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Abstract

This study utilized an Indigenous Determinants of Health framework to tell the story of a group of Kānaka Maoli women leaders on Kaua‘i, referred to here as the Po‘e Aloha ʻĀina. Several Hawaiian women leaders from both the kūpuna (elder/grandparent) and mākua (parent) generation engaged in talk-story sessions—a form of open-ended, qualitative interviews that allowed the participants to direct the session. The women began with their own stories, and ended with their vision for the next generation, for their communities, and for their occupied Nation. Their data was subsequently coded using a Modified Grounded Theory. Early stages of this research explored Hawaiian Food Sovereignty and Hawaiian health disparities through these sessions. After coding the data, the research evolved into a larger project about disrupted access to Hawaiian land and usurped Hawaiian governance. The dissertation includes an exploration of the history of how Hawaiians have such restricted access to land within their own homeland; furthermore, it explores the interlocking issues that the next generation of Hawaiians are facing on Kaua‘i in hopes to address some of the simultaneous crises of housing and suicide.

A small portion of this research was a collaborative dance with a Hawaiian women-led nonprofit, Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA), working in the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola. The research, and the work of KKOA, culminated by the end of this dissertation in the first stages of establishing an agricultural training & youth center in Anahola.
Lay Summary

This research on Land, Governance, and Hawaiian Food Sovereignty germinated from long-term relationships on Kauaʻi. As the epicenter of experimental GMO agriculture & seed production, Kauaʻi was experiencing island-wide protests pushing for the protection of water, land, and people in 2014. The research began by interviewing several key Hawaiian women leaders on issues of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty and Hawaiian health. For some of the women, especially in the older kūpuna generation, it evolved to uncovering core issues of land dispossession and a desire for deoccupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

While some research involving Kauaʻi-based co-participants has occurred on Kauaʻi, there remains a need for additional qualitative research, especially featuring the voices of Hawaiian women leaders. Part of this research was conducted in collaboration with Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA), a nonprofit led by Hawaiian women; in part, the results of this research are being utilized to write grants for KKOA in support of establishing an Agricultural Training & Youth Center.
Preface

This particular research was designed by the author of this dissertation, Heather Lebrun, with the participation of several women leaders on the island of Kaua‘i. All data was collected & analyzed by Heather Lebrun; the results are the interpretation of Heather Lebrun only. Many significant Hawaiian women leaders on Kaua‘i contributed to the research via sharing their history and mana‘o through research interviews. I would like to especially acknowledge Ku‘uleialoha Punua, President of Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA) for her vision and contribution to this dissertation. I also want to honor and acknowledge several important women who contributed also, including Pono (who chose to remain anonymous); Lynette Haulani Fernandez, Noelani Josselin, Puanani Rogers, Lorilani Keohokalole-Torio, Chesley Contrades, Tiana Laranio, Richell Sweet, Crystal Bilyeu, Kalei (who chose to remain anonymous), Stacy Sproat-Beck, Kauui Fu, and Wanda Shibata.

The research was conducted with ethics approval from the UBC Behavioural Research Ethics Board, Application ID H16-02675.
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Chapter 1: Introduction-Tell the Story of the People who Love the Land

Mele Aloha ʻĀina/Kaulana Na Pua

Kaulana nā pua aʻo Hawaiʻi
Kūpaʻa mahope o ka ʻāina
Hiki mai ka ʻelele o ka loko ʻino
Palapala ʻānunu me ka pākaha.
Pane mai Hawaiʻi moku o Keawe.
Kōkua nā Hono aʻo Piʻilani.
Kākoʻo mai Kauaʻi o Mano
Paʻapu me ke one Kukuhihewa.
ʻAʻole ʻaʻe kau i ka pūlima
Maluna o ka pepa o ka ʻenemi
Hoʻohui ʻāina kūʻai hewa
I ka pono sivila aʻo ke kānaka.
ʻAʻole mākou aʻe minamina
I ka puʻukala a ke aupuni.
Ua lawa mākou i ka pōhaku,
I kaʻai kamahaʻo o ka ʻāina.
Mahope mākou o Liliʻuʻlani
A loaʻa e ka pono a ka ʻāina.
A kau hou ʻia e ke kalaunu
Haʻina ʻia mai ana ka puana
Ka poʻe i aloha i ka ʻāina.

Famous are the children of Hawaiʻi,
ever loyal to the land.
When the evil-hearted messenger comes,
with his greedy document of extortion,
Hawaiʻi, land of Keawe answers,
the Bays of Piʻilani help,
Mano’s Kauaʻi lends support.
And so do the sands of Kukuhihewa.

Tell the story
Of the People who love their land.

Ellen Kekoaohiwaikalani Wright Prendergast penned the lyrics of this song of Aloha ʻĀina in the late 19th century in protest of the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom (Nordyke & Noyes, 1993). At this tumultuous time in Hawaiian history, former Hawaiian Kingdom citizens were required to sign a loyalty oath to the occupying haole Provisional Government in order to

1 Kaulana Nā Pua ʻFamous are the Childrenʼ; also known as Mele Aloha ʻĀina, ʻThe Song of Those Who Love the Landʼ (or support restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom); also known as Mele ʻAi Pōhaku, ʻThe Stone-Eating Songʼ. It is listed first in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, followed by the English translation.
2 Love for the land/waters & the rightful Hawaiian government
3 Foreign/foreigners; often used in today’s vernacular to signify whites
maintain their government employment. Out of their fierce devotion to their Nation and their Queen, the members of Ka Bana Lāhui⁴ refused and were thus forced out of their jobs; they asked Prendergast to write Mele Aloha ‘Āina as a response. Prendergast, a friend of Queen Lili‘uokalani,⁵ was entrusted to write this song at the time of their resignation as an expression of their pain and their protest (Nordyke & Noyes, 1993). The members of Ka Bana Lāhui then formed a new band in support of the Queen (Stillman, 1993).

One of the key leaders and co-participants in this research, “Pono,”⁶ introduced me to this protest anthem during our talk story sessions together. She reminisced about the days of her youth when she danced hula to Mele Aloha ‘Āina before large crowds of tourists. She reflected that the crowds likely had little inkling as to the meaning of this song, and its rejection of American occupation.

Tourists and settlers alike are largely ignorant of the details of the Overthrow and ensuing Occupation. The occupying government lied to the world about the Overthrow; and even attempted to hide the grim truth of what occurred with the Overthrow & ensuing Occupation from successive generations of Kānaka Maoli.⁷ The legacy of this obfuscation is evident in

⁴ The Royal Hawaiian Kingdom Band.
⁵ Queen Lili‘uokalani=the last reigning monarch of the Hawaiian Kingdom.
⁶ Pono’s name has been changed to protect her identity as she is a visible leader in the Hawaiian Islands.
⁷ Used interchangeably in this paper with ‘Hawaiian’. Note: ‘Hawaiian’ in this paper refers to the Indigenous people of the land—never to the in-migrants of the last century and a half.
educational curriculums, media, and public discourse even today in the islands.

The lyrics of this song express Hawaiians’ foreboding of the erosion of Hawaiian civil rights that would result from becoming annexed to the United States. Following the forced removal of Queen Liliʻuokalani’s rule by white subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom and other resident foreigners, Hawaiians’ were discouraged and even punished for speaking ‘ōlelo Hawaiʻi and practicing aspects of their culture. Hawaiians were eventually dispossessed of their lands and economic base and, as a result of the colonial occupation, ultimately rose high in the ranks of grievous statistics regarding their health and well-being.9

The wrongs perpetuated against the Hawaiians by the Provisional Government of the Republic of Hawaiʻi (1893-1898), coupled with the ensuing actions of the United States10 against the Hawaiian Nation for the last 125+ years legally constitute, per the United Nations, a genocide against the Hawaiian Kingdom subjects (United Nations Office on Genocide, n.d.). One can merely review the health disparities facing the Hawaiian people as incriminating evidence of this assault on Hawaiian prosperity and vitality

8 The Hawaiian language
9 Hawaiians experience some of the worst health disparities in the United States, as well as high incarceration rates and the shortest life expectancy in Hawaiʻi.
10 The USA illegally annexed Hawaiʻi, a sovereign nation-state, against the will of its citizens; America occupied the Hawaiian Kingdom with its military, and later make Hawaiʻi a state--while ignoring United Nations requirements to offer a return to self-governance as an option to the people during the statehood vote.
(Johnson, 2004; Shintani et al., 1991; Lasserter, 2010; Mau et al., 2001; Aluli, 1991; Moy et al., 2009, Cook et al 2003). But the occupiers sought to cover up their wrongs against the Hawaiian people, and instead blame the victims for the trauma inflicted against the Hawaiian Nation by the colonizing government. These wrongs have begun to be exposed in the last few decades.

For those of us who are haole in-migrants or tourists who love the islands, it may be shocking and unsettling to come to terms with the wrongs perpetrated against the Hawaiian Nation, which continues to play out under the U.S. military, the federal and state government, and the multinational GMO corporations operating in Hawai‘i.

The global invisibility of the treachery that occurred and continues against the Hawaiian people doesn’t neutralize the effects of the crimes of the Occupiers. This global invisibility relevant to the history and the truth of the Occupation points to the successful propaganda campaign carried out by the narcissistic government that usurped Hawaiian authority. Today’s current extortion by this occupying government, in reference to Mele Aloha ʻĀina, is the threat that if Hawaiians do not opt for federal recognition, they will lose what little they have. In regard to the agencies of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Department of Hawaiian Homelands, and within the rights to Hawaiians-only education at Kamehameha Schools, the inference is that they had better accept federal recognition, or they could lose everything.
This study delves into the history of Hawaiian subjugation as a pretext to amplifying the Resurgence & vision of powerful Hawaiian wāhine who are in leadership on Kaua‘i. This thesis focuses on the manaʻo,11 experiences, and dreams of Hawaiian women leaders in their 60s and 70s (kūpuna generation) and those of Hawaiian women leaders in their 20s, 30s and 40s (mākua generation) on issues including land, food sovereignty, health, and the next generation. The women are currently located on the island of Kaua‘i, primarily (but not solely) located on the East and North sides; many were also involved in work in the Hawaiian homelands community of Anahola. All are leaders in their own spheres of influence.

While I have been in community with many of these women in various capacities over the last 20 years, much of what the women shared in this research is at a depth and intimacy that was not possible in everyday life, when I lived on Kaua‘i as their colleague, neighbor, teacher, or friend. This shift from friend to researcher enabled me to spend time to deeply listen to their stories in a way that I would not have otherwise experienced.

This dissertation includes an extensive literature review that contextualizes the women’s words within a historic narrative; I provided this backdrop in order to better understand how we have arrived at this place where Hawaiians have little access to land and scarcely any form of self-

11 Thoughts, ideas
governance in their own homeland. I utilized Indigenous Methodologies through which to gather data & accumulate knowledge of the issues at hand. An Indigenous Social Determinants of Health framework provided the appropriate lens through which to examine the overview of the effects of the Overthrow and ongoing occupation of the Hawaiian Kingdom. This Indigenous Determinants of Health framework makes visible the interlocking factors that are undermining the next generation of Hawaiians.

A comprehensive understanding of the issues facing Hawaiians on Kaua‘i is needed in order to address the ongoing crises in housing, health, the economy, or food security. Merely addressing a single issue, or taking a single focus in isolation will not solve the overall puzzle. The genocide resulting from colonial occupation results from several factors outlined in this study, including: separating Hawaiians from place, from the land of their familial descent; imposing an educational system that is not designed for Hawaiian success, but rather has its roots in Euro-American culture, language, and history; legislating a foreign language onto the occupied people and punishing those who attempted to speak it in public; removing traditional economic pathways of the Hawaiian people; replacing traditional foods and foodways with processed, imported foods and biotech food systems; establishing the largest military installation on the globe within the Hawaiian Islands, making Hawaiians a target for anti-American aggression; and causing housing prices to soar beyond what most Hawaiians can afford, creating Houselessness and all
its attendant side-effects. By understanding the larger picture within this Indigenous Determinants of Health framework, hopefully organizations and government entities on Kauaʻi can consider a more comprehensive strategy to improve the lives of the people.

The kūpuna in this study share their stories and their dreams for the future; some in refusal of the options America offers them but in affirmation of vibrant dreams of Hawaiian Resurgence. Roughly three generations since Mele Aloha ʻĀina was written, many of the elder women featured in this research continue to reject the US government’s puʻukala in exchange for Hawaiian self-determination. They express their Aloha ʻĀina as an interlocking love and devotion both for the ʻĀina of Hawaiʻi, together with a deep longing for the restoration of righteous Hawaiian governance. It is as if many of the older generation could remember Hawaiian self-governance through the memories and conversations of their own kūpuna, who heard the stories and conversations of their kūpuna, whose parents were adults when Liliʻuokalani still reigned. They were born and raised during a time before computers and

12 In referencing Hawaiian Resurgence, I am leaning heavily on the Indigenous writings from scholars in Canada such as Leanne Simpson, Jeff Corntassel, and Sarah Hunt on Indigenous Resurgence—an academic theory emerging as an alternative response to state recognition, efforts of reconciliation, or rights-based discourse. It is a theory interwoven with an alternative vision of nationhood, one that brings the past into the present as the way for the future (Simpson, 2011:148). By looking back to the ways of the ancestors and cultivating life in areas of Indigenous language, knowledge, and culture, one builds up the nation. Gleaning from the work of these Indigenous scholars, I recognized patterns of what I am calling Hawaiian Resurgence in the work and everyday lives of the women who participated in this research.
cell phones, before television aired 24/7, and during a time when they learned many things from the older generations.

The words of the kūpuna emerge alongside the stories of a younger generation of Hawaiian women who are struggling to support their families and maintain their presence on an island that is increasingly becoming a land for wealthy haole. Amidst an accelerated erosion of housing access and alongside an island-wide fight to preserve the island from being an outdoor laboratory for GMO experimentation, those of this next generation express their Aloha ʻĀina, if not directly through dreams of restored Hawaiian Kingdom sovereignty, then through their standing up in defense of the ʻĀina itself to preserve it for future Hawaiians.

These younger women exhibited their Aloha ʻĀina through actions initiated against corporate biotechnology corporations that have co-opted Kauaʻi’s agricultural infrastructure; through maintaining a relationship with their ancestral land, which was stolen without their knowledge as in the case of one of the interviewees; or through raising their own children or working with children from their communities.

Some of the younger generation made their stands amidst a struggle to maintain survival on an island undergoing intense economic pressure with a soaring cost of living and evaporating housing options.¹³ To move a family off-

---

¹³ These problems are cutting across many groups currently on-island, including Hawaiians, other locals and as well as haole who call the islands home.
island takes an enormous amount of money as well as courage to venture to an uncommon land and culture, potentially cut-off from supportive family networks, and perhaps without the college degrees that can assist with upward mobility in American society.

It is essential to showcase the words and experiences of the women, which speak louder than statistics. Many non-Hawaiians in community with these women may not realize the history and depth of their struggle; it is important for the collective community to take notice and work collaboratively for change.

In an environment where Hawaiian place-names, language, history, economy, education, land tenure and self-governance have been undermined by the occupying government, it is important to tell the story of the people who love the ‘Āina, both in their own words, and through a historical context. The women’s tenacious Aloha ‘Āina is a testimony to a people who have refused—despite being occupied by the largest military power on the planet—to be annihilated nor intimidated; and instead, are taking back their power and inheritance as the rightful stewards of the islands. May their voices resound throughout the land.
1.1 Historical Overview

The Hawaiian Kingdom’s sovereignty was recognized internationally by the Family of Nations in 1843.\textsuperscript{14} However, Hawaiians were illegally dispossessed of their government when a group of Caucasian businessmen, in collusion with the US military, deposed the Hawaiian monarch fifty years later (Burdekin & Laney, 2008; H. Trask, 2001; Chock, 1995). The white interlopers, themselves a minority in the Hawaiian Kingdom, went against the will of the majority of the Kingdom’s subjects. They occupied the government with the explicit threat that anyone who sought to stop them would be murdered; this was underscored by the heavily-armed U.S. troops that landed to support them. While a subsequent American President decried the Overthrow as an ‘Act of War’ against a friendly nation, the U.S. Congress voted to annex this foreign country in 1898—an illegal act not permitted by the U.S. Constitution (H. Trask, 2001; Inciong, 1991; Levy, 1975; M. Trask, 1991; Silva, 2004).

This small group of conquerors within the islands went on to become the leaders of the Provisional government; furthermore, they became the arbiters of what was known as Hawaiian history. Due to the occupation and ensuing war crimes committed against the Hawaiian people, their version of reality gained ascendance. When the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown, a law was passed to eliminate government funding of any school that did not teach in the English

\textsuperscript{14} Family of Nations, a term that is now obsolete, was a term used to describe the sovereign states amongst which the rules of international law applied. At the time of Hawai‘i’s acceptance by this group, it was a whites-only club, in effect.
language, thereby reducing Hawaiian-medium schools from 150 in 1880 to none by the turn of the century. One haole missionary decried this move of eliminating Hawaiian language in the schools as ‘suicide,’ but the white occupying governmental leaders ignored such sentiments (Lucas, 2000).

Re-writing the history books, white leaders began to re-invent Hawaiian identity and culture in the institutionalized school system. By hiding U.S. complicity in the Overthrow, and by perpetuating a lie that Hawaiians actually wanted to become part of the United States, the ongoing genocide could be re-made into a fantasy narrative about the original people liberated from an oppressive monarchy to share in the joys of American democracy.

A revisionist history was part of the childhood upbringing of some of the women in this dissertation, who were raised in an educational system where they were taught this fallacy. It was not until Dr. Noenoe Silva uncovered the Kūʻē Petitions in the National Archives in 1996 and made them public that some of the women in this research were able to realize the hidden truth from Hawaiʻi’s past (Silva, 2004). Even now, true Hawaiian history is being revealed and uncovered weekly by scholars who have learned the language and are working diligently to uncover true history.15

15 Exemplis gratis, until recently, one of the Queen’s right-hand men, William Pūnohuʻāweoweoʻulaokalani White lay in an unmarked grave, unknown and forgotten except seemingly by his own family. A historian who through investigating archives in ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi, discovered his contributions to the Queen and to the Kingdom, found his unmarked grave, raised monies to establish a tombstone for the forgotten hero, hosting a momentous event in August 2017 to let people know what truly happened (Ron Williams, Jr, 2017).
A Hawaiian Resurgence is currently underway in the islands today, stretching back to the Hawaiian Renaissance of the 1970s and gaining momentum as Hawaiian activists and scholars cut through racist tropes and propel Hawaiian immersion education. This Resurgence has matured with a generation of students who were raised in their language and culture in Hawaiian-immersion programs and Hawaiian culture-based charter schools throughout the occupied Kingdom (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2013).

The Kingdom of Hawaiʻi continues to be illegally occupied, unbeknownst to most Americans and to the over 10 million tourists who come to Hawaiian shores every year, who may assume that the Indigenous Hawaiian people willingly became part of the United States (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2014). The Overthrow of Hawaiʻi and the ensuing injustices experienced by Kānaka Maoli remain largely invisible to the American consciousness today (Hall, 2009).

1.2 Research Questions

This doctoral research centers on the voices of several Hawaiian women leaders on Kauaʻi who shared their stories and manaʻo with me on multiple issues through open-ended qualitative talk-story sessions. While the sessions initially focused on Hawaiian food sovereignty and health, the research trajectory evolved to explore the underlying issues of land dispossession and the loss of self-governance, as well as documenting the Indigenous Determinants of Health that are impacting Hawaiians on Kauaʻi as a result of over a century of military occupation. Furthermore, the research revealed the
women’s expression of Hawaiian Resurgence, Aloha ʻĀina, and Hawaiian Futurities.

This dissertation is partially a platform amplifying the women’s voices, and partially an unraveling of myself as a haole in-migrant, who slowly had her eyes open through the years of this study to the history and current realities facing the Hawaiian women in my life and in the wider community. This thesis could be seen as a call-out to continental Americans and non-Hawaiians in Hawai‘i to awaken to the reality of what has occurred and is occurring, and begin to utilize their voices and their power to support Hawaiians in the restoration of Hawaiian Governance and land tenure.

My initial purpose in pursuing this research was influenced by the fact that the GMO companies had made Kaua‘i the epicenter of GMO experimentation; it began in the midst of large-scale protests against these corporate GMO-seed companies. The research was initially conceived to support Hawaiian women leaders who were desiring to protect their island from these nefarious corporate monoliths. The largest GMO corporations on the planet had turned the Westside of Kaua‘i into the epicenter of GMO experimentation and seed production. This experimentation was believed by many locals to be causing birth defects, rapid environmental destruction of the reefs, and pesticide drift that was poisoning local residents. The pesticide drift shut down a school due to the poisoning of staff and students.
This research was in part a collaboration with Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA), a Hawaiian-women’s nonprofit in the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola, Kaua‘i. KKOA was established to support Hawaiian youth & families in their identity, health, and food security. I had helped connect the founders of KKOA in 2008 in the midst of community tragedy and remained an advisor to the Board since that time. As I have longstanding relationships with the President and Vice-President of KKOA apart from their activism, I conferred with them in aspects of the design and trajectory of this study.16

In 2013 and 2014, initial questions during the talk-story17 sessions focused on explorations into Hawaiian food sovereignty through Hawaiian health, diet, and briefly into land-access issues. The women weighed in on questions such as: How do you define Hawaiian health? Are their health issues in your family? How often do you eat fast food? How often do you eat traditional food? Do you currently grow, gather or hunt your own food? How important is it for Hawaiians to have control over their food supply? Do you have access to land on which to grow your own food? Does your family have a

16 I also traveled to Moku O Keawe in 2014 on behalf of KKOA with a former member of their Board who is also part of this study, Chelsey Contrades. We explored agricultural models on Hawaiian Homelands near Waimea to see if KKOA could establish similar models on Kaua‘i.

17 Hawaiian creole pidgin for an experience of talking with your neighbors and friends and family; it was used in this study instead of traditional interview-style of gathering data.
history of land struggles? Are you on a waiting list to have access to land, or do you currently have a land award from DHHL?

After coding the women’s words from the first round of discussions, it became obvious that these topics just scratched the surface of a much larger story underneath deleterious Hawaiian health statistics and desires for restored food sovereignty. It became clear from these preliminary talks with various Kanaka women leaders that Hawaiian health and food sovereignty was a complex issue in their lives that could not be separated out from a multiplicity of issues such as Hawaiian land tenure; the education and raising up of the next generation of Hawaiian youth; complex international trade agreements that shape agricultural policy that impacts the island; America’s century-long military occupation of the islands; and the ecological destruction of the ‘Āina since Hawai‘i was invaded. Hawaiian health and food sovereignty are intricately intertwined with the larger issue of Hawaiian self-determination that has been stymied and impeded by the U.S. takeover of the Hawaiian Kingdom, a dispossession of the land, and a general subjugation of the Hawaiian people within their own island territory.

As a result, my initial conceptions of for this study have evolved to a larger Indigenous Determinants of Health framework that encapsulates whose controlling agricultural systems on Kaua‘i and what is eaten, grown and harvested there; stories of land struggle; and the women’s dreams for the island. I revisited the latter questions from the first round of research, namely
focusing on the women’s experiences with land tenure, and inquiring of both the younger and older generations’ ability to acquire DHHL land awards.

As the women shared about the historic loss of land in their families and the struggle for land access in their own lives, I began to research the roots of the dispossession Hawaiians have collectively experienced in order to understand the historic context to the phenomenon I was learning about through their stories. How did we get to this place where Hawaiians are landless within their own islands? This led to an exploration of the history, that is included in this thesis to further provide context to the women’s stories.

I also heard from some of the younger generation, who did not own land or have DHHL awards, about their struggles to find and afford rental housing on an island where the wealthier haole continue to buy up land and housing. As the situation facing Hawaiians has deteriorated in an era of unprecedented wealth at the top and skyrocketing land values, the struggle of the younger generation was just to have a place on the island to exist.

I also asked the women, in open-ended sessions, about their visions for their community or island. Their stories often referenced the next generation as both a source of concern and a major impetus for their activism.

What emerged in the women’s words was a pattern of Hawaiian Resurgence and an ever-present thread of Aloha ʻĀina. While this thread wove all their lives together within the tapestry of the Lāhui, I began to notice variation in the expression of Aloha ʻĀina. It is as if Aloha ʻĀina evolved between
the kūpuna and the mākua generation of women leaders, revealing variation in how each generation expressed it.

As I noticed the Hawaiian women leaders exemplifying Resurgence, I dove deeper into the literature on Indigenous Resurgence to provide context to what I was witnessing. I reflected on how these women demonstrate Resurgence in their leadership as they moved forward to create a better society for the younger generations of Hawaiians, and as in the case of the kūpuna, they put forth their desires for restored Hawaiian nationhood.

While an island-wide fight over the use of GMO agriculture and experimentation surrounded the beginning of this study, alongside meetings with the Department of Interior (DOI) over federal recognition—towards the end of the research phase of this study, issues around kuleana land rights, alongside the premature death of numerous men in their late 20s and early 30s committing suicide on the Eastside, impacted it. This study evolved to include the examination on many interlocking oppressions that the next generation are facing, to provide context to the women’s futurities, and hopefully to provide insight into the several overlapping areas that are impacting the next generation of Hawaiians and other locals on Kauaʻi’s Eastside.

It is important to record and amplify the voices of Kānaka wāhine on the island of Kauaʻi both in academia and in government. While many Hawaiian women on Kauaʻi are central and powerful in their communities, they are less
visible in academia and governmental circles on Kaua‘i, in O‘ahu, and further afield.

I recently presented some of this research at a conference featuring Indigenous-centered scholarship. After my presentation, a Hawaiian UCLA doctoral student from Kaua‘i approached me who had been present in the audience. She emphasized that Kaua‘i wāhine were unique from women on O‘ahu and the other islands. While several Kānaka Maoli scholars have achieved a significant platform in academia and politics, it has largely been focused in Honolulu, O‘ahu, the Hawaiian Islands’ commercial and governmental center. Limited research exists that amplifies the voices of Kānaka women who represent Kaua‘i, and, as this young graduate student pointed out, it is much needed.

This research desires to not only feature Hawaiian women’s voices from Kaua‘i in an academic forum, but to simultaneously bring to the forefront the discussion of Hawaiian loss of land, governance, and thus food sovereignty on Kaua‘i itself within an Indigenous Determinants of Health Framework. While Indigenous peoples’ loss of land to colonization may be well documented in academic circles or amongst Hawaiian families—on Kaua‘i, this reality is not extremely visible in non-Indigenous public discourse, local media, or amongst public education institutions. It is not common knowledge that Hawai‘i had a Westernized form of government and land tenure system and was recognized as part of the Family of Nations, possessing over 136 consulates around the world
It is disheartening to realize the lack of consciousness that exists in the non-Hawaiian population on Kaua‘i about Hawaiian loss of land, struggles for land access, and dreams for restored sovereignty. This reality facing Hawaiians is invisible to the governmental, media, educational, and religious institutions on Kaua‘i. We who are not Hawaiian on Kaua‘i and elsewhere have a responsibility to reverse the silence and emphasize the need to huli the system.

Over the last decade, I have not witnessed an increase in understanding of Hawaiian issues in the public outside of Hawaiian circles but rather a decrease as the island becomes more heavily populated by wealthy haole. Recently, I have witnessed in conversation with some haole, as Kuleana land claims controversies were featured in the local media associated with Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg’s land acquisition, a stubborn ignorance as in-migrants debate whether Hawaiians could truly rule themselves. I heard outsiders weigh-in on whether Kānaka have the right to self-determination; and how their struggles for Kuleana lands could be disrupting the ecological harmony of wealthy haole’s property. There is a need for consciousness-raising in the haole population, and even amongst many of the local youth on Kaua‘i, about the
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18 Both Dr. Ron Williams, Jr. and Dr. Keanu Sai have visited Kaua‘i by invitation of a Hawaiian activist group and raised awareness through public speaking events, of which have had a strong impact on some of the kūpuna featured in this research.

19 Zuckerberg and his partner Pricilla Chan purchased 700 acres in 2014 in Pila’a on the island of Kaua‘i; in 2018, they purchased an additional 89 acres. The ‘stubborn ignorance’ referenced here was witnessed in haole community members who were not personally affiliated with Zuckerberg’s estate, but who commented on it in public spaces.
true history of the Hawaiian kingdom and the illegality of the United States’ current occupation of the islands. A knowledge of the Hawaiian people’s historic and expert grasp of governance, media, agricultural stewardship, and survivance needs to be made visible in Kauaʻi society to reverse the false narrative from the occupiers about Hawaiian inferiority.

It is my hope that this research will impact some of the next generation of ōpio on Kauaʻi. It is important to highlight for the younger generations of Hawaiians on Kauaʻi the voices and stories of the women leaders in their midst. In the vacuum of prominent Polynesian/Hawaiian/Indigenous role models in mainstream American media, it is important to provide a platform for Hawaiian voices to be heard by the next generation of youth, while make visible the ongoing struggle for land and food sovereignty.

Lastly, this dissertation is a call to other haole ‘mainlanders’ who like me, in-migrate from the continental United States with little knowledge of the history and reality facing the Hawaiian population in the islands. It is time we educate ourselves; use our access to privilege, power, and resources to raise awareness of true history of Hawai‘i; initiate public discussions; put pressure on government officials to recognize Hawaiian rights to land; and support those who want to govern their own affairs once again in the islands. It is imperative haole American citizens pursue justice in solidarity with our Hawaiian neighbors and call upon the U.S. government to relinquish its hold on the government of the islands. We must advocate for recompensation of land and
restoration of self-rule to the Hawaiian people. It is time to recognize the genocide locally, nationally, and internationally and partner with Kānaka Maoli to support their desire for freedom.

1.3 Identification

Haʻina ʻia mai ana ka puana Ka poʻe i aloha i ka ʻāina.
Tell the story of the People who love their land.20

I am endeavoring to shed light onto aspects of the lives and experiences of the women featured in this study. I am telling the stories not because they cannot; but because they are situated in a different emplacement, whether it is raising their children, harvesting their gardens, fighting for the protection of the ʻĀina or for Hawaiian rights, or endeavoring to continue other positive impacts within their communities. My locus in time and place finds me ensconced in a university, initially supported by a fellowship, positioned to chronicle their stories and amplify their voices to an audience beyond their current spheres of influence.

I am a foreigner to Hawaiʻi from the continent, or ‘mainland,’ as the United States section of North America is referred to in everyday conversation on Kauaʻi. I was born and raised off-island, and only arrived on Kauaʻi for the first time, to reside, in January 2002--completely unaware of Hawaiian history or Hawaiian & local cultures on the island. My impression of Hawaiʻi from my childhood was a playland in the Pacific for the very wealthy. As I was not

20 Mele Aloha ʻĀina
wealthy, I did not think about it or even desire to visit there. I only arrived there unexpectedly as one of the endless numbers of ‘hippies’ that flock to the island to live off nature and experience the wild beauty present in Kauaʻi’s landscape. I had a spiritual experience while living in the tree house by the ocean and was subsequently mentored by Hawaiian and local aunties who became family to me. Originally only planning to be on Kauaʻi for a short time, as a result of my unexpected changes in my life, I felt led to stay and work in a local high school that was known for spitting out haole teachers on a regular basis. I subsequently became embedded in the local community through my role as a high school teacher.

I taught for many years at Kapaʻa High School, the school educating youth from the North and East sides of the island and the one that—as I heard from white residents when I accepted a job there—previously had an unofficial ‘Kill Haole Day’ at the end of the school year. This school had a high turnover of haole teachers arriving to fill teaching shortages, many of whom would leave the position when they could not successfully handle the local students, integrate into local society, or survive the long distance away from family and friends on the Continent. Stories of in-migrant teachers walking out in the middle of a school day and never returning were not unheard of.

21 This was an event I was told about by more than one long-time haole resident about Kapaʻa High School, supposedly the last day of school.
My initial experiences teaching at Kapa‘a High School were challenging, as I realized that Kaua‘i culture was dissimilar to American culture, and that haole like me were ill-prepared to step into students’ lives and be able to teach them in an effective manner. However, I soon was able to integrate better into the community through accompanying local and Hawaiian youth around the world on different educational endeavors over several years of teaching high school. Because of this, and as one who desired to learn local and Hawaiian ways of dealing with students, I gained respect from many students and their families and garnered a place in the community.

I do not have a direct lineal connection to the land of Kaua‘i; my connection to Kaua‘i instead is through the people who became my support network and social circle. I never desired nor imagined I would be conducting doctoral research in collaboration with members of my community on Kaua‘i.

I left Kaua‘i to travel to the Middle East in 2010; while there, after securing an internship working on issues of human trafficking, I ended up receiving a scholarship and attending university as a graduate student under the first female Bedouin professor in Israel. I worked with her to explore the transition of Bedouin women from a sheep economy to a cash income in unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Naqab/Negev Desert.22 Around the time I finished my M.A., many of my close friends on Kaua‘i began sharing with me

22 See my previous research in The Economy of Survival: Bedouin women in unrecognized villages by Abu-Rabia-Queder; Morris; and Ryan, 2017. Note: My former last name was Ryan.
about the GMO fields on the Westside of the island, and the strange health and environmental impacts that were occurring on Kaua‘i as a result. This led to a study of Hawaiian food sovereignty on Kaua‘i, through the words of the women leaders I knew there. As I had past experience as a food sovereignty activist in Southern California in the 1990s, I was quite interested in the ongoing debate. This initial study evolved to this thesis today.

As a haole researcher, I have a tremendous amount to learn regarding Hawaiian culture, history, and language, and regarding the localized communities on Kaua‘i. I cannot offer expertise on Hawaiian culture, but rather be a bridge and use my privilege in my current position as a doctoral researcher to amplify the women’s voices. I can also focus a spotlight on the co-participants’ desires for restoration of justice for Hawaiians, something which emerged and became visible in this research. I have also used my position to help write grants for Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola in support of their work in the Anahola community, utilizing aspects of this research.

I originally had no desire for graduate degrees, as graduate school seemed at odds with the life I was living in community on Kaua‘i. Yet my desire is that this dissertation will link the concerns and experiences of the collaborators to a wider spectrum of people. Hopefully, it will contribute to a just end to this debacle known as the American occupation of Hawai‘i; will make visible that which is historically and contemporarily unjust; and ultimately catalyze non-Hawaiians to do something that will help reverse the
damage. What that will look like exactly, I cannot fully foresee, as a pebble
cannot see in advance the ripples that result when it hits the surface of the
water.

1.4 Study Site—Kaua‘i

Kaua‘i is the northernmost of the islands in pae ‘āina Hawai‘i.
Archaeological evidence exists pointing to human habitation of Kaua‘i as early
as 200 A.D. (Kaua‘i Historical Society, n.d.). The island is leeward of the other
islands, and is located 80 miles from O‘ahu across the widest channel of all the
islands. The prevailing trade winds made it difficult to travel southeast towards
the other islands, limiting travel between Kaua‘i and the other islands in times
past to chiefs who had large canoes and paddling crews or to breaks in the
typical wind patterns (Andrade, 2008; Conrow, 2014).

Kaua‘i, at 6 million years old, is the oldest Hawaiian island. It is 1,450
square kilometers in area, with its highest two peaks being Kawaikini at 1,598
meters, followed by Mount Wai‘ale‘ale at 1,569m. The eastern side of Wai‘ale‘ale
is purportedly the wettest spot on land, promoted locally as thus, averaging
1,170 centimetres, or 460 inches a year. This compares to 71 inches in 2015 in
Princeville, and 30 inches at the Lihu‘e Airport (State of Hawai‘i Data Book,
2015).

The Wailua River, or Wailuanuiaho‘ano, as it was traditionally named, is the
most sacred site on-island, and home to 7 heiau, a birthing stone, burial
grounds, fishponds, and petroglyphs (Ho'omanawanui, 2012; Ching, 1981). The chiefs of Kaua‘i resided in this area; Kaumuali‘i, the last chief of Kaua‘i prior to the unification of the islands under Kamehameha I, was born on the birthing stone at Wailuanuiaho‘ano (Ho‘omanawanui, 2012). This large ahupua‘a, measuring 20,000 acres, is bordered by three mountains: Wai‘ale‘ale, Makaleha, and Kalepa to the north, northwest, and south respectively, and empties into the ocean to the east (State of Hawai‘i Data Book, 2015).

In many songs, Kaua‘i is referred to as Kaua‘i o Manokalanipō, named after a famous chief during a prosperous era. In ancient times, the island was known as Kamawaelualani (Andrade, 2008). The island was also known for its spiritual nature, called Kaua‘i Pule O‘O, Kaua‘i of strong prayers (Joesting, 1988). Kaua‘i has a reputation as being the only island unconquered by Kamehameha I when he unified the islands. Twice, Kamehameha attempted to take the island by conquest but was turned back, once by the weather and 8 years later by disease. However, at least one Hawaiian kumu related that Kamehameha was actually prevented by the strong prayers of the people of Kaua‘i.24

24 Personal Communication, the late Kumu Kae‘e Ah Loo, 2004.
Kaumualiʻi, the last chief of Kauaʻi, became part of Kamehameha’s kingdom diplomatically, and was allowed to keep his position and that of his aliʻi on-island. However, in 1824, after Kaumualiʻi’s death, an uprising occurred over which son would take over his father’s position. Ten ships came from Oʻahu and slaughtered the people of Kauaʻi in the uprising, using guns and cannons against the Kauaʻi artillery of sticks and spears (Andrade, 2008; Joesting, 1988).

Ironically and sadly, Kauaʻi experienced a second massacre in its recent history exactly 100 years later, in 1924. During a labor protest, 17 striking Filipino sugar plantation workers and 3 police were killed during a stand-off while fighting for unionization (Conrow, 2014). Until recently, very little history was publicly preserved about this massacre. In 2019, Filipino historians have brought attention to this event in anticipation of the 100-year anniversary of the tragedy. Additionally, these historians have discovered what they believe to be the mass grave of the Filipino workers (Loehrer, Garden Island, 2019). Currently, a film is being made about the murder of the Filipino workers.

1.4.1 Kauaʻi firsts

Kauaʻi has some unique ‘firsts’ since haole records of contact with Kānaka Maoli, that set Kauaʻi apart historically from the other islands. The infamous Captain Cook, whose arrival heralded the beginning of many subsequent ships visiting Hawaiian shores, first landed in the islands on Kauaʻi’s western shore, at Waimea Bay in 1778 (Akana, 2014). As well, the first
successful sugar mill in the islands began on Kaua‘i’s south shore, in Koloa, in 1835 (Kaua‘i Historical Society, accessed September 27, 2017). The establishment of haole-cultivated sugar industry instigated a series of changes in the economy and governance of the islands that ultimately led to the demise of the Hawaiian Nation.

1.4.2 Land Divisions

Kaua‘i traditionally was divided into five land divisions called moku: Halele‘a, Na Pali, Kona, Ko‘olau, and Puna; and then further divided into 50 ahupua‘a. Kanaka Maoli scholar from Kaua‘i, Dr. Carlos Andrade, describes these ahupua‘a, part of a complex system of land division, as “extend[ing] from the cool, moist uplands, down across…coastal plains, out into ocean waters, encompassing fringing reefs and sand-bordered bays…” (2008). Ahupua‘a residents shared resources under the leadership of a manager called the konohiki. The konohiki’s administration included regulating water distribution amongst the ahupua‘a residents for agricultural purposes as well as regulating fishing.

Today, thanks to Kaua‘i’s Prince Kūhiō’s work in the Territorial Legislature, the islands are divided into counties. Kaua‘i County also includes the island of Ni‘ihau, a haole-owned island that is inhabited by Hawaiians that are the sole continuous Hawaiian community in the world who still speak their
The government seat for the County is located in Lihu‘e, in the southeast corner of the island near the harbor of Nawiliwili. Kapa‘a is the most populated city on Kaua‘i, located on the Eastside of the island.

1.4.3 Current and Historical Population Counts

Although Kaua‘i was the site of the genesis of the sugar industry for the islands, it had the smallest population recorded in census records. In 1831, when census data is first available, only 12,024 people were recorded on Kaua‘i compared to 29,755 people in the commercial and governmental center of Honolulu; 42,742 on Maui; and 45,792 on Moku Keawe. By 1872, due to decimation from foreign diseases, the population had dropped on Kaua‘i to 5,194, while populations on Maui and Big Island were 1/3 of their 1831 census data (State of Hawai‘i Data Book 2016).

Kaua‘i County’s 2017 census registered 72,159 residents, a population which, prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, swelled to nearly 100,000 on any given day due to the large numbers of tourists. In 2012, 17,792 identified Caucasian; 16,881 residents identified Hawaiian or Part-Hawaiian [sic]; 12,662 were listed as Filipino; nearly 6,000 identified as Japanese, and 14,601 were
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25 The dialect entails the use of ‘T’ in place of ‘K’ so that Kaua‘i is pronounced Taua‘i.
26 Big Island.
27 With the onset of Covid-19 global pandemic, tourism was nearly shut-down on Kaua‘i, resulting in diminished traffic and increased unemployment.
listed as mixed ethnicity, non-Hawaiian (Kaua‘i Tourism Report, 2018; Ethnic Stock by County 2012 update).28

1.4.4 Hawaiian well-being on Kaua‘i

Hawaiian well-being and health are linked to overarching systems, infrastructure, and environments that western frameworks of health often overlook (Greenwood, de Leeuw, Lindsay & Reading, 2015). Health researchers can ignore and minimize how historic and ongoing colonialism have embedded deleterious impacts on Hawaiian well-being, health, and longevity (DeLeeuw, Greenwood & Lindsay, 2013). The next several subsections are within an Indigenous Social Determinants of Health framework, discussing various aspects of life on Kaua‘i that result from colonial occupation and how these situations potentially impact the Hawaiian community.

1.4.5 Tourism

The latest report on tourism produced by the County of Kaua‘i (Zachary, 2018) states that Kaua‘i is at a ‘tipping point,’ and is experiencing a situation of ‘overtourism’ from too many visitors on the island. The County stresses the need to ‘refocus.’ Significant strain has been placed on local infrastructure, with frequent traffic problems plaguing residents, who have only a 2-lane highway around the island.
In 2017 there were 1.277 million visitors that arrived by air, with an additional 214,500 cruise ship arrivals coming twice a week. The first six months of 2018 showed an increasing number of tourists arriving, peaking with a record-breaking all time high in June of 2018 of 33,368 average daily visitor count. This high number came even though Kaua‘i has received unusual amounts of rain in 2018 and even record-breaking flooding in April 2018 that eliminated some North Shore communities and parks from tourists’ itineraries for the ensuing six months (Zachary, 2018; UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018).

Numbers are up in part due to an airline adding daily nonstop service from Seattle to Lihu‘e for 2018, increasing air arrival passengers by 60K per year. Additional airlines are increasing daily flights and expanding routes from across the United States and also Canada; and another airline, Southwest, opened up discount direct flights to Kaua‘i for the first time in 2019,29 promising even larger numbers of air passengers arriving, increasing airline seats to Kaua‘i by 43%. Due to the high influx of tourists, on any given day even before these flights are expanded, 1 in 3 people on Kaua‘i is a tourist.30 At current population levels, the most tourists Kaua‘i can handle per day is 25,000, after which local infrastructure can no longer accommodate both residents and visitors and ensure a tolerable quality of life (Tourism Report,

29 Southwest Airlines.
30 Again, these statistics were compiled pre-Covid-19 pandemic. It is not clear how the pandemic will disrupt Kaua‘i tourism in the long-term.
2018; Kauaʻi Economic Outlook, 2018). The current and anticipated number of tourists is then, in fact, untenable.31

For Hawaiian people and locals on Kauaʻi, overtourism is deleterious to their everyday lives. Traffic becomes very congested on a continual basis; housing for locals gets converted into the cash cows of tourist rentals; County Governance prioritizes the needs of visitors, who bring in money, over the concerns of residents. Some of these tourists decide to move on-island, additionally reducing housing options and squeezing out Indigenous and local residents. Further, tourism can commodify Hawaiian culture and package it for profitable consumption, warping the image of what it means to be Hawaiian in the public sphere.

Furthermore, an over-reliance on tourism in the economy puts Hawaiians and other residents at-risk should there be a disruption in air travel, as has occurred with the onset of Covid-19. The economy needs to be diversified to protect the livelihoods and survival of local residents.

1.4.6 Housing Crisis

Kauaʻi has the highest population growth currently of any county in Hawaiʻi, primarily resulting from in-migration rates from the continental US. Yet the ratio of household income to the price of a single-family dwelling is the worst of any county in Hawaiʻi. Affordable housing and strains on local

31 This is referring to life on Kauaʻi pre-pandemic. Much has changed with the pandemic, the full impact of which remain to be seen.
infrastructure are identified by the County government as two of the most pressing problems facing Kaua‘i today. Roughly 1/3rd of Kaua‘i residents experience severe housing problems; and presumably statistics have spiked in the last couple of years above this mark, as AirBnBs have increased since this assessment (Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018; Smith et al/Appleseed 2018; Zachary, 2018; Kaua‘i General Plan, 2018; OHERO Kaua‘i Gov 2016; Kaua‘i Health Report, 2015; Vaughan, 2018).  

Pre-pandemic County estimates place the housing shortage at -3,000 units, as of 2018, with a projected shortfall of ---9,000 by 2035. The homeless population has increased in recent years, with Kaua‘i debating whether to create an ‘‘ohana zone’ to provide at least electricity and water to the islands’ homeless population (UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018; Smith et al/Appleseed 2018; Zachary, 2018; Kaua‘i General Plan, 2018; UHERO Kaua‘i Gov 2016; Kaua‘i Health Report, 2015; Vaughan, 2018).

The housing crisis is partially attributed to the influx of haole from the continental U.S.; 7,000 new residents have moved to Kaua‘i in the last decade. The Housing is also in part to the AirBnB phenomenon on Kaua‘i, as in recent years the number of vacation rentals on Kaua‘i has increased to 1 in every 8 homes. Many of these vacation units are illegal, but little enforcement exists to bring them into compliance (UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018; Smith et

---

32 This dire situation has only worsened under the global pandemic. Pacific Business News (Nov. 6, 2020) states that the median price of a home on Kaua‘i increased 45% in October 2020 to $985,000; home sales jumped by over one-third on Kaua‘i compared to 2019 (Noelani Josselin, Personal Communication, 2020).
Additionally, over half of the vacation rental units on Kaua‘i are owned by non-Hawai‘i residents who live off-island. Between 2008 and 2015, the average price of a home on Kaua‘i was over $700,000; in Oct 2020, it spiked to nearly $1 million. Forty-three percent of homes purchased between 2008-2015 were by mainland haole. The County instituted an affordable housing ordinance in 2008, requiring developers to construct 30% of their project as affordable housing, but to date nothing has been built in accordance with this (UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018; Smith, et al., 2018; Tourism Report, 2018; Kaua‘i General Plan, 2018; UHERO Kaua‘i Gov 2016; Kaua‘i Health Report, 2015; Vaughan, 2018).

This lack of housing is perhaps one of the most egregious outcomes of colonization to impact the Hawaiian people. It is a genocidal outcome that began with loss of land tenure and has led to houselessness. The underlying message is clear: you no longer have a place in your own homeland. While the U.S. Government may not be overtly pursuing the destruction of Hawaiians, the crisis is not being addressed at a level that is reversing or impeding the injustice. It is an issue that demands attention; yet Hawaiians have little financial or political pull with government to gain any traction towards change.
1.4.7 GMO Agriculture Industry on Kaua‘i

While tourism is the main economy on Kaua‘i, the largest agricultural endeavor on Kaua‘i is the GMO seed corn industry, located primarily on the West side of the island (UHERO Kaua‘i 2016). Kaua‘i, the epicenter for global GMO field testing and seed cultivation, had become the center of controversy in island-wide protests in 2013 and 2014 against unbridled GMO agriculture experimentation and spraying.

The County of Kaua‘i passed landmark legislation in 2014 to create a pesticide spray buffer around homes, hospitals and schools and halt experimental GMO open-air testing on Kaua‘i. In response to the groundbreaking legislation, other counties in Hawai‘i also passed protective measures. Several of the multinational GMO corporations sued Kaua‘i County in court, effectively delaying or blocking the populist legislation for Kaua‘i, Maui, and the Big Island (Brower, 2016).

Currently, GMO companies are growing and expanding operations on the West side of Kaua‘i. Dow DuPont currently is increasing its operations on Kaua‘i by 50% and adding $12 million in infrastructure; while Hartung, which bought Syngenta, is expanding to alfalfa production for livestock (UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018).

Indigenous response to the GMO fields on Kaua‘i have been divided; in a region that lacks a variety of potential employment options, there may exist some Hawaiians who are employed by the GMO companies on the West side
likely appreciate the paycheck. Some Hawaiians from other parts of the island who are employed elsewhere may feel the freedom to be concerned about the deleterious impacts on the waters, land, and people these foreign corporations are bringing. Local government needs to work to create environmentally-sustainable and safe employment options for Hawaiians and others on the West side. Likewise, GMO corporations need to comply with legislation that Kaua‘i passed that include ceasing all GMO experimentation; informing the people what pesticides are being sprayed; and creating a buffer between schools, hospitals, and residences with the pesticide spraying. Thus far, the corporations have not complied with these demands and have instead pushed their own candidates onto the County Council to influence future legislation.

1.4.8 Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) on Kaua‘i

Hawai‘i is not only the epicenter of the global GMO seed industry, it is also the world’s largest military installation. Not far from the GMO fields on the West side of Kaua‘i is the world’s largest test range, the Pacific Missile Range Facility at Barking Sands (PMRF). PMRF covers 42,000 square miles of airspace and is capable of conducting military operations on both the surface and subsurface of the ocean, as well as in the air and in space (Pacific Missile Range Facility, Barking Sands, n.d.). This base has been used by the U.S. Military since 1940 and is restricted from the general population, though missile tests can sometimes be seen by Kaua‘i residents in the skies over their

Since 1961, the site includes the Kaua‘i Test Facility, owned by the Sandia National Laboratories for the US Department of Energy. On their website, Sandia boasts that KTF has supported 400 missions, and has “a broad, unrestricted, and unpopulated ocean impact area,” providing “high-velocity water impact and underwater trajectory experiments” (Sandia National Laboratories, n.d.). From PMRF, the U.S. Military has tested the Advanced Hypersonic Weapon, a weapon that can hit anywhere on the planet within an hour’s time (US Army, n.d.). Yet the daily goings-on at PMRF seem invisible in day-to-day Kaua‘i life.

The installation of numerous military bases in the islands has placed Kaua‘i in a vulnerable position in terms of retaliation. We already see how this plays out with the attack on Pearl Harbor in WW2; as well as the threats from North Korea to target Hawai‘i during the current Trump Era. The Hawaiian Kingdom was a neutral nation prior to American takeover. The U.S. has imposed their military bases upon Hawai‘i for the protection of the American continent; the U.S. has not consulted the Hawaiian people about this imposition and subsequent potential consequences to Hawaiian people and land.
1.4.9 Hurricanes and Weather Events

Hurricanes have impacted Kaua‘i three times in recent history. Hurricane Dot hit Kaua‘i in 1952, and Hurricane ‘Iwa in 1982. The greatest damage was done by ‘Iniki in 1992, when the eye of a Category 4 hurricane passed directly over Kaua‘i. Kaua‘i was considered a federal disaster area after ‘Iniki, and the island took many years to rebuild their roads, hotels, roofs and infrastructure (Kaua‘i Historical Society, Sept 27, 2017).

In April 2018, Kaua‘i rainfall broke U.S. rainfall records for a 24-hour period when 49.7 inches of rain was recorded at Waipā on the North Shore (Honolulu Star Advertiser, January 30, 2019). Kaua‘i experienced record flooding, causing severe damage to many homes and roads. Sections of the island were cut off from food and transportation, requiring military airlift and boats to evacuate tourists, ferry residents, and provide food and potable water (UHERO, Kaua‘i Economic Outlook, 2018). Sections of the North Shore of Kaua‘i nearly a year after the initial floods, continued to be cut off from normal traffic and were restricted to truck convoys twice a day.

1.4.10 Health Disparities

While Kaua‘i may be a playground for the rich, Hawaiian and other local residents suffer increasing health disparities; and in some areas are in a full-blown health crisis. A recent report on Kaua‘i County’s health indicates that the lack of economic security, including the lack of affordable housing and access to quality food, has resulted in high levels of mental health issues on
island such as depression, anxiety, and suicide. Mental health services are extremely limited on Kaua‘i, and especially for teens. Many teens suffer from suicide and other issues including eating disorders and cyber-harassment. Teens in need of mental health services encounter extended wait times, as a shortage of psychiatrists and social workers exists on-island. Hawaiian teens especially suffer high rates of suicides. Substance abuse exacerbates issues; and no in-patient drug treatment facility is found on Kaua‘i, with only one addiction specialist on-island. A lack of health specialists puts further economic strain and emotional stress as it requires patients to fly off-island to receive services (Kaua‘i Health Report, 2015).

Hawai‘i in general has the worst record of treating mental illness in the adult population in the entire United States. Only 1 in 3 adults who have mental illness and 1 in 3 teens who suffer from major depression actually receive treatment in Hawai‘i (Hawai‘i News Now, November 2018; Mental Health America, Access to Care Data, 2018).

In the Spring of 2019, an unusually high number of young adults committed suicide on the North and East side of Kaua‘i. These suicides have corresponded with a spiraling housing shortage on island, again lending evidence of the effects of colonial occupation of Hawai‘i. The housing crisis has gotten worse than delayed reports can evidence, as in the last 12 months I have witnessed tragic laments posted on my Facebook newsfeed, full of 20 and 30-something former students and their peers that cannot find a place to live.
These are not statistics, these are people, whose lives are hanging in the balance, or ending, while unwitting whites move to the island in droves. Investors looking for a profit buy up real estate to rent to tourists vs local residents. State and business policies encourage tourists to come in ever-increasing numbers; and those Hawaiians and locals squeezed to the edge fall through the crevices. Many who could afford to do so have moved off-island, leaving family and friends to communities on the continent in search of survival. But many cannot afford to do this.

The historical loss, trauma, and high rates of stress on the Hawaiian community on Kaua‘i has adversely affected their health (Cook, Withy & Tarallo-Jensen, 2003; Liu & Alameda, 2011). The suicide rate for Hawaiians on Kaua‘i is four times higher that of other groups. Kānaka Maoli on Kaua‘i have the highest death rate from breast cancer, five times than other groups in the county; double the mortality rate from diabetes than the rest of the population; and the highest rate of mortality from stroke and heart disease, 2.5 times higher than County’s overall population (Healthcare Association of Hawaii, 2015).

Following are several statistics that reveal how the Kaua‘i community is suffering. Kaua‘i County has the highest rate of obesity among teens of all counties in Hawai‘i. Less than half of teens get daily exercise. Forty percent of adults on Kaua‘i eat less than 1 fruit a day. Kaua‘i has the highest rate of adult diabetes across the archipelago. Asthma mortality rates are highest for
adults in this island, vs. the rest of the state. Half of all motor-vehicle collisions are alcohol-related, a higher incidence on Kauaʻi than the rest of Hawaiʻi. Sexual and physical violence rates are higher than the state and the US. A recent study says there is a shortage of obstetric and gynecological specialists on island. And a higher share of adults on Kauaʻi than in the rest of the state do not have health insurance (Healthcare Association of Hawaii, 2015).

The facts presented are concerning. Something must be done immediately to support the current young adults to survive economically and psychologically on Kauaʻi. The situations impacting my former students are often invisible, from my experience, amongst many in the haole community on Kauaʻi. It is like a stratified, 2-tiered society of the middle and upper-class immigrants living in parallel communities near the original host Nation--a Nation which is marginalized and economically exploited on the lands their ancestors stewarded.

These statistics are evidence of the genocidal implications of colonial occupation of the Hawaiian Islands on the Hawaiian people. Issues of tourism, housing, military occupation, and viable employment options need to be paramount in public and governmental forums to reverse the damage that is ongoing.

1.4.11 Anahola

At this juncture we will narrow the focus from all of Kauaʻi to the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola, where many in this study are
located. Anahola is also where the Hawaiian non-profit I have partnered with in this research is based.

The community of Anahola sits mauka and makai of Kūhiō Highway on the northeast area of the island of Kauaʻi. Expansive Anahola Bay shows sweeping views of the Kalalea Mountains. Remnants of a dock from earlier times are visible in the surf; the pilings standing as sentinels watching the endless waves roll in.

Five-hundred and eighteen Hawaiian families live in Anahola, at a population of 2,122. It is primarily a Hawaiian Homelands community managed by the Department of Hawaiian Homelands (DHHL) vs. an incorporated municipality. Because DHHL is historically underfunded, Anahola lacks community infrastructure, health clinics, grocery stores, gathering places, and other community services that are necessary for healthy communities. There is a higher incidence of poverty, unemployment, suicide and drug use in Anahola compared to state-wide statistics. Pre-Covid-19 unemployment sat at 33%; the poverty level is significantly higher than Hawaiʻi’s average. The most common jobs in Anahola are service sector jobs in 1) hospitality & restaurant, averaging $28,000/year in wages; and 2) retail, averaging $34,000/year; and 3) transportation and warehousing, earning $23,000/year. Outside of the community, stigma is associated with living in Anahola, with a reputation of poverty, high drop-out rates, crime, and drug abuse.
The shape of the mountain range and the names of the peaks of the mountains in Anahola—Hokualele (pathway to the stars), Konanae (an arc), Kikoʻo (to be potbellied), Amu (shear, the name of a wind that blows from this peak), Puʻu Anakoa (to be courageous)—give insight into deeper meanings of this place. When I would see this beloved mountain range, I always saw, when noticing its shape, someone on their back, praying. A local Hawaiian-immersion teacher once told me that Kauaʻi was known as Kauaʻi Pule OʻO, the island of strong prayers, in pre-Christian times, and that Kamehameha I had been held back by these prayers when he unsuccessfully tried to conquer Kauaʻi. I saw Anahola, as a predominantly Hawaiian community, containing the signature of the original spiritual imprint of the people of Kauaʻi.

Referencing the last peak, Puʻu Anakoa, I believe that the destiny on the youth of Anahola is to be courageous in the face of much struggle (Marti-Kini, 2009).

Apparently, to some residents and even foreigners, Anahola is known for its spiritual implications. My students from Anahola, before I moved there, warned me of night marchers and other spiritual activity that they had experienced there. I encountered non-Hawaiian locals from other communities on island that would at times avoid Anahola due to its spiritual activity. While I was one of the few whites in the community, I noticed a spiritual practitioner from the Hindu temple on Kauaʻi moved into Anahola as well, drawn to the spiritual elements. The Dalai Lama, when he visited Hawaiʻi in 1994, asked to visit just two places in Hawaiʻi, both on Kauaʻi: Polihale and Anahola. He said
his people recognized the place as a site of great spiritual significance (Marti-Kini, 2009) and that all beings entered the world at this spot.

It is not definitive what Anahola means. According to one source, a local teacher versed in Hawaiian language found several references in 5 Hawaiian newspapers between 1835 and 1925 that spell Anahola with an ‘e’, as in Anehola. It is possible that the spelling of the community was changed in recent times. If Anehola is the correct spelling, one possible definition is “the time/hour of the breath of life” (Marti-Kini, 2009).

Some of the oldest homes in A-town, as the youth sometimes refer to it, are on the ‘downside’, near the Bay. This area is known as The Village and consists of fee-simple properties owned by Hawaiians. Haole have also bought properties owned previously by Hawaiians, especially on the beach. Hawaiian Homelands make up the other properties in Anahola, and are also scattered amidst some of the fee simple properties of the Village.

When I lived in Anahola with a Hawaiian family for many years, there was a large sign in the front yard that read, ‘This ain’t America. This is the Hawaiian Kingdom.’ At that time, one could find signs down the road from my place, facing the haole-owned homes on the beach, that said, ‘Haole go home!’ or ‘Egrets go back where you came from’ using the name of the white birds that had been introduced to the islands as a moniker for haole.

Living in Anahola, one can witness firsthand the social injustices that have rippled outwards in all directions from the Overthrow of the Hawaiian
monarchy, the ensuing military occupation, and the total oppression that has displaced and undermined the original inhabitants there. Yet one can also witness the strength, love, and power exhibited by the community and especially the women, some of which have collaborated in this research.

1.5 The Women of This Study

*I ka ‘ōlelo no ke ola, i ka ‘ōlelo no ka make.* In words are life, and in words are death. These women’s words give life to reshape reality. In re-storying the Hawaiian women’s words in this dissertation, life comes back to the Kingdom, and overcomes the death that was spread by the false prophets of the Overthrow and maintained by various imposing governmental forces that have perpetuated genocide in the last 125 years.

In support of uncovering truth and working for justice, this study includes the stories of powerful Hawaiian women leaders on Kaua‘i. The women shared their experiences with land access & loss; many of the women also shared about their dreams for the future and their expression of Aloha ‘Āina, whether it was in defending their land from GMOS or longing for a restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom of their kūpuna.

These kūpuna in this study share their stories, their pasts, and their dreams for the future of their island and the next generation on Kaua‘i in refusal of the options America offers them but in affirmation of vibrant dreams

---

33 “In words are life, in words are death...” Hawaiian proverb.
of Hawaiian Resurgence and the return of the Hawaiian national governance over the islands. They express Aloha ʻĀina: an interlocking love and devotion both for the ʻĀina of Hawaiʻi, together with a deep longing for the restoration of righteous Hawaiian governance over the ʻĀina.

Following are a list of the women that were part of this research, as well as additional interviews that were included in the research for context and breadth. Each of the women has been or continues to be a leader in her community. The women are separated by generation, kūpuna or mākua; the years at the end of their listing signify the time of their interviews in this study.

1.5.1 The Kūpuna Generation


4. Puanani Rogers, Director of Hoʻokipa Network for Kauaʻi; Host of Kauaʻi Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kauaʻi Poʻo of Kalahui Hawaiʻi; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ʻĀina O Nā Wāhine O Waiʻaleʻale (President of Women’s Patriotic League); interview conducted in 2016.

6. Wanda Shibata, former liaison with the Governor’s Office for Kaua‘i, governmental and business leader, interview conducted in 2017.

(7. Wanda Oshiro, though not individually interviewed, was included alongside her daughter Richell Sweet in 2017 regarding Kuleana Land claims).

1.5.2 The Mākuʻa Generation


8. Lorilani Keohokalole-Torio, formerly the leader of the M.O.M. Hui & former member of H.A.P.A. Foundation; currently Anahola resident & community activist, 2014.

9. Chelsey Contrades, born and raised in Anahola and current resident, former KKOA board member, member of the M.O.M. Hui, community leader, interviewed in 2014 & 2017.

10. Richell Sweet, Youth Coordinator for KKOA; former member of M.O.M. Hui, interviewed in 2014 & 2017.

11. Tiana Laranio, formerly KKOA Board member, member of the M.O.M. Hui, former County Council Candidate, community leader, interviewed in 2014, and 2017.


1.5.3 Additional Interviews

The following interviews were supplemental for contextual understanding of some of the issues addressed in this study.


15. Gary Hooser, former County Council member, member of H.A.P.A., introduced the bill against GMOs on Kaua‘i, interviewed in 2014.

16. Former Commissioner for DHHL, anonymous interview off the record, interviewed in 2016.


22. Kaui Fu, Community Services Coordinator at Waipā Foundation. Kaui was not formally interviewed, but contributed an important comment while another participant was sharing her mana‘o.
1.6 Dissertation Overview

The following chapters of this study are arranged in a unique way. Rather than reserve the women’s voices for a separate chapter, I have interwoven their comments throughout the paper, surrounding them contextually with the literature and data that provides the backdrop for their stories. This context further informs the reader about the bigger picture of which they speak. Their words give life to the history and data, expressing how these facts have both impacted them, and are lived out, in real time.

Chapter 2 explores the Indigenous Methodologies & Research Methods employed in this study, featuring the work of various Indigenous Scholars including Linda Smith, Sarah Hunt, Lisa Hall, Margaret Kovach and many others. Indigenous Methodologies are a natural choice when working with Indigenous collaborators as these frameworks account for the colonial realities ever present in Indigenous lives, while acknowledging and centering Indigenous voices and cultural ways.

This research also includes a modified Grounded Theory in the coding of the collaborative talk story sessions, as well as components of Action Research in how the study played out. In the chapter, I include 10 principles of Indigenous Methodologies that were utilized; as well as a section on Friendship as Method that was a unique aspect of the research. Examining my role as an external-insider was an important part of Chapter 2, also, to elucidate how I related with members of the community with which I partnered.
Chapter 3 outlines the historic unraveling of Hawaiian land tenure and self-governance, beginning with changes that happened in the Hawaiian Kingdom under Kamehameha I and ending the story with the unconstitutional annexation of the Hawaiian Kingdom against the will of the people by the U.S. Government. The chapter investigates aspects of the Mahele, in pursuit of elucidating how Hawaiians have arrived as essentially landless in their own lands. This includes a discussion amongst scholars regarding the Mahele: whether it was a foreign solution to a catastrophic depopulation issue resulting from introduced disease; or rather a vehicle of Hawaiian agency to protect Hawaiians from losing land tenure in the wake of anticipated foreign conquest.

Details of how the Land Commission failed to meet the needs of especially rural Hawaiians far from the Governmental center during the Mahele, as well as the failures of unethical surveyors and even greedy konohiki are found in the history. The formation of Land Hui was a successful way the Hawaiian community retained tenure of ahupuaʻa in Hāʻena, Wainiha, and Moloaʻa for part of the century subsequent to the Overthrow.

The Kūʻē Petitions were an important part of Hawaiian history that were lost from public discourse until uncovered in the National Archives by Dr. Noenoe Silva. These petitions were evidence that the Hawaiian people did not want to lose their Nation and become a part of the United States, contrary to popular myth perpetuated in occupied Hawaiʻi by foreigners. These petitions
were used by the Queen and her subjects to communicate to Congress and the American people their desire for freedom and self-determination.

The Morgan Report (Morgan, 1894), steeped in racist propaganda, is covered in this chapter. This Congressional report was used to exonerate the members of the US government who had secretly supported the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government. US investigators were never able to find the ‘smoking gun’ that linked U.S. Minister John Stevens to his crime at that time; however, recently historians have found the written note between Stevens and the rebel Sanford Dole who usurped the Queen against the majority of the Hawaiian Kingdom subjects.

Chapter 4, entitled *Health of Hawaiian Lands and Bodies within an Indigenous Determinants of Health Framework*, reframes Hawaiian health with an understanding of how the military occupation of Hawai‘i has negatively impacted the Hawaiian community. This occupation has resulted in a myriad of effects, many of which are not linked to the original cause when discussed in traditional health literature. Within this framework, this research looks at the educational system, the suppression of the Hawaiian language, the health disparities of the Hawaiian people, the destruction of the land, the effects of hosting the largest military installation on the planet, the loss of food sovereignty, and the controversies around federal recognition that impact the Hawaiian nation as a result of occupation. These topics follow the themes
expressed in the talk-story sessions with the women and paint a picture of the
overlapping issues that touch every Hawaiian under colonization.

Chapter 5, *Hawaiian Lands in Hawaiian Hands: Kuleana Lands, DHHL, and the Housing Crisis* covers the various controversies that are ongoing today
that separate Hawaiians from the land in their own homeland. The chapter
starts with discussing the Kuleana Land issue that flared up when Facebook
founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg sought to quiet title his huge purchase in
Moloaʻa Valley in 2016, down the road from one of the main collaborators in
this study. This put Kuleana Land claims in the media spotlight as well as the
center of discussion amongst many Hawaiians on-island during that time.

The women share their heart-wrenching experiences with the
Department of Hawaiian Homelands (DHHL), an entity established by the US
Government to distribute land leases to Hawaiians, yet one that is not
adequately funded by the State of Hawaiʻi such that it can actually accomplish
its mission. This leaves the Hawaiian community in a permanent state of
deferral. A few of the women in the study, who could jump through the hoops
required to establish colonially-mandated blood quantum levels, have been
waiting on the list for years to try to obtain a land lease; others in this study
can’t even get on the waiting list as they do not have the blood quantum the
U.S. Government requires.

In conclusion in Chapter 6, Hawaiian Resurgence is explored as the
response of the women to the genocidal occupation of their lands. Aloha ʻĀina
is an aspect of this Resurgence that emerged from the talk-story sessions. The women expressed their Aloha ʻĀina in two significant and distinct ways:

Hawaiian Resurgence via the restoration of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty; or a rejection of Federal Recognition and a future of restored Hawaiian Governance over all of the Hawaiian Islands.

The second half of Chapter 6 takes on an Action Research component in its vision of moving forward with Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA), an Anahola-based Hawaiian women’s non-profit that figured prominently in this study. After an 11-year struggle for access to land that is still being waged in various ways, KKOA obtained initial access to land from DHHL through which they are establishing a Community Garden and a Youth and Agricultural Training Center for the Homelands Community of Anahola. As parts of this research have impacted KKOA in its programming, KKOA’s next steps are featured as a way to end this paper from a place of hope—hope for the future generation of Hawaiians being raised up on Hawaiian Homelands in Anahola.
Chapter 2: Indigenous Methodologies & Research Methods

Following here is a brief overview of the research—how it started, who the participants are, and what my role is as a haole ally. This is followed by a deeper outline of the Indigenous Methodologies that are utilized in this research, underscoring the intuitive selection of choosing Indigenous Methodologies when working with Indigenous participants in a colonial context. This chapter also explores Friendship as Method and a modified Grounded Theory when coding the data.

2.1 Research Overview

As a haole researcher with long-standing, close relationships in a localized Hawaiian community, I have logically looked to Indigenous scholars for paradigms that more aptly frame the research contained in this project. I do not seek to claim Indigenous Methodologies as my own, but rather look to Indigenous scholars and their frameworks as a more practical and intuitive lens through which to analyze life and produce knowledge.

Indigenous Methodologies differ to western paradigms of knowledge production as they are more connected to reality; they expose Colonialism, whose status quo often benefits from remaining ‘invisible’ in public discourse. Indigenous Methodologies therefore can instruct and inform the research of non-Indigenous scholars and Indigenous scholars alike.

It was best to use Indigenous epistemology and frameworks when producing knowledge with Indigenous co-participants. While looking to
Indigenous Methodologies as the best and most logical tools through which to engage with Indigenous participants and expose colonial paradigms, I am doing so as a haole external-insider, looking to Indigenous epistemology and ontology as more effective frameworks for this study.

A system such as traditional western academia—an institutionalized force that has both perpetuated and benefited from colonialism—has been ensconced in a paradigm of reality that is detached from our relationship to the earth and, in most cases, everyday people’s struggle for survival. Academia has traditionally ignored at best--and at worst, perpetuated--the subjugation of Indigenous peoples; therefore, it cannot offer a logical framework through which to accurately analyze Indigenous reality. We must look to Indigenous Scholars and their contributions of Indigenous Methodologies for guidance in producing effective research that makes sense in a disconnected world, to make academia face the ongoing reality of colonialism for many Indigenous peoples.

The research discussed in this dissertation exemplifies a mixed qualitative approach of Indigenous Methodologies that included using Modified Grounded Theory as an analytical tool (Kovach, 2011) in the process of analyzing data. I utilized modified Grounded Theory to code the data from preliminary interviews, pulling out the themes and organizing the quotes in groupings under 31 thematic categories and another 30+ subcategories.
This research germinated from discussions over years with a key female leader in her community on Kaua‘i, Ku‘uleialoha Punua,34 regarding her vision to see Hawaiians restored to their land and growing their own food. This vision contrasted to a parallel pattern of multi-national corporations that have made Hawai‘i, and specifically Kaua‘i, the epicenter of GMO field testing and seed production since GMO’s introduction into the islands in the 1990s (Brower, 2016).

Each talk-story session was conducted between 2014-2017 with primarily a number of Hawaiian women leaders on the island of Kaua‘i utilizing ‘talk-story’ as the primary research method. Talking story allowed the collaborator to proceed in her own direction in terms of sharing her mana‘o, and involved a back-and-forth approach to interviewing.35

Interviews were recorded and transcribed on a hand-held recorder, and later on an iPhone, sometimes utilizing a clip-on mic. At times, I also took notes on my laptop during the conversation; at others, I simply enjoyed the flow of conversation and resolved to review the material during transcription. I later emailed each woman a copy of her transcripts so that each co-participant

---

34 Ku‘ulei was influential in this study, and remains an influential figure in the author’s personal life. However, she did not read this dissertation prior to its publication, and the opinions and views expressed in this dissertation by the author and various co-participants may diverge greatly from her own, and should not necessarily reflect on her or on her affiliated non-profit, Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola, (KKOA).

35 Women’s voices and stories are at the core of this study; however a few interviews were conducted with various men in initial stages of the study primarily around the GMO issue politically, but also around issues of land and survival on Kaua‘i.
could review their words and edit them before including them in my dissertation.

Many of these talks were with long-term friends, women who were willing to open up and share from deep within their naʻau of their pain, their desires, and their dreams. Some of these women may not call themselves ‘leaders,’ but by virtue of their roles in their communities invariably are. Their stories touched on, among other things, their personal struggles with obtaining access to land as well as maintaining that access; their hopes of the next generation having access to the land; the need to seek justice and uncover their true history of the Lāhui; and their vision for their island, their people, and the future of pae ‘āina Hawaiʻi.

Some of the women interviewed were not long-term friends of mine but were referred to me through friends—in effect, a modified form of snowball sampling. Other women I met through my affiliation with Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola36 (KKOA), of which I am an advisor to the Board.

I was specifically able to benefit from the manaʻo of two key men dedicated to the Lāhui, referred to me by several of the Kauaʻi women leaders who had seen them conduct talks on-island: Dr. Keanu Sai, a key Kānaka leader working on an international level to expose the military occupation of Hawaiʻi and the U.S. government’s violations of international law; and Dr. Ron

---

36 KKOA is a Kānaka women-led non-profit in the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola, Kauaʻi that began as a result of three young Hawaiian suicides in October 2008.
Williams, Jr., a non-Hawaiian researcher fluent in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i who works translating original Hawaiian source documents to uncover Hawaiian history. I also spoke with former students, Wendell Soares and Tyson Hawelu, who shared some of their struggles as young Hawaiian men trying to survive on Kaua‘i while facing extremely high costs of living and limited affordable housing options. I interviewed Roland and Butchy Durant, part of a family in Kapaia, Kaua‘i whose kūpuna have lived for as long as they can remember on a lo‘i without title, and have successfully defended their right to stay there in multiple court cases. These sources provided rich additional context to my main research.

Further, I interviewed Bernard Carvalho, Mayor on Kaua‘i from 2010-2018 during the GMO controversy of 2014; as well as the County Council member Gary Hooser regarding the legislation he introduced to ban GMO open-air testing and establish spraying buffer zones for the GMO companies. While the research evolved beyond a focus on food sovereignty and GMOs on Kaua‘i, the former Mayor and former Council member Hooser still established context to the issues.

The long-term friendships and my long-standing relationship with KKOA were established over many years of living on Kaua‘i, prior to my role as a doctoral student. I lived many of those years with a multi-generational Hawaiian family in Anahola, while working in two public high schools on Kaua‘i. At both campuses, I taught Social Studies and also took charge of each
respective school’s Alternative Learning Center\textsuperscript{37} where students arrested for violence or drugs were relegated to an “off-campus” learning center. In one high school, the population of ALC students were primarily from the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola.

I later opened a school program for high school students who had either dropped out or were at risk of doing so. I primarily focused on Hawaiian students from Anahola—a Hawaiian Homelands community which was not culturally supported by the structure and content of American public education and which had a reputation locally for high drop-out rates.

Some of the women interviewed I met through my role as a teacher, as they were parents of students to whom I was close. In one case, the collaborator was a colleague at the school where I taught. She invited me to live with her family in 2004, leasing to me a studio apartment in her home in the Anahola Village—an older section of the community that was not primarily Hawaiian Homelands, but fee-simple lots purchased originally by Hawaiian families from the U.S. government.

Interviews began in the summer of 2014, during the height of the furor over the GMO controversy on Kauaʻi. The women, largely residing on the North and East-side of Kauaʻi and far from the West-side communities economically connected to the GMO companies and their fields, talked about their views of

\textsuperscript{37} ALC—more affectionately known as “Ass-holes’ Last Chance.”
the GMO issue, and their experiences working for food sovereignty in their communities. They were leaders in their own spheres of influence.

In 2016, I returned twice to Kaua‘i on research-related business. In February I attended a Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola board meeting where I presented some of my research on Indigenous Resurgence, and also asked for their thoughts about the research. The board asked me to incorporate in my research on Indigenous Resurgence any examples of successful youth-related programs that they could replicate in Anahola. The Board asked me to present my findings in the Fall of 2016.

In November 2016, I returned to Kaua‘i for 4 weeks to present my research findings to the Board of KKOA and conduct further interviews. These interviews were largely follow-up talks with the initial interviewees, going deeper into their experiences and struggles with land issues. Additionally, two more women were interviewed who were new to the research and added much to it.

I returned in March 2017 for additional follow-up interviews, focusing this time also on the Kuleana land controversies that had sprung up on-island since Mark Zuckerberg, CEO of Facebook, had attempted to quiet title 700 acres he had purchased on the North Shore of Kaua‘i. This process required him to contact numerous Kānaka residents who were connected to Kuleana land claims. The incident blew up in local media in January of 2017, sparking a flare-up in tensions around Kānaka land claims and Hawaiian land injustice.
issues on Kaua‘i. Some Hawaiians marched outside Zuckerberg’s property in 2017 in support of Kānaka land rights.

Overall, I conducted 14 in-depth talk story sessions with Kānaka Maoli women leaders on Kaua‘i. Of those women, 7 were kūpuna, and 7 were mākua. My emphasis and interest centered largely on Kānaka women leaders’ views; however, I also conducted an additional 4 interviews with Kānaka Maoli kāne, and 2 haole men, totaling 20 talk-story sessions en total. I also spoke with individuals from various agencies including the Department of Interior (D.O.I.) and the Department of Hawaiian Homelands (DHHL), which were not considered interviews but rather informative discussions that helped me when wrestling with understanding some of the themes the women highlighted.

Incidentally, I was able to write several successful grants for KKOA that included the research results they requested on Indigenous Youth programs that they could replicate in Anahola, specifically around the Youth Council; this action research has had a positive immediate impact as a result.

2.2 Conducting Research in Western Institutions

The history of research in western academia has a long record of objectifying and exploiting the Indigenous ‘Other,’ a concept solidified through imperialism and justified by philosophy and science for the subjugation of Indigenous peoples (Smith, 2012). Research became part of the mechanism of imperialism to colonize a people group, classify them, and put them in a scientific box.
As well, there has been a long history of parachute researchers (Castleden, Morgan & Lamb, 2012) coming in and going out of Indigenous communities, extracting cultural, spiritual, and botanical knowledge and repackaging it in western frameworks. This knowledge then profits non-Indigenous academics, universities, and corporations with little to no benefits trickling back to the Indigenous community from whence the knowledge came.

These travesties of justice that have passed as academic research have had deleterious effects on Indigenous people and communities. Research on Indigenous people has influenced education, law, and government policy. Western research has framed how western eyes view Indigenous people; at worst it has been fed back to Indigenous people as the story of who they are.

In light of this, is western research even now a good thing? Is it necessary? Can it be done in such a way to cause good? If so, how does one do research in Indigenous contexts in such a way to eradicate harm and result in benefits for the Indigenous people involved?

Good research can indeed by conducted in Indigenous contexts, validating Indigenous frameworks and employing collaborative processes that result in emancipatory methodologies that benefit both researcher and the collaborative partners. In this chapter, among other objectives, I will discuss the necessary components of Indigenous Methodologies (IM) and critically reflect on how this research met those standards.
2.3 Defining Indigenous & Indigenous Hawaiian

The United Nations has used the term Indigenous loosely for a few decades; however, a formal definition has never been adopted. The working definition is stated thus:

Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies now prevailing on those territories, or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions, and legal system (United Nations, 2004).

Many Indigenous nations/people groups: 1) have experienced the destructive forces of colonization in the loss of land stewardship, language, culture, power, government and ways of living; 2) have lived intimately acquainted with their ecosystems and regions where they dwelt, and thus had a history of stewarding the area sustainably; 3) have placed a high value on relationships to the land, animals, plants and each other.

Kānaka Maoli (real people) are the Indigenous people of Hawai‘i. Kānaka scholars and activists often identify as Kānaka or Kānaka Maoli or Kānaka ‘Ōiwi or ‘Ōiwi (bone people) (Kauanui, 2008). While the U.S. government has sought to designate Native Hawaiian as only those who can prove 50% blood
quantum, Hawaiians themselves do not designate ethnic inclusion on these terms but on ancestral connection and community relationship.

Many of the women in this research employed the term Native Hawaiian or Hawaiian to identify their people and themselves. In this dissertation, I use the term Hawaiian and Kanaka/Kanaka Maoli interchangeably to identify the Indigenous people of the islands.

Some haole in-migrants into Hawai‘i have claimed the term ‘Hawaiian’ to designate anyone who lives within the state of Hawai‘i; however, this misnomer is at best evidence of a lack of awareness of the history of Hawai‘i and at worst an attempt to undermine Indigenous Hawaiian rights and unique identity.

2.4 Indigenous Epistemologies, Histories, and Methodologies

Western research models are grounded in humanism. “Humanistic explanations separate people out from the world around them, and place humanity on a higher plane than animals and plants due to language and reason” (Smith, 2012: 101).

Indigenous epistemology, in contrast is described beautifully here by Indigenous scholar, Margaret Kovach:

[Indigenous epistemology] is experiential, derived from teachings transmitted from generation to generation of storytelling. It comes from a language that emphasizes verbs, not nouns...Indigenous ways of knowing arise from interrelationships with the human world, the spirit, and the inanimate entities of the ecosystem (Kovach, 2005: 27).
Hawaiian epistemology goes beyond standard empiricism of the 5 senses to include extra-sensory perception including akakū (vision or trance); hihi‘o (dream); ‘ūlāleo (supernatural voice or sound); honi pāha‘oha‘o (mysterious smell); and ʻili ʻouli (skin signs) (Meyer, 1998). Hawaiian scholar Manulani Meyer goes on to state that “matter is not separate from spirit” and underscores the importance of spirituality as equally essential to Indigenous epistemology as mind and body (Meyer, 2013: 97).

Indigenous spirituality and cosmology are legitimate ways of knowing, and many scholars besides Meyer cite dreams and visions as valid aspects of Indigenous epistemologies (Vaioleti, 2006; Holmes, 2000; Kovach, 2005). “Concepts of spirituality...are critical sites of resistance for Indigenous peoples. The values, attitudes, concepts and language embedded in beliefs about spirituality represent, in many cases, the clearest contrast and mark of difference between Indigenous peoples and the West” (Smith, 2012: 143).

Most the women I interviewed expressed a relationship with Ke Akua and included their spiritual realities as part of this research project. Some of the participants were even spiritual mentors to me prior to my role as researcher in relationship to them, cultivating Hawaiian values of aloha, mālama, haʻahaʻa, and hoʻoponopono. Many of the women, especially the kūpuna, referred to the Christian Deity and text, the Bible, citing also at times that this was the religion of their last reigning Queen.
Indigenous ways of knowing have been rejected by the colonizers as inferior. Rather, Indigenous peoples have been expected to conform to western notions of knowledge and standards of achievement. Western notions of privatization of land essentially in many instances foregrounded the dispossession of Indigenous peoples, thus dismantling Indigenous ways of passing down knowledge; Indigenous people were then required to unilaterally adopt foreign epistemologies and existence in order to assimilate to dominant paradigms (Smith, 2012).

Smith implicates education as one of the main culprits in disrupting Indigenous knowledge and history. “...What was regarded as being worthy of history was that which was connected to the industrial state...the economists, scientists, bureaucrats, and philosophers. That they were all men of a certain class and race was ‘natural’ because they were regarded as fully rational, human beings” (Smith, 2012: 78). Indigenous people were essentially written out of history, presented in exaggerated stereotypes and as a conquered people.

History and what is taught in western contexts is mostly about power: “It is the story about the powerful and how they became powerful and then how they use their power to keep them in positions in which they can continue to dominate others” (Smith, 2012: 80). History and education are two contested sites that need to be revisited as a first step in the Decolonization of the mind (Ngugi wa Thiong’o, 1986) and in the procurement of Indigenous intellectual sovereignty.
Research in western contexts in the past has been presented as neutral, innocent, and scientific, when it is in fact loaded with a set of preconceived notions about ontology, epistemology, and axiology. It is shaped by a certain set of values and beliefs that are not normally contested in academia.

Academic writing, built out of research, tells a story; it erupts from a particular perspective, using certain language and is contained within an inherent value system. Says Smith (2012), “Academic writing is a form of presenting knowledge. It privileges sets of texts, views about history, what issues are significant” (pp. 83-84). In this research, Indigenous scholars are privileged in the text as are the voices of the Kānaka collaborators.

Indigenous researchers are breaking down traditional research paradigms by reclaiming Indigenous knowledge and practices and placing them centrally within their research. Polynesian scholars in the literature have incorporated three forms of Indigenous Pacific knowledge production. In each example, Indigenous scholars are throwing off western ‘garb’ and wearing their own clothes.

Kali Fermantez (2013) has brought ‘talk story’ into his research with a marginalized Hawaiian community; Leilani Holmes (2000) recorded what she has termed ‘living memory’, listening and writing down the stories of the kūpuna; and Timote Vaioleti (2006) introduced ‘Talanoa’, influenced by Tongan cultural values of ‘ofa (deep love and compassion driven by connectedness). It is refreshing to hear from these Indigenous scholars and others who produce
scholarship reflective of Indigenous realities. Indigenous people are no longer silenced on the sidelines left out of the discussion nor having to resort to squeezing their knowledges and practices into western boxes.

“Aloha is the intelligence of the Hawaiian people” (Olana Kaipo Ai, as cited by Meyer, 2013). Aloha is a necessary component for a system that is in harmony with the land, other people, and plants and animals; a system that includes giving back when something is taken; honoring and caring for relationships; trusting in other people and spiritual beings for protection and safety. Aloha is a necessary ingredient in Hawaiian living, and in restoring hope for the next generation. It is essential also in conducting research within Kānaka community.

What does aloha look like in the world of research? By looking to Indigenous & specifically Kānaka methodologies and epistemologies, one can put structure to these unquantifiable markers and create a just research project that engenders aloha. Researchers can exemplify these values by showing genuine concern for the interviewee. By giving back to the interviewee for her time through a special food or drink or gift, one honors the time and words of the participant. These values are also expressed in giving the

__________________________

38 Aloha=Love, affection, compassion, mercy, sympathy, pity, kindness, sentiment, grace, charity; greeting, salutation, regards; sweetheart, lover, loved one; beloved, loving, kind, compassionate, charitable, lovable; to love, be fond of; to show kindness, mercy, pity, charity, affection; to venerate; to remember with affection; to greet, hail. (wehewehe.org)
collaborators editorial control of the words they share, deepening trust and communicating a true concern for their feelings and position in the community.

2.5 Return to Wise Stewardship and the Truth of our Interconnectedness

Western academia is a foreign culture for students who come from Indigenous communities. From my own limited experience of living with Kānaka community for 8.5 years, even as a haole, the culture at the university I attend in comparison to living amongst Hawaiian community feels distinctly cut off from the heart. While my experience of community on Kaua‘i while living off-island continues to be rich and interconnected, my experience in Vancouver and at UBC has felt disconnected and isolated.

Western academia, science, and western society in general can promote illusions of disconnection and invulnerability. The myths of invulnerability, objectivity, and superiority create distance and defenses from the inescapable plight of being human. Indigenous cultural values embrace vulnerability, the innate need for human community and family connections, and acknowledge their dependence on the earth, unlike western society. They have not relinquished the value of relationships in pursuit of invulnerability. When a society for their survival is no longer aware of their dependence on the earth, no longer recognizes their need to trust in power(s) greater than themselves, no longer acknowledges their need for other humans, it is in great trouble. Invulnerability is an illusion, that can be perpetuated in the mind, in systems of thought, in politics of action, codified in legal constructs and perpetuated in
daily life. But it is an illusion, nonetheless. And one society may destroy another to expunge evidence of their own vulnerability exposed in the ‘Other’; prove their superiority; make way for their system of exploitation invulnerable to limits—but it is all a lie. And we are currently seeing all around us--in documentaries, in research, in news reports—the demise of planet earth under the predominance of western ontologies, where the unbelief of our dependence on the earth and our interconnectedness with each other is leading to planetary destruction. What is needed are constructs that promote an awareness of interconnection and interdependence to return to wise stewardship over the earth, as exemplified by many Indigenous scholars.

2.6 Ten Core Principles of Indigenous Methodologies

I have outlined ten core principles that are imperative to Indigenous methodologies that informed my research. I have stated them below, then will extrapolate upon them in groupings.

1) Relationships---Developing friendships, which includes developing trust and establishing who you are as the researcher in the project;

2) Respect—Listening, learning, honoring others’ thoughts, culture, limits, and desires;

3) Reciprocity—Giving back to the participants/community;

4) Nonhuman actors---Recognizing the importance of relationship not just to people, but also to land, place, and nonhuman actors such as animals and plants;
5) Ethics—Gaining approval through the proper channels, not only at the university level but also via appropriate leadership within the Indigenous community. Furthermore, it is crucial to be ethical in all you do as a researcher in the research process---in terms of confidentiality, sharing royalties, co-authorship, etc;

6) Sharing power—Being conscious of inherent power imbalances built into western research projects; establishing protocols to address it;

7) Supporting marginalized voices—Honoring voices of especially women and youth, those who typically have not had a voice in western research projects;

8) Community Input—allowing the community or partners you are collaborating with to impact the research process;

9) Indigenous Epistemologies—honoring Indigenous ways of knowing and knowledge production, including theoretical and methodological frameworks that are honoring of the Indigenous cultures;


These core principles, when practiced, create a space where Indigenous knowledge can be produced or conveyed in an academic context. They expand the boundaries of what constitutes research, decolonizing research paradigms so that the epistemologies and knowledges of Indigenous peoples can be honored in an academic realm.
The principles affect the research space beyond cultural sensitivity to decreasing institutional discrimination and leveraging power back in the direction of Indigenous participants (Flicker et al., 2014). By following these principles, Indigenous epistemologies and frameworks can emerge and be validated. They create a space for Indigenous voices to be heard and heeded in a western, predominantly white and male, upper middle class academic world. They dismantle unfair privilege built into the western research paradigm, which has historically been uncritically enshrined as universal truth and a superior epistemology to that upheld by other cultures.

2.7 Relationships—Respect, Reciprocity, and Non-Human Actors

The first 4 of the 10 core principals I have grouped together here under the principle of Relationships as the umbrella. The importance of establishing and maintaining strong relationships when conducting research within Indigenous communities was emphasized multiple times in the literature (Suchet-Pearson, Wright, Lloyd, Burarrwanga, & Hodge, 2013; DeLeeuw, Greenwood, & Cameron, 2012; Fillmore, Dell, & Kilty, 2014; Castleden et al., 2012; Ritchie et al., 2013; IPSG, 2010). “In this story of our collaboration, it is clear that researcher relationships built on trust, respect, reciprocity, and contingency are foundational” (Suchet-Pearson et al., 2013).

Indigenous cultures value relationships and connections in place-based community. Research methodologies in Indigenous contexts must therefore start with establishing relationships or amidst existing relationships.
Researchers have come in and out of Indigenous communities without accountability and without sharing the benefits of the research with the Indigenous community. Western research paradigms conversely do not emphasize relationships, but quantifiable data, the scientific paradigm, and a disembodied detached observer that creates absolute knowledge (Castleden et al., 2012).

Locating one’s position is part of establishing relationships and building trust, when pre-existing relationships are not already in place between the researcher(s) and her Indigenous partners. Koster, Baccar, & Lemelin (2012) references Absolon & Willett (2005) in suggesting that “…Locating ourselves within our research is one way of ensuring accountability, building trust, and decolonizing research” (Koster et al., 2012:196).

Clark, Hunt, Jules & Good (2010) provide guidelines for decolonizing the research project and team via an “intersectional approach” which deals with the “power, ethics, and diversity of who is involved in the research” (p244). The questions they suggest decolonize the team by examining race, gender, and class amidst “shifting and fluid identities” (Clark, Hunt, Jules & Good, 2010: 244) as well as defining one’s communities, accountability, and authenticity. They provoke researchers to focus on their personal feelings towards the research and encourage a self-awareness as to how intersecting systems of privilege affect the researcher. This rigorous process of self-examination and identification help build rapport and create mutual understanding and trust on
the research team amidst making power imbalances visible and dismantling them.

In examining my own privilege, I have benefited from higher education, and possessed a bachelor’s degree when I arrived on the island of Kaua‘i in 2002. I had the experience of arriving on island very poor, which set me apart from many people in the white community who transplant to Kaua‘i from the continental US with oftentimes more money and possessions than local and Hawaiian residents on Kaua‘i. My experience was that my economic status actually eliminated barriers that usually stand between in-migrants and members of the local community. Hawaiian co-workers assisted me in providing occasional rides and even food until my life stabilized economically.

When I became a doctoral student at the University of British Columbia, I stepped into another level of potential privilege and power. I had to realize that while I viewed myself as a part of the community, what I write and what I publish can impact how others view the community and the Kānaka leaders I was working with in this study. While I was working with many long-term friendships, I needed to be sensitive to how my research can impact them. As protection, I put in place permission to the women to pull their research at any point during my program; full transcripts of the interviews were available upon request; and that I would let them view the excerpts if they requested from their interviews that I was using prior to submission. Because Hawaiian cultural values engender politeness, I anticipated most of the women would not
ask to see their transcripts. As a result, I emailed most of the interviewees their quotes without waiting for a request. I also protected anonymity to those who wished to protect their identity.

This research elucidated Hawaiians’ relationship to Place/Āina as family member. While western paradigms fail to acknowledge nonhuman relationships in research, I feel it is important to include and acknowledge such relationships as central to research in Indigenous contexts. Suchet-Pearson and her co-researchers have done cutting-edge work collaborating with Aboriginal participants and honoring non-human actors in the research process. “Recognizing nonhuman agencies as part of our human relational sphere, as salient and purposeful contributors to our research collaborations, opens spaces for more meaningful engagements with ‘place’...The sand and beach...actively sustain our relationships” (Suchet-Pearson et al., 2013:35). Suchet-Pearson’s co-author, Yolŋu elder Laklak Burarrwanga, speaks into the importance of these relationships, much like what is found in Hawaiian contexts: “Land is your family. Place is your family too. You always come from the land. This place...is mother land to me. I am caretaker...Without it you have no...language, identity, culture, kinship” (Suchet-Pearson et al., 2013:35). These researchers push the rigid boundaries erected in western academic spheres to honor an alternative epistemological framework. It is important to incorporate this point of view in research so that the academy will decolonize knowledge and its production. This is also especially important in this research
as some of the women expressed a strong connection to the land and their island home, which I explore further in a subsequent chapter.

I had a pre-existing relationship with many of the Kānaka co-participants with whom I recorded talk-story sessions. My collaborative work with Kuʻuleialoha Punua formed the foundation of much of this research. I have served as an advisor to the board of KKOA since 2010, of which Kuʻulei is president. Kuʻuleialoha was my neighbor when I moved to the island of Kauaʻi in January of 2002. She quickly became one of my closest friends, treating me as family as I had moved to the island by myself as a single woman, and had no roots there. As she is several years my senior, I also viewed Kuʻuleialoha as a mentor and as an older sister or aunty/mother figure and looked to her for guidance and support.

In 2008, I helped connect Kuʻuleialoha Punua with another leader in the community, Kupuna Manulele Clark. The Hawaiian community of Anahola, where I resided, was reeling with the deaths of three Anahola teenagers who committed suicide in close succession in October 2008. These two women came together and formed Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola (KKOA), a Hawaiian-run nonprofit that sought to “build up identity through cultural values” for the youth in Anahola, in order to give them hope and let them know that people cared about them.

39 The acronym KKOA was a play on words, ke koa, signifying strong warrior in ʻōlelo Hawai‘i.
For many years, Kuʻuleialoha had shared with me her vision for the island, of restoring Kānaka to the land to grow food and live off the land. She herself lives on farm property near the ocean, raising chickens, farming organically, and propagating numerous fruit trees bearing mango, ʻulu, and avocado. She lives completely off the grid, utilizing such technologies as solar power and rainwater cache to supply her needs on the farm and in the home. She has presented her vision to restore Kānaka to the land and create a thriving local food economy with each successive mayor of Kauaʻi for many years. She also desires to establish an agricultural and youth center for the youth of Anahola, modeled from Maʻo Farms—an organic farm in Hawaiian Homelands community of Waianae, Oʻahu that trains youth to grow food; pays them a stipend; and offers them college credit towards a degree. As a close friend and adviser to KKOA, I share in her vision for the island, and endeavor to see such goals accomplished.
It was my hope in starting this research to support her efforts and the efforts of Hawaiian women leaders on Kaua‘i. Many of these women in the research considered me part of their community; I have many strong long-term relationships with former students, their families, & the family I lived with for many years in Anahola. I have a sense of belonging and experience a level of deep friendship that has not been replicated in my experiences in my current city where I am enrolled in a PhD program. I continue to return to Kaua‘i on average for 1-2 months annually, hosted by friends, to maintain my community relationships there.

2.7.1 Friendship as Method

Friendships fall under the umbrella of Relationships within the 10 core principles of Indigenous Methodologies utilized in this study. As several of the

---

41 Photo credit Dennis Fujimoto/Garden Island.
research participants were friends, it is important to explore friendship as method. G.A. Fine (1981) defines friendship as “a cultural institution for the transmission of knowledge and performance techniques...” (p.225). DeLeeuw et al. (2012) view friendship as a potential tool for decolonizing research, as it is “one among many spaces through which research is constituted, experienced, known, evaluated, and critically interrogated...” (p.189).

Tilmann-Healy (2003) has defined friendship across social groups as a legitimate method of qualitative inquiry, one in which members of the predominant group can advocate alongside friends in subaltern groups (p.731). She limits the methodology within an “ethic of friendship, a stance of hope, caring, justice, even love. Friendship as method is neither a program nor a guise strategically aimed at gaining further access. It is a level of investment in participants’ lives that puts fieldwork relationships on par with the project” (Tilman-Healy, 2003: 735). I identify with Tillman-Healy’s description of a transition in her text of just friends to just friends.

My friendships were the on-ramp into this research, though these relationships were not established with this goal in mind, as my personal goals did not encompass the pursuit of graduate degrees when I lived on Kaua‘i. However, when I later found myself doing just that, I felt a desire to promote justice for my friends and their situations.

According to Kath Browne (2003), research can be introduced into pre-existing relationships vs. solely pursuing research in areas where one has to
cultivate connections (p.134). Browne found that interactions with her close friends, with whom she conducted research, were similar whether in formal research spaces or in everyday interactions. I found this to be true to an extent in my talk-story sessions with very close friends. However, the sessions created a space for deeper, more intimate communication with my close friends than what would have normally transpired. Whereas our typical communications often consisted of discussions of events that came up in our day-to-day lives, these research sessions created spaces to go deeper in their histories and personal stories. I learned things that I did not know about these women, even though I had been close to some of them for 15 years. It was as if my friendship bond created a platform from which to go deep and conduct effective narrative research; the friendship afforded access to their deeper thoughts and feelings and gave them a space to be heard. They could trust me to share these very intimate feelings and experiences; they could cry, laugh, and express frustration. And the research created a situation where I was able to learn much more about my dear friends, than what normal conversation may have cultivated.

I find it interesting that these stories only emerged within the framework of research. Did my friends refrain from sharing these histories, thoughts, and experiences in normal conversation because they would be seen as contentious or controversial? Was there an unseen dynamic operating when Hawaiian space and haole space intersected, where my Hawaiian friends politely avoided
topics that had to do with the oppression of Hawaiians, in normal conversation? Did they think that I would not be interested? Was it too painful to talk about in normal day-to-day interactions? These are questions that came to mind as the talk-story sessions revealed perspectives and experiences that never before came up in day-to-day conversation.

2.7.2 External-Insider

Also found under the core principle of Relationships is the examination of my relationship to the research collaborators as a haole from the continent who became, through living and working together in the community, an external-insider.

Zavella (1993) found insiders less likely to experience distrust from interviewees during the research process (p.54). I am obviously not an insider, as I was not born and raised in the community, and also do not have Hawaiian lineage. However, I do identify in ways with the label external-insider. Banks describes four categories of positionality in Indigenous research: Indigenous insider, Indigenous outsider, external-insider, and external-outsider. According to Banks, one can be Indigenous and from the community, but be seen by other community members as an outsider because of their alignment with the outsider culture. Conversely, one can be an external-insider in which one has rejected many of the attitudes and values of her original culture and “is viewed by the new community as an ‘adopted’ insider” (Banks, 1998: 8). I experienced this in part during my time living amongst Hawaiian community, e.g. one of the
kūpuna in this research used to tell me that I was “one of them,” that I had “taken on their ways,” even affectionately referring to me as her “tita,” something her mother would call her close friends. This was not so much me trying to be someone I am not, but rather, as a single woman living and working in Hawaiian community coming from outside, I was very sensitive to dynamics of belonging; I learned social skills and ways of dealing with life situations such that I could successfully navigate the new culture I had immigrated into. I felt more at home with the culture and the relationships I had developed on Kaua‘i than with the culture and relationships amongst which I had been raised in the Midwestern United States, although I found some similarities at times with the rural nature of both communities. My sense of comfort and acceptance also reflected the graciousness and hospitality exhibited by the host community, with cultural traits of nurturing and embracing others.

Bishop (2005) warns against an essentializing of the categories of insider/outsider, at the risk of ignoring the complexities involved and the intersections of age, gender, education, and class can have on the research (p.111). Chavez (2008) furthers this sentiment, quoting Naples (1996) who states that “Insiderness or outsiderness are not fixed or static positions, rather they are ever-shifting and permeable social locations that are differentially experienced and expressed by community members” (Naples, 1996: 140). Chavez (2008) posits: “Our degrees of insiderness can shift depending on who
in the community we are interviewing, and depending on the topic we are discussing…” (pp.476,479). Merriam et al (2001) echoes Naples and Chavez, emphasizing the fluidity of one’s position as a researcher (p.411).

Narayan (1993) elegantly extrapolates on the polarizing debate of insider/outsider:

Instead of the paradigm emphasizing a dichotomy between outsider/insider or observer/observed, I propose that at this historical moment we might more profitably view each [researcher] in terms of shifting identifications amid a field of interpenetrating communities and power relations (p.671).

While enjoying an external-insider status with close friends during this research, I experienced something different with a kūpuna and activist who was a friend of a friend but with whom I had no previous relationship. She was a bit reserved when we met for breakfast at a local café; however, when she heard that I had pule’d\(^{42}\) before our time together, she shared that she then felt she could trust me. While she did not practice the same religious tradition as I do, the admission of including prayer before the interview engendered trust. Our rapport grew in subsequent interactions as she realized we had more mutual friendships in the community and I was not merely a haole outsider.

\(^{42}\) This is putting a Hawaiian word “pule” with English style of past tense that is far from properly speaking ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i; “I prayed.”
My insider status would not translate out of the localized community within which I had established long-term friendship bonds. In other communities across Hawai‘i, unless my current friends had ties of kinship or deep friendship with people in those places with which to connect me, I believe my insider status would become outsider, by virtue of my ethnicity and where I was born. The only factor that could possibly mitigate this outsider difference would be how I talked, i.e. if I could speak pidgin, and how I dressed, and how I conducted myself over time.

Because I am a close friend, or a friend of a friend, the interviewees were more willing to trust me and open their hearts to share. It is because of these close bonds and my place in the community, that I desired to be sensitive to the women, in terms of giving them permission to review the interviews I included in this research. In this way, I hope to achieve a respectful representation of the words they shared, and show care in how I present their words.

I shared a passion with many of my interviewees for the building up of the Lāhui and the emancipation of the occupied Kingdom of Hawai‘i; this affected our interactions, and how we perceived one another. It was obvious that, beyond being a close friend in the community, I had now become an ally to them in their needs and aspirations as Hawaiians.

Though I was formerly identified as a friend, neighbor, colleague and teacher when I lived on Kaua‘i, I now am also interacting with the women I
interviewed in the capacity of doctoral researcher, affiliated with a western institution of higher learning. In this respect, I must be sensitive that my written word has power. In Hawaiian culture, spoken and written words are considered to have mana, or power (Silva, 2004). In western academic contexts, words also have mana, the power to shape and influence people’s perceptions. Therefore, what I write, and how I write will have impact on the people who are exposed and influenced by my words.

With the opportunity to share their views, some of the women mentioned they wanted their voices to be heard. My hope is to extend the audience who can hear their voices and impact how non-Hawaiians perceive the history and situation on Kaua‘i.

2.8 Leveraging Power—Ethics, Community Input, & Including Marginalized Voices

The next four core principles in Indigenous Methodologies, from my list of 10, can be grouped under the principle of Leveraging Power back to the community collaborators.

2.8.1 Ethics

Ethics boards have formed to guide the research process and ensure certain protocols are implemented to avoid the exploitation of Indigenous communities. In Canada, the Tri-Council Policy Statement 2 is in place to guide researchers, emphasizing respect for Indigenous people and a concern for Indigenous community. The parameters of the TCPS2 and local university
ethics boards are not enough, however, for engaging in ethical research with Indigenous communities (TCPS2, 2014).

The First Nations Information Governance Centre, with the Canadian National Aboriginal Health Organization and the leaders involved with the First Nations Regional Health Survey devised a set of principles to guide research with Indigenous groups, formally known as OCAP: 1) Ownership, collectively held over information and knowledge; 2) Control, over the research process; 3) Access, to the data collected, and 4) Possession, as in the Indigenous community possesses the data and materials when the project is over (Masching, 2014). These principles center Indigenous priorities and authority, as Clark et al. (2010) emphasized in their research. They safeguard Indigenous communities and knowledge, protecting communities from exploitation. Indigenous sovereignty also is recognized in the direction and outcome of the project.

This research began in communication with KKOΑ’s Board and with some of the interviewees involved in this project, and I have maintained this communication throughout the research process. Once receiving the ‘green light’ from KKOΑ, I proceeded to embark on a research process. I then approached the University of British Columbia at Vancouver Office of Research Ethics to gain their approval in order to conduct research amongst the Hawaiian community on Kauaʻi. I have kept the President of KKOΑ, Kuʻuleialoha Punua, updated on my progress, not so much in her role as
president but in her role as close friend and mentor, and as someone who is interested in this research personally.

My ability to conduct research with the women I worked with rests on my reputation in the community and my established long-term relationships with Kānaka leaders and community members. I was embraced and accepted with several Kānaka families after years of serving as a teacher at both Kapa‘a and Kaua‘i High Schools. I had also started my own school for Hawaiian Homelands’ students who had dropped out of high-school.

2.8.2 Including Marginalized Voices

How Indigenous women were classified as ‘Other’ by western peoples had long-term ramifications for their roles in their own societies, impacting women’s power, roles in tribal government, and their ability to own land. To this day Indigenous women have had to fight for their status and their rights both with western governmental entities and within tribal governing bodies. Their voices were marginalized in research as well via colonialsim; ideas about them were presented to the world that greatly impacted how they were viewed in the dominant society (Smith, 2012; Simpson, 2014; Tuck, 2009).

I have to examine my own voice, and how it intersects with the voices of the women. For instance, what I am absorbing in my doctoral education may not reflect the world view of the women with whom I am collaborating. I may see interactions on-island through a lens of evaluating white privilege, racism, and other constructs garnered from years of university education; while some
of my participants may see the interactions quite differently. This requires an acknowledgment on my part that our knowledge is situated within each of our locations of class, culture, education, and ethnicity. This acknowledgment results in carefully monitoring power relations between me and my collaborators in the practice of producing knowledge (Rogowska-Stangret, 2018). There is room for gentle, reflective, and open-hearted conversations that lead to a mutual understanding and appreciation of other’s viewpoints.

While marginalized voices have been speaking up in western academic contexts, Indigenous women have not fit purely into Feminist, 3rd world, people of color or Black critiques of the privileged mainstream (Smith, 2012: 81). Indigenous voices have had to find their own spaces to critically contest western hegemonic power over what constitutes history, research epistemologies, methodologies and the notion of ‘Other.’

Lisa Kahaleole Hall (2009) has reflected on this mismatch within mainstream feminist dialogue. She has highlighted the hypervisibility of the tourist-oriented, sexualized commodification of the ‘hula girl’ contrasted with the invisibility of Hawaiian women in feminist and postcolonial discourses that do not acknowledge the existence of Hawaiian women or the ongoing military occupation of Hawai‘i. During her time as a student at UC Berkley, she could find nothing in her courses that talked about Kānaka history or the Hawaiian woman’s experience, thus rendering her experience invisible. She found America’s denial of their imperial history exemplified on campus. “Perhaps the
trope of the vanishing native is a wishful projection of a nation whose citizens refuse the status of settler…”(p.21).

When the white oligarchy took over Hawai‘i, women were shoved in the background. The Queen was vilified in colonial media as a cannibalizing whore, conducting orgies in the Palace. Unlike the powerful leadership roles Hawaiian women had prior to occupation, women were not allowed a voice in the white male colonizing culture.

Including marginalized voices is an important way to leverage the balance of power in research projects. The importance of including the voices of women, and youth, is emphasized in much of the literature on Indigenous methodologies (Clark et al., 2010; Tupuola, 2006; Tuck, 2009; Flicker et al., 2014; Fillmore et al., 2014). Tuck (2009) collaborated with youth in NYC, giving them control over the design, methods and analysis of the research project (p.53). However, these youth researchers “felt like novelty acts” when presenting their work at academic conferences, and were disappointed by the research process. Aspects of the process were empowering for them, and others deeply discouraging. Tupuola conducted research with young Samoan women, giving them an opportunity to comment on renowned research done about Samoan girls in generations past that had a lasting impact on how Samoan girls are perceived by the dominant society. Although she herself is a Samoan female, she did not want to speak on their behalf but instead created a space where their voices could be heard.
An arts-based, youth-led model of research was employed in Flicker et al.’s project (2014) on Indigenous youth and HIV; this was utilized as a way to equalize the power differential between academia and Indigenous participants. As Indigenous youth are overrepresented in HIV exposure, and traditional health approaches are proving unsuccessful, researchers are turning towards alternative paradigms in an effort to affect the target group. This model proved successful in engaging the youth: “Youth are able to represent, eschewing stereotypes or marginalizing discourses that attempt to oppress them, and replacing those representations with ones of strength, empowerment and cultural pride” (p.28). The arts-based approach combined with a model that gave youth an active role in the project resulted in the youth better remembering the information and taking a greater initiative to get involved in the project.

Fillmore et al. (2014) collaborated with Indigenous women recovering from drug and alcohol use and who were seeking treatment, legitimating their voices in the research project:

Aboriginal women’s voices are consistently absent in the literature on drug use and treatment and researchers and treatment professionals alike know little about the destructive impact of stigma...of First Nations, Inuit, and Metis women in treatment...(p.38).

One Indigenous participant in the project felt empowered by being able to share her voice in this platform:
When I was first interviewed for this project, I didn’t think much of it because I felt that I had no voice and what could I possibly do to help another person...Having gotten involved...helped me to know that I am someone and that I can help others and that I do have that voice...(p.50).

In this research, I wanted to use my access to higher education to promote the women’s voices, vision and their futures. Like Tupuola, I wanted to create a space where their voices could be heard. Since living on Kaua‘i, I have felt a strong desire to support my Kānaka students to have land or gain access to land. Through this research, I have even deepened in my commitment to fight for access to land to the next generation of Kānaka youth. As I do not possess financial reserves in order to buy them land, I desired this research to help expose the land injustices, support Hawaiian activism, and potentially impact government policy that restores the land and governance back in Hawaiian hands.

2.8.3 Community Collaboration & Action Research

In the literature, Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars alike supported community-based participatory action research (CBPR) and participatory action research (PAR) when conducting research involving Indigenous peoples. CBPR and PAR have the potential to encompass the core principles of Indigenous methodology. The Indigenous Peoples Specialty Group (IPSG) of the Association of American Geographers (AAG) lists CBPR as “the
new paradigm of collaborative research” (IPSG, 2010:1) going beyond participatory research through making Indigenous self-determination central to the research project. “Moreover, as collaborators, Indigenous peoples are no longer treated simply as ‘informants,’ but knowledge-holders and experts on particular topics in relation to their own identities, histories, environment, and definitions of self-determination” (IPSG, 2010:1).

Through these core principles in CBPR models, Indigenous collaborators are recognized as creators and holders of knowledge. Alternative paradigms of knowledge creation are also recognized, creating a viable pathway for emancipatory Indigenous research. Although my research does not purely follow a model of CBPR or PAR, it touches on inviting community input and participation via the Hawaiian-led organization, Kūkulu Kumuhana O Anahola, through seeking their input and approval each step in the process.

Kovach (2005) proposes participatory methodologies when working with Indigenous communities, describing it as an “ally” (p.23). Fermantez (2013) found this method empowering for the marginalized Hawaiians he collaborated with, insisting that any research with Indigenous people should have a participatory aspect: “...PAR...seeks to invert the power relationships, thus bringing the power to the people, to the grassroots” (p.116-117). Suchet-Pearson et al. (2013) see PAR’s focus on social justice and co-participation as a much-needed shift from traditional geographic research: “...Priorities are community-defined and set in motion along an iterative cycle of action-
reflection...” (p.23). PAR models empower the Indigenous participants and possess a “sensitivity to the often inequitable power relations inherent in any act of research” (Suchet-Pearson et al., 2013: 23).

Tupuola (2006) utilized participatory research processes with young Samoan women. These processes “...enable young people to empower themselves through active, dynamic and dialogic engagement...benefit[ting] young people who do not have the opportunity to share, exchange and engage with other young people about issues most pertinent to them” (p307, 309). She felt in the future that more participatory research is needed to allow young people a safe space to engage with each other freely, perhaps through global satellite research sites.

DeLeeuw et al. (2012) outline participatory research as a “framework that emphasizes redressing power imbalances between researchers and subjects” in which Indigenous people are “now understood as collaborators, partners or active members in a research paradigm designed to build knowledge for all” (p.184). However, the researchers are concerned with potential pitfalls in utilizing CBPR and PAR models, e.g. white researchers ignoring true power imbalances simply by labeling Indigenous participants as ‘partners,’ or white progressive researchers being resistant to examine any complaints that Indigenous participants may have with the process, as it conflicts with the researcher’s self-image of a ‘good’ researcher. Furthermore, the authors mentioned concern that collaborative research models can potentially place
unnecessary burdens on Indigenous participants who are engaged in economic survival and busy lives. They caution researchers to not expect all research projects with Indigenous communities to have the same level of community participation (DeLeeuw et al., 2012: 187).

While this project does not purely fit under the CBPR classification, aspects of CBPR & PAR are woven throughout the process that I would like to highlight. Initially this research focused on Hawaiian health and Kānaka food sovereignty on Kaua‘i. I met with the Board of KKOA in the summer of 2013 before commencing on this research to discuss the doctoral project and receive their input. As one of the goals of KKOA is to promote food sovereignty and restore Kānaka to the land, they were very much interested in this work. I met again with the Board in July 2014, when I returned to the island to conduct interviews. KKOA sent me to Moku O Keawe (Big Island) with another member of the board and co-participant in the study to interview farmers on Hawaiian Homelands who were implementing green houses and who had established a successful farm-to-table model with local restaurants. I wore two hats on that trip, one as researcher and the other as advisor that reported back to the Board regarding the trip. Although I eventually shifted the focus of this research, as a result of the women’s talk-story sessions, and did not incorporate the data I collected on the trip for this project, it did give evidence as to how the Hawaiian women of KKOA, some of whom are co-participants in this study, impacted the research process along the way.
I met again with the KKOA Board in February 2016 to present my research and share my findings thus far. The Board at that time commissioned me to conduct research on what is in essence Indigenous Resurgence. They requested I research successful programs other Indigenous communities had implemented with youth and families. They wanted programs that addressed issues the youth faced, e.g. suicide, drugs, school drop-out and asked me to report back to them in the fall. Below, I included aspects of my report to them here in this section, as it relates to my research overall.

2.8.4 Models & Research of Indigenous Resurgence Presented to KKOA

‘Ōiwi youth suffer high rates of suicide, substance abuse, and violence (Trinidad, 2009). According to Trinidad (2009), youth intervention programs often frame Indigenous youth as ‘at-risk’ without analyzing critically the structural underpinnings that marginalize the youth, or acknowledging the strengths inherent in their culture and their community. “Many programs for marginalized adolescents see youth as problems rather than as problem-solvers. Programs that provide opportunities through youth participation shift the power dynamics and encourage youth to take an active role in being the change” (p.4). Trinidad’s (2009) research encourages Resurgence through the indigenization of Hawaiian youth programs, centring them in Hawaiian epistemology in order to support Hawaiian identity and the importance of place and genealogy to Hawaiian culture (p.7-8).
For many Indigenous groups, suicide is a critical issue. First Nations youth in Canada are 5-7 times more likely to commit suicide than their non-native counterparts. Canada’s First Nations population—and especially the next generation-- has the highest rate of suicide of any population in the world.

“Issues facing children and youths are rooted in histories of colonization, dislocation from their traditional territories, communities and cultural traditions, and the intergenerational impacts of a residential school system that took Indigenous children away from homes and communities in an attempt to remove cultural influences (Shantz, 2010: 230).

Shantz (2010) discovered that the difference in levels of suicides from one reserve to another was the factor of Resurgence—those communities cultivating traditional culture, preserving their land, and fighting for self-determination had lower levels of youth suicide. It was not individual children but the health of the whole community that engendered the difference.

In response to suicide, the Mohawk youth of Tyendinaga formed a Youth Council on their own initiative to experience Resurgence of their traditional culture. Their activities included the building of the first traditional longhouse in their community in over 100 years; fishing to supply the longhouse feasts; and teaching traditional drumming and songs. Community organizers report that youth suicide and depression in that community has decreased dramatically as a result (Shantz, 2010). Shantz’s (2010) research reflected Trinidad’s (2009) findings, that revealed youth felt connected to their
community when actively engaged in the decision-making process of implementing major community activities. The youth in Tyendinaga changed their lives by exercising their agency in community Resurgence.

In November 2016, I returned to Kaua‘i and presented these findings to the Board regarding examples of Indigenous Resurgence in other communities, including Tyendinaga. KKO A was hosting a booth at the Hawaiian Independence Day Festival in Anahola. While (wo)manning the booth, I shared the results of the research informally with the members of the Board. The example of the Tyendinaga Youth Council sparked much discussion and excitement; the Board expressed a desire to incorporate the Youth Council into their work in Anahola. I eventually partnered with them to write two grants that would support the implementation of a Youth Council in Anahola, one in which 3 youth were selected to participate in a state-wide Hawaiian agricultural conference for the purposes of supporting the new Agricultural Training & Youth Center in Anahola that KKO A is establishing. The research came full circle, the results of which now have a life of their own through the programs emerging.

2.9 Indigenous Epistemologies, Concepts and Language

When Samoan scholar Anne-Marie Tupuola (2006) embarked on her research, she desired to change academia with her methodology, for the young women in her study to be agents of social change. “I wanted Samoan concepts to stand up on their own in western academia and not be cultural
condiments…” (p.295). She utilized a participatory methodology that was inductive in nature, producing theory from the young women’s own analysis. She further incorporated Pacific world views by replacing English words such as ‘adolescence’ and ‘development’ with Samoan terms and emphasized the Samoan concept of fa’aaloalo (respect) to create a safe space for all the participants to share their experiences (Tupuola, 2006). By utilizing Indigenous concepts in her work, she was able to create a nurturing space where young Samoan women feel comfortable to articulate their thoughts, and share their knowledge. This inclusion of Indigenous concepts, language and epistemologies exemplifies the final 2 core principles of Indigenous Methodologies featured in this chapter.

As mentioned earlier, Pacific theorists Timote Vaioleti (2006) and Kali Fermantez (2013) have utilized Indigenous methodological frameworks in their research to capture Indigenous voices more successfully. Vaioleti employed Talanoa as a Tongan method of gathering information and ascertaining how people are feeling. Talanoa closely resembles the western concept of the narrative, yet centrally repositions Tongan cultural frameworks.

In the grounded epistemology evidenced in Holmes’ (2000) research in Hawai‘i, knowledge first emerges from the family and one’s ancestors. Epistemology may include dreams, prayers, and other forces outside of human volition. She drew her knowledge from multiple sources including hula, oli (chants) and what she termed the Hawaiian corpus, a collection of foundational
oral and written histories of the Hawaiian people. She furthermore collaborated with Hawaiian women and created knowledge out of the Indigenous epistemology of living memory, recording stories of the kūpuna (p.49). By utilizing Indigenous epistemologies and concepts, Holmes was able to convey Hawaiian knowledge in an authentic and validating way.

In this particular research, I employed “talk story” as a major method of data collection. Talk Story is the pidgin English for getting together and sharing, conversing, and hanging out with friends and family. Talk Story is described by Kali Fermantez (2013) in his research:

‘Talk story’ has been used by geographers and other social scientists as an appropriate research method that has proven successful as an unthreatening and comfortable way of accessing information in the local Hawaiian context. Despite the contrived nature of qualitative research in general, this kind of approach can enable more ‘natural’ interactions and responses to occur” (Kearns 2000, 109; referenced by Fermantez, 2013:115.)

My interviews were not purely one-sided. They consisted of minimal open-ended questions, inviting the women to share about their experiences with land or acquiring land on Kaua‘i, their activism, and their vision for the island. But with close friends, the interviews were a lively exchange of ideas, feelings, and input. And while their words were paramount to the experience, I also interjected my mana‘o in some situations with close friends, so that it
became an experience at times of laughter and deepening friendship, and at times brain-storming around social justice issues impacting their lives. The Talk Story method incorporates a relaxed manner which is in part interview, in part conversation, incorporating activities such as talking, telling stories, eating, and spending time with friends.

This incorporation of Hawaiian ways of speaking is part of the inclusion of Indigenous concepts, language, and epistemologies that round out the 10 core principles mentioned in this chapter.

2.10 Modified Grounded Theory as a Tool for Data Analysis

Kovach (2011) supported the utilization of a modified grounded theory method within an Indigenous Research Methodology because 1) it enabled Indigenous epistemology to guide the process; 2) supported the use of Indigenous theory to impact interpretations; 3) honored the transmission of knowledge through oral storytelling; 4) supports an inductive approach; and 5) emphasizes the importance of researcher’s knowledge of the subject area (5). She warns against losing perspective of the whole research process. “For Grounded Theory method to work with an Indigenous Methodology framework, there must be attention to maintaining a holistic conceptualization of the stories shared in the research. Always the berries and the bush” (p.6).

I used a modified Grounded Theory method in the analysis of the talk story sessions, adhering to her advice by making the method work for me rather than cause the research to serve the method. After transcribing the
interviews from 2014 and 2016, I utilized this method to pull out themes in the transcripts, and then created documents that categorized women’s quotes under these categorical themes.

In 2017, the research conducted was so close to the end of the interview process that I did not follow the full process utilized in previous years, but used a form of the coding process. I transcribed the interviews then made notes in the margins of the transcripts that highlighted themes in each quote. This allowed me to do a rudimentary coding process that could be quickly seen when reviewing transcript pages. I also began referencing whole interview transcripts, rather than just relying on coded compilation of women’s quotes, because I wanted to maintain awareness of the whole interview, i.e. the berries and the bush (Kovach, 2011).

This tool of a modified Grounded Theory method served my research by remaining an auxiliary support to my Indigenous Methodology framework. It supported the talk story data collection method, and allowed me to pull out important themes in the research. It provided an opportunity early in this research process of identifying important contexts to the women’s stories, allowing me to redirect future interviews to go in new directions or to go deeper into other areas. It served as a complementary research tool to an Indigenous Methodological framework.
Chapter 3: The Slow Genocide Waged Against the Hawaiian People: The History of Hawaiian Land Dispossession

Genocide, according the United Nations definition, includes those actions, even which may occur in a state of peace, “that cause serious bodily or mental harm to members of a group” (United Nations, n.d.). It includes “deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part” (United Nations, n.d.). The Hawaiian nation has undergone serious physical, economic, linguistic, and spiritual harm, as illustrated in this chapter, as a result of the Overthrow orchestrated by the narcissistic gang of foreigners that established the interim Republic of Hawai‘i; and the imperialist occupation of the Hawaiian islands by the United States of America (Cook et al., 2003; Jones, 2016).

This chapter is the first of three chapters that illuminate the components of the genocide that has occurred against the Hawaiian Nation and which lasts until today. It begins by weaving a story that provides the context to the women’s stories and experiences through establishing a historical outline for the loss of land and governance. It is followed by words from the women about the suppression of the truth of what happened, and the criminalization of the Hawaiian language.

I will begin this sub-section by providing a historical overview, using historical accounts and a few primary sources to reveal monumental shifts the Hawaiian Kingdom underwent over a period of roughly 100 years beginning in
the late 18th century. This will be followed by a closer analysis of some of the events surrounding the privatization of land under Kamehameha III as an attempt to examine the historical roots of land dispossession of the Kānaka people. This historical context sets the stage for understanding better the material shared by the women in this project, and helps us understand better the cause of how Hawaiians lost the land and governance, explaining a major part of the genocide waged against the Hawaiian people.

A number of international forces were converging, affecting pae ‘āina Hawai‘i such that it underwent great changes in its internal governance. Under Kamehameha I, the islands became unified into one Kingdom, ruled by chiefs from Moku O Keawe. Kamehameha the Great created a strong centralized government that underwent even more radical changes upon his death, including the breakdown of the traditional religious system.

Soon after the kapu was abolished, American Protestant missionaries from New England sailed to Hawaiian shores. Kamehameha had previously invited religious teaching from Great Britain, yet none had arrived. The American missionaries worked closely with the ali‘i, committing the Hawaiian language to paper for the first time and teaching the ali‘i to read and write. Ka‘ahumanu, former wife of Kamehameha I and acting regent for Kamehameha

---

43 Kamehameha I reigned from 1782 to 1819.
II, opened up the teaching of reading and writing to the maka'āinana, officially proclaiming Christianity the new state religion (Sai, 2008).

In 1823, King Kamehameha II and Queen Kamamalu left for London to have an audience with the King of England; however, it is said measles killed them before this meeting occurred. The British government assured the surviving delegation that the British Monarch, George IV, desired to maintain a protectorate relationship with the ‘Sandwich Islands’. However, Kaʻahumanu and the other ruling chiefs viewed the relationship that Kamehameha I established with Great Britain as one of comity instead of vassalage (Sai, 2008).

In 1831, Kaʻahumanu expelled Catholic priests who had arrived in Hawaiʻi and began preaching without royal permission (Silva, 2004; Sai, 2008). The French arrived after reports of the Kingdom’s rejection of Catholicism reached them. Captain Laplace on the ship Artemise demanded many conditions be met under threat of war, including freedom for Catholic worshippers in Hawaiʻi; land allotted to the French for a Catholic church in Honolulu; and $20,000 be given to France as a guarantee that the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi would continue to honor these stipulations. He further demanded that Hawaiʻi accept their alcoholic beverage exports, thus repealing Hawaiʻi’s prohibition laws. The Kingdom of Hawaiʻi met the conditions to avoid war with France (Silva, 2004; Sai, 2008; Kuykendall, 1938).

The French continued to stir up trouble for the Kingdom in the ensuing years as did the British Consul to Hawaiʻi. In response, King Kamehameha III
sent envoys to secure new consuls from England and France; obtain the countries’ assurances of recognition of Hawaiian Independence; and to make treaties (Kuykendall, 1938; Silva, 2004).

While the emissaries were endeavoring to establish consuls and treaties, a British ship under Captain Paulet arrived in Hawai‘i. Listening to the complaints of the British consul, Paulet proceeded to make threats against the Hawaiian Kingdom. King Kamehameha III, hearing a French fleet was on its way to the islands, provisionally ceded the Kingdom to the British. Paulet seized the Kingdom’s ships and renamed them; he also had the Hawaiian flags destroyed and raised British flags in their place. Soon thereafter, another British ship arrived and restored Hawaiian sovereignty, removing Paulet.

On July 31, 1843, the Kingdom officially celebrated Hawaiian Sovereignty Restoration Day. For 50 years after, this day was celebrated nationally as La Ho‘iho‘i Ea, Restoration Day, in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. It was on this day that King Kamehameha III declared “Ua ma uke ea o ka ‘āina i ka pono: the sovereignty of the land is preserved because it is just and good.” This became the motto of the Kingdom (Silva, 2004: 37; Kuykendall, 1938). Ironically, it is now the state motto of the occupied Kingdom of Hawai‘i, with the word for ‘sovereignty’ being translated instead to mean ‘life.’

As a result of King Kamehameha III’s diplomatic efforts, the Hawaiian Kingdom was recognized as an independent state by Belgium, the United States, Great Britain and France (Sai, 2004). U.S. Secretary of State, Daniel
Webster penned in December 1842: “…that the Government of the Sandwich Islands [sic] ought to be respected; that no power ought either to take possession of the islands as a conquest, or for the purpose of colonization, and that no power ought to seek for any undue control over the existing government…” (Chock, 1995: 463 quoting Kuykendall, 1938: 157).

France and Great Britain signed a joint declaration on Nov 28, 1843, which became Lā Kūʻokoʻa (Independence Day)44, a day still celebrated in the Hawaiian community:

Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and His Majesty the King of the French, taking into consideration the existence in the Sandwich Islands [sic] of a government capable of providing for the regularity of its relations with foreign nations, have thought it right to engage, reciprocally, to consider the Sandwich Islands as an Independent State, and never to take possession, neither directly or under the title of Protectorate, or under any other form, of any part of the territory of which they are composed (Sai, 2004: 54 referencing 1843 Anglo-Franco Declaration, Executive Documents of the US House of Representatives).

44 There is currently a bill at the time of this writing before the Hawaiʻi State Legislature to reinstate this day as a government holiday.
The U.S. reaffirmed its commitment to respect Hawai‘i’s sovereignty at this same time (Chock, 1995). This came in the form of a letter from Secretary of State John C. Calhoun on July 6, 1844 (Sai, 2008).

Despite France’s official recognition of Hawai‘i’s sovereignty, future French admirals or consuls continued harassing the Hawaiian government. On August 12, 1849, French admiral De Tromelin with the French consul landed 300 soldiers on O‘ahu. This army ransacked Governor Kekuanao‘a’s home, took over the fort, damaged the canons, and stole the king’s private yacht. They additionally stole special Hawaiian heirlooms, taking them and the yacht back to France. King Kamehameha III ordered that no resistance be made, presumably to avoid war (Dunn, 2004).

The Hawaiian Kingdom was the first non-Western nation to be accepted into the Family of Nations. Hawai‘i continued to enter treaties with powers within the Family of Nations, eventually entering five with the USA. They joined the Universal Postal Union in 1882 and eventually had over 130 consulates and 11 embassies internationally, prior to the Overthrow (Sai, 2004; Williams, 2019). The Hawaiian Kingdom was an internationally recognized sovereign and independent government.

This level of international recognition placed the Hawaiian Kingdom in a unique category very different from that experienced by colonies.

Recognition as a nation-state did not make Hawai‘i immune from imperialism as evidenced by Kamehameha III’s concern with the potential for imperial conquest. But recognition of Hawai‘i’s territory does signal that the relationship between Hawai‘i and other colonial powers at that time was very different from those colonies who were not afforded recognition (Preza, 2010: 38-39).

This is a critical distinction to some Hawaiian activists, one that inspires sovereignty leader Keanu Sai to pursue justice on an international level, fueling the pursuit of claims in international courts. However, its unique status did not spare Hawai‘i from illegal conquest and colonial occupation that other Indigenous nations also experienced.

3.1 The Mahele

Hawai‘i, prior to western impact, was a subsistence economy based in agriculture and aquaculture in which land, ocean, and all natural resources were communally-governed (McGregor, 1996). Land tenure was the center of the social and political system (Silva, 2004); Kānaka Maoli did not own land prior to the Mahele but had rights of access to land and to natural resources on the island in exchange for agricultural produce (McGregor, 1996; Banner, 2005; Preza, 2010; Chinen, 1958).

Islands were divided into ahupua‘a, a measure of land that encompassed natural resources from mauka to makai (from inland to sea). Families could presumably meet all their natural needs within their own ahupua‘a, and
konohiki were responsible for the administration (Lam, 1989). Aliʻi and makaʻāinana existed in a mutually dependent relationship; the makaʻāinana fed and clothed the aliʻi, and the rulers effectively managed collective resources, including regulating fishing and the canals that fed the individual loʻi (Lam, 1989; Silva, 2004). Hawaiians were not tied to land but had the freedom to move under a different konohiki if they preferred (Banner, 2005; Chinen, 1958). While makaʻāinana had to provide for the aliʻi from their labors, there are accounts that konohiki would seize hoaʻāina possessions if they became too prosperous (Chinen, 2002).

Hawaiʻi was noted in Polynesia to be extensively and masterfully cultivated; as stated, the hoaʻāina produced abundantly and efficiently for their needs and that of the aliʻi (Lam, 1989). Initially, Kānaka Maoli were widely admired by western visitors who came to the islands and noted their agricultural expertise and diligent labor (Kameʻelehiwa, 1992; Banner, 2005). As disease ravaged the population, fields were abandoned; there is evidence that even whole ahupuaʻa were left in disuse as a result of epidemics (Preza, 2010). Aliʻi demand for sandalwood lumber in order to trade with foreigners put a further strain on makaʻāinana agricultural pursuits and the centuries-old land-use system began to crumble (Banner, 2005). At that point, the economy began to shift from subsistence production to producing commodities for trade with whaling ships, and those transacting business in the sandalwood industry (Reich, 1980).
King Kamehameha III was aware of internationally-recognized law amongst the Family of Nations in respect to private property, i.e. land under allodial title, as evidenced in records of discussions with his advisors. The Mō‘ī was concerned about the confiscation of Hawai‘i’s lands in the event of conquest. Internationally it was recognized that private property would be off-limits to conquerors (Preza, 2010). One of the Mō‘ī’s foreign advisors, Richard Wyllie, suggested: “It is only private property that is respected, and therefore it would be wise to put every native family throughout the islands, in possession of a good piece of land, in fee simple, as soon as possible. If danger comes, we shall then have done our duty in providing for the poor natives, and if it does not come, we shall only do them justice…” (Osorio, 2002: 48).

As a result, Kamehameha III instituted the Mahele, a process that transformed the traditional land-use system of Hawai‘i into one of private property (MacKenzie, 2012). During this process, King Kamehameha III separated out 1.5 million acres as government land, and retained 1 million acres for himself and subsequent monarchs (MacKenzie, 2013). As well, the land of 245 chiefs and konohiki were separated out from the king’s portion (Reich, 1980). The maka‘āinana were to receive 1/3 of the land in this division (Osorio, 2002).
Preza posits that the Mahele is the most misunderstood event in Hawaiian history. He and a handful of other scholars today propose King Kamehameha III saw the Mahele as a way to protect & preserve Hawaiian land holdings (Preza, 2010; Banner, 2005) vs. a submission to pressure from outside influences that dispossessed the Hawaiian population--a theory proposed previously by scholars. The privatization of land that ensued was different than what was occurring in some areas of the Pacific--this was a legal maneuver adopted and implemented by the Hawaiian Kingdom, with advice from haole advisers, rather than a colonial enterprise forced upon Indigenous people (Preza, 2010). The Hawaiian Monarch potentially exercised agency in adapting to international law and internationally-recognized ideas of land tenure in an effort to support his government and his people.

Kanaka scholar Osorio presents another perspective, proposing the Mahele was a “foreign solution to the problem of managing lands increasingly emptied of people” (Osorio, 2002: 49). As the Mōʻī was responsible for the care of all the land and the institution of konohiki to manage it effectively, he was facing great challenges in the wake of massive depopulation. Thus, the Mahele could have been a political and legal maneuver on the part of Kamehameha III to preserve Hawaiian land use vs. dismantle it (Osorio, 2002; Solis, 2013).
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However, historical evidence reveals that Kānaka Maoli were uncomfortable with the level of influence wielded by foreigners in the Hawaiian Kingdom Government. In 1845, in the wake of much change, Hawaiian Kingdom subjects began to protest the number of foreigners being appointed to positions of authority in the government. Sixteen hundred Kānaka signed a petition that was published in both Hawaiian language and English missionary newspapers, entitled in English “A Petition to Your Gracious Majesty, Kamehameha III, and to all Your Chiefs in Council Assembled.” The petition asked that all foreign officers be replaced by Kānaka officers; that haole would not be allowed to become citizens of the Kingdom; and that no more land be sold to foreigners. Kānaka leaders in the King’s service, Keoni Ana and John Papa IʻI, assured those protesting that land would only be given to certain foreigners, and of course they wouldn’t be allowed to sell it to other foreigners (Silva, 2004). King Kamehameha III traveled to Lahainaluna, believed to be the center of the protest, to allay concerns about these appointments, assuring the people that the foreigners were loyal to him and that they were needed until native Hawaiian replacements could be trained (Chinen, 2004).

3.2 The Land Commission

The Land Commission (LC) deserves scrutiny because of its huge impact on the distribution of kuleana lands amongst the makaʻāinana, and as an important fulcrum in history whose impacts reverberate today.
Once the LC was created in 1845 by a legislative act, it began business the subsequent Spring by placing in ad in the *Polynesian Newspaper* announcing the need for Kingdom subjects to file for western land title. The publication of this note set off the clock, giving people 2 years within which they could lay claim to a piece of land (Chinen, 2002; Banner, 2005; Kuykendall, 1938). The Land Commission did not have the power to divide up the land, but instead to evaluate land claims and grant land awards based on those claims, as well as defining the boundaries of each land commission award. The legislation required that 5 commissioners be appointed by the Minister of Interior to serve on the Board (Chinen, 2002; Kuykendall, 1938).

The Land Commission proceeded to establish principles from which they implemented their duties, including the last principle, which stated: “Parties who fail to present their claims by February 14, 1848, are forever barred from asserting their claims” (Chinen, 2002).

The initial composition of the Land Commission consisted of five appointees, both haole and Hawaiian. William Richards, who had served as chaplain and interpreter to the King since Richards’ arrival in Hawai‘i 22 years prior, was appointed President of the LC. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) forbade missionaries to take government positions; thus Richards resigned with the Board to be able to serve the King in this capacity. John Papa I‘i, a long-term attendant and advisor to the monarchs, one of the three treasurers to the Kingdom and
previously the superintendent of schools, served as President of the LC when Richards was absent. John Ricord, the first lawyer to work for Kamehameha III, was also appointed. He had only arrived from the U.S. the year before and had been subsequently appointed as Attorney General to the Kingdom. James Young Kānehoa, son of John Young and Kaʻoanaʻeʻaha, niece to Kamehameha I, was initially appointed, as was Zorabella Kaʻauwai, a lesser chief from Maui (Kuykendall, 1938; Chinen, 2004; Brown, 2016).

The LC went through a revolving door of commissioners, with only John Papa Iʻi remaining on the board from the original commission until its dissolution in 1855. Originally, the LC was intended to operate for a short duration. A law was passed enabling it to remain effective until the work was completed as the magnitude of the task became evident. When the LC dissolved, the commission consisted of John Papa Iʻi, William L. Lee, John Smith, Joseph Kekaulahao and G.M. Robertson (Brown, 2016; Chinen, 2002).

William L. Lee is an interesting example of the foreigners who had become central to the dramatic events unfolding in the Hawaiian Kingdom during this era. Lee arrived October 12, 1846, only 25 years old. He was born in New York and had recently graduated from law school. While traveling with friend Charles Bishop to Oregon Territory, his ship went off course due to violent storms. The ship docked in Hawaiʻi to recover (Chinen, 2002; Dunn, 2004).
Soon after his arrival, Lee was recognized as only the 2nd trained lawyer to arrive in Hawai‘i. The Kingdom felt they needed legal assistance and prevailed upon Lee to stay and assist them. Lee convinced his friend Bishop to stay as well, vs. travel on to Oregon Territory (Dunn, 2004). He was appointed as judge for the Supreme Court less than 6 weeks after his arrival.

It must have been a tumultuous time for the Monarchy; perhaps they were desperate to establish a successful, western-style government in order to dodge the imperial ambitions of some European nations. Lee may have been seen as means to an end for the Hawaiian monarchy, who sought legal aid to adapt in the rapidly changing environment. In 1847, he was elected as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court; as well he was appointed to the Land Commission and made president of the Board and appointed to the Privy Council of the King.

Lee was assigned to write up the Principles that guided the LC. He was also asked to draw up the Criminal and Civil Codes for the Hawaiian Kingdom, including the Masters and Servants Act of 1850, which provided the basis of law for immigrant workers on the sugar plantations. In 1851, he was elected to the legislature and became Speaker of the House. He was asked to draft the 1852 Constitution, which was later replaced by King Kamehameha V. When he tried to withdraw from some of his positions, he was prevailed upon to remain by the King and other government officials (Levy, 1975; Dunn, 2004; Chinen, 2002). Lee had suffered from tuberculosis in his younger years, and the illness
resurfaced in 1853. He later died in 1857 on a trip to San Francisco with his wife (Dunn, 2004).

Lee was able to leverage his position in the Kingdom to benefit greatly from the Mahele and the release of land sales to foreigners. He pushed the Mōʻi to sell him prime land on Kauaʻi that opened the door to Lee entering into the sugar business. Royal Patent 188 was issued to William Lee for Lihuʻe Plantation, Puna District, Kauaʻi on December 21, 1849 for a sum of $9,350 (Chinen, 2002).

In letters to a childhood friend, Lee shared that he is “inclined to skim over the surface of things rather than dive into their hidden depths” (Dunn, 2004: 66). I wonder if this expressed tendency to skim along the surface negatively affected his time as President of the Land Commission, however. Having only arrived late in 1846, it can be assumed that Lee knew little about the culture or the language prior to his service on the LC, making him perhaps a less than optimal president, but one who potentially understood American land tenure law.

Lee and other haole in the Hawaiian Kingdom government exemplified toward Kānaka Maoli an extinction discourse, expressing this racial-eliminationist ideology (Jones, 2017) with both a sense of nostalgia and of inevitability that Hawaiians--as inferior to Western peoples--would eventually disappear. In his personal letters to a friend, Lee laments that the Hawaiian nation “will soon pass away and give place to the sturdier Saxon...Alas! For the
poor Hawaiian. My heart bleeds at the thought of his approaching destiny!”
(Dunn, 2004: 73). His erroneous assumption that the Hawaiians would ‘soon
pass away’ was a dangerous attitude that impacted his attitudes and decisions
when serving on the Land Commission, serving on the Supreme Court, and in
drafting Constitutions and laws that had incredible impacts on the future of
Hawai‘i and her people. Lee’s fatalistic attitude regarding the future of the
Hawaiian people had disastrous consequences in terms of his policies that
impacted Kānaka land access. In effect, his thinking and ensuing policy
resulted in genocidal actions against the Hawaiian people.

Lee did suggest the first 4 sections of the Kuleana Act which, according
to Stauffer (2004) were the most supportive portions for the hoa‘āina in this
piece of legislation. The 4th section set apart a portion of government lands on
each island for sale to maka‘āinana that did not receive adequate land
(Stauffer, 2004). However, in light that so few makaʻāinana ultimately received
kuleana awards compared to the intention expressed by the Mō‘ī, one can
surmise that Lee’s deficits in language and culture stymied his effectiveness as
President of the important commission. While he apparently had the favor and
trust of the King and his advisors, he may not have been able to adequately
address the needs of the people of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

The Land Commission was filled with aliʻi and foreigners who did not
seem to champion the cause of the makaʻāinana with one notable exception.
Samuel Kamakau, educated in Lahaianaluna, was appointed in 1848 when
Necko Namau'u resigned. He served until 1850, when he was replaced by G.M. Robertson, but passages from his later writings and actions stand out as advocating for the makaʻāinana in their land claims. Following his tenure on the Land Commission, Kamakau presented a petition to the House of Representatives asserting that the kuleana land awards were too small. This was tabled by a motion of G.M. Robertson, Kamakau’s replacement on the Land Commission. Robertson had a reputation during his time on the LC for deliberately shrinking the size of the kuleana awards (Chinen, 2002).

Considering that Robertson was on the Land Commission at this time in 1851 when Kamakau presented the petition, and remained so until it dissolved in 1855, it seems that his motion to table this petition was indeed unjust and potentially at conflict with his position on the Board. Robertson’s rulings, too, resulted in genocidal consequences for the Hawaiian people.

Kamakau later offered suggestions of how the LC could have operated at greater benefit for the majority of hoaʻāina. His manaʻo was that the LC should have allowed a time span of 20 years for the hoaʻāina to file their claims, stating that many of the makaʻāinana in the country were not educated in a western sense (Chinen, 2002: 81 referencing Kamakau: 407).

I did not find information regarding why Kamakau left the Land Commission. He was replaced by Robertson, who had very different views on how to treat the hoaʻāina. Could it have been political? Were the other members on the committee sympathetic to award smaller parcels to the
makaʻāinana on behalf of the chiefs? As the other Kānaka on the Commission were chiefs, were they more interested in keeping the konohiki portions large, at the expense of the hoaʻāina? These are questions that require greater scrutiny.

It is possible some hoaʻāina did not file claims for Kuleana Lands due to problems with their konohiki. Minister of the Interior Keoni Ana (John Young II) whose half-brother served on the Land Commission from 1846-1847, reported to the House of Representatives that the Land Commission experienced many complaints from the hoaʻāina about mistreatment from the konohiki class, who were dispossessing them of their land and planted crops. The House of Representatives passed many measures in response, but the upper house did not agree with many of the laws proposed by the lower house. Thus, no laws giving the commission the ability to deal with unjust konohiki materialized (Chinen, 2002). It is possible this injustice was addressed in other ways, as my research is only a part of the picture. However, I did not come across such information in my research.

Kamakau laments that “there was no powerful chief to stand back of the people...” (Chinen, 2002: 38; quoting Kamakau, 1992: 404). Kamakau does note that Kamehameha III was concerned about the mistreatment of the hoaʻāina prior to the Mahele, and thus created the Constitution of 1840 in response. Prior to this Constitution, konohiki were allowed to revoke land use, but apparently this did not occur often (Chinen, 1958). The Constitution of
1840 removed this ability of the konohiki to remove hoaʻāina arbitrarily from the land and established a constitutional monarchy in the islands (Chinen, 1958). It was revised in 1852 (Chinen, 2004: 38, quoting Kamakau, 1961). While Kamakau indicates that Kamehameha III did take measures to protect the hoaʻāina, he apparently felt that it didn’t go far enough to champion and protect the makaʻāinana’s needs.

Stauffer (2004) in his research on the Mahele quotes an unknown source from Kuykendall’s work, who states many hoaʻāina had not submitted claims for kuleana lands; that the LC would have better served the hoaʻāina had they investigated the actual occupiers of the Kuleana land plots and heard their claims vs. only hear the testimony provided by claimants who knew how to participate in the western legal process (Chinen, 2004:20, quoting Kuykendall, 1938: 293). He further references Kuykendall’s work, laying blame for the landless condition of many Kānaka in the early 20th century with the government for not ensuring that kuleana lands were made inalienable for the hoaʻāina (Stauffer, 2004:23 referencing Kuykendall, 1938: 293).

Notably, the Hawaiian Kingdom government had opportunities to make changes in the process in order to assist the hoaʻāina. William L. Lee alerted the King and other government officials that most of the hoaʻāina were not aware of the importance of filing claims for a plot of land (Chinen, 2002). In a letter between Lee and the Rev. Oliver P. Emerson of Waialua, Oʻahu, Lee again acknowledges that the hoaʻāina are not prepared to take advantage of this
opportunity to own land; however, his response appears nonchalant, stating he felt they should avail themselves of the opportunity nonetheless (Chinen, 2002:74).

Lee became aware that some konohiki were informing tenants on their lands that they did not have to file claims with the LC; that the hoa‘āina could live on their lands as in years past, trusting the konohiki to care for them. Kamakau records that those hoa‘āina who did not file claims were in compromised situations when the konohiki later sold their lands to haole. According to Kamakau, those hoa‘āina became landless wanderers that had to work ‘like slaves’ (Chinen, 2002: 78 quoting Kamakau).

On April 13, 1854, 105 Kānaka residents from Koʻolau, Kauaʻi sent a petition to the House of Representatives complaining about the konohiki selling their lands resulting in the loss of their access to their ancestral lands. A few days later, another petition arrived from Oʻahu begging the Legislature to forbid the sale of land to foreigners. A bill was proposed in the House to block the sale of konohiki lands to foreigners but was tabled and not pursued thereafter (Chinen, 2002).

The Land Commission was dissolved on March 31, 1855. Subsequent to its dissolution, it became clear that several chiefs had failed to file their land claims with the LC prior to the deadline, including Lunalilo and even Namauʻu, who even served on the LC. In 1860, many years past the deadline, the legislature passed an act that gave the chiefs another chance to file claims with
the Minister of Interior. However, no such provision was given to the makaʻāinana, many of whom failed to file in time and even begged the legislature after the fact for an extension. Furthermore, the majority of the chiefs failed to pay the commutation required by the Mahele laws. In 1909, the territorial legislature passed a statue forcing the payment, after which the majority of chiefs (or their descendents) followed through (Chinen, 2002).

During the LC era there were roughly 88,000 Hawaiians in the Kingdom; however, only 8,421 were awarded kuleana plots, averaging 3 acres each (Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992). This statistic doesn’t reveal how many families needed plots of land vs. how many actually received them, so it is not entirely helpful in painting a full picture. However, it does appear at least to be a dismally small amount of land being set aside for the makaʻāinana, and well below the 1/3 intended by the Mōʻi. The awards amounted to 28,658 acres, which is less than 1% of Hawaiʻi’s land area (Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992). This is a travesty of justice that led to the genocide of the Hawaiian people.

As of the 1848 deadline, 14,195 subjects applied for a kuleana land award. The majority of these applied in the last month before the LC’s deadline (Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992; Chinen, 2002). My research was not able to uncover the reasons so few people applied; however different researchers have presented possibilities. As capitalism and western land tenure were foreign concept for Hawaiians, it is possible that some people didn’t understand fully the need to file, or how it could protect them (Chinen, 2002; Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992). There
could have also been pressure from konohiki not to file, or a sense that attempting to file to retain konohiki lands was rude behavior (Chinen, 2002; Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992). Two years may have been too short a time for the makaʻāinana, especially on outer islands, to receive the information and follow through with all the steps of the process (Chinen, 2002). It could also be that the system the LC set up was ineffective, in requiring applicants to come to them; perhaps the Board should have gone to applicants if they desired to be truly effective (Stauffer, 2004).

In the process of obtaining an award with the LC, applicants had to file claims, present testimony with a witness before the LC; hire a surveyor to survey their plots; and submit payment for all fees. Problems arose around surveying the land awards especially. As no guidelines were established for the surveyors, no uniform regulations existed regarding what instruments to employ in the surveying process. Additionally, there was no stipulation as to what lands should be included within the kuleana parcels, nor any qualifications required on the part of the surveyor. Foreign surveyors unfamiliar with the cycles of kalo production could assign significantly less land to the award than a surveyor familiar with Hawaiian agricultural needs. Kuleana plots were only granted on land you were actually using. However, kalo fields had to lie fallow for 2-3 years between harvests, so the fallow fields needed to be included in the award even though they may appear as not being used. Some of the surveyors hired did not distinguish this need in their
surveys and outlined land awards that were too small to meet the people’s needs (Chinen, 2002).

On the West side of Kaua‘i, records show people complained to the LC of a corrupt surveyor who could be bribed by konohiki to not properly survey maka‘ainana land claims. The claimants in Wahiawa Valley, Kaua‘i, reported that the surveyor was paid off by the konohiki and that he refused to survey anyone’s lots. Despite their complaint, records do not indicate that justice was done on behalf of these people.

Claimants in Hanalei, Kaua‘i also complained of injustice from a foreign surveyor, who surveyed land to the benefit of haole neighbors and at the expense of maka‘ainana. One claimant said the surveyor listened to lies of haole who said they had bought his land. Local authorities apparently were afraid of the haole and did not approach them regarding the land theft (Chinen, 2002).

Evidence exists that some haole served as allies to the Hawaiian people. A haole pastor on O‘ahu surveyed maka‘ainana lands for free, and acknowledged that larger land tracts were needed by the families in his surveys. He advocated on behalf of the people before the LC, alerting them that a famine was happening for the people due to loss of crop cultivation. He pushed the hoa‘aina to abandon the kuleana claims process, giving up fighting with local konohiki, and instead he advised them to pursue the purchase of government lands (Chinen, 2002).
Of those who were able to obtain Kuleana land awards, during the last quarter of the 19th century, they began losing their kuleana lands rapidly. Act 33 of the 1874 Hawaiian Kingdom Legislature served to alienate many makaʻāinana through unscrupulous lending practices that resulted in Hawaiian lands slipping out of Hawaiian hands. This Act sanctioned by the haole-dominant legislature authorized Hawaiian Kingdom citizens to borrow money with their homes as collateral at very high interest rates--on average 13%--for short term loans. The legislation ensured that the loans could be administered without the borrower showing any proven way to repay the loans; it also removed any judicial safeguard from the whole process. When borrowers could not repay the loans, the lands were put up for auction, with the only notification being a small announcement in the newspaper. This law enabled lenders to privately auction off Hawaiians’ lands without due process; furthermore, it allowed lenders to work together with the auctioneer and auction bidders to personally secure the title to the land in question. The Act was passed by the legislature, overseen by wealthy banker Charles Bishop--the friend of William Lee who arrived in Hawaiʻi 30 years earlier on an adventure--and who married into the Royal family and prospered greatly as a result. Kauaʻi representative Pius Koakanu was the only legislator to stand up against this Act’s passage and the only Kānaka recorded to have interacted with this bill. Wealthy haole businessmen were apparently actually prospecting for land through this process, including William R. Castle; evidence shows that several
white lenders worked with bidders to secure the title themselves (Stauffer, 2004).

Were hoa‘aina, accustomed to subsistence living, at times cash poor and susceptible to the lure of such easy money for the promise of western material goods? The scope of this research has not been able to answer this question, and points to a need for further research in the future. Preza’s research (2010) indicates a court hearing in 1863 where the judge referred to Kānaka predominance in business and commerce over foreigners; as well Preza points out that Kānaka created communal land hui’s that required a large initial investment of cash—both examples indicate Kānaka had access to capital. Is it possible those Kānaka having predominance in business were of the aliʻi/konohiki class, and not the hoa‘aina? More research is required to answer these questions & to fully understand how we arrived at such disproportionately high levels of Kanaka landless-ness. Obviously, being able to read the Hawaiian language would empower researchers to view primary sources in the 19th century Hawaiian language newspapers, that are a rich treasure trove of information from that time.

3.3 Sales of Government and Konohiki Lands and the Formation of Land Hui

While there are examples of victimization and exploitation in relation to land and the hoa‘aina, there are also clear examples of agency and collective action.
Prior to the overthrow of 1893, Hawaiians purchased over 70% of the government grant awards that were sold; most of these purchases took place in the 1850s. Nearly all the desirable government lands were purchased in this decade, with most purchases being made by native Hawaiians. Foreigner purchases of government lands did not outpace Hawaiian purchases until the 1880s, when the population was nearly equal between the two groups (Preza, 2010).

Land-buying associations, or hui kū‘ai ʻāina, were an example of Kānaka agency and resourcefulness, enabling Hawaiian families to retain lands under the new westernized tenure system. These land hui allowed for the families to collectively steward an ahupuaʻa, and work together, living off the land (Vaughan, 2018; Stauffer, 2004).

Andrade (2008) states that Hawaiians entered into cooperative land hui because the Mahele did not create a path for continued survival via the kuleana land awards. Prior to the Mahele, hoaʻāina were dependent on the konohiki to govern communal irrigation of the loʻi. After the Mahele, there were no laws in place governing how the konohiki would administer the water usage under the new land system (Stauffer, 2004). Hawaiians could circumvent this problem via the collective purchase of entire ahupuaʻa, or portion thereof, from the konohiki.

Roversi (2012) documents at least 16 prominent land hui in Hawaiʻi as part of an incomplete list spanning over 40,000 acres. The amount of hui lands
sold to Kānaka was apparently greater than the amount of kuleana lands awarded to the makaʻāinana (Solis, 2013).

A prominent example of the land hui was found on the North Shore of Kauaʻi, an island that received 1,824 of acres of kuleana allotments, fewer Kuleana Awards than all the other islands except Lanaʻi (Chinen, 2004). In 1869, 71 Hawaiian Kingdom citizens came together and formed the Wainiha Hui Kuʻai ʻĀina, preserving the 15,000 acre Wainiha ahupuaʻa for collective use (Solis, 2013; Roversi, 2012). Each hoaʻāina held a portion of the land in fee simple, but managed the land communally with the other people (Roversi, 2012).

One Kanaka scholar, Sheleigh Solis (2013), whose kūpuna on both sides of her family were members of the Wainiha Hui, extensively researched the creation of the Wainiha Hui Kuʻai ʻĀina. “Hawaiian Land Hui were a unique creation that attempted to utilize the emerging capitalistic economy of the Kingdom to preserve collective rights of Kānaka to ʻāina”(Solis, 2013: 22). The Hui agreed on bylaws for the communal operation of the land, created a constitution, and had each member sign it in agreement. The Hui allotted each member 5 acres of land and agreed to meet every six months. Tenants were only allowed to sell to other Hawaiian Kingdom subjects, and not to foreigners. If Hui members moved away, they were allowed a proxy that had to join the group and honor the laws (Solis, 2013).
Two other Land Hui on Kaua‘i were found on 2,500 acres in Hā‘ena, and between 1,500 and 2,500 acres in Moloa‘a. Research is needed to determine if the land hui of Moloa‘a was formed by the people of Koʻolau who were dispossessed of land and a home when their konohiki sold the lands to haole, as mentioned in Chinen’s (2002) research.

In Hā‘ena, the Hui Ku‘ai ʻĀina O Ha‘ena survived legally well past many of the hui cooperatives in Hawai‘i, not breaking up til it was forced to partition by two wealthy haole businessmen in the 1960s (Andrade, 2008).

The Mahele was not adequately carried out on behalf of the makaʻāinana class, though the intention of King Kamehameha III behind the Mahele was to adequately disburse land allotments to all concerned. As in present times, leaders can have ideas that seem good but are not sensitized to the needs of the people, and do not result as intended. Due to the sheer magnitude of the work required to divide and title all the land; the radical and rapid changes the Kingdom was undergoing in terms of governmental changes, disease outbreak, native population collapse, and influx of foreigners and foreign influences; the threat of conquest from aggressive European powers—all these factors influenced a government that was facing huge hurdles. King Kamehameha III expressed a desire to distribute 1/3 of the lands to the hoaʻāina, but that did not materialize. Also, the government passed measures in favor of the aliʻi but at the expense of the makaʻāinana. Furthermore, Act 33 of 1874 dispossessed many Kānaka of the kuleana lands they were able to retain, in an
unscrupulous manner (Stauffer, 2004). The Kānaka did have other means apparently to acquire land as evident in recent scholarship (Stauffer, 2004; Solis, 2013; Preza’s, 2010; Andrade, Banner, 2005; Roversi, 2012); Kānaka were resourceful and put together land hui, as well as purchased the majority of grants the government sold prior to the Overthrow. However, the Mahele set the stage for the dispossession of the makaʻāinana under the criminal occupation by the U.S. military since 1893. The Mahele created a fracture, that with the pressure of various forces in economy and law, and with the Overthrow and ensuing Annexation, resulted in a break of the ‘Ōiwi ability to collectively live on the land (Preza, 2010).

3.4 An Act of War & Annexation

On January 16, 1893, the U.S. Minister to the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi John L. Stevens ordered troops from the USS Boston to come ashore in Honolulu. The USS Boston, a state-of-the-art warship, had arrived in Pearl Harbor five months earlier per Stevens’ request of the U.S. Government. The warship contained canons, rapid-fire guns, torpedoes, and 280 trained troops (Van Dyke, 2008). Stevens, in tandem with white pro-annexationists, was preparing for their covert armed insurrection against the Hawaiian government.

Stevens, previously from Maine, had once owned a newspaper there in conjunction with James Blaine. Blaine now served as his superior as the Secretary of State for the U.S. Government. Blaine had appointed Stevens to Hawaiʻi in 1889, perhaps with the hidden agenda of annexation of Hawaiʻi to
the United States. Blaine conferred on Stevens the status of Plenipotentiary, granting Stevens the ability to act independently on behalf of the U.S. Government in Hawai‘i (Meleisea, 2015).

Stevens, once he arrived at his post, worked in tandem with the pro-annexationists, many of them descendants of missionaries, to plan the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani. He gave Lorrin Thurston, a white politician in Hawai‘i, letters of introduction in the U.S. Government in Washington, DC, where Thurston traveled to advocate on behalf of the planter class who sought annexation (Van Dyke, 2008; Coffman, 2016). While Thurston was in DC, U.S. President Benjamin Harrison passed a message to him assuring him that they would back up the move for annexation (Meleisea, 2015). Some elements within the United States government wanted Hawai‘i for strategic military purposes; they were amenable to this small group of white insurrectionists setting the stage for that transfer.

Stevens wrote lengthy letters back to his long-time friend Blaine at the State Department, sharing his plans to use U.S. troops in Honolulu, and acknowledging that these actions would violate international laws. He pushed for U.S. annexation of Hawai‘i, especially to prevent the strategic aspects of Hawai‘i’s geographic location from potentially benefitting other nations (Van Dyke, 2008).

The golden hour is near at hand [referring to stealing Hawai‘i for American interests]...So long as the islands retain their own
independent government there remains the possibility that England or the Canadian dominion might secure one of the Hawaiian harbors for a coaling station. Annexation excludes all dangers of this kind” (Meleisea, 2015: 233).

When Stevens wrote his boss and long-time friend and asked if he supported annexation as the Secretary of State, Blaine did not respond on paper. Though something constrained him from saying on paper directly to Stevens that he was for annexation—whether it was knowledge of the illegality of such a move in international law and the problems that could arise with a written record of his assent—he did state his desires for acquiring Hawaiʻi in political contexts within the United States. Both as a Congressman, and later as the Secretary of State, Blaine is found pushing for the incorporation of Hawaiʻi into America. He advised President Harrison of Hawaiʻi’s value to the U.S., such that it should be seized (Coffman, 2016).

There are only three places that are of value enough to be taken that are not continental. One is Hawaiʻi, and the others are Cuba and Porto Rico (sic). Cuba and Porto Rico (sic) are not now imminent and will not be for a generation. Hawaiʻi may come up for decision at any unexpected hour, and I hope we shall be prepared to decide in the affirmative (Dando-Collins, 2014. U.S. Secretary of State James Blaine, to President Benjamin Harrison, August 10, 1891).
Blaine’s comments in Congress and to the U.S. President prior to the Overthrow, and his total omission of any objection whatsoever to Stevens’ expressed plans of using U.S. military to back up an overthrow of the Monarchy indicate his approval of Stevens’s plans. Additionally, his reception of Lorrin Thurston in Washington, DC, and his introduction of Thurston to the U.S. Naval Secretary; as well Blaine’s decision to give Stevens’ plenipotentiary status, which empowered Stevens to act upon his expressed intentions without any hint of objection from his superiors, support the presupposition that Blaine was in agreement with Stevens’ and Thurston’s conspiracy to overthrow a peaceful government, with whom the U.S. had a treaty of amity.

Mid-afternoon on January 17, 1893, a German immigrant militia of 15-20 armed themselves with ammunitions that had been smuggled into Honolulu. This militia was commandeered by the so-called ‘Committee of Safety’—a group of 13 whites, so-named to support their ruse that they were simply protecting white life and property. This committee was made of whites who were either immigrants from, or descended from immigrants originating from, America, Britain, Australia, Portugal, and Germany—at a time when whites made up less than 5% of the total Hawaiian Kingdom’s population. This group that committed treason included Lorrin Thurston, Sanford Dole, W.O. Smith, William Castle, A. S. Wilcox, William C. Wilder, Crister Bolte, Henry Waterhouse, Andrew Brown, G.F. Glade, Henry E. Cooper, F. W. McChesney, Theo Lansing, and John McCandless. Just days before, Thurston had received
word from Washington, DC on January 11 that time was running out if they wanted to annex Hawai‘i to the U.S. under the Harrison administration. A new president was coming into office soon, meaning the ‘Committee of Safety’ would have to act quickly. Minister Stevens ordered troops to shore January 16 in anticipation of their plan; and on January 17, the conspirators declared themselves the new provisional government, without actually confronting the Queen or any officials of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Although those willing to fight for the Kingdom well outnumbered this small group, the Kānaka would also have to face the USS Boston’s canons as well as the 162 U.S. troops from the ship that had come ashore the day before. Well-aware of the hostilities arrayed against her Kingdom, Ke Ali‘i ‘Ai Moku restrained her people from rising up to protect her in order to prevent bloodshed (Sai, 2015; Borch, 2016; Silva, 2004; Kualapai, 2005; Coffman, 2016; Dando-Collins, 2014; Meleisea, 2015; Van Dyke, 2008; Mackenzie, 2012; Kauanui, 2012).

Prior to the criminals demanding surrender from the Queen and gaining control of her military, or even the Kingdom’s police--Stevens had already, as a Plenipotentiary representing the United States, officially recognized the installment of the rebel government, and informed the queen as such (Van Dyke, 2008).

Lili‘uokalani conditionally surrendered to the United States, protesting the so-called Provisional Government:
I, Liliʻuokalani, by the grace of God and under the constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom, Queen, do hereby solemnly protest against any and all acts done...by certain persons claiming to have established a Provisional Government of and for this Kingdom...I yield to the superior force of the United States of America, whose Minister Plenipotentiary, his Excellency John L. Stevens, has caused United States troops to be landed at Honolulu...Now, to avoid any collision of armed forces and perhaps the loss of life, I do, under this protest, and impelled by said force, yield my authority until such time as the Government of the United States shall, upon the facts being presented to it, undo the action of its representatives and reinstate me and the authority which I claim as the constitutional sovereign of the Hawaiian Islands” (Meleisea, 2015: 234. Blount’s Report, House Executive Documents, 53rd Congress, 2nd session, no 47, and in the Honolulu Daily Bulletin, 18 January 1893).

The Queen wrote several impassioned letters, including to acting President of the Provisional Government Sanford Dole and also to U.S. President Harrison. She referred to Hawaiʻi’s status as a recognized sovereign nation in the Family of Nations, and of the treaties between the U.S. and Hawaiʻi. She emphasized to the President that she only yielded to the ‘Committee of Safety’ due to the U.S. forces that had come on shore to threaten the Kingdom (Silva, 2004).
Dismissing her protests, President Harrison made good on his promises to Thurston; after Secretary of State Blaine signed a treaty of annexation with the Provisional Government on February 14, 1893, President Harrison sent it to the Senate for ratification (Sai, 2004). Before it could be ratified by Congress, Harrison left office to a new incoming Commander-in-Chief, Grover Cleveland. Cleveland called the insurrection ‘a disgrace’ and withdrew the treaty before it could be ratified. He commissioned a special investigation into the Overthrow assigned to Congressmen James Blount (Silva, 2004; Meleisea, 2015).

Blount arrived in Hawai‘i to find the Stars and Stripes flying over ʻIolani Palace. He immediately removed it and commanded the U.S. troops back on their ships (Meleisea, 2015). Although he never found a written document directly linking Stevens to the crime, his investigation concluded that the U.S. legation was responsible for the Overthrow, in conjunction with the U.S. Marines and Naval officers, violating international law and Hawai‘i’s sovereignty (Sai, 2004).

The women of Kauaʻi’s chapter of Hui Aloha ʻĀina organized a memorial that they presented to Senator Blount on May 15, 1893, signed by 809 Hawaiian women from that island (The Daily Bulletin, Volume V, Number 731, Page 4, May 19, 1893). The words are powerful in revealing the women’s feelings towards their island home and recent political events. I have included their words here due to the importance of highlighting Kauaʻi women’s leadership and impact historically.
1. That we are Hawaiian women resident upon the Island of Kauaʻi.

2. That we and our ancestors from time immemorial have resided in these tropical islands under the government of our native aliʻi and that we have known and now know no other home than here.

3. That we, representing the mothers and wives of the Hawaiian Nation, are vitally and affectionately interested in the government of our country, and deem ourselves entitled to raise our voices in protest and prayer at the present crisis in its affairs, to protest against what has been done, and to pray that recent wrongs may be speedily undone.

4. That we have seen with grief and dismay the abolition of the forms of government to which we, in common with all our race, have from the dawn of our national history, been devotedly attached; and have noted with profound sorrow that the naval arm of the United States, a nation which we have been taught to love and reverence for it justice towards and protection of the weak and oppressed, has been used by those in command to compass the overthrow of the political conditions heretofore existing in Hawaiʻi.

5. That prior to January 17, 1893, the Hawaiian nation and government were being conducted under constitutional forms, wherein the lives, liberty, property and religious views of the people were fully protected; that although the Constitution then in effect was of revolutionary origin, it having been imposed upon the King and people by military force, in
1887, and although it contained provisions which bore with harshness and injustice upon the native Hawaiians, yet the Hawaiians lived and were protected under it, and had, as a nation, no wish or intention to see it abrogated or altered, except by constitutional methods.

6. That on said 17th day of January, during the reign of law and profound peace and by means of a revolutionary project, aided and abetted by naval forces from the United States cruiser “Boston,” then lying in the harbor of Honolulu, and concurred in and promoted by His Excellency John L. Stevens, the United States envoy at the Hawaiian Court, the Hawaiian Monarchy and Government were forcibly dissolved, abolished and overthrown, and a so-called “Provisional Government” erected in their stead, with whose subsequent history you, esteemed sir, are no doubt familiar.

7. That it is the avowed intent of the said Provisional Government to affect the incorporation of these Islands into the American Union, under the phrase of the annexation of Hawai‘i thereto.

8. That indications point with irresistible force to the belief, that it is the intent of said Provisional Government to effect such annexation upon terms and conditions which will practically deprive the native Hawaiian of rights and privileges theretofore possessed and exercised by him of participating in the government of his native land, and that will reduce the Hawaiian to the condition of a serf in the land of his birth.
9. That the said Provisional Government does not represent the people of these Islands, and does not exist by the consent of the people, but in defiance of their wishes, and that in particular the native Hawaiians, who constitute a majority of the national population are opposed to the said Provisional Government, to the methods of its creation and administration, and its avowed purposes and objects.

10. Wherefore we do humbly and fervently pray and beseech you, honored sir, in your capacity as the envoy of the great American President and nation, to diligently inquire and consider whether our foregoing assertions and complaints be founded in truth and justice; and if they shall be established as being so founded, that you, sir, and those whom you here represent, may be moved to speedily undo the great wrong that has been done to our Queen, our country and ourselves by the power and in the name of the United States; and that as an essential element in the righting of those wrongs, our Hawaiian Queen, Liliuokalani, our government and constitution, may be restored to place and power, and may be henceforth protected from any assaults committed in the name and under the protection of the Starry Flag, which, in your land and throughout the world, stands as the badge and symbol of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity.

And your petitioners will ever pray.
President, Mrs. Anna Lanihau.

Vice-President, Mrs. Sarah Charman.

Secretary, Mrs. Rose Kanewanui.

Treasurer, Mrs. Charlotte Kakina.

COMMITTEE.

Mrs. Amy Mahikoa.

Mrs. Mary Kaiawe.

Mrs. Harriet Mundon.

Mrs. Mary Ann Makaila.

Mrs. Abby Kauaʻi.

Mrs. Kaenaku Kauaʻi.

Mrs. Elizabeth Hart.

Mrs. Keakaʻaia Kahalelole.

Mrs. Mary Ann Spalding.

Miss Hannah Uhuʻuhu.

Mrs. Mary Hapuku.

Mrs. Hannah Lovell.\footnote{A copy of this document was given to me by Puanani Rogers, President of Hui Aloha ʻĀina chapter on Kauaʻi. The Daily Bulletin, Volume V, Number 731, Page 4, May 19, 1893.}

Once Blount’s report was released, President Cleveland decried the coup as an ‘act of war,’ declaring to Congress: “A substantial wrong has thus been
done which a due regard for our national character as well as the rights of the injured people requires that we should endeavor to repair” (MacKenzie, 2011: 626). The provisional government’s hopes of a quick annexation were temporarily dashed. U.S. President Cleveland ordered the Provisional Government to step down and to restore the Monarchy to the Hawaiians. Sanford Dole refused, ironically telling America to stay out of Hawai‘i’s internal affairs. The ‘Republic of Hawai‘i’ was therefore established in 1894 with sugar baron Sanford B. Dole as president (Silva, 2004).

3.5 The Morgan Report—A Racist Treatise of Pro-Annexationist Propaganda

When Dole refused to follow Cleveland’s direction, the U.S. President then turned the matter over to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the leadership of a pro-annexationist John Morgan (Meleisea, 2015). The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been requested to investigate “whether any and, if so, what irregularities occurred in the diplomatic or other intercourse between the United States and Hawai‘i in relation to the recent political revolution in Hawai‘i” (Los Angeles Herald, 1894). Blount had shown in his report that there was probable cause for trying Stevens with treason (Sai, 2004). The contrasting Morgan Report, as it became known, was released on February 26, 1894 (Morgan, 1894). The Senate committee report claimed that the Queen destroyed her own Monarchy before the U.S. troops even landed by her desire to undo the Bayonet Constitution (Los Angeles Herald, 1894). In
1887, when the Queen’s brother Kalākaua was in office, he had been threatened at the point of death by a group of whites to institute a new constitution that gave increased governmental power to the white planter class. It was this constitution that the subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom petitioned their Queen to destroy, asking her to restore the previous constitution (Silva, 2004) and it was this situation that pro-annexationists were using as a scapegoat to justify their criminal acts.

The government officials behind the Morgan Report (Morgan, 1894), together with the crooks who cowardly usurped the lawful Hawaiian government under Queen Liliʻuokalani, exemplified collective pathological narcissism (Jones, 2017). They believed in their own superiority to the Hawaiian people, and utilized legal means to gain control of Hawaiian governance, and thus be able to obtain Hawaiian lands and resources. Greed and a desire for power motivated these people to utilize deception and manipulation in order to obtain their desires. Governments controlled by collective narcissism will blame their victims of committing the very crimes that were perpetuated by the government.

The Morgan Report is a jeremiad of pro-annexation sentiment; it made many statements that were willfully manipulative and deceitful, including accusations that the Queen wanted to murder her opponents (Los Angeles Herald, 1894; Morgan, 1894). This was part of the defamatory discourse launched against Liliʻuokalani by pro-annexationists, who twisted facts to vilify
the Queen in the media and before government officials in order to justify their criminal antics. A political cartoon published in the United States at this time underscores this accusation, hinting that the Queen and the Hawaiian people were blood-thirsty and cannibalistic, intent on murdering Dole (Silva, 2004). However, the white sugar barons/pro-annexationists were the ones who had murderous intent: many of them had been fully prepared to murder Kalākaua if he hadn’t capitulated to this particular group’s lust for power and control. The ‘Committee of Safety’ were the ones that took up arms and thus threatened death against the Hawaiians to achieve their political purposes in the Kingdom, rather than adhere to democratic principles.

The Morgan Report justifies the Overthrow by saying America has always needed to interfere in the affairs of Hawai‘i (Los Angeles Herald, 1894; Morgan, 1894). While America and American descendants who had become Hawaiian citizens interfered with the installment of Kalākaua and the enforcement of the Bayonet Constitution, these were illegal acts, and were not required for the maintenance of the Kingdom, but rather the increase of haole control over the Kingdom. A sovereign and independent nation, with recognized independence in the Family of Nations and treaties of amity with the United States and other nations, had just been unjustifiably taken over by U.S. troops. To couch this violence in rhetoric that says, ‘this is how it has always been’ and sweeping it under the rug is disguising the fact that there have been those from America that have always coveted Hawai‘i—that would be a more honest statement.
This document makes the outrageous statement that Hawaiians have been fascinated with the idea of becoming part of the United States since Kamehameha I; it also highlights military officers in the U.S. Government who stated annexation was “indispensable to the proper defense and protection of [America’s] western coast cities” as justifiable cause for this takeover (Los Angeles Herald, 1894). The report states that the only misstep on Stevens’ part was to declare Hawai‘i as a protectorate; the report claimed that since he disavowed this action, that matter was resolved (Los Angeles Herald, 1894).

This report is a legal document that was used by the U.S. Senate to tie the hands of the President of the United States from reinstating the constitutional monarchy and lawful government of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Random examples of its ludicrous statements revealing the racist underpinnings to the rhetoric include on p. 452, Morgan (1894) states that the real reason the Hawaiian population has decreased dramatically is because the women ‘are so fond of gaiety’ in the towns they supposedly ‘crowded into’ to ‘indulge in dissipation’ which has resulted in seeing families as ‘a burden’ and leading to a ‘willful curtailment of the birthrate.’

Here, the U.S. Government, via Senator Morgan, blames the unfolding genocide against the Hawaiian people on Hawaiian women. He goes on to deride Hawaiian women by patronizing them, commenting that they have so easily adapted to ‘civilized’ clothing, wearing them ‘as easily and naturally as the mulattoes or quadroons in our own country’ (Morgan, 1894: 453). Morgan
justifies his genocidal report by eugenics. He exemplified collective pathological narcissism by making invisible Hawaiian suffering and disenfranchisement.

When Morgan visited Hawai‘i in the midst of compiling his report, he gave a speech at Kawaiaha‘o Church on O‘ahu, where he was confronted with organized and articulate Kānaka protest. He attempted to reassure the Hawaiian people that under United States control ‘they would be able to vote just as blacks did in the American South’ in the late 1890s (Silva, 2004: 148). Morgan is a clear example of how racism was a critical component of annexation discourse; it was used as a justification for the Overthrow, as well as a means to control and suppress the people in the occupied Kingdom. His racist attitude was a precursor of Hawaiian experience under American governmental control. Racism was an ongoing instrument used to undercut Kānaka leadership and political power by the haole ruling elite in Hawai‘i (Williams Jr, 2015). The Provisional Government in fact used the state constitution of Mississippi, a state that was infamous for its abhorrent record of racism, as a template to disenfranchise the Kānaka Maoli.48

This disparagement of Hawaiians’ character, starting with their leader the Queen and also given to them as a people group, worked to create a false narrative that states that Hawaiians cannot self-govern. Again, this is evidence of collective narcissism on the part of Morgan and those in the US government

________________________

48 Ron Williams, Facebook post, 2019.
and Provisional Government that sought to undermine Hawaiian self-determination. Abusers and narcissists convince their victims that they cannot survive without them. Through media, government, and education, this narrative was asserted by racists and abusive government officials.

The ruling oligarchy was deeply insecure and outnumbered in the islands at this time and pushed for the U.S. Government to not only take over, but to limit suffrage to Hawaiians. Out of this insecurity, the Provisional Government forced a new constitution on the people, suppressing freedom of speech by forbidding publishing or speaking against their governance, and requiring people to sign oaths of allegiance to the new government to be able to vote or hold a government job. Hawaiians gathered for a massive peaceful protest on O'ahu in response, calling for the restoration of a constitutional monarchy (Silva, 2004; Williams Jr, 2015). Many Kānaka refused to sign these loyalty oaths, and lost their jobs.

The Queen sustained many insults and accusations against her character because of her stand for justice for the Hawaiian Kingdom. She stood up against the lies of the pro-annexationists in America’s public discourse, and gained the ire of those who wished to acquire the islands under dishonest pretenses. One accuser was Sereno Bishop, an ardent racist and missionary son who wrote for the United Press. Born and raised in the Hawaiian Kingdom, Bishop had written over 100 articles in the Hawaiian language press with the audacity to take the pen-name Kamehameha (Williams, Jr., 2013). Bishop
actively smeared Ke Aliʻi ʻAi Moku, accusing Liliʻuokalani of conducting orgies in ʻIolani Palace and claiming in the American press that native Hawaiians despised her (Silva, 2004, quoting research from Lydia Kualapai).

Queen Liliʻuokalani resided temporarily on the East Coast of the United States, traveling between Washington, DC and New York City to advocate on behalf of her beloved nation. She hosted bi-weekly receptions attended by hundreds, with guests including Congressmen and their families, and church-goers of every denomination. At these receptions, attendees could see that she was nothing like her accusers presented in the press. She also published an autobiography, and wrote for a San Francisco newspaper, in an effort to stand up for herself and her nation (Silva, 2004).

### 3.6 The Kūʻē Petition—The Lāhui moves to block Annexation

When a subsequent American president, McKinley, would see no problem in acquiring Hawaiʻi illegally by a treaty of annexation with the Provisional Government, the Queen worked with three Hawaiian political groups to activate a petition drive. Hui Kalai ʻĀina was the Kingdom’s first political group; it had been established with the help of a haole ally and newspaper editor after the Bayonet Constitution was forced upon Kalākaua in 1887. The group desired to restore the monarchy’s power as well as restore voting rights to Kānaka men. Hui Aloha ʻĀina was established after the Overthrow with Joseph Nawahiokalaniʻopuʻu (Nawahi) as President and Kuaihelani Maipinepine Campbell heading up the Hui Aloha ʻĀina O Na Wāhine (women’s chapter).
These groups were extremely active following the Overthrow in petitioning the United States and other foreign governments for help in their battle for the restoration of their Kingdom. Members of these political groups worked extensively throughout the islands collecting petitions to be submitted to the U.S. Congress to block the treaty of annexation (Silva, 2004; Sai, 2004; Silva, 1998).

Emma ‘A’īma Nawahi, wife to Joseph, accompanied Kuaihelani Campbell to Moku O Keawe to collect signatures. In Hilo they conducted a meeting at the local church not only to collect signatures, but to showcase the hearts of the people regarding annexation before a San Francisco-based reporter who was covering the protests. They reprinted her article in Ke Aloha ‘Āina, the patriotic newspaper run by Joseph Nawahi, and after his death, his wife. Emma Nawahi spoke before the crowd:

…We will make [America] understand that just as they love their land and would endure suffering before giving it up, so do we love our land, and we pray they do not take it from us. Here is our hope...Upon this petition of ours that we are submitting for signatures today, you, the women of Hawai‘i, have a chance to express your thoughts...This is our only way to fight (Joseph Nawahi, 1897 in Ōiwi, 1998).

A woman came from Moloka‘i to speak on behalf of people there at the meeting:

I am telling you the truth, the people of Moloka‘i completely oppose annexation. They are very fearful that if annexed to America, their lands
will be lost. The foreigners will gather the benefits, and Hawaiians will enter into a crisis more severe than today's (Joseph Nawahi, 1897 in Ōiwi, 1998).

Figure 2. An example of the Kūʻē Petitions from Kauaʻi.
The political hui was able to garner 38,000 petitions, out of a population of 40,000 Hawaiians surviving in pae‘āina Hawai‘i. As a result of their effort, and the diplomatic efforts of Hawaiian delegates who met with members of Congress in DC, the treaty failed to be ratified by the Senate (Sai, 2004; Silva, 2004).

3.6.1 Illegal Acquisitions

In April 1898, the U.S. declared war against Spain, fighting in the Pacific in the Spanish colony of the Philippines. In May 1898, the occupying government, the Republic of Hawai‘i, violated the Hawaiian Kingdom’s previous committment to neutrality by giving America permission to use Hawai‘i as a re-coaling stop on their way to Manilla. The Spanish Vice-Consul in Honolulu lodged a formal complaint with the Provisional Government against the violation of Hawaiian neutrality. The U.S. State Department was notified in June, and a month later Congress—in complete disregard of the rights and the desires of the Hawaiian people, and after a vociferous debate--passed a joint resolution saying Hawai‘i was annexed to the United States. A joint resolution in Congress does not possess the legal right to takeover a foreign government, yet it occurred. This illegal takeover of Hawai‘i marked the beginning of a new level of America’s imperialist endeavors, moving beyond the immoral conquest of Indigenous Nations on the continent to nations farther afield (Sai, 2004; MacKenzie, 2012; Kauanui, 2012).
Auwē! Kuʻu aloha i kuʻu ʻāina hanau ame kuʻu lāhui aloha. Ka wiwo kuʻu iwi ke koko o kuʻu koko. Aloha! Aloha! Aloha!

Aue! My love for my birthland and my beloved people. Bones of my bones, blood of my blood. Aloha! Aloha! Aloha!—(Queen Liliʻuokalani’s entry into her diary when she heard of the illegal annexation of her nation to the United States found in Silva, 2004).

Coffman states that, since the Overthrow, historians and others have tried to locate what he calls a ‘smoking gun’ in order to attach unequivocally responsibility for this egregious violation of international law to the United States government.

...The non-native majority of the presidentially appointed Native Hawaiian Study Commission squelched the Hawaiian claim for reparation, substantially on the contention that no one could prove the intent or malice of the U.S. Government. They sent the Native Hawaiian members of the commission on a fruitless search for a ‘smoking gun’... (Coffman, 2016: 111).

Dr. Keanu Sai, in an interview in March 2016, produced a copy of the ‘smoking gun’ that he felt proved American culpability. While Stevens testified under oath before Congress that he had not intervened or collaborated with the insurgents in the Overthrow of the Monarchy, this document proves otherwise.

If the U.S. legation legitimately had nothing to do with the Overthrow, they would only acknowledge a revolt once it controlled the government offices, the military, and the police.\(^{50}\)

The document emerged when archival documents held by the descendants of William O. Smith, the first Attorney General in the Provisional Government and one of the Committee of 13 who overthrew the Monarchy, were turned over to the Hawaiian Mission House Archives in 2016; Dr. Ron Williams, Jr. came across it during his research. The document is a letter written to Sanford Dole on January 17, 1893 from Minister Stevens on U.S. legation stationery. It is labeled ‘Private.’ It reads: “Judge Dole, I would advise not to make known of my recognition of the de facto provisional government, until said government is in possession of the police station.” It is evidence of the maleficent intent and reprehensible conduct exhibited by the white people who stole the islands of Hawai‘i from Kānaka Maoli.

\(^{50}\) Keanu Sai, Personal Communication, 2017.
This chapter traced the story of Hawaiian loss of land and governance until the illegal Annexation of the occupied Hawaiian Kingdom to the United States of America. In subsequent chapters, we will examine both the fall-out of this occupation 125+ years after the Overthrow; as well as the women’s response of Resurgence in the face of annihilation.
Chapter 4: Health of Hawaiian Lands and Bodies within an Indigenous Social Determinants of Health Framework

4.1 Reframing Health in Kānaka Maoli Contexts

I will utilize an Indigenous Social Determinants of Health framework in this chapter to better understand the experiences of the women and Hawaiians in general on the East side of Kaua‘i. Each section of this chapter highlights aspects of the women’s words that speak critically to the ongoing legacy of colonialism in their daily lives—a legacy that reverberates in their physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual health. I begin this chapter by examining Hawaiian definitions of health and the distal determinants at the root of Hawaiian health disparities. Subsequently, I discuss the centrality of place to Hawaiian health and well-being, and link the women’s stories of land, health, and wellness to the larger factors impacting these areas of their lives. I close the chapter discussing the importance of an Indigenous/Hawaiian Food Sovereignty framework, especially since every major GMO corporation has made Kaua‘i its headquarters for experimental field testing.

This research began by examining issues of food sovereignty and related health disparities; yet from the women’s participation, a more complex matrix emerged, detailing stories of land loss, dreams for the next generation, and futurities of restored Hawaiian Nationhood. I soon realized that issues of food sovereignty and health are historically situated within the context of material and cultural loss amidst violent colonialist-induced trauma. Narratives of
health for Kānaka Maoli revolve around identity and culture, while Western notions focus on bodies, individual responsibility, and measurable physical symptoms. Addressing health disparities hitting the Hawaiian community means recognizing the consequences of genocide resulting from colonialism, which include the dispossession of land; the evisceration of place; the removal of culturally-appropriate, Hawaiian language education; the colonization of foodways; the disruption of right livelihood; and the theft of self-governance that are underpinning disease. The results of this research required a framework that made the connections between the women’s individual well-being and the ongoing realities of colonialism.

Typical western health research, which focuses on the physical health of bodies, and on factors such as health care coverage, education, and poverty as determinants of health often myopically fail to address the bigger picture of social determinants of health (Braden & Nigg, 2016; Moy, Sallis & David, 2010). McMullin (2005) frames the prevalent American mindset well:

“...Most middle-class Americans have an understanding that health is the body without disease. These concepts are tied to the notion that anyone can achieve health through self-discipline—a nutritious diet, exercise, and preventive medical care—regardless of the political and economic factors that frame their very existence. This observation is significant because it not only reveals the legitimacy of scientific understandings and its link to knowledge/power, but also the
internalization of this knowledge into symbols of what it means to organize and participate in US society as an independent and productive member” (p.810).

An Indigenous Determinants of Health framework acknowledges that colonialism is the core distal determinant for overall Indigenous health. Loss of land tenure, cultural repression, racism, lack of economic development, destruction of traditional foodways, and the loss of self-governance are results of the occupation experienced by Hawaiians; these distal determinants are at the root of Hawaiian health disparities (Czyzewski, 2011; Greenwood et al, 2015; CSDH, 2007).

Critical research on Hawaiian health has shown the Hawaiian definition of health encompasses a broader explanation, going beyond an individual’s healthy food choices or committed exercise regime. Hawaiian health encompasses broader themes of connection and interrelationship, including maintaining a spiritual connection to one’s ancestral place; having one’s cultural identity in tact; maintaining relationship with one’s ohana and community; having a relationship with Akua, whether within the traditional Hawaiian spirituality or with the Christian God; and belonging to a place (Oneha, 2001; Davis, 2010; Mokuau, 2011).

McMullin’s research (2005) elucidates that Hawaiian health included the ability to retain Hawaiian identity and culture, and was not defined solely within Western notions of health--as a body without disease. She found fault
with biomedical options as a remedy to the documented health crisis, but rather advocated for examining social inequalities and focusing on Hawaiian agency as a solution.

Health systems that service Hawaiian community need to incorporate Hawaiian knowledge (Greenwood, M., De Leeuw, S., Lindsay, N. M., & Reading, C. (2015). Historically, Hawaiians saw healing as a spiritual matter, where pule\textsuperscript{51} was revered above knowledge. Healers separated illness into two categories: that which originated from within, often times in the digestive tract, or that which came from outside, as a spiritual matter. Medical healers were called kahuna, and pule was seen as a way to obtain knowledge. Healers included bone-setters, surgeons, fertility experts, pediatricians, mid-wives, massage therapists, and experts who treated the spiritual aspect of the sickness (Archer, 2018).

4.2 Relationship to Place as a determinant of Hawaiian Health

“The main thing that connected me was land, the ‘āina; one thing that is constant is this island. The one thing that was constant was this place...In the end, we are still left with the land. If it is poorly taken care of, how can it take care of us?”

Chelsey Contrades, Activist, mother, former KKO A BOD memeber and M.O.M. Hui member, Anahola, Kaua’i\textsuperscript{52}

Like Contrades, various scholars have underscored the value of place in discussions of Indigenous health. “...Concern about the health standards of

\textsuperscript{51}prayer
\textsuperscript{52}Chelsey Contrades, Personal Communication, 2014.
Indigenous peoples needs to take into account the broader perspective...Alienation of people from their environment—from the natural world—may be as closely linked to the host of health problems that beset Indigenous peoples as the more familiar life-style risks of modern living…” (Durie, 2004). Interventions for restoring Hawaiian health must include an acknowledgment of place, centrality of identity, importance of relationships, as well as the spiritual connection that is part of all of these factors (Oneha, 2001; Aluli & McGregor, 1994).

“Our family’s award, where we lived, went back to my great-great grandfather, he got it from his father. The father said, ‘For the love of my son, I give it to my son, $1.’ We have that record. So does the Bureau of Conveyances. They also have the map and the quit claim deed. The quit claim deed had someone else’s name on it. I asked my aunty, who this is, and she said, ‘We don’t know.’

“I realized this [person…]...he had made the claim when our family actually still lived there, in the 1800s. He worked for the plantation, and they adversely possessed it. The mind-set back then was not the same as it is now. [Hawaiians] didn’t have the concept ‘I own it.’ It was more like, ‘I have always been here, how can you take me away from this?’

“...To keep the anger is not helpful. It doesn’t do anything, and it doesn’t teach the kids how to have a relationship with the area. [Our land] is still there. It is about malama ‘āina. It is about the stories, that were important. My aunties have stories, they have recorded them, and written them down. And when we share that with other people who are from that area, that establishes identity. Our identity and our relationship with the Place, that doesn’t go away because somebody else is there.” Kalei, Community leader, Kaua‘i

Through her own painful experience, Kalei poignantly underscores that place is integral to the identity of the Hawaiian people. According to Moloka‘i

53 famous person whose name was on the deed, name deleted for privacy protection
54 Malama ‘āina: Caring for the land.
scholar Dr. Alma Trinidad’s research (2011), place is more than space, it is a deep connection to the land from which springs forth the lived experience of Hawaiian culture:

The relationship between health and place among Indigenous peoples tends to be overlooked by the helping professions. Place is not only a site of social relationships and positioning; a cosmological and metaphysical relationship with the land also serves as a reference point for health and well-being...

Land and the Hawaiian people were historically inextricably linked. Tongan scholar Epeli Hau‘ofa (2008) asserts that people and the land were indivisible:

To remove a people from their ancestral, natural surroundings or vice versa—or to destroy their lands with mining, deforestation, bombing, large-scale industrial and urban developments...is to sever them not only from their traditional sources of livelihood but also, and much more importantly, from their ancestry, their history, their identity, and their ultimate claim for the legitimacy of their existence (p.75).

Foreign occupiers in the islands, contrastly, see place in Hawai‘i potentially as a vehicle for profit, for enjoyment, or for strategic military power. For those of us who are haole, it is important to be able to comprehend the full weight, length and breadth of the devastation that has occurred by the genocidal displacement of Hawaiians from their traditional lands. It is critical
to understand the impact this genocidal occupation has had on Hawaiian health and well-being.

Davianna McGregor (2007) extrapolates on Gegeo’s assertions on the significance of place, specifically to Kānaka Maoli, quoting Edward Kanahele from a personal interview: “As a native Hawaiian, a place tells me who I am and who my extended family is. A place gives me history, the history of my clan, and the history of my people...A place gives me a feeling of stability and of belonging to my family, those living and dead” (p.6).

The loss of a beloved place where one’s family has inhabited for generations can feel like death and result in deep grieving, trauma, and health disparities (Lee, 2012: 10-11). For Kānaka people, the land is a sibling who cared for them as they also cared for it, practicing malama ‘āina. As Kana‘iaupuni & Malone (2006) state, “In Kānaka Maoli perspective, it was unfathomable that someone else could deny their rights to a place, a precious ancestor, the same land that a family had worked and lived for generations and generations” (p.286).

The loss of place goes well beyond the reality of economic loss, which is profound, as the loss of land led to a loss of the traditional economic base for the Hawaiian people. It meant a loss of identity, and a loss of well-being. As Hawaiian scholar Keola Beamer (2014) asserts, “The ‘āina is our kūpuna’s kupuna, the foundation of our being...Our places shape the ways we see and
are in the world...But for many ʻŌiwi, this connection to ʻāina goes much
deeper. It is not dissimilar to connections to one’s father or mother…” (p.55).

Numerous Hawaiian scholars, alongside Indigenous scholars
internationally, describe the sense of connection to land & to place as an
intrinsic aspect of the self in Indigenous community (Alfred, 2009; Beamer,
2014; Byrd, 2011; Corntassel, 2012; Gegeo, 2001; Hauʻofa, 2008;
Hoʻomanawanui, 2012; Kanaʻiaupuni & Malone, 2006; Kilikoi, 2010; Lee,
2012; McGregor, 2007; Meyer, 2013; Pitawanakwat, 2008; Sherman, 2008;
Silva, 2004; Simpson, 2011; Watts, 2013). “…We as ʻŌiwi are inseparable from
our kulāiwi... Our well-being...is a product of the well-being of our kulāiwi,
the ʻāina that is made up of generations upon generations of our iwi kūpuna.
What happened to our ʻāina over the past 6 generations has also happened to
us” (Peralto, 2014: 90, emphasis mine).

The nation, the people, and the land are intertwined. As the people are
colonized, so is the Land. As the land and waters have been degraded and their
places desecrated, so have Hawaiian bodies. As the Hawaiian Nation and the
ʻāina were wrapped up together in the past, so is their future and the destiny of
Hawai‘i. Not only does place reflect back to Kānaka Maoli who they are and
where they come from, and links them to their kūpuna and to their family and
community, the condition of the land and sea that makes up place further

56 The land in which his ancestors’ bones are buried, literally ‘bone plain.’
reflects back the state of their health and well-being and the current state of their occupation. And as Hawaiian scholar Peralto postulates, what has happened to the ‘āina has happened to them.

And what has happened to Hawai‘i land and sea is significant. As Braddah Iz laments in his soulful song Hawai‘i ’78, written during what is known as the Second Hawaiian Renaissance, if the former kings and queens were to see Hawai‘i now “...how would they feel about the changes of our land?...Tears would come from each other’s eyes, as they would start to realize, that our people are in great, great danger now...” A subsequent verse to the song interchanges ‘land’ for ‘people’, “that our land is in great danger now...” further underscoring that the land and the people’s past, present, and future are intertwined. As the land was lost, so was the health and well-being of Hawaiian lives and bodies.

4.3 Environmental destruction of Place

“I love our ‘Āina...Aloha ‘Āina and Malama ‘Āina are two of the most important aspects that Kānaka Maoli learn growing up. It is inside us, it is deep-seated. Water and land are never separated to us...We need to plant our own food, get rid of those GMO poisons and pesticides that they are trying to use to kill our ‘Āina...That has been a battle for us, to get rid of GMOs...My mind can’t wrap around the fact that people are supporting poisons, using poisons on our ‘Āina.” [1] Aunty Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Kaua‘i Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kalahui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

57 A period of cultural, lingual, educational Hawaiian Resurgence from the late 1960s through the 1970s.
“My whole thing before I thought about my daughter, was the land. I knew [the GMO companies] were doing things with our land that was not good…”

Richell Sweet, Activist, Mom, formerly of M.O.M. Hui & Youth Coordinator for KKOA.

What has happened to the land since colonization from the United States and their ensuing real estate transactions, military installments, and GMO experimentation has been detrimental, as Richell emphasizes. Evidence of the deleterious impact colonization has had on the land is seen in the vanishing reefs (Murphy, 2012); in the garbage washing up on Hawaiian beaches, including debris from the Great Pacific Garbage Patch (Eriksen et al, 2014); in the 60% of species of flora and fauna endemic to Hawai‘i that are now endangered (Darowski, Strilchuk, Sorochuk, & Provost, 2007). The transnational agricultural biotechnology giants have made Hawai‘i their ground zero for all experimental open-air testing, dumping restricted-use pesticides (RUPs) on 1,141 test sites throughout the islands, and using 17 times more RUPs on Hawaiian soil than on GMO corn on the continental US (Brower, 2016). Cesspools in Hawai‘i release untreated human fecal waste into the land, after which it can potentially pollute the sea, rives, and groundwater (LaDuke & Cruz, 2013). Two hundred and thirty-six sites of uncleaned pollution sit scattered throughout the islands, all sites of former military activity; the US military used the island of Kaho‘olawe as a bombing range for decades, leaving behind over $400 million USD in clean-up costs; three

60 Richell Sweet, Personal Communication, 2014.
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Superfund sites are on O‘ahu from former sugar plantation and military sites, contaminating water and soil (LaDuke & Cruz, 2013).

In 2012, a front-page news story in the Los Angeles Times declared the reefs on Kaua‘i were disappearing at a rate previously unseen by marine biologists, with a fungus spreading at a rate of 1-3 inches a week. This fungus was wiping out 100-year old corals in under two months (Murphy, 2012). Scientists documented the Black-Band Disease on Kaua‘i, but said its cause was difficult to pinpoint as it was caused by multiple factors vs. a single pathogen (Kellogg et al, 2017).

Local doctors noted what appeared to be a spike in a heart-related birth defects in newborns on the West side of Kaua‘i, where the epicenter of Kaua‘i’s GMO industry is located. The rate of heart malformations at birth on the West side were ten times the national average. GMO companies had leased 12,000 acres in this area and were spraying 17 times more restricted-use insecticides than what occurs on cornfields on the continental United States, averaging 18 tons of restricted-use pesticides a year.

The pediatric surgeon in charge of Hawai‘i’s birth defects also reported seeing a surge in babies born with their abdominal organs outside their bodies, something parents experienced on the West side of Kaua‘i as well (Pala, 2015). A range of doctors from Kaua‘i went on the record stating concerns over
higher-than-normal rates of miscarriages, cancers, rare birth defects and respiratory problems, among others (Brower, 2016).

Hawaiians lost 90% of their population from the time Captain Cook began the assault on Hawaiian sovereignty to the time Sanford Dole with his gang of usurpers and the U.S. military completed it. Hawaiians have the worst life expectancy of any major ethnic group in Hawai‘i; they have the highest mortality rates in the US from cardiovascular disease, and rank 2nd for obesity; they report the highest incidence of cancer of any people group in Hawai‘i (Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2011; Fong, Braun, and Tsark, 2003).

The destruction of place and the ‘āina is simultaneous with the destruction of Hawaiian bodies.

4.4 Historical Trauma

“To think, there was an actual act of betrayal, there was collusion between these men [in the 1890s], and yet, they set their systems in place and made it seem legal...How can you make it right? There are ways of darkness, and there are ways of light. Ways of darkness want you to believe what is not true. They want to persuade you in all these ways to believe a lie. But if you wait long enough, that [lie] becomes the status quo. But that is not right...We are the host culture, we are the original natives, the First Nation in Hawai‘i. I think it is important to look back and see how did this happen? The Hawaiian people have lost their lands, and have lost many of the rights to their lands, by the different imposition of different guests, and all the incidents that led up to becoming a state, and becoming a part of the United States. So, I go back to ho'oponopono—how do you resolve this? As the truth is coming to light...that the lands of the Hawaiians have been taken, Hawai‘i itself has been taken... I think the trauma is really related to the grieving that happens that you have been wronged, terribly wronged, terribly oppressed, and it has not yet been brought to resolve, in the way it should. It is time to make it right. And that hasn’t happened yet in Hawai‘i. And I think...that is the trauma. That is the grieving. It is a sorrow, because it is that scripture that says, ‘Hope deferred makes the heart sick.’ And
so, your heart gets sick as you are hoping and you are waiting, it is like your heart is broken.”

Pono, Grandmother, Dancer, Singer, Artist.

Pono personalizes for us here the historical trauma caused by the colonialist conquest and the ongoing occupation of the Hawaiian Islands, a trauma that broke her heart; the same trauma that significantly impacts current generations of Hawaiians, that has not been resolved and leads to many of the current health disparities. The effects of the Overthrow; the incarceration of their Queen; the threat of death given to all that opposed the colonialist conquerors; the ongoing subjugation of the Hawaiian people; the loss of land and abundance; and the ongoing occupation continue to render negative health effects on the Hawaiian Nation (Kaholokula, Nacapoy, and Dang, 2009; Czyzewski, 2011).

The influence of a collective trauma on well-being needs to be considered in the context of the group’s historical and contemporary stressor experiences. ...the concept of historical trauma...highlights the idea that the accumulation of collective stressors and trauma that began in the past may contribute to increased risk for negative health and social outcomes among contemporary Aboriginal peoples (Bombay, Matheson and Anisman, 2014 referencing Walters et al., 2011; Brave Heart, 1999; Brave Heart & DeBruyn, 1998).

The 2018 Office of Hawaiian Affairs report on Hawaiian women’s health and well-being states that a significant way that historical trauma manifests is in substance abuse. One-third of Kānaka Maoli adults report binge-drinking. Twice as many Hawaiian women report to be binge or heavy drinkers than non-Hawaiian females in the islands (Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2018).

As the Hawaiian people experienced collective genocidal violence via loss of governance, land, and language under foreign occupation, researchers have documented that many Hawaiians experience Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) in their own families as a result, watching their parents and then replicating it in their own intimate relationships. Both high school-age females and young adult Hawaiian women report higher rates of IPV than non-Hawaiian females in Hawai‘i, increasing for Hawaiian women in their middle-aged years. Survivors of IPV report unanimously substance abuse to cope (Shoultz, Oneha, Magnussen, 2012).

The Hawaiian Nation has experienced collective IPV from the occupying government. The occupiers have abused the people, and yet blamed them for the very trauma that has been inflicted upon them. They have perpetuated rumours about the character of the Hawaiian people; have stolen their lands for military exploitation and for economic profit; have eliminated their economy; and have ignored Hawaiian suffering while commodifying Hawaiian culture to support economic gain.
Survivors of IPV on the interpersonal level have found help in reconnection—spiritual re-connecting, connecting to the natural land and waters around them, strengthening family relationships, re-connecting to cultural roots, and re-affirming a sense of belonging. These practices could perhaps also support recovery from the collective IPV that the Hawaiian people have suffered under settler colonial genocide: being restored to ancestral lands, restored to self-rule; and their rightful independence acknowledged internationally (Shoultz, Oneha, Magnussen, 2012:7-8).

4.5 Hawaiian Health Disparities

“I come from a family of diabetes and heart disease. My dad lost his sister and she was young, in her 20s, to liver and kidney failure, and then his youngest sister has lupus and has been in the hospital for 14 years...I was on the verge of diabetes, on the verge of heart attack and stroke...”62 Tiana Laranio, Activist, mom, former County Council candidate, former KKO A BOD member, M.O.M. Hui member.

“The three main health problems—diabetes, heart issues, and obesity—are the main health issues for Hawaiians...My grandmother passed away with cancer. I had another grandmother that had a heart issue...so she passed away at 42. My grandfather died at like 58...I have heart concerns with my siblings...so at 50 I was warned that I could go over to Diabetes 2 if I didn’t watch what I was eating. It was kind of a wake-up call...”63 Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKO A.

“We have real problems, like high blood pressure. It is not just the food we eat, it is stress, it is life, that causes it. For the most part, Hawaiians were healthy, because we were warriors. But for now, most of us die early. It is scary. It is not just the heart, it is a combination of things.”64 Haulani Fernandez, Grandmother, former President of the Kapaʻa Neighborhood Center; born and raised in Anahola, Kauaʻi.

64 Haulani Fernandez, Personal Communication, 2014.
“My mother had lupus...she had arthritis and sugar imbalance—diabetes. My father had a heart health condition. His dad had cancer.”65 Pono, Grandmother, Artist, Musician, Dancer.

“On both sides of my family, there is high blood pressure. My grandparents on both sides, they are diabetic.”66 Chelsey Contrades, Mother, Activist, former member of KKO A BOD, former M.O.M. Hui member.

As evidenced in the women’s words, Kānaka Maoli experience higher than average rates of disease. Hawaiians are reported to have a higher prevalence of diabetes, prediabetes, and metabolic syndrome; to have a diabetes mortality three times higher than whites; and a cardiovascular disease mortality twice that of Japanese in Hawai‘i. Native Hawaiians have the 2nd highest rate of Type 2 diabetes in the US and have a diabetes mortality that is three times higher than Caucasians. Hawaiians have a rate of cardiovascular disease twice that of Japanese in the state, and three times that of Caucasians. The death rate from cardiovascular disease of Native Hawaiians is twice the overall rate of the state of Hawai‘i (Johnson, 2004; Browne, Mokuau, & Braun, 2009; Mau et al, 2001; Mau et al, 2009; Curb et al, 1991).

Historical data records reveal Hawaiians were healthy and robust, with Hawaiian commoners described as ‘thin;’ yet today, Hawaiians have one of the highest rates of obesity in the United States. Seventy-five percent of Hawaiian adults are overweight or obese, as are 33.5% of Hawaiian high school students. Hawaiians have the highest obesity rates in Hawai‘i, 2.3 times greater than

everyone else. Thirty-eight percent of Hawaiian women are obese, which is twenty percent more than their non-Hawaiian female counterpart. Obesity has been linked with various diseases including Type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, hypertension, high cholesterol, and cancer (Shintani et al, 1991; Lassetter, 2010; Aluli, 1991; Moy et al, 2009; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2017; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2018; Aluli, 1991; Swinburn et al, 2011; Mihesuah, 2003).

Statistics on Hawaiian health are difficult to read, due to the depressing picture they illustrate; however, understanding these statistics within a framework of colonial genocide helps shed light on how land dispossession and historical trauma are the root of these health disparities. Scientific studies assert that Kānaka Maoli have the highest cancer rates in Hawai‘i; the 2nd highest rate of cancer in the United States; and one of the highest rates of cancer in the world. Hawaiians have been first for both men and women in cancer mortality since the 1980s. Cancer incidence in Hawai‘i is highest for Native Hawaiian women. In 2016, 21% of Native Hawaiian women ages 45-54 had cancer, twice the rate of non-Hawaiian women; Kanaka wāhine had double the rate of cancer than that of their Hawaiian male counterparts (Matsunaga et al, 1996; Aluli, 1991; Hughes, Tsark, & Mokuau, 1996; Johnson, 2004; Office of Hawaiian Affairs, 2018).

Native Hawaiians have the shortest life span in the state, dying at a rate 146% higher than any other population in the US. In an assessment of years of
productive life lost, 39,645 years of potential life were lost due to early deaths of Kanaka ʻŌiwi, losing more years than any other group. Assessing data over three decades, Hawaiians experienced higher rates of chronic disease compared to every other group. Hawaiians have higher mortality rates when compared to all other groups in the United States, attributed to cardiovascular disease, hypertension, cancer, diabetes, gout, digestive diseases, and disease of the gallbladder. Native Hawaiians have the highest age-adjusted death rates for all causes of death in Hawai‘i, and also the highest death rate of any ethnic group for heart disease, cancer, and diabetes (Shintani et al, 1991; Aluli, 1991; Moy et al, 2009; Johnson, 2004).

Scholars have mentioned Hawaiian values of pono, mana, ha‘aha‘a, lōkahi, and ʻohana as essential to discussions of Hawaiian health. I would like to add Aloha ʻĀina as a critical component to the restoration of Hawaiian health, as it involves restoration of both the ʻāina and Hawaiian self-governance. The restoration of land and governance ameliorates trauma via reconnecting people to self-determination and to place. For Hawaiians and other Indigenous peoples, the restoration of self-governance is the key to eliminate many issues that are the root of health disparities. Aloha ʻĀina will be discussed more in a subsequent chapter (Lee et al., 2017; Oneha, 2001; Davis, 2010).
4.6 Additional Determinants of Hawaiian Health

Part of what became visible in this study were some of the multiple interlocking forces that the next generation of Hawaiians face on Kaua‘i. When one reads stories and facts about suicide, incarceration, disease rates and etc., it is often difficult to point a finger to the exact culprit and therefore evince an exact solution. But this study’s participants and other research continuously points back to Colonialism, which has resulted in a form of genocide, as the primary distal factor impacting Hawaiian & Indigenous health and well-being.

From colonialism, several intermediate determinants emerge, such as a foreign education model imposed on Hawaiian youth; the loss of food sovereignty; the loss of land tenure; limited infrastructure in some Homelands communities; overwhelming military presence in the Hawaiian Islands; and the lack of economic development. Emerging out of these intermediate determinants spring forth a host of social disparities impacting the Hawaiian people, including elevated high school drop-out rates; low wages and unemployment; poverty; food insecurity or an overabundance of imported, highly processed foods; high levels of incarceration; high suicide rates; lack of housing/houselessness & overcrowding; and as we have seen, alarming levels of disease. What follows are several of these interlocking determinants facing the next generation of Hawaiian youth, and the Hawaiian community overall.

4.7 The Imposition of an American Educational System

“Education, just imagine the lies that were fed to us all these years, the denial. Our history that was like we were not Hawaiians anymore, we were Americans.”
By the time I was a junior or senior in high school, there was this beginning of ‘Wait a minute, that is our island they are bombing [Kahoʻolawe.] But why? The truth was never really taught. And being that the truth wasn’t really taught, you know that some history was being hidden, with their masking of the whole injustices that were being done behind that...It was a shocker to us, to not even know our history, and then to find out, that we have actually been invaded by foreign powers, and that has not been made right. And that our voices have been silenced for all these years, over 100 years...The important thing to know is that our people, and our Queen, prayed for us—that one day we will rise up and be heard. And I think this [time that we are in] is the answer to that prayer...I feel like it is important for us to know our history and what took place. It is only like in the last 20 years that things have been uncovered. It is kind of like what was brewing in our gut in the 1970s...All of these things started becoming more visible. Like it was our eyes being opened to something very, very dark being done to us.”67 Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKOA.

“When we were growing up and being educated in the public-school system, we were never allowed to know about the anti-annexation petition. Previously, education and information on Hawaiian History in public schools was very limited; only recently through research has information emerged on the political history and how it has played in the collapse of the Hawaiian nation. Prior to this, we were taught only American history, and world history in the schools. The Hawaiian Renaissance opened the doors to truth.”68 Wanda Shibata, Community Leader.

As these Hawaiian women leaders explain, American education was historically a key tool of colonialism, misinformation, and suppression of Hawaiian identity for Kānaka Maoli in Hawaiʻi nei.

Hawaiians can potentially internalize a sense of inferiority if they fail at western educational models. Rather than recognizing the inherent flaws of the system, individuals can instead internalize their failing as proof of the inferiority that is conveyed by the colonial power’s economic, governmental,

67 Kuʻuleialoha Punua, Personal communication, 2016.
educational, and media systems. As Nicole Reyes (2013) states in her research, “Within the context of colonialism, education has played a commanding role in the harming of Indigenous minds and subjectivities” (p.210).

McCubbin and Marsella’s research (2009) exposes the misperception of Indigenous Hawaiian students as substandard students in the American school system by educators and researchers from the continental U.S. From their analysis, they concluded the reasons Hawaiian students fell behind other groups was because Hawaiian students defined achievement differently than Western educators, viewing it in terms of their contributions to their family and the needs of others. In addition, they point out school conflicts emerged as a result of cultural differences between students and administrators, as many Kānaka Maoli students handled conflict differently than their principals and teachers. Finally, they point to the fact that Hawaiian children’s peer interaction in classrooms was seen as negative by haole teachers rather than a positive cultural dynamic (p.384).

Metis scholar Howard Adams (1975) highlights the problem with mainstream education in Indigenous societies in his book, _Prisons of Grass_. Though written over forty years ago, the arguments he makes about the education of Indigenous students remain relevant:

The majority of Metis and Indian students drop out of school because of their lack of interest in the academic subjects. They do not see any relation between the subjects taught in school and practical living in
their community. It is more than a gap between curriculum and community; it is a gap between school and native society...The study of ancient [western] history, English literature, or advanced mathematics is meaningless to people who live on a day-today survival basis in a racially colonized situation...(p. 153).

This assertion of Adams is echoed in recent scholarship by other researchers (Barnhardt & Kawagley, 2005; Ball, 2004). The imposition of an American white, western middle-class model of education can set up Hawaiian and other minority and Indigenous students in the U.S. for failure, feelings of internalized inferiority, and dropping out.

...Education that is conceptualized, vetted, and delivered predominantly by academics and professionals of European descent...can shatter Indigenous students’ sense of cultural pride and seriously challenge their confidence in the validity of the cultural knowledge that they bring to the training (Ball, 2004: 457).

Pacific scholar Ropate Qalo and Elise Huffer (2004) advocate that “Pacific Islander values must be integrated into the schooling experience of students in the region so that the experience is not only more relevant but also conducive to harmonious societies in the future” (p.88). Educators, and especially women educators, in the region have been advocating for the integration of Pacific Island epistemologies: “The coconut tree must be allowed to live with the computer tiger” (p.100).
Indigenous scholar Leanne Simpson (2014) states that the education system “refuses to acknowledge our culture, our knowledge, our histories, and experience” (p.5). I would add, it also refuses to acknowledge their power. In Hawai‘i, the education system refuses to recognize Hawaiian power, as it is threatening to the systemic white American dominance over business, government, media, religion, and education.

Research has shown that culturally-relevant education reduces Indigenous high school drop-out rates; however, mainstream education marginalizes Indigenous learning pathways and content (Reading & Wein, 2013). Hawaiian scholar-activist Dr. Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua (2009) asserts that there needs to be an economic shift alongside an educational change for Kānaka Maoli students. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua recognizes the necessity of an ecological shift as well. She sees Indigenous education in conjunction with Indigenous economic and ecological restoration as keys to Hawaiian Resurgence, emphasizing ‘Ōiwi models of teaching and apprenticeship: “Sustainable self-determination and epistemic self-determination go hand in hand; as we clear the space for ‘auwai to flow, we must also fight for epistemic space for Indigenous knowledges to flourish...” (p.71).

Hawaiian students in the public-school system exhibited higher drop-out rates, drug use, absenteeism, arrests, pregnancy, and violence. “Manifestations of inequality in student lives is linked to a larger structural inequality in Hawaiian nation; under prolonged military occupation by US, lands and school
systems in controlled by national and local governing entities” (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2009: 66). A new movement of Hawaiian charter schools emerged and flourished from this need to support Hawaiian students in their education. Activists recognized the need for schools grounded in Hawaiian history, culture and values. “…We are teaching students the nature of foreign lands that we have not seen. How is it that we disregard teaching the nature of our own lands...?”(Peralto, 2014:90).

In 1978, during the Hawaiian Renaissance, a state Constitutional Convention was convened that resulted in amendments re-establishing Hawaiian as one of the official languages of Hawai‘i. At this time, Hawaiian immersion pre-schools were created, and 20 years later, students graduated from a Hawaiian immersion high school, the first students to be educated in Hawaiian since the overthrow of the Kingdom (Mackenzie, 2012).

4.8 The Suppression of the Hawaiian Language

“The native Hawaiian language was suppressed when I was growing up. My grandmother would only speak Hawaiian behind closed doors, but in public she wasn’t allowed to speak Hawaiian. The Hawaiians had to go underground...My great-great grandfather George Makalena was a deacon at Kawaiaha’o Church. However, the sermons were all in English, because the [Hawaiian] language was banned in 1898. The native Hawaiians had to learn English. Politically speaking, when a culture—including their traditions, religion, language, land and economy—gets suppressed, eventually the race becomes or is forced to be dependent on western ways.”69 Wanda Shibata, Community Leader.

“I was raised by my grandmother and my great-grandmother. They would talk, about the days when they had to basically hide. They didn’t want us speaking

the language, because it would harm us. They were protecting us...” **Noelani Josselin**, activist, grandmother, entrepreneur.⁷⁰

Related to the imposition of a western educational model is the suppression of the Hawaiian language. After beginning this research, I began hearing stories from Hawaiian colleagues of the suppression of the Hawaiian language amongst their grandparents and parents. Within a few years of the Overthrow, Hawaiian was banned from all private and public schools in the islands; any school that failed to comply lost all government funding. Students who spoke Hawaiian at school could be physically punished; parents and other adults in the home would suffer censure for speaking it publicly, as with Wanda’s grandmother in the case above. By 1902, 6 years after the legislation banning the Hawaiian language from schools, all Hawaiian language schools were closed (Lucas, 2000).

Haulani’s mother, Lorna Leialoha Kauo, was fluent in ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i. I remember when I lived with the family, visiting Lorna when she was in her early 90s, and seeing her large Baibala Hemolele⁷¹ open in her living room. Apparently, while she worshipped and read in Hawaiian, she didn’t teach her children to do so in her native tongue.

“They [parents Lorna and Joe] couldn’t speak Hawaiian because they thought they would be reported to the Kahu.⁷² My parents spoke fluent Hawaiian. Did they speak it at home? Never. ‘Cause they were so afraid that they would be punished if they ever spoke Hawaiian. Why do you think we never did the hula?”

⁷¹ Hawaiian Language Bible
⁷² Kahu, in this context=pastor of the church
We had to hide...My father got in trouble for speaking Hawaiian. They said, ‘You know Mr. Kauo, you know we are going to report you to the fire department’ [where he worked part-time], like dat...The government would do that, the people that ran Kauaʻi. They would cause Hawaiians to lose their jobs or they would take away something. And my mother was very careful. She did not want them to take away anything that she had worked for. I am glad she was that way. We could have lost a lot...Otherwise we would all be speaking Hawaiian. Wouldn’t that have been wonderful?”

Haulani Fernandez, Great-Grandmother, former President of Kapaʻa Neighborhood Center; born and raised in Anahola, Kauaʻi.

The loss of the Hawaiian language is believed to have a negative impact on Hawaiian health, instigating potential self-hatred and a sense of low self-esteem and shame (Marshall, 2006). By being forced to learn in English, Hawaiians were required to adopt the language in which they were seen as ‘Other.’

The movement of Hawaiian immersion charter schools has been a powerful force to restore Hawaiian language. As well, the Constitutional Convention of 1978 made the Hawaiian language the legal language in the islands for the first time since the Overthrow. Moving further, to fully reverse these deleterious health effects caused by language loss, the Hawaiian language needs to be implemented in the broader public sphere as well, made as a requirement for all peoples of Hawaiʻi to adopt in order to live in the Hawaiian Islands. The revitalization of the Hawaiian language is directly linked to the improvement of Hawaiian health through the psychosocial benefits that would result from the elevated position of Hawaiians in society, and the halting

of some of the cultural trauma that has persisted since the Overthrow (Townsend, 2014).

4.9 Indigenous & Hawaiian Food Sovereignty & the Fight against GMOs.

Because of the strong link between Indigenous culture to Indigenous relationship to land and foodways, advocates of improving Indigenous health have pushed for restoring Indigenous Food Sovereignty as a solution to health disparities.

Food sovereignty is a concept formulated over two decades ago by an international coalition that pushed for a global re-visioning of agricultural paradigms. This network of subsistence and small farmers known as La Via Campesina rejected the neoliberal structures of agrochemical corporations and international trade agreements that disrupted their social fabrics, economies and ways of life and instead encapsulated a strategy that radically restored power and economic life into their hands (Wittman, 2011; McMichael, 2006; Martinez-Torres & Rosset, 2010). Food sovereignty--the “right of each nation to maintain and develop its own capacity to produce its basic foods respecting cultural and productive diversity...” (Via Campesina, 1996), basically the right of each people group to control its food production in its own territory--has been proposed by the coalition as a necessary precursor to achieving actual food security. From source to production, it involves the rights of localized people groups to control their own food systems (Wittman 2011).
Food sovereignty has since attracted increasing attention as a concept and an emergent framework, beginning in activist grassroots spheres and expanding to NGOs, government policy-makers and academic circles (Wittman, 2011). Five hundred delegates from 80 countries met in Mali in 2007 to discuss food sovereignty and further define it as: “The right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods...[that] puts the needs of those who produce, distribute and consume food at the heart of food systems and policies rather than the demands of markets and corporations” (Via Campesina, 2007).

NGOs and government agencies not interested in a radical restoration of economic empowerment to small farmers or Indigenous people-groups may talk in frameworks restricted to food security vs. food sovereignty. Food security, as defined by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, is achieved when people have access and economic means to procure sufficient nutritious food in order to ensure an active life. This definition avoids any discussion of who controls the food supply; as well as lacks any critique on how food policy is constructed and who ultimately benefits (Patel, 2009). Food sovereignty alternatively transfers the discussion around food security from one that establishes adequate caloric intake to one that appropriately addresses imbalanced power dynamics that exploits people and resources and undermines local economies. It is a paradigmatic shift from food security, in that it actually restores power to the people on the land, removing it from the
hands of multi-national corporate interests and the government entities that enable them to exploit rural communities and food production systems.

Indigenous food sovereignty positions this concept within the context of the restoration of governmental sovereignty, economy, culture, and land access to Indigenous peoples. As Indigenous peoples have lost access to sites for cultivating, gathering, fishing, and hunting traditional foods through colonization (Turner and Turner, 2008), a restoration of Indigenous food sovereignty is an important key in Indigenous Resurgence and self-determination (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2009; Morrison, 2011; Corntassel, 2012).

Secwepemc elder and activist Dawn Morrison leads the Working Group on Indigenous Food Sovereignty in British Columbia. She is working to assist Indigenous nations as well as settler communities in collaborating for a just food system. “The food sovereignty approach provides a restorative framework for identifying ways that social and political advocates from the settler communities can work to support Indigenous food sovereignty in a bottom up approach to influencing policy, driven by traditional practice and adaptive management” (Morrison, 2011:104).

Morrison feels the narrow definition of food sovereignty from La Via Campesina is insufficient, and is a reaction to the WTO policies. In personal talks with her, Morrison conveyed the need to understand the intersectionality of the Indigenous Food Sovereignty framework, which encompasses land,
water, social determinants of health, social policy, spirituality, Indigenous Epistemology, and economic development.74

The critical importance of this framework in addressing colonization is that Indigenous Food Sovereignty cannot be achieved without having control and access to the land, and the political power to shape governmental policy and the economy. Additionally, Indigenous Food Sovereignty leads to the restoration of Indigenous health; honors Indigenous Knowledge and culture; and includes Indigenous cosmologies. As Indigenous lives are interconnected to the land and waters which their communities stewarded and which sustained them, Indigenous Food Sovereignty frameworks restore Indigenous identity and support Indigenous self-determination.

4.9.1 Hawaiian Food Sovereignty

“It is amazing how if you have fruit tree, how you can feed so many people, in a time of crisis. And that is the Hawaiian way, that is what the ulu tree represented. This provision and plenty, this is what they did. You come under the tree, under the shade, sharing with it, eating the fruit of it. That was our original culture. It has gotten lost, but we can implement that as our way again...” Pono, Grandmother, Musician, Dancer, Artist.

“It scares me to think we might not have food coming into our island...So we have to get prepared. But everybody has to work together, like the government, the churches, the businesses. I know everyone has to make money to survive, but what if we all work together?” Haulani Fernandez, President of Kapa’a Neighborhood Center, Grandmother; born & raised in Anahola, Kaua‘i.

“Well, in particular I think a lot of the local food production is done by non-Hawaiians. We do not have a single farmer that is Native Hawaiian at the market. Well, I take that back...There are a few, but let’s just say that the majority of the marketers are not Native Hawaiian. Having Anahola being the

largest population of Native Hawaiians from North to East shore, they are definitely marginalized in the area of local food production. I definitely agree on that. It is something that needs to be on the front line of issues.” **Kaui Fu,** Community Services Coordinator at Waipā Foundation, 2014.

“But food, we don’t have access to food. Here in Anahola we don’t have a farm that is really producing its own food to feed the community...I really wanted to do a survey to see how many families are actually doing gardens in their yards. I know we got the farm lots, but even there, there is a lot of people on agricultural lands who aren’t farming. Especially these high-priced Ag zone real estates are not being utilized. What I really wanted to do was help families plant gardens in their own yards.” **Tiana Laranio,** Mother, Activist, former County Council candidate, former KKOAA BOD member, M.O.M. Hui.

The loss of Hawaiian food sovereignty and farming practices has led to a demise in Hawaiian health. Traditionally, kalo and poi made up the majority of the Hawaiian diet, supplemented by fish and other fruits and vegetables expertly cultivated in the islands; today poi is nearly priced out of most Hawaiian pantries.

America, in its 125+ years of occupation of the Hawaiian Islands, has been able to turn upside down Hawaiʻi’s efficient food systems and convert the island population into customers for its global food industry, while capitalizing on Hawaiʻi’s rich agricultural resources to support the multinational GMO seed industry.

Currently, Hawaiʻi sits in a vulnerable position in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, 2,506 miles from the continental United States. A large percentage of Hawaiʻi’s agricultural resources are allocated to GMO multinational corporations, producing GMO seed for export, vs. producing food for Hawaiʻi. Simultaneously, Hawaiʻi spends $3.1 billion annually to import
85%-90% of its food supply for the islands’ residents (Meyer, 2013; Dept of Business, Economic Development, and Tourism, 2012).

In this precarious position, Hawai‘i is only 7 days away--at any given time--from a food crisis should natural or economic disaster strike and prevent food imports from arriving on Hawaiian shores (Vaughan & Ayers, 2016). Food insecurity poses a real threat to the islands. By all appearances, U.S. governance exhibits minimal concern for the precarious position that Hawaiians and other residents have been placed in as a result of gross mismanagement of land and ocean-based food systems under the United States occupation.

Traditional Hawaiian diets were high in fiber and complex carbohydrates while low in fat and cholesterol. Importing food vs. growing traditional foods has deleterious effects on Hawaiian health. Studies indicate that traditional diets of many cultures are linked to low rates of obesity, diabetes and cardiovascular disease (Mihesuah, 2003), while Western ‘modern’ diets have similarly been linked with obesity and cardiovascular risk. The highly-processed, affordable, and efficiently-marketed food of the international global food system--which is what is currently imported to Hawai‘i--has led to increased obesity around the globe (Swinburn et al, 2011).

When Hawaiians encountered Cook, Cook’s crew reported that Hawaiians were strong, robust, lithe, in excellent shape. Hawaiians were experts in intensive cultivation and management of food systems with a diet
consisting of kalo, sweet potato, fish, pork, coconut, banana, fern, limu and other foods from the seas (Dela Cruz-Talbert, 2014; Archer, 2018).

The introduction of a traditional Hawaiian diet has been found in scientific studies to be very effective in reducing obesity and cardiovascular disease risk factors for Native Hawaiians (Shintani et al, 1991; Shintani et al 1994; Shintanti, et al, 1999). A return to Hawaiian food sovereignty could thus remedy some of the diet-related health crisis in Hawai‘i. However, to achieve this, this entails Hawaiians first restored to their lands.

“At Waipā, we have been doing Poi Day every Thursday since the late 1980s. Back then, the original founders of Waipā—my dad and Hawaiian leaders in our community—realized what was happening: as a commercial vs. subsistence product, poi was being priced beyond the amount that family and kūpuna could afford. And if kūpuna weren’t eating it and not feeding it to their mo‘opuna—their grandchildren—then kids would not have a taste for poi and it would stop being eaten as our cultural staple food. They realized that with the access to land and water and relationships with other farmers in the community, they could get bags of raw taro from farmers, grow their own taro, and just process it here themselves with the help of volunteers who were also kūpuna...Over the years that grew from 5-6 people making 100 lbs. a week to up to 50 people showing up and processing 1,200 lbs. a week. In 2017, Waipā moved into our commercial kitchen and poi mill and decreased production to a more reasonable level... Poi continues to be made each Thursday, and is still sold at cost for us which is $5/lb. to families, and $2/lb. to kūpuna, at about 50-60% of the price of poi in retail markets...We supplement the cost of production with grants, donations, program fees and other fundraising, as it is a food justice project, and important to keep the price at a level that is sustainable for the poi consumers. It is estimated that Waipā’s poi feeds over 120 people weekly.” Stacy Sproat-Beck, Waipā Foundation Executive Director.
The Waipā Foundation75 has endeavored to achieve an affordable price for poi for the Hawaiian community on Kauaʻi. By providing an opportunity for kalo farmers to process their own poi, they are empowering them to remain in farming as a livelihood. By helping these farmers continue, Waipā plays a crucial role in maintaining access to a traditional Hawaiian staple, thus preserving not only farming but preventing a continuation of cultural erosion.

What Waipā and Stacy Sproat-Beck has done has been invaluable; it needs to be replicated throughout the islands, as Hawaiian loss of land tenure and traditional foods remains a critical issue that needs to be addressed in the occupied state. Loss of Hawaiian land tenure has led to the loss of Hawaiian food security which in turn has led to deteriorating Hawaiian health. Hawaiian control over food systems, land and waterways is integral to a restoration of Hawaiian sovereignty and well-being, as Hawaiian scholar Dr. Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua states. “...it is through producing one’s own food and feeding others that a people can thrive... [Hawaiian food sovereignty is] fundamental therefore to the long-term survival and independence of Kānaka Maoli,” (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2009:69,70).

Traditional Hawaiian food systems were central to Hawaiian society as they not only produced food, but built community and enhanced the knowledge of the people of their interconnectedness with all of creation. Goodyear-Kaʻōpua

75 Waipā Foundation stewards the 1,600 acre ahupuaʻa of Waipā that flows into Hanalei Bay. It is a center for connecting the community to Hawaiian culture and values and has been operating for over 20 years. Waipa hosts a community poi day every week.
calls for a major transformation of current land-use policies, economic priorities, and educational models currently in place under occupation to support the renewal of the Hawaiian peoples’ ability to sustain themselves from the ‘āina (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2009:69,70).

4.9.2 GMOS on Kaua‘i

“Well this was what was eye-opening, biotech propaganda is being sent home with the keiki. [In this biotech propaganda] A cockroach is trying to tell a story about GMOs how they can save people, that is hewa.” Chelsey Contrades, Mother, Activist, former BOD member for KKOA, M.O.M. Hui.

“When I was growing up, they used all kind of pesticides, you know the pineapple, and we got it all when we were growing up. Now I know why my father always used a bandana over his nose, I am sure he was affected by it. Every summer he did it, night and day, [driving the trucks in the fields] it affected his lungs, his breathing, he had ulcers, he had asthma, and he had problems. He never complained, but I am sure it was all of that poison, pilau. So to me why do we even think we are going to support this [GMOs]?...They never thought about it until ‘Whoa! That is maybe why we have hard time breathing!’ Until finally people come in and they educate them. So my thing is, we don’t need any more poisons, we got enough. You know what I mean?” Haulani Fernandez, Former President of Kapa‘a Neighborhood Center, Grandmother, born and raised in Anahola, Kaua‘i.

With these GMO companies, a lot of small farmers are losing their leases from Grove Farms and Robinson’s and small farmers and ranchers are getting booted off because of the GMO companies. [Land] is being bought out by the GMO companies because they would rather get them [small farmers] out of the way. [The GMO companies] may not even be using the field, and it is just getting them out of the way.” Tiana Laranio, Mother, Activist, former candidate for County Council, former BOD member for KKOA, formerly M.O.M. Hui.

It is outrageous, unnatural, and diabolical [Her response to the GMO companies making Kaua‘i their headquarters] Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKOA.

I think that it is very unfortunate, I think that it is not healthy. I think it is an imposition to others, an imposition to the island, the people [to have the GMO companies here.] I think that somehow they need to share the truth of what they are doing, and what it is being sprayed, and the impact of it. It is unfortunate to have to enact laws to require this of them, [referring to transparency] but I think
they need to examine what they are doing, and to be transparent to the community. I do think that the information should be made available to the public, and to stop whatever is wrong, whatever is posing a danger. And [the GMO companies need to] go back to where they came from, rather than poisoning our home. If they are okay with living with what they are doing in their own home…” **Pono, Grandmother, Musician, Artist, Dancer.**

The Hawaiian people intensively and expertly-cultivated the land, making the islands a self-sustaining archipelago that supported a healthy populace under Hawaiian rule. The population was not dependent on importing food from elsewhere to feed them. Kalo was the staple of the food system, and people worked together to feed themselves and one another with a healthy diet that also included, among other things, fish, fruit and vegetables (Osorio 2002; Vitousek et al, 2004; Archer, 2018; Vaughan, 2018).

As explained by Hawaiian scholar Manulani Meyer (2008), ‘āina is the nexus of “love, joy, and nourishment” for Hawaiian people, and is not something they learn about but something they best learn from. “[‘Āina] is not about emptiness, but about consciousness” (p.4). The stewardship relationship that Hawaiian people had with the ‘āina was intelligent and progressive in that people interacted with the land and waters to sustain the population while caring for these resources so that it could continue to abundantly feed future generations. Dr. Mehana Vaughan’s ground-breaking research of fishing stewardship on parts of Kauaʻi (2018) documents how Kānaka Maoli fishermen and women have cared for reefs and inshore areas for generations, feeding their families and communities while supporting healthy marine populations...
for the long-term. This preservation of fish populations has changed drastically for the worse under U.S. occupation.

As a result of the prime climate conditions, Hawai‘i’s agricultural cycles encompass 3-4 growing seasons a year compared to the continental United States’ 1-2 growing seasons (Brower, 2016). This propensity for abundance that the Hawaiian people adroitly stewarded did not go unnoticed by whites who viewed the ‘āina in a speculative manner. Haole businessmen, some offspring of missionaries who came to share seemingly for the eternal benefit of people’s souls, began to initiate sugar plantations and shape governmental policy for the financial benefit of their own pocketbooks.

Hawai‘i’s rich and abundant agricultural resources have been continuously exploited for financial profit by haole businessmen since the 19th century til today. What began as exploitation by big businesses that made millions from sugar cultivation, has evolved into Frankenfoods as multinational corporations have made Hawai‘i their staging grounds for GMO seed production and open-air experimentation. As stated in a previous section, under U.S. occupation, the Hawaiian Islands have transformed from what was once a healthy, self-sustaining society to a food-dependent colony that imports nearly all its food, while multinational corporations exploit Hawai‘i to conduct open-air GMO experiments and propagate GMO seed (Meyers, 2013).

The global agricultural biotechnology industry orchestrates most of their experimental testing in the occupied islands of Hawai‘i, over 3,300 GMO field
tests in the last 20+ years with Kaua‘i as the epicenter. A big part of the experimental testing done in the islands is related to testing herbicide resistance in GMO crops, though open-air pharmaceutical testing was also conducted. The remainder of the GMO activity in the islands revolves around the cultivation of parent corn seed that is exported around the globe (Brower, 2016).

While GMO promotes itself as something needed to ‘feed the world,’ (Jacobsen, Sorensen, Pedersen, Weiner, 2013; Leu, 2004) the reality is that most of the genetic engineering done in the world makes crops herbicide-resistant (Shiva, 1999). Its propaganda is a distraction from their most important goal, which has absolutely nothing to do with feeding the world, but instead with lining GMO mega-corporations’ coffers with money.

Much of the experimentation on Kaua‘i is on state lands seized from the former Hawaiian monarchy (Brower, 2016). The companies are exempt from federal regulation like the Federal Clean Water Act. The corporations that moved in to appropriate Kaua‘i’s plantation infrastructure consisted of Monsanto, Syngenta, BASF, DuPont, and Dow—chemical companies, not humanitarian organizations. Unlike their presentation in local community on Kaua‘i, these GMO corporations are profit-oriented vs. community-oriented in their scope; when three island counties in Hawai‘i passed legislation in order to protect communities with spray buffers or moratoriums on experimental
growing, 4 of the 5 multinationals took the small counties to court and blocked all protective legislation.

Kauaʻi witnessed the largest public protest in its history in the fall of 2013, when citizens banded together to demand protection for the people and the ‘āina from the GMO corporations. After tense public hearings, the Kauaʻi County Council passed a measure that required the companies to disclose what pesticides they were administering, to create 500-foot buffer zones around homes, schools, medical facilities and 100-foot buffer zones around waterways; and for studies to be instigated as to the health and environmental effects of these field tests and GMO seed production.

Mayor Bernard Carvalho vetoed the bill, which then passed the County Council a 2nd time, overriding his veto. This Bill 2491 became the first law in the U.S.A. passed by a local government against the GMO corporations in an area where actual GMO cultivation was occurring (Brower, 2016). Moku o Keawe followed Kauaʻi in passing protective legislation, declaring that no GMO operation would ever be allowed to set-up shop there; Maui then passed a law putting a moratorium on all GMO operations until the health and environmental impacts could be reviewed. All three measures have been blocked in court by the biotech multinationals.

To further illustrate biotech companies’ involvement with legislative affairs on Kauaʻi: after Kauaʻi tried to limit GMO companies with these legislative bills, the island saw GMO companies’ allies get voted onto County
Council on Kaua‘i. One of these men was recently exposed for running a crystal meth drug ring on Kaua‘i and for using guns and intimidation to keep enemies at bay (Eagle, N. & Lyte, B., 2020). Another County Council member with connections to GMO companies has been in trouble in local news for vitriolic word battles with other Kaua‘i residents (Freudenthal, B., 2018).

Between 2007 and 2012, just one of the multiple companies that abuse Kaua‘i’s soils, waterways, nonhuman animals and nearby human populations, used at least 90 pesticide formulations for 300 days of the year, at 10-16 applications per day. This company, DuPont, actually used a lower volume of pesticides than the other companies on-island (Brower, 2016). From December 2013-July 2015, 36,240 lbs. of restricted-use pesticide76 (RUPs) were utilized.

The seed corn cultivated by the biotech companies on Kaua‘i receives 17 times more RUPs than comparable plants grown on the continental U.S. The majority of the RUPs allowed in massive quantities on Kaua‘i are recognized as carcinogenic by the American Cancer Society (Brower, 2016); what is not known is what occurs when these pesticides combine together, creating synergistic effects that have not been adequately investigated. As most pesticide and GMO research in universities globally are funded by the industry itself, it is unlikely that true science in the public interest will ever be able to

76 RUPs are required by the Environmental Protection Agency to require special permits and special protective equipment to administer due to known harmful consequences.
watchdog these mammoth industries and adequately investigate the effects of these myriad chemicals.

Doctors, nurses and other health professionals who testified for Bill 2491 on Kaua‘i revealed that they were witnessing a higher than normal rate of miscarriages and birth defects on the Westside of Kaua‘i, the site of all the GMO operations, coupled with an elevated rate of rare cancers—in fact, the cancer rate on the West side was ten times the statewide average. Women were experiencing unpleasant hormonal abnormalities resulting in excessive facial hair and higher levels of infertility; respiratory ailments that didn’t respond to typical treatments; and most concerning—a spike in babies born with rare heart defects on the Westside that required babies to go to the continental US for treatment. The rate of babies on the Westside born with these serious heart defects was ten times the national average (Brower, 2016).

Egregiously, GMO companies are allowed by the government to monitor themselves in Hawai‘i. The companies are not required to report information about their field trials; they are allowed to conceal it as a ‘trade secret.’ No environmental assessment of the GMO experiments in Hawai‘i has been done in over 20 years (Brower, 2018).

To get an idea of the power that these companies wield governmentally, individuals involved in the creation of GMO products from the biotech companies are often appointed by US presidents to lead the Food and Drug Administration, the regulatory agency in charge of reviewing the new GMOs for
human health impacts. These appointees are involved in approving the products their former company created. These individuals then go back to job promotions in the original GMO company (Meghani & Kuzma, 2011). Thus, there exists a revolving door between the biotechnology industry and government regulators responsible for protecting the public.

The Moms on a Mission (M.O.M.) Hui of Hawaiʻi was started in 2012 on Molokaʻi by Mercy Ritte, daughter-in-law to famous long-time Aloha ʻĀina activist, Walter Ritte. Mercy’s son became ill after pesticide dust from nearby agricultural fields blew into her home. Extremely concerned about the ongoing health risks posed to her own children and the other children of the island, Mercy decided to push for the eviction of the GMO seed companies—the primary employers on her island—and work to replace them with alternatives that support the local people and the land (Gupta, 2015). Native Hawaiian women activists started M.O.M. Hui chapters on several islands in the island chain to support sustainable agriculture and fight the chemical agriculture-GMO industries in Hawaiʻi. Four of the women in this study were active members of the M.O.M. Hui on Kauaʻi.

"God forbid if anything ever happened to us. To keep myself and my family alive—that is my greatest concern. When I was bearing my 2nd kid, that was when it came in my face. This is not for me—in this time nothing that I do is for me—it is for my kids. Which is why I jumped on 100% with the MOM Hui... Made me proud to be part of something, felt like it was something that was worth it, for our keiki and our ‘ohana on Kaua’i... The MOM Hui is a group of moms who support sustainability, local farmers, healthy ways of living—for the children—past, present, and future... At times it feels like an endless battle, but I have hope... I can persevere.” **Chelsey Contrades**, Mother, Activist, Former BOD for KKOA, former M.O.M. Hui member.
The occupying American government and military saw the Hawaiian people as Other, as expendable, as an obstacle to be removed so that American military ascendancy could be secured. In essence, America said, ‘We are more important than you. Our security is more critical than your right to be free.’ Ensuing generations of Americans, specifically those who have lived in the Hawaiian islands, have either been taught to remain unaware to the ongoing injustice, or have chosen to deny Hawaiians the same rights to liberty and the pursuit of happiness that Americans purport to enshrine. These dismissals of Hawaiian rights for the sake of securing military strength and prime land has had long-term deleterious effects on Hawaiian health and well-being. It is important to make the correlation between Occupation and ongoing suppression of Hawaiian life.

Americans are actively benefiting from the privilege of having greater military strength than the Hawaiian people. Haole Americans are able to move freely onto the islands, buy real estate, and enjoy the pleasant weather and culture—even if it means potentially displacing the original residents and rightful heirs to the land, who may not be able to afford the resulting spike in rents and land values caused by haole in-migrants. Hawaiian well-being would improve with protections put in place to preserve the ability of Hawaiians to remain on land and in homes on Kaua‘i. Part of this answer is found in the restoration of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty, which involves increased access to the land and the return of self-government.
One area of Hawaiian health that has only recently emerged is the potential impacts of Covid-19 on the Hawaiian population. At this writing (July 2020), tourism has been stalled and community-spread seems to be very small on Kaua‘i. However, widespread community outbreak in California has revealed that the Polynesian community in California has had the greatest percentage of death of any people group from Covid-19 (Barboza & Poston, 2020). Kaua‘i is on the edge of multiple crises at this time as a result of ongoing Occupation coupled with the Covid-19 pandemic: first, from the possible spread of Covid-19 and its potentially disproportinate death rate on the Hawaiian community; second, from economic downturn as the Kaua‘i economy is overly dependent on tourism; and thirdly, a housing catastrophe once landlords evict all the Hawaiian tenants who have been unemployed for several months and unable to pay their high rents. The government of Hawai‘i and Kaua‘i needs strategic insight on how to navigate the uncertain months ahead.

This chapter highlighted the women’s words alongside the context of an Indigenous Social Determinants of Health Framework, examining health disparities and the various impacts on Hawaiian bodies via an imposed western educational system; the suppression of Hawaiian language; and the co-optation by American government and corporations of the rich agricultural resources that Hawaiians once stewarded. Next, I will examine the impacts of the
imposition of US occupation on issues of land tenure and housing, with attention also to the US military and federal recognition.
Chapter 5: Hawaiian Lands in Hawaiian Hands: DHHL, Kuleana Lands, the Housing Crisis, Military Occupation, & Federal Recognition

“The fact that this is all stolen lands. There is no such thing as ceded lands because to cause lands to be ceded, it takes two entities to make an agreement on that, but that never happened. We never ceded our lands. There’s no document saying that we did, so it was just blatantly stolen by the United States of America. Our governance is land-based. It has to come from the bottom up! This is how we care for our people.” Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Kaua‘i Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po’o of Kalahuī Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

On December 30, 2016, one of the planet’s wealthiest and most powerful men, Facebook CEO and billionaire Mark Zuckerberg, filed 8 lawsuits to quiet title the 34 Kuleana properties on his $200m-plus, 700-acre beach-front property in Moloa‘a, Kaua‘i. Zuckerberg may have been accustomed to property rights of land-owners on the continental United States, which generally prohibits others from traversing one’s land, unlike Hawai‘i which gives rights to Kuleana land hers to cross someone’s property to access their plots. Unlike many large land-owners who move into the islands who may not bother to notify Kuleana land heirs, Zuckerberg’s intent was to pay off the hundreds of descendent heirs to the 34 Kuleana land plots on his land, many of whom may have been unaware of their land rights.

Zuckerberg and his partner Priscilla Chan had already made the local news earlier in the year when his neighbors protested his use of a 6-foot lava rock wall constructed along the edge of their property. His litigation against the Kuleana heirs sparked a further outcry amongst native Hawaiian residents on
Kauaʻi, leading to State Representative Kaniela Ing from Maui initiating legislation to protect Kuleana land rights (Letman & Wong, 2017; Vaughan, 2018).

Very quickly, the Facebook CEO may have realized that the optics of what appeared to be a billionaire utilizing the American legal system to potentially separate Hawaiian people from their ancestral land claims was not good. He penned an article in the local Kauaʻi newspaper stating that he would drop the lawsuits in an effort to cultivate a peaceful coexistence with the residents of Kauaʻi (Wong, The Guardian, 2017; Vaughan, 2018).77

When I landed on Kauaʻi two months after Zuckerberg’s announcement, some of the women I spoke with remained very stirred about the Kuleana land issue, and regarding reclaiming Hawaiian rights to ancestral lands. Zuckerberg’s situation, due to his visibility globally, became a focal point for the emotional turmoil many Hawaiians feel over the loss of land and self-governance in the islands. As expressed by Aunty Puanani at the beginning of this chapter, many Hawaiians feel their land rights have been stolen from them since the Occupation.

In April 2017, young Kānaka men made Kauaʻi newspaper headlines for staking claims to Kuleana and ancestral lands in both Wailua and Wainiha, Kauaʻi. These young men moved onto the lands, cultivated their own food, and

77 The Chan-Zuckerberg’s use their considerable wealth to contribute to many charitable organizations and causes on Kauaʻi, and have contributed to the Hawaiian nonprofit featured in this study, KKOA.
refused to leave. The Wailua residents said they were descendants of the last reigning Queen of Kauaʻi, Deborah Kapule, and insisted they possess the paperwork showing she gave that land to her descendants (Alayvilla, Garden Island, 2017).

The Wailua standoff occurred near the mouth of the Wailua River, an area rich with historic relevance for Hawaiians on Kauaʻi. The Kauaʻi aliʻi, like Kapule, were born and resided beside the Wailua River. The Kānaka protestors were living on the ruins of the Coco Palms, a famous resort near the river mouth, prominent in decades passed but an eyesore since its destruction from Hurricane ‘Iniki in 1992. New developers had taken the site over as a place to re-establish a successful resort.78 SWAT teams were sent out and arrests made in Wainiha. In Wailua, the Kauaʻi courts initially ruled against forcible removal of the Kānaka residents; however, the protestors were forced off the land by the spring of 2018.

These situations highlight Kānaka efforts to regain their land, as well as reflect deeply-felt frustrations in the hearts of some of the Hawaiian people on Kauaʻi who see wealthy outsiders come and buy land--sometimes only as an investment or a part-time vacation home--while many Hawaiians on Kauaʻi struggle to afford rents or find rental housing, let alone have access to buying land. Kauaʻi County member Mason Chock summed up the truth of the

78 However, these investors have reportedly dropped the project after a prolonged occupation and other continued setbacks.
situation, “Only people from abroad or outside Kaua’i can even afford to live on Kaua’i now,” (Letman & Wong, 2017).

5.1 Richell (Oshiro) Sweet and Wanda Oshiro

I pull into the concrete driveway under a make-shift awning, greeted by a beautiful baby girl dressed in her diapers, pigtail atop her head.

“Nanea!” I jump out of my car with my gift bag, in awe at how beautiful she is. She had grown so much since I last saw her. Her mother, my former haumana Richell comes to the door, hugs me, and welcomes me into her hale. It was spotless, an amazing attribute considering Richell had just birthed her third daughter in less than five years.

Wanda, Richell’s mom, greets me with a hug and honi (kiss). We had all become close since Richell was my student at Kapa’a High School years before. Though I had lived off-island since 2010, we had stayed in touch across oceans and continents. Today, I am meeting them to record our conversations while we talk about their family’s Kuleana lands.

Wanda related to me how she had called up her mother, asking for the paperwork about their family’s Kuleana lands, which she refers to as konohiki lands. “I told [my mom], we are going to get your land back. And it is going to be ours!”

79 Haumana=student.
80 Hale=home.
Wanda calls up her mother again, while we are sitting and watching the babies. Was the land listed under the name Manewa? Or Kaheaku? Richell’s grandmother, Wanda’s mother, determined it was under Manewa.

Grandma: “I gotta look at the briefcase that has all the pepahs. They claimed my great-grandfather had a son, but no one even heard about him having a son…that is the one who got the land…I don’t know how to speak Hawaiian. I don’t understand Hawaiian [to read the papers]. You have to see my sister Penny, sister Rochell…they can speak Hawaiian…”

Wanda: “We don’t have to speak Hawaiian! When you get home, see if that briefcase [with the papers] is underneath the table. I am going to fight for this land! This guy Zuckerberg opened up this whole can of worms, and now the Hawaiians are fighting to get their kuleana lands back…”

I pulled out my laptop and began looking up the Land Commission Award that would be listed under the name Manewa, their kupuna. I had spent time at the Kauaʻi Historical Society, taking meticulous notes from Director Helen Wong Smith about how to look up Kuleana land awards online. I reviewed my notes carefully.

Heather: “First we go to Waihona ʻĀina…we try to look it up here.”

Waihona ʻĀina is a website that has digitally archived 4 databases: the Mahele with the disbursement of Kuleana Awards; the Boundary Commission Database, the Royal Patent Database, and the Land Grants database, which
involved the sale of government lands separate from the Mahele.\textsuperscript{81} It took us some time to troubleshoot the navigation of the website, and then suddenly, it was there--the scanned original document of the Mahele Award to their ancestor, Manewa. We got chicken-skin.\textsuperscript{82}

‘Be it known to you, the Land Commissioners, that the foregoing diagram is my claim for land which is stated to you, for you to award. The right to it has been held from the year 1839 until this year of 1848, in January, and it is for you, the Land commissioners at Kale Kauila, to consider. This claim of mine is at Kalihiwai on the island of Kauaʻi. A respectful farewell, I am, Manewa, your servant. The witnesses: A. Pepeiao, Ikaaka’ (Creed, (n.d.). LCA #10078.)

Listed below Manewa’s claim were excerpts from the Foreign Testimony volume, and from the Native Testimony. Both showed the same person giving testimony: Kaumana, who verified that Manewa was indeed inhabiting the lands in Kalihiwai.

After finding the Land Claim Award (LCA) we then located the Royal Patent. We had to call on Victoria Creed for help, the President of Waihona ‘Āina, an elderly haole woman who had been accumulating this database for over 20 years. We grabbed my book of Hawaiian land terms to understand some of the language used in the documents.

\textsuperscript{81} Creed, Victoria. \texttt{www.waihona.com}
\textsuperscript{82} Hawai‘i Creole Pidgin way of saying ‘goose-bumps.’
Heather: “ʻĀpana, what does ʻāpana mean? It says it means portions of land...you had two lots apparently. You had a lo‘i and a kula, and also a house lot. This land was given to your kupuna by the konohiki back in 1846. Wow, here it is! A seal from Kamehameha III...I heard if you have this, you can turn this in and not pay your taxes!”  

Wanda: “According to [her neighbor], the King gave our family land all over the Na Pali coast, Kalalau, all that our family’s land!...We are going to get our land back! Not only are we going to get our land back, but we gonna educate others. One braddah at church, he is fighting for his land too...”

Richell pays on the website the nominal fee for a copy of the Royal Patent from King Kamehameha III to Manewa [included below], for his Kuleana land Award. We had trouble getting it printed out; Victoria Creed agreed to mail it to us. Wanda closes our time together with an important statement.

Wanda: “*The lands awarded by the King cannot be sold.* That is the number one thing I remembered.”

---

**Waihona ʻĀina - Mahele Documents record: 13122**

Claim Number: 10078

Claimant: Manewa

---

83 There were several rumors about land and issues like this on the ground in Kaua‘i. It was hard to know where to turn to separate fact from rumor. I later found out from the Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation that it was not true that the royal seal precluded the need to pay taxes.

84 Wanda Oshiro, Personal Communication, 2017; italics mine.
Other claimant:

Other name:

Island: Kauaʻi
District: Halelea
Ahupuaa: Kalihiwai
Ili: Moelelipuu, Kaehu

Apana: 2 Awarded: 1
Loi: 1 FR:
Plus: NR: 259v9
Mala Taro: FT: 171v12
Kula: 1 NT: 183v12
House lot: 1 RP: 7849
Kihapai/Pakanu: Number of Royal Patents: 1
Salt lands: Koele/Poalima: No
Wauke: Loko: No
Olona: Lokoia: No
Noni: Fishing Rights: No
Hala: Sea/Shore/Dunes: No
Sweet Potatoes: Auwai/Ditch: Yes
Irish Potatoes: Other Edifice: No
Bananas: Spring/Well: No
Breadfruit: Pigpen: No
Coconut: Road/Path: No
Coffee: Burial/Graveyard: No
Oranges: Wall/Fence: No
Bitter Melon/Gourd: Stream/Muliwai/River: Yes
Sugar Cane: Pali: Yes
Tobacco: Disease: No
Koa/Kou Trees: Claimant Died: No
Other Plants: Other Trees:
Other Mammals: No Miscellaneous: Kaiapu pali, Puhinui pali

No. 10078, Manewa

N.R. 259v9

Be it known to you, the Land Commissioners, that the foregoing diagram is my claim for land which is stated to you, for you to award. The right to it has been held from the year 1839 until this year of 1848, in January, and it is for you, the Land commissioners at Hale Kauila, to consider. This claim of mine is at Kalihiwai on the island of Kaua‘i.
A respectful farewell,

I am, MANEWA, your servant.

The witnesses: A. Pepeiao, Ikaaka.

**F.T. 171-172v12**

No. 10078, Manewa, Claimant

Kaumana, sworn, says I know Claimant's lands in Kalihiwai. They consist of 1 loi & kula & house lot.

No. 1 is house lot in "Moaleipuu."

No. 2 is loi & kula in "Kaehu."

No. 1 is bounded:

Mauka by Konohiki's kula

Napali by Kalihiwai River

Makai by Nohomalie's house lot

Koʻolau by Kiapu pali.

No. 2 is bounded:
Mauka by Kalihiwai River

Napali by Puhinui pali

Makai by Pupu's loi

Koʻolau by ditch.

These lands were given to Claimant by the Konohiki in 1846. No one has disputed the claim till now.

Kupihea, sworn, says I know Manewa's lands. I have heard all that Kaumana has said & it is all true. Manewa now holds these lands unmolested.

**N.T. 183-184v12**

No. 10078, Manewa

Kaumana, sworn, he has seen Manewa's land in Kalihiwai consisting of one loi and a small adjoining pasture in the ili land of Kaehu and a house lot in the ili of (?).

Section 1 - House lot.

Mauka by Konohiki pasture

Napali by Kalihiwai river
Makai by Nohomalie's house lot

Koʻolau by Kiapu pali.

Section 2 One loi.

Mauka by Kalihiwai river

Napali by Puohenui pali

Makai by Poipu's land

Koʻolau by ditch.

This land to Manewa was from the Konohiki in 1846 and it has been peaceful since that time to the present.

Kupihea, sworn, he has seen Manewa's land in Kalihiwai of two sections.

Section 1 - House lot.

Section 2 - One loi.

He has known in the same way as Kaumana and Manewa has had this claim without objections.

[Award 10078; R.P. 7849; Kalihiwai Halelea; 1 ap.; 1 rood 9 rods; Kaehu
Kalihiwai Halelea; 1 ap.; 1 rood 14 rods]
Figure 4. Richell’s ancestor’s Land Claim Award.

5.1.1 Kuleana Land was not to be bought or sold

Wanda: “The lands awarded by the King cannot be sold. That is the number one thing I remembered.”

King Kamehameha III had debated with his Privy Council on December 20, 1849 about ways to protect Kuleana lands from passing out of Hawaiian hands. He made his wishes known to his subjects—that they were not to sell

---

85 Wanda Oshiro, Personal Communication, 2017; italics mine.
their kuleana lands—yet nothing was codified into law to protect awardees from becoming alienated from their Kuleana lands. Research shows, interestingly, that Hawaiians did not sell their Kuleana lands in the first generation after the Mahele,86 perhaps out of respect for the Monarch’s wishes. Amazingly, the findings from this research reveal some of the women still had this directive from King Kamehameha III seared into their consciousness, passed down from their kūpuna, nearly 170 years later--Kuleana lands were not to be sold.87

“My tūtū said, land was never to be bought or sold, but passed on. We are borrowing our land from our children...You lease the land, you farm the land, but you cannot buy the land. That is common knowledge, land was never to be bought or sold...We got into a system where we had to pay taxes, after Hawaiʻi became a state...We had so much land out there, we had to do something or else or we were going to lose it, which [much of it] we did. ‘Cause you cannot pay for your land tax when what you do is fishing you know, farming. How do you take care of taxes that you owe with the government if you are living sustainably on your land? It was something then they started, my tūtū them, started working for the County so they had money. And then there were fundraisers. We would make laulau, whatever we had to do to pay the taxes. To this day we still do that. We have the taro festival...the whole family gets together and sells plate lunch. Just so that it is not hard on the whole family to pay the taxes. But it is not easy...So we lose our land, we cannot afford.”88 Noelani Josselin, Activist, Grandmother, born in Hana, Maui and lives on Kaua‘i.

Haulani expressed frustration, as she had paid her taxes faithfully for years, until her husband passed away. Since then she could not keep up with payments, and didn’t know what was happening to her kuleana lands as a result. She anxiously hoped that someone would notify her if anyone intended to pay the back-taxes and adversely possess her land.

*I was the only one interested in my whole family to pay the taxes for the kuleana lands...I paid taxes for years at Papa’a [her kuleana lands]...I kept paying and paying and paying until [husband] George died, and then I cannot afford it anymore. It is not fair...Somebody gotta know [what’s happening to my lands]...the government, the tax office...If someone is going to buy it, then I am...*
going to need to know about it, right?" 

Haulani Fernandez, Activist, Former President of Kapaʻa Neighborhood Center, Grandmother, Born & Raised in Anahola, Kauaʻi.

The western cash tax system has been eviscerating Hawaiians from their lands since the Kuleana Act of 1850 first required cash taxes to be paid, vs. food crops or hand-made goods, on Hawaiian land holdings (Vaughan, 2018). In this research, according to the women’s stories, it appears different pockets in Hawaiʻi may have implemented cash taxation at different times, perhaps in proximity to Oʻahu or to cities. Women reported that their families did not have to pay cash taxes until, in Pono’s situation on Oʻahu, the Overthrow; and in Noelani’s case in Hana, until Statehood.

Findings indicate, as in Noelani’s situation, that families relied on strong ‘ohana networks to work together to pay taxes and preserve their relationship to ancestral family lands. But today, as Hawaiian land values have skyrocketed, research indicates that family networks on Kauaʻi can no longer sustain paying the tax bills that can be anywhere from $20,000-$480,000 (Vaughan, 2018: 98).

_I experienced in my family, as in other families I know, that when the change happened with the U.S. Government coming into Hawaiʻi, a lot of the families had been given land…my family was given land from the King…So, a lot of the families like mine, were being charged taxes for the land that they owned, and they couldn’t afford the taxes. Now it was required to have money… And a lot of the land was taken because they couldn’t pay the taxes…_ 

Pono, Grandmother, Dancer, Musician, Artist.

---

Some struggles over keeping kuleana lands in the family came not from cash taxation systems but from distant relatives. Haulani shares that years earlier, she had to hire a lawyer and attend a hearing to prove she was the legal heir to her Kuleana lands, as a distant relative was claiming they belonged to her.

_They had called a meeting for us... she had a lawyer. She came in to say that the land was hers...I did my homework, and in no shape or form [was it hers]. We are all family, but she is in a different line!...And so, they open up the meeting, they said she was there saying that this was her family’s land. And I showed it was my family’s land. They were brothers, but the land was descended through my line. I wanted to tell her...I am an heir to this guy, closer than you are. My lawyer just kind of explained it so clearly, so easy. You could see it, that it was not connected to her at all. She said it was hers!...There’s plenny stories like that._

_Haulani Fernandez, Former President of Kapa’a Neighborhood Center, Grandmother, Born & Raised in Anahola, Kaua‘i._

Often times, one family member cares for the land and pays the taxes, although the land belongs to a myriad of descendants, some of which may not even know they have a share in the land plot. This story has played out in a more public, dramatic fashion in the Zuckerberg case, where Hawaiian has turned against Hawaiian in the same extended family. Dr. Carlos Andrade is working to clear his title and eliminate numerous fractional heirs to the Kuleana lands he is claiming. Other heirs, relatives of Andrade, have contended with him and the Facebook CEO both on the auction block and in legal proceedings, contesting Zuckerberg and Andrade’s attempts to eliminate them

from the titles. Andrade ended up bidding over a million dollars to acquire sole
title to three Kuleana plots on Zuckerberg’s estate, while one of his relatives
outbid him at nearly ¾ of a million dollars for one plot (Letman, 2019).

As mentioned in the earlier section, on the West side of Kaua‘i, one
women in this research shared how her family also lost their Kuleana lands to
wealthier haole that her kupuna trusted. They had lost title to it over 150 years
ago, but never realized it because they were allowed by the plantations to live
continuously on the property until recent times when the plantation system left
the region.92

Currently, there are a few people working together on Kaua‘i to help
Hawaiians trace their Kuleana lands and become aware of what is happening
to them. More support is needed to empower Hawaiians on Kaua‘i to track
down and reclaim their Kuleana lands.

5.2 Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA)

What needs to be done first, is to release the lands that have been held back, to
the Hawaiian people, in a timely manner, so that people can enjoy their
life...There is such a long wait, that people may even die waiting, which just
makes no sense. And somehow, there needs to be a change. Whoever is in
authority and making these decisions, needs to escalate the process, of releasing
the land to the people. There needs to be a change in blood quantum legislation,
and it needs to be done soon-not dragged out. And the quantum should be any
quantum. As it is now, it is like you have no freedom to choose your mate [in
terms of offspring’s blood quantum]. It is prohibitive. You should be able to be
free to marry who you want and have children, and not have to worry about
blood quantum.93 Pono, Artist, Grandmother, Musician, Dancer.

92 This female Hawaiian leader also chose a pseudonym for personal reasons.
“That is the struggle, land for my children, unattainable, out of our range. I wish we could get Hawaiian Homelands, but I am not a beneficiary because I am not 50% [blood quantum]. I am 25% [blood quantum], and my children are less! That blood quantum issue has been a real thorn in our side for many years. People have tried to change it. But you know it is a federal law? Hawaiian Homelands is a federal act. It takes a Congressional Act to change that. The fact that the U.S. Government raised the blood quantum to 50% when at first it was offered by our Congressman, our Hawaiian people, that you had to be 1/32 blood. So as long as you had a drop of blood, you are Kānaka Maoli, you are entitled to our National Crown Lands.94 Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Community-Radio show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kala Hui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

I am 29 years old, I have 3 kids. I am native Hawaiian, but I cannot qualify for my own land, ‘cause I don’t have 50% blood quantum. I am 48%, so I am a lessee for my mother, who is half, but my mother doesn’t have a [DHHL Award] house yet. But if she does get a house, she can give that to me, then I can give that to my kids. So that is a lot of things we have to go through until me or my kids get a house to live.”95 Chelsey Contrasdes, Activist, Mother, former BOD member of KKOAP, M.O.M. Hui.

I sat down at the desk while a short burst of rain poured outside in Kilauea on the north shore of Kaua‘i. It was the evening before March 26, Prince Kūhiō Day in the islands. And as I sat down to read one of the well-worn books on Hawaiian history I found at the local library, I glanced down the page and realized it was speaking of Prince Jonah Kūhiō.

Jonah Kūhiō Kalaniana‘ole was a member of Hawai‘i’s royal family and a non-voting delegate to the House of Representatives in the U.S. Congress representing the Territory of Hawai‘i from 1902-1922, after it was unconstitutionally annexed by joint resolution to the US (Tong, 2013). The

95 Chelsey, Personal communication, 2017.
ruling haole elites of the Republican Party in Hawai‘i aligned themselves with Kūhiō as they saw him as a means of acquiring Hawaiian votes. In Kūhiō’s 20-year tenure, he helped establish county governments on each island, ensuring each island had some measure of home rule. He also made a case for some portion of land being returned to Kānaka Maoli in what became known as the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA). “If conditions remain as they are today,” said Kūhiō in 1920, “it will only be a matter of a short space of time when this race of people, my people, renowned for their physique, their courage, their sense of justice, their straight-forwardness, and their hospitality, will be a matter of history” (Daws, 1968:298).

The crisis of Hawaiians’ landlessness was being seen as a ‘problem’ by haole elites at this juncture. Many hoa‘aina had been able to retain their kuleana lands for at least one generation after the Mahele, apparently honoring King Kamehameha III’s express wishes that they never sell their kuleana lands. However, the last quarter of the 19th century saw Hawaiians losing their kuleana lands in greater capacity due to the unscrupulous lending practices found in Act 33 of the 1874 Hawaiian Kingdom Legislature. While this prospecting was legalized by a whites-dominated legislature in O‘ahu, it strategically undermined Hawaiian land tenure, and may have helped lead to the ‘problem’ summarized by whites at the time Prince Jonah pushed for homesteads to be allotted to his people (Stauffer, 2004).
As a territorial representative, Kūhiō ardently pushed for homesteads to be allotted to Hawaiians before the U.S. Congressmen. He argued that the maka‘āinana had not received their fair share in the Mahele, where, he stated, their 1/3 interest in the land was recognized but not actualized in how the kuleana distribution evolved. He also brought up the Crown Lands--1.75 million acres of land that had been set aside by King Kamehameha III as his private landholdings during the Mahele. With the illegal takeover of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893 and the ensuing annexation to the U.S. in 1898, the Crown Lands had been transferred to the United States government (Kauanui, 1999; La Croix & Roumasset, 1990). Kūhiō stressed Article 95 in the 1894 Republic of Hawai‘i Constitution, which removed the trust status of the Crown Lands after they were seized by the Provisional Government. Prince Jonah pointed out that the maka‘āinana had assumed that the Crown Lands were being held in trust for their direct benefit by the Monarchy, and with the Overthrow, the maka‘āinana had lost that potential benefit. He called the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act ‘belated justice’ (Van Dyke, 2008: 241, quoting the December 1920 Senate Hearings).

Territorial Senator John Henry Wise also deserves mention, as he was a key player in pushing for the passage of the HHCA (Van Dyke, 2008). Wise was a graduate of Oberlin College in Ohio, where he had been financially supported by the Hawaiian Evangelical Association (HEA), a white-run Hawai‘i missions board that envisioned Wise as their answer to a declining Hawaiian congregant
base. The Protestant churches in Hawai‘i were losing Indigenous attendees to disease; as well, the HEA lost congregants to the Anglican, Catholic, and Mormon denominations as the board increasingly publicly denounced the Mō‘i and the government of the Monarchy. The HEA consisted of the ‘sons of the mission,’ many of whom forced the Bayonet Constitution on King Kalākaua and deposed the subsequent Mō‘i Lili‘uokalani. Their desire in increasing the Hawaiian membership base was linked to their desires to maintain the power and political influence they enjoyed as head of the protestant churches in a society where religion and governance were traditionally intertwined. Wise however failed to live up to the expectations of the HEA, and upon his return from Oberlin, quickly realized that the Hawaiian congregants wanted their Queen reinstated. He broke ties with HEA and supported the cause of the Royalists. He was arrested during a round-up of 300 Royalist supporters in 1894 and was one of the last to be released, in January 1896. He was thereafter regarded with skepticism by the haole planter elite due to his support of deposed Queen Lili‘uokalani (Williams Jr, 2013; Van Dyke, 2008).

Reverend Akaiko Akana, pastor of the Kawaiahaʻo Church in Honolulu, as well as John Henry Wise, spoke before the U.S. Congressional Committee. Akana further supported Kūhiō and Wise’s claims that the land rightfully belonged to the maka‘ainana, and restoring it to them was an act of justice vs. charity. U.S. Secretary of Interior Franklin Land echoed this sentiment expressed by Akana, and used the same words as Kūhiō, calling the
establishment of the HHCA ‘belated justice’ (Van Dyke, 2008: 243, quoting “December 1920 Senate Hearing” emphasis mine).

The Territory of Hawai‘i’s former Chief Justice Alexander George Morison Robertson, himself married to a Hawaiian, forcefully testified against the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act before the Congressmen. Representing Parker Ranch\(^96\) as their attorney, he claimed that there were “hundreds of white men out there [in Hawai‘i] who feel they are absolutely against this bill and that they are being discriminated against” (Van Dyke, 2008: 245 quoting “December 1920 Senate Hearings”). Incidentally, Robertson’s father had been Vice-President of the Land Commission, which had the task of privatizing Hawaiian lands within a western tenure system, where he gained a reputation for trying to restrict the size of kuleana awards to the maka‘āinana to be as small as possible. The elder Robertson also helped Kamehameha V write the 1864 Constitution, which required a property requirement for voting under direction of the Mō‘ī. Kamehameha IV appointed the elder Robertson as a justice to the Supreme Court, where he authored a decision that limited the maka‘āinana’s freedom to utilize lands of their ahupua‘a (Van Dyke, 2008). For while the elder Robertson was a powerful figure in the Hawaiian Kingdom--one who supported the Mō‘ī and the ali‘i--his son was part of the Overthrow; he appeared to be one that supported the interests of those in power at the

\(^{96}\) largest ranch in Hawai‘i, located on Moku Keawe
expense of the rights of the maka‘ainana. In that regard, both the elder and the younger were similar in their political ambitions.

The younger Robertson worked under President Sanford B. Dole in the Provisional Government, serving initially as Deputy Attorney General and later as part of the Hawai‘i Supreme Court. Robertson sat on the military tribunal that tried the Queen, Kūhiō, Wise and nearly 300 other Hawaiians loyal to the Queen. Robertson was admitted to the bar of the U.S. Supreme Court over 20 years previously. Robertson’s testimony regarding HHCA had powerful sway before the Congressmen. Using a racial framework, Robertson fought the idea of territorial taxes having to pay for Homelands, saying it would take money out of the pockets of whites to support Hawaiians (Kauanui, 2008).

Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole and John Henry Wise suggested in 1920 that Hawaiian Home Lands be administered to Hawaiians of 1/32 blood. However, as the act made its way through legislative processes, sugar planters and others against the bill worked to have the blood quantum set at 50%, impacting the Hawaiian community for generations afterwards. They also reduced the leases from 999 years to 99 years. The prime agricultural lands were removed, leaving potential allotments that were typically of poor agricultural quality and lacking water resources. Irrigation was a huge problem for lessees, as the sugar planters controlled and diverted the water; this, however, could not resolve before Congress and nothing was done to assist the lessees (Van Dyke, 2008; Mackenzie, 2012; Daws, 1968; Kauanui, 2008).
5.2.1 The Department of Hawaiian Homelands

“My dad was on the list [to be awarded land] for 25 years before he was awarded residential property in Wai’anae [O‘ahu]. I am on the list myself for the last 14 years. My husband is not on the list because he doesn’t make blood quantum...I am pretty far down there on the list. I get offered homes that go back into foreclosure, but I cannot take them. Some people have [died] in their houses, or was forced to leave, so I cannot take those homes. It is such an emotional issue, around the home, someone that was forced to leave. I don’t want a house like that, I don’t want it that desperately. We were just offered a home in Anahola that is 47 years old, that looks pretty bad...The husband got kicked out because the wife died and he wasn’t Hawaiian, so he got removed, and then some kids ripped off his stuff.”

Lorilani Keohokalole-Torio, Mother, former H.A.P.A. Board member, former alaka‘i of M.O.M. Hui, Kaua‘i chapter.

“My uncle qualified to be on the [DHHL] list, but then he couldn’t qualify for the loan [to build the house on the land.] It’s a $200,000 loan. So, all these people ended up getting land awards, but they couldn’t afford to get the house, because there are all these limitations on what kind of house you can build with DHHL...My great-aunt died without ever getting her Hawaiian home. She was 91 when she was going to get it, and she died at 90. Access to land is really difficult, and that is the biggest problem. From the beginning, the land started being taken away. And you got a lot of displacement. And that is life, especially as a culture, as a Hawaiian. If you have land—you can cultivate, you can create life. You take that away, and you start putting up all these laws, and all these walls, not allowing people to be sustaining for themselves and their family...

I was raised in Hawaiian Homelands. My mom has lease on my grandmother’s land, and my sister has a lease on my mom’s land. But me and my siblings are only 35.5% [Hawaiian] so we cannot apply for a lease on Hawaiian Homelands. We can get it passed down to us as long as we are ¼ Hawaiian. That is kind of a problem because once we [die], we cannot pass it down to our children. It gets taken back by DHHL. That is always a struggle.”

Tiana Laranio, Activist, Mother, Formerly BOD member of KKOA, formerly of M.O.M. Hui.

“[DHHL] should have a goal to go through the list, so that everybody who is on the list would have a piece of property.

And I know they have their reasons of why they are not distributing it fast enough, which is usually funding. The reason the funding is tied up is because it comes from the top...Every time they have to give out the properties, they have to put in infrastructure. And it is at least $140,000 to create the whole

infrastructure for each award. To create that much infrastructure for the whole community...that is a lot of money. Right now [DHHL] has a process, that is the way they do it...And when your name gets called, you have to qualify [for the home loan.] Not everybody qualifies, because houses these days are expensive. My idea is to get people on their property, to look into models of building homes that are not so expensive. It doesn’t have to be the model that the Hawaiian Homelands is offering, which costs a lot of money. Having models of homes that might just be a nice [start] to get them on their land, where they can add walls, you know, maybe live more Hawaiian style...But you build what is affordable. You try to work with the people, to have them succeed. In another way you look at the people as success stories, not as losers. And then you offer them some fruit trees [for food security]...Get them inspired. I think that is a good plan, to make it affordable.99

Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKOА.

The troubles the women expressed with the American government actually releasing the land and providing Hawaiian Homes to Hawaiians are well illustrated by statistics. The Report of the Federal State Task Force on Hawaiian Home Lands revealed that sixty years after the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA) was passed, less than 38,000 acres of the 200,000 set aside for Hawaiians had actually been distributed; most of the land was being leased to non-Hawaiians or used for military facilities, parks, airports, and schools (M. Trask, 1991). An expose in the Wall Street Journal in 1991 revealed that only 3,700 Indigenous Hawaiians were actually given land in the first 70 years of the Hawaiian Home Lands Commission, with a waiting list (at that time) 21,000 people long. The Department of Hawaiian Homelands failed to provide lessees with basic infrastructure of utilities, water, and roads as

required by law. At the time, 10% of the Native Hawaiian population was houseless, and of that number, 40% had been waiting on the Home Lands list for over 7 years (Faludi, WSJ, 1991). Seventeen years later, the DHHL made a precipitous increase in distribution compared to the first 70 years of the agency; however, only an additional 4,300 more awards had been distributed (Kauanui, 2008).

A report released in the summer of 2018 by an Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) trustee, interviewing former and current DHHL directors about the failure of the system to adequately provide land for Hawaiians, revealed that 9,700 awards had been released in the 97 years since the HHCA was passed (Office of Rep. Gene Ward, 2018).

According to the report, more people were purportedly dying on the list than actually receiving land. DHHL Directors lamented that the cost of putting in infrastructure for the awards, coupled with the fluctuating federal and state funding, impaired their ability to release land to waiting applicants (Office of Rep. Gene Ward, 2018).

To qualify for a spot on the waiting list, DHHL applicants are required to wade through the tedious job of filling out a 30-page application, as well as supply up to 30 notarized documents. Besides birth certificates for the applicant, their parents and grandparents, the applicants have to also produce notarized copies of marriage certificates, death certificates, baptism records, divorce certificates, and documents related to military service, hospital stays,
and employment records (Kauanui, 2008). Once an applicant qualifies for a spot on the list, they then have to qualify for the loan for a home.

The state agency is historically underfunded. While DHHL is the only state agency mandated to receive sufficient funding by the state Constitution, they have had to lease DHHL lands to non-Hawaiian entities to pay for their salaries and operating costs rather than to pay for infrastructure and the release of new awards (DHHL website, accessed January 17, 2017).

In 2007, six Kānaka beneficiaries to the HHCA filed suit against the state of Hawai‘i for insufficiently funding DHHL, also suing DHHL and its commissioners for failing to demand sufficient funding from the Hawai‘i State Legislature. In 2012, in what became known as the Nelson case, the Hawai‘i Supreme Court ruled that Hawai‘i must provide sufficient funding for DHHL for operating budgets; however, they failed to define what constituted sufficient. Another ruling in 2015 ordered the state legislature to provide DHHL with $28 million in funds for its operations, but the state’s Attorney General’s office appealed the decision. The Governor’s Office, Speaker of the House, and the President of the Hawai‘i State Senate all labored to strike down the 2015 ruling against adequately funding DHHL (DHHL Website, accessed January 17, 2017; Office of Rep. Gene Ward, 2018).

While Hawaiians make up the largest houseless population in the islands, DHHL is the 2nd largest land-owner in the state, after Kamehameha
Schools. DHHL has never been adequately funded and is land-rich but cash poor (Office of Rep. Gene Ward, 2018).

The women in this research had much to say about their experiences with the Department of Hawaiian Homelands—having the proverbial carrot dangled in front of them, this ever-elusive promise of a home that doesn’t materialize—and that is only for the Hawaiians that have enough Hawaiian koko (blood) to measure up to the U.S. government’s idea of Hawaiian identity, at 50% blood quantum, to be able to get on the waiting list. Hawaiian’s oppression from the US, while ubiquitous, lacks a clear target for blame and redress of wrongs. It seems DHHL may bear the brunt of people’s frustration, while the federal government is too large and too far away to feel any Hawaiian anger.

On Kaua‘i, you find Lynette H. (Haulani) Fernandez listed, as of 2017, in spot number 8 on the waiting list. She was added to the list on November 23, 1979. She is still awaiting a farm lot award today, over 40 years after getting on the waiting list.

“My years of experience with Hawaiian Homelands have not been good ones. I only get what I want, that I am entitled to, because of my efforts, of going in and spending hours and hours and hours. I spent so much money flying over to O‘ahu, that is the only way I got anything. Otherwise I would have nothing today. It is so sad. But they never change. It gets worse... Look at that list! The 50% [blood quantum] list—it’s huge! People are dying on that list. Grampa and Gramma you know, they are dying, they waited on this list all these years. Does [DHHL] care? They don’t give a crap. You die waiting for your land. They don’t care. You know what I mean?...So we got 20,000 [applicants] on the list still. It never goes down because people just keep on applying. But they don’t ever satisfy that list in a way that makes a difference. Plenny people have the same story. They have the same thing to tell. The [generation older than me] don’t want to make any waves, they don’t grumble...I am looking out for my children. Before we die, we want our children
to each own a piece of land, so they can build a house along. So, I’m a Hawaiian—I am going to have to fight for my kids…”

Haulani Fernandez, 
Grandmother, Born & Raised in Anahola, Kaua‘i.

At one time in the early 1980s, Haulani was offered a DHHL farm lot in Anahola; but the requirement was that she could not build a house and live on the land; she had to implement an active farming operation in order to have the land award. Out of an honest respect for the requirements set out by DHHL around the land, she deferred her award. At the time, Haulani and her husband didn’t feel they could honestly live up to the expectations required for the farm lot property.

“I deferred! And after it is all over, a year goes by, and those people [who got the awards] are building homes! And they [DHHL] said we couldn’t have homes, only a caretaker’s house to watch the property. But these were homes! And people didn’t give a heck. But I hadn’t had that attitude! I thought these rules were for real! And that you had to follow the rules! And that is when I realized, do not follow the rules! I was so upset. Til today, I am upset...That was 1983. And I bang my head against the wall you know why? People aren’t farming...people are building the house, but that was not supposed to be. They are giving land out over the whole state, but not Anahola. I could die before I get my farm lot...If you don’t complain and go to the office, [you don’t get anywhere.] You have to almost do that, to the point they don’t want to talk to you anymore. They will give you a piece of property when they are so tired of seeing your face and name. And that is what happened. The raw land distribution. In 1993, they had to give out 150 properties or they were going to lose federal money. So, they gave raw land distribution [without infrastructure in place]. I thought, ‘if I don’t grab it, I won’t have the opportunity again.’ So that is how I have a lot at Aliomanu....it’s been 22 years...After 7 years, they were gonna come in and put in the infrastructure, but they don’t. [DHHL] say they don’t have the money... they said we are going to have to find our own water meter. They put it on us, the people. They say to us, ‘if you want water, then you go find a meter.’ George [husband] said, ‘Don’t worry, Mom. We are going to find it.’ Then we said, ‘What about electricity?’

The hurricane actually saved us, ‘Iniki back in 1992. It busted up Kaua‘i, but it was a help to us that it happened. Because Hawaiian Homelands approved almost anything that you went for [at that time]. These American guys from the mainland came to help with electricity [restore electric poles for the island]...They asked if they could park their trucks on [my mother’s] property. We were the only ones with hot water, ‘cause we had gas. They asked if they could shower at our house, if we could feed them. We said, ‘Yeah, no worries.’ Then we washed their clothes. In return for all of that, they put in our electricity [at Aliomanu]. They connected all our poles with no cost to us. They put in all the pipes for our water, laid it in the ground, and we didn’t expect anything, they just did it. They were here to help our people. And so, we helped them in return. And in return, they helped us. I was so thankful to them...

[DHHL] said, ‘We not gonna put in water, we not going to put in infrastructure’, so that the people kine of like, that whole place was awarded, but people turned the land back in! The smart ones, my neighbors, they haven’t given up. And I said, ‘why should you give up?’ But I don’t know when they are going to get their water......But all the haoles down there [in Aliomanu], how the heck do they have all their water?

But that is how Hawaiian Homelands was, and still is that way. I have big issues with them. That is why I do my own thing. I don’t really ask permission to do anything. I think everyone is doing that too. We were supposed to have a shopping center [in Anahola, from DHHL], and we still don’t have it. We had meetings for months and months. They gave up prime land to [the utility company] for a solar electric system, and we still don’t have a shopping center. So, we still have to drive [somewhere else] to shop. And we have to pay [convenience store] prices for a loaf of bread or milk. Now that is not fair. It just isn’t proper the way they are operating, you know?...And anywhere else you go, they got it beautiful. And then look at Anahola? That marketplace looks like a dump! I mean, who the heck would want to stop and shop? You walk in dirt, there is no grass, there is no cement, there is no walking path, you know? It is like there is no planning, no architect. We don’t have a fire department, we don’t have a health clinic. We don’t have anything these other [neighboring] communities have...

If we waited for Hawaiian Homelands, we would never get anything. It is because they are under the State, I think, dependent on [government] funds. That is how I figure. So, they are kinda like strapped, but to me, they are not giving out enough lands. Because they don’t have money. ‘Cause infrastructure gotta go in first, yeah?...It’s always a fight. You don’t get answers. They never get back to you. And how come...it is like their hands are tied.

If they would just think about us as regular people, and we come with a lot of family members, that we need the homes, we need the land, we need homes TO LIVE! It’s our children! Look at me! Had all my kids with me when they were growing up, you know what I mean? And then you want something for them, to leave something for them, because they won’t be able to afford to buy houses
[with Kauaʻi’s real estate market.] That is our job as parents, to leave them something. ‘Cause they cannot afford at all, and that is the sad part about that.\textsuperscript{101} Haulani Fernandez, Grandmother, Former President of Kapaa Neighborhood Center, Born & Raised in Anahola.

Haulani and her husband, while waiting for a farm lot when they first moved back to Kauaʻi, applied with DHHL to lease pasture land to raise animals. It was later taken back with only 30-days’ notice, but apparently nothing was done with the land after they were removed.

“I go all over Anahola, and I try to get land ‘cause George wants to raise cattle for our family, and pigs, and we wanted to grow our own food and you know? No can get land! Month-to-month revocable, meaning you go in, you get a piece of land, you get 5-acres, you fence it all in, then when you get a month’s notice, ‘Sorry, we need your property back, we have plans for it.’ Then you have to take down [your fence, take care of your animals]...that’s what happened to us...[I asked DHHL] ‘Why are you taking it away?’ [DHHL said:] ‘Oh, we got plans for it.’ Bull. Some of the properties they never had plans for it. Never. That’s what made me more upset.”\textsuperscript{102} Haulani Fernandez, Grandmother, Former President of Kapaa Neighborhood Center, born and raised in Anahola, Kauaʻi.

Right after Haulani’s spot, the DHHL lists show Kuʻuleialoha Punua in spot number 9, waiting for a farmland award since December 1973.

Kuʻuleialoha Punua has had her own struggles with DHHL, both as a potential beneficiary, and also with her non-profit based in Anahola, KKOA. She too was offered a farm lot in the early 1980s, but turned it down because she couldn’t faithfully commit to the farming plan required for acceptance of the award.

When she saw that the people who did accept rarely farmed, and illegally built homes, she was dismayed that she had taken the requirements seriously.

\textsuperscript{101} Haulani Fernandez, Personal Communication, 2014 & 2016.
\textsuperscript{102} Haulani Fernandez, Personal Communication, 2016.
Years later, when attempting to get land for her Anahola-based non-profit, she initially ran into DHHL’s continuing resistance to release any land.

“My experience regarding KKOA is a disappointing one. A tragedy had happened in the community with the youth...Manulele [co-founder of KKOA] and I felt like, if anything, DHHL would want to help the community move forward, to heal, to create that safe place, to be part of this. It just sounds kind of reasonable, right? It was disappointing because that was 2009, and we are in our 9th year, and there has been a no-show on DHHL’s side. I was very hopeful when we first started this, because we flew to Honolulu, we had an appointment with the property manager for Kaua‘i...He told us to write a proposal, and when he comes to Kaua‘i, he will show up what is available. So, we were very hopeful, this is in January 2009. And I gave him our proposal letter that year, and he never after that gave us any time, any feedback. He didn’t show us a piece of property. He was suddenly on board with the Anahola Association [another group in Anahola]. The funds were there, and so was [this DHHL man.] Everything [the Anahola Association] was pushing for, they got. They got the land for the photovoltaic project, and that organization is getting a cut of that. Back then, [DHHL] asked us for bylaws and we shipped it all over to Honolulu, and yet there is no response. It is almost like the squeaky wheel gets the grease? I am not like that. These guys are professionals. They should be a little more responsive to our community. It is frustrating...You would think DHHL would step up to the plate, and say ‘Of course we want to help this community succeed, of course we want a safe place for the youth’, but it just hasn’t happened.”103 Kuuleialoha Punua, KKOA Board President.

A month after this interview, in January 2017, the same DHHL official Ku‘uleialoha and her Board members met with in 2009 finally responded to KKOA. This official showed KKOA some possible properties they could work with to establish something for the youth. Nearly three years after this DHHL official’s response, in October 2019, KKOA finally received initial access to land, and permission to begin their center for the youth and for agricultural training for the Anahola community. While many in DHHL are now supporting

Kuʻulei & KKOÁ’s efforts to help the Anahola community, the continued wrangling for right-of-entry permits are nerve-wracking and exhausting. Much of the wait and bureaucratic delay seem to be out of the agency’s hands, impacted by other entities in the occupying state government.

Despite the fact that the women’s experience with DHHL was not a factor in selecting them for this research, across the board—not one of the women had anything positive to say about DHHL. Each one either had a negative personal experience, or witnessed members of their extended family suffer while hoping to obtain land for themselves or their ‘ohana. When I called a representative of DHHL to inquire as to why there were so many problems with DHHL, they indicated that it would take years to answer that question, and they were reluctant to give any concrete answers. They failed to return subsequent emails asking for information.

The website for the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands greets you with the following analogy: “This site is designed to make your entry into the program as smooth and fruitful as possible. Like the ‘ulu tree, the Hawaiian Home Lands program can provide sustenance for generations to come” (DHHL website, accessed January 17, 2017). With the ‘ulu tree, a grower can have mature fruit in 3-5 years after propagation, or 5-10 years if grown from seed. But for DHHL, their “‘ulu tree” takes 20-44 years before some Hawaiians can reap a harvest, as that is how long applicants wait to receive a parcel of land.
The website goes on to put the burden of whether or not you can qualify to be on the list, on the applicant’s shoulder: “Entry into the program, however, depends largely upon you….While it often takes time, for most people it is a process well worth the effort” (DHHL website, accessed January 17, 2017).

According to DHHL, it is incumbent upon the Hawaiian applicant as to whether they qualify for the American idea of who is considered Hawaiian, i.e. 50% blood quantum. It is dependent on the applicant if they can afford and have the time to track down all the necessary certified documents and have them notarized. And it is incumbent upon the applicant, if they can outwait the state who is withholding the funds, and not die before you can get an award. If an applicant does die, however, the website states they can designate a successor to inherit their place on the list. But they have to be able to go through the process, and prove 50% blood quantum before they do (DHHL website, accessed January 17, 2017).

For many Kānaka Maoli, Hawaiian Homes appears like a proverbial carrot that has been placed in front of people, promising land, without ever really materializing. In essence, it keeps Hawaiian struggling for crumbs, while the United States military, government, and businessmen make off with the cake.

The DHHL website, with some digging around, contains a list for each island of all the people who have qualified to apply for a plot of land. On Kaua‘i, as of January 17, 2017, 124 years after the destruction of the
monarchy, the website reveals over 1/3 of all the applicants have been waiting between 30-44 years for an award. 593 people have been waiting on the list for 30 years or more. 87% of the people on the list have been waiting for 20 years or more (DHHL website, n.d.).

This is an average of only 100 awards a year, though we know that most of these were distributed in the last 30 years than the first 70; since the Wall Street Journal expose, the department increased their release of awards by 62%. However, by the 2018 report, 44,000 applications for home or land still languished on the waiting list at DHHL. As of 2016, 44,429 applications are before DHHL from nearly 30,000 applicants. Some of these applicants hold multiple applications for land. For example, 22,660 of the 2016 applications were for residential awards; 18,694 for agricultural plots, and 3,075 for pastoral land (Office of Rep. Gene Ward, 2018).

Much DHHL unawarded land is tied up in leases with non-Hawaiian entities, preventing their release to Hawaiian applicants. For example, on Kaua‘i, lessees include the United States Navy, leasing land for a dollar for 65 years, and the Aloha Beach Resort on the East side of the island, among others. On Moloka‘i, Hawaiian HomeLands leases include the U.S. Air Force. On the Big Island, Hawaiian HomeLands have been leased to numerous commercial endeavors including a Toyota car sales business, Big Island Energy Company, and Hawaiian Telecom. On O‘ahu, GTE the Hawaiian Telephone Company, the Hawaiian Electric Company, the U.S. Army, Board of Water
Supply, T-Mobile Cellular, the U.S. Coast Guard, and dozens of others leasees use land set aside for Native Hawaiian residences (DHHL Annual Report, 2013).

One would only be shocked at the current state of Hawaiian homelessness in the face of so much un-awarded land if they were under the illusion that the American government is benevolent and just to the Hawaiian nation. Ensuring Hawaiians have land has never been a priority of the occupying government. The U.S. has stolen the land, and created a façade of potential land acquisition for Hawaiians that is in fact nearly impossible to successfully navigate into landed status. The system has made it illegal for Hawaiians to sue the federal government, and leaves Hawaiians with no mechanism to adequately address the injustices before them. As the Nelson case enters its 2nd decade of legal wrangling, it begs the question---where do Hawaiians go to address the grave injustices perpetrated against them by the federal and state governments? What is their recourse? None exists for an occupied nation of subjugated people who are the rightful heirs of land that the United States considered extremely valuable. The least America could have done was pay the people for the stolen land. But the haunting words of Mele Aloha ‘Āina remind us that the Po‘e Aloha ‘Āina rejected the US Government’s ‘sums of money’ for the ‘astonishing food of the land.’ The current utter disregard for the Hawaiian people makes the supposed American ideals of justice, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness a complete farce 5000 miles from the shrines to America’s founding fathers.
I had heard that there was just “one guy” overseeing everything associated with DHHL in the Department of Interior in Washington, DC (Faludi, WSJ, 1981). I thought I would just call them myself, to see what it was like in DC in regard to Hawai‘i and to determine if this was actually true.

I found a number on a DOI website online. Someone answered immediately without any official introduction, and declares, ‘This is Mano!’ I was stunned for a second, as it wasn’t what I expected from calling a federal agency in Washington, D.C.

Me: “Hello?”

Mano: “This is Mano.”

Me: “Is this Washington, D.C.? The DOI?”

Mano: “Yes.”

Me: “Oh, okay. I just wasn’t expecting…umm. You took me aback.”

Mano: “Wait one sec.” He puts down the phone, I can hear him talking to someone on another line for a while, then dead silence. Then he picks the phone back up. Maybe it really was true, that just one person oversaw Hawaiian Homelands issues in Washington, D.C. I would have to wait til the next day to find out if this rumour were true, as he agreed to talk to me at 3pm his time, Friday afternoon for all of 10 minutes.

104 Name changed.
Just after 3pm D.C. time, I put in a call to Mano. The phone rang and rang. This time, a voicemail. At least it sounded more like a D.C. office, with a voice identifying the agency I was calling. But Mano must have been busy, as he did not answer, and did not contact me back, despite me leaving email, phone number, and a request to speak with him. It took a few more days to nail him down, and then I got much more than 10 minutes of his time.

Perhaps the most startling revelation I received from my subsequent one-hour phone call with Mano was that the goal of DHHL wasn’t actually to put Hawaiians on land; there wasn’t an urgency to get as many people as possible on the land and off the list, at least not at the Federal level. He didn’t seem to have solutions to the current waitlist crisis, or even see it as a crisis. He suggested that if Hawaiians got successful micro-businesses, they could acquire land more easily; but he didn’t explicate how that could happen legally or logistically.

Mano confirmed he was the one person in D.C. overseeing Hawaiian affairs for the DOI. During the discussion, Mano said he spoke as a representative of the U.S. government, that he was a federal official. He believes the state of Hawai‘i is only a state of the US, and always will be. He desires and supports federal recognition. It was an enlightening if not disheartening conversation. Whatever the solutions are to the current and historic crushing disenfranchisement of the Hawaiian people, and the homelessness, health, and economic crises that have ensued, the answers don’t appear to be with Mano.
and the Department of Interior. America needs to be held accountable, and if it won’t come from the federal government, it needs to come from somewhere.

5.3 Housing Crisis

“These people [from the mainland] come in and buy [local housing.] And they flip it over as a rental. They don’t live here, they just have the money to invest, and then they going to make it right back by renting it out for double the money that the local person was paying before. They see it as a deal, they jump in, they know the traction is there…I want to get out of this poverty level, but the climb is so high [weeping]. Are my kids going to be okay after I hustle my ass to get us there?...I don’t want to leave here. I don’t want to get kicked off this island ‘cause the economy told me to! There’s no way. Can’t do that. But it is not easy living here, that is for sure.”

Chelsey Contrades, Activist, Mother, Former BOD of KKOA, M.O.M. Hui.

“So I actually rent from a good friend of mine, who is from Wisconsin. She and her husband just bought property on the East side of Kapahi. I am very happy for them that they were able to purchase a house and be able to settle there, but for me being born and raised here—I am renting from them. But I am thankful, because it is really hard to find rentals that were affordable, so they helped us out and gave us a decent deal on our rental, but it was definitely hard to find. Being where cost of living is higher than the paying wages here on the island, I am living paycheck to paycheck, barely...”

Tiana Laranio, Activist, Mother, Former candidate for County Council, former BOD of KKOA, M.O.M. Hui.

Rental housing is an essential part of any discussion of Hawaiian lands, as 43% of the population in Hawai‘i are renters (Smith, et al., 2018). While this statistic hasn’t been broken down demographically, it can be assumed that Hawaiians are largely found in this people group, as Kānaka Maoli are at the bottom of the economic ladder in Hawai‘i and have a slim possibility of acquiring DHHL land. As rent in occupied Hawai‘i is higher than any where on the United States continent, it can be assumed that this has a huge impact on

Hawaiians, who earn the least economically of all people groups (Geminiani & DeLuca, 2018).

The amount a renter would have to make to afford housing in Hawai‘i averages $35/hour; this contrasts to the average renter’s salary of $15/hour. A renter who only made minimum wage would have to work 116/hours a week to afford a 1-bedroom in Hawai‘i (Smith, et al, 2018). From a local organization researching these issues and advocating for reform:

Residents who have been struggling for years under the pressure of expensive housing and relatively low wages are reaching their breaking point. Families who have lived in Hawai‘i for generations are being displaced from their homes and their islands by a steady flow of short-term visitors...Tourism needs to be carried out in a way that is balanced and sustainable over the long-term. The current state of VRUs [vacation rental units] is not. Hawai‘i needs to act before further damage is done (Geminiani & DeLuca, 2018).

On average across the island chain, 1 in 24 houses are used as vacation rentals; on Kaua‘i, 1 in 8 homes are withdrawn from the housing market and set aside for tourists. A non-resident who buys a home in Hawai‘i for cash flow can make 3.5 times the income they would make from renting long-term to a resident. Many of the vacation rental units (VRUs) can be assumed to be illegal, e.g. of the 9,000 tourist rentals on Maui, only 223 are actually legal. As Hawai‘i
has the lowest property tax rate, VRUs are safe investments for speculators (Smith et al, 2018).

In the findings on the mākua generation, evidence exists of increased stress in the attempt to locate affordable housing. Radical and innovative protective measures need to be implemented immediately in Hawai‘i in order to ensure ‘life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness’ for Hawaiian and local peoples, without creating ghetto-ized ‘affordable housing’ enclosures.

The longer this crisis continues, the more outmigration will happen of Hawaiian and local people; the more homelessness; the more hopelessness; the more drugs; the more suicides. People often do not organize protests on Kaua‘i or have time for endless bureaucratic meetings to agitate for change, while working 2 and 3 jobs to keep their families afloat.

Some of the mākua generation talked more about the struggles to make ends meet, raising families on Kaua‘i where housing values had skyrocketed and where they were struggling to find a place to live. They didn’t talk about restored Hawaiian Kingdom rule, but of having land and being able to remain on the island vs. moving to the continent to survive economically. As outsiders from the continent were buying up real estate, they felt themselves struggling economically.

One parent commented on the pressure the next generation must feel as more and more wealthy outsiders moved to the island, with late-model cars
while the local Hawaiian youth struggled to find a good job and a place to live.

She was worried they would look to drugs to deal with their pain.

“Even in my growing up local, I can remember a time when it was very simple. And having to see so much things, big hotels coming up, next thing you know we got all these [late model] cars on the road and it is stifling me, ‘cause not that I need the materialist things, but you are starting to feel obsolete. And I am working full-time, I have a roof over my head, and I have a stable family life, how in the world am I feeling fearful? Can you imagine what these kids here in Anahola are feeling? You see what I mean? Can you imagine what their thoughts are like? ‘I will never get that. I will never get a house. I will never get a good job. Because we are supposed to only be custodians and landscapers, or bus drivers.’ And then somebody comes along, ‘Here try this. You eva try this? Try this,’ [referring to drugs] and then they get lost.”

Crystal Bilyeu, Mother, former VP of KKOAA, wife to the late Kalapana musician Malani Bilyeu.

While the focus of this research is on Hawaiian women leaders on Kauaʻi, I also talked story with two young men around age 30, who were formerly my students and whom I had known half their lives, about their experiences with trying to survive on Kauaʻi.

“All the Hawaiians, we buy cars instead of houses. We just feel like, that is the only thing we can buy or afford. We don’t ever own it though. The bank does. So, we just pay forever and ever. Everyone realizes we are just shot. Kauaʻi isn’t going to be Kauaʻi anymore. It is turning into California, or like everywhere else. Kauaʻi is going to be all built up in like 20 years, it’s already happening...”

Wendell Soares.

“I am not going to be able to live here forever, I cannot afford it. I am going to have to move to the mainland. As the years go on, rent is never gonna go down, and look at all the people coming in. We got to deal with more shopping centers, all the mainlanders with the money, making the property values go up, but who doesn’t want to live in paradise? You know what I mean? So that is what is going on. I will probably not be able to live here. I only live here ‘cause my grandma guys are here. If it wasn’t for that I would be gone. There is nothing for the young generation.”

Tyson Hawelu.

The inability to pass legislation that preserves appropriate housing options for the Hawaiian community by the U.S. and occupied State Government is a genocidal oversight that, whether conscious or not, is the last step to a long process of appropriating Hawaiian lands, waters, and resources for the enrichment of foreigners and a foreign military and government at the expense of Hawaiian health, prosperity, life and well-being. Providing affordable and culturally-appropriate housing options is a health issue that needs immediate attention for the sake of the next generation of Hawaiians on Kaua‘i.

5.4 The U.S. Military Occupation

"Military is another big blotch on our history. They are the most destructive people on the planet, the [US] military. What for? So that they can go out and kill people? Military is war, it’s a war machine, to kill humanity, to kill innocent women and children in many countries, all for power, for imperialism, for money and for greed. That is what America is, it is a greedy, war-mongering, power-crazy place that I do not want to belong to...

We went to visit [Puerto Rico], on a military mission, because they were being bombed at the same time we were being bombed, on Kaho‘olawe, same time, 60 long years. So I went there to give support, to share our stories, to try and unite ourselves... We got PRMF on Kaua‘i that is making us a target. Like Pearl Harbor, they weren’t after us, they were after the military. It was because of the military that we got attacked, not because our people were enemies. We had learned they were firing rockets from Mana [PMRF], headed to the Marshall Islands—real crazy, real stupid. We are against this. We went to storm the gates and got arrested for that. There was 7 of us that got arrested." [3] Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host on Kaua‘i Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kalahui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

2018 was a rough year for Hawai‘i. Historic flooding hit Kaua‘i in April, reaching nearly 50 inches of rain in 24 hours (1,262mm), causing damage to
homes, roads, cars and infrastructure, and breaking all previous US rainfall records. Volcanic eruptions on Moku O Keawe wiped out subdivisions; Hurricanes Lane, Norman, and Olivia passed nearby the archipelago leaving strong winds, high surf, and damaging rains; wildfires stoked by dry winds from approaching hurricanes spread fires that wiped out entire neighborhoods on Maui; and an errant state-wide missile alert that told everyone that Hawai‘i was about to be obliterated by an inbound missile, presumably from North Korea, went to every cell phone within range in the state and was not corrected for 38 minutes.

January 13, 2018, just after 8a.m. Pacific Time

Saturday morning was beginning in typical fashion. A large low-pressure weather system had arrived the day before, escorting with it dry conditions and gentle winds. The sun, having already crested the horizon an hour previously, was yearning for its upward zenith. Surfers were already en force on the North Shore of Kaua‘i, paddling out to catch winter waves. The signature Kaua‘i roosters--their ancestors freed from their cock-fighting cages by Hurricanes ‘Iniki and Iwa decades before—had kept watch from early morning hours until now, and continued to issue their shrill alarms. The baby chicks clucked in the bushes with their mothers on the sides of Kaua‘i roadways that were already clogged with tourists’ vehicles carrying passengers to beautiful Kaua‘i sites.

Nearly 110,000 tourists came to Kaua‘i that January (Dept. of Business, Economic Development, & Tourism, n.d.) and any number of them had already
begun their exodus from the 743 hotels and 3,614 Airbnb’s (Geminiani & DeLuca, 2018) to the destinations found in their guide books. Thousands of shiny late-model rental cars descended on the 2-lane road that encircles the perimeter of most of the island that morning, wreaking havoc on the daily lives of local people by making trips as simple as driving to the grocery store into a frustrating, slow-moving traveling odyssey. It was a typical Saturday morning on Kaua‘i.

Then suddenly, cell phones began to issue an alert in all capitals: “BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT INBOUND TO HAWAI‘I. SEEK IMMEDIATE SHELTER. THIS IS NOT A DRILL.” The alert had emitted to every cell phone in the Hawaiian Islands that was turned on and in range. It was 8:07am, Kaua‘i time.

The shock, disbelief, and uncertainty became palpable. While some people, without cell phones on or accompanying them, were oblivious to the life-changing alert-- others panicked. The television began to show a scrolling banner across the screen, accompanied by a voiceover warning people with the following message:

“The U.S. Pacific Command has detected a missile threat to Hawai‘i. A missile may impact on land or sea within minutes. THIS IS NOT A DRILL. If you are indoors, stay indoors. If you are outdoors, seek immediate shelter in a building. Remain indoors well away from windows. If you are driving, pull safely to the side of the road and seek shelter in a nearby...
building or lay on the floor. We will announce when the threat has ended. Take immediate action measures. THIS IS NOT A DRILL. Take immediate action measures.”

12 minutes. Those who knew how much time til missile strike fumbled with the mere minutes of normal life left, wrestling with comprehending the unexpected turn of events.

Radio on Kaua‘i also reported an incoming missile threat and advised people to take shelter. On my Facebook newsfeed, former students talked of holding their babies near them and weeping. Others reached out in disbelief—could this be real? Still others said tearful good-byes to their loved ones and friends; others advised their friends and family to turn to Jesus. People turned to various social media in their only immediate way to express themselves in the wake of jammed cell phone towers.

The erroneous missile alert was issued from a bunker in Diamondhead, on O‘ahu. Officials from the Hawaiian Emergency Management Agency were subsequently scrambling to issue a 2nd follow-up alert, assuring the public that the first alert was a mistake; however no ‘false alarm’ message existed in their software (Flynn, 2018). Although the agency posted on their social media platforms by 8:20am that the islands-wide missile alert was a mistake, it took officials fully 38 minutes to release a second state-wide cell phone alert, this time stating: “There is no missile threat or danger to the State of Hawai‘i. Repeat. False Alarm.” 8:45am. 38 minutes of uncertainty, impending doom,
tearful goodbyes, and panic. One father opened a man-hole cover and hid his children in the sewers. There were reports on Kaua‘i of others driving erratically in an effort to get home to loved ones. Sadly, one person died of a heart-attack, yet it was a miracle that more mishaps hadn’t occurred as a result of the misinformation.

In the ensuing weeks, anger was directed to the government worker who had inadvertently released the errant alert. A scathing op-ed in a prominent American newspaper (Washington Post, January 2018) penned by a haole immigrant, included indictments of Hawai‘i’s ineptitude compared to the continental United States. However, where was the anger in media and the public towards the American war machine? The United States had made the Hawaiian Islands vulnerable to such an attack by establishing Hawai‘i as the epicenter of American military operations for the Western hemisphere in the last half century, referred to by Aunty Puanani at the beginning of this section. Why wasn’t the American military highlighted as the cause of the problem? The U.S. has made Hawai‘i—formerly a neutral nation prior to occupation—the target for any potential enemies of America, thus warranting the need for missile alert programs.

“We all know the truth, that there hasn’t been any annexation. So we are not under the United States—they have no jurisdiction over us. It is all a game of pretend with them, and denial, in one ear and out the other. And because of an Act of War against us by the US Military in 1893, we have been militarily occupied since then. Under occupation, the international laws stand that we should be ruled under [Hawaiian] Kingdom Laws as an occupied nation, not the state laws that they are trying to impose on us and shove down our throats. That is something that needs to be corrected! We are supposed to be governed under
Kingdom laws as an occupied nation! Our own laws!” Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Community-Radio show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kala Hui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

The American military machine has brought about the demise of Hawaiian health due to the occupation and ongoing colonization that it ensured, starting with a group of racist, ragtag haole sugar planters in the 1890s who couldn’t stand for Hawaiian self-governance to impede potential business profits (Niheu, Turbin, & Yamada, 2007). These ambitious businessmen could never have snatched self-governance away from Kānaka Maoli had it not been for the overwhelming military back up of the U.S. Navy. And although the military temporarily withdrew for 5 years after the Overthrow until a new President agreed to unconstitutionally seize the Islands, the threat of American retaliation, should Hawaiians dare to pick up weapons against Americans to reclaim their homeland, must have been a possibility in everyone’s minds.

To give one an idea of the military power that is stationed in Hawai‘i, and its significance and centrality to America’s military operation, Hawai‘i is the home of the United States Indo-Pacific Command, formerly USPACOM. This massive multi-agency unified military machine oversees operations for over 100 million square miles, or over half the Earth’s surface, stretching from California to India and from the Arctic to the Antarctic. It is supported by US Army, US Marines, US Air Force, the US Pacific Fleet, US Forces Japan, US Forces Korea, Special Operations Pacific and Special Operations Korea (Ferguson & Turnbull,
Because Hawai‘i is on the front lines of America’s military operations, it is the only state with a system implemented to rapidly notify residents via cell phones of incoming missile threats.

On Moku O Keawe, the US military has installed a 109,000-acre bombing range between Mauna Kea and Mauna Loa that is the largest military site in the islands. The Army discharges 7 million rounds of ammunition annually here, and hopes to expand the site by an additional 79,000 acres of land. Also, on Moku Keawe, people have discovered unexploded ordnance, and ammunitions on the land and sea including grenades, shells, rockets, mortars, napalm bombs, and missiles, even killing 9 people who came upon the unexploded ordnances (LaDuke & Cruz, 2013).

Kaho‘olawe is an island that was completely taken over by the U.S. military in World War II, and became a bombing range thereafter. Kānaka Maoli risked their lives and even died to protect this island and protest its bombing, beginning in the 1970s. Due to the efforts of Kānaka Maoli across the islands, the US military agreed to stop bombing Kaho‘olawe. The clean-up effort has surpassed $400 million USD (LaDuke & Cruz, 2013).

Depleted uranium, something the US military denied was on their sites in Hawai‘i, was later discovered to be found at Schofield Barracks Base as part

110 This movement was during a time known as the Hawaiian Renaissance—when the reclamation of Hawaiian language, culture, history, identity, and political power experienced revival in the islands.
of the development of a top-secret nuclear weapon known as the Davy Crockett (LaDuke & Cruz, 2013). Depleted uranium is a probable carcinogen and is known by the World Health Organization to have a deleterious impact on kidneys and lungs (Arfsten, Still & Ritchie, 2001). If top secret weapons development is occurring in Hawai‘i, the US government makes the islands even more a target for America’s enemies.

Three of the four Environmental Agency-identified Superfund clean-up sites in Hawai‘i are a result of the US military poisoning the land and water of Hawai‘i, on military installations on O‘ahu. The first, at Schofield Barracks—the largest US Army base in the U.S. (Ireland, 2011) --is cleaning up groundwater contaminated with trichloroethane. This chemical, according to the Center for Disease Control in the United States, is known to cause damage to the liver, nervous system, kidneys, blood, immune system, heart, and body weight, as well as causing an autoimmune disease known as scleroderma, after only short-term exposure (Agency for Toxic Substances & Disease Registry, n.d.).

At all of the previous Naval Computer and Telecommunications Area Master Station Eastern Pacific sites around O‘ahu, the EPA is cleaning up polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), volatile organic compounds, semi-volatile organic compounds, and metals. The third Superfund site is located at Pearl Harbor military installation--an area encompassing 1200 acres (Ireland, 2011)
-- where soil, sediment, and groundwater has become poisoned with metals, organic compounds, and petroleum hydrocarbons. \textsuperscript{111}

\textbf{5.5 Federal Recognition}

“Now the DOI thing, the Department of Interior thing, they came in 2014, and the Hawaiian people came out and said, ‘We don’t want the DOI. We want our independence. We want our land.’ But federal recognition has been a push \textsuperscript{[of the DOI]} even after all the people had spoken that they don’t want \textsuperscript{[federal recognition.] They don’t want to be governed by the federal government, and recognized as a Native Hawaiian tribe, and be given their piece of land where they can be Native Hawaiians and be forgotten. They want to run all of Hawai‘i and take care of the land, and be gatekeepers of their own land.\textsuperscript{[Native American] Tribes get funding from the federal government, and they become dependent on the federal government to feed them and support them, and that is basically gonna happen in Hawai‘i [if we agree to recognition.] So what \textsuperscript{[certain official] wants, is that the government of the United States can have all the land and have everything, you know, like all of Hawai‘i and Hawaiians would have only a little land. You know what I am saying? It is just like bondage, in our own land...And that is why I really oppose the DOI coming in...”\textsuperscript{112} Ku‘uleialoha Punua, President of KKOA.

“The way I was brought up, ho‘oponopono...it was the way to not only resolve something but also bring peace to a situation and to actually have forgiveness between each other, with the highest resolve of making things pono, making things right...I was recently at the Department of Interior [Federal Recognition] meetings, and I also attended a prelude to the meetings with [Hawai‘i Senate member] Colleen Hanabusa who came to Kaua‘i. It seemed like she was trying to help...She was speaking specifically to the Hawaiian Homes group in Anahola, and was citing the different legal sequence of things. But it didn’t seem like the community understood what she was saying; instead, what [the community] did do, was voice their trauma. Grown men were brought to tears...They were trying to ask for a solution...They were citing the unfairness and the theft and the trauma...I thought, is there someone to whom the beneficiaries could outline their concerns? In other words, we could have a separate person, a lawyer, who understands and could separately address the people’s concerns, funded by the trust itself...separate from the [OHA] trustees. Because it was interesting that evening, no one understood what she was presenting. If a lawyer was there, who could examine all that has happened legally, and then represent the

\textsuperscript{111} Environmental Protection Agency, https://www.epa.gov/superfund/search-superfund-sites-where-you-live

\textsuperscript{112} Ku‘uleialoha Punua, Personal Communication, 2016.
beneficiaries, not the trustees...and have some method of understanding...It was interesting, because after Hanabusa was the Department of Interior [Federal Recognition] meeting and they [the DOI representatives] wanted the beneficiaries to sign an agreement, saying [the beneficiaries] were in agreement with what the [U.S.] Department of Interior was proposing. But how can they sign something they may not even fully understand? You can’t do that. The future of Hawai’i, millions of dollars, and they are being pressured to sign this and agree with what the Department of Interior is proposing...The beneficiaries should have someone legally represent their interests, and establish a format for the beneficiaries to understand all the aspects of what it means legally...It is just what is right. It would be fair.”

Pono, Grandmother, Dancer, Artist.

July 1, 2014. It was a warm evening on the windward side of Kaua’i. The trade winds were not reaching the brightly-lit cafeteria of Kapa‘a Elementary school, where people had gathered to participate in the special hearing ordered by the U.S. Department of Interior. The DOI, under the Obama Administration, had come to Hawai’i to convene meetings with the Kānaka community, gathering input regarding the U.S. Government’s offer to grant Kānaka Maoli federal recognition as a tribe--a dependent nation under U.S. rule.

People sat patiently at lunch tables, utilizing copies of the evening’s agenda as personal hand-held fans, waiting patiently as different ones spoke. The air hung warm and still, the stillness laden with the possibility of speaking back; it enveloped people in a sense of anticipation and promise, as if one could hear in the low murmurs the echoes of the generations who had come before.

113 Pono, Personal Communication, November 2016.
A dignified woman in her 60s stepped up to share her manaʻo before the panel of US government representatives. The stately, elegant entertainer and kupuna, her jet-black hair woven in a slender rope upon her shoulder, glowed in a white muʻumuʻu as she approached the microphone. She graciously greeted the formal, unsmiling foreigners who were seated on the stage. She began her turn at the mic by thanking the panel for listening to everyone. She hoped they would take this input—the anger and frustration-- back to President Obama to “make things pono for us.” Standing at the front of the auditorium, she explained Kānaka connections to their ancestors, and how every Kanaka in the room had their kūpuna from the beginning of time standing with them at this meeting. The elder woman entreated the panel to hear what her kūpuna had to say to them. And then suddenly, in response to the federal government’s offer to make the Hawaiians a tribe in their own lands, she turned her back to the stage and stood silently, not moving. The whole auditorium watched, hushed. Tears stung my eyes as a deafening silence crashed into the room. Throughout the hall, and throughout the generations, you could hear a collective resounding roar: ‘AʻOLE!’ in response to the USA’s offer to give the Hawaiians tribal, dependent status underneath the US government. The Hawaiian people were refusing—it was time to restore justice and sovereignty and give the foreign interlopers the boot.

This was the sentiment that was expressed repeatedly that night, and at the other meetings held by the DOI across the islands that summer.
Overwhelmingly, individuals asserted that the land had been unlawfully seized, and that it was time to return it to the Hawaiian people (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua & Kuwada, 2018; Chang, 2015). Hawaiians did not want to be second-class American citizens, or have a tribal government-to-government relationship with the USA that made them financially dependent on the federal government. Instead, they were seeking justice, desiring what was rightfully theirs—the rich, beautiful, magnificent Hawaiian Islands and their self-governance thereof.

This was the same sentiment expressed by Hawaiians in 1893 when their Queen was deposed and their Kingdom overtaken by a cadre of business men backed by the US Marines (Sai, 2015; Silva, 2004); the same cry for the return of their beloved land when Kānaka organized petitions and the majority of the Kingdom citizens signed it, declaring they did not agree with annexation; the same cry heard in 1897 when the U.S. Congress unconstitutionally voted to annex the sovereign Hawaiian Kingdom under a joint resolution (Kanaʻiaupuni & Malone, 2006). ‘Give back the land—’Aʻole—no! to becoming part of your nation, or a tribe within your nation. We want our Kingdom returned.’

As the elegant kupuna left the mic, she acknowledged the Creator, ‘Mahalo Ke Akua,’ and met with applause from the mostly Kānaka crowd as she returned to her seat in the auditorium.

The occupying government keeps Hawaiian sovereignty on a “permanent state of deferral” (Salazar, 2017). As the U.S. Constitution does not honor pre-existing Indigenous relationships to land and self-determination (H. Trask,
many Hawaiians have given up hope that their Kingdom will be restored to them (Chang, 2015). Concerns exist that Hawaiians who work for state agencies such as the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Department of Hawaiian Homelands do not represent the Hawaiian people, but instead represent the state who employs them in their push for federal recognition. Many of these advocates of federal recognition earn their money from federal grants and salaries associated with the occupying state (Kauanui, 2005).

Indigenous scholars lament that state recognition will not work to achieve Indigenous Nationhood as it does not result in actually transforming the colonialist condition (Alfred, 2009; Coulthard, 2014). The politics of recognition actually reinstitute the very power structures from which Indigenous people are seeking emancipation (Coulthard, 2014:6). Recognition does not restore Indigenous autonomy, culture, or government but aligns Indigenous people to hegemonic structures of power and governance currently in existence. “Indigenous people focused on a quest for power within a paradigm bounded by the vocabulary, logic and institutions of sovereignty will be blind to the reality of a persistent intent to maintain the colonial oppression of Indigenous nations” (Alfred, 2011: 119).

The Federal government claims it has no trust obligations to the Hawaiians, so they do not oversee the state of Hawai‘i’s treatment of Kānaka Maoli (M. Trask, 2008). The Akaka Bill, explained below, was proposed to create a Hawaiian governing entity in order to speak on behalf of the Hawaiian
people with the state and federal governments, establishing Hawaiians as a domestic dependent nation. Opponents instead want to end the 125+ year occupation of their country (Sai, 2008).

The Akaka Bill, or the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act, was introduced by US Senator Daniel Akaka in 2005 (Kauanui, 2008; Hirsch, 2015). This bill would bring the United States’ federal Indian policy to Hawaiians, giving them the same status as Native American nations; however, certain Hawaiian activists rejected this, stating Hawaiians’ exceptionalism as a previously internationally-recognized sovereign nation, instead of criticizing America’s imperialist subjugation of Native Americans on the Continent previous to their own conquest by the US (Byrd, 2011). The Akaka Bill failed to pass, after successive attempts; instead in 2011, the Hawai‘i State Legislature passed Act 195, the First Nations’ Government Bill, to enact a roll of Kānaka Maoli as a first step in creating a Hawaiian governing entity subject to the state and federal US governments (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2014).

Yet a movement of Hawaiians rejecting Federal Recognition is growing in the islands, viewing the settler state’s motives as a policy of containment vs restoring a level of self-governance (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua & Kuwada, 2018). Hawaiian opponents of Federal Recognition, whether through the failed Akaka Bill or the DOI’s activities, see the politics of recognition as a ruse for elimination and genocide vs. restoration (Milner & Goldberg, 2008). Federal recognition is seen as a derailment of Hawaiians’ increasing demands for
independence and ultimately an attempt to finally extinguish Hawaiian claims to land (Kauanui, 2005 & 2008; Salazar, 2017). “Recognition as a tribe is far less than what Hawaiians deserve and far less than what the history of US-Native Hawaiian relations demands in terms of reparations, restitution, or sovereignty” (Chang, 2015: p.74).

It is likely that any move to assign the Hawaiian people federal recognition, proffered by the American government, is a veiled attempt to contain Hawaiian land rights for the benefit of state and federal governments and potential business investors.

The Coco Palms development has floundered since the Hawaiian activists’ prolonged occupation; at the time of this writing (March 2019) it has defaulted. It is not clear from news reports if the prolonged occupation undermined the developers’ ability to attract investors. This situation reflects a tension in current settler colonial governments where Indigenous peoples’ rights conflict with business peoples’ ambitions, undermining economic security for investors (Blackburn, 2005). By achieving certainty via containment of Hawaiian rights and land claims, business interests can move forward unhindered in their pursuit of economic profitability. Wealthy land owners and businesses in Hawai‘i seek quiet title actions and other legal mechanisms in order to achieve containment of Hawaiian land access and Kānaka rights, in order to enjoy unhindered exclusive access to land for either enjoyment or profit.
There is a proverb in Hawaiian culture that positions the time before you as the time that came before, and the time behind you is the time to come, ka wā ma mua, ka wā ma hope (Ching, 2003). To look towards the future, one must look at the time that came before. Besides rejecting the DOI’s offer, when the elder turned her back on the crowd, she may have been speaking to the U.S. Government representatives about her people’s future, by turning her back to look at the past. This was similar to the iconic Braddah Iz on his famous album cover for Facing Future, with the directive to look backward to the ancestors, to their words they spoke in 1893 and 1897; to read the letters from Queen Lili‘uokalani imploring the U.S. Presidents to give back the Hawaiian Kingdom which was illegally taken. By her simple gesture, the elder may have been beseeching the panel to do their research, discover the true history of Hawai‘i, listen to the ancestors; that her response was their response. The Panel from Washington D.C., though understanding the rejection evident in the act, may have missed the deeper meanings conveyed by her response.

Many of the older generation rejected federal recognition as a cheap substitute for the glory that was once theirs, or that of their forebears—self-governance, and sole stewards of the ‘āina. While there have always been individuals who have done so, the Hawaiian Nation as a whole historically could not be bought out by money. Federal recognition is a shadow of their former self-governance; without a restoration of land, the gaping wounds
inflicted on the Hawaiian people will not heal. Only when the island chain is restored to the Hawaiian people will the wellness of their bodies, families, lands and waters be revitalized.
Chapter 6: Moving Forward on Kauaʻi: The Women’s Visions for their Island Community & the Next Generation

6.1 Overview

“This is a Renaissance going on. Our people are waking up...Kānaka Maoli voice is getting stronger and stronger! We fear not anymore. We have Ke Akua on our side. Ke Akua’s laws are the laws we follow, not theirs.” Puanani Rogers, Director of Hoʻokipa Network for Kauaʻi; Host of Kauaʻi Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign,’ Kauaʻi Poʻo of Kala Hui Hawaiʻi; Peleikikena of Hui Aloha Ō Nā Wāhine O Waiʻaleʻale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

The vibrant and resilient leaders who participated in this project are powerful women who exhibit their Aloha ʻĀina via everyday acts of Resurgence—works that are all too often unseen and uncredited—working daily to sow hope for the next generation, uncover their history, restore food sovereignty, and build up the future of their beloved communities. As evidenced by Aunty Puanani Roger’s words above, for the women I interviewed and continue to work with, this hope and vision for the future fuels their daily choices, actions, and community-building. I have come to see this as Aloha ʻĀina in action. As discussed in this paper, Aloha ʻĀina has many meanings revolving around the restoration of the land and Hawaiian self-governance. Throughout the thesis, the women’s stories of Aloha ʻĀina and of caring for the next generation were the catalysts for their activism and service to their communities.

I bring this thesis to a close with a discussion of Aloha ʻĀina, because it is through the deep love and bond that the women in this dissertation have with the ʻāina or with their beloved occupied Nation that imbues their words,
making Aloha ʻĀina foundational to this research. Aloha ʻĀina is a concept that encapsulates the women’s deep familial connection to “that which feeds us” and to the past for the sake of the future generations of Kānaka Maoli on Kauaʻi.

The women in this study exhibit their everyday acts of Aloha ʻĀina in a myriad of ways, as exemplified in the previous chapters: through working to protect their communities from GMO experimentation and pesticide spraying run amok; by teaching the next generation about the ahuapuaʻa they live in & about the values of Hawaiian culture; by pushing government agencies to release land for their children; by protecting sacred places; by supporting Hawaiians to grow their own traditional foods in their yards and neighborhoods; and by delivering fresh food door-to-door during a pandemic.

The deeper meaning behind these acts of Aloha ʻĀina and of caring for the next generation reveal the catalysts for many of the women leaders’ activism and service to their communities. Aloha ʻĀina, as evidenced in the women’s talk-story sessions, is a living and evolving concept that is changing with the generations, taking on new aspects and expression as the needs and goals of each generation adapt to external conditions.

For some, especially in the older generation, expressions of Aloha ʻĀina encompassed not only a dedication to the physical ʻāina—the land and water of their island home—but even more prominently, a rejection of Federal Recognition. Instead of American recognition of Hawaiians as a tribe within
their occupied land, several kūpuna participants reflected both a patriotism & a love for the Hawaiian Kingdom, and a desire to see Hawai‘i gain its independence from the USA. These women leaders had heard the stories of their grandparents, who had heard the stories of their grandparents, who had been alive during the Hawaiian Kingdom era. This made the past very real for some of the older co-participants. Their aspirations, activism, and vision for the next generation can be understood within this context.

This older generation is incredibly invaluable to the activists of the next generation, as their viewpoint can see 125+ years behind them. They can offer a broader vision to the younger generations of who they are, and where they came from. They can truly look back to effectively see Hawai‘i’s future. For this reason and many others, the elder generation is invaluable to the younger ones.

For the younger mākua generation, with ages spanning their 20s to 40s, Aloha ‘Āina was exemplified in the talk-story sessions primarily through a love for the ‘Āina and a desire to connect and preserve it for their descendants. This generation expressed their Aloha ‘Āina by doing the work necessary to directly raise the next generation rather than an obvious identification with the restoration of the occupied Kingdom. Their focus was understandably more on
material survival and providing for their family’s existence; while their views on restored Sovereignty were not immediately visible.114

Additional research is warranted to fully examine what the women co-participants of the mākua generation felt regarding issues surrounding Hawaiian Sovereignty and Federal Recognition. What became clear in the research is that many of the women in this generation, much like the leaders before them, are fiercely dedicated to the ʻĀina and displayed a determination to survive on the Island and raise their children, while preserving the land, water, and food systems for the next generation.

While I enjoyed previous relationships with many of the co-participants prior to this research, I had no idea of the depth of their families’ struggles for land; nor was I aware of the histories of pain, or their dreams for the future. As a result of slowing down to listen deeply to their thoughts, their stories, and their futurities, I have been impacted as the listener; their words have been powerful.

Over the years of researching and writing this dissertation, I have been changed indelibly by the force of their words. Where before I was an unofficial ally to my friends, colleagues and neighbors, I am now much more aware of the malevolent backstory that has shaped the islands’ trajectory. As I can see more

114 Many of the older generation brought up a love for the Hawaiian Kingdom & dreaming of restored sovereignty, but this theme didn’t come up in the interviews with the younger generations.
clearly my friends’ identities within the context of long-term occupation I am able to support Hawaiian Resurgence in a more deliberate way.

The critical need for Hawaiian Sovereignty has become central to my thoughts; a quiet but persistent urgency has increased within me that those of us who are white and have a platform must utilize it for justice when addressing issues of occupation and stolen land. We can express our own Aloha ‘Āina as allies, by loving our Hawaiian neighbors and honoring their histories and struggles. And as Aloha ‘Āina is a verb and not a noun, we allies cannot only be witnesses, but must take action. We must self-educate and then activate. It is my hope that other whites like myself will see more clearly the series of injustices that have been perpetuated against the Hawaiian people by the American government and thus advocate for restoration of land, resources, and sovereignty to the Hawaiian people & for all Indigenous Nations who have been occupied by the USA.

In this chapter, I will explore the broader concept of Aloha ‘Āina, as well as its distinct expression via a specific Hawaiian non-profit, KKOA--the Anahola-based women-run organization that is featured prominently in this research. The women of KKOA exemplify Aloha ‘Āina in the Hawaiian Homelands community of Anahola through caring for the families and next generation; and via supporting the restoration of Hawaiian food sovereignty through the establishment of their Agricultural and Youth Training Center, Ulupono Anahola. This research has in part been influenced in its trajectory
through direction from KKOA; additionally, this study is assisting in establishing funding for KKOA to continue its important work, as I serve as grant-writer to the organization, utilizing this research to help frame requests for funding.

6.2 Aloha ʻĀina as Hawaiian Resurgence

When reading the women’s stories of Aloha ʻĀina in this study, it is crucial to recognize it within the larger historical context of Aloha ʻĀina in the Hawaiian Nation. Aloha ʻĀina is a Hawaiian concept that can translate to both a love for the physical ʻāina, as well as a love for the actual Hawaiian Kingdom government. Aloha ʻĀina, described by Hawaiian scholar Kilikoi as the “most basic and fundamental expression of the Hawaiian experience” (Kilikoi, 2010: 75), points to the deep and intimate relationship that existed and continues between Kānaka Maoli and both their beloved land and nationhood. Aloha ʻĀina is captured in hundreds of Hawaiian mele, and is reflective of the love, the familial bond, and the honor of the land’s beauty that is part of Hawaiian culture. It also represents Hawaiian patriotism, but rather than extolling the loyalty of a people group, it represents a deep loyalty to the land itself (Silva, 2004), a love for the land that is interconnected with the chiefs and the people.

Aloha ʻĀina is a verb, and not a noun, in that it signifies action and participation (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2013), loving the land and defending the nation, the Mōʻi, and the islands. As I have shown throughout this thesis, the women of Kauaʻi express this in their everyday work, which shows their love of
the ‘Āina and the Nation. Aloha ‘Āina is committing passionately to preservation of both healthy Kanaka relationship with the land & waters and healthy self-governance—something that the haole oligarchy that conducted the Overthrow and the ensuing US government has undercut and actively opposed. As described in Chapter 3, Hawaiians have been forced off the land and relegated as interlopers in their own islands; the provisional government that endeavored to sever the Hawaiian people from the islands, and subjugate them to a haole oligarchy whose prime motivation was greed and power. This leadership locked in their domination and control of the islands and set a trajectory of subjugation of Kānaka Maoli that is being resisted to this day through the assertion of Aloha ‘Āina.

Hawaiian intellectual and ground-breaking scholar Noenoe Silva states that Aloha ‘Āina was the “cornerstone” of the Hawaiian struggle to regain the Kingdom in the last decade of the 19th century (Silva, 2004:11). Emma ‘Aʻima Aʻii Nawahi and her husband and colleagues developed this discourse as resistance to the Provisional Government and an expression of loyalty to their Queen and the restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The women in this study personify this resistance today; they keep the flame of Aloha ‘Āina alive to lead the way for the younger ones coming after them.

Historically, the Kānaka Maoli who fought the haole coup and potential American occupation referred to themselves as “ka poʻe aloha ‘āina” or “the people who love the ‘āina and nation” (Silva, 2004: 131). The male Poʻe Aloha
ʻĀina brazenly emblazoned their chests with tatoos of “Aloha ʻĀina” in defiance of the Provisional Government. Poʻe Aloha ʻĀina means more than the English word for patriot, as it had to do with deep affection and connection to the Hawaiian Islands as well as the Hawaiian Kingdom (Silva, 2004; Kilikoi, 2010; Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2013).

Leaders within the Hawaiian nation formed the Hui Aloha ʻĀina as an organized political group, comprised of both a women’s and a men’s division, representing nearly half of the electorate. Silva was the first scholar in Hawaiian studies to write of this significant group, a nationalist entity that was a tour de force at the forefront of the Hawaiian resistance. Hui Aloha ʻĀina provided extensive documentation regarding the 1893 coup to the U.S. Government during President Cleveland’s appointed investigation of the Overthrow; much of their documentation was included in Senator Blount’s damning report against the white usurpers. Under the leadership of Queen Liliʻuokalani in exile, Hui Aloha ʻĀina also organized an archipelago-wide petition drive that forcefully withstood the initial U.S. Congressional attempt to annex the occupied Hawaiian Kingdom via treaty in 1897 (Silva, 2004).

During the 1970s, Aloha ʻĀina again emerged in Hawaiian politics, becoming part of the lexicon of the Hawaiian sovereignty movement through which Kānaka sought the restoration of land rights and Hawaiian land stewardship (Gupta, 2015).
“...Aloha ‘Āina as a practice of sustainable self-determination is a strategy for both economic and political autonomy, and is a concept that brings personal and state-level responsibilities together in one framework. To practice Aloha ‘Āina thus is to engage in a struggle to counter the interwoven political, economic, and environmental injustices that Native Hawaiian communities face today” (Gupta, 2015: 535). Yet, Aloha ‘Āina runs deeper than loving the land and water, or being a patriot, but encompasses a spiritual component also. As Kuʻuleialoha Punua described it, Aloha ‘Āina represents being aligned with righteous spiritual governance as well. It is deeply recognizing that one has to be in right alignment with both earthly and spiritual governance, being loyal to those aliʻi who are protecting you and protecting the land; by loving them and being right with them, you are loving the ‘Āina. ‘The Sovereignty of the land is perpetuated by the righteousness of the people.’ As the people live righteously, they protect the sovereignty of the land, and also the life of the land, interchangeably. It is within this historical context that the women of Kauaʻi express their Aloha ‘Āina in everyday acts, both seen and unseen, for the future of their communities.

Utilizing Aloha ‘Āina as a rallying cry continues in new generations of resistance. Aloha ‘Āina was a concept utilized by both Kānaka Maoli and non-

116 The basis for the current occupying state government’s motto, taken from a statement made by King Kamehameha III in 1843.
Indigenous activists protesting the widespread implantation of transgenic seeds in the Hawaiian Islands during the protests of 2014 (See Chapter 4). Various non-Hawaiian activists may have interpreted the concept singularly as a restoration of the land, water and food systems rather than a deeper and broader commitment to the reinstitution of Hawaiian governance in the islands and the restoration of Hawaiian people. One scholar speaks to this use of this framework in the fight against GMO industrial agriculture in Hawai‘i.

“...[A]loha ‘Āina...draws productively upon native orientations towards sustainability, even though it is at times operationalized in a way that elides the material realities of Indigenous displacement” (Hobart, 2016:429). To support the restoration of the land and waters, one must support the reinstitution of righteous Kānaka Maoli governance over the lands that belong to them.

Any activist movement in the islands that supports the restoration of the earth and natural resources but doesn’t concurrently support the restoration of Hawaiian governance is cut off from the root of the degradation of the land and seascapes and merely reinforces a different vision of displacement of the original host people. Whether supporting the preservation of a pristine paradise for wealthy haole’s enjoyment or pushing back on GMO experimentation for the health of families in the community, these complementary interests have different visions for the use of the land, but neither will necessarily result in justice for the Kānaka Maoli. It is encumbent upon those of us who are haole
allies, when advocating for environmental issues, to be aware and empowered to support the restoration of lands and governance to the Hawaiian people simultaneously.

6.3 Aloha ʻĀina today: Women’s Resurgence on Kaua‘i

Throughout the talk-story sessions I shared with these leaders over the last several years, the women’s motivation to continue with their work is rooted in the complex relationships, histories, and politics expressed in Aloha ʻĀina. The women’s motivations include concern for the next generation; a desire to preserve the ʻĀina; a desire to perpetuate Hawaiian culture & values; a restoration of Hawaiian food sovereignty; and a yearning to return to de-occupation & Hawaiian sovereignty. Aunty Puanani’s words encapsulate both the exigency and the anguish experienced by kūpuna and mākua alike to preserve the younger generations from the annihilation of colonialism:

“In fact, all I do is for our future generations, not for me. It is not a selfish thing. If it is selfish, then it is wrong. It is not Ke Akua’s way. So how do we save the future for our children? When people are trying to kill it? They are trying to kill, trying to steal, my babies’ futures. They do not realize they are killing the future of our babies. That is heart breaking, and it hurts all of us so badly...” Aunty Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho‘okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Kaua‘i Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kalahui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ʻĀina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

Both the kūpuna and the mākua generation participants in this study felt a great responsibility to work for the benefit of their own children and for the next generation of Hawaiian children in their communities. The women’s Aloha ʻĀina was expressed through their urgency to preserve the land and
waters for their children, as well as work for the next generation to know their identity and true history. It is this concern for the next generation that makes these women leaders in their communities, doing the daily work of Resurgence that often goes unnoticed in the wider colonial-settler society and in the Academy.

Crystal Bilyeu expressed her Aloha ʻĀina through her nonprofit work in the Anahola community. Her vision was to build up the youth in their true Hawaiian identity & accurate portrayal of their history via the mentoring of the next generation by community aunties and uncles. Through her own process of overcoming her struggles, she wanted to offer them spiritual support in order to provide community and hope.

“I got people...that would be more than willing to teach the kids, you know....giving them some kind of identity and purpose. And I can only give them what I know to be true, and that works. So I can give them spirituality, I can give them connecting them to community, I can give them hope. I certainly wouldn’t be here today without the Lord’s help...In the sense if we don’t educate our keiki today, about yesterday, then they not gonna know, and that will kill them. Their life span is not going to be long...death is not only physical. Now I might cry ‘cause I have died inside a couple times, being let down and through all my trials and tribulations, I was a walking dead woman...KKOA hits home for me ‘cause there were many times I did not want to be here. But...God said, no, I get one purpose for you...Get up, stop feeling sorry for yourself, and keep on going. So, here I am today.”117 Crystal Bilyeu, former KKOA Vice-President, mother, musician.

As seen in Crystal’s story, women-led organizations like KKOA are offering hope and support for the next generation of Hawaiian youth. As

KKOA’s mission is to empower the Hawaiian community of Anahola in their identity and self-sufficiency, they are nurturing space from which Aloha ‘Āina can be cultivated in the next generation and in the families of Anahola.

Another crucial site for cultivating Aloha‘Āina in the community and mentoring the next generation is within the context of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty, as shared by Lorilani Keohokalole-Torio:

“There are so many micro-farms that are successfully running on [Kaua‘i]. They are young guys, families that got together to open up farms. They can be mentors for people...”

Lorilani Keohokalole-Torio, mother, activist, formerly alaka‘i of M.O.M. Hui and former H.A.P.A. Board member.

KKOA, who is currently establishing an Agricultural Training Center on Hawaiian Homelands, has looked to other models in the islands like Ma‘o Farms and the Waipā Foundation, where Hawaiian leaders have established Hawaiian Food Sovereignty programs that have supported the youth and young adults towards successful futures. Kaua‘i has much potential to develop sites of mentoring in agricultural endeavors. Hope in the restoration of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty was woven throughout the talk-story sessions in this research, as seen in discussions with Stacy Sproat-Beck, who is mentoring youth at Waipā:

“We hope to be able to create opportunities that are ‘āina-based that can actually have financial returns for people within our community here, that can also preserve cultural connections as well.

“One lesson that we have learned is to start the kids in our programs from a younger age. We start them in kindergarten, and try to keep them coming back

every year. So, we build on their knowledge, and build a community for them, an ‘ohana here. The youth gain life, leadership and work skills; they establish a deeper connection to the land; they find that they have a community both here and among the other groups and communities that we are connected with statewide. We are like family to kids that have been participating for many years. So they have a family-community connection; they have a connection with and a responsibility to the land; they have skills, and we try to keep it fun at the same time. So, they love this place and want to come back and care for it. Those connections also help to create resilience and accountability in them which helps to keep them from [self-destructive cycles] or helps them to come back when they go there. It’s obviously easier to be preventative in the beginning than to get them back after having gone there but unrealistic to expect that of everyone.”

Stacy Sproat-Beck, Director of the Waipā Foundation.

Restoring Hawaiian Food Sovereignty with the next generation not only passes down Hawaiian culture, improves Hawaiian health, and provides potential economic pathways that are alternatives to tourism; but it also supports the youth in healing from the trauma of colonization, thus potentially preserving them from dealing with colonialism in potentially harmful ways. As we saw with the Indigenous Determinants of Health framework explored in earlier chapters, many factors under colonialism contribute to the suffering of the Kānaka Maoli population. The restoration of Hawaiian Food Sovereignty is one viable pathway to address many of these interlinking factors.

The recent suicide crisis on the East side underscored the need to provide hope, health, and community to the younger generation. Additionally, the recent pandemic sweeping the globe has underscored the necessity of diversifying the Hawaiian economy away from tourism and utilizing the

agricultural productivity on Kaua‘i to support the people economically & spiritually.

“We have land and resources to create a diverse agriculture, [to] create jobs and opportunities for the community, [to] creates that agricultural economy. A lot of things can grow here... They did a study recently showing the hale koa [tree] that is so prevalent produces higher ethanol than ibizias. There are things we can do to create job opportunities for our community. Nobody is being able to live their lives because they are trying to provide and feed their family, so there is a lot of resentment, and emotional things that come up. Toxic things like alcoholism and other things that come up to numb yourself from the struggle, so then you create all these family problems, hurtful relationships.” Tiana Laranio, mother, activist, former M.O.M. Hui member and KKOA BOD member

Supporting the agricultural training of the next generation of Kānaka Maoli within a culturally appropriate context will support them in recovering from the toxic legacy colonialism has left. It is one approach to chipping away at those daunting health statistics outlined in this study and reverse the oppression of the Indigenous population in the Hawaiian Islands. Hawaiian Food Sovereignty also encapsulates land tenure and self-governance as well as perpetuating Hawaiian culture; creating food security; and re-introducing traditional foods for a healthier diet.

To even begin the work of restoring Hawaiian Food Sovereignty, Hawaiians first need access to land. As has been outlined in previous chapters, it is extremely difficult to ever obtain land as a Hawaiian; KKOA had to struggle for over a decade to be entrusted with lands through which to support the local community. Hawaiians not only lost their lands under American rule; it is an epic struggle just to have access to land at any level over which to steward. Whatever lands Hawaiians had access to historically, after the ascendance of
the haole planter class, they were marginal, without water, and not suitable to agricultural sustainability.

The passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act gave some hope Hawaiians would be restored to land for ranching and farming; however, again the haole planter class were able to retain the best farmlands. The occupying state government has continued to put a chokehold on the release of funds to DHHL such that very few lands are ever distributed to Native Hawaiians, especially in comparison to the number of Hawaiians requesting land.

Just this month, July 2020, the Supreme Court of the State of Hawai‘i ruled that those Hawaiians who have been sitting on the waitlist with DHHL, awaiting a land award for decades, are entitled to compensation for the government’s gross mishandling of the distribution of land awards. Since the time this lawsuit was first brought before the court 2 decades ago, over 400 Hawaiians have died waiting on this list. It remains to be seen if any monies will actually be awarded the Hawaiian beneficiaries (Hofschneider, 2020).

To achieve sustainable Food Sovereignty models, arable land and access to water must be released immediately to Native Hawaiians. The government must allocate funds earmarked for the infrastructure needed on Hawaiian Homelands, or relinquish governance back to Hawaiians due to the inability to protect and serve the needs of the Native Hawaiian population. The neglect and marginalization of the Hawaiian people, upon whose culture the occupying state’s entire tourism economy is built upon, is a travesty of justice. The
occupying government must do an about-face and release money, lands, and justice to Kānaka Maoli.

The Hawaiian women leaders featured in this study have shared their hearts and lives in this study. Their example of Aloha ʻĀina lived out on a daily basis, often unacknowledged and unpaid, demands a response. The alternative, to be complacent, is to participate in the slow genocide of the Hawaiian people. Those of us who are listening cannot ignore this Kāhea to Action any longer. Those of us who are haole must add our voices, privilege and power on the side of Justice, following the lead of these incredible women.

6.4 Aloha ʻĀina in Anahola: KKOA’s everyday expression of Resurgence

Everyday acts of Resurgence are often conducted by women, outside of the public eye or in daily struggles that are often not seen as political in the same way as larger visible struggles for sovereignty. Haulani Fernandez spoke in her stories the innumerable amount of times she had to call or show up at the DHHL offices, before anything was accomplished. She has had to be determined across years and decades, speaking up continually against the occupying state and the forces she had to contend in order to advocate for her family to have access to land. Having lived next door to Haulani for years, I witnessed her expression of Aloha ʻĀina on a weekly basis through her drive towards supporting the youth and community, and her struggle for obtaining land for her descendants.
Kuʻuleialoha Punua and KKOA Vice-President Rae Makanani Nam work around the clock, especially since the advent of Covid-19, to meet the needs of the Anahola community; and to accomplish their dream of establishing an Agricultural & Youth Training Center, Ulupono Anahola. Working with the women who run KKOA, I have seen firsthand the small, daily tasks involved in their longer-term struggle to express their Aloha ʻĀina through supporting the youth and families of Anahola, and via securing land for Hawaiian food sovereignty and prosperity. Kuʻulei positions her acts of everyday Resurgence within the context of the collaborative work of the community.

“When you are doing this everyday work, that becomes your Sovereignty stance. If I am sustaining myself by the hard work I am doing, planting the food, working the land...you are making that statement of Sovereignty. If you are doing it as an individual, you satisfy yourself. You feel good about it, you know you are working with the ʻĀina. But as we are doing it as a community, then we are expanding that Sovereignty. We are all investing in something that is creating Sovereignty. It is not just in the talk. It is in the doing.” Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKOA.

Indigenous scholars make the argument that everyday acts of Resurgence, which have always been central to their survival, must be recognized as important to their struggles for self-determination along with larger, politicized direct actions. “Intimate, every day, embodied spaces of Resurgence have always been vital to the survival of Indigenous people and our ways of being...they are, or should be, one-and-the-same as those legal orders which guide our publicly visible, large-scale expressions of self-determination” (Hunt, 2015). These acts include growing your own food, only eating food that is harvested or hunted by Indigenous people, speaking your Indigenous
language, practicing Indigenous values or culture, or many other everyday acts shared throughout these thesis (Corntassel, 2012).

Women are leaders in Indigenous and Hawaiian Resurgence movements in North America and in the occupied Kingdom of Hawai‘i. KKOA is no exception. KKOA was founded in 2008 by two Hawaiian women, and the Board of Directors has been primarily comprised of Hawaiian women. Most of KKOA’s work is conducted by two women in particular, mentioned in the previous paragraph: President Kuʻuleialoha Punua, and Vice-President Rachelle Makanani Nam. They work continually, without pay, in everyday acts of service for the community of Anahola, working to create a future fueled by Aloha ʻĀina.

KKOA has recently acquired access to the first 10 acres of a 30-acre parcel in Anahola. After petitioning the DHHL for 11 years to have an Agricultural Training & Youth Center, their dream is finally materializing. Their Aloha ʻĀina was the flame burning in their hearts to endure the years of bureaucracy, grant-writing, applications, coalition building, attending meetings, and working in the community. While wrangling with government entities for access to the land is still ongoing, they have hope.

With the acquisition of their dream, and the onset of the Covid-19 pandemic, the women’s workload has increased exponentially. I am utilizing aspects of this dissertation to labor beside them; per their request, I am writing multiple grants in order to support their work to help eventually ensure Food Sovereignty for Anahola.
It has been Kuʻulei’s dream for decades to see Hawaiian people back on their own land, growing their own food and becoming self-sufficient once more. Now in the face of the current pandemic, KKOA’s plans for family farming seems more important than ever. In the past month (June 2020) the barge company that ships the food to Kauaʻi announced that, without the state economically rescuing the company, they could no longer guarantee regular shipments of food and supplies to Kauaʻi; shipments would be reduced to twice a month, at a 49% increase in price (Blasco, 2020; Gomes, 2020). As grocery stores on Kauaʻi only have a few days’ supply of food at any given time, supporting Hawaiian families to grow their own food is critical. Despite these threats to the food supply, Kuʻuleialoha Punua remains hopeful about the future of the community because of the possibility of securing access to land:

“There’s a lot of hope in what we are seeing ahead of us. The number one hope is that we were awarded the land to start with ten acres and in our 2nd phase to obtain the 30 acres...And this will be a place where the community, every generation, can nurture their own identity and their well-being towards living a healthier life.”

120 Kuʻuleialoha Punua, President of KKOA.

As an expression of Aloha ʻĀina, the development of this project is about more than land; it is about community, identity, and the restoration of Hawaiian health and well-being. It is also about the return of food sovereignty which contributes to the return of Hawaiian Independence, that, as seen

throughout this thesis, is a long-cherished dream hidden in the elder women’s hearts.

My role with KKOA could be seen as that of a non-Hawaiian ally; but it has also been that of a friend. I have relationships with these two women that span nearly 20 years. Much of my work with them is the week in-week out conversations, pule, and grant-writing that funds their activism on the ground. For me, my work is part of staying connected to these essential relationships that were and continue to be part of my support network. The work is also something I feel committed to that is necessary, to bring hope and restoration to the community of Anahola, where I once lived.

I had many tough moments during this research; I would have quit if it had not been for the deep responsibility I felt to the women in this work and the commitment I have to my friendships on Kauaʻi. This doctorate is much more than a degree program for me, or a stepping-stone for career advancement, or a rite of passage. I have seen it as a vehicle through which I could support these women in their work and use my platform to support their voices. I have also felt beholden to the women who entrusted me with their stories to do something with them that supports their cause. I now stand in support for the total restoration of Hawaiian Sovereignty, something that would marginalize me in the greater haole community, and in the church community, on Kauaʻi. But my dream is for my former Hawaiian students to have land and
homes where they can enjoy life and raise their children, in their own homeland.

For me, this work with KKOA has come full circle. My former student and ‘hānai’ daughter Richell Sweet has joined KKOA now as the Youth Coordinator. Kuʻuleialoha has been a mentor and friend to me for these past 20 years, and a relationship that I have cherished for Kuʻulei’s wisdom, love and support of me personally. I was a mother-figure and mentor for Richell; now, she is a huge support and inspiration to me today. It is a joy to witness her working alongside Kuʻulei and Aunty Rae in their work in the community.

For Kuʻuleialoha, her work in Anahola has come full circle too. Kuʻulei has been involved with the halepule Koʻolau Huiʻia, the historic Hawaiian church on the hill overlooking Anahola. When her husband was asked to speak at the church. Kuʻulei began to do some research about the church’s history, only to discover her great-great grandfather had been the kahu 150 years before—something she had never known. He had come from Maui to serve the Anahola community as the pastor. For Kuʻuleialoha, her service is completing something her family was called to generations ago.

### 6.5 Closing Words

Indigenous Resurgence calls people out of struggling for recognition from the colonizing government, to ‘flourishing the Indigenous inside’ (Simpson, 2011). Goodyear-Kaʻōpua places the Hawaiian concept of Ea as central to Hawaiian Resurgence, which makes “land primary over government, while not
dismissing the importance of autonomous governing structures to a people’s health and well-being” (Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, 2014).

It is through the mākua generation’s expression of Aloha ‘Āina that we see both the ‘flourishing of the Indigenous inside’ as quoted by Simpson and the concept of Ea as delineated by Goodyear-Kaʻōpua. The mākua generation’s Hawaiian Resurgence expressed itself in the preservation of the ‘Āina alongside the preservation of Hawaiian identity, history, and culture for the next generation.

This research revealed something very special in the kūpuna generation, however; their Aloha ‘Āina was connected back 125+ years, through their kūpuna, to the patriots who followed the Queen. These women often expressed a loyalty to the Queen, and a deeply cherished desire to see the restoration of Hawaiian sovereignty. From their vantage point, the restoration of the Hawaiian Kingdom is not only the past, but it is Hawaiʻi’s future. Hawaiian self-determination and the restoration of sovereignty is not only a living memory; is it their future. They see it in the next generation, for whom the mākua generation is fighting for in their struggle to maintain their presence on the island, raise their children, and preserve the ‘Āina from environmental destruction. And it is for the next generation that these kūpuna are planting in the ground, fighting for land, and standing up to preserve their culture and their history.
The glaring health disparities that stare us starkly in the face—the evidence of the genocide against the Kānaka Maoli that has been perpetuated by the illegal occupation of the Hawaiian Government—cannot be remedied by a single-issue focus. They must be addressed comprehensively, with an awareness of the deleterious effects colonization has wielded upon the Hawaiian population. Aloha ʻĀina expressed through Hawaiian Food Sovereignty projects is one such comprehensive approach, that not only protects the future generations in a literal way through food security; it further empowers the youth to experience their culture and be strengthened in their identity via mentorship and a restoration of Hawaiian food ways and agricultural practices.

In this thesis, I have endeavored to tell the stories of various women who are Poʻe Aloha ʻĀina on Kauaʻi. I have had the honor, and responsibility, to bring forth their words in this study. I am blessed by their time and their trust of me in this work. It is vitally important to amplify the voices of Hawaiian women, and especially from Kauaʻi.

I mentioned in the Introductory chapter that this dissertation was not only about amplifying the women’s voices, but also about the unraveling of my perceptions as a haole in-migrant onto Kauaʻi. From that angle, my research has helped uncover for myself and hopefully other haole the larger picture how colonialism leads to the myriad of disparities in the islands; yet colonialism
makes its own crime invisible, and blames the Hawaiian people for their experience of marginalization.

The research has delineated the many aspects of life impacting Hawaiian health, within an Indigenous Social Determinants of Health lens. This is an effective framework when governmentally addressing issues impacting the Hawaiian community on Kaua‘i. The research points to the reality that a single-focused approach to any problem will not be wholly effective, until the larger picture is addressed.

What also emerged from this research were the soulful expressions of Aloha ʻĀina across the generations. I was deeply affected by how much the older generation loved their Queen, and cherished deeply in their hearts dreams of restored self-rule over the Islands. Their tears emerged when recounting how their true history was hidden from them, and how painful it was to discover what America had done to their people.

The struggle for the mākuʻa generation was evident through the words of the women, fighting to both preserve the ʻĀina while simultaneously maintaining their existence; facing the highest rental prices in America and confronting the iniquities of the DHHL; living paycheck to paycheck, while desiring to raise up the next generation in their culture.

This research is just the beginning of listening to the stories of Kanaka wāhine on Kauaʻi. While there is much more work to be done, in my own small
way, I hope I have answered the incarnate call to *tell the story of the people who love the land.*

I would like to conclude with the words of Aunty Puanani Rogers, who calls attention to the need to support the Hawaiian struggle for sovereignty for as long as colonialism is alive in Hawaii. As I began this chapter with this quote, I would like to close with it in its fuller context:

“*Kānaka Maoli voice is getting stronger and stronger! We fear not anymore. We have Ke Akua on our side. Ke Akua’s laws is the laws we follow, not theirs. So, I pray. I pray all the time. Have to keep the faith. Things do not happen sometimes the way we would like to see it happen but we gotta have patience, because Ke Akua is going to do it in His own time and in His own way. Is the way I believe. But in the meanwhile, we are suffering. Suffering! Long-suffering is supposed to teach us many things, and I am sure we are learning a lot of lessons on how not to be, yeah? And so now, as my Puerto Rican friends taught me to say, La Luca Continua, the struggle continues.*” [4] Puanani Rogers, Director of Ho’okipa Network for Kaua‘i; Host of Kaua‘i Community Radio (KKCR) show ‘Living Sovereign;’ Kaua‘i Po‘o of Kalahui Hawai‘i; Pelekikena of Hui Aloha ‘Āina O Nā Wāhine O Wai‘ale‘ale (President of Women’s Patriotic League).

Me ke aloha pumehana,

Heather Lebrun, December 2020
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