

LISTEN BUT DON'T ASK QUESTION

HAWAIIAN SLACK KEY GUITAR
ACROSS THE TRANSPACIFIC

/ Kevin Fellezs /



LISTEN
BUT
DON'T
ASK
QUESTION

BUY

DUKE

**UNIVERSITY
PRESS**

TO PREVENT PIRACY
AND PROTECT THIS
INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTY, PLEASE
DO NOT CIRCULATE OR
FORWARD THIS PDF.
DELETE IT WHEN YOU
ARE DONE WITH IT.

LISTEN
BUT
DON'T
ASK
QUESTION

HAWAIIAN SLACK KEY GUITAR
ACROSS THE TRANSPACIFIC

/ Kevin Fellezs /

DUKE

Duke University Press Durham and London 2019

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

© 2019 DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS. *All rights reserved.*

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Designed by Courtney Leigh Baker

Typeset in Arno Pro, Bell, and Trade Gothic by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Fellezs, Kevin, author.

Title: Listen but don't ask question : Hawaiian slack
key guitar across the Transpacific / Kevin Fellezs.

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2019. |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2019012126 (print) | LCCN 2019017236 (ebook) |

ISBN 9781478007418 (ebook) | ISBN 9781478005995 (hardcover :
alk. paper) | ISBN 9781478006718 (pbk. : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Hawaiian guitar music—Hawaii. | Hawaiian
guitar music—California. | Hawaiian guitar music—Japan. | Ha-
waiian guitar music—Pacific Area. | Guitar music (Slack key)—
Hawaii. | Guitar music (Slack key)—California. | Guitar music
(Slack key)—Japan. | Guitar music (Slack key)—Pacific Area.

Classification: LCC M142.H3 (ebook) | LCC M142.H3 F455 2019
(print) | DDC 787.870969—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2019012126>

Cover art: Cyril Pahinui, 2012. ©Marco Garcia/WireImage. Courtesy of the
artist and Getty Images.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

For Mom and Dad

DUKE

**UNIVERSITY
PRESS**

I would think, first, Hawaiian style is you listen but don't ask question. [Go to your] favorite person [whose] style of playing you like. Don't ask him any question. You just watch or you hear and you go home and practice. That's the only way. Never ask question. And you have to have that in you. That's the only way—that's the way *I* learned.—GABBY PAHINUI, in *Slack Key and Other Notes*

It is interesting to note that in Hawaiian, the past is referred to as Ka wā mamua, or “the time in front or before.” Whereas the future, when thought of at all, is Ka wā mahope, or “the time which comes after or behind.” It is as if the Hawaiian stands firmly in the present, with his back to the future, and his eyes fixed upon the past, seeking historical answers for present-day dilemmas. Such an orientation is to the Hawaiian an eminently practical one, for the future is always unknown, whereas the past is rich in glory and knowledge.—LILIKALĀ KAME‘ELEIHIWA, *Native Land and Foreign Desires*

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments / ix

A Note on the Use of Hawaiian and Japanese Terms / xv

Introduction: Mapping the Polycultural TransPacific / 1

1 Getting the “Right Hawaiian Feeling” / 37

2 Taking Kuleana / 70

3 The Aloha Affect / 108

4 Sounding Out the Second Hawaiian Renaissance / 145

5 ‘Ohana and the Longing to Belong / 183

6 Pono, A Balancing Act / 219

Notes / 253 Glossary / 269

References / 273 Index / 311

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ay, bruddah, no worry how much water below you. Only need worry how much water *above* you.—NAINOA “FRIDAY” FELLEZS

My cousin Nainoa “Friday” Fellezs gave me this advice the first time I visited Hawai‘i as a child, when I was too nervous to enter the tall waves of O‘ahu’s North Shore. He had saved my life a week or so before this, pulling me out of a hole in a pier, as a wave took me in and held me under the water. I’ve never been afraid of the water—my earliest visual memory is of my mother holding me in a swimming pool when I was four—but on that bright beach-side morning, the memory of getting sucked into that hole was still a bit too raw. His words, however, somehow comforted me, forming a metaphor I have drawn from ever since. This book, in many ways, has survived countless near-drownings, but as the waters pulled me back to sea, the water below remained a buoyant, nurturing environment, granting me the ability to swim freely, the churning waters of the surf breaking behind me. Writing, similar to diving below the surface into the deep, is both exhilarating and sobering, and I am thankful for having so many other Nainoas pulling me out of trouble as well as nudging me back into the water. Indeed, there have been many along the way who have helped me keep my head above water.

As anyone who has conducted research in multiple sites knows, the project is an expensive undertaking. I received generous funding from the University of California’s Pacific Rim Research Group as well as substantial startup funding from the University of California, which allowed me to conduct fieldwork in Hawai‘i and Japan in 2009 and 2010, along with a return trip to Japan in late 2011. I am grateful to the Columbia Music Department for subsidizing a research trip to Japan in 2012 as well as to Columbia University for two Humanities and Social Sciences Junior Faculty Summer Grants that allowed

a return to Hawai‘i and Japan in 2012 and 2013. In 2015, a generous three-year grant from the Center for the Study of Social Difference at Columbia University enabled my partners, Paige West and J. C. Salyer, and me to launch a colloquium series for invited scholars and activists to share their knowledge and expertise regarding global climate change and its effects in the Pacific. I was extremely fortunate to spend a year in Japan as a Tsunoda Senior Fellow at Waseda University in Tokyo during the 2015–16 academic year. I would like to thank Yamamoto Shuhei for guiding me through the intricacies of Japanese bureaucracies—not only at Waseda University but also in several other capacities, including assisting me in opening a bank account—guidance above and beyond his nominal responsibilities.

I want to extend a heartfelt mahalo nui loa (thank you very much) to the many *kī hō‘alu* (slack key) artists who shared their time and thoughts about the music and the meanings they attached to their performances. First among equals, Patrick Landeza was a crucial member of this project, which began in California. His performance in our wedding ceremony will always be a highlight of the day for my wife, Laurie, and me—his music allowing my father to attend in spirit. Other guitarists in California with whom I had the pleasure of discussing their thoughts on slack key guitar are Daniel Ho, Steve Sano, and Jim “Kimo” West, each one a thoughtful contributor.

I am deeply indebted to Milton Lau for sharing his *mana‘o* (thoughts) as well as his *Kāne‘ohe* home, and for introducing me to many of O‘ahu’s premier slack key practitioners, including George Kuo. I am grateful to all the guitarists I first met at Milton’s home who shared their time and thoughts with me: Stephen Inglis, Ku‘uipo Kumukahi, Makana (né Matthew Swalin-kavich), LT Smooth, and Paul Togioka. I was blessed with Ozzie Kotani’s willingness to open his home to me, sharing his *mo‘olelo* (history, story), insights, and concerns in the magnanimous spirit I hope is honored within these pages. It was my great fortune to “talk story” with Peter Medeiros, the long-time *kī hō‘alu* instructor at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, as well as Bobby Moderow Jr., and Jeff Peterson. Above all, I am eternally grateful to Keola Beamer, the Rev. Dennis Kamakahi, and Cyril Pahinui, all of whom took time out to speak with me and whose aloha will always be deeply treasured. I was privileged to host Cyril at Columbia University for an SRO concert—with one of Sonny Chillingworth’s aunties in attendance, no less—and an oversubscribed workshop, which he graciously taught without complaint. I remain deeply appreciative to the Center for Ethnomusicology and its director, Aaron Fox, for all the logistical and financial support for Cyril’s visit.

It has truly been an honor to become friends with Yamauchi “Alani” Yuki, Japan’s premier slack key artist. An informative interlocutor, Alani-san has given me recordings and books without ceremony, escorted me to neighborhood *izakaya* (bar-restaurants) and soba noodle shops to discuss Hawaiian music, and familiarized me with the various used record shops in Tokyo and Nagoya that specialize in recordings of Hawaiian music. He opened his workshops, concerts, and home to me on numerous visits to Japan. We share a collector’s obsession with vinyl LPs, and I have him to thank for helping me find many of the out-of-print Hawaiian recordings currently in my collection.

I am grateful to Agnes Kimura (née Michiyo Shichikura) for giving so generously of her time and thoughts. Marty Slack Key (a.k.a. Marty Koawood, né Nobuo Fukutomi) in Kyoto proved to be not only a wonderful interviewee but also a key interlocutor in the ways in which Hawaiian music fits into a broader Japanese popular music world beyond Tokyo and Yokohama. I am extremely fortunate to know a number of Japanese slack key guitarists and Hawaiian music artists in Tokyo: Abe Toshinori, Akanuma Masayuki (“Cry for the Nations”), Aotani “Terry” Teruyuki, Endo Yuko Hatako, Mike Guiry, Hattori Hideki, Hirakawa Toru, Ichimura “Califso Ha’aheo” Shinichiro, Ishikawa “Pops” Toshiaki, Kagawa Ryo, Kawami Jiro, Kawasaki “Makalani” Kumiko, Matsumoto Noburo, Nakahara Hiroaki, Niiya Yoshiko, Nishimori Tomoaki, Noda Yutaka, Okamoto Kenichi, Ozeki Makoto, Sagae Hide, Seki Taturou, Sekimoto Atsushi, Shidara Nariaki, Shimada “Bombelo” Masato, Shimada Masayo, Shimo Takahiro, Suzuki Rika, Takahashi “KaMoku” Yokinobu, Tokaki Kyoko, and Uchida Hitoshi.

I would be utterly remiss if I did not single out Sekiguchi Mayumi for her generosity and efforts to make each of my visits to Japan enjoyable while granting me unrestricted access to backstage, workshops, performances, and other Hawaiian music events. She provided everything from car rides to directions to out-of-the-way venues, and put up with all my questions, scheduling demands, and even record-shopping wishes. I will never be able to repay her adequately. Sekiguchi Chieko welcomed me into the Japanese “slack key ‘ohana,” as well, often serving as unofficial translator while keeping me abreast of current colloquialisms and social trends. Suzuki Shu was more than generous with his time, his Japanese-language Hawaiian music publications, and his willingness to accompany me on vinyl-hunting expeditions. As is clear by now, I really did ask Alani, Mayumi, Shu, and Chieko to accompany me on far too many record shop excursions, and I want to publicly express how much I appreciate their willingness to give their time and energy so graciously. Luthier Shimo Takahiro provided the humor to many

an evening (he also plays a pretty mean ‘ukulele and guitar) and generously opened his home and luthier workshop to me. Hawaiian music fans such as Hirata Chieko, Morishita Masakazu, Sasaki Junko, Sasaki Toru, and Wakui Chieko gave me a sense of belonging in the Hawaiian music ‘ohana. It was a pleasure meeting Hilo Kume, a skillful visual artist who painted many of Yamauchi’s recording covers. I also want to thank all the participants in the various ho‘ike (recitals) and Hawaiian music concerts I was able to attend.

Of course, the project was not simply one of hanging out with guitarists, enjoying their music, and sharing food, drink, and conversation. I want to also thank multiple colleagues whose input and support were essential to my thinking on this project. Christine Balance and Lucy Burns invited me to participate in the “California Dreaming: Production and Aesthetics in Asian American Art” workshop at the University of California, Irvine, and I am grateful for their input and support. I also want to thank the other workshop participants, whose insightful comments helped considerably at an early stage in my research: Lan Duong, Allan Isaac, Sansan Kwan, Mariam Beevi Lam, Linda España-Maram, Yong Soon Min, Eric Reyes, Nayan Shah, Alexandra Vazquez, and Mina Yang. My copanelists at the “In the Mix: Asian Pop Music” conference at Princeton University, where I presented some early thoughts on the Tokyo scene, deserve a special thanks: W. Anthony Sheppard, Sean Ren, and Peter Steele. Friends and colleagues who lent their thoughtful comments and time include J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Dean Itsuji Saranillio, Jessica Schwartz, Amy Ku‘uleialoha Stillman, Ricardo Trimillos, John Troutman, Grace Wang, Deborah Wong, and Christine Yano. I am especially grateful to Ricardo Trimillos for sending me an out-of-print recording, *Nā Mele Paniolo: Songs of Hawaiian Cowboys*, complete with liner notes and lyric sheet. I also want to give a very special shout out of gratitude to Andrea Eden Low for her comments, insights, and helpful research assistance.

Japanese scholars such as Kawamoto Akitsugu, Mōri Yoshitaka, Ohwada Toshiyuki, Takahashi Sota, Torii Yusuke, Wajima Yūsuke, Waseda Minako, and Yaguchi Yujin shared their expert insights into Japanese music cultures. I want to extend a warm thank you to Wajima Yūsuke for inviting me to give a talk on the Tokyo Hawaiian music scene at Osaka University, as well as the astute audience members with whom I had the pleasure of interacting. I also want to give a heartfelt thank you to Inoue Takako for inviting me to give a talk at the University of Tokyo for the Music and Society Forum, which gave me the opportunity to present some of this research to several Japanese scholars, including Waseda Minako, Kaori Fushiki (\\m/), Hanzawa Asa-

hiko, and Setooka Hiroshi. I want to thank all those present for their generous hospitality, insightful discussion, and scholarly recommendations.

My editor, Ken Wissoker, as always gave me needed prompts, advice, and encouragement. I am continually grateful for his support and guidance. Duke editorial assistants Olivia Polk and Nina Foster also deserve many thanks for shepherding the manuscript through the long process to publication, as well as Christopher Catanese, Ellen Goldlust, Chad Royal, and all their colleagues at Duke University Press. I also want to thank copy editor Melanie Mallon for her extraordinary proofreading job. I want to thank the anonymous readers for their insightful comments, corrections, and editorial suggestions as well. Their critiques pushed me in productive ways, and I hope I have rewarded their efforts with a more cogent work.

Most importantly, in addition to the entire Fellezs and Panaewa ‘ohana throughout the islands, I want to thank my cousins—Nainoa “Friday,” Regilene “Sweetie,” Regina Kahaunani, and Gilman-Paul “Butchie”—as well as their families and my Auntie Gladiola, for always finding time, energy, and aloha for their prodigal “mainland” relation. A special debt of gratitude goes to my wife, Laurie, who has learned to love Japanese food beyond sushi and ramen and who continues to forgive her husband for always returning from Japan with new luggage filled with all the vinyl LPs he purchased “for research.”

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

A NOTE ON THE USE OF
HAWAIIAN AND JAPANESE TERMS

A number of Hawaiian and Japanese terms appear frequently throughout the text. I provide a short definition the first time a Hawaiian or Japanese term is introduced, but readers can turn to a short glossary of terms found at the end of the text. For defining Hawaiian terms, I use Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert's *Hawaiian Dictionary*, revised and enlarged edition (1986), and attempt to be as accurate as possible with the diacritical markings, following the 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i (1978) spelling guidelines. For defining Japanese terms, I use Shigeru Takebayashi's *Pocket Kenkyusha Japanese Dictionary* (2003), and, again, I try to be as accurate as possible with the diacritical markings. For Hawaiian terms, the 'okina indicates a glottal stop, and the macron indicates an extended vowel. In quoting historical or other texts, however, I leave unchanged any spellings, including earlier Hawaiian writings that lack diacritical markings, for example, the use of "Hawaii" instead of "Hawai'i" as with the musical group, the Sons of Hawaii, which never used the 'okina. I spell Hawaiian names without any diacritical marks for those whose careers began prior to the (Second) Hawaiian Renaissance period (or occurred entirely before the period) or who mostly used those spellings throughout their lives, for example, Raymond Kane instead of Kāne, Sol Hoopii instead of Sol Ho'opi'i, Ledward Kaapana instead of Ledward Ka'apana, and so on. As in quotations from older sources, words (such as Waikiki) are spelled without diacritical markings when used as part of a name (such as Outrigger Reef Waikiki Beach Resort) in which the diacritics do not appear. Any spelling errors are entirely mine and should not reflect ill on any source.

I use three terms interchangeably to describe Native Hawaiians—Kanakanaka Maoli (literally, true people), Native Hawaiian, and Hawaiian—which attends to the various issues concerned with Kanaka Maoli belonging, performativity, and history. The terms reflect the tensions brought by the distinctions

that assigned naming and self-naming articulate for Kanaka Maoli. Although there are several other possibilities, including Kanaka ‘Ōiwi (People of the Bone) and ‘Ōiwi Maoli (True Bone), among others, I do not use them for the sake of clarity rather than any political purpose their absence may imply. I recognize that I am writing an English-language text for English-language readers, and the terms “native Hawaiian” and “Native Hawaiian” are used in specific ways in English-language political and juridical discourse. In J. Kēhaulani Kauanui’s important study *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*, she follows the legal discourse in distinguishing blood-quantum designations by using lowercase “native Hawaiian” to refer to the 50 percent blood-quantum definition and uppercase “Native Hawaiian” when the 50 percent definition is not applied. See Kauanui’s “A Note to Readers,” which traces the history and uses of the various terms used to describe native Hawaiians (2008b). I do not follow the same convention, however; I use uppercase “Native Hawaiian” whenever using the term to describe Kanaka Maoli. Other terms that Kanaka Maoli have used to identify themselves appear only in quotations.

There are other precedents besides U.S. legal discourse. Queen Lili‘uokalani used the term “Hawaiian” to describe Kanaka Maoli in her *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen* ([1898] 2013), as did many other early Native Hawaiian writers and commentators. As Native Hawaiian professor of medicine and Hawaiian sovereignty activist Kekuni Blaisdell notes, however, “[Kanaka Maoli] is preferred to ‘*ka po‘e Hawai‘i*’ (Hawaiian people) because the latter depends on the Western, not Hawaiian, generalization from the island of Hawai‘i. Further, *kanaka maoli* was the term by which our noble ancestors identified themselves” (quoted in H. Wood 1999, 12). In using the three terms (Kanaka Maoli, Native Hawaiian, Hawaiian) to name Kanaka Maoli, I aim to continually highlight the issues and concerns informed by collective namings.

Following Noelani J. Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, I use Kanaka Maoli when writing in the singular and undifferentiated plural. Kānaka Maoli, with the macron above the *a*, is used when the number of Native Hawaiians to which I am referring is a known quantity. I also want to note that the terms “on-island” and “off-island” in this book indicate whether an individual or a practice is in Hawai‘i (on-island) or outside Hawai‘i (off-island), rather than the conventional uses of the terms in Hawai‘i to distinguish between the speaker’s present residence or visitation on a particular island and subjects or objects located on another island.

Noenoe K. Silva offers a critical approach to using Hawaiian within an English-language text, and I follow her and other Kanaka Maoli scholars in

not italicizing “Hawaiian words in the text in keeping with the recent movement to resist making the native tongue appear foreign in writing produced in and about a native land and people” (2004, 13) unless quoting writers who have italicized Hawaiian terms. I italicize Japanese words, however, and use Japanese-language convention when citing names (surname followed by given name) unless quoting a source that does not practice this convention or in naming Japanese Americans (which I cite in conventional English-language usage of given name followed by surname). As is usual practice, I will refer to most individuals by surname exclusively after initially citing a full name.

I use the term “haole,” which originally meant “foreigner” but is used in Hawai‘i to mark whites and whiteness. I use it primarily to describe whites in Hawai‘i unless quoting older writings in which haole is used to designate any non-Hawaiian foreigner. I also use the lowercase “local” when referring to individuals of non-Hawaiian, non-haole lineage born and raised in Hawai‘i. This is how the term is currently used in Hawai‘i and marks a particular immigration and labor history that I detail in the text. Additionally, any lowercase “local” merely indicates residence in Hawai‘i without designating any particular racial, ethnic, or historical background. I use uppercase “Local” when discussing the broader everyday culture in Hawai‘i, for example, loco moco is a Local dish eaten by local Filipinos as well as Native Hawaiians. I explain this at more length in the introduction.

I use the terms “kī hō‘alu,” “Hawaiian slack key guitar,” and “slack key” interchangeably. All the guitarists I spoke with, Kanaka Maoli and non-Hawaiian alike, in Hawai‘i, California, and Japan, use the term “slack key” most of the time (the text reflects this practice). Some argue that since slack key is *not* indigenous Hawaiian mele (song, chant, poem), kī hō‘alu is a Hawaiian translation of “slack key” rather than the reverse. As I describe in the text, George Kanahale and the Hawaiian Music Foundation first adopted the term “kī hō‘alu” for wide use in 1972 to acknowledge its origin as a *Hawaiian* folk music.

I apologize for any misunderstandings my authorial decisions and deficiencies may cause readers and beg the indulgence and understanding of Kanaka Maoli for my writing inadequacies.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

INTRODUCTION

MAPPING THE POLYCULTURAL TRANSPACIFIC

Our culture is living and evolves over time with the Kanaka Maoli peoples [*sic*]. The embodiment of Kanaka Maoli identity manifests in both traditional and contemporary artforms and cultural expressions. Authenticity, quality, and cultural integrity of Kanaka Maoli cultural expressions and artforms are, therefore, maintained through Kanaka Maoli genealogy.—*Palapala Kūlike O Ka 'Aha Pono Paoakalani Declaration* (2003)

To define, or name, is to conquer. The debate over definitions [of the Pacific] is also a struggle over domination of the region, over its constitution, as well as over whom to include within and exclude from it. . . . And, *of course*, few bother any longer to speak of the islands, around which the idea of the Pacific first took shape.—ARIF DIRLIK, “The Asia-Pacific Idea”

I am sitting in my mother's kitchen in San Francisco, California, with my mother and Auntie Esther, a woman who is not actually the sibling of either of my parents—we have no “blood” shared between us. She is, as Hawaiians say, my “calabash auntie,” someone who is a close friend of my father and mother and who has always been treated as a family member.¹ In many ways, she has been closer to me than many of my “real,” that is, biological gene-sharing, aunts, an active interlocutor in the extended family of calabash aunts and uncles my sister and I share, people who, by most accounts, are not “blood relatives” but whose relations can only be described as familial.

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

These relationships can be quite complicated to an outsider; for example, in addition to my two biological grandmothers, I had a Russian “babushka grandmama,” who was married to a Filipino “uncle,” and whose only child, a daughter, was an “auntie.”

My mother and Auntie Esther are busy making supper. Between sneaking bites from the emerging meal, I join them in a discussion about comfort food—those dishes that signify safety, roots, love, and belonging. Auntie Esther volunteers that one of her favorite dishes is poi, the kalo (taro) custard that is a staple of the traditional Hawaiian diet (Hobart 2016). When I cry out, “Yuck! I hate that stuff!” she turns to me with mock anger, shouting back, “What? You no like poi? Eh, I more Hawaiian than you!”

This culinary vignette encapsulates the central predicaments that I explore in this book. As Hawaiian hip-hop group Sudden Rush once asked, “What is a true Hawaiian?”² How might someone claim Hawaiian identity? How might performing *kī hō‘alu*, or Hawaiian slack key guitar, demonstrate “being Hawaiian,” especially since to play the music correctly, a guitarist must convey the feeling of aloha ‘āina (love of the land) and embody “the right feeling of being Hawaiian inside,” as slack key guitarists put it? *Kī hō‘alu* is a fingerpicking open-tuning acoustic steel-string guitar folk music tradition that emerged from the paniolo culture of Hawai‘i in the mid-nineteenth century. Paniolo is the Hawaiian language term derived from the Spanish word *español* to denote “Hawaiian cowboy,” signaling the significant role Mexican vaqueros, or horse-mounted cattle herders, played in the formation of Hawaiian ranch culture.³ Two fundamental non-Hawaiian elements—the instrument and the ranching culture from which *kī hō‘alu* emerged—indicate the already-mixed nature of the Hawaiian slack key guitar tradition. How do guitarists become “almost Hawaiian inside,” as many non-Hawaiian guitarists put it, when performing “Hawaiian” slack key guitar?

How, in other words, do slack key guitarists articulate Hawaiian belonging? What constitutes Hawaiian belonging? How might slack key guitarists enable or inhibit larger Kanaka Maoli (literally, true people, but meant to denote Native Hawaiian) issues connected to Hawaiian belonging, such as territorial sovereignty or political autonomy, particularly as Hawaiian music has served as an affective cultural link between Kanaka Maoli identification and political aspirations despite its long history of commodification (Garrett 2008; Imada 2012; Stillman 1989, 1995a; Troutman 2016)?⁴ Conversely, because Hawaiian musicians have articulated various political concerns through their music, how has the commodification of Hawaiian music, and *kī hō‘alu* in particular, affected its relationship to Kanaka Maoli social concerns?

Because this project considers *kī hō‘alu* guitarists in California and Japan in addition to Hawai‘i, another series of questions unfolds: How do diasporic Hawaiians fit in any discussion of indigeneity and cultural performance and performativity? How might Japanese guitarists reproduce or challenge the long history of cultural appropriation, commodification, and non-Hawaiian indigenization accomplished through “Hawaiian at heart” rhetoric (L. K. Hall 2005) or the celebrated open-ended inclusivity allowed by the “*aloha spirit*”? How can one “touch the *‘āina*” if born, raised, and living “off-island”?

Similar to my mother, Auntie Esther self-identifies as a “full-blooded (local) Japanese (American)” woman, to use the blood-quantum terminology I challenge throughout this work (Okamura 2004). Yet she was born and raised in Hawai‘i and, thus, is a “local (Japanese [American]) girl” with a claim of intimacy with Hawaiian-ness as practiced in the islands, distinct from my San Franciscan upbringing, in which I accessed Hawaiian-ness through popular culture but performed it primarily in interactions with my father and his friends who had personal connections to Hawai‘i such as Auntie Esther (Ito) or Uncle Dave (Chong).⁵ These individuals were part of my extended *‘ohana*—“aunties,” “uncles,” and “cousins” who laid claim to the same reciprocal responsibilities and privileges inherent within normative biological kinship relations and, more importantly, within Hawaiian norms for belonging. The Hawaiian word “*‘ohana*” is usually glossed in English as “family” or “kin.” As the relationships I am describing suggest, however, *‘ohana* is often used to describe self-assigned familial/kinship relationships that transcend the biological within Hawaiian communities. Yet these “uncles” and “aunties” enjoyed the full range of rights and responsibilities of biological kin; for instance, they punished my sister and me in the absence of our parents without requesting permission from them to do so, nor were their children immune from my parents’ admonitions.

My father resorted to speaking Hawaiian Creole English (HCE), or pidgin (English), as it is more commonly referred to in Hawai‘i, with our Hawaiian *‘ohana* in the San Francisco Bay Area. While my father enjoyed close companionship with many non-Hawaiians, the use of pidgin marked a distinctive space of belonging and friendship. At home, pidgin permeated family conversations. My father never called me “son” or by my given name, for instance, preferring to call me “bruddah.” My parents claim that the first phrase I learned as a child was “*all pau!*” (all finished!) to end my meals. I can claim direct lineal descent through my father, a Native Hawaiian, but was born and raised in San Francisco. On my father’s maternal side are connections to the Panaewa *‘ohana* on the “Big Island” (Hawai‘i) as well as to relations

on Kaua'i. My father's paternal side remains largely undocumented with our last name courtesy of Portugal, though the spelling is the result of romantic intrigue generations back, according to family mo'olelo (story, tale, myth, history, tradition). Whatever the case, my grandfather also claimed Kanaka Maoli koko (blood), and though I met him only once, as a young teenager, his phenotypic appearance registered easily as Native Hawaiian.

While genealogy grants Hawaiian belonging, claims to being Hawaiian by diasporic Hawaiians can disappear or be grossly attenuated by the logic of blood quantum, notions like "the local," or the connections between 'āina (land) and kânaka (humans) that define "the indigenous."⁶ Individuals who grew up in Honolulu, or who shuttled between Hawai'i and the San Francisco Bay Area, for example, hold distinct social memories, with the latter performing "mainland" variations of Hawaiian cultural practices (if at all) and acquiring very different senses of Kanaka Maoli belonging (Graham and Penny 2014). Members of the Hawaiian diaspora are largely absent in Hawaiian sovereignty discourse, especially if they are born and raised in places like Idaho or Nebraska with little Pacific Islander or Hawaiian presence. The fact that more Kanaka Maoli reside in the continental United States than in Hawai'i speaks to the ways in which territorial dispossession and diaspora transform not only the crucial relationship of the 'āina to its indigenous inhabitants but also the internal dynamics of the Native Hawaiian 'ohana itself (McGregor and MacKenzie 2014, 10; also Kana'iaupuni and Malone 2006).

JAPANESE AMERICAN CULTURE informed my family life as much as or more than Hawaiian cultural norms and practices. My maternal grandparents, Kazuma and Hatsune Kido (城門 一真と城門 初音), with whom I was close, played important roles throughout my childhood and youth. When I was fourteen, my grandparents and parents purchased a home together, largely to move my immediate family out of the working-class neighborhood in which I had spent my childhood and early adolescence. While my family lived in a separate flat from my grandparents, the rear doors were never locked, and we treated the entire building as a communal space. My grandmother never really learned to speak English, and I grew up hearing, if not always completely understanding, the Japanese language. She was the source for the Japanese part of the mixed Japanese Hawaiian cuisine I call "comfort food."

Much of my home culture reflected my Japanese ethnicity: My mother cooked vegetarian Japanese meals; we removed our shoes on entering the

home; we participated in many traditional Japanese holidays and attended celebrations of particular birthdays that are significant for Japanese; we participated in the ritualized giving and receiving of *o-miyage* (gifts) between Japanese visitors, relatives, and friends; and we observed the payment of *kōden* (funeral money) at Japanese funerals and took part in the annual cleaning of Japanese graveyards during the August *ōbōn* season, among many other imported Japanese customs.⁷ I was also expected to obey my grandparents' demands without question and to assist them in all sorts of tasks without complaint (members of their Japanese generation also held this expectation for me, especially those without children or grandchildren of their own).

My parents speak to yet another set of movements—my father, born on Kaua'i, raised on O'ahu, and my mother, born on a farm in Alviso, California, but spending four years, 1941–45, in the Heart Mountain, Wyoming, concentration camp as a young girl, then returning to post–World War II life in San Francisco with her parents and younger brother—eventually meeting each other in Los Angeles in the 1950s. Once married to my mother, my father would live the rest of his life in San Francisco.

These sets of relationships are not simply legal distinctions; nor are they matters of keeping biological kinship relationships distinct from calabash relations or distinguishing self-assigned affiliations as enabled by notions such as “Hawaiian at heart,” through which the tourist industry, for example, offers a sense of Hawaiian belonging to anyone with the ability and inclination to purchase Hawaiian culture in some form. Claims for Hawaiian belonging resonate with the political issues that animate indigenous struggles for the return of Native Hawaiian political autonomy, self-determination, and territory, among a host of political and social issues. Hawaiian music plays an essential role in determining the range of subjectivities given legitimacy and in establishing authority in matters of Kanaka Maoli cultural boundary production and maintenance, especially important because of the music's long presence within North American (and global) popular music culture (Denning 2015; Garrett 2008; Sing 2003; Troutman 2016).

As a Japanese Hawaiian *hapa/hāfu* (literally, half in Hawaiian/Japanese, though in Japan it carries a pejorative connotation that is not as resonant in Hawai'i) born and raised in San Francisco, California, I can claim a combined insider/outsider positioning to the spaces and places under study. I confess my outsider/insider status to be clear about the analyses I provide here. I want to be especially careful to avoid essentializing Hawai'i/Hawaiian and Japan/Japanese or framing my access to Hawaiian or Japanese culture as

somehow organic, inevitable, or without gaps, mediations, and misunderstandings (Tsing 2007). Michelle Bigenho's wonderfully textured term "intimate distance" speaks to some of my concerns about my own positioning (Bigenho 2012). I want to underline my inability to "speak for" Hawaiians or Japanese. I am "speaking about" from my own standpoint (a Japanese Hawaiian born and raised in San Francisco, California), as will be evident in the ways in which I respectfully challenge, or "speak with," various guitarists I engage here.

As Vicente M. Diaz has proposed,

One consequence of [a] critical [approach] to historical, cultural, and political studies is a recognition of the partiality of any inquiry, that is, an acknowledgment of an ideological interest that shapes one's inquiry and narrative as well as a recognition of an incompleteness in the analyses. In this latter sense, "partiality" denotes the fact that there is no omnipotent vantage point from which to pronounce the definitive or whole truth of any human practice or event. One always sees only a slice, at a given time, from a particular vantage point, of a fluid and uncontainable history or cultural practice. (1994, 31)

I, no less than Diaz, recognize the partiality of my inquiries and analyses. Importantly, this book is not about *my* sense of identity but about the ways in which slack key guitar musicking and identity, shaped by broad and distinct historical contexts, interact to form attachments beyond and across normative political and social categories, and how those attachments assist or inhibit Kanaka Maoli efforts for self-determination.

To be explicit, I am primarily concerned with the performance and production of polycultural belonging, not identity per se. I am interested in unraveling how "insiders" are produced in contemporary slack key around the transPacific. How are various boundaries articulated, mapped, negotiated, trespassed, made inclusive or exclusive, or otherwise constructed? This book is the result of "talking story," hanging out at venues, homes, and other spaces with various Kanaka Maoli and non-Hawaiian guitarists who perform *kī hō'alu* in Hawai'i (primarily on O'ahu), California (primarily the San Francisco Bay Area), and Japan (primarily Tokyo). Questioning any normative understanding of Native Hawaiian music, I seek to understand the ways in which one particular form—slack key guitar—articulates the complex histories, affiliations, and connotations of Hawaiian belonging through a musical idiom that Kanaka Maoli musicians understand as both "impure," because of slack key's imported instrumentation and the rhythmic and structural influ-

ences beyond its original basis in hula ku‘i (joined hula—hula created in the nineteenth century that blended, or joined, Hawaiian and European musical elements), and an essential, even overdetermined, part of Native Hawaiian culture (Handler and Linnekin 1984; Hobsbawm and Ranger 2012; Johnson 2008; Jolly 1992; Kame‘eleihiwa 1992; Keesing 1989; Trask 1991b).

Kanaka Maoli Keywords

The overarching theoretical conceit I use in this text is to mobilize four Hawaiian terms—namely, *kuleana* (prerogative, or responsibility), *aloha* (love), *‘ohana* (extended family), and *pono* (holistic balance). These are overly concise definitions, which I will expand on later, but they will help us think through how variously positioned Hawaiian slack key guitarists articulate Kanaka Maoli notions of belonging through a discourse and practice of Hawaiian musical values and aesthetics. While I rally various non-Hawaiian theoretical terms, my priority is to keep these ‘*ōlelo Hawai‘i* (Hawaiian language) terms central to theorizing contemporary *kī hō‘alu* practices, performances, and aesthetics in relation to notions of Kanaka Maoli belonging.

I am interested in mobilizing ‘*ōlelo Hawai‘i* terms as decolonizing exercises “to bring ‘the insights gained on the periphery back to the center to raise havoc with our settled ways of thinking and conceptualization” (Erlmann 1996, 470–71), or as Ana María Ochoa Gautier put it, to “unsettle the philosophical ground for the formation of concepts” (2016, 122).⁸ This use of Hawaiian language terms disturbs our settled ways of thinking by provincializing the intellectual and ideological bedrock undergirding them (Chakrabarty 2000; Mignolo 2011; Szego 2003). While following Hawaiian epistemological norms by centering Hawaiian aesthetics and terms, I also trace the ways in which those terms have been transformed by settler-colonial logics to demonstrate the difficulty of centering Kanaka Maoli ways of knowing and structures of feeling—how difficult it is, in other words, to strip Hawaiian terms of their commodified, (mis)translated, and otherwise appropriated definitions to (re)define them in ways that empower Kanaka Maoli understandings and aspirations. This, then, is the difficult work of decolonizing Kanaka Maoli knowledges and perspectives (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2015; Oliveira and Wright 2015; L. T. Smith 2013).

Centering Hawai‘i and Native Hawaiian values means “refusing,” in Audra Simpson’s sense of indigenous refusal of settler-colonial logics (Simpson 2007, 2014), the idea of Hawaiian isolationist exceptionalism—the “most isolated” status of conventional geographic and cultural imaginings. It is to

recall and reference Hawaiian long-distance seafaring traditions, which connected Hawaiians to the Marquesas, Tahiti, and Sāmoa, and to displace renderings of Hawai‘i as a crossroads *between* the imperialist desires of Japan and the United States to reposition Hawai‘i as *central* to the power dynamics within the greater Oceania (Morgon 2011). Reclamation of the ‘āina begins with this refusal to participate in colonialist imaginings and constructions of Hawaiians and their culture as isolated, small, and marginal—in a word, inconsequential (Stilz 2015; Swadener and Mutua 2008).

Two terms—hānai and local/Local—do not receive chapters of their own but are important threads knitting the keywords into a coherent mo‘olelo. My concern is to avoid misunderstandings or confusion for readers familiar with these terms’ meanings in Hawai‘i since my usage does not entirely correspond with their signification in the islands—there are overlaps, to be sure, but I am often intentionally metaphorical. In subsequent chapters, I emphasize the larger, multiple meanings the keywords connote for ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i speakers, tracing a genealogy of both Kanaka Maoli and settler-colonialist interpretations, not as a callback to original meanings or a mere critique of settler-colonialist redefinitions, but as a way to recognize language as dynamic. The genealogies demonstrate the history and effects of settler colonialism as well as the agency of Kanaka Maoli in initiating new meanings themselves, similar to how Hawaiian musicians picked up the guitar and modified it to fit their aesthetics even as it changed them. Unlike the linguistic changes brought about by nineteenth-century missionaries, however, I am not discarding Kanaka Maoli meanings but extending them into contemporary contexts as a decolonizing practice (see Trask 1987b, particularly 167–69; Tuck and Yang 2012).

Hānai, an Adoptive Strategy

Hawaiian kumu (teacher) Mary Kawena Pukui defines hānai as “Foster child, adopted child; foster, adopted; to raise, rear, feed, nourish, sustain; provider, caretaker (said affectionately of chiefs by members of the court)” (Pukui and Elbert 1986, 56). Pukui’s definitions, including the ones I do not list here, point to a process I am calling “adoptive strategies,” so while I rely on Hawaiian understandings of the term, I largely use hānai to think about how non-Hawaiian guitarists negotiate their sense of belonging within a slack key ‘ohana, testing and reshaping the limits of Hawaiian inclusion through the ways in which they articulate the other Hawaiian terms—kuleana, aloha, pono—in their slack key guitar practice.

Hānai offers a path away from the non-Kanaka/Kanaka binary, away from the larger U.S. racial black/white binary in which indigeneity disappears (Alcoff 2003; Alfred and Corntassel 2005), away from the discursive equivalence of the local and Native Hawaiian experience (Fujikane and Okamura 2008; Lum 1998; Miyares 2008; Ohnuma 2002), away from the representational lack of the historical and contemporary agency of Kanaka Maoli (Silva 2004; Stillman 1989, 2003). To give it a more positive spin, hānai reinserts Kanaka Maoli agency by giving the granting of hānai to Native Hawaiians. Hānai is not a claim brought by the haole or local settler. Hānai is a gift of Kanaka Maoli. But, as I discuss throughout the book, there are conditions to being a member of the 'ohana—there is kuleana inherent to aloha.

Traditionally, Kanaka Maoli practiced three types of adoption: ho'okama, ho'okane/ho'owahine, and hānai (Howard et al. 1970). Ho'okama was the adoption of a child or an adult—an important aspect of Hawaiian adoption was the adoption of mature individuals—"for whom they had a special regard" (Howard et al. 1970, 22). According to E. S. Craighill Handy and Mary Kawena Pukui, this "relationship [involved] love, respect and courtesy, but not necessarily responsibility of any sort, and rarely a change of residence" (Handy and Pukui 1958, 71). Handy and Pukui describe the ho'okane/ho'owahine relationship as an "adoptive platonic marital relationship" that could be entered into between married or unmarried individuals. This relationship may be initiated by asking an individual directly, or their parents, to form an adoptive ho'owahine (wife) or ho'okane (husband) relationship. Handy and Pukui note that this "does not imply having the sexual husband-wife relationship, but a sort of brother-sister relationship" (1958, 55). As implied, this form of adoption was not limited to adult individuals. The ho'okane/ho'owahine relationship could form between a child "of six or seven" and an adult (55).

Hānai was distinguished by the nurturing relationship between an adoptee and a set of parents with "four principles . . . of particular importance in the traditional patterning of *hanai* relations. These were kinship and seniority between the natural parents and the adopting parents, and the age and sex of the child" (Howard et al. 1970, 24). In a child hānai, the adopting parents raised the child as one of their own but with important qualifications. According to Charles Kenn, "The [adopted] child became a part of the new household (*ohana*) if the [adopters] were also blood relatives; otherwise, it remained a part of the *ohua*, or those that were attached to the household unit but not related in any way blood [*sic*] to the *akana*, or family proper. The

Hawaiians were very careful as to the parentage of a *keiki-hanai* or [adopted] child and did not [adopt] ‘indiscriminately’ as is often believed” (Kenn 1939, 47; quoted in Howard et al. 1970, 24).

There are several important qualities to the *hānai* relationship that I do not necessarily address, including the priority of grandparents over biological parents, who “had to have the grandparents’ consent in order to keep their own children” (Howard et al. 1970, 24). A final note from Handy and Pukui, however, distinguishes Hawaiian from U.S. adoptive practices: “Unlike the modern way of concealing the true parentage of an adopted child, he was told who his biological parents were and all about them, so there was no shock and weeping at finding out that he was adopted and not an ‘own’ child. If possible, the child was taken to his true parents to become well acquainted with them and with his brothers and sisters if there were any, and he was always welcomed there” (Handy and Pukui 1958, 72). Leilani Holmes describes the relationship similarly: “*Hānai* involves rearing the child as one’s offspring, with all the rights and obligations that entails. *In hānai it is assumed the child will know and even maintain close contact with his or her birth parents.* The mainland pattern of adoption, which focuses on the severing of genealogical ties, inverts Hawaiian practices in *hānai*” (Holmes 2012, 217, emphasis added).

While I use the term as a metaphoric adoption of non-Hawaiian guitarists into a “slack key ‘ohana,” weaving the relationship into a broad understanding of the relationships among guitarists within a transPacific slack key guitar scene, two final elements of *hānai* are worth keeping in mind. First, the *hānai* relationship features *kuleana* in terms of responsibilities and obligations, with adults often entering into the relationship with an eye toward being taken care of in their old age. Stories throughout the literature on *hānai* indicate that though this *kuleana* was largely a loving reciprocation by appreciative children toward their adoptive parents, many children resented the demands of these parents, particularly when biological offspring were not pressured in the same way to provide and care for aging parents (Handy and Pukui 1958; Howard et al. 1970; Linnekin 1985). Second, the “most frequently cited motive for adoption . . . was simply fondness for children and a desire to have some in the household” (Howard et al. 1970, 27). This informal adoption—there is no paperwork filed with a governmental or other interested organization—is still widely practiced in Hawai‘i (*hānai* is still practiced within my own family, for example), distinguishing Hawaiians from other ethnic groups there (Howard et al. 1970, 29). As an aside, slack key guitarist Gabby Pahinui was a *hānai* child of the Pahinui family, and his roots,

like those of many Hawaiians, extend to a number of the islands, not simply the one on which he was raised.

I would like to think about hānai within slack key as an adoptive strategy that allows for Kanaka Maoli prioritizations. For example, in the 1970s, Kanaka Maoli guitarist Keola Beamer advocated for spreading knowledge of slack key to any guitarist since so few Hawaiians were performing it at the time. I think of non-Hawaiian hānai into the slack key 'ohana—an expected outcome of Beamer expanding access to kī hō'alu—as part of a campaign to preserve and extend the guitar tradition. As the parental figures in slack key, Kanaka Maoli guitarists remain the final arbiters of sanctioning who is hānai, granting an agentive gatekeeping role to Hawaiians. I want to be clear: I am not claiming that any guitarist has become an actual hānai into a particular Kanaka Maoli 'ohana, nor has there been any formal institutionalization of slack key in the way hula has established.

Furthermore, as already noted, hānai does not mean that a guitarist need forsake other connections and genealogies. In this sense, hānai enriches both sides of the adoption, feeding lines of affection, camaraderie, and exchange across multiple genealogies, histories, and 'ohana—a polycultural sense of family that exceeds bourgeois Western norms. In this way, hānai allows Kanaka Maoli to think beyond blood quantum, race, ethnicity, and emplacement in building inclusive networks of Hawaiian belonging, or 'ohana. This sense of hānai also permits Kanaka Maoli to maintain connections to the 'āina whether they are on- or off-island by extending genealogies across the waters to, for example, California or Japan.

Similar to my conception of hānai is the Japanese practice, adapted from earlier agricultural customs, of “adopting” sons when, for example, a business owner does not have any children (or a son) to inherit his business. The *iemoto* system of Kabuki training has a formalized ritual known as *shūmei* (name succession), when a student takes on a stage name (Kondo 1990; Ortolani 1969; R. J. Smith 1998). There is the *yōshi*, or “adoption by marriage” (Garfias 1960), system in *gagaku* (imperial court music) as well, and in traditional instrument schools, achieving *natori* (master) status is signaled by assuming a professional name (Malm [1959] 2000, 201). As I detail later, Japanese have a similar relationship of mentorship and obligation between senior and junior classmates that is a model for some adult life relations called *senpai-kōhai* (senior-junior). Hānai, in other words, need not denote blood relations, but names intimate familial relationships nonetheless.

There are limits to hānai. Importantly, it was “never synonymous with genealogical inheritance or lineage” (McDougall 2006, 221). In other words,

hānai is not a heritable position. This is not the precedent set by U.S. courts, however. In 2003, a suit was brought against the Kamehameha Schools by Kalena Santos, haole mother of Braden Mohica-Cummings, in which she alleged that her father was a hānai grandson of an elderly Native Hawaiian couple, arguing that this meant she and her son were both Hawaiian, entitling her son to enroll in the prestigious Kamehameha Schools, which were limited by their original charter to children of Hawaiian lineage. The Kam schools, as they are known in Hawai‘i, are particularly attractive in a state with an impoverished public school system. Even though Santos and her son shared no Hawaiian genealogical heritage, U.S. district court judge David Ezra ruled in Santos’s favor, conflating two kinds of Hawaiian adoptions—keiki hānai and keiki ho‘okama (both described above; keiki means child)—reflecting contemporary U.S., rather than Kanaka Maoli, understandings of adoption (McDougall 2006, 222; also Rohrer 2016).⁹

It would be disingenuous to suggest that hānai, even as flexibly as I am applying the concept here, would solve these sorts of complications (in fact, it would likely complicate things even more) or would somehow foreclose attempts to subvert Kanaka Maoli prerogatives, meanings, and political aims. I want to be careful, on one hand, about any and all claims of hānai, for they may enact material effects that harm rather than benefit Kanaka Maoli, as the Mohica-Cummings case reveals. On the other hand, to forgo an ancient Hawaiian practice that provides sustenance and nurturing by expanding a sense of ‘ohana, granted and received with obligations identical to that of blood relations, would impoverish Kanaka Maoli sensibilities. The rich sense of belonging in the extensive Hawaiian ‘ohana—including calabash and hānai relations—is a type of human connection I am loath to surrender because of challenges to Kanaka Maoli priorities and protocol. To do so would suggest a fragility to Kanaka Maoli cultural and material continuance that belies the vital robustness of Native Hawaiian traditions.

In discussing the possibilities hānai opens up for non-Hawaiian participation in Hawaiian cultural life, I want to foreclose any furthering of Native Hawaiian disappearance such a discussion might signal by pointing to an issue Lisa Kahaleole Hall discusses regarding the easy assumption of Hawaiian identity by non-Hawaiians: “Those who do not claim to be literally Hawaiian often make a symbolic claim. *‘Hawaiians at heart’ assume that knowing and appreciating Hawaiian culture is enough to transform them into being Hawaiian.* Indeed, some have gone so far as to claim that they are more Hawaiian than actual Hawaiians, because they have greater cultural or language knowledge” (2005, 410, emphasis added). Hall also notes the shame and anger

felt by Native Hawaiians “cut off from their cultural history,” particularly when confronted by non-Hawaiians’ claims to being “more Hawaiian” for superior knowledge of language or other cultural practices (L. K. Hall 2005, 411; also Marshall 2011, 117–20). The situation Hall describes is not *hānai* but cultural appropriation wrapped in a paternalistic sense of appreciation for Native loss.

Yet that loss is real. At the height of the Second Hawaiian Renaissance, in the 1970s, when Hawaiian cultural rejuvenation, including Hawaiian language use, was becoming a politically charged performative act of Hawaiian identity, Eileen Lum wrote a letter to the editor of *Ha‘ilono Mele*, the newsletter for the Hawaiian Music Foundation, dismayed by the “very poor pronunciation of Hawaiian words by performers of Hawaiian music here. And performers recording songs, in particular. This ranges from abominable to disgraceful to merely adequate” (Lum and Aldwell 1979, 7). Enid Puakealoha Aldwell wrote in the same column in support of Lum, ending her letter, “Regardless of the problems, I agree that we must keep trying in our efforts to preserve the accuracy of this beautiful language. And I’m happy to find others feel the same way” (7). Three years earlier, Kimo Turner, a frequent contributor to *Ha‘ilono Mele*, had also written a letter to the editor, praising Keli‘i Tau‘a’s decision to compose songs “dealing with contemporary matters” in the Hawaiian language while bemoaning the fact that Tau‘a mispronounced “hōkūlē‘a” on the song of the same name (Turner 1976b).

Lum, Aldwell, and Turner were not the first to raise this issue. In the December 6, 1930, issue of the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, Native Hawaiian writer A. K. Poepoe lamented, “I feel that unless we distinguish the placement of our tones with its characteristics, and our phonetic system, in the vocal organs, from those we hear, the future generations will sing Hawaiian compositions, Hawaiian words, Hawaiian interpretation, with a foreign tone quality” (11). The inability to speak Hawaiian correctly may further inhibit Native Hawaiians who come to it as a second language, exacerbating feelings of alienation and exclusion from the Kanaka Maoli ‘ohana (L. L. Kimura 1989). Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio, echoing his self-identity as a “perhaps deficient Kanaka Maoli,” reminds us of the stakes at play:

[For] Kānaka Maoli . . . studying our own culture is no mere academic exercise. We are trying to survive. Thus, even the best-intentioned non-native scholars can tell us little beyond how they perceive us. To have others learn our language—better than we know it—and master our arts and sciences is flattering and important. *But others cannot tell us*

who we are. We will always mediate and often contradict their findings with what we know and what we feel. If the scientist is uncomfortable with this caveat, I will simply repeat what I have said from the beginning of this essay. *Identity is no small matter for us.* (2001, 376, emphasis added)

I mean to invoke the Hawaiian meaning of *‘ōhana*, expanded through the use of *hānai* and the acknowledgment of calabash relations, as a kind of belonging, a way of breaking the biological in thinking about identity and difference at a time of increasing reliance on tools such as DNA or blood quantum to determine identity claims. Instead, I focus on the ways in which Hawaiians have already structured viable, expansive, and inclusive alternatives to gene-sharing kinship networks that stay mindful of “blood” relations as well (Haraway 1989, 2003; Kauanui 1998, 2008b; Tallbear 2013).

What Kine Local You?

The “local” is another category of belonging in Hawai‘i that, while not rooted in traditional Hawaiian practices, has achieved near-equal status of Hawai‘i belonging to that of Kanaka Maoli. Locals characterize themselves as “easy-going, friendly, open, trusting, humble, generous, loyal to family and friends, and indifferent to achieved status distinctions” (Okamura 1980, 128)—values consistent with current notions of aloha. Lori Pierce connects the transformation of aloha to one of the most damaging aspects of local identity for Kanaka Maoli: “The discourse of aloha asserted the equality of ethnic groups through assimilation. Every group in Hawai‘i was equally welcome and had an equal claim on the right to be in Hawai‘i. *Hawaiians themselves were incorporated into this system of ethnic equality in order to undermine their prior claim to the right to control the political and social destiny of Hawai‘i*” (2004, 144–45, emphasis added). This shift to identify as “Hawaiian” in some way worked simultaneously with the rhetorical elimination of Hawaiians. As ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui argues, “[Non-Native] ethnic groups in Hawai‘i and beyond (including Asian, white, and other groups) insist on claiming an indigenized identity through the use of such terms as *kama‘āina*, ‘local,’ ‘hapa,’ and ‘Hawaiian at heart;’” which “is a continuation of the erasure of the Native that began during initial exploration and claims on the islands by explorers and colonizers” (2012, 230; see also Arvin 2015; Beamer and Duarte 2009; H. Wood 1999).

The term “local,” used to describe any inhabitant of Hawai‘i, especially those born and raised in the islands, first gained wide usage in the wake of the

infamous Massie case of 1931 (Stannard 2005; Skwiot 2010; Edles 2004; Rosa 2000; Wright 1966). The term was used to distinguish the five defendants—Native Hawaiians Benny Ahakuelo and Joseph Kahahawai, local Japanese Horace Ida and David Takai, and local Chinese Hawaiian Henry Chang—from the haole military plaintiffs. The trial was the result of an alleged rape and beating of Thalia Massie by five men. In September 1931, Lt. Thomas Massie and his wife, Thalia, were out at a Waikiki club with other officers and their wives. After slapping a superior officer in the face, Thalia left alone before midnight. Two hours later, Thomas called Thalia at home, and she asked him to come home immediately. When he arrived, she claimed five men had beaten and raped her. That same night, police arrested Ahakuelo, Kahahawai, Ida, Takai, and Chang in an unrelated car accident. Thalia eventually identified the men as her attackers, though initially she could not describe the men who had assaulted her, nor could the doctors find any evidence of rape (Rosa 2000; Stannard 2005). Yet, despite the absence of evidence linking her and the men, all five were charged with rape based on her tardy identification.

The haole press and the U.S. military presumed their guilt. In December 1931, however, the jury failed to reach a verdict given the lack of evidence, resulting in a mistrial. Displeased with the trial result, Rear Admiral Yates Stirling tacitly endorsed lynching by stating publicly that he “half suspected” that one or more defendants would soon be “swinging from trees by the neck” (Skwiot 2010, 132). Days later, Horace Ida was beaten unconscious by U.S. Navy personnel. In January 1932, Grace Fortescue (Thalia’s mother), Thomas Massie, Edmund Lord, and Albert Jones kidnapped and murdered Joseph Kahahawai. On their way to dispose of Kahahawai’s body, a policeman stopped their car for speeding. When he discovered Kahahawai’s dead body, they were arrested and charged with murder.

U.S. newspapers, convinced the four individuals had acted honorably, editorialized in favor of U.S. federal government intervention. The *New York Sunday Review* ran the headline “Honor Killing in Honolulu Threatens Race War,” as discussion of the case began dominating the national media (Stannard 2005, 264). Reflecting the *Review*’s headline, the mainstream press deemed the murder of the innocent Kahahawai an honor killing in the service of protecting haole women and effectively blamed the victims of a racist justice system for an impending “race war.” The defendants hired Clarence Darrow, of Scopes trial fame, whose entire four-and-a-half-hour summation was broadcast nationally. Unlike the trial for Thalia Massie’s alleged rape, however, the evidence and testimony were overwhelming, and the jury returned a guilty verdict, but for manslaughter rather than murder. Judge

Charles Davis pronounced a maximum sentence of ten years' hard labor for all four defendants.

His decision angered the media as well as the military, including the secretary of the U.S. navy, and petitions to the office of Governor Lawrence Judd called for martial law and full pardons for the defendants, including a signed petition from 103 members of the U.S. Congress.¹⁰ In a “not-so-secret, secret memorandum” sent to sympathetic continental U.S. newspaper editors and members of the U.S. Congress, haole oligarch Walter F. Dillingham warned that while lynchings “may be condoned” in the continental United States, in Hawai‘i, the nonwhite majority made it “vital to stress the necessity of abiding by the laws of the country” (Skwiot 2010, 133; Melendy 1996, 218). Although Judd refused to overturn the verdict, he commuted the sentences to a single day served under the high sheriff in his office. The convicted quartet, however, spent “less than a day signing paperwork and posing for press photos on the balcony of the ‘Iolani Palace” before being released (Rosa 2014, 96; Wright 1966).

Reaction to the Massie and Kahahawai cases galvanized a crossracial coalition of local voices, publicly decrying the commuted sentences with street protests and letter-writing campaigns. Princess Abigail Kawānanakoa, echoing the voices of a newly self-conscious local populace, asked the poignant question, “Are we to infer from the Governor’s act that there are two sets of laws in Hawaii—one for the favored few and one for the people generally?” (Skwiot 2010, 133). The two cases not only gave shape to the idea of certain members of the Hawai‘i population as local, they changed the electoral political landscape. The response from the voters in the 1932 election was to vote in local Asians, who were overwhelmingly Democrats, to the state legislature, beginning a trend that eventually overturned the Republican stranglehold on political power in Hawai‘i some two decades later.

I want to be clear that in marking a “local” from simply “someone living in Hawai‘i,” I am using the term similar to John Rosa’s definition. Rosa names four major groups that are “based on place and not necessarily on race or ethnicity alone”: Kanaka Maoli, haole, locals, and “for lack of a better term, Others” (2018, 79). Though he notes that these “groupings and their definitions are shifting[,] . . . the issue of place [as origin] is central in determining each of the four [groups]” (79). Accordingly, Kanaka Maoli are indigenous to the Hawaiian Islands. Haole are whites from Europe and the continental United States.¹¹ Locals share an immigrant labor history rooted in the plantation era (late nineteenth through the early twentieth centuries), arriving mainly from China, Japan, the Philippines, Portugal, and Puerto Rico

(Okamura 2004). For Rosa, the Others (nonlocal, nonhaole, non-Hawaiian) include Asian immigrant arrivals since the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965; other Pacific Islanders, such as Samoans and Melanesians; and Latinx and black Americans (despite a long and relatively unrecognized history of blacks in Hawai‘i [see Jackson 2014 (2004)]). Importantly, “because the majority of Hawai‘i residents do not always remember this post–World War II history as readily as Native Hawaiian and plantation histories, these [Other] groups might not always be recognized as locals in mainstream understandings of Hawai‘i history” (Rosa 2018, 80; cf. Okamura 2000, 2004).

Following Rosa, who notes how “in recent decades, a more flexible definition of local has come to include almost anyone born and raised in the islands,” though “the more restrictive definition still exists . . . evident in the frequent need to add qualifying adjectives, such as ‘local haole’ or ‘local Samoan’” (2018, 85), I differentiate between a lowercase “local” and an uppercase “Local” to make a distinction between local individuals and a collective sense of “the Local.” Accordingly, “local” would indicate any individual born and raised in Hawai‘i. When used as an adjective to describe quotidian life in the islands, especially those aspects shaped by the plantation immigrant labor history of Hawai‘i, such as the creation of pidgin English, I use the uppercase “Local,” for example, “local Japanese” as distinct from “Local culture.” Thus, many individuals can be local—local Samoan, local haole, local Japanese—but of those three, only the local Japanese would be members of the population that helped shape Local culture. (In referring to an all-inclusive sense of Hawai‘i’s population—local, tourist, recent arrival not born in Hawai‘i, and so on—I use a lowercase “local.”)

As for racial mixture, Rosa argues that “interracial marriage does not necessarily reduce racial and ethnic tensions,” while observing that “children today of part-Hawaiian ancestry might identify themselves as Kanaka Maoli rather than emphasizing another ancestry that might be Asian or White” (2018, 87). Rosa notes that this is a reversal from previous eras, in which mixed-race Hawaiians would identify as white or Asian because of the denigration of Hawaiian culture—a situation Lisa Kahaleole Hall and Jonathan Kamakawiwo‘ole Osorio lament, namely, the internalization by Kanaka Maoli of the low status of their culture, especially prior to the 1970s Renaissance.

But as Rosa cautions elsewhere, “The Massie Case narrative should not be told in reaffirming local identity at the expense of Native Hawaiian: historical narratives in Hawai‘i have too often been mobilized against the very people that they were originally meant to empower” (2000, 110). The crossracial

identification that resides under the sign local/Local has been used to obscure Native Hawaiian priority to land claims, political self-determination, and Hawaiian identity and culture. The fact that local/Local identifies non-Kanaka Maoli identity and culture as “Hawaiian” in some way speaks to Native erasure. The inclusion of the Portuguese and Puerto Ricans as non-Asian exceptions to the formation of the Local rather than under the sign of haole indicates the intersection of race and class in marking these designations.

Correspondingly, the plantation system used a tiered wage structure that was demarcated by race and nationality, with, for example, Portuguese earning more than Chinese and Japanese, who earned more, in turn, than Filipinos (Okiihiro 1991; Geschwender, Carroll-Seguin, and Brill 1988). The Portuguese were brought in to work on the plantations, though many of the males were hired as luna, or overseers, over the otherwise majority Asian labor population (Asian males were never made luna). Portuguese women labored in the fields and mills alongside Asian laborers but were hired at higher wages than their Asian peers (Okiihiro 1991; Takaki 1983). Puerto Ricans, arriving primarily after 1900 as working-class plantation labor, remain Local and have not yet been folded neatly into the haole population. The Local culture, in other words, was constituted by placing individual locals within a racial hierarchy that mirrored the continental U.S. racial formation, while overlaying any racial tensions through a shared cultural mixing of particular “locals” (Fojas, Guevarra, and Sharma 2018), creating a Local culture rhetorically shaped by an adopted and shared sense of aloha.

Further complicating this predicament, as Jonathan Y. Okamura explains (echoing Rosa), is that the “the aloha spirit” as articulated by Local culture is not the wholly inclusive collective that advocates describe: “Local culture and identity . . . exclude groups such as haoles, African Americans, immigrants and other newcomers, the military, and tourists” (1998, 274; also Joyner and Lāeni 2004; Ohnuki-Tierney 1990). There is historical precedent for the situation Okamura describes, which should give pause when considering the “natural open-armed welcome” of Kanaka Maoli. Mary Kawena Pukui offers an interesting theory about early inhabitants of the Hawaiian archipelago in discussing the kauwā, or outcasts, who were “so despised that they were never allowed to mingle even with the commoners nor to marry anyone but a *kauwā*” (Handy and Pukui 1958, 204). Pukui notes that if a kauwā were to have a child with someone outside their caste, the baby would be put immediately to death, a penalty any nonkauwā individual faced if they walked “on land set apart for the *kauwā*,” as they were “regarded as defiled” (Handy and Pukui 1958, 204).

Pukui ends her discussion of the *kauwā* by stating her “belief that the despised *kauwā* were early settlers, who fought against those who migrated hither at a later date, were badly defeated, greatly reduced in numbers and forced by their conquerors to live a segregated life on a tract of land allotted to them—despised and regarded as the very lowest of the low” (Handy and Pukui 1958, 205).¹² Susanna Moore makes the same tentative suggestion (citing Pukui), elaborating further that *kauwā* were used in human sacrifice, including replacing chiefs sentenced to death (S. Moore 2015, 15).

Kauwā bore distinctive facial tattoos so that they could be recognized and were still being discriminated against in the early twentieth century, as an anecdote regarding the broken engagement of Pukui’s uncle reveals. When his mother, Pukui’s grandmother, discovered her would-be daughter-in-law was of *kauwā* heritage, “excellent though the girl was, she was absolutely not acceptable as a new addition to the family” (Handy and Pukui 1958, 205). It has never been a simple matter, in other words, to claim Hawaiian belonging, even for someone born and raised in the Hawaiian Islands.

I COULD HAVE USED other Hawaiian terms (all definitions from Pukui): *mana* (supernatural or divine power, miraculous power, authority); *kū‘ē* (to oppose, resist, protest); *mana‘o* (thought, idea, belief, opinion, theory, thesis, intention, meaning, suggestion, mind); *ea* (sovereignty, rule, independence, life, air, breath, spirit); *mele* (song, chant, or poem of any kind); or countless others. But as I thought about my long journey from my mother’s kitchen to Hawai‘i and Japan, the six Hawaiian terms (*kuleana*, *aloha*, *‘ohana*, *pono*, *hānai*, *nahenahe*) fit my central argument: Hawaiian slack key guitarists embody and musically articulate Kanaka Maoli responses to events after 1778 that are sounded out through a *nahenahe*, or sweet, gentle, and melodious aesthetic, which has been misheard as disarmingly welcoming or simply-mindedly passive. I suggest *nahenahe* sounds out Native Hawaiian refusal, or better, Kanaka Maoli cultural priorities.

The kitchen conversation with which I began this introduction initiated a journey among the practitioners and performers of Hawaiian slack key guitar. I hope to provide a hybrid *mo‘olelo* inspired by nineteenth-century *mo‘olelo* published by Kanaka Maoli such as Samuel Kamakau ([1964] 1992a, b, c) and David Malo ([1898] 1951) with their blend of the historical and personal. In blending historical, ethnographic, and personal *mo‘olelo*, along with using Hawaiian-language keywords, it is necessary to provide the outlines of the

Hawaiian histories that accrue to each term, unmasking settler-colonialist logics that have tampered with the terms, and acknowledging Kanaka Maoli efforts to maintain their cultural priorities.

The Polycultural TransPacific

I begin by understanding the polycultural transPacific as a space with fluid content, boundaries, and logics. The Pacific is a term—a discourse, an invention—that has been formed in relation to U.S. hegemony and Asia, particularly Japan and China, as well as by the movement of Southeast and South Asian immigrants to the United States and Europe in the last half of the twentieth century, as succinctly described by Arif Dirlik, Viet Thanh Nguyen, and Janet Hoskins.¹³ The transPacific they describe is one in which Pacific Islanders remain marginalized and inconsequential—minor players in their homelands. The names for the region, the Asian Pacific and the Euro-American Pacific, preferred by Hoskins and Nguyen (e.g., 2014) and Dirlik (e.g., 1992, 1998), respectively, indicate their privileging of non-Pacific Islander economic and militaristic power.¹⁴ I am looking elsewhere for my definition—to Hawai'i, Hawaiians, and their musicking, to the very inhabitants of the “most isolated land in the world,” to those whose worth has been measured by conquest, subordination, dispossession, displacement.

As the Dirlik quotation in this chapter's epigraphs suggests, the ideological construction of the Pacific has often excluded Pacific Islanders, as the dominant economic and political players in the region (primarily the United States and Japan since WWII, in Dirlik's analysis) have determined the region's borders. Dirlik argues that the “contradiction between its Asia and Pacific content—the people who inhabit it, in other words—and a regional formation that was very much a Euro-American invention” (1992, 59) is fundamental to comprehending the region as a cohesive region. The term the Pacific Rim also focuses attention away from the islands between Japan and the continental United States, as well as placing Mexico and South and Central America at an arm's length from the “Pacific.” Dirlik acknowledges that the term Pacific basin ignores the “sea of islands” in favor of the flows of capital, goods, and labor that circulate across it. More importantly, Dirlik notes, “There is no Pacific region that is an ‘objective’ given, but only a competing set of ideational constructs that project upon a certain location on the globe the imperatives of interest, power, or vision of these historically produced relationships” (1992, 56) generated by capitalists in the European-U.S. metropole.

In arguing for the term Euro-American Pacific, Dirlik repeats the idea that “those who are located either on its physical boundaries”—he is referring to the concept of the Pacific Rim—“or within them” (again, those silent Pacific Islanders) “do not play equally important parts in its constitution or structuring.” His focus on European and U.S. activities in the region justifies Pacific Islanders’ marginal presence in his calculus: “The people in the region obviously did not require a place in Euro-American consciousness to know that they existed, but . . . the production of the region as a region, that is to say its modern history, was very much a consequence of Euro-American activity” (1992, 64). In arguing his position, Dirlik offers that this “is not to say that people in the Pacific did not interact with one another, but from the perspective of the region that had emerged by the late eighteenth century, these interactions were local, and so was the inhabitants’ consciousness of them” (64). He acknowledges that Asian activity in the region, particularly as an immigrant labor force but also through the original movement of Southeast Asians into the Pacific millennia ago, complicates the Euro-American construction of the region. Nonetheless, he credits Euro-American actors as the primary instigators of a region-wide consciousness of itself *as a region*.¹⁵

In the contemporary moment, however, Japan “would perpetuate the ‘de-centeredness’ of the region and sharpen the contradictions between its Asian and, by this time, American aspects” (Dirlik 1992, 70) so that the idea of an “Asian Pacific” would not be entirely implausible. Dirlik reasons, however, that Japan’s ambiguous position in the Pacific (and in Asia) is subordinate to a U.S. global hegemon. In the end, Dirlik asserts that the “Pacific region took shape originally through Euro-American activity that was oriented to an Asian world economy (China); it is now shaped increasingly by an orientation to a North American market through the activity of Asian peoples” (1992, 73). In viewing capitalist and imperialist activity as foundational in the construction of a “Pacific,” Dirlik consistently demotes Pacific Islanders as part of the developing world caught between Japan and the United States, “bashing one another over their status in the world and in the region” (1992, 77).

Janet Hoskins and Viet Thanh Nguyen, in their seminal collection *Transpacific Studies: Critical Perspectives on an Emerging Field*, argue that as “a route and a region between the United States and Asia, the Pacific, both in terms of how it has been imagined and experienced, is central to the problem of how Americans, Asians, and Pacific Islanders know themselves and each other,” while urging “Asian and Pacific Islander academics to theorize the transpacific and their relationship to it,” simultaneously recognizing the impact of European and U.S. activities in the region (2014, 4).

Hoskins and Nguyen focus on the rise of an Asian Pacific, linking it to the Atlantic while largely ignoring Pacific Islanders. Recognizing that the rhetoric of “American and Pacific centuries implicitly praises the economic potential of the United States and powerhouse Asian countries, with cultural potential a distant second and the Pacific Islands largely absent” (2014, 8), Hoskins and Nguyen stretch the consequences of transPacific activities by arguing that Afro-Asian “intersections” built important if fragile connections in “efforts to link domestic struggles with international” ones and serving “as a counterpoint or balance to transatlantic orientations, lending more credence to the role that the Pacific and Asia have played in shaping the United States and Europe” (9).

While Dirlik’s and Hoskins and Nguyen’s analyses turn on the overdetermining role that U.S., European, and Asian capital and military might have played in shaping an Asian-Euro-American Pacific (Rim), including, to a lesser degree, Latin America (Delsing 2015), I want to shift focus to those “largely absent” Pacific islands and their inhabitants in conjuring a polycultural transPacific. Doing so allows us to consider that agentive Pacific Islanders did not stand idly by during the colonization and dispossession of their homelands. My focus on *kī hō‘alu* harnesses the “cultural potential” announced by Kanaka Maoli musicians’ entrance into the circuits of global capitalism with music that has had an outsized influence relative to their status as musicians from “tiny islands in the middle of nowhere.” This focus still allows consideration of the various effects Europe, the United States, and Asia have exerted on them but provincializes those influences through a focus on Kanaka Maoli acts, discourses, and strategies for negotiating the power dynamics at play in the region. Hoskins and Nguyen offer that despite the transPacific, as a term, being linked to a “regional manifestation of globalized interests emerging from both Asian and western nation-states,” they hope to vitalize “its potential as a set of theories and methods that can help activate those alternative and dissident intellectual currents produced from Enlightenment thought and resistance movements of anticolonial nationalism and minority empowerment” (2014, 23–24). They see this as a political move, urging “transpacific studies to prioritize Asian and Pacific theories, perspectives, and objects of inquiry” to contest and control “the production of knowledge, its location in universities that are part of nation-states, and the enmeshment of those states in colonialism and capitalism” (25).

I am sympathetic to their project although I view the way out of the predicament they describe as turning away from actors in the metropole and looking toward Pacific Islanders themselves. John Carlos Rowe, alone

among the collection's contributors, notes that the focus on the Pacific Rim has relegated the "Pacific Ocean and its diverse island cultures" as mere "way stations in the journey between East and West" leading to "the neglect of the multiple imperialist activities that have reshaped the Pacific island communities from nations in Europe, Asia, and the United States" (2014, 135–36). Still, he concludes by asserting that the "differences among indigenous peoples in the Pacific region should also remind us that 'oceans disconnect' even more than they 'connect'" (147)—an idea I challenge. There is more to the story of the Pacific than settler colonialism and imperialism, which tends to keep the focus on nonindigenous constructions of the transPacific.

I want to think of the polycultural transPacific in the ways that Weiqiang Lin and Brenda S. A. Yeoh hope for even though "what is supposedly a shared, and transpacific, universe of mutual alliance and exchange is also paradoxically unilateral and hegemonic in imagination and exercise," silencing "the many subaltern viewpoints that are waiting to be uncovered from a different locus and positionality" (2014, 44, 45). While Hoskins and Nguyen remain focused on an "Asian Pacific"—primarily as Asian transnational migrations across the area and the countries of destination, particularly the United States and Canada—the locus for this book is in the practices and performances of Hawaiian slack key guitarists from different positionalities along the polycultural transPacific, *both in circulation and in local contexts*.

The term "polycultural," borrowed from Vijay Prashad, who borrowed from Robin D. G. Kelley's introduction of the term as drawing "from the idea of polyrhythms—many different rhythms operating together to produce a *whole* song, rather than different drummers doing their own thing" (Prashad 2011, 66) emphasizes the gathering of differences to constitute material and ideational moments, objects, and subjects. In other words, rather than a claim to a pure lineage or an authenticity grounded on some foundational purity, the polycultural is a claim to multiple lineages, themselves the products of multiple mixings. After citing Kelley's pronouncements on the rich tapestry of multiplicity that cultures continually draw from, reshaping constantly under the pressures of movement, including affections and affiliations as well as conflicts and antagonisms across difference, Prashad cautions, "The theory of the polycultural does not mean that we reinvent humanism without ethnicity, but that we acknowledge that our notion of cultural community should not be built inside the high walls of parochialism and ethno-nationalism" (2011, 65). More pointedly, as Kelley argues in his original article, "so-called 'mixed race' children are not the only ones with a claim to multiple heritages. All of us, I mean ALL of us, are the inheritors of

European, African, Native American, and even Asian pasts, even if we can't exactly trace our bloodlines to all of these continents" (1999, n.p.). Likewise, I view the polycultural as being "born into histories" (Ciccariello-Maher 2017), a plurality of lineages, genealogies, and pedigrees engendering multiple strains, relations, and progenies.

I am using the term "polycultural transPacific" to highlight multiple issues. First and foremost, I want to foreground the Pacific Islanders, specifically Kanaka Maoli, as central participants in this study, and I use an upper-case Pacific in transPacific to highlight my intent. Unlike Dirlik, Nguyen, and Hoskins, I view the Japanese and U.S. guitarists as peripheral to indigenous Hawaiians, the dominant players in this Pacific-wide slack key guitar "scene." Second, I want to keep in mind the multiple lineages—the polycultural origins—of the slack key guitar tradition. Finally, I want to note the mixed lineages many of the guitarists in this study embody and perform.

Paul Lyons discusses the arguments forwarded by observers such as William Pila Wilson, "a non-Hawaiian long committed to Hawaiian language revitalization," who argues that Kanaka Maoli indigeneity is spurious "since Hawaiians migrated from different places, and intermarried, [thus] an 'authentic' *lāhui* cannot be constituted" (2010, 25). Essentially, critics of Hawaiian sovereignty undermine Native Hawaiian priority and precedence in the islands by locking Hawaiians into a permanent and irrevocable past, burdening them with blood-quantum purity, and demanding their total separation from modernity. *There are no "real Hawaiians" anymore because, my goodness, they eat fast food, use cellphones, are part Japanese/Filipino/haole, and forgot how to speak Hawaiian!* (Franklin and Lyons 2004; Kauanui 1998; Saranillo 2013). I detail various attempts to negate Native Hawaiian presence in contemporary Hawai'i throughout the text, along with the ways in which Kanaka Maoli have countered, persevered, and revitalized cultural practices despite these attacks. Yet attempts to convert Kanaka Maoli successes at cultural renewal into material reclamations have proved less successful. That "failure," however, may be due to the ease with which cultural practices can be appropriated by non-Hawaiians while shutting the door on social justice efforts on behalf of all those "untrue" Native Hawaiians.

Relatedly, David A. Chang argues,

Studies of indigenous people and resistance to colonialism have often treated indigenous people as inward looking, emphasizing such topics as deep knowledge of homeland geography, the preservation of

“tradition,” and continuity of social structure and practice. These are essential topics and deserve further research. Yet the focus on them means we risk failing to see that resistance to colonialism by Kānaka Maoli and other indigenous people has often been as much about looking outward at the world as looking inward to the homeland. . . . The Kanaka embrace of a broad and cosmopolitan world asserted the lāhui’s (nation’s) sovereign place in the world and its future. (2015, 860)

I use the concept of *hānai*, or adoption, to conceptualize alliances across difference and to recognize, as Chang suggests, the many ways in which Kanaka Maoli have been active participants and not mere observers in the dynamic social and political transformations *in and beyond* Hawai‘i.

Most importantly, however, is my emphasis on the polycultural as an integral part of Kanaka Maoli-ness. In evoking a polycultural perspective, I do not assume any anterior purity but see all the varied strands that coalesce into a given formation at a particular historical conjuncture as themselves products of multiple lineages. In a tidalectic move, borrowing from Kamau Brathwaite’s rejection of dialectics to embrace more fluid, cyclical, and helical notions of social processes, I characterize the polycultural as always becoming (DeLoughrey 2007). I am not concerned with tracing any strand back to an originary point, nor do I think it productive, if even possible. While Hawaiians have been characterized as isolated, for example, they carried on long-distance pan-Pacific communication with Fiji, Sāmoa, and Tahiti for centuries prior to James Cook’s voyage in the late eighteenth century (Daws 1968; Kirch 2012). Likewise, Japan is invested, at least officially, in a rhetoric of purity and isolation, but their culture is the product of local tastes and material conditions shaping and being shaped by borrowings from India, China, and Korea, which share long histories of intercultural exchange among themselves as well as with other cultures and peoples. Japan also experienced centuries of contact with Europe through Dutch and Portuguese merchants, priests, and sailors beginning in the sixteenth century (Befu 2016; Manabe and Befu 2014). Finally, it is a cliché to refer to the United States as “the land of immigrants,” though my understanding of its formation is informed by Native understandings of settler colonialism and a centuries-long genocidal program against indigenous peoples.¹⁶ The lack of pure beginnings does not mean mixtures are entirely innocent, in other words, and I remain sensitive to the sometimes-contradictory aspects of the polycultural.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

By engaging the Kanaka Maoli concepts of kuleana, aloha, 'ohana, and pono to frame my analysis of contemporary ki hō'alu practices, I mean to highlight variously positioned guitarists in attempting to redraw the (trans)Pacific as a space producing what Beverley Diamond, Kati Szego, and Heather Sparling describe as "indigenous modernities." They assert that "the very application of the concept of 'modernity' to indigenous cultures is part of a broad movement to decouple the idea of the modern from Euro-American centrism. Indigenous modernities often differ from the 'developmentalist' narratives of 'the West' and emphasize the fragmentation, deterritorialization, and struggles for reclamation that are parts of indigenous experience in most parts of the world. Reclamation, recontextualization, and expansions of 'traditional' concepts *to include new realms of experience* are important elements of 'modernity'" (2012, emphasis added).

I join their call to *reclaim, recontextualize, and expand* "traditional" concepts within a larger project of decolonization, including the decolonizing of academic discourse. I follow Ramón Grosfoguel's definition in which the decolonial, versus the postcolonial, does more than simply return empire's gaze, it pointedly ignores it: "Decolonial thought, on this approach, exchanges 'a Eurocentric critique of Eurocentrism,' built on the likes of Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault, for 'a critique of Eurocentrism from subalternized and silenced knowledges'" (2011, 3). Still, similar to Teresia K. Teaiwa, "without intending to marginalize my Indigenous intellectual ancestors, I direct my reflection toward the implications of being influenced by white theorists, explicitly acknowledging that influence, and critically mobilizing that influence in my work" (2014, 45).

In addition, decolonized indigenous modernities include the efforts of indigenous peoples in the Pacific (and elsewhere) to define their epistemology in their own terms. Rural villagers in the Solomon Islands, for example, "with little to no schooling or awareness of the debates going on internationally in philosophy and the social sciences" are constructing indigenous epistemologies on their own (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2001, 55; also Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2002). Most importantly, their efforts are "not only about ethnic identity and revitalizing culture" (55) but about making real material changes to their daily lives.

Another example can be seen in the political battle over the building of the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT) complex on Mauna Kea on the island of Hawai'i, in which Eurocentric notions of scientific progress confront Hawaiian

epistemes and cosmologies. I am not pitching this narrative as a battle between (European, Western) rationality and (Hawaiian, indigenous) religious belief (Teaiwa 2014). Rather, I want to suggest that this is yet another skirmish in a struggle over dominant and subaltern ways of knowing, of deeply divergent ways of conceptualizing the relationship between human and non-human, for example (R. D. K. Herman 2016). Specifically, for Kanaka Maoli, “human nature” signifies a unifying term—human (in) nature—rather than two terms, “the human” and “nature.” The protests sharpened the criticisms by Hawaiian sovereignty activists, cultural revivalists, and their political allies of the nature of development on Hawaiian lands. Practicing ho’oponopono (to correct, to put to rights), the activists named themselves “protectors” rather than “protestors,” using mele as a central part of their efforts to halt further construction on the sacred mountain (Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2017). As the struggles on Mauna Kea were taking place, there was a controversial attempt by the N’ai Aupuni organization, a group that “exists solely to help establish a path for Hawaiian self-determination,” according to its website, to hold a vote on the relationship between Hawai’i and the United States. N’ai Aupuni was eventually forced to abandon their program by several court rulings, including a U.S. Supreme Court injunction, as well as opposition from other Hawaiian sovereignty groups (Goodyear-Ka’ōpua 2014; Hussey et al. 2008; Langer 2008).¹⁷ In both cases (the TMT standoff and the N’ai Aupuni election attempt), music and chant played key roles in galvanizing Kanaka Maoli social activists, evidenced by the many YouTube videos of the activities on Mauna Kea and various other actions.

Kanaka Maoli epistemologies and ontologies—ways of knowing, ways of being—provide alternate ways of studying the heavens and the waters while achieving the purported goals of Western science to understand, to know, to apprehend. How, in fact, did those ancient Pacific sailors journey purposely across thousands of miles of open waters without a “scientific” knowledge of astronomy, oceanography, and climatology? As Bruce Masse’s research demonstrates, traditional Hawaiian astronomy was recorded in genealogical chants, religious iconography, and sacred legends that have proved remarkably accurate in their observation of empirical celestial phenomena, corroborated by historical records in Asia and elsewhere for at least the past 1,500 years (Masse 2016).

Osorio characterizes Hawaiian dispossession as dismemberment, “a story of violence, in which [settler] colonialism literally and figuratively dismembered the *lāhui* (the people) from their traditions, their lands, and ultimately their government. The mutilations were not physical only, but also psychological and spiritual. *Death came not only through infection and disease, but*

through racial and legal discourse that crippled the will, confidence, and trust of the Kānaka Maoli as surely as leprosy and smallpox claimed their limbs and lives” (2002, 3, emphasis added). Following Osorio’s analogic dismemberment, I want to consider the possibilities of a restorative prosthetics, as evidenced in the revival of indigenous Hawaiian musical practices such as slack key, or in the agri- and aquaculture practices enabled by scholar-activists such as Nōelani Goodyear-Ka’ōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika’ala Wright, whose projects involve the revival of indigenous sustainable land and sea management.¹⁸ Revitalizations of musical practices and the reinforcement of Kanaka Maoli aesthetics in traditions such as *kī hō’alu* perform similar contestations to the twin ideas that Hawaiian culture, one, was completely eradicated and, two, has been relegated to an irretrievable past without relevance or utility for contemporary life.

Hawaiian musicking has not only proved to be a felicitous vehicle for circulating various ideas about Hawaiian-ness for both settler colonialists and Kanaka Maoli—often for opposing ends—but also highlights the fractal diversity and plurality of Hawaiian-ness, complicating slack key’s circulation outside Native Hawaiian spaces as well as its enjoyment and performance by non-Hawaiians. In this light, I want to add the idea of the seafaring to the tensions between root and route, home and diaspora, emplacement and circulation (Clifford 1997). Hooking myself to the *Hōkūle’a*, the seafaring project bringing together Native Hawaiian and Tahitian sailors with sailing techniques long thought lost at sea, I use the idea of seafaring to locate both the movement (*of* their ship) and the stasis (*on* their ship) of seafarers to think through the idea of slack key traveling from Hawai’i in two directions. One direction is to the east, as Native Hawaiians traveled to California, orienting it not as the West Coast of the continental United States, or as the edge of the “American Far West” (and thus ignoring Hawai’i’s own—and earlier—history as the furthest western outcropping of cowboy/ranch culture, which I detail later), but as the East Coast of Oceania, a reorientation I highlight throughout this book. The other direction is westward to Japan, similarly reorienting the Eurocentric “Far East” as the West Coast of Oceania. Just as importantly, these reorientations center Hawai’i (Akami 2008). No longer the “most isolated inhabited archipelago in the vast Pacific Ocean,” Hawai’i is the locus of *movement from*, rather than simply a *crossroads through*, a space of originary power and cultural meanings, a land of beginnings rather than endings, of possibilities both fulfilled and yet to be realized.

I focus on guitarists who draw from the Hawaiian slack key guitar tradition to think through the various articulations of the polycultural trans-

Pacific. In doing so, I aim to center Hawai'i in this work, pushing Japan and the West Coast of the United States to the periphery. Rather than a mere de/recentering of margin and center by revealing the importance of Hawaiian music culture on Japan and the continental United States, my intent is to also register the more difficult task of demonstrating how Native Hawaiian musicking challenges capitalist processes of commodification and cultural appropriation that turn on the support of settler colonialism—a relationship that, when its influence is left unexamined, often paints an overdetermined picture of Hawaiian cultural subordination and dilution. Thus, though I weave a story of a California Hawaiian diaspora as well as the Japanese fascination with Hawai'i into a broader capacious narrative, it is in service to the discussion of how Hawaiian slack key guitar musicking travels *from* Hawai'i, westward to Japan and eastward to California.

WHILE ON THE SURFACE, California, Hawai'i, and Japan seem to have little in common, these three sites share several overlapping characteristics. For instance, Japan and Hawai'i have both had long histories of isolation following an early period of cultural “root-ing” from elsewhere. Japan’s “origin cultures” are China, either directly or through Korea, and India, often mediated by Chinese scholars (De Bary, Keene, and Tanabe 2001). Hawai'i was initially settled by sailors from the homeland of Kahiki (Tahiti) in the first millennium CE, with a final wave in the thirteenth century (Kame'eleihiwa 2009; Kirch 2012; Kirch and Sahlins 1992; Kuykendall [1938] 1965). Hawai'i would not see any large-scale visitations until Cook in 1778, and seventy-five years later, Japan would end its two-hundred-year *Sakoku* (locked country) period with the “gunboat diplomacy” of U.S. Commodore Matthew Perry in 1853—a mere forty-five years before the same sort of “diplomacy” gained the United States the Territory of Hawai'i.

I give considerable scope to Japan, especially as it connects to Hawai'i. While California has a distinct history, it shares many of the issues—indigenous dispossession, cultural denigration, and devastating depopulation—with Hawai'i and Japan. (In fact, at one time, when Hawai'i annexation efforts stalled in the U.S. Congress, one option considered by desperate annexationists was to have Hawai'i brought in as a county of California; Coffman [1998] 2016, 284.) Hawaiians and Japanese venerate mountains and water, attach significant meanings to toponyms, maintain an investment in genealogies, hold deeply spiritual connections to the natural world (ideally, there is no gap between “human” and “nonhuman”), and, as I discuss in the next chapter,

share pedagogical principles in their traditional music training, despite holding otherwise largely incompatible aesthetics (Andrade 2008; Bacchilega 2007; De Bary, Keene, and Tanabe 2001; Goldberg-Hiller and Silva 2011; Oliveira 2014; Pukui and Mookini 1974).

California is connected to Japan through Japanese immigration and to Hawai'i through the Kanaka Maoli diaspora as well as Japanese immigration (Fu and Heaton 1999). Particularly in terms of slack key guitar, California and Hawai'i are linked through the Mexican vaqueros from the area (when California was still part of Mexico) and the establishment of their ranching culture in Hawai'i.

Every single notable guitarist, regardless of location, has a working-class background, connecting them to the longer folk music history of slack key guitar. Very few of the guitarists, including some major Hawai'i guitarists, are able to make a living simply by playing music, even with the increased income possibilities provided by teaching. This is an old mo'olelo. As George H. Lewis observed, the music of revered Native Hawaiian guitarist Gabby Pahinui "had never been popular enough to base a career around, and he made his living working on street crews for the city of Honolulu," as did 'ukulele virtuoso Eddie Kamae and celebrated slack key guitarist Leland "Atta" Isaacs (1986, 49).

But Gabby Pahinui revealed that the strength of Hawaiian cultural traditions was its fundamental fungibility. For example, he did not simply copy his teachers blindly but innovated on traditional Hawaiian aesthetics by grafting jazz and other non-Hawaiian musical aesthetics into his performances *as an organic Native Hawaiian approach* to invigorating Hawaiian musicking. As one of Pahinui's most acclaimed students, Peter Moon, admitted, "Sometimes when the old guys come down [to Pahinui's home in Waimānalo], Billy Harbottle and all his side-kicks, they play all these things like, 'White Sands,' 'White Ginger Blossoms,' 'Stomping at the Savoy' and they'll play old-style, these jazz chord movement things, with the straight down-beat strumming. 'Chang-chang-chang-chang.' It's really funky, you know. A lot of [Gabby Pahinui's] repertoire is like that" (Akamine 1977a, 7).

Pahinui, however, disavowed any jazz influence in his music, stating, "[Jazz] gave me an influence as a style of music, but that was for jazz music, not Hawaiian . . . knowing [jazz] didn't change my music. I don't regret playing just Hawaiian music though" (Kasher and Burlingame 1978, 17). Yet not only can one hear the influence of swing jazz, signs of other non-Hawaiian musical graftings are in Gabby Pahinui's music. Renowned slack key artist and songwriter Rev. Dennis Kamakahi recounted to me how much Gabby

loved mariachi music, influencing his approach to the guitar. Listen, for instance, to the opening of “Wahine U‘i” from *The Gabby Pahinui Hawaiian Band*, vol. 1 (Panini Records, 1975, LP, track 8) or the intro to “Ku‘u Pua Lei Mokihana,” track 2 from the same recording. You can also hear Pahinui’s appreciation for the Beatles and other young rock musicians in the opening and closing riffs and vamps to many of the songs in the Gabby Pahinui Hawaiian Band repertoire. Is that a reference to the Rolling Stones’ “Let’s Spend the Night Together” in the opening vamp to “Hula O Makee”? Are those sly Beatles references in the bass intro to “Kaua‘i Beauty” or in the introduction to “Lei Ohu”?¹⁹

KĪ HŌ‘ALU IS NOT INNATELY Hawaiian but is learned by careful observation and imitative repetition, a performative activity, to borrow from Judith Butler (1999). The anecdotes by various guitarists about their learning experiences indicate that the stereotype of Native Hawaiian culture as celebrating indolence, lacking in standards, and without clear aesthetic goals is misguided at best. Hawai‘i’s isolation, too, has been overemphasized. For example, despite being consistently figured as a Native Hawaiian musical tradition, kī hō‘alu requires the guitar, an imported instrument. While adapting the guitar to Hawaiian aesthetics, Kanaka Maoli guitarists absorbed musical influences from various other places, including Spain, Mexico, and the continental United States, perhaps through the people bringing guitars to the islands: New England sailors and missionaries, Mexican vaqueros, Portuguese sailors, Filipino and Puerto Rican plantation laborers. Another possibility is that Hawaiian seamen may have returned home with guitars, along with knowledge about performing on the instrument, as there was an extensive amount of Hawaiian employment, both coerced and voluntary, on European and U.S. ships beginning in the eighteenth century (Barman and Watson 2006; Chappell 1997). In moving to the present day, I posit that California is one of the sites where kī hō‘alu is undergoing a series of regional reinventions that reflect diasporic Hawaiians’ struggles for recognition as “real Hawaiians” distinct from, yet still related to, on-island Kanaka Maoli and the shared history that has resulted in the separation of Hawaiians from Hawai‘i.

In making the claim that kī hō‘alu has been transformed in its travels outside Hawai‘i, I point to kī hō‘alu’s similarities to another “traveling music,” the blues, originating in the southern United States, traveling north and west as blues artists joined the Great Migration and began developing regional styles of the blues, creating, for example, a Texas or Chicago blues style distinct from

each other as well as from the blues of Mississippi. Additionally, the adaptation and creative “reuse” of instruments from outside a community to give expression to the community’s aesthetic values is evidenced by, in the case of Hawai‘i, the “slacking” of the guitar’s strings so that when strummed unfretted (an “open tuning”), they sound a major key tonality, a dominant feature of traditional Hawaiian music; an oral tradition that is transformed when the music enters the marketplace through recordings and performances in public spaces by taking the music outside the community that gave birth to it; the increasing professionalization of the musicians as recordings and professional concertizing augment or replace, in *kī hō‘alu*’s case, backyard jams, family *lū‘au*, and other informal spaces for the performance of the music; the introduction of musicians from outside the original community, who often further transform the music; a playing style, while idiosyncratic or “wrong” in terms of standard Western performance standards and aesthetics, that defines the nature of the music; and, historically, a second-class status in terms of scholarly interest and perceived cultural importance. Moreover, Hawaiian slack key guitarists share identical open tunings with blues and other folk traditions. Because *kī hō‘alu* is intimately linked to Hawaiian folk culture, it has fueled debates over artistic legitimacy and authenticity.

There is a long history of a proliferation of *kī hō‘alu* styles unique to each of the Hawaiian Islands due to the relative lack of intra- and interisland travel by rural *paniolo* for much of *kī hō‘alu*’s history. In fact, the Big Island, Hawai‘i, became home to several regional styles because of its large geographic territory. Hawaiian guitarist Peter Medeiros writes in his magisterial slack key method book, *Hawaiian Slack Key: A Lifetime of Study*,

Before broadcast music and mass media became established in Hawai‘i you could identify the family of a slack key player, where the player probably came from, and the style if not the tuning the player was using. Where in 1920 Aunty Alice Namakelua would play in an unadorned *wahine* style from Hamakua, her contemporaries in Honolulu might have been playing a style of slack key influenced by ragtime and using non-chord tones to embellish their music and you could still tell who they learned from. Those players on Maui, Moloka‘i, Kaua‘i and Ni‘ihau would play their family tunings and they would be so different from those played on the islands of Hawai‘i and O‘ahu. But there were links of a common heritage tying all of them together: the language, the rhythm of the hula, and all of the music—the hula *ku‘i* songs and the art songs of the monarchy and post monarchy period. (2009, xiv)

While guitarists and the music they created circulated among the islands, in other words, local tastes prevailed enough for distinct repertoire, tunings, and styles to emerge.

Therefore the idea that there are different styles or kinds of slack key guitar is not entirely novel. Yet many contemporary ki hō‘alu artists in Hawai‘i, who justify their blending of ki hō‘alu with rock or hip-hop by pointing to, for instance, Gabby Pahinui’s introduction of jazz elements into the music or the distinctions between Pahinui from earlier guitarists such as Namakelua, balk at the idea of a Californian or Japanese ki hō‘alu. (I came across this refusal to affirm regional stylistic variation many times in my interviews with guitarists in all three sites for distinct reasons, which I detail throughout the text.) Because I raise the possibilities for, rather than insist on, new categorizations for local variants of slack key, I give ample space to guitarists’ hesitancies or outright denials in considering any such claim.

But I mean to draw on the ways in which embodied soundings in and *out of place* help human subjects make sense of their world, which they shape and are shaped by, extending the idea to think about when those emplaced and embodied acoustemologies (Feld [1982] 1990; also Stokes 1994) get taken up by other bodies in (or the same bodies en route to) other places. What happens when birdsong (im)migrates? What shifts? What remains the same? This is one aspect of “dislocating” sounding practices and musical traditions. For both Kanaka Maoli and non-Hawaiian slack key guitarists, the knowing and the production of experiential truth Feld discusses is shaped by emplacement within an imagined Hawai‘i, past and present, distinct in each individual’s case because the guitarists’ embodied, phenomenological relationships to the Hawaiian ‘āina differ. I want to think through this predicament of a traveling, or dislocating, Hawaiian acoustemology—its transformations, its circulatory pathways—as waves traveling from the center of the ocean, breaking into surf at different beachheads; as the sands as well as the tides; as the rocks churned into sand as well as the waters that circulate through cloud, ocean, and rain; as inseparable yet distinct elements in an ever-changing individuated yet encompassing whole. In what ways, then, are these various interactive if mediated aspects of a Hawaiian guitar tradition articulations of a shared acoustemology, a *shared* sense of aloha ‘āina? How are they distinct? It is not simply a matter of aesthetics or measuring instrumental acuity among the participants. It is also a matter of positioning these guitarists within the histories into which they are born, the imagined intimacies to which they aspire, and the level of kuleana they take on.

Chapter 1, “Getting the ‘Right Hawaiian Feeling,’” is a discussion of the definitions and meanings attributed to Hawaiian music and slack key guitar along with the ways in which slack key transmission plays a part in shaping some of those meanings. Concerns with transmission and pedagogical standards offer ways to think about how, if at all, Native Hawaiian musical and cultural priorities and precedence are monitored and maintained by variously positioned guitarists. The subsequent chapter, entitled “Taking Kuleana,” focuses on the ways in which the term’s twinned Hawaiian meanings—responsibility as well as a small parcel of land—share an intertwined history that continues to shape the relationship of Kanaka Maoli and Hawaiian slack key to the ‘āina, or land. The history of the two meanings is articulated by contemporary slack key artists as they take kuleana, or responsibility, while negotiating the history of the guitar tradition and its roots in rural Hawai‘i—the kuleana, or small family plots. The complications of stewardship, both cultural and material, are bound up in the performance and the perpetuation of slack key.

Chapter 3 is entitled “The Aloha Affect” and traces how the term has been reinterpreted by various interested parties. The “new” meanings New England missionaries gave to “aloha” are now so pervasive that it is difficult to realign aloha with kuleana—in other words, by recharging aloha with a sense of reciprocal obligation. The obligation to embody aloha in its post-missionary nonobligatory sense for Native Hawaiians is not only sanctioned by the state but has been internalized by everyone from tourists to Hawai‘i residents, making the recalibration of aloha to its kuleana-laden meaning a difficult task, which is both taken up and complicated by contemporary slack key guitarists. Yet a genuine sense of aloha organizes the Japanese Hawaiian music scene, especially when centered on the Hawaiian slack key guitar “subscene” within it. Can there be an ethics of aloha allowing for “good faith” inclusion that has, regrettably, little recent history to guide us?

Chapter 4 marks the historical conjuncture in which the relationships among Hawaiian music, musicians, and the music industry were transformed. A discussion of the Hawaiian Renaissance of the 1970s and some of its key figures, including members of the musical group Sons of Hawaii and guitarist and activist George Helm, connects the struggles for Hawaiian self-determination in cultural and political terms to Hawaiian music. Slack key, I argue, with its nahenahe aesthetic, sounds out an acoustemology in which we are no longer the center, no longer simply the heedless partakers, but the

self-reflexive caretakers of, or better, co-participants with, the moana (sea) and the ‘āina (land) and all that is contained within them.

Chapter 5, “‘Ohana and the Longing to Belong,” focuses on the question of belonging as it applies to diasporic Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians. How has ‘ohana been refigured to be consonant with the unconditionally giving spirit of aloha as it is currently formulated? Is there a way to rethink the concept of Hawaiian belonging, of ‘ohana, to regain the responsibilities as well as the privileges (another meaning of kuleana) of Hawaiian belonging? The final chapter is concerned with pono and the concept of restoring balance through the performance and aesthetics of slack key guitar. As in the other chapters with a focus on a Hawaiian keyword, I begin chapter 6 with definitions—original meanings and changes to those meanings. I also think through what restoring balance, or ho‘oponopono, might mean. I follow these speculations with a look at the debates surrounding the short-lived Hawaiian Grammy Award, a period in which slack key guitarists played a major part. This episode is another example of what I mean by dislocating—placing the music within a polycultural transPacific that is in constant motion, jostled by, in this case, the exigencies of the commercial music industry, local pride in the wider music industry’s recognition of the value of Hawaiian music, and the politics of genre categorization.

I conclude with some thoughts on the possibilities of hānai given the odds that, currently, there may be more non-Hawaiian slack key guitarists than Native Hawaiian practitioners, and I explore what this might mean for slack key, Hawaiian culture, and by extension, Kanaka Maoli political aspirations. I close with a notion that Gabby Pahinui’s book-opening epigraph reminds us is “Hawaiian style”—to refrain from asking questions of Kanaka Maoli and instead to listen carefully, patiently, and humbly to what they have to offer about notions and structures of belonging, sovereignty, and all the myriad issues confronting Native Hawaiians today.

The bulk of the text interweaves threads from each location as I attempt to address the complexities of the polycultural transPacific, underscoring the arbitrariness of separating its co-constituent parts. I want to highlight the interconnectedness of Oceania—this “sea of islands” in Epeli Hau‘ofa’s conceptualization (1994). Hau‘ofa reconceives the peoples of the polycultural transPacific as living within a “sea of islands” rather than on “islands in a far sea,” writing,

[If] we look at the myths, legends, and oral traditions, and the cosmologies of the peoples of Oceania [a term he prefers to “Pacific Islands”

(1994, 153)], it becomes evident that they did not conceive of their world in such microscopic proportions. Their universe comprised not only land surfaces, but the surrounding ocean as far as they could traverse and exploit it, the underworld with its fire-controlling and earth-shaking denizens, and the heavens above with their hierarchies of powerful gods and named stars and constellations that people could count on to guide their ways across the seas. Their world was anything but tiny. They thought big and recounted their deeds in epic proportions. (1994, 152)

I want to sustain this vision of the polycultural transPacific as a “sea of islands,” not as a largely empty space pocketed by small landmasses scattered about its vast expanse but as a full space, *an epic space*, interconnected rather than separated by water. Indeed, all Pacific peoples feel as at home in the water as they do on land, finding material sustenance as well as spiritual power within its fluid forms. Gary Okihiro makes the important point: “In the USA, the Atlantic and its European civilization is the normative self (with a gesture toward the Black Atlantic), while the Pacific is its other, distant and Asiatic (erasing Pacific Islanders)” (2014, 85). Colonialist conceptions of the Pacific as “empty” diminish the largest area on the planet, including by disconnecting it from the Atlantic on one end and the Indian Ocean on the other (all sandwiched between the Arctic and Southern, or Antarctic, Oceans)—the world really has only a *single ocean*, of course, easily dwarfing the landmass of the planet (Teaiwa 2006). I would like to begin with this reversal of perspectives, to enter the waters of the polycultural transPacific to hear the *nahenahe* music of open-tuned guitars sounding out Hawaiian values as it laps up on the shores of not only Hawai‘i but Japan and California as well.

DUKE

NOTES

Introduction

Epigraphs: Palapala Kūlike O Ka 'Aha Pono Paoakalani Declaration (2003); Dirlik (1992, 76, 78, emphasis added).

1. The term “calabash” to indicate nonbiological familial relations can be traced to the practice of granting houseguests the privilege of eating “at the same eating place as the *ohana*. This was a high honor bestowed upon the guest in ancient Hawaii. The outgrowth of this practice has come to be called ‘calabash’ relationship, in which one family claims relationship to another because in the past, their common ancestors ate together out of the same calabash of poi” (Kenn 1939, 47, quoted in Howard et al. 1970, 29). Note that Charles W. Kenn suggests a permanent or crossgenerational relationship between families.

2. The song “True Hawaiian” appears as track 2 on the Sudden Rush recording *Kū'ē!!* (Way Out West, 1997), CD.

3. The Mexican vaqueros were likely called paniolo because they spoke Spanish rather than being misidentified as Spanish or as arriving from Spain.

4. There are other terms used to describe Native Hawaiians: Kanaka 'Ōiwi, People of the Bone, referencing an important material element in Native Hawaiian cosmology and spiritual belief; Hawai'i Maoli, or Native Hawaiian; and Hawai'i oiaio, true, or authentic, Hawaiian. Throughout the text, I mention other terms used by Kanaka Maoli to describe themselves.

5. The term “local girl/boy” is used to denote individuals born and raised in Hawai'i who do not claim Kanaka Maoli heritage. The term is a legacy of the plantation economy, which infantilized its labor in linguistic and other public representations throughout the colonial and territorial periods.

6. See, for example, Osorio (2014).

7. In Japan, families will clean the graves of their ancestors, often taking long, expensive trips back to familial hometowns during *ōbōn* (Festival of the Ancestors) to do so. Since many Japanese Americans do not have ancestors buried in the United States, they often clean the graves of Japanese cemeteries as a way of continuing the tradition.

8. Admittedly, Veit Erlmann is raising a healthy skepticism in his essay regarding such a theoretical move, but I hope to provide a cogent rebuttal throughout the text.

9. There were several legal attacks on Native Hawaiian rights simultaneous with the Mohica-Cummings case. *John Doe v. Kamehameha Schools* was a suit brought by haole interests arguing that the school's restrictive admissions policy was race based and thus discriminatory, ignoring the reparative intent of the policy. Similarly, the *Arakaki v. State of Hawai'i* lawsuit brought by haole residents alleged that the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the Hawaiian Home Lands Department had programs that were race based and discriminatory. All cases were brought to further the interests of haole residents, ignoring the Native Hawaiian dispossession these institutions were established to amend, if not correct. This sly use of the rhetoric of "colorblindness" undermined the once-progressive notion of multiculturalism.

10. Lawrence Judd was the grandson of Gerrit P. Judd, a missionary and minister of finance under Mo'i Kamehameha III during the Māhele of 1848, discussed in chapter 2.

11. For nuanced, cogent studies of haole-ness in Hawai'i, see Rohrer (2008, 2010).

12. Menehune is the name given to Hawai'i's indigenous inhabitants living in the islands prior to the arrival of the people who would become Hawaiians from their homeland, Kahiki (Tahiti), around 800 CE. For more regarding the historical menehune, see Andrade (2008) and E. C. Smith (1971, 48–49); for a refutation of the existence of menehune, see Luomala (1951).

13. For a concise overview of the ways in which "the Pacific" has been constructed, see Matsuda 2006.

14. Other descriptive terms have been used for the area, such as Gabriel Solis's "Black Pacific" (G. Solis 2014; Vince Schleitwiler also uses the term in his recent *Strange Fruit of the Black Pacific: Imperialism's Racial Justice and Its Fugitives*; 2017), and I rely on the work of Gerald Horne's *White Pacific* (2007) in thinking about the role of black Americans in Hawai'i and of U.S. imperialism in Oceania more broadly. Solis's work is focused on New Zealand and Papua New Guinea, and while I find his work illuminating, his South Pacific informants described themselves as "black" for important historical and material reasons that have little to do with Hawai'i or the global circulation of Hawaiian music and musicians. Kanaka Maoli have never described themselves as "black," and colorized racialization of the participants in this study would more closely adhere to notions of "brown-ness" resonant with the idea of a "Brown Pacific" (G. Solis 2014, 2015; also Takara 2004; Taketani 2014). I see Solis's and my work as appositional, however, and redolent of the many-hued character of the expansive "sea of islands." As I will detail (and complicate) later, however, Hawai'i has long been figured as a multicultural paradise, where people of various histories, ethnicities, and races have merged those lineages into a rich tapestry of polycultural inclusion.

15. For more on the production of a space called "Oceania" or "the Pacific" from this perspective, see Wilson and Dirlík (2012); Wilson and Dissanayake (1996).

16. Relatedly, David S. Wilcove glumly reports, "Hawaii has been rightly called the extinction capital of the world; for its birds, plants, insects, and other species, the past few centuries have been a bloodbath. Every one of Hawaii's remaining native forest birds is included in the most recent *State of the Birds* 'Watch List.' Even more alarming is the fact that seven bird species have, in all likelihood, vanished since 1980. (The most recent loss was the Poo-uli, the last known individual of which died in captivity in 2004.) These

represent global losses, because the species involved existed nowhere else on earth. No other nation has experienced so many global extinctions of birds within its borders in recent decades” (2015).

17. An alternative group, Aha Aloha Aina 2016, formed and has proposed its own vision of moving toward Hawaiian independence. Multiple groups advocate for the return of Hawaiian sovereignty with varying visions of what that means and how to achieve it (Kame‘eleihiwa 2004; Kauanui 2008a, 2008b, 2012; Trask 1987a, 1999).

18. For further examples of this revival of Hawaiian land use practices, see Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua (2013), also McGregor (2007).

19. On a YouTube video, an uploader going by the name of Kimonui, has a video, “Talking Gabby Story,” in which a story is told of Gabby Pahinui taking the opening lick from Three Dog Night’s “Shambala” to compose his own “Wai O Ke Aniani” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MoqEqozh-fA>; accessed February 25, 2016). While the narrator in the video uses another title, “O Nani Kauai,” he is certain that the song is from *Gabby*, the so-called Brown Album, the Gabby Pahinui Hawaiian Band’s debut recording from 1972 (Panini Records). In any case, the opening riff to “Wai O Ke Aniani” does sound similar to the “Shambala” riff. While I am uninterested in ascertaining whether the story is true, it indicates the widespread belief regarding Pahinui and other Native Hawaiian musicians’ willingness to integrate influences from contemporary popular music during the Second Renaissance period.

CHAPTER 1. Getting the “Right Hawaiian Feeling”

Epigraphs: Akamine (1977a, 6); H. Wood (1999, 5).

1. Hapa haole, literally “half foreigner,” is used to categorize Hawaiian-themed popular music that is based on continental U.S. popular music forms. As noted in the text, since most of this music was composed in the early twentieth century in attempts to cash in on the Hawaiian craze of the time, the songs follow vaudeville and Tin Pan Alley forms rather than traditional Hawaiian mele or hula forms. For a more detailed investigation of the hapa haole song phenomenon, see Charles Hiroshi Garrett, “Sounds of Paradise: Hawai‘i and the American Musical Imagination” (in Garrett 2008); Buck (1993); George Kanahele, “Hapa Haole Songs,” in Kanahele and Berger (2012, 244–46); Connell and Gibson (2008); and Solberg (1983). For a study that recuperates hapa haole song from its critics, though with important qualifications, see Aiko Yamashiro (2009). There is also a Japanese equivalent called hapa kepani, or half Japanese.

2. Sudden Rush’s version of “Hi‘ilawe” appears as track 2 on the release *Ea* (Quiet Storm Records, 2002), CD.

3. I discuss in the next chapter, which focuses on kuleana, or rights and responsibilities, the idea of using tunings and performing songs without permission and the serious breach of Hawaiian protocol it represents. I discuss the Hawaiian Renaissance period in more detail in chapter 4.

4. One of the few historical photographs I have seen of a paniolo with a guitar is an undated (c. 1950s?) image of Japanese paniolo Yoshi Kawamoto, available at “Paniolo Preservation Society Honors the Japanese Cowboy on Sat., Feb. 4 during Waimea’s