Pākaʻa to kill Hoʻokeleihilo and Hoʻokeleipuna. Once these hoʻokele are killed, Kūapākaʻa is taken on as navigator for Keawenuiaʻumi and taken back to Hawaiʻi where he must continue to clear the path for his father to come back to his aliʻi. He is challenged by the fishermen of the aliʻi to race where they insist on betting their lives, against the wishes of Kūapākaʻa. The fishermen had been among those who had driven Pākaʻa out of the aloaliʻi and the Kūapākaʻa’s victory serves as a final defeat of all of his father’s enemies. As the fishermen are about to be put to death, Keawenuiaʻumi pleads for his fishermen to be spared as he will lack fish if they are killed. Kūapākaʻa then reveals that Pākaʻa would be able to return to Keawenuiaʻumi if these fishermen are no longer serving under the aliʻi and Keawenuiaʻumi accepts and Kūapākaʻa is sent out to find his father on Molokaʻi and bring him back to Hawaiʻi.

The very last condition necessary for Pākaʻa to return to Hawaiʻi is for Keawenuiaʻumi to return the lands that were rescinded from him. Initially, when his son comes to Molokaʻi to bring him back to Hawaiʻi, Pākaʻa insists on staying on Molokaʻi unless his lands are returned. His son agrees to return to Hawaiʻi to ask, but before he can do so, Keawenuiaʻumi’s aliʻi come seeking out Kūapākaʻa to see if he had fulfilled his task. They stumble upon Pākaʻa and notify him of Keawenuiaʻumi’s desire for him to return:
Pāka’a relays these desires to Kahikuokamoku directly, demanding that not only his lands, but his position within the aloali‘i be returned to him before he agrees to return. Once again, though Keawenuia’umi is the haku of Pāka’a, he is still bound by kuleana to endow his kahu with certain rights. Additionally, Pāka’a advocates for his son alongside himself, requesting that his son be granted similar status, just as his own father guided his entry into the court of Keawenuia’umi.

Pāka’a and Kūapāka’a triumphantly return to Hawai‘i and Pāka’a is finally returned to his haku, where the cycle of recognition and enactment of kuleana manifests in the act of homegoing. Their reunion is bittersweet as the lands and rights of Pāka’a are returned:

A hala nā lā malihini, a laila, ‘ōlelo akula ‘o Keawenuia’umi iā Pāka’a, ‘He nani ia ua ho‘i hou maila ‘oe, no laila, ke ho‘onoho hou aku nei au iā ‘oe ma kou mau kūlana mua, a ke hā‘awi aku nei au iā ‘oe i kou mau ‘āina mua a me nā pono ‘e a’e a pau, a ke hā‘awi aku nei au iā ‘oe ka ho‘oponopono ‘ana o ka mokupuni ‘o Hawai‘i nei.’ (Nakuina)

Pāka’a’s restoration as an ali‘i of Hawai‘i marks the completion of the homegoing process not only for himself but for the mo‘okū‘auhau of his father Kūanu‘uanu, who was originally an ali‘i in the court of Keawenuia’umi, serving as kahu.

These kuleana cycles of separation, recognition, and return are undergirded by a continual, dutiful adherence to the preservation of mo‘okū‘auhau relations. Just as Kūanu‘uanu and La‘amaomao teach Pāka’a things that enable him to execute his kuleana, Pāka’a does the
same for Kūapākaʻa. Not only that, but within the Hawaiian worldview, moments in which kuleana are not being fulfilled are suffuse with incompetence and unrest. Undoubtedly, this is a manifestation of the Hawaiian philosophical concept of pono. Often glossed as righteous, it also connotes a view of harmonic relations in the world, where human actions should be guided by the pursuit of this harmony. This is indicated by the use of the word “ho'oponopono” to refer to the restoration of Pākaʻa as an aliʻi of Hawaiʻi.

In pursuit of locating the Hawaiian diaspora within a larger societal and cultural matrix of Kānaka Maoli society, this moʻolelo serves a purpose in helping to direct readers towards an understanding of how to maintain pono - through the recognition of kuleana, which is accorded by moʻokūʻauhau. Thus, one might advise that Hawaiians in the diaspora be diligent in the preservation of moʻokūʻauhau through rigorous pursuits of skills and proficiencies that will aid in enacting kuleana. Kūanuʻuanu, Pākaʻa, and Kūapākaʻa all possessed ʻike particular to their role within the aloaliʻi of Keawenuiaʻumi, which dictated what kuleana they needed to fulfill to maintain pono. In the moʻolelo incompetence is punished and leads to the immiseration of those who are bound by pilina to those incompetent people. This process of seeking out one’s kuleana as well as the skills to enact it provide a cohesive framework for bringing the diaspora to terms with the pilina engendered by the inherent moʻokūʻauhau relation that connects them to Hawaiʻi.

At once, the transitory nature of pilina and kuleana emerge alongside the preeminence of moʻokūʻauhau as Kūanuʻuanu, Pākaʻa, and Kūapākaʻa are embroiled in a series of voyages away and towards the sands of their births. Indeed, kuleana to community and to personal pilina becomes mutable through the transitory act of movement from island to island. Kūapākaʻa clarifies this as he assures his father Pākaʻa that it would be okay for him to be a kauwā, due to his mother’s status as an aliʻi on Molokaʻi: “ʻO kou wahi aliʻi auaneʻi, ʻo ke aliʻi aʻe o kuʻu
makuahine aliʻi loa koʻu noho ʻana i kēia ʻāina ʻo Molokaʻi.” Had he stayed on Molokaʻi, he would have remained an aliʻi, but if he were to leave, his status and kuleana would shift accordingly. This shifting of kuleana is crucial to an analysis of the Hawaiian diaspora as the investigation of one’s locational status within the community grants them the ʻike necessary to carry out communal responsibilities and obligations, thereby granting them a sense of belonging within the lāhui Hawaiʻi.

Carrying ʻIke

During the Wrigley Field program mentioned in the preface, I was the only Hawaiian in the Stanford cohort. Among 20 participants, a handful of teaching assistants, and several lecturers, I was the only Kanaka Maoli. Despite my official kuleana as a student, I was often put in positions where I was the only outlet for knowledge about Hawaiʻi and Hawaiian people. My fellow students would regularly look in my direction for advice on how to conduct themselves in a culturally appropriate manner, what certain Hawaiian words meant, and about the general historical and cultural context that surrounded us. These questions, while rooted in a desire to look towards someone they saw as most proximal to the knowledge they sought, often resulted in a sense of anxiety over whether or not I was the right person to impart this ʻike. Any expressions of not knowing the answers felt as if I had relinquished my kuleana to Hawaiʻi.

The teaching assistants and my fellow students comforted me in the thought that I did not have to supply my own labor without compensation if I did not want to, but something in my naʻau tugged me in the other direction. To me, how could I be so outwardly proud of being Hawaiian yet lack knowledge when questioned? Fundamental to this line of thinking was the expectations that I had been raised with in the Hawaiian community that I was meant to be able
to display knowledge about Hawaiʻi. These pressures were both internal and external. Growing up, other kids would ask me to perform external expressions of culture such as hula, language, or surfing to prove my Hawaiianaess. Additionally, other Hawaiians would expect me to know important moments in Hawaiian history, understand commonly used phrases in Hawaiian, and have a working knowledge of ʻāina.

In the Wrigley program, these pressures manifested once again, pushing me to think critically about whether or not they were worth listening to. After all, gaining cultural knowledge was something that felt objectively good, a fulfillment of my genealogical obligation. Nonetheless, caving to external pressures to conform to ideals of the culturally exotic Native Hawaiian felt wrong. How could I balance these pressures that drove me towards similar ends? In a way, I continue to mediate vying motivations to attain ‘ike Hawaiʻi between those that share the same kuleana as me and those that seek to impose colonial methods of ethnic verification.
William Heath Davis: Moʻokūʻauhau, Arrivance, and Settler Colonialism

Tucked between a statue of San Diego’s first “town dog” and a Thai restaurant shoved into the first floor of a historic hotel sits the oldest structure in New Town San Diego - the William Heath Davis House. Its innocuous position in downtown seems to almost undercut its importance. In fact, were it not for museum signage and its exuberant yellow exterior, one might easily miss it on their way to pick up their pad see yew. Nonetheless, the quaint building represents a chapter in the story of Native Hawaiians. The house is named for the California trader William Heath Mahi Davis, a key figure in the history of Kaleponi and San Diego.

The house had only very briefly served as the dwelling place of Davis, but as I ventured through the rooms, I felt more able to understand what his story meant for me. After all, growing up in America’s Finest City, I had been fed the nominative history of the city. I recalled lessons about the mission system, visits to Old Town San Diego, and brief lessons about the Kumeyaay tribe. In it, I imagined my family and I to be recent incursions into this history, migrants paving our own way as representatives from our community, untethered from precedence. As children, we were meant to find some sort of kinship in the history of the Spanish discovery and American takeover of Kaleponi. Our day began with the pledge of allegiance followed by our choice of
patriotic song (often “God Bless America”) as we prepared to learn about Manifest Destiny and the Mexican-American War. We were implicitly encouraged to look favorably on the annexation of our state to the Union.

Many years later, after relinquishing myself the appreciative attitude towards American expansionism, I began reading in preparation to apply to the honors thesis program. I knew I wanted to research the Hawaiian diaspora, but was unsure of what avenues I might take to connect myself to what seemed like a scant history. I was encouraged, however, after reading the work of J. Kēhaulani Kauanui and even further bolstered when I was given the opportunity to speak with her as she gave multiple talks at Stanford. Grateful, I appealed to her for advice and she sent me several articles she had written on the diaspora, which have both been mentioned in the introduction chapter. In “Diasporic Deracination”, Kauanui generously offered opportunities for further research: “There are many other little-known and under-researched cases of Hawaiian presence in the continental United States…and the case of William Heath Mahi Davis, an intriguer who ran trade circuits between Honolulu and the West Coast, and even took credit for founding the modern city of San Diego (after marrying into the Spanish gentry).”

Immediately, my naʻau felt drawn towards knowing more about Davis.

Many questions ran through my mind, thinking about the possible ways I could explore questions of Hawaiian diaspora identity through Davis. In a way, there was a sense of moʻokūʻauhau, not in the direct kinship lineage sense, but in the sense that we had inhabited the same land away from Hawaiʻi. I was no longer an aberration in the Hawaiian community, but following in the footsteps of many Kānaka who had come before. The looming importance of connecting oneself through the practice of cultivating historical memory aids in the naturalization of one’s present condition. Perhaps being born and raised in San Diego offered an
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alternative, unique perspective to being Hawaiian - one which is necessarily intertwined with acknowledgments of settler colonialism and arrivance.

**Indigenous Settler Colonialism and San Diego**

Inextricably linked to any analysis of Indigenous diaspora is the ways that Indigeneity itself is constituted, especially as it intersects with the imbrication of diaspora in settler colonial structures. In the wāhi of the life of William Heath Mahi Davis, there remain crucial linkages to draw out between the settler colonial process that was unfolding in the 19th century and the migration of Kanaka Maoli to Kaleponi. Davis was born in 1822 and observed the American conquest of the state, in which the transition between Kaleponi being a Mexican province to an American state brought cause for re-negotiation of citizenship and identity. In this tumultuous period, the devastating impact of settler colonial institutions against California Native peoples cannot be understated - thousands of Native people were murdered in the California genocide.

How, then, is kilo mua responsible for acknowledging the position of Kānaka Maoli within this context? By understanding the thematic concepts of moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ʻike as essential to the Hawaiian cultural identity, this kilo mua analysis should absorb them into the analytical framework. This entails much more than a study of those thematic concepts as they live within the world of the wāhi, but also as genealogy, responsibility, and knowledge constitute a holistic relationship between researcher and research topic. Moʻokūʻauhau, then, does not only appear in the frame of unearthing the ancestral lineages of the research subject, but understanding the connective tissue that binds myself as an author to Davis. In this case, as this chapter will demonstrate, there are ancestral connections undergirded by the occupying of the same physical place that adheres my story to his. Indeed, this requires an especially wide net to
cast in terms of kuleana, where I will draw on the theory of trans-Indigenous solidarity to understand how obligation functions between Indigenous peoples in which one party takes up the subjectivity of an Indigenous settler. Additionally, these revival of historical memory demonstrates the theme of ʻike, in which knowledge about diaspora figures establishes the moʻokūʻauhau and kuleana.

A mindlessly celebratory appraisal of William Heath Mahi Davis without paying heed to the collaborative relationships with settlers and subject positions as Indigenous settlers that Davis and other Hawaiians in this period occupied would be insufficient. Hōkūlani Aikau addresses these tensions in “Indigeneity in the Diaspora: The Case of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah”. The article investigates the Indigenous settler colonial dialogics involved at the site of Iosepa, a Native Hawaiian Mormon settlement in Utah where collective memory and lineage serve an iterative role through the Iosepa Festival. Intertwined in the story are grappling with Indigeneity, historical memory, and Native Hawaiian cultural adaptation. Aikau draws a number of Indigenous scholars to evidence the point that Hawaiians at Iosepa “draw upon broad understandings of indigeneity [sic] as well as religious narratives that reiterate settler-colonial discourses to understand their relationship to the land.”

Indeed, Kānaka Maoli are not absolved of complicity, but are drawn into a nuanced narrative that takes into account the multiplicity of vantage points that arise in an interrogation of histories of settler-colonialism. For Aikau, present-day stories told about the first Polynesian Mormons in Utah are important, yet lack reckoning with the racialized hierarchy set by religion: “The stories that are told about the first Polynesians to settle in Utah are an attempt to overcome ‘the unbearable sentiments of tragedy’
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and racism, loneliness, and being misunderstood and ostracized while also referencing, although not acknowledging, a larger structure of inequality and dominance within Mormonism.”

I look to Aikau’s study of Iosepa as an exemplary handling of the way that kuleana functions in the diaspora and draw upon my own analysis of the transitory nature of kuleana in the previous chapter. The motivating drive for a study of the wāhi of Davis’ life will serve to understand how kuleana not only transitions as one moves to different place, but also the ways that new kuleana emerge depending on one’s positionality in regard to Indigeneity and settler colonialism. In addition, Jodi Byrd’s tripartite framework of settler-Indigenous-arrivant, which she borrows from Kamau Brathwaite, serves to complicate binaries of Native/settler, colonizer/colonized. Arrivant highlights the subjectivities of Native Hawaiians as a people actively affected by colonialism as Euro-Americans jockeyed for a position in the Hawaiians soon after they arrived. Nonetheless, the cultural tenets of moʻokūʻauhau and kuleana resurface as manifestations not only of how William Heath Mahi Davis engaged with the sociopolitics of Kaleponi, but also in the study of how historical memory aids and abets an Indigenous-centric remembering of Davis in the present-day.

Kumeyaay I Ka Wā Mua

In particular, the physical site of study relevant to this kilo mua analysis of William Heath Davis is what is now called San Diego, though he had been involved in multiple pioneering efforts throughout the state. As such, this thesis will bring in a brief history of the Kumeyaay Nation since their first contact with Euro-Americans. The Kumeyaay are a Yuman-speaking people that have lived in what is now considered south San Diego for 12,000 years. The

---
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Kumeyaay were organized into tribal bands, many of which persist to this day. Each band was headed by a Kwaapay, who managed the economic and administrative matters of the band, either inherited or was appointed to his position. They practiced a complex system of ecosystem management in which resources from both inland and coast were distributed fairly such that all tribal members had access to what they needed.\textsuperscript{53}

The Kumeyaay first encountered the Spanish in 1542 with the arrival of Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo to what is now the San Diego Harbor. However, the Spanish mission system only took hold in 1769, with the establishment of Mission San Diego de Alcala by Father Junipero Serra. With this, Kumeyaay culture and life were irrevocably altered as they were brutally enslaved by the Spanish, their traditions stamped out in the missions, and their land acquisition by the Spanish empire. Nonetheless, Kumeyaay resisted Spanish missionization through periodic revolts, most notable of which was the 1775 revolt, in which Kumeyaay from around San Diego set fire to the Mission and killed several Spaniards. As Richard Crawford notes, “The insurrection reflects the Kumeyaay, or perhaps more correctly largely the Tipai, response to the Spaniards’ inappropriate actions. The revolt was not just a military action or a spiritual quest. The sacking was a rational, and calculated reaction to increased conversions, rapes, thefts, transmittal of diseases, and fear of forced imprisonment.”\textsuperscript{54} While the 1775 revolt did not extinguish the Spanish drive to colonize the area, it does point to the nature of the relationship between the Kumeyaay and European settlers.

The Kumeyaay continued to mount military resistance to colonial occupation well into the 19th century, including during the Mexican period of California, which began in 1821 after
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Mexican independence from Spain. Skirmishes between the Kumeyaay and Mexicans in 1826 and 1837 indicate an abiding current of resistance throughout this period. Though the Mexican Constitution of 1824 codified equality of all Mexican citizens, land dispossession continued for the Kumeyaay people as more and more Euro-Americans settled into their territory. It is in this period of California history that William Heath Mahi Davis enters Kaleponi.

Moʻokūʻauhau

This chapter will delve into a brief overview of how moʻokūʻauhau may inform us in our analysis of Davis. His genealogical past was filled to the brim with the stories of figures that loomed large in the historical consciousness of the time. His grandmother was Mahi Kalanihoʻoulemokuikekai, who married Oliver Holmes. Mahi Kalanihoʻoulemokuikekai was descended from the high chiefs of the island of Maui, including Kamehamehanuiʻailūʻau. Here, I trace my own moʻokūʻauhau to the wāhi I am investigating to weave myself into the story I hope to tell. Two of my great-times-8-grandparents are Kekaulike and Kekuʻiapoiwa Nui, the parents of Kamehamehanuiʻailūʻau. Though distant, these moʻokūʻauhau connections of kinship emphasize the care and aloha I must engender to tell this story within a Hawaiian ethic of storytelling.

Kamehamehanuiʻailūʻau was the uncle and namesake of King Kamehameha I, the great unifier of the Hawaiian Islands, and the aliʻi who defeated Mahi’s father Kalanihoʻoulemokuikekai at the Battle of Nuʻuanu. Kamehameha I then adopted Mahi Kalanihoʻoulemokuikekai in the custom of aliʻi adopting the aliʻi of defeated chiefs that was prominent at the time. The pilina between aliʻi was kept sacred, even through the heat of protracted wars over territory. Mahi was a high chiefess of Oʻahu during the time of...
Kamehameha placing her in a very important position at the turn of the 19th century. Oliver Holmes, a trader from New Bedford, Massachusetts would marry Mahi and they had a child named Hannah Holmes, mother to William Heath Mahi Davis.

Davis’ father also came from a distinguished parentage, descended from the old guard of families that composed the original New England settlers. He claimed lineages that include General William Heath, a Revolutionary War general who enjoyed a closeness to George Washington and was one of the last surviving generals of the American Continental Army. In addition, Robert Davis, his paternal grandfather, participated in the Boston Tea Party.

At once, William Heath Davis’ lineages link him both to the origin story of the settler colonial United States through the American Revolution, while also enfolding him in the ali‘i of Hawai‘i. It is curious that Davis never directly mentions his ancestry in his autobiography. Historian Andrew Rolle’s biography takes lengths to outline these facts about his genealogy, while Davis himself seems to cast these things aside. Perhaps he figured those that would read it would know his ancestral pilina? Historial Charles Churchill attributes this to the inferior status in the racial order of California accorded to Kanaka Maoli, implying that Davis strategically avoided mentioning his ancestry to escape the racist attitudes of the time.55

In any case, he begins his first autobiography *Sixty Years in California* with his first visit to Kaleponi: “My first visit to California was in 1831, in the bark ‘Louisa’ of Boston, captain George Wood, with J.C. Jones as supercargo and owner and Charles Smith as assistant supercargo.”56 In fact, Davis neglects to mention anything of Hawai‘i in over 600 pages of the

book beyond his business dealings. There is essentially no account in his autobiography of his relationship with Hawai‘i or his Hawaiian relatives. Despite this Rolle makes a small note of Davis’ connection: “There were, of course, his Hawaiian relatives and Davis kept up his contacts with them.” Rolle even seems to imply a persevering connection with Hawai‘i: “Yet he seemed unable to forget the Hawaii of his youth in spite of the unhappiness caused him by several years of legal disputes over various family lands.” What are we to make of this discrepancy? Why did Davis not account for this relationship in his autobiography? In any case, Davis seemed to have a tenuous relationship not only with Hawai‘i, but with his ‘ohana, complicating an analysis of mo‘okū‘auhau through his own kinship.

However, mo‘okū‘auhau is a multiplicitous element of Hawaiian culture where Kānaka Maoli will, at times, genealogize to a general kinship tie to Hawaiian nationhood. Phrases like “our kūpuna” or “our ancestors” in reference to broader, collective constructions of ancestry serve to reference a national cultural identity, rather than specific ancestors. These expansive allusions to national identity provide the basis for a sense of kinship not only across genealogies, but also physical spaces. Not only that, but the concept of pilina provides another avenue of connection that can encompass a sense of mo‘okū‘auhau. It is from this combined sense of pilina and mo‘okū‘auhau that I derive a sense of connection to William Heath Mahi Davis. Davis’ historical presence in Kaleponi acts as a reference point to help locate myself within a historical Hawaiian nationhood - in acknowledgement of that presence, I draw myself into the genealogical relationship that he established by contributing to his historical memory. These efforts to locate myself within a larger history of California Hawaiians by using William Heath Mahi Davis’ life produces a sense of kuleana. This kuleana is defined in terms of Indigenous-to-Indigenous
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relationships. Davis’ subjectivity as an Indigenous settler implies certain obligations towards acknowledging his role in the settler colonial process. After all, Davis was one of California’s most notable pioneers during a period in which California Native life was substantially disrupted.

**Davis as Settler and Indigenous**

To address Davis’ interactions with Native California peoples, I refer to Ashlyn Weaver’s study of the racializations of diaspora Hawaiians in California in the 19th century:

Historical evidence reveals that while Native Hawaiians were recognized by Euro-American settler society as culturally, distinct, they did not consider Native Hawaiians as social equals. According to Chang (2011), settlers failed to take into account the dramatic social and cultural differences between Native Hawaiians and the Native American populations alongside whom they lived and worked as immigrants to California (Chang 2015). (Weaver)

Kānaka Maoli had arrived in Kaleponi in numbers as the need for cheap labor in pioneering efforts drew in populations from various places. Despite the role they played in this, white society largely rejected Hawaiians and relegated them to status as savages. Weaver demonstrates that Davis was observant of this: “Churchill tells us that William Heath Davis exclaimed during his stay in California, ‘The Hawaiians on the coast were - like the Indians - the common laborers, often little better than slaves, and clearly at the bottom of the social and racial hierarchy.’”

Weaver draws on the work of David Chang, who has illuminated the 19th and 20th century history of interactions between Kānaka Maoli and California Native people to demonstrate how discursive moves made by Euro-Americans to construe Native Hawaiians as savages depended on the comparisons between Kānaka and California Natives.

---

Despite Davis’ recognition of this, his biography tells of his attempts to develop New Town San Diego, takes up the “discourse of civilization”, in which he derided certain groups of “Indians” as uncivilized or primitive. Having married into the Spanish gentry of California, Davis’ laudatory tone of the California Missions was linked inextricably to his denigration of Native peoples in his biography. Of the Mission system, he was staunch in his praise:

The first priests who established the Missions were directly from Spain. They were superior men in point of talent, education, morals and executive ability, as the success of the Missions under their establishment and administration showed. They seemed to be entirely disinterested, their aim and ambition being to develop the country, and civilize and Christianize the Indians, for which purpose the Missions were established. They worked zealously and untiringly in this behalf, and to them must be given the credit for what advancement in civilization, intelligence, industry, good habits and good morals pertained to the country at that day, when they laid the foundation of the present advanced civilization and development of the country. (Davis)

For Davis, the expansion of the settler state of California was an unquestionable moral good. When he wrote about clashes between Native people and Californians, he consistently foisted blame onto the former: “The battle raged all day, the savages shoring great stubbornness in continuing it.”60 He appraises the outcome of the battle as successful: “Their leader, when taken, was found to be wounded. He and the more prominent of the band under him were immediately beheaded. The remainder were turned over to the Mission of Santa Clara to be civilized and Christianized anew.”61 The discourse of civilization is reified consistently throughout Davis’ autobiographies as he recounted raids and battles between settlers and California Natives.

Davis’ exploits in San Diego are also marked by settler colonial discourse. Davis wrote about the “Indian outbreak reaching San Diego.” By portraying Native people in the language of

60 William Heath Davis, *Sixty Years in California: A History of Events and Life in California; Personal, Political and Military, under the Mexican Regime; during the Quasi-Military Government of the Territory by the United States, and after the Admission of the State into the Union, Being a Compilation by a Witness of the Events Described* (San Francisco: A.J. Leary, 1889), [http://archive.org/details/sixtyyearsincali00davirich](http://archive.org/details/sixtyyearsincali00davirich).
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disease, they are relegated to the position similar to a natural disaster that befalls the noble California gentry class that Davis admired so greatly. Davis’ description of the Kumeyaay further reinforced his fear of “savages”: “The same tribe of Indians had made several attacks upon the Presidio of San Diego for the purpose of plunder, and the capture of women, but were frustrated; and also pursued and severely chastised. The savages in that part of the country had the reputation of being braver and better fighters than those in the north. The San Diego Indians ate the meat of horses as well as of cattle.”

For an economy-driven man like Davis, Native people were simply hindrances to his success as a trader and developer. Like other pioneers of the day, Indigenous people either were “unproductive” occupants of lands ripe for development or populations that were valuable insofar as cheap labor could be extracted from them.

Davis’ substantial role in the settlement of California fits neatly within the context of his overtly Christian-influenced discourse of civilization. Davis saw himself as a key figure within the expansion of Euro-American settlement in California, as he served in many important roles throughout the state. He assisted Sutter in the development of what would become Sacramento, owned property in San Francisco, and mingled with the landed gentry class of California. Accordingly, his desire to establish a large city in San Diego by his hand fit neatly with the larger context of his business ventures. He entered into a partnership with Andrew Gray, Jose Antonio Aguirre, Miguel de Pedrorena, and William C. Ferrell, and they obtained a land grant of 160 acres for the site of their prospective city. One of Davis’ first major contributions to the development of the inchoate New Town San Diego was the construction of a wharf, made with timber which he shipped from San Francisco. Davis also understood the military importance of a harbor like San Diego: “New Town’s promoters wisely gave a tract of land to the government on

---
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which to build the San Diego Barracks and from 1852 to 1920 several hundred men were usually stationed there.”

Despite such ambition, the San Diego venture was not successful for Davis and his partners. Piling debt in his northern California properties, an inability to entice buyers to come settle in San Diego, and failed expeditions to find coal and gold in the county eventually toppled Davis’ and his partner’s dreams. However, Davis was adamant that he had left his mark as the original founder of New Town San Diego. As such, he reported his involvement in the eventual prominence of San Diego with pride in an 1887 interview with a San Diego newspaper: “Of the new town of San Diego, now the city of San Diego, I can say that I was its founder.” Davis went on to describe the process he undertook in appraising the site of San Diego and developing the first “American” structures on it, distinct from the old Spanish settlements at the Mission and Presidio. He concludes the interview with a scant retelling of what he perceived to be the cause of failure to establish a lasting settlement: “At that time I predicted that San Diego would become a great commercial seaport, from its fine geographical position and from the fact that it was the only good harbor south of San Francisco. Had it not been for our civil war, railroads would have reached here years before Stanford’s road was built for our wharf was ready for business”. Though Davis bemoaned the failure for his vision of San Diego to come to fruition, Rolle maintains, “In some respects, Davis deserved more credit than he received.”

---
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Kuleana of Moʻokūʻauhau Memory

If Davis is to be credited with the founding of a major American city, complications arise in the kilo mua goals of using historical memory to gain a sense of kuleana. Doing so requires a profound acknowledgment of the ways that American expansionism contributed to Indigenous genocide. It requires one to question the ways that such an acknowledgment can be rooted in a Hawaiian ethic of Indigeneity. Here, I look towards Kēhaulani Vaughn’s study of the 1992 Treaty of Friendship and Mutual Recognition between Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i and the Juaneno Band of Mission Indians, Ajachemen Nation. Vaughn recounts the histories of Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i as an organization primarily concerned with the cause of Hawaiian sovereignty: “Overall, Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i was committed to honoring the prior commitments and relationships of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i while creating new diplomatic relations that epitomized Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i as an international actor.”

Using Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua’s four goals of Hawaiian Studies, research, Vaughn demonstrates how the treaty acts as a political expression of trans-Indigenous solidarity. Vaughn urges diaspora Hawaiians, such as herself, to seek out these solidarities with Indigenous people on the continent:

As more people move to southern California, it is vital to center Native life and build relationships among Indigenous communities that directly honor the people of the land. This includes Native Hawaiians living in California and in the broader diaspora. Trans-Indigenous recognitions, as exemplified by treaty-making, demonstrate intentions that surpass a sole community’s survival and create a larger shared community of Indigenous survivance in California and Hawai‘i. Therefore, alongside other Native Hawaiian scholars, I argue that we should not only embody a praxis of kuleana, but also acknowledge the Native Hawaiian values of ea, pono, and lāhui that are central for Hawaiian studies and for a healthy Hawaiian nation - including those in the diaspora. (Vaughn)

---

Vaughn encourages solidarity building on the basis of mutual Indigeneity, while articulating this through a “praxis of kuleana”. Here lies a prime opportunity to frame a kilo mua analysis of William Heath Mahi Davis within the moʻokūʻauhau-kuleana-ʻike framework of this thesis.

As this thesis is eminently concerned with the topic of diaspora, kilo mua stands as a potent tool for investigating the ways that historical memory conjures kuleana on the basis of shared Kānaka Maoli cultural identity and memory. Though I do not claim direct ancestry to William Heath Mahi Davis, his life represents a significant episode in the broad timeline of California Hawaiians, the community I claim proximity to, whereby Kānaka Maoli are shown to have been interwoven with the history of modern San Diego. Indeed, this simultaneously enfolds Hawaiians within a history of settler colonialism in California, requiring one to be wary of the pitfalls of vacuous celebratory remembrances that seek to uncritically gain purchase in the origin story of the settler state for the purpose of acceptance within the neoliberal multicultural order. Rather, a kilo mua analysis grounded in Hawaiian/Indigenous ethics of historical memory pushes the researcher to take seriously the social-cultural-political ramifications in both the past and present. By claiming proximity to Davis, I do not seek to reify claims to belonging within the American body politic, but rather to contend with the kuleana obligations that the proximity entails. Here, the Kānaka Maoli moral orientation towards ʻike is revealed. As Meyer reminds us, ʻike should have utility for it to be validated within a Hawaiian epistemology. If ʻike is to have utility, the attendant associations with ʻike must be critically regarded.

For myself, as a mea haku mua, I am obligated to weave the past with the present and future. The associations with Davis I feel not only prompt me to think about how to reconcile the historical memory of Kānaka Maoli involvement in settler colonialism, but also to understand how I can rectify historical injustice through an ethic of mutual Indigeneity. In fact, by
understanding the past, one is able to gain clarity about the ways that a future can be created that tends to crucial linkages between Native peoples. Through my investigation of the wāhi of Davis’ life, I seek to locate myself not only with a Kānaka Maoli timespace, but also to that of the Kumeyaay whose land I derive my connection to Davis through. This ‘ike then becomes an affirmation of the kuleana I hold as an Indigenous settler.

William Heath Davis Photo: UC Berkeley

**Praxis, Peoplehood, and Positionality**

In Chapter 3, I discussed a ceremony I took part in at the West Berkeley Shellmound, the most sacred site of the Ohlone people. That would not be the end of the assemblages of solidarity
I would experience by the end of the summer. When I returned to San Diego, I continued to undertake the role my kuleana asked of me - advocating for Mauna Kea in Kaleponi. This brought me to a warehouse in Logan Heights to participate in a ceremony in a series of many that supported the Run4Salmon, a campaign led by Chief Caleen Sisk to bring back the salmon to the territory of the Winnemum Wintu of Northern California. As the Run4Salmon campaign coursed throughout California, spreading the message it enfolded other Indigenous social justice campaigns into its calls for justice.

As I walked into the warehouse timidly, I was greeted by a big hug from Kumu Mikilani Young, a kumu hula who held a large presence in Southern California and was at the forefront of the Southern California campaigns to Protect Mauna Kea. Alongside her were Chief Caleen Sisk, Niria Alicia, and representatives from the Kumeyaay tribe, Indigenous women representing Kānaka Maoli, Winnemum Wintu, Kumeyaay, and others. The event was held to promote the demands that we all held in regards to the protection of our lifeways, but there was no feeling that we were competing or vying for space. Rather, Chief Caleen pointed out that the protection of one of our sacred sites brought in the sacredness of all of our sacred sites, articulating the solidarities that bound us together, some as Indigenous settlers and others as Indigenous. As Chief Caleen told the story of the salmon, how the Shasta dam had prevented them from making their yearly migration, I thought about how Niria Alicia had taught me that movement itself was sacred. It resonated with me as I recalled that many Hawaiian moʻolelo begin or end with the gods traveling between Hawaiʻi and Kahiki.

Chief Caleen affirmed the commonalities further when she shared how the salmon Native to the territory of the Winnemum Wintu had genetic descendants in Aotearoa. The tribe had journeyed to the Southern Hemisphere to bring back some salmon to Winnemum Wintu
homeland to return the sacred fish to their homelands. She had also mentioned that, on their way home, the salmon were relieved with the cool ice from Mauna Kea to swim in. This moment was one of deep revelation, where the kuleana I had as a Kānaka Maoli whose birth sands were in Kaleponi emerged further. All the overlapping layers of pilina washed over me. Chief Caleen had traveled to Aotearoa, just as my ancestors likely had and cultivated relationships with the Maori, a people Kānaka Maoli consider cousins. On her return trip, she traveled to our most sacred temple to replenish the life force of the sacred fish she hoped to repatriate back to her territory. I wondered how I, as a Hawaiian, could be the metaphorical mountain ice that helped carry the salmon home.

In remembering this cherished moment, I recall the songs the Kumeyaay tribe opened the event with that night - beautiful, resonant bird songs that filled the room with warmth and depth. They offered their songs to the protection of Mauna Kea and the return of the salmon back to Winnemum Wintu. In reawakening these memories, I wonder how to reconcile their presence with the memory I bring to the fore in this chapter. Through kilo mua, I beckon Davis into the present, hoping to make clear my pilina to the place I was born and the people of that land. This work functions as a mechanism for reifying connections to my fellow Hawaiians, while simultaneously expressing a commitment to coming to relationships with the Indigenous people whose land I have lived as a guest on.
In December of 2018, I became pāʻele. Pāʻele is the ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi word to denote the blackness derived from the traditional tattooing process. I remember starting on my journey, asking whether or not I should even be tattooed in the first place. After all, from what I had known, tattoos were to be earned, the sacred marks denoting achievement or high status. Nonetheless, my body ached to be adorned with the lineages I had come from. I called the kahuna mea kākau, the tattoo practitioner, humbly asking if I could even consider becoming pāʻele. I remember explaining to him that I had grown up in Kaleponi, separated from ʻāina and from significant access to ‘ike Hawaiʻi. I didn’t expect him to echo the same story back to me. He also explained to me that, for Kānaka Maoli, earning kākau consists of living up to your kuleana to uphold your moʻokūʻauhau, lāhui, and yourself after you are tattooed, not before. I nodded earnestly.

He had also grown up in Kaleponi, but wore the title of kahuna, bestowed upon him after years and years of studying the practice in Hawaiʻi and Samoa. As he relayed his life story to me, I grew more and more elated, thinking that I had found good news, someone who understood my insecurities about being from the diaspora. However, I remembered one of the burdens I carried in from Kaleponi - my family had no knowledge of my moʻokūʻauhau beyond my great grandparents. How could I be marked with the symbols of my genealogy when I didn't even know the names of my kūpuna? He threw me a lifeline, assuring me that as long as I could give him the names of my great grandparents, he could bring out all the names that came before them. I sent him the information he asked for and patiently waited.
A couple of months later, I received a message from him with detailed family information, tracing my genealogy back to the beginning of Hawaiian time. Generations upon generations full of names cascaded forth, encouraging me to commemorate my kuleana to them through the process of kākau. From then on, I spent hours and hours memorizing generations, looking for names I might recognize. I pored over pages and pages of historical documents about the places the names came from. Finally, the time was right for me to affirm my kuleana in blood and ink.

We met at Keaīwa Heiau in the ahupuaʻa of Aiea to finally consecrate my skin with the patterns the kahuna had designed to represent my moʻokūʻauhau. Keaīwa has historically functioned as a heiau of healing. I wondered about what the kahuna of ka wā kahiko would think of a Kanaka Maoli born 2500 miles away, receiving kākau in this place. Would they think it was healing, too? Would they recognize me as one of them? Would I recognize my kuleana to them? I took a deep breath and listened to the tap of the tools as I waited patiently for answers to be carved into my body.

Fig. 4 My completed alaniho, December 2019
To Research One’s Own

To move onto the final leg of this journey of kilo mua, this thesis will delve into the moʻolelo derived from ethnographic walaʻau sessions with diaspora Kānaka Maoli. These sessions were recruited through word of mouth, social media, and email and were conducted through Zoom for forty-five minutes to an hour. Each collaborator identified with the label of diaspora in different ways from one another and from even their past selves, resulting in a broad range of experiences represented. This chapter seeks to contextualize these fifteen Kānaka Maoli and how their identities are described, constituted, and articulated through reflexive practices of storytelling about collective and personal Hawaiian identity formation. Through kilo mua, this chapter will seek to bring these experiences into conversation with one another, demonstrating the nuances and intricacies of Hawaiian identity that are shared with or distinct from one another.

Discourses about diaspora Kānaka Maoli are often couched in the presumption of tragedy - the dismemberment from culture and land or the assumed rejection of Native Hawaiian society and identity by the individual(s). Rather, the stories shared by the Kānaka I spoke with describe a profound intellectual reckoning with Hawaiian culture and identity, success in cultivating Hawaiianess through gaining ʻike, and frequent homegoing voyages back to Hawaiʻi. All of these components contribute a recurrence of the themes mentioned in previous chapters about Ka Ipumakani a Laʻamaomao and William Heath Davis - the primacy of moʻokūʻauhau in determining proximity and claims to Hawaiian identity, processes of recognition of
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pilina/kuleana both for the Kānaka themselves and those around them, and the centrality of ‘ike and proficiency.

Many of the participants I spoke to offered commentary on the deference of blood quantum to moʻokūʻauhau in regards to claimancy over Hawaiian identity. In Rona Halualani’s study of the cultural politics of Hawaiian identity, she terms conversations about the specific amount of Hawaiian ancestry one has as “blood talk”, in which the metaphor of blood serves as a quantitative indicator for proximity to Hawaiian identity and claimancy towards Hawaiinanness.\(^70\) Halualani findings show a pervasive preoccupation with blood quantum and its trappings: “Deeply held within the private memory of Kanaka Maoli (indigenous Hawaiians), blood quantum invocations culturally work as historical recollections of being denied indigenous recognition (and sovereignty) and serve as departure points from the sweeping, non-discriminating identity sentiment, ‘Hawaiianness at heart,’ in addition to illustrating in part the unquestionable discursive influence of the racial order encoded by policy and law.”\(^71\) The Kānaka of Halualani’s study diverge from those I spoke to in this sense. Nearly twenty years after the publication of Halualani’s *In the Name of Hawaiians*, Kānaka Maoli in the diaspora prioritize the concept of moʻokūʻauhau, though in varying degrees.

Though shifting intra-family dynamics, physical separation, and lack of institutional resources sometimes stifle diaspora Hawaiians’ desires to profess detailed knowledge about their moʻokūʻauhau, they find ways to allude to belonging through lineage. Rather, there is a generous allusion to a broader moʻokūʻauhau that explicitly designates one as a descendant of pre-contact Hawaiians, while simultaneously expressing a working progression towards gaining specific

\(^70\) Rona Tamiko Halualani, *In the Name of Hawaiians: Native Identities and Cultural Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
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knowledge of ancestry. Further, the high stakes of verification of Hawaiian identity are produced and amplified contextually, where the historical place of moʻokūʻauhau as a traditional practice to gain proficiency becomes an obligation for diaspora Hawaiians in the present-day. Hence, the colonial technology of blood quantum is supplanted by a Kānaka Maoli indicator of belonging. The cultural currency and import represented by the metaphor of blood is transferred to the acknowledgment of moʻokūʻauhau as the defining factor for membership in the Hawaiian community.

After making this shift towards a Hawaiian-centric means of identifying oneself within a constellation of Hawaiian social and cultural networks, diaspora Kānaka Maoli seek to contextualize themselves in terms of kuleana and pilina. Kuleana is defined through a discursive and relational negotiation proffered through real-life experiences both in and outside Hawaiʻi. This negotiation is both a personal and community process and is founded on relative positionality within the lāhui. I invoke the cultural value of haʻahaʻa to describe this desire to act within positionality. Haʻahaʻa is an ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi term denoting broadly cultural humility, to describe the foundation that diaspora Hawaiians use in these negotiations. Haʻahaʻa may then also be contrasted with mahaʻoi, an undesirable trait in Hawaiian culture where one oversteps social boundaries through a rupture in the accepted code of kuleana. Diaspora Hawaiians express their desire to display haʻahaʻa in interactions with on-island Hawaiians, particularly in spaces where cultural knowledge and Hawaiianness is front and center in a deliberate demonstration of Hawaiian cultural values. Nonetheless, there are nuances within the community, wherein some diaspora Hawaiians report a stricter set of cultural standards imposed on them, despite their haʻahaʻa, creating a demand to prove oneself within the cultural community in ways that they perceive on-island Hawaiians are excused from. Others feel as if their tendency towards haʻahaʻa
serves as a way to permit them entry into Hawaiian spaces, resulting in a recognition of their inherent proximity to Hawaiinanness, granted by moʻokū‘auhau.

Indeed, the process of recognition between Hawaiians is mediated in part by proficiency, creating a paradoxical relationship for some. At once, pressures to embody haʻahaʻa prevent or discourage diaspora Hawaiians from taking up space in places where ‘ike is honed, but proficiency and ‘ike are a means for verifying one’s pilina and kuleana and entrance to the community. At once, ‘ike Hawai‘i is both a part of a progressive goal towards and the means of access to acceptance within the lāhui. Thus, diaspora Kānaka Maoli are pressed to discover ways of attaining ‘ike Hawai‘i, both on their own and in community, as a means of overcoming barriers to acceptance.

The moʻolelo offered here as part of this thesis by these collaborators construct a picture of the Hawaiians in the diaspora deeply concerned not only with reinscribing claims to Hawaiianeness, but the desire to do so in a culturally appropriate manner. Kānaka Maoli in the diaspora have iteratively become historically aware of the methods inchoate to colonialism that have bludgeoned cultural and kinship ties, resulting in a community with a keen sense of their kuleana as Hawaiians to restore them. Diaspora Kānaka deftly navigate spaces both within and without Hawai‘i which allow them to perceive the uniqueness of Hawaiian cultural values and strive towards cultivating them deliberately. In these stories are potent, restorative visions of Hawaiian identity preservation and resurgence in the diaspora, through the Hawaiian cultural regimes of moʻokū‘auhau, kuleana, and ‘ike.
Sacred Moʻokūʻauhau and Sanguine Metaphors

In pre-contact Hawaiʻi, Kānaka Maoli introduced themselves with lengthy oral recitations of ancestral lineage, which demonstrated the primacy of moʻokūʻauhau in Hawaiian society. Moʻokūʻauhau undergirded many aspects of Hawaiian life as it was often a precondition for entering into certain relationships, access to physical spaces, and distribution of labor roles. Moʻokūʻauhau served as a mediating base for Hawaiian society in which the attainment of mana, sometimes translated as ‘spiritual power’, was a central goal. Mana could be transferred through hereditary means, making moʻokūʻauhau a marker of one’s spiritual and cultural largesse.

Even as Hawaiʻi was united and transformed into a constitutional monarchy, moʻokūʻauhau remained a pivotal component of Hawaiian society. Hawaiian-language newspapers published lengthy genealogies of famous chiefs and figures from moʻolelo. Debates about the methodology of procuring these genealogies proliferated the op-ed sections of these newspapers. Publications of moʻokūʻauhau in newspapers persevered into the 1930s. Hawaiian-language newspapers featured genealogies several generations long, underscoring that, even through American annexation, Hawaiians still understood moʻokūʻauhau to have a central place in culture and society. Despite this, the confounding logic of blood quantum lay on the horizon.

J. Kēhaulani Kauanui discusses the effect of the 1921 imposition of blood quantum on the cultural politics of Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi in her book *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. In 1921, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was passed, designating homesteading lands in Hawaiʻi for those qualifying as “native Hawaiian”,
denoting people who are defined as having 50 percent Hawaiian blood. The introduction of this 50 percent threshold demarcated discursive boundaries between sets of Hawaiians based on whether or not their quantum qualified them for Hawaiian Homesteads. As native Hawaiians became able to live on homesteads, these areas were discursively portrayed as sites for demonstrating authentic Hawaiian identity. The implication of this led to associations of blood quantum with a graduated view of claims to Hawaiianness. Hawaiianness, in this case, refers both to assumptions of cultural authority vis-a-vis cultural competency as well as essentialist notions of the impacts of social injustice. In essence, the higher one’s blood quantum, the higher the perceived claims to ‘ike and need for Hawaiian-serving programs.

As such, the metaphor of blood not only served as a colonial technology, but is naturalized to the Kānaka Maoli cultural vernacular. One collaborator explicitly mentioned their own quantum unprompted as a way of introducing themselves:

As a Hawaiian or part Hawaiian, it's a good question, because I'm very much mixed. I recently did 23andme and I have to tell you, Keoni, I was kind of disappointed in that I'm eight percent and my Hawaiianess is probably the part of my heritage that I most associate with...And now that I know the full makeup of my genetics, it's kind of interesting. But so to people who are not Hawaiian, I would say, yeah, that I am part Hawaiian, but I also want to give reverence to people who are full Hawaiian.

Their expressed disappointment in the numerical value of their quantum points to a view that does not necessarily presume Hawaiianess as quantifiable, but rather one in which quantum determines one’s claimancy to Hawaiianess. This contention is confirmed by their description of themselves shifting from “Hawaiian” to “part Hawaiian” and further affirmed by their deference to those who are full Hawaiians. Here, the phrase “part Hawaiian” elides mahaʻoi

---

72 Kauanui discusses the differentiation between native Hawaiian and Native Hawaiian as a means of distinguishing discrete political-cultural groups within the Hawaiian community.

73 Rona Tamiko Halualani, *In the Name of Hawaiians: Native Identities and Cultural Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
claims to Hawaiianness, while conveying a sense of partial connection. While this mention of quantum went unprompted, blood quantum vernacular sometimes appears as a method of confirmation and recognition:

When I say, “Oh, I’m Hawaiian.” The first question that I always get is well, how much? People always ask that.

Blood quantum has become infixed to the everyday Hawaiian parlance such that even casual conversation may result in the summoning of blood. Another collaborator emphasized their personal proximity to these “full Hawaiians” through confirmation of familial relationship to a full Hawaiians and alluding to membership in a Hawaiian cultural body based on blood:

And my grandmother was full Kanaka. We not only grew up around Hawaiian culture, our koko, we have koko, Hawaiian blood. But my grandma was really weird about teaching us some things because she was in that era where they would literally beat people if they spoke Hawaiian. She told me one time that she got caught speaking Hawaiian and they electrocuted her. They gave her electroshock therapy in the islands.

By tracing their lineage to their grandma, this collaborator engaged in the act of proving their claims to Hawaiianness, while avoiding mentioning their own blood quantum. Additionally, higher blood quantum is subtly linked to social injustice, which takes the form of linguistic eradication in this case. These assertions that full Hawaiians have deeper claims to Hawaiianness and the subtle associations made with cultural loss contribute to and reflect common sense understandings of blood quantum as the central indicator of identity. As such, Kānaka Maoli are naturalized to the discourse of quantification of identity.

Despite this, collaborators frequently worked to assert claims to Hawaiianness through the affirmation of moʻokūʻauhau and lineal descent. For one collaborator in their early twenties
who was raised in Southern California, attending the University of Hawai‘i shifted their preexisting criteria for tracing Hawaiian identity:

> When I got to UH, I started learning you don't have to judge your Hawaiian identity off of blood quantum. You have the moʻokūʻauhau. And I say, all right, you can go by it, your genealogy. And that's how you identify you’re Hawaiian. You don't have to go by the colonial notion of blood quantum, you’re Hawaiian just as long as you go back and you can trace your lineage back. And so that was something that definitely was like a journey for me. And it's something that was like, wow, like to realize that because that idea was planted so long ago, it affected me in my upbringing. Up until the point where I was able to actually learn that, oh, wow, like, that's a fake concept that they created to divide us.

For many, the unlearning of blood talk in the Kānaka Maoli vernacular was a process they observed secondhand, which points towards the fact that shifts towards moʻokūʻauhau as a determinant for Hawaiianness have been somewhat recent. Here, this unlearning process directly followed a voyage of homegoing from Kaleponi to Hawai‘i. In some ways, barriers to claims of Hawaiian identity, such as blood quantum and diaspora status are discursively intertwined as one collaborator noted:

> I think being a Hawaiian in California doesn't make you any less Hawaiian despite blood quantum or anything, I think there's always still time to learn about your genealogy and your culture, regardless of where you are, as long as you are willing to learn.

Here, blood quantum is paired alongside diaspora subjectivities, signifying salient associations between the primacy of blood quantum and the devaluing of diaspora status. Nonetheless, they contend a potentiality for making claims towards Hawaiianness through privileging moʻokūʻauhau. ‘Ike about genealogy upends the erasing logic of blood quantum. Blood quantum logics inevitably lock Hawaiianness into a state of gradual disappearance, consigning the Hawaiian into a prophecy of extinction. Moʻokūʻauhau acts as a reinforcing practice against the equivocation of quantum and claims to Hawaiianness. It should be noted that this collaborator
does not necessarily express that moʻokūʻauhau stands alone as a matter-of-fact point of access to Hawaiinanness, but specific knowledge about genealogy is the precondition for being Hawaiian, a theme which will be explored later in this chapter.

The Cultural Politics of Kuleana and Recognition

Diaspora Hawaiians, in acknowledgment of their moʻokūʻauhau, venture forth to locate themselves within the cultural-political matrix of kuleana by navigating overlapping processes of recognition. Through the initial process of recognition involving the invocation of moʻokūʻauhau preferentially over blood quantum, diaspora Hawaiians move towards a culturally-mindful framework of identity. They make attempts to locate the nature of their kuleana, while simultaneously reifying the transitory nature of kuleana by recognizing that their status as diaspora differentiates them from on-island Hawaiians. While doing so, they enact haʻahaʻa to ensure that they are acting within the cultural strictures, once again adducing Kānaka Maoli protocols to determine what actions to take. As such, they undertake journeys to attain recognition, both from Hawaiians from Hawaiʻi, fellow diaspora Hawaiians, and even non-Hawaiians.

For some collaborators, kuleana was defined explicitly through familial pilina emphasizing the importance of moʻokūʻauhau in the formulation of ancestral obligations:

That knowledge got lost somewhere along the way and through hula and through conversations with people like you like, this stuff is coming back in like it's not an option to let it go away anymore, like I have to tell her. I just feel such a deep need for my daughter. I think that's our kuleana. I feel such a deep obligation and responsibility to do that for her, but mostly for my grandmother. I have this picture of my mom and my grandmother that I look at every day.
Here, a collaborator I spoke with couched their kuleana within a multigenerational assemblage of pilina. In fact, this articulation is representative of the threefold Hawaiian ontology of body in which three piko of the human body correspond to three markers of generational time, the piko poʻo (wā mua), piko waena (kēia ao), and piko maʻi (wā hope). Kuleana is the establishing factor for the maintenance and cultivation of Hawaiian identity, but also serves as a cultural tool to determine how Hawaiian identity should be expressed. In addition to this, one collaborator noted the multiplicity of kuleana in that it can come to mean many things:

So when I first heard the word kuleana, it's like, Oh, it's just responsibility. Like, OK this is easy, I can write about this, but as I went through my schooling here and different internship opportunities as well as work opportunities I realize like kuleana is not just like your responsibilities that you have to do for the task that you commit to. It's more of, for me, my kuleana goes way more than just my work kuleana, my school kuleana; it's my kuleana for my family, for my ancestors, like what do I need to do to make them proud, but also figure out who I am too.

Once again, the emphasis of moʻokūʻauhau in the establishment of kuleana remains an important impetus for engaging with Hawaiian identity critically. Not only does it refer to the tasks demanded of a Kanaka Maoli, but also to the drive for self-exploration and locating oneself within a cultural history.

Because kuleana is role and place specific, there is no concrete endpoint for finding out what one’s obligation within the Hawaiian community is. Indeed, as the example of Ka Ipumakani a Laʻamaomao demonstrates, kuleana has transitory properties that can complexify diaspora Hawaiians’ quest for searching out their kuleana endlessly. One collaborator expressed the mutable nature of kuleana in the context of their career trajectory:

I'm sorry, but I unfortunately, I'm doing poetry. And I'm not going to go back and get my Hawaiian language degree, I would love to, but you know, I just don't have time and it's
just because everything is always changing with my kuleana and what I feel I need to do is always changing.

As such, events such as when Kānaka Maoli move from one place to another result in re-negotiations of kuleana. The collaborator quoted above also reckoned deeply with the potential career path of teaching children in Waiʻanae, a historically disinvested community on Oʻahu with a high concentration of Hawaiian children. Though their partner was a kama‘āina to that place, they still grappled with the potential of teaching in Waiʻanae:

And then he kind of talks to me about how he really wants somebody like me to teach at like, Waiʻanae high school, for example, because he's like, you know, we need more teachers in a way like me, but like more. So like, we need more Hawaiian teachers who understand, like the Hawaiian experience in a way to be able to teach our kids that they're worthy right and that they don't have to change. And like all the things that, like white teachers have taught them, that is wrong is not really wrong, right? So that they don't have to do all this unlearning years later of, you know, the way people treated them in high school kind of thing. And so I was talking to him about how I was very uncomfortable with even trying to claim something like Waiʻanae, right? Like trying to say, Waiʻanae is my community?

Though they understood the importance of ensuring that Hawaiian children can be taught by Hawaiian teachers, their tendency towards haʻahaʻa induced them to hesitate away from the idea so as to dispel any misconceptions that they felt they were entitled to take up a position they felt held great importance. Additionally, the gravity of the pilina from kumu to haumāna is acknowledged here, where school kumu are one of the primary imparters of ʻike, a kuleana traditionally held by close family members.

Another collaborator noted a similar situation, in which their training as an environmental scientist would grant them job security in Hawaiʻi. As someone trained in the natural sciences, they recognized the tremendous negative impact that settler colonialism imposed on Hawaiʻi:

There's always jobs in my industry and my friends were always like, Hey, you should come move out here, and I would really love to go to the islands. The last time I visited, I
realized, with my ecologist lenses on, what a biological desert [O'ahu] has become because of all of the invasive species and the poor land management that's been instituted by settlers for so long. And it was shocking because in my mind as a child, I always saw Hawaii as this rich garden kind of place. But as a scientist, I saw it again and I was like, “This place has been massively abused and that sucks because it's by no fault of the people who are from here [Kanaka]”.

Nonetheless, they described not wanting to be maha‘oi and take up space they perceived belong naturally to kamaʻāina Hawaiians:

But I also kind of feel conflicted with that, because I don't know if I'm the best person to do that [habitat restoration] work. I don't know if that work is better done by people who are more Hawaiian like that's just kind of what I struggle with like, am I Hawaiian enough? Am I connected to this culture enough to step into that responsibility? Or is someone else better suited to it? Or is someone better? I don't know someone more deserving of that work because they're there [on the islands], right? So anyways, that's my thoughts on that, like taking space away from other Hawaiians or something like that.

Deference is given to Hawaiians from Hawai‘i, in particular those with cultural ‘ike, indicating a conception of kuleana attached to one’s proficiency in Hawaiian knowledge, despite the positive ramifications of a Kanaka environmental scientist from the diaspora working in Hawai‘i.

Haʻahaʻa becomes enmeshed with the quest to determine one’s responsibility.

Further, haʻahaʻa becomes a pathway to becoming familiar with cultural knowledge and is recognized as a Hawaiian cultural pillar in and of itself. One collaborator I spoke with emphasized the importance of humility:

When I think of people who a lot of times say they’re Hawaiian at heart or, you know, people who show an exuberant affinity for Native Hawaiian culture, I don't think they're like that. I don't think they second guess themselves and think, “Oh, am I being too much? Is it OK for me to know this or do this? I don't want to impose?” That consciousness or humility, to me, is a Native Hawaiian cultural attribute. I think that’s what I struggle with that because I see these people who are so overzealous and want, want, want and want the knowledge and are seeking out all of this information. And in a way, it's mahaʻoi. You're imposing yourself. And then there are people like us or other people who want to learn more, and we are being cognizant. We are trying to be
Respectful, and we ask ourselves, “Is this the right time?” And you might have had this thought, too, like the knowledge will come to me when it's meant for me. Ha’aha’a manifests as a twofold method for maintaining Hawaiian cultural boundaries, but also as a potential limiting factor. In this sense, Hawaiian cultural knowledge is understood as sacred practice to be gatekept and earned, rather than freely taken. After all, for many, the attainment of ʻike Hawaiʻi is a key step in the maintenance of Hawaiianness and in the process of recognition from other Hawaiians.

ʻIke Hawaiʻi as Hawaiian Identity

One commonality between nearly all the collaborators I spoke with was the centrality of Hawaiian knowledge as a verification of authentic Hawaiian identity. Different people referred to different specificities in regards to the kinds of knowledge that qualified as contributing to Kānaka Maoli identity, but were commonly referred to as “culture”, “history”, or even specific practices. While this is not necessarily a unique aspect of diaspora Hawaiians or even Hawaiianness, the emphasis on a rigorous working knowledge of the world, combined with the barriers to cultural ʻike in the Hawaiian diaspora creates a set of circumstances that provide for a significant addition to the discourse of Hawaiian identity. While Hawaiians have been grappling with the nature of belonging since time immemorial, modern day negotiations of identity are firmly rooted in the discourse of the Second Hawaiian Renaissance.

After decades of cultural denigration, Hawaiian cultural consciousness began to reconstitute itself in the 1960s. John Dominis Holt IV is often credited with catalyzing the movement with his book On Being Hawaiian in which he ponders deep questions of self and Hawaiian identity within a sociopolitical climate that was (and still is) generally hostile to Hawaiians. With this introspective look at Hawaiianness, Kānaka Maoli movements to recover
and amplify traditional cultural practices surged across the islands. Mele Hawai‘i, moʻolelo, hoʻolei, ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi, and aloha ʻāina were taken up by communities across Hawai‘i, but one of the most notable stories of the era was the revival of Hawaiian voyaging practices, hoʻokele.

The birth of the Polynesian Voyaging Society and the maiden voyage of the Hōkūleʻa in 1976 was a crowning achievement for Kānaka Maoli cultural nationhood. With the generosity and help of Satawalese pwo navigator Papa Mau Piailug, Hawaiians sailed to Tahiti without satellite navigation technology for the first time in centuries. As Hōkūleʻa sailed into Papeʻete, anthropological theories about Kānaka Maoli mindlessly drifting to Polynesia from South America disintegrated. The marked impact the revival of hoʻokele practices had on collective cultural esteem is impossible to measure, but it served as a beacon of hope for a shift in Hawaiian cultural pride. Hawaiians previously had experienced decades of degradation of their culture and identity. Shame about being Hawaiian permeated generations of Hawaiians, but the Hōkūleʻa served as a symbol for Hawaiian ingenuity, discursively linking Hawaiian knowledges and literacies with cultural and national pride.

Even in previous eras in Hawaiian history, ʻike had been linked to Hawaianness through the metaphor of blood as mentioned before. Hawaiians who had 50 percent blood quantum or more were perceived to be more culturally knowledgeable, rendering them deserving of homestead land, which they would use that cultural knowledge to cultivate. However, diaspora Hawaiians who I spoke to have foregone the primacy of blood quantum as a marker of proficiency in favor of an a posteriori understanding of ʻike as a precondition for identity claims. Rather than koko being the sole marker of claims to proficiency of ʻike, moʻokūʻauhau becomes the necessary prerequisite for accessing ʻike. ʻIke then functions as an indicator for recognition of fulfilling one’s kuleana that they derive from their moʻokūʻauhau. Proximity to ʻike was a
frequent theme present in the moʻolelo of my collaborators. In the introductory statements of one session, the collaborator listed all the cultural activities transmitted from their grandmother, despite shame around Hawaiianness:

And yeah, my grandma had a hard time growing up in that era, and she spoke ʻōlelo fluently, you know, but she wouldn’t teach us. She was my one speaker and she wouldn't teach us. She taught us words here and there. But the only customs she really taught us was hula and some of the food that they would make. Like she would make chicken long rice and kalua pig and all the classic stuff, you know. And but as far as language she was, I don't know if it was just the inherent fear of not wanting to teach us.

This statement reflected many diaspora Hawaiian anxieties about lack of cultural access due to separation not only from the cultural center of the community, but also from family members that may have had the knowledge. The period of time in which Hawaiianness was devalued and invisibilized has brought another layer of complication for all Hawaiians, whether in the diaspora or not. Nonetheless, some collaborators pointed to the higher proximity to cultural knowledge that kamaʻāina Hawaiians inhabit as a cause for divide within the lāhui:

And like protocol and ʻōlelo, you know, like. Like, I feel like that's that's what a lot of, I guess, Hawaiians are born and raised here and in the culture kind of look at when when I interact with them, like it may not be like explicitly look to my face, but the way a lot of Hawaiians who were born and raised in Hawaii treat diasporic Hawaiians is always as if we don't know enough, you know?

Cultural self-esteem among diaspora Hawaiians is inflected heavily by the lack of access to cultural knowledge in ways that are explicitly recognizable to the larger Hawaiian community. Though there are some sites of Hawaiian cultural cultivation and exploration in the diaspora, they are either sparse or sometimes unrecognized by kamaʻāina.⁷⁴ These embodied moments are enshrined in memory and function as barriers to connections between diaspora and kamaʻāina.

---

Nevertheless, many of my collaborators noted generative experiences they had in honing their ʻike to counteract these barriers. In some cases, this ʻike concerned traditional practices, while others procured a sense of identity through reading about Hawaiian identity, philosophy, and history. For several of the people I spoke with, hula stood out as a prominent commonality that granted them a sense of Hawaianness:

But it was really important for my dad and my mom that we connected with our Hawaiian culture. And so they put us in hula classes and I did hula for a few years.

To be completely honest, it was really hard for me, and I'm still struggling now with figuring out who I am as a Hawaiian because, you know, moving here, I thought I knew everything about Hawaii. I've come here before because growing up, I danced hula and Tahitian in Fremont. So that was kind of my bridge to who I was as a Hawaiian growing up in California. That's how I learned about who I was, but also found something that I really enjoyed doing.

We grew up dancing hula from a really early age. I think I was four years old. My grandmother danced hula and spoke Hawaiian.

And if there have been Native Hawaiians, I haven't really known how to seek them out except going through like a hālau. So what I've done has been in hula hālau, that's like how I have helped to reconnect and stay connected. That's been my lifeline. Hula is one of the Hawaiian traditional practices that have maintained unbroken lineages even through periods of cultural eradication. While there were bans on hula during the 19th century, hula practitioners continued to practice until a revival of hula prompted by King David Kalākaua. Its significance as a component of Hawaiian life is underscored by its ubiquity in Hawaiian moʻolelo, its place amongst aliʻi, and its informational richness. As Renee Pualani Louis notes, “Hula performances are the perfect multisensual delivery system of Kanaka Hawaiʻi spatial/temporal knowledges.” Its centrality to Hawaiian culture lends itself well to being an anchor for diaspora Hawaiians to maintain a sense of ʻike Hawaiʻi. Hula then accords diaspora

---

Hawaiians not only with the technical ‘ike involved in the physical process of dancing, but the ‘ike Hawai‘i embedded in the stories of places and people that they depict. Hula is a way for diaspora Hawaiians to overcome physical barriers to ‘āina and procure knowledge about ‘āina.

More intangible forms of knowledge also served as ways for diaspora Hawaiians to connect with their Hawaiianess. Similar to hula, ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i is seen as a central component in the constellation of ‘ike Hawai‘i. Due to the accessibility of online resources and widespread desire for Hawaiians to share access to language learning, using ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i as a marker of Hawaiian proficiency in ‘ike lends itself well to supporting diaspora. One collaborator mentioned their positive experience learning ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i at the University of Hawai‘i:

And so far. So far with, you know, going to UH, people who grew up in Hawaii have been very welcoming, especially in my ‘ōlelo class. My Hawaiian professor, who was born and raised in Hawaii, was amazing. She was very welcoming and understanding and kind of praised me, not kind of, she did praise me for coming back and like trying to learn the language.

Here, this collaborator reported a sense of acceptance and recognition fostered by the attainment of ‘ike. In this case, the physical act of homegoing also precipitated both the opportunity to hone language skills as well as the ability to learn from a Hawaiian professor in Hawai‘i. Another collaborator recounted their language story as it developed in Kaleponi:

But I remember, maybe when I was six years old, we were in Kaimukī in the family home with my grandmother. It was my birthday, and she was speaking to my uncle in Hawaiian, asking him to “go get the pie out of the kitchen to put candles on my birthday.” She was speaking a language with words I did not understand. However, I understood the aloha-filled intent. So that is iconic for me. I don't know why it sticks in my head, in my heart, but it does. And then three or four years later, I got enrolled in the Kamehameha Schools Ho‘omāka‘ika‘i Explorations program, Ho‘omāka‘ika‘i ‘73. And that changed my life. I. From then on, embarked on, well as much as I could from California, a goal to learn as much as I could about our heritage and our culture. I enrolled in a class at Berkeley, so driving from San Jose to Berkeley every Saturday to study Hawaiian language.
ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi serves as one of the most critical elements of reconnecting to Hawaiian identity for Kānaka in the diaspora, whether they are learning in Hawaiʻi or off-island. Its foundational place within the Hawaiian worldview is emphasized by ʻōlelo noʻeau such as “I ʻōlelo no ke ola, i ʻōlelo no ka make.” In language there is life, in language there is death. Diaspora Hawaiians, in making concentrated efforts to attain language skills, recognize its importance and, in turn are recognized by other Kānaka.

For one collaborator, they noted how ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi serves as a gateway to other forms of ʻike:

But on top of that, I think there's just the richness of not only like what is like the language itself, but kind of what's been stored in language you talk about like the fact that we have so many archives of newspapers and stuff like that.

The language is seen as having intrinsic, nominative status within the cultural vocabulary, but also acts as a portal to understanding historical sources, which this collaborator emphasized as crucial to Hawaiian identity formation. For one collaborator, historical ʻike undergirds a self-contained kuleana to help contextualize one’s own identity, but also the demonstration of ‘ike was spoken of in terms of kuleana:

Some people, they're like, “Oh, do you do you guys where grass skirts live in huts” and stuff like that. Back then I obviously laughed just because I don't know any better and thought it was ridiculous to say since it's nothing like that. I didn't know the history, but now listening to comments like that, it's really hard because it's not OK. So my kuleana now as a Hawaiian going back to California, is to inform and educate other people who don't know the true history of Hawaii and how it was overthrown and illegally occupied.

The learning of ʻike is not simply enough to complete the process of cultural belonging for this collaborator, but the outward demonstration of their proficiency to those who may not hold it is

what defines their kuleana as a Hawaiian. Here, processes of recognition of ‘ike are affirmed as ‘ike is only activated as cultural practice in the utility it provides in storytelling.

**Pāʻele: Reprise**

What, then, are we to make of the ceremony I experienced in December of 2018 - the becoming pāʻele? On the hallowed grounds of the heiau of Keaʻīwa, I laid down and became the first in generations of my ʻohana to be emblazoned with an alaniho, the quintessential Hawaiian kākau denoting one’s genealogy. What’s more is that this ceremony was administered by another Hawaiian from the diaspora. In fact, both of us hailing from Kaleponi, conducting traditional kākau practice in the ‘āina of our ancestors provides an even stronger parallel to the processes of diaspora affirmation recounted above.

Indeed, this process was mediated strongly by moʻokūʻauhau, in which we were both made to verify our ancestral connections to Hawaiʻi before proceeding. Not only was this event a commemoration of ancestry, but the recognition of lineage was itself the key to carrying out this process in a culturally appropriate manner. Had I not been able to recall my ancestors, I would not have been permitted to undergo the process. Further, had the mea kākau not had the ‘ike to help me do so, we would not have found ourselves there. It was only through his ability to conduct moʻokūʻauhau research, which he had honed in the Hawaiian Studies department at the University of Hawaiʻi, was he able to investigate the names in my family history. Not only that, but his expertise in the art of kākau was cultivated meticulously through years of research and practice in Samoa, which he had entered through his pilina with his Samoan ʻohana.

Before he began tattooing me, we prayed to gbd ahu of the heiau as tourists and locals milled about, carrying on their day. As I stood before him while he stenciled the patterns onto
me, he notified me once again that undertaking this process was a commitment to fulfill my kuleana. The alaniho itself symbolized a deep obligation to my kūpuna and my lāhui. Should I accept, I was to live my life in pursuit of making them proud because they would now see visually that I had made that commitment. Here the enfolded valences of moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ʻike were center stage.

As I was tattooed, we talked about the struggles of growing up away from our kulāiwi, not feeling Hawaiian enough, and wanting fervently to be a good Hawaiian. Looking back, I now see that many of these questions were answered at that moment. From one diaspora Hawaiian to another, we both affirmed and accepted the genealogical obligations inherent to us since birth. Thankful for the ʻike that allowed him to tattoo me, I now hold the ʻike that brings me to fulfilling kuleana - the names of my ancestors, the places their bones are buried, and the dedications I made on that day.
In November of 2021, during a protest for the protection of Mauna Kea, I was given a huli kalo, a cutting of a taro plant, by Aunty Laulani Teale. She had brought several huli kalo to give to fellow Mauna Kea protectors, some Hawaiian and some not. Eagerly, Mahina Kaomea and I both accepted the huli and we imagined how to give our new friend a home to thrive in despite the incompatibility between the climate where the kalo had come from and where we resided. After all, Stanford sits in a semi-arid Mediterranean climate, with little rain compared to the tropical biomes of Hawai‘i. What’s more is that we had missed the planting season in Kaleponi by a couple months. Despite that, we adopted a determination to see our kalo flourish.

Though outwardly I cheerfully imagined how we might do this, I thought in my head how I had never cared for kalo long-term before. In fact, besides periodic weeding during community work days, planting kalo in lo‘i, and cleaning and peeling kalo, I lacked any real experience caring for them. In addition, the Hawaiian cosmology places substantial importance on the cultivation of kalo. Two of the primordial akua, Wākea and Papahānaumoku, had a daughter named Ho‘ohōkūkalani. Wākea and Ho‘ohōkūkalani had a child who is stillborn and was buried, named Hāloanakalaulukapalili. Ho‘ohōkūkalani wept over the burial site of her child, and the first kalo plant emerged from the soil. Once again, Ho‘ohōkūkalani became hāpai and gave birth to the first human, which they named Hāloa in remembrance of the stillborn child. Hāloa is the progenitor of all Kānaka Maoli, rendering the relationship between kanaka and kalo one of kinship.

Accordingly, kalo serves as an ontological metaphor for Kanaka Maoli. The structure of the plant has lent itself for metaphorizing it to family structure:
The establishment of an ecologically integrated evolutionary genealogy with Hāloanakalaukapalili, the kalo-child, as the older sibling to Hāloa, the human child embeds an ecological consciousness as part of the moral fiber in the felting of Hawai‘i society. In ʻohana, the older siblings are responsible for the caregiving and nourishing of younger siblings. Younger siblings reciprocate by listening to and supporting their older siblings. (Louis)

Thus, from my planting of the huli, enfolded metaphors of both Hawaiian cultural status and kinship emerged. Indeed, the stakes were high. As a diaspora Hawaiian, this was not a simple, routine exercise of planting food for sustenance. Embedded in the moment was a symbolic verification of cultural identity. After all, what kind of Hawaiian cannot care for kalo? I voiced to Mahina my concerns about not knowing what to do and deferred to their better judgment. They had been able to experience a long-term relationship with kalo given their kuleana as one of the many people that steward Ulupō, a heiau with lo‘i kalo in Kailua, O‘ahu. As we planted our huli into the modest clay pot we had borrowed, Mahina offered a prayer to sanctify our planting.

Since then, our kalo has grown quickly, shooting up towards the ceiling of my dorm room. Two more dark green leaves have cleaved off from the original. They even have a name, Hōkūikamakaluhihohonu, to commemorate the period of sleep they endured before they sprouted up. Though the true test will come when it is time to harvest, I cannot help but be proud of Mahina and myself as we continue to kilo this kalo. We keep a watchful eye over whether or not the soil is too dry, if the leaves are able to catch the sun, or if a new leaf is poised to emerge.

To me, Hōkūikamakaluhihohonu is not only a cherished friend, but also a symbol. Perhaps the future of the Hawaiian diaspora (and by extension Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i) rests on some of the principles at play in the care of Hōkū. This process was initiated by the act of movement, they were brought from Hawai‘i, our kulāwi, out to San Francisco. In Pacific Studies, diaspora has often been compared to the act of voyaging. The nominative role that the revival of
traditional voyaging practices has had in the Hawaiian cultural consciousness connotes the centrality of the act of movement. In a sense, the diaspora can be seen in a similar way to Hōkūikamakaluhiihoonu.

As Hawaiians, we understand ʻāina to play a central role in our ability to flourish. Research by Mary Oneha has even connected sense of place and ʻāina to Kānaka Maoli health outcomes.77 When Hawaiians move away from Hawaiʻi, there is a strong desire to cultivate culturally rich spaces.78 Diaspora Hawaiians sometimes voice frustration in the inability to feel connected ʻāina as it is a central pillar of Hawaiian culture. Much like the kalo, which is used to very specific climate conditions, Native Hawaiian health is associated with conditions only found in Hawaiʻi. However, Hōkūikamakaluhiihoonu shows that perhaps we may find fertile ground wherever we go if we are supported properly. If we are to understand the kalo as a metaphor for the Kanaka, one may see the potential in thinking about an expansive nature of Hawaiiananness that enfolds notions of adaptability and connectedness. After all, Hōkū’s growth would have never happened without the assistance of Mahina’s ʻike. It is in the assemblages of the lāhui in Kahiki, in which kamaʻāina Hawaiians and diaspora Hawaiians collaborate, that flourishing happens.

Rather than attempting to embark on my own solitary journey of caring for the kalo I had been given, I looked to someone who had ʻike I did not. In turn, I hope to reciprocate in guiding Mahina in navigating the complexities of going to school in California, a place they are new to. In a sense, my kuleana not only to care for kalo, but also to care for the younger Hawaiians that

---

attend Stanford is layered and embedded into the kalo itself, which serves as an ontological presence that represents these commitments I have inherited as a Hawaiian. In thinking of myself both as the kalo and the kanaka that cares for the kalo, I hope to cultivate my genealogical obligations.

**Kilo Kuleana**

Perhaps after conducting my kilo mua practice on the wāhi I have chosen to study for this thesis, it may be also called kilo kuleana. If kilo mua is a personal practice in understanding how to locate oneself within a Kānaka Maoli timespace, one is able to utilize it to uncover critical cultural obligations and responsibilities. I ventured to understand Kaleponi and how diaspora Hawaiians fit into the context of Hawaiian history and nationhood. What I ended up discovering was that the cultural norms that oversee Hawaiian identity formation and societal role distribution in Hawaii‘i can be found in an analysis of diaspora. Moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ‘ike are the driving elements of kilo mua in the first place and any example of it should predictably result in a thematic exploration of them.

The moʻokūʻauhau-kuleana-ʻike onto-epistemological framework in Hawaiian culture manifests in variations throughout this kilo mua study of the Hawaiian diaspora. The moʻolelo “Ka Ipumakani a Laamaomao” demonstrates the foundational nature of these cultural concepts. Moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ‘ike appear as themes in a parable-like story, rendering them as core concepts within Hawaiian culture, as well as a means for cultivating an ethical orientation. As the figures in the story navigate their kuleana using their moʻokūʻauhau to guide them, they undertake processes of gaining ‘ike that allow them to fulfill their obligations. This moʻolelo also
projects an ideal sense of Hawaiian ethics in society as well, creating moralizing truths about how one should conduct themselves within a complex social landscape.

By enfoldling this foundational understanding of moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ʻike into my analytical framework, I was able to grapple with the story of William Heath Davis. At first, I struggled with how to fit a traditional historical analysis into kilo mua. Especially fraught were the contexts that Davis was embedded in - the settler colonization of California. Nonetheless, armed with the foundational cultural concepts I learned from the moʻolelo of Laʻamaomao, an understanding of how historical memory can act as a genealogizing factor based on mutual place-belonging became the appropriate application of kilo mua as an interpretive framework. Rather than analyzing moʻokūʻauhau within the context of Davis’ life, genealogy was conjured by our shared subjectivities as diaspora, which became fertile ground for kuleana to materialize. Thus, kuleana was demanded of me as the researcher, as I illuminated the trans-Indigenous solidarities necessary for my positionality. A meta-acknowledgement of ʻike was rendered in the very act of research also being the ʻike required to enact kuleana.

This same awareness was present in the talking sessions/interviews conducted with members of the diaspora Hawaiian communities. Through these conversations, moʻokūʻauhau, kuleana, and ʻike seemed to persevere from Hawaiʻi into California, extending the essence of Hawaiian cultural nationhood into places where Kānaka have voyaged. The Hawaiians I spoke to were eminently concerned with their kuleana, which was channeled through the desire to embody haʻa ʻa. The drive to display humility resulted in complex negotiations both within self and within community that produced varying senses of proximity to Hawaiianness, other Hawaiians, and to cultural knowledge. These conversations manifested a vision of diaspora
Hawaiians not based in a tragic uprooting from culture and ʻāina, but in the hopeful re-planting of Hawaiian values into a new context.

**Hoʻokele Hope**

Recalling the kilo mua orientation of time as having spatial qualities, one wonders what ka wā hope (the future) holds in terms of destinations we have yet to meet as a lāhui. As mentioned above, the diaspora is sometimes thought of in metaphorical terms, likened to the voyagers of the Hawaiian past and present. Hoʻokele, the Hawaiian voyaging tradition, is facilitated by vast repositories of ʻike, where observations of currents, star patterns, winds, fish and birds all coalesce into the mind of the navigator, bringing them to the knowledge of where to take the waʻa. Herein lies a fundamentally sound allegory for the ways that kilo mua may help diaspora Hawaiians to formulate conceptions of self, community, and past within the spacetime matrix of wā. Through an attentive observation of the past before us, the ʻike necessary to chart our way to desirable futures becomes known.

Embedded in these concomitant cultural norms of ʻike is the responsibility to uphold a consciousness of moʻokūʻauhau that is gleaned through many fonts of knowledge. By reinforcing the collective cultural identity through endemic Kanaka Maoli structures of kinship and belonging like moʻokūʻauhau, barriers such as blood quantum, displacement, and cultural loss can be dissolved. ʻIke about moʻokūʻauhau accumulated through kilo mua can function to bolster cultural identity formation. As an Indigenous autoethnographic methodology, kilo mua gives us the ʻike to navigate our way into the future. Knowing how ʻike about the past, our moʻokūʻahau, our kūpuna, and our present empowers us, what must the lāhui do to ensure that the diaspora has the tools to conduct this knowledge production?
I have seen and heard many ideas from Kānaka Maoli in recent years in regards to how we might build the proverbial wa‘a that can allow us to traverse these waters. One collaborator mentioned the idea of Hawaiian-focused charter schools in California, following in the tradition of the charter school movement in Hawai‘i. My godmother, Denise Espania, is the po‘o kumu of Mālama Honua Charter School in Waimanālo, where they teach children mea ho‘okele along with the other required curricula of the State of Hawai‘i. During the summer after my freshman year at Stanford, I visited their class one day and watched with teary eyes as the keiki chanted to their kumu to gain entrance into their school. I accompanied them as I visited one of the wa‘a they planned to sail on, beaming as I watched young Hawaiians proudly raise their hand to answer questions about their ancestors’ proud tradition of ho‘okele. I spoke with the kumu throughout the day about how many of the keiki at the school slipped through the cracks in the public school system, eventually finding a home in the Hawaiian-focused educational space at Mālama Honua. As the keiki were picked up by their parents at the end of the school day, sovereignty songs of an independent Hawai‘i blared from a speaker.

As Nainoa Thompson, pwo navigator and president of the Polynesian Voyaging Society once said during a talk at Stanford, “We don’t need leaders, we need navigators.” Every year, Mālama Honua PCS graduates young navigators, ready to guide the lāhui into the future. These young Hawaiian kids, much like Hōkūikamakaluhihohonu, were not destined to fail from the outset, despite their troubles in traditional public schools. They just needed the right soil to help them brave the waters of life. The other day, Mālama Honua welcomed their sixth graders back from their 4 day voyage on Kānehūnāmoku, a wa’a based in Ka‘alaea, O‘ahu. These keiki had basked in the ‘ike ho‘okele from their kumu, a combination of knowledge thousands of years old and new ideas from the present which culminated in a test of not only their ‘ike, but also a
recognition of their kuleana. Before sailing, they learned the moʻokūʻauhau of the traditions as well as the genealogy of the canoe itself. Though these keiki were not in the diaspora, I cannot help but see the linkages between the challenges that lie before our people, no matter where we are. The colonial structures that diaspora Hawaiians continuously endure find their analogues and extensions in the public school system of the State of Hawaiʻi - both dismiss Hawaiian values and Hawaiianness itself. Within these constellations of obstacles, I wonder, how will the diaspora prepare to launch itself into the vast ocean that lies behind us? Aia ma mua ka ʻike Hawaiʻi e hiki ai i nā pua Kahiki e mohala. Toward the past lies the Hawaiian knowledge that allows the flowers of Kahiki to bloom.

ʻAmama, ua noa.
Glossary of Hawaiian Words

ahupua‘a - 1. Land division usually extending from the uplands to the sea, so called because the boundary was marked by a heap (ahu) of stones surmounted by an image of a pig (pua‘a), or because a pig or other tribute was laid on the altar as tax to the chief. The landlord or owner of an ahupua‘a might be a konohiki.

2. The altar on which the pig was laid as payment to the chief for use of the ahupua‘a land.

alakaʻi - to lead, guide, direct; leader, guide, conductor, head, director

aliʻi - chief, chiefess, officer, ruler, monarch, peer, headman, noble, aristocrat, king, queen, commander; royal, regal, aristocratic, kingly; to rule or act as a chief, govern, reign; to become a chief

aloaliʻi - in the presence of chiefs; royal court

inoa - name, term, title


2. nvt. To raise, rear, feed, nourish, sustain; provider, caretaker (said affectionately of chiefs by members of the court). Cf. akua hānai, hanaiāhuhu, hanaina. Hānai holoholona, to feed and care for domestic animals

haku - to compose, invent, put in order, arrange; to braid, as a lei, or plait, as feathers

hōlua - sled, especially the ancient sled used on grassy slopes; the sled course. Papa hōlua, sled. He‘e hōlua, to ride a hōlua sled; the hōlua course;

hoʻokele - from kele, to sail

hoʻolaula - introduction

kahua - foundation, base, site, location, ground, background, platform, as of a house; an open place, as for camping or for sports, as for ‘ulu maika or hōlua sliding; playground, arena, stand, stage, courtyard course, camp; bed, as of a stream
kahuna - priest, sorcerer, magician, wizard, minister, expert in any profession (whether male or female);

kahu iwikuamoʻo - phrase combining kahu, honored attendant, and kuamoʻo, backbone

kākau - to tattoo; tattooing

Kaleponi - California

kamaʻāina - native-born, one born in a place, host; native plant; acquainted, familiar, Lit., land child

kanaka - human being, man, person, individual, party, mankind, population; subject, as of a chief; laborer, servant, helper; attendant or retainer in a family

kāne - male, husband, male sweetheart, man; brother-in-law of a woman; male, masculine; to be a husband or brother-in-law of a woman

kauoha - order, command, demand, testament, decree, precept, will, message, statement; to order, command, direct, send for, subscribe, dictate, assign, decree, entrust, bequest, commit into the hands of; to summon, to order, as groceries or goods

kaʻao - legend, tale, novel, romance, usually fanciful; fiction; tell a fanciful tale

kilo - stargazer, reader of omens, seer, astrologer, necromancer; kind of looking glass (rare); to watch closely, spy, examine, look around, observe, forecast

koko - blood

kulāiwi - native land, homeland

kuleana - right, privilege, concern, responsibility, title, business, property, estate, portion, jurisdiction, authority, liability, interest, claim, ownership, tenure, affair, province; reason, cause, function, justification; small piece of property, as within an ahupuaʻa; blood relative through whom a relationship to less close relatives is traced, as to in-laws

kupuna - grandparent, ancestor, relative or close friend of the grandparent's generation, grandaunt, granduncle

kuʻu - my, mine (this form may replace both kaʻu and koʻu; it is frequently used before ipo and lei and kinship terms and expresses affection
lāhui - nation, race, tribe, people, nationality;

loko iʻa - fish pond

makana - gift, present; reward, award, donation, prize; to give a gift, donate

malihini - stranger, foreigner, newcomer, tourist, guest, company; one unfamiliar with a place or custom; new, unfamiliar, unusual, rare, introduced, of foreign origin;

mana - supernatural or divine power, mana, miraculous power;

mohala - unfolded, as flower petals; blossoming, opening up;

moʻokūʻauhau - genealogy

moʻolelo - story, tale, myth, history, tradition, literature, legend, journal, log, yarn, fable, essay, chronicle, record, article; minutes, as of a meeting

paeʻāina - archipelago

pāʻele - dark, black; to blacken; to tattoo solid black without design; to paint black, as a canoe; to blot

piko - navel, navel string, umbilical cord

pilina - association, relationship, union, connection, meeting, joining, adhering, fitting

pono - goodness, uprightness, morality, moral qualities, correct or proper procedure, excellence, well-being, prosperity, welfare, benefit, behalf, equity, sake, true condition or nature, duty; moral, fitting, proper, righteous, right, upright, just, virtuous, fair, beneficial, successful, in perfect order, accurate, correct, eased, relieved; should, ought, must, necessary

pua - lower, blossom

pule - prayer, magic spell, incantation, blessing, grace, church service, church; to pray, worship, say grace, ask a blessing, cast a spell

wahi - place, location, position, site, setting. (Ka wahi contracts to common kahi).
walaʻau - to talk, speak, converse; formerly, to talk loudly, shout

wā - period of time, epoch, era, time, occasion, season, age

wahine - woman, lady, wife; sister-in-law, female cousin-in-law of a man; queen in a deck of cards; womanliness, female, femininity; feminine

‘āina - land, earth

‘aha - sennit; cord braided of coconut husk, human hair, intestines of animals; string for a musical instrument

‘awa - the kava (Piper methysticum), a shrub 1.2 to 3.5 m tall with green jointed stems and heart-shaped leaves, native to Pacific islands, the root being the source of a narcotic drink of the same name used in ceremonies (Neal 291), prepared formerly by chewing, later by pounding

‘ike - to see, know, feel, greet, recognize, perceive, experience, be aware, understand; to know sexually; to receive revelations from the gods; knowledge, awareness, understanding, recognition, comprehension and hence learning; sense, as of hearing or sight; sensory, perceptive, vision

‘ōiwi - native, native son

‘ōlelo - language, speech, word, quotation, statement, utterance, term, tidings; to speak, say, state, talk, mention, quote, converse, tell; oral, verbatim, verbal, motion

‘ōhua - retainers, dependents, servants, inmates, members (of a family), visitors or sojourners in a household
Bibliography


———. “‘We Will Be Comparable to the Indian Peoples’: Recognizing Likeness between Native Hawaiians and American Indians, 1834-1923.” *American Quarterly* 67, no. 3 (2015): 859–86.


———. “Which of These Things Is Not Like the Other: Hawaiians and Other Pacific Islanders Are Not Asian Americans, and All Pacific Islanders Are Not Hawaiian.” American Quarterly 67, no. 3 (2015): 727–47.


Nakuina, Moses. *Moolelo Hawai‘i o Pakaa a Me Ku-a-Pakaa, Na Kahu Iwikuaamo o Keawenuiaumi, Ke Alii o Hawai‘i, a o Na Moopuna Hoi a Laamaomao*, n.d.


