SETTLER MILITARISM

WORLD WAR II IN HAWAIʻI & THE MAKING OF US EMPIRE

JULIET NEBOLON

Settler Militarism

JULIET
NEBOLON

Settler Militarism

WORLD WAR II IN HAWAIʻI AND THE MAKING OF US EMPIRE

Duke University Press Durham and London 2024

Printed in the United States of America on
acid-free paper ∞
Project Editor: Lisa Lawley
Designed by Matthew Tauch
Typeset in MeropeBasic by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Nebolon, Juliet, [date] author.
Title: Settler militarism : World War II in Hawai'i and the making of US empire / Juliet Nebolon.
Other titles: World War II in Hawai'i and the making of US empire
Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2024. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2024003242 (print)
LCCN 2024003243 (ebook)
ISBN 9781478031017 (paperback)
ISBN 9781478026778 (hardcover)
ISBN 9781478060031 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Settler colonialism—Hawaii—History. | Martial law—Hawaii—History—20th century. | World War, 1939–1945—Hawaii. | Hawaiians—Ethnic identity—History. | United States—Armed Forces—Hawaii—History. | Hawaii—Colonization—Social aspects. | BISAC: SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / American / General | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / American / Native American Studies
Classification: LCC DU627.5 .N436 2024 (print) | LCC DU627.5 (ebook) | DDC 940.53/969—dc23/eng/20240430
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2024003242
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2024003243

Cover art: Lehuauakea, *Huliau Me Ka Māuiki'iki'i (Revolution and the Solstice)*, 2022. Oil, ink, and metal leaf on wood panel, 18 × 24 in. Photo courtesy of Mario Gallucci.

For Chris

Contents

Acknowledgments

I could not have written this book without the help, support, and knowledge of so many people. My academic journey began at Wesleyan University, where advisers Alex Dupuy and J. Kēhaulani Kauanui instilled in me a love for learning, research, and creative thinking. My greatest thanks go to Kēhaulani Kauanui, whose conviction and fortitude continually inspire me and who has offered crucial insight, unflinching critique, and kindness at every stage. I continue to be indebted to her mentorship. As a graduate student at Yale University, I was lucky to work with brilliant advisers. My committee chair, Mary Lui, single-handedly trained me to conduct archival research, listened to and corralled my expansive ambitions, and provided honest, incisive feedback on numerous drafts of my chapters. Thank you to Matthew Frye Jacobson for sharing his encyclopedic knowledge of American cultural history and for his true generosity as a teacher. Inderpal Grewal guided my understandings of transnational feminism and offered vital advice at key moments. I am also grateful for all that I learned in classes and conversation with Jean-Christophe Agnew, Jafari Allen, Laura Barraclough, Ned Blackhawk, Daniel Botsman, Daphne Brooks, Alicia Schmidt Camacho, Hazel Carby, Michael Denning, Kathryn Dudley, Crystal Feimster, Zareena Grewal, Greta LaFleur, Albert Laguna, Kathryn Lofton, Joanne Meyerowitz, Stephen Pitti, Joanna Radin, and Laura Wexler. At Yale, friends and members of my cohort provided kind feedback and camaraderie: Susie An, Melissa Castillo-Garsow, Melanie Chambliss, Karla Cornejo Villavicencio, Marilyn Flores, Arielle Gorin, Holly Miowak Guise, Fadila Habchi, Christopher Kramaric, Najwa Mayer, Kaneesha Parsard, Sebi Pérez, Joey Plaster, Melissa Paa Redwood, Tyler Rogers, Ashanti Shih, Aaron Sweeney, Bo Tao, Randa Tawil, Quan Tran, and Heather Vermeulen. Thank you to LiLi Johnson and Courtney Sato for their friendship, support, and insight during these years and after.

I am grateful to have spent two years as a postdoctoral fellow at the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History at Harvard University. Thank you to Walter Johnson, Arthur Patton-Hock, and Monnikue McCall for creating a generative space in which to make the transition from graduate student to scholar, and especially to Walter for his generous guidance and support during this period. I'm so grateful for the mentorship and friendship of Genevieve Clutario, who offered encouragement and advice as I navigated writing, teaching, and the job market. Genevieve, Vince Brown, Dean Itsuji Saranillio, Nayan Shah, Penny Von Eschen, and Robin D. G. Kelley offered invaluable criticism and insight on a very early draft of this manuscript that greatly impacted the trajectory of the project. Leanne Day became a close friend while we were living in Boston, and I'm so thankful for her friendship and incisive understanding of my work. During these years at the Warren Center, I was lucky to receive mentorship, friendship, insight, and reinforcement from David Armitage, Melissa Castillo-Garsow, Chris Clements, Eleanor Craig, Christina Davidson, Philip Deloria, Ruodi Duan, Nick Estes, Garrett Felber, Elizabeth Hinton, Lauren Kaminsky, Ju Yon Kim, Tej Nagaraja, Kristin Oberiano, Stuart Schrader, Kristina Shull, and Kirsten Weld.

I have such good fortune to work at Trinity College surrounded by outstanding colleagues and intellectual interlocutors. Davarian Baldwin's mentorship and leadership are inspiring and indispensable. Deepest admiration for Christina Heatherton and Jordan Camp, whom I am so lucky to know and work alongside. Amanda Guzmán has continually been a source of good sense and humor, and I am so grateful for her friendship and our lunches. Without the hard work and expertise of Veronica Zuñiga, our program and collective project could not function. I treasure the research community we have created in our Entangled Histories cluster at the Trinity Social Justice Institute: thank you to Christina, Jordan, Davarian, Amanda, Diana Aldrete, Mary McNeil, Channon Miller, and Leniqueca Welcome for your commitment to making this space what it is. Thank you as well to colleagues who have offered support, insight, or friendship over the years: Zayde Antrim, Jeffrey Bayliss, Benjamin Carbonetti, Sonia Cardenas, Elise Castillo, Dario Euraque, Scott Gac, Cheryl Greenberg, Christopher Hager, Isaac Kamola, Anne Lambright, Seth Markle, Steve Marston, Reo Matsuzaki, Rebecca Pappas, Diana Paulin, Ibrahim Shikaki, Tom Wickman, Stephanie Wong, and Hilary Wyss. Thank you to Jeffrey Liszka and Yolanda Bergstrom-Lynch for their hard work with library materials and digital collections that enriches our classrooms and campus. I am lucky to teach wonderful students, for whom

I have great respect and from whom I have learned so much: thank you in particular to Natalie Tanaka, Felipe De La Cruz, and Momo Djebli.

Many others have impacted this work by contributing critical engagement or constructive critique over the years. And many, whether they may remember or not, offered kind encouragement or advice at pivotal moments in this project's journey. Thank you to Hōkūlani Aikau, Wesley Attewell, Abigail Boggs, Leslie Bow, Jodi Byrd, Keith Camacho, Christopher Capozzola, Clint Carroll, Jason Chang, Cindy I-Fen Cheng, Megumi Chibana, Kandice Chuh, Patrick Chung, Christian Ayne Crouch, Robert Culp, Joseph Darda, Iyko Day, Adrian De Leon, Tabetha Ewing, Keith Feldman, Andrew Friedman, Candace Fujikane, Takashi Fujitani, Evyn Lê Espiritu Gandhi, Rebekah Garrison, Alyosha Goldstein, Vernadette Vicuña Gonzalez, Rebecca Herman, Lauren Hirshberg, Hiʻilei Hobart, Rebecca Hogue, Daniel HoSang, Michael Innis-Jiménez, Khalil Anthony Johnson, Kyle Kajihiro, Eng-Beng Lim, Lori Kido Lopez, Jodi Kim, Lili Kim, Paul Kramer, Jana Lipman, Uahikea Maile, Simeon Man, Nayan Shah, Laurel Mei-Singh, Max Mishler, Mary X. Mitchell, Emily Mitchell-Eaton, Christian Hart Nakarado, Tiara Na'puti, Logan Narikawa, Richard Nisa, Jean O'Brien, Gary Okihiro, Josephine Ong, A. Naomi Paik, ʻUmi Perkins, Khury Petersen-Smith, Joel Pfister, Laura Pulido, Chandan Reddy, Roberto Saba, Dean Saranillio, Cathy Schlund-Vials, Rebecca Schreiber, Noenoe K. Silva, Seema Sohi, Kim TallBear, Eric Tang, Ty Kawika P. Tengan, Wesley Ueunten, Julie Weise, Joseph Weiss, Tessa Winkelmann, Lisa Yoneyama, and Timothy Yu.

The knowledge and hard work of archivists and librarians have been invaluable to this project, especially Sherman Seki at the Archives and Manuscripts Department in the Hamilton Library at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa; the archival staff at the Hawaiian and Pacific Collection in the Hamilton Library at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa; Marcia Kemble at the Japanese Cultural Center of Hawaiʻi; Eric Vanslander at the National Archives in College Park, MD; William Greene at the National Archives in San Bruno, CA; the Northern Mariana Islands Museum of History and Culture in Saipan, N.M.I.; and Kalani Kaanaana at the Hawaii Medical Library at the Queen's Medical Center in Honolulu. Gwen Sinclair at the Government Documents Collection in the Hamilton Library at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa generously shared her research and collection of newspaper articles that pertained to US military landholdings. I likewise acknowledge the *Honolulu Star-Advertiser* for allowing me to reprint some of the images in this book.

I could not have completed my research for this project without financial support from the American Studies Program, the Yale Club of San Francisco, the John F. Enders Research Fellowship, and the Smith Richardson Founda-

tion at Yale University; the Charles Warren Center at Harvard University; and Trinity College. An American Council of Learned Societies Fellowship offered critical support toward the completion of this project. Opportunities to present or workshop portions of this manuscript yielded invaluable feedback and discussion that strengthened the work. Thank you to Charles Geisler, Raymond Craib, Paul Nadasdy, and the participants of the Summer Institute on Contested Global Landscapes at Cornell University; Cathy Schlund-Vials and the participants of the Bodies Living with Violence Workshop at the University of Connecticut; Joanna Radin and participants of "Cold War Indigeneity in Science and Medicine" at Yale University; Mary Lui and members of the Yale Asian American Studies Working Group; Margot Canaday, Nancy Cott, Robert Self, and participants of "The Intimate State: Gender, Sexuality, and Governance in Modern U.S. History" at Brown University; the History Department and participants of the "New Approaches to Gender and Migration in the U.S. since 1900" at Bates College; Katherine Achacoso, Halena Kapuni-Reynolds, Logan Narikawa, and participants of "(Re)mapping Indigenous and Settler Geographies in the Pacific" at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa; Paul Kramer and participants of "Social Landscapes of U.S. Military Empire" at Vanderbilt University; Christina Heatherton, Jordan Camp, and members of the Entangled Histories Research Cluster at the Trinity Social Justice Institute; and Roberto Saba, Katie Brewer Ball, and members of the Indigenous Studies Research Network at Wesleyan University.

An early version of chapter 2 appeared as "'Life Given Straight from the Heart': Settler Militarism, Biopolitics, and Public Health in Hawai'i during World War II," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 1 (2017): 23–45. I sincerely thank the two anonymous reviewers and the AQ Editorial Board, particularly Hōkūlani Aikau, for their feedback on this article during the revision process, which was also very influential for my overall project. A previous version of chapter 5 appeared as "Settler-Military Camps: Internment and Prisoner of War Camps across the Pacific Islands during World War II," *Journal of Asian American Studies* 24, no. 2 (2021): 299–335.

Ken Wissoker believed in this project since our first meeting at the Association for Asian American Studies conference, and I have truly valued his vital advice and direction. Thank you to the editorial board and staff at Duke University Press, especially Joshua Gutterman Tranen and Kate Mullen for their support throughout the revision and production process and Lisa Lawley for her hard work as project editor. Thank you to Donald Pharr for his careful copyedits and Andrew Ascherl for his meticulous work creating the index. I deeply appreciate the two external reviewers for their careful

engagement with my work and their insightful, capacious, and generous feedback, which greatly transformed the project and improved my writing.

I am eternally grateful for wonderful family and friends. Thank you so much to the Changs in Honolulu for opening their homes to me. I am lucky to have had the company of extended family during my research trips. I am thankful for the love and support of the Nebolon and McCluskey families in California; and the Michael, Lowe, Mark, Dow, and Ng families in Massachusetts. My best friend, Lily Fesler, has been a constant source of support, laughter, and adventure since we met in our dorm room on the first day of college. Thank you to my dad, whose enthusiasm each time I express my passions has fostered my belief in myself. I have a lifetime of gratitude for my mom, whose love, experience, and insight have given me the confidence to pursue my personal and intellectual ambitions, and who has encouraged and thought with me throughout this project. As my mother, companion, confidant, and teacher, she is my guidepost and my inspiration.

Finally, I am so fortunate to share my life with Chris Michael and Joss Nebolon-Michael. Joss, who came into the world just as I finished this book, already brings me immeasurable joy with each gleeful smile, curious babble, and discerning glance. I cannot wait to know the person he becomes. Words cannot fully express my gratitude for Chris, who for sixteen years has continued to teach me what it means to truly be a partner in every imaginable way. He has supported my dreams before his own, but our journey together already exceeds them. This book is dedicated to Chris: almost half of my life has been made with you, and I still love you more each day.

Introduction

Settler Militarism, Racial Liberal Biopolitics, and Social Reproduction

Two wartime photographs publicized key US imperatives of martial law during World War II in Hawai'i. The first, published in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* in April 1942, depicts a high school student in O'ahu, Susan Kang, receiving a vaccination from US Army captain H. R. Meiz, supervised by Colonel Edgar King, a surgeon, and M. F. Haralson, the commissioner for the Territorial Board of Health (figure I.1).[1] The caption reads, "Susan Kang . . . answers the citywide 'call to arms' and is immunized against typhoid," thus linking this vaccination to patriotic military defense under martial law in Hawai'i during World War II. In fact, Kang was one of 363,000 civilians who were subject to mandatory vaccinations by military order in the islands. Kang is standing facing away from the supervising white male officials, who, instead of looking at her face, are focusing intently on the sight of the injection, with the number of personnel far exceeding the need for the proper execution of the procedure. Meiz's firm grip on Kang's arm implies that she is being subjected involuntarily, and he looks down and leans slightly away from her—as though he is holding an animal, not a human being. This dehumanizing portrayal suggests a racial and gendered difference between these individuals that paradoxically otherizes this young girl while also portraying her as a model for wartime patriotism and assimilation.

Another photograph, thought to have been taken by the US Navy, depicts four women defense laborers, Isabel Nascimento, Catherine Ohumukini, Harriet Garcia, and Sally Young, smiling as they move pallets at a storehouse (figure I.2). The happy faces of the four women pictured here

belie the reality of the acute labor shortage during this period, in which the US Army unilaterally froze employment and wages, required many laborers to work seventy hours per week, and criminalized absenteeism.[2] As Samuel Kamaka Jr. remembers, when the war started, "We were frozen to our jobs, so we couldn't leave or run away and go away to school, so everything was in confusion. . . . We had twelve-hour shifts. . . . We worked six, six days a week and we had a lot of overtime, of course. . . . I think it was sixty-five cents an hour."[3] The US military government employed workers, in conjunction with an unprecedented acquisition of Hawaiian land, to clear and industrialize landscapes for use as bases, training grounds, ammunitions storage, and other military installations.

Taken together, these two photographs demonstrate how the patriotic necessity of the health of all people in Hawai'i was fundamental to extreme wartime requirements for total labor mobilization in the service of war. That is, after a settler colonial history in which disease itself had been complicit in the deaths of many Kanaka Maoli (the Indigenous people of Hawai'i), the pressures of wartime mobilization led the military government to target the optimal health of all lives—white, Asian, and Hawaiian—even as it perpetuated militarized racial logics that demonized Japanese immigrants and settler colonial structures that naturalized white possession and denied Native sovereignty.[4] Thus, these photographs illuminate select components of the social reproduction of US settler militarism: in these unsettling racialized, gendered, and biopolitical scenes, we can see the imprint of a martial law government working to reconcile its wartime capitalist dependence on nonwhite life and labor with its colonial and military desires to otherize, dispossess, and deplete the vitality of those same lives. Significantly, mandatory vaccination and labor were only a part of this biopolitical, capitalist project that sought to cultivate and purportedly "improve" people and land in Hawai'i, specifically to intensify the racialized and colonial expropriation of life and land as a wartime resource.

Throughout this period the US military unilaterally acquired Hawaiian land at an unprecedented rate, conscripting spaces to fortify militarized biopolitical projects that socially reproduced the uneven racialized, gendered, and colonial relations of this imperial war. Further, just as mandatory immunization cultivated health to boost labor productivity, so too did blood banks collect biological resources from this "healthy" population, reporting donation statistics via a racial hierarchy of patriotic service. Homemaking campaigns targeted immigrant families as a central unit of wartime social reproduction, promoted assimilation to American nutritional standards and

FIGURE 1.1 · The caption of this photograph in the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* is "ANSWER 'CALL TO ARMS': Susan Kang, student at Farrington high school, answers the citywide 'call to arms' and is immunized against typhoid by Capt. H. R. Meiz of the army. Looking on (*left to right*) are Col. Edgar King, Hawaiian department surgeon, and M. F. Haralson, territorial health commissioner and administrator of the emergency medical service of the office of civilian defense." *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, April 8, 1942. Hawaii War Records Depository HWRD 0738, UHM Library Digital Image Collections.

domestic customs, and masked the persistence of Native Hawaiian food cultures and land-based epistemologies of health. In wartime schools, teachers cultivated "proper" Americanized language, speech, and citizenship in the classroom while training students of all races in gendered wartime vocational skills. Beyond these biopolitical projects that both incorporated and differentiated diverse peoples in Hawai'i, the US military government interned Japanese settlers it deemed "disloyal" or "unassimilable" in military camps across the United States, Hawai'i, and the Pacific Islands.[5]

The World War II period in Hawai'i remains surprisingly understudied, despite its significance as the site of the longest imposition of martial law in US history (1941–44). The declaration of a state of emergency after the bombing of Pearl Harbor validated the defense of the United States by any

FIGURE 1.2 · From back of print: "Isabel Nascimento (*back left*), Catherine Ohumukini (*right*), Harriet Garcia (*front left*), and Sally Young working on pallets. (Scene at storehouse)." United States Navy ?, undated. Hawaii War Records Depository HWRD 2164, UHM Library Digital Image Collections.

means necessary: a democratic state at war can monopolize instruments of violence, intern populations, place an entire territory under martial law, and subjugate citizens and others with impunity. The extended period of martial law that followed transformed the wartime "state of emergency" into a technique of governance, through which the military state's suspension of constitutional rights permitted and innovated means for the administration of daily life. The mechanisms of martial law transformed not only landscapes and security measures but also standards for health and well-being, access to geographic mobility, language and cultural production, responsibilities of citizenship, and the economics of the home and family—all in the name of military defense and mobilization.

At 3:30 p.m. on December 7, 1941, the afternoon of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor, Territorial Governor Joseph B. Poindexter declared martial law in Hawai'i.[6] This measure, enacted in consultation with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, authorized Walter C. Short as the military governor

of Hawai'i and suspended the power of the territorial government.[7] General Delos C. Emmons, who replaced Short as military governor on December 17, announced via the *New York Times* that "martial law in Hawaii has been purposely designed to meet war conditions of military and vital necessity which were forced upon these islands by a new type of fast long-range invasion warfare." The military government in Hawai'i justified the enactment of martial law to the US government and the American public with its assertion of the "constant threat of repetition" of an aerial attack and because of the supposed threat of local Japanese informants living within Hawai'i itself.[8] The US War Department originally planned to evacuate all Japanese, who constituted more than a third of Hawai'i's population, but concerns about a labor shortage and its possible effects on wartime productivity led Emmons to eventually abort this plan. Emmons also reasoned that Nisei in Hawai'i could possibly serve as useful translators and soldiers during the war.[9] As in other instances of US martial law in colonial contexts, the US military enacted measures in Hawai'i to restrict and surveil civilian activity, including the immediate apprehension of "prime suspects," the fingerprinting and photographing of all civilians age six and older, and nightly blackouts and curfews.[10] The military also authorized orders to surveil and censor other domains of civilian life, such as news media, personal correspondence, radio signals, women's occupational statuses, noncitizens' home addresses, educational curriculum, foreign language instruction, and public health and sanitation.[11]

Hawai'i took on dual functions as both "home front" and "war front" during World War II: Hawai'i's location at the intersection of these spaces is illustrative of how the islands constituted both a US settler colony that was "included" in the US nation-state and a vital military outpost that connected the United States to the rest of the Pacific Theater. For these reasons, the martial law period in Hawai'i is an important era in which to analyze the convergence of these two settler and military regimes. I use the term *settler militarism* to refer to the dynamics through which settler colonialism and militarization simultaneously perpetuated, legitimated, and concealed one another during World War II.[12] Settler colonialism is a colonial project that—in contrast to franchise colonialism, which primarily uses Native peoples as a source of labor and capital—is predicated on land acquisition and the replacement, or elimination, of Indigenous peoples. Haunani-Kay Trask's work has been foundational to the study of settler colonialism in Hawai'i, as have the other contributors to *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i*, edited by Candace Fujikane

and Jonathan Okamura.[13] Militarization is the process by which military logics, force, occupation, and expansion come to be accepted as a solution or logical inevitability by the government and the general public.[14] Both projects are not merely political but are also cultural, social, economic, racialized, and gendered regimes that continually rearticulate themselves into everyday life in both hyper-visible and ostensibly invisible forms.

Settler militarism is thus a transnational and imperial dynamic through which structures of settler colonialism and militarization share mutual investments in land acquisition and the continued dispossession of Indigenous peoples. In Hawai'i and the Pacific Islands, settler militarism—though always complex, varying, and contested—emerged in the late nineteenth century, intensified during the World War II period, and continues to be elaborated in new, perverse forms today. Significantly, although settler militarism has operated across various locations throughout US history, it was never inevitable, is always unfinished, and is fundamentally reactive in nature: it is always responding to the continuing vitality of Native life and claims to sovereignty.[15] Settler colonialism is by definition incomplete: even as it desires totality via the social reproduction of the racial, gendered, and economic conditions that fortify it, it by necessity can never be total.[16] As Dean Itsuji Saranillio argues, conceiving of white supremacist structures such as settler colonialism in Hawai'i as "emerging from positions of weakness, not strength," more precisely illuminates both the desires and the inherent flaws of these regimes.[17] That is, every history of conquest, dispossession, and exploitation has produced its own contradictions as well as the conditions of its own challenge and demise.

Furthermore, an examination of the history of US settler militarism challenges dominant exceptionalist narratives of the World War II period in Hawai'i, which depict violent carceral projects such as internment, militarized land acquisition, and martial law as necessary aberrations during an otherwise "good war" fought in the name of liberal democracy.[18] That is, the period of martial law in Hawai'i was certainly unprecedented in many ways, but US military governance also built upon long-standing colonial, racial, and gendered dynamics in the islands that would continue to evolve and proliferate even after martial law was lifted in 1944. Scholars in Hawaiian studies such as Haunani-Kay Trask, Noenoe K. Silva, and Saranillio have already traced how the US military has played an integral role in securing settler claims to land in Hawai'i throughout history.[19] Trask and Silva discuss the involvement of the US military both in King Kalākaua's forced signing of the 1887 Bayonet Constitution and in the 1893 overthrow of Queen

Lili'uokalani. Trask further observes that the 1876 Reciprocity Treaty, which allowed for the duty-free trade of sugar between the islands and the US continent, also ceded Pu'uloa (now Pearl Harbor) to the United States for use as a military base upon its renewal in 1887.[20] This led to the illegal annexation of Hawai'i through the 1898 Newlands Resolution, which was a domestic US Congress resolution not recognized by international law that included the seizure of 1.8 million acres of Hawaiian Kingdom Crown Lands and Government Lands.[21] Significantly, Silva notes that Congress passed this resolution in order to secure the use of Hawai'i as a coaling station during the Spanish-American War.[22] Kanaka Maoli widely protested against this resolution and US annexation in 1898 through petitions that were signed by more than 38,000 of the population of 40,000.[23] In Hawai'i, the ever-changing structure of settler colonialism has always been intertwined with US military expansion. Yet despite these shared investments, settler and military relations have not always been smooth and sometimes were even extremely tense. For example, as Saranillio notes, there have often been frictions between the federal government and the Big Five sugar corporations, which monopolized the plantation economy, the territorial government, and affiliated legal and cultural institutions.[24] One period when these tensions came to a head was during the 1931 Massie case, which ended in the mistrial of five Hawaiian, Japanese, and Chinese men accused of beating and raping Thalia Massie, the wife of a naval officer. In the aftermath a US admiral incited the lynching of the accused, resulting in the death of Joseph Kahahawai. Unhappy with the supposed inability of the Big Five to govern and "control" the multiracial population in Hawai'i, US congressmen attempted unsuccessfully to place Hawai'i under a military commission.[25]

The specific collaboration of settler and military projects in the islands—while indeed sometimes fraught—laid the groundwork for their escalation during World War II and beyond. For example, on December 7, 1941, Governor Poindexter's power to declare martial law was derived from US settler colonial legislation: Section 67 of the 1900 Hawaiian Organic Act granted the territorial governor the power to "suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus or place the territory or any part thereof under martial law."[26] In the wake of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, discourses of "military necessity" against the Japanese enemy rationalized the US military presence and accelerated its acquisition of land. Over the course of the war, the US military occupied an all-time high of 648,666 acres of land in Hawai'i, which was more than eighteen times the 35,750 acres that it had used in 1940.[27] Vernadette Vicuña Gonzalez observes that the US government constructed the bombing

of Pearl Harbor as the *principal* violent event that led to Hawai'i's supposed "inclusion" in the United States. That is, militarized, patriotic tropes of collective injury and sacrifice have masked past and present US settler colonialism, including the 1893 overthrow, the 1898 unlawful annexation, and Hawai'i statehood in 1959.[28] Furthermore, as Fujikane, Okamura, and Saranillio have illustrated, in Hawai'i the patriotic and militarized narrative of the "World War II Nisei soldier" created the conditions for Asian settlers, and particularly Japanese settlers, to benefit from postwar movements for American citizenship, Hawaiian statehood, and civil rights—over and against Native Hawaiian resistance to these movements.[29]

Building on and indebted to this previous work in Hawaiian studies, the concept of settler militarism necessitates that we consider the regimes of settler colonialism and militarization in the Pacific Islands and Asia—as well as the racial triangulation of Indigenous peoples, Asian settlers, and white settlers—as intertwined. At the same time, we must recognize the dangers of combining these histories and structures uncritically via inclusionary rather than relational analyses. Although US wars have informed the experiences of Asian and Pacific Islander communities and their diaspora throughout history, we must acknowledge that the terms *Asia/Pacific* and *transpacific* are necessarily militarized and colonial categories.[30] The use of these terms without attending to these violent histories, as well as to the specificities of Pacific Indigenous peoples, histories, and struggles, simply rehearses settler, military, and colonial logics.[31] In this book I interrogate the settler military epistemologies that have engendered these categorizations, understanding that it is the history of US and Japanese colonialism, settler migration, militarization, and empire—not any inherent similarity between these areas or between Pacific Islander and Asian peoples—that has led Asia and the Pacific Islands to be considered by some to be one region. With this dynamic tension in mind, this book draws from Pacific Indigenous studies and Asian American studies and works to bring these fields into productive and closer conversation. As a mixed-race Asian American settler whose maternal grandparents and their siblings crossed the Pacific in the 1940s fleeing the Japanese bombings of China, my family history's imbrication with settler colonial wartime migration animates my responsibility to research settler military histories and the violent structures they have engendered. This book is written with the intention that understanding the historical entanglements of settler colonialism, capitalism, and military empire—which continue to structure our present—is integral to envisioning and strengthening solidarities across racialized and settler colonial contexts. I offer this book with the

hope that this relational research can contribute to further work that moves us closer to a reimagined future.

Accordingly, *Settler Militarism* builds upon recent work in American studies that elaborates settler colonialism as a relational analytic that is "constitutively entangled" with other formations such as white supremacy, racial capitalism, incarceration, immigration control, militarism, and overseas empire.[32] I argue that Hawai'i during World War II exemplifies a specific convergence of settler colonialism and militarization, but history is replete with examples of settler militarism in other arrangements and geographic contexts. For example, nineteenth-century US westward expansion was inextricably tied to and bolstered by the utilization of US military power, and today every US military base and former internment camp in the continental United States sits on Indigenous land.[33] Further, we cannot consider US overseas military basing without interrogating the history of settler colonialism that underlies and supports it. For example, although US military buildup in South Korea does not require the replacement of Korean sovereignty with US sovereignty, US military expansion during and after the Korean War was predicated on the use of military bases located in US settler colonies such as Hawai'i and Guam. The US military presence in South Korea endures today because of the maintenance of this network of settler military bases. Moreover, although the US occupation of Okinawa technically ended in 1972, US militarization in Okinawa has historically bolstered and masked Japanese settler colonialism in the island, and this continues even today: almost 75 percent of the US military installations in Japan are located in Okinawa, and US military installations cover 20 percent of the island, yet Okinawa does not even make up 1 percent of the total land area of Japan.[34] Thus, although it is outside the scope of this study, the dynamic of settler militarism surely permeates contexts beyond the World War II period in Hawai'i.

Racial Liberal Biopolitics

In addition, Hawai'i was a principally *biopolitical* space under martial law: in this book I examine settler militarism in ways that animate and complicate Michel Foucault's theory of biopolitics and its technologies of rule that "'make' live and 'let' die."[35] That is, biopower helps us to analyze the kinds of power that life-cultivating institutions can wield, but there are specificities—such as those that govern colonial, racialized, and capitalist contexts—that Foucault's writings do not fully explain. Because Foucault considers power as

amorphous and nonspecific, strictly Foucauldian interpretations of biopower cannot imagine power working differentially or there being differential levels of acquiescence to these projects.[36] For example, Silvia Federici argues that Foucauldian notions of biopower cannot account for how its "make live" imperative to reproduce the population targets men and women's bodies and livelihoods in highly differentiated ways. Likewise, I argue that biopower is not amorphous or undifferentiated: rather, the textures of its techniques seek to produce and order life according to the specific and varying racialized, gendered, and colonial desires of settler militarism, capitalism, and US empire.

During World War II, these asymmetrical dynamics were complex and rapidly changing. Over the course of the war, Hawai'i's population grew from approximately 423,000 to 500,000 as large numbers of soldiers and defense workers arrived from the continent to aid in military mobilization. Additionally, many civilians moved from the neighbor islands to O'ahu, hoping to be employed in defense work.[37] In 1940 women accounted for only 42 percent of the population in the islands, and after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the influx of servicemen and defense laborers, coupled with the evacuation of many (mostly white) women to the US continent, led men to far outnumber women in the territory. Thus, gender dynamics in Hawai'i were different from those in the continental United States, where women outnumbered men during the World War II period.[38] In 1940 Asian settlers made up at least 56 percent of the population in the islands, whereas white settlers made up 25 percent, and Native Hawaiians made up 15 percent. Japanese alone accounted for 37 percent of the total population, numbering at over 157,000. For comparison, this is more than the total number of Japanese Americans who were interned in the entire US continent during World War II.[39] Eighty percent of the population in Hawai'i were US citizens at this time.[40] All of this created a very specific wartime regime designed particularly for civilians living in Hawai'i that was characterized by a series of martial law policies that used logics of race, gender, and indigeneity as a means to regulate Hawai'i's racially diverse population during wartime. Furthermore, Hawai'i, which has throughout history been depicted as a "multiracial paradise," played a particular role at the intersection of US and Japanese empires, both of which used antiracism as an empire-building discourse. Just as the United States portrayed itself as an antiracist liberal power over and against Japan and other Axis enemies such as Germany, Japan portrayed its Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere as an antiracist alternative to Western imperialism and white supremacy, including US empire.[41] Thus, although it is significant that

martial law projects incorporated individuals of all racial groups during the war in a way that US wartime projects in the continent did not, there were domestic and transnational reasons why inclusionary racial logics were fostered selectively in some spaces but not in others.

Scholars such as Jodi Melamed or Mary Dudziak generally consider the racial liberal transition to have taken place in the United States during the postwar or Cold War period, but in Hawai'i discourses of antiracism, tolerance, and inclusion proliferated during World War II, even alongside militarized racist rhetoric that demonized the "Japanese enemy."[42] In Foucault's theorization of biopolitical governmentality and its "apparatus of security," he states that "instead of a binary division between the permitted and the prohibited, one establishes an average considered as optimal on the one hand, and, on the other, a bandwidth of the acceptable that must not be exceeded."[43] Wendy Brown articulates "tolerance" as a specific element of this biopower: "It is a singular form of such management insofar as it involves the simultaneous incorporation and maintenance of the otherness of the tolerated element."[44] In Hawai'i a biopolitical logic of "tolerance" preserved asymmetrical dynamics of racial otherness within a liberal democratic rhetoric of inclusion—that is, via "racial liberalism." Likewise, martial law projects in Hawai'i did not exclude nonwhite others outright via racist policies; rather, the US military government "tolerated" the racial difference of diverse peoples out of a military necessity for total labor mobilization in the islands and created a "bandwidth of the acceptable" for wartime behavior on the part of these peoples. Furthermore, military documents of the period professed triumphantly that during World War II, Hawai'i "became a *laboratory* for the study of martial law," connoting imagery of the islands as controlled environments in which experiments were conducted upon bodies, populations, and landscapes in order to boost military strength and productivity.[45] Describing Hawai'i as a "laboratory" suggests that this "experiment" concerned the extent to which these protracted conditions of biopolitical control and racial liberalism in Hawai'i could serve as a successful model for other current and future US military occupations in the Pacific Islands, Asia, or, indeed, throughout the world.

As this wartime regime of racial liberalism included all racial groups in the biopolitical administration, it simultaneously continued to intensify the classification of these racially differentiated peoples while denying Hawaiian indigeneity. For example, as I explain in chapter 2, the Honolulu Blood Bank accepted donations from those of any race throughout the war—which was not always the case in the US continent. Yet the military government also

published monthly statistics of which racial group was donating the most blood, which "included" Hawaiians as a so-called racial group rather than acknowledging Hawaiian indigeneity and sovereign rights to land. As Jodi Melamed argues, official antiracism does not eliminate racial difference but rather accentuates a hierarchy of differential racialization through veiled racial codes of privilege and stigma, thus fortifying the conditions for legitimate state violence.[46] Racial liberal programs in Hawai'i, from blood donation to English-only education, compelled broad wartime participation without accounting for structural inequalities created by past and present racial and colonial violence. In fact, pressures to demonstrate patriotism via participation and labor were most acute for racialized peoples and noncitizens—particularly those who were suspected of disloyalty—as well as for Kanaka Maoli, who were granted citizenship under the 1900 Hawaiian Organic Act, which designated Hawai'i as a US territory.[47] Overall, racial liberal inclusion contributed to a biopolitical regime of social ordering and reproduction during the war in Hawai'i: I use the term *racial liberal biopolitics* to refer to this dynamic. Yet, in actuality, the US military government's biopolitical regime of racial inclusion was far from "inclusive," and furthermore it was reliant upon spaces of racial exclusion and incarceration: as chapter 5 explores, the US military imprisoned Asian settlers and Indigenous peoples in internment and prisoner-of-war camps across Hawai'i, the Marshall Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands during this period.

Furthermore, racial liberal biopolitics in wartime Hawai'i was specifically a means through which the military government denied Hawaiian sovereignty and naturalized Hawaiian dispossession for the purposes of settler military buildup and expansion. Aileen Moreton-Robinson's work illustrates how settler colonial logics of white possession operate "through the racialized application of disciplinary knowledges and regulatory mechanisms [i.e., biopower], which function together to preclude recognition of Indigenous sovereignty."[48] In Hawai'i the US military government's racial liberal biopolitical projects worked against Hawaiian sovereignty by seeking to reproduce the conditions of settler militarism: that is, by intensifying racial differentiation, masking indigeneity, and rationalizing militarized land acquisition. Racial liberalism thus not only incorporated to differentiate, but it also foreclosed a critical analysis of indigeneity and settler colonialism. A principal example of this dynamic at work is the US military government's argument—ostensibly made in the spirit of racial "tolerance"—that "the Chinese, Filipino, Hawaiian, and various Caucasian people caused no concern because it was known where their sympathies lay. The big question mark

were the Japanese with their quaint oriental customs, poorly assimilated into our western civilization."[49] The hyper-visibility of both racial differentiation and anti-Japanese racism within racial liberal statements such as this created a boundary for acceptable loyal behavior on the part of so-called good racialized peoples. The continual inclusion of Hawaiians as a "racial group" in Hawai'i also placed Native Hawaiians alongside immigrants as "assimilable," and it classified them as a racial group rather than an Indigenous people with land and sovereignty rights amounting to a national claim. Further, the militarized caricature of the "Japanese enemy" rationalized the project of martial law as a necessary wartime aberration and obfuscated the ongoing history of settler colonialism and unlawful occupation that formed its conditions of possibility in Hawai'i.[50] This critique of race and indigeneity as distinct yet interrelated categories is essential to halting the reproduction of racial discourse and classifications that are predicated on an a priori assumption of the US nation-state as a white possession—such as that expressed above in the military government's statement.[51] Overall, under martial law, racial liberal biopower simultaneously intensified the codes of gendered white patriotism as a regulatory power, perpetuated the differentiation of racialized peoples, precluded a recognition of indigeneity, and elided the ongoing history of settler colonialism—and thus was *always* also gendered, colonial, and militarized as it stretched to absolve the contradictions embedded in the regime of settler militarism. Yet at the same time, this project and its rationalizations were always unfinished, always unstable, and always failing.[52]

Capitalism and the Social Reproduction of Settler Militarism

During World War II, settler militarism and racial liberal biopolitics operated together in the service of capitalism; collectively, the social reproduction of these structures created the conditions for the late twentieth-century expansion of US military empire. In discussing capitalism and social reproduction in this way, I draw from Cedric Robinson and scholars of racial capitalism, Native American and Indigenous studies, and Marxist, transnational, and Black feminisms: scholars across these fields invoke histories of transatlantic slavery, colonial conquest, and the enclosure of the European commons in order to analyze race, gender, and indigeneity as material relations of capitalism.[53] Building upon these conversations, we can understand how the era of so-called primitive accumulation—that is, the plundering

of racialized unpaid labor and Indigenous lands as well as the rupture of noncapitalist social forms such as reciprocal relations between humans and the natural world—never ended, as Marx originally formulated, but continues to sustain capitalist modes of production.[54] This understanding of primitive accumulation further affects how we interpret Marx's theories of abstraction—that is, the equation of objects and labor that are unequal, and the denial of their incommensurability.[55] Marx theorized in the *Grundrisse* that capitalist modernity desires abstraction, arguing that the United States had "truly realized" labor abstraction through its indifferent aggregation of differing types of labor.[56] Yet in spite of this, we know that capitalism has not only abstracted and denied but also has continually *profited from* the specific inequalities and differences produced by histories of race, slavery, and colonialism. In this way, capitalism produces the myth that it accumulates indifferently and homogeneously while profiting materially from the racial, gendered, and colonial differentiation of life: as Federici argues, beyond the appropriation of uncompensated labor and land, primitive accumulation is also the accumulation of these differences that are constitutive of capitalist production and reproduction.[57]

Racial liberal biopower thus aids and abets capitalism's violent dynamic of abstraction via the social reproduction and ordering of peoples, landscapes, and relationships such that relations of capital and property seem rational and inevitable rather than failing, incomplete, and contradictory.[58] For example, both settler militarism and capitalism are dependent upon the accumulation of life, labor, and land to reproduce themselves, yet they are also continually producing their own conditions of austerity through violent and extractive projects that are life and land destroying.[59] Further, this repertoire of settler military, capitalist, and racialized biopolitical mechanisms for dispossession built upon and aligned with colonial discourses of "improvement" and modernity that underlie liberal Lockean theories of property. For example, John Locke's assertion in *The Second Treatise of Government* that it is only improvement via rational labor that can produce valued property is a racial liberal biopolitical logic that devalues and marginalizes Indigenous noncapitalist relations to land while presenting predatory capitalist projects as modern, life-cultivating, and in the service of "public good."[60] We can see this logic of improvement operate across settler military regimes of land acquisition, public health, domestic science, and education.

Further, as capitalism produces unsustainable dynamics of inequality and scarcity that eventually hinder its reproduction, it seeks to remedy its own insufficiencies through military expansion, war, and the colonial

appropriation of additional markets, labor, land, and natural resources, as well as through the reiteration of these forms of expropriation within.[61] Thus, as we can see in the case of martial law in Hawai'i and in subsequent US military occupations elsewhere, twentieth-century US empire continually rearticulated and elaborated the primitive accumulation of life, land, and labor as it expanded across the Pacific Islands toward Asia—even as this project was often cloaked within liberal tropes of rescue and rehabilitation, liberation and human rights, or free-market inclusion.

That is, racial liberal biopolitics works to socially reproduce the racial, gendered, cultural, and economic conditions that fortify settler militarism and capitalism. Yet during World War II, these regimes did not have enough willing, healthy laborers to reproduce and expand themselves.[62] At the start of the war, this acute shortage led the US army to unilaterally control labor standards, including wages, working conditions, and the proportion of laborers allocated per wartime industry. Over the course of the war, the US military required workers in public utilities, local and federal government, and government contractors and subcontractors to remain in their positions, while criminalizing absenteeism. Often, laborers were required to work up to seventy-hour weeks. The provost court gave those who disobeyed these regulations punishments ranging from a $150 to a $1,000 fine to jail sentences of up to one year.[63] The military government and the plantations collaborated via a "labor-loan" program, in which plantations forcibly loaned workers to the above industries while continuing to pay them plantation wages and pocketing the surplus from the higher defense wages.[64] This repertoire of labor-control projects increased the number of laborers employed by the federal government eight-fold during the war.[65] These figures speak both to the scale of forced wartime labor and to the immense collective profit that the US military and plantations accumulated during this period. All of these measures—and in particular, the sugar plantations' "labor-loan" program—were examples of the primitive accumulation of labor and, because of the nature of the work, contributed to the primitive accumulation of land. Furthermore, these coercive and punitive responses to labor scarcity are an expression of settler militarism reacting to its internally produced crisis. They reveal the military government and settler military regime's reliance on labor, as well as its fear of the labor unrest that would have occurred had martial law not been declared.

The US military and business leaders sought to rationalize and mask the reality of this inhumane, extractive project: labor-control discourses dovetailed with wartime patriotism and racial dynamics. For example, workers

who participated in labor unrest, were frequently absent, or showed a lack of morale were labeled as subversive to the war effort. Many unions were anti-Japanese, and some even explicitly colluded with the military government: for example, the Stevedores Union agreed to surveil its multiracial workforce—many of whom were Japanese, Filipino, Chinese, and Hawaiian—for "security and efficiency on the warfront." In 1943 Military Governor Richardson argued that Japanese labor unrest necessitated the continuation of martial law and blamed the high absentee rate in waterfront work on the alleged "traditional laxity here of the work habits of the Filipinos."[66] Richardson's racialized explanation sought to mask the contradictions of this martial law labor regime built upon a de facto convict labor system. Further, the US military's constant focus on public health not only sought to increase worker productivity but also performed the ruse that the US military government valued life in Hawai'i. Yet labor control would not have been necessary if this wartime project were truly benevolent or life cultivating, rather than extractive, racially exploitative, and colonial.

Beyond the defense industries that the US military government explicitly controlled and surveilled, this book primarily considers the additional forms of racialized and gendered labor required for the social reproduction of settler militarism and capitalism. Social reproduction comprises the myriad biological, physical, and affective labors necessary to reproduce the living worker as well as to reproduce the social, structural, political, and economic relations of production.[67] For example, martial law centralized gendered forms of white patriotism as dominant models for assimilation and loyalty in order to optimize and reproduce the population for war. Just as US martial law harnessed logics of militarized masculinity in the making of patriotic servicemen, defense workers, and blood donors, so too did it necessitate militarized femininity: wartime mobilization depended upon the feminized, affective labors of domesticity and care in its reproduction and maintenance of a multiracial population ready and supposedly willing to serve the war effort. The military government enlisted women of all races—for example, as nurses, mothers, and teachers—in this reproductive labor and in many cases subjected them to increased military scrutiny. Nurses and teachers constituted the principal executors of the wartime registration, fingerprinting, and vaccination of civilians in the islands. Hawaiian, immigrant, and white mothers faced pressure to abide by wartime rationing and nutritional regulations, manage efficient homes, and raise healthy, patriotic children. Teachers were instructed that in the classroom, "*All* prejudices *must* be submerged," in order to help cultivate feelings of patriotism and loyalty among their

multiracial students.[68] Because of the specific race, gender, and class dynamics of Hawai'i, it was in many cases Indigenous and immigrant people of color who were enlisted to carry out this gendered labor.

Social reproduction thus recapitulated the uneven and hierarchical conditions of settler militarism and capitalism, which included the contradictory project of cultivating life and labor within a wartime context marked by death, displacement, and dispossession. Reproductive labors, in this sense, not only sought to reproduce the worker in the service of total wartime mobilization but were also tasked with absolving the contradictions of settler militarism and capitalism while reproducing these structures' asymmetrical conditions of emergence, including the differentiated dynamics of race, gender, and colonialism for primitive accumulation in its various forms.[69] For example, chapter 1 examines the federal government's acquisition of land for military purposes via eminent domain cases in the US district court and via leases, licenses, and permits from the territorial government and private landowners. Legal regimes of eminent domain and land leasing employed capitalist logics of property and fair exchange to conceal the reiteration of primitive accumulation and render the US military's unilateral environmental desecration of Hawaiian land as "just." As I discuss in chapters 2, 3, and 4, affective, biopolitical labors of nursing, mothering, and teaching sought to cultivate biological life and produce feelings such as safety, patriotism, or well-being, even as they also fortified settler military conditions of gendered racialization, violence, and extraction. Chapter 2 focuses on how wartime public health projects targeted health and hygiene practices as a means to aid military surveillance, territorial organization, and labor productivity: the mandatory immunization program vaccinated individuals to maintain an uncontaminated military base in Hawai'i and reproduce healthy citizens who could contribute to the defense industry, and the Honolulu Blood Bank stored donations from these healthy citizens for use in the case of another emergency. Chapter 3 examines the US military government's focus on home economics, nutrition, mothering, and child care: these domestic projects included families of all races, while also constructing the "secure" American family home over and against Asian immigrant family practices that did not meet these standards, and masking the persistence of Native Hawaiian food cultures and land-based epistemologies of health. Chapter 4 analyzes wartime education and language projects for civilians in Hawai'i—including primary, secondary, and university education; foreign language schools; the Speak American Campaign; and the recruitment of Hawai'i Nisei to the Military Intelligence Service Language School. These wartime pedagogies

were more than simply an effort to educate children about language and citizenship; they constituted a repertoire for the social reproduction of settler militarism.

As Hawai'i became a biopolitical center of the Pacific War, the coercive conditions of martial law, settler militarism, and racial capitalism compelled all people in Hawai'i to cultivate biological health, even as these conditions divided the inhabitants according to invented classifications. This project brought Indigenous and immigrant peoples into its administration of life on the condition that they labored in the service of the US war effort, exhibited patriotism and loyalty, affirmed their position in the settler colonial racial hierarchy, and did not make alternative claims to sovereignty over occupied lands. Furthermore, the productive and reproductive labor of predominantly nonwhite settler and Indigenous peoples fortified a military state that not only did not "include" many of them as full citizens in the liberal sense but that also actively worked to dispossess and incarcerate them—even as it purported to be invested in their health and livelihood beyond the extraction of labor and biological resources.[70] In this way the military state cultivated the health and extracted the labor of those living in Hawai'i for the express purpose of reproducing the security and vitality of *other* lives in the US military, continent, and empire. That is, the military state used the collective product of this wartime labor—the infrastructure of settler militarism—to violently invade and occupy others' lands, often interning them, all under the guise of liberation.[71] Chapter 5 focuses on the wartime internment of Japanese immigrants, Indigenous peoples, and prisoners of war across Hawai'i and Micronesia—and furthermore the circulation of prisoners between these camps and those in the US continent. Decentering the focus on internment as a domestic project of racialized exclusion that took place only in the continental United States, this chapter analyzes how this transnational network of camps used varying logics of racialized military detention, Indigenous displacement, and racial liberal biopolitics as it evacuated and interned Asian and Indigenous peoples across lands acquired for US military projects. This is one example of how techniques of settler militarism were replicated and transformed across the Pacific Islands and Asia, laying the foundation for US military empire in the late twentieth century and today.

Settler militarism is contradictory: as it allegedly prioritized life in Hawai'i, it also elaborated the conditions for violence and death in militarized spaces. Yet, given the long and continuing history of US colonialism and capitalism, it should not surprise us that the "make live" imperative of racial liberal biopower became a tool in the death-dealing context of

war: it fortified the burgeoning US military empire and its ambitions to govern which lives it valued, which it extracted, and which it considered disposable. However, this project has never been sustainable, and settler militarism and capitalism sought to mitigate this unsustainability via imperial expansion toward additional sources of labor, markets, and natural resources. Thus, as settler militarism claimed to protect and fortify those lives that it was continually depleting, it was banking on its future absolution and regeneration via imperial war and the plundering of others' lands and livelihoods. Settler militarism—which is necessarily entangled with the relations of capitalism—operates in contradiction to the lives and communities it purports to govern.

As US empire and capitalism tend toward crisis, settler militarism is one imperfect "solution" to this crisis that is always on the brink of collapsing beneath the weight of its own asymmetry. It is also continually faced with opposition and resistance. Significantly, this understanding warns us of the violent lengths that are necessary to mask settler militarism's contradictions. World War II was such a period when many of the structures that intersect with that of settler militarism reached the apex of their contradictory formations: including militarized regimes of security and demands for patriotism, liberal modes of racial capitalism, legal means of property accumulation by Indigenous dispossession, and biopolitical governance and regulation. However, we should not understand this wartime peak in colonial violence and military surveillance as indicative of settler militarism's strength, totalization, or so-called success. Rather, this illustrates the extent to which its mechanisms needed to stretch in order to maintain its ruse of liberal democratic rationality: that is, the myth that settler militarism and this war were just, desired, inevitable, and in the interest of all.

Notes

ABBREVIATIONS

AR19: Japanese American Relocation and Internment—The Hawai'i Experience, JCCH

CM: Carey D. Miller Collection, HC

HC: Hawaiian Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i

HWRD: Hawaii War Records Depository, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i

JCCH: Japanese Cultural Center of Hawai'i, Honolulu, Hawai'i

JIR: Japanese Internment and Relocation Files, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai'i

NA: National Archives and Records Administration II, College Park, Maryland

NASF: National Archives at San Francisco, San Bruno, California

RG 21: RG 21, Records of District Courts of the United States, U.S. District Court, District of Hawaii, Honolulu, Civil Case Files, 1900–1984, NASF

RG 126: RG 126, Records of the Office of Territories, Classified Files, 1907–1951, NA

RG 181: RG 181, Records of Naval Districts and Shore Establishments, Naval Facilities Engineering Com. Western Division, Land Acquisitions, 1944–1961, NASF

RG 494: RG 494, Records of U.S. Army Forces in the Middle Pacific, 1942–1946, NA

INTRODUCTION. SETTLER MILITARISM, RACIAL LIBERAL BIOPOLITICS, AND SOCIAL REPRODUCTION

1 The *Honolulu Advertiser* and the *Honolulu Star-Bulletin* were two of the major newspapers in Hawai'i and still exist together in one entity as the *Honolulu Star-Advertiser*. Joseph Garner Anthony considered the two newspapers to be essentially an outlet for military government propaganda during this period. Anthony, *Hawaii under Army Rule*, 38.

2 Scheiber and Scheiber, *Bayonets in Paradise*, 80.

3 "Interview with Samuel K., Jr., Kamaka," in "An Era of Change: Oral Histories of Civilians in World War II Hawai'i," interview by Holly Yamada, 546, UH Center for Oral History, http://hdl.handle.net/10125/29869.

4 Throughout this book I use the terms *Kanaka Maoli*, *Native Hawaiian*, and *Hawaiian* to refer to the Indigenous people of Hawai'i. The term *Hawaiian*, in this sense, does not simply refer to an individual who was born or has lived in Hawai'i but rather denotes indigeneity to Hawaiian lands through genealogical ties. On logics of white possession, see Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*; and Arvin, *Possessing Polynesians*.

5 As Dean Itsuji Saranillio writes of Asian and Asian American settlers in Hawai'i, "These are the non-Indigenous and nonwhite groups who were exploited for their labor and have their own histories of subjugation by imperialism, yet occupying a kind of liminal space that traces racial difference and instances of cohesion with haole settlers and/or Native peoples. These processes consisted of a delicate arrangement of variously mediated struggles, which were orchestrated by U.S. designs for empire and global imperial politics, labor immigration and protest, economic depression and planter access to U.S. markets, racial tensions and alliances, and struggles for equality in tension with deoccupation." Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 74. Haunani-Kay Trask's work has been seminal to the study of Asian settler colonialism. See Trask, "Settlers of Color," as well as other essays in Fujikane and Okamura, *Asian Settler Colonialism*; and Saranillio, "Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters." Keeping in mind this complex history of settler migration and racial formation, I use both *settler* and *immigrant* when referring to Asians in Hawai'i. This is because Asian immigrants and Asian Americans in Hawai'i were and are settlers.

6 Maui was also attacked on this date, as was Guam. Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 186; Camacho, *Cultures of Commemoration*, 41.

7 Walter Short had at that time occupied the position of Hawaiian Department commander lieutenant general. Okihiro, *Cane Fires*, 210.

8 "General Emmons Gives Views," *New York Times*, May 17, 1942; Okihiro, *Cane Fires*, 239.

9 The term *Nisei* is a Japanese-language term that refers to a Japanese American who is a second-generation immigrant. Accordingly, the term *Issei* refers to the first generation, and *Sansei* refers to the third generation. *Kibei* is a term used to refer to Japanese Americans (usually Nisei) who went to Japan to receive higher education and then returned to the United States. See Fujitani, *Race for Empire*.

10 Another principal example of US martial law is Military Governor General Arthur MacArthur Jr.'s declaration of martial law in the Philippines on December 10, 1900. In Hawai'i, at first, nightly curfews between 6:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. applied to every civilian, including citizens and "enemy aliens." On February 3, 1942, curfew was extended to 8:00 p.m. for all civilians except for "enemy aliens." This remained the same until September 1, 1942, when curfew was extended to 10:00 p.m. for US citizens. On December 10, 1943, "enemy aliens" were also

allowed to be out until 10:00 p.m. By General Orders No. 62 on July 19, 1944, all blackout restrictions were removed, but curfew remained from 10:00 p.m. to 5:30 a.m. "Part Four: Security Regulations Affecting Alien Enemies and Dual Citizens," folder 46, Box 4, AR19: Japanese American Relocation and Internment—The Hawai'i Experience (AR19), JCCH, 237–39.

11 Anthony, *Hawaii under Army Rule*.

12 For my previous work on settler militarism, see Nebolon, "'Life Given Straight'"; and Nebolon, "Settler-Military Camps."

13 Trask, *From a Native Daughter*; Fujikane and Okamura, *Asian Settler Colonialism*; Trask, "Settlers of Color," 45–65. Patrick Wolfe, though not the first to use the term "settler colonialism," authored influential work theorizing settler colonialism's structures and operation. See, for example, Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism." Other scholarship that has greatly influenced my understanding of how settler colonialism operates includes Deloria, *Playing Indian*; O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting*; Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*; Byrd, *Transit of Empire*; Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*; Estes, *Our History Is the Future*; Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*; and Arvin, *Possessing Polynesians*. On not letting settler colonial studies stand in for Native American and Indigenous studies, the role of Indigenous scholars in studies of settler colonialism, and the multiple genealogies of settler colonial studies, see Kauanui, "'Structure, Not an Event'"; and Kauanui, "False Dilemmas."

14 Woodward, "Military Landscapes." See also González, Gusterson, and Houtman, *Militarization*.

15 Manu Karuka analyzes this colonial dynamic as one of "countersovereignty." He states that "my invocation of 'countersovereignty' proceeds, first, from a sense that settler invocations of sovereignty require recognition of Indigenous modes of relationship, however muted or displaced, in order to maintain any semblance of stability or coherence." Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 2.

16 For example, Philip Deloria and Patrick Wolfe argue that claims of settler sovereignty paradoxically depend upon a symbolic idea of the "Native" as a necessary element of differentiating the settler colony from the mother country. Philip Deloria writes that a key contradiction of American identity is the simultaneity of its reliance on the so-called Indian Other in order to exist and its need to eliminate it in order to complete its individualization: "Here, then, lies a critical dilemma of American identity: in order to complete their rite of passage, Americans had to displace either the interior or the exterior Indian Other. As long as Indian Others represented not only us, but also them, Americans could not begin to resolve the questions swirling around their own identity vis-á-vis Indians and the British. Yet choosing one or the other would remove an ideological tool that was essential in propping up American identity without Indians. At the same time, there was no way to make a complete identity while they remained." Deloria, *Playing Indian*, 37. As Patrick Wolfe writes of settler colonialism, "On the one hand, settler society required the practical elimination of the natives

in order to establish itself on their territory. On the symbolic level, however, settler society subsequently sought to recuperate indigeneity in order to express its difference—and accordingly, its independence—from the mother country." Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism," 389.

17 Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 9.

18 For Lisa Yoneyama's insightful critique of this "good war" narrative, see Yoneyama, *Hiroshima Traces*; and Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*.

19 Kajihiro argues that the white oligarchy and the US military formed an alliance during the territorial period leading up to World War II. Furthermore, Saranillio analyzes how Hawai'i statehood continues to sustain and elaborate US settler, economic, and military investments in the islands. Trask, *From a Native Daughter*; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*; Kajihiro, "Militarizing of Hawai'i," 172; Saranillio, "Colliding Histories," 283–309; Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*.

20 Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 11, 12; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 126; Gonzalez, "Wars of Memory."

21 Native Hawaiians continue to contest US possession of these 1.8 million acres today, which were never legally transferred by the Hawaiian Kingdom but were ceded in 1898 by the Republic of Hawaii, a de facto government created by white settlers in the aftermath of the overthrow. Kauanui, "Sorry State," 110–12.

22 Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 160.

23 Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood*, 2, 28–29. See also Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*.

24 The Big Five included Castle and Cooke, Charles Brewer and Company, Alexander Baldwin, Theophilus H. Davis and Company, and Heinrich Hackfield and Company (eventually renamed the American Factors). On the Big Five, see Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 68–69, 70–71, 85, 97.

25 The allegation of rape was later proven to be falsified. The five men accused were Joseph Kahahawai, Ben Ahakuelo, Horace Ida, David Takai, and Henry Chang. Ida was severely beaten but survived his attack. The men responsible for these acts of violence were arrested but received a commuted sentence. Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 72–74. See also Stannard, *Honor Killing*; and Rosa, *Local Story*.

26 Anthony, *Hawaii under Army Rule*, 5.

27 United States Department of Defense, "Report on Study of Military Real Property, State of Hawaii," [Washington?], 1960, Hawaiian Collection, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (HC), 5.

28 Gonzalez, *Securing Paradise*, 118–19.

29 Scholars such as T. Fujitani have critiqued the ideal of white military masculinity, particularly in regard to how it led to the problematic idealization of the "patriotic World War II Nisei soldier" as the model for the successful assimilation of Japanese American immigrants. Fujitani, *Race for Empire*. Scholars have analyzed the shifting racial triangulation between Native Hawaiians, Asian settlers, and white settlers throughout the twentieth century. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argues that in the 1920s, Hawaiians were defined as "Native" over and against "alien" Asian immigrant laborers but were still considered subordinate to white

settlers, who prioritized Americanization as the path to success for the Hawaiian territory. My work on the World War II period contributes to this scholarship through its focus on how these racializations of Asians and Native Hawaiians changed so radically between the prewar and postwar periods. Fujikane and Okamura, *Asian Settler Colonialism*; Saranillio, "Colliding Histories"; Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*; Kauanui, "Colonialism in Equality," 636–37.

30 In her article "Asian American Studies and the 'Pacific Question,'" J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argues against the irresponsible inclusion of Pacific studies underneath the banner of Asian American studies, yet she also argues that because of the shared histories of Asia and the Pacific Islands, the comparative engagement of Pacific studies and Asian American studies is vital. The term *Asian/Pacific American* similarly erases this heterogeneity: work by Kauanui, Saranillio, Fujikane, and Okamura has illustrated how despite the fact that Asian American settlers have faced colonialism, oppression, and labor exploitation, they do not have the same relationship to the US state as do Native peoples in the Pacific Islands. Kauanui, "Asian American Studies." See also Diaz and Kauanui, "Native Pacific Cultural Studies on the Edge"; Diaz, "To 'P' or not to 'P'"; Kim and Sharma, "Center-To-Center Relationalities." Key volumes that place histories of US and Japanese colonialism and war in conversation include Fujitani, White, and Yoneyama, *Perilous Memories*; Shigematsu and Camacho, *Militarized Currents*; Chen, *Asia as Method*; Camacho, *Cultures of Commemoration*; Fujitani, *Race for Empire*; Yoneyama, *Hiroshima Traces*; and Yoneyama, *Cold War Ruins*.

31 On this call for "specificity," see, for example, Teaiwa, "bikinis and other s/pacific n/oceans." On the reorientation of the colonial gaze that perceives islands in Oceania through the lens of "smallness," see Hau'ofa, "Our Sea of Islands."

32 Byrd, *Transit of Empire*; Goldstein, *Formations of United States Colonialism*; Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein, "Introduction," quotation from 1; Vimalassery, Hu Pegues, and Goldstein, "Colonial Unknowing"; Leong and Carpio, "Carceral States"; Day, *Alien Capital*; Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*; Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy, "Predatory Value"; Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*; Singh, *Race and America's Long War*; Hernández, *City of Inmates*; Walia, *Border and Rule*; Hu Pegues, *Space-Time Colonialism*; Kim, *Settler Garrison*; Lê Espiritu Gandhi, *Archipelago of Resettlement*.

33 As Nick Estes writes, "Bloody wars of conquest defined the period following the United States' assertion of control over the river trade, lasting for nearly half of the nineteenth century," elaborating that these wars constituted a "total war on Indigenous life." Estes, *Our History Is the Future*, 90. See also Grenier, *First Way of War*. On the long history of militarization's impacts on and appropriation of Native communities and land, see LaDuke, *Militarization of Indian Country*.

34 Uenten, "Rising Up," 92. See also Ginoza, "R&R at the Intersection."

35 There is an extensive history of US biopolitical governance across colonial and racialized contexts. Among others, see Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies*; Polk, *Contagions of Empire*; Vora, *Life Support*; Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*;

Melamed, *Represent and Destroy*; and Reddy, *Freedom with Violence*. On biopower, see Foucault, "*Society Must Be Defended*," quotation from 241; Foucault, *History of Sexuality*.

36 Federici argues that "Foucault's analysis of the power techniques and disciplines to which the body has been subjected has ignored the process of reproduction, has collapsed female and male histories into an undifferentiated whole." Further, Foucault's theories do not leave room to think about an individualized subject, a way "outside" of the regime, or resistance. Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 8. In this book I use Foucault alongside theorists of race and colonialism and Marxist theorists of social reproduction, whose dialectical approaches urge us to understand that any time power is exerted, there is inevitably resistance.

37 "Summary of Annual Report, Board of Health, Fiscal Year Ending, June 30, 1943," 942 Reports—Annual—Governor—1943, Box 561, RG 126, NA, 164. "Report of the Governor of Hawaii Honorable Joseph B. Poindexter to the Secretary of the Interior for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1942," File No. 942 Reports—Annual—Governor—1942, Box 561, RG 126, NA, 12. See also Allen, *Hawaii's War Years*, 336, 366.

38 This was lower than the national average, in which women constituted 49.8 percent of the total population. Bailey and Farber, *First Strange Place*, 191–92. On World War II gender dynamics in the continental United States, see Escobedo, *From Coveralls to Zoot Suits*, 3. See also Milkman, *Gender at Work*; Yellin, *Our Mothers' War*; Anderson, *Wartime Women*; and Honey, *Creating Rosie the Riveter*.

39 By 1948, white residents made up 33.4 percent, Japanese made up 32.6 percent, and Hawaiians made up 15 percent. Statistics for 1940 draw from the US census, and those from 1948 were estimated by the Department of Health: T. H. Perry, F. Philipp, and Ralph Elliott, *Hawaii and Its People; Land Utilization*, Table 2 (Honolulu, 1949), HC.

40 After the passing of the Hawaiian Organic Act in 1900, all Native Hawaiians became US citizens. Kauanui, "Colonialism in Equality," 642; Kauanui, "Hawaiian Nationhood," 32–33; Polmar and Allen, *World War II*, 372.

41 Fujitani, *Race for Empire*.

42 On the shift from "vulgar" to "polite" racism, see Fujitani, *Race for Empire*; Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights*; Singh, *Black Is a Country*; Melamed, *Represent and Destroy*; and Man, *Soldiering Through Empire*. On Hawai'i statehood and liberal multiculturalism, see Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*; and Miller-Davenport, *Gateway State*.

43 Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 6.

44 Brown, *Regulating Aversion*, 26, 28.

45 This is part of a larger historical trend in which colonial states have considered territories, particularly islands, as "laboratories." Edmond and Smith, *Islands in History and Representation*. Quotation from "Part I: Historical Overview of the Internal Security Program in Hawaii" (Part I), "Part I: Historical Overview of the

Internal Security Program in (Copy #3)" (Part I: #3), Box 892, Military Government of the Territory of Hawaii (MGHI), RG 494, NA, 1; emphasis mine.

46 Melamed, *Represent and Destroy*, 5. See also Reddy, *Freedom with Violence*.

47 Kauanui, "Colonialism in Equality," 642; Kauanui, "Hawaiian Nationhood," 32–33.

48 On white possession, see Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 129. Further, as Maile Arvin argues, "In the logic of possession through whiteness, both Polynesia (the place) and Polynesians (the people) become exotic, feminized possessions of whiteness—possessions that never have the power to claim the property of whiteness for themselves. Instead, the Polynesian race is repeatedly positioned as almost white (even literally as descendants of the Aryan race), in a way that allows white settlers to claim indigeneity in Polynesia, since, according to this logic, whiteness itself is indigenous to Polynesia." Arvin, *Possessing Polynesians*, 3.

49 Part I, Part 1: #3, Box 892, Military Government of the Territory of Hawaii, RG 494, NA, 7.

50 Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, Hussey, and Wright, *Nation Rising*.

51 Moreton-Robinson, *White Possessive*, 47–61.

52 As Alyosha Goldstein writes of US colonialism, "United States colonialism is a continuously failing—or at least a perpetually incomplete—project that labors to find a workable means of resolution to sustain its logic of possession and inevitability by disavowing the ongoing contestation with which it is confronted and violent displacement that it demands." Goldstein, "Toward a Genealogy," in Goldstein, *Formations of United States Colonialism*, 3.

53 Robinson, *Black Marxism*; Johnson and Lubin, *Futures of Black Radicalism*; Day, *Alien Capital*; Goldstein, "'In the Constant Flux'"; Melamed, "Racial Capitalism"; Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*; Federici, "Silvia Federici"; Lowe, "Afterword"; Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy, "Predatory Value"; Jenkins and Leroy, *Histories of Racial Capitalism*; Kosher, Cacho, Byrd, and Jefferson, *Colonial Racial Capitalism*; Nichols, *Theft Is Property!*; Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*; Davis, "Women and Capitalism"; Weinbaum, *Afterlife of Reproductive Slavery*; Morgan, *Reckoning with Slavery*.

54 Marx conceives of primitive accumulation, or "so-called primitive accumulation," as the "original sin" of capitalism through which producers were forcefully divorced from their means of production and subsistence and transformed into "'unattached' proletarians" (Marx, *Capital*, 363–65). Although Marx considers the expropriation of the agrarian peasant and enclosure of the commons in England and Scotland as the paradigmatic case, he writes of primitive accumulation in the United States: "The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement, and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and looting of the East Indies, the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of the era of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief

momenta of primitive accumulation" (Marx, *Capital*, 365–71, quotation from 376). Yet many scholars have since contested this fundamental understanding of primitive accumulation as a discrete "stage" in the progression from feudalism to capitalism, arguing that it is instead an ongoing dynamic central to the process by which capitalism reproduces itself. For example, Cedric Robinson argues that the dispossession of Black workers for the development of global capitalism did not end with the abolition of slavery: "As peasants, as tenant farmers, as migrant laborers, as day laborers, as domestic servants, and as wage labor, their expropriation extended into the present century" (Robinson, *Black Marxism*, 112). Silvia Federici argues that Marx was mistaken when he theorized that the violence of the earliest phase of capitalism would recede: "A return of the most violent aspects of primitive accumulation has accompanied every phase of capitalist globalization, including the present one" (Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 12–13). Glen Coulthard, Jodi Byrd, Alyosha Goldstein, Jodi Melamed, Chandan Reddy, Robert Nichols, and others write against Marx's and Marxist conceptions of colonial dispossession as an "originary," rather than continuing, structure of capitalist accumulation. These scholars argue that Marxist and other critiques that understand class as the central contradiction of capitalism (rather than dispossession in its settler colonial and racial forms) simply rehearse and perpetuate these violent logics and their accompanying structures. Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*; Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy, "Predatory Value"; Nichols, *Theft Is Property!*; Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property*; Kosher, Cacho, Byrd, and Jefferson, *Colonial Racial Capitalism*; Goldstein, "'In the Constant Flux.'"

55 In *Capital* Marx writes on abstraction and the fetishism of commodities: "The equalization of the most different kinds of labor can be the result only of an abstraction from their inequalities, or of reducing them to their common denominator, viz. expenditure of human labor power or human labor in the abstract." He continues: "Whenever, by an exchange, we equate as values our different products, by that very act, we also equate, as human labor, the different kinds of labor expended upon them. . . . It is value, therefore, that converts every product into a social hieroglyphic." Marx, *Karl Marx*, 474.

56 Marx writes that "this abstraction of labour is only the result of a concrete aggregate of different kinds of labour. The indifference to the particular kind of labour corresponds to a form of society in which individuals pass with ease from one kind of work to another, which makes it immaterial to them what particular kind of work may fall to their share. Labour has become here, not only categorially but really, a means of creating wealth in general and has no longer coalesced with the individual in one particular manner. This state of affairs has found its highest development in the most modern of bourgeois societies, the United States. It is only here that the abstraction of the category 'labour,' 'labour in general,' labour *sans phrase*, the starting-point of modern political economy, becomes realized in practice. Thus the simplest abstraction which modern political economy sets up as its starting-point, and which expresses a relation dating back to antiquity and

prevalent under all forms of society, appears truly realized in this abstraction only as a category of the most modern society." Marx, *Karl Marx*, 389.

57 As Federici writes, "Primitive accumulation, then, was not simply an accumulation and concentration of exploitable workers and capital. It was also an accumulation of differences and division within the working class, whereby hierarchies built upon gender, as well as 'race,' and age, became constitutive of class rule and the formation of the modern proletariat." Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 63.

58 That is, as Saranillio argues, we must understand settler colonialism and capitalism as fundamentally unsustainable, always in contradiction, and tending toward crisis. Saranillio refers to this project as "unsustainable empire." Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*. This also resonates with Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy's conception of "economies of dispossession": "These are the rationalities that disavow racial and colonial violence by constituting people, land, and the relations of social life as translatable into value form, making incommensurate histories, experiences, and forms of social being commensurate by reducing them to their meaning and value within 'the capital relation,' placing them within the ontology of dis/possession." Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy, "Predatory Value," 7.

59 Scholars have theorized the relationship between capitalism and biopower, noting that capitalism's requirements for life and labor are insatiable and that this led to biopolitical projects that targeted life cultivation and population regulation in order to reproduce laborers. Furthermore, centering the racial and gendered context of slavery and colonialism—rather than that of the white male European metropole—reveals how death and life depletion have always formed the conditions for biopower's "make live" imperative, in the service of capitalist accumulation. In contrast to Foucault, Federici argues that techniques of biopower emerged prior to the eighteenth century: capitalism's consumption of life spurred the European demographic and economic crisis of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and thus the need for labor that led to the rise of biopower and discipline of women's bodies and reproduction, including the persecution of so-called witches (Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 86). She writes that "we can also see that the promotion of population growth by the state can go hand in hand with a massive destruction of life; for in many historical circumstances—witness the history of the slave trade—one is a condition for the other" (16). Further, she argues that mercantilism, with its need for a large and disposable population of laborers, was the most "direct expression of requirements of primitive accumulation" (87). This resonates with Cedric Robinson's understanding of the relationship between transatlantic slavery and capitalism: in the English colonies, sugar production's desires for labor outpaced supply (with settler colonial genocide accentuating this labor shortage as well), thus requiring huge amounts of slave labor to the extent that from 1675 onward, English traders constituted the majority of the transatlantic slave trade. Robinson, *Black Marxism*, 117. As Nikhil Pal Singh observes, "Marx recognized that capital formed in contradiction not only to exploited labor, but to life itself. Capital accumulation

spurs population increase while voraciously depleting labor. The societal crisis that capitalism constantly faces is the ongoing violent dislocation of these two processes." Singh, "On Race, Violence," 58. This dynamic reverberates in various ways into our present. Writing in the context of global capitalism and the outsourcing of reproductive labors and biological resources, Kalindi Vora argues that contemporary capitalism's extraction of life is inherently asymmetrical and builds upon colonial legacies: "This form of accumulation and production can be seen in its historical context of colonialism and its antecedents as a system of continuing the transmission of what I call vital energy—the substance of activity that produces life (though often deemed reproductive)—from areas of life depletion to areas of life enrichment." Vora, *Life Support*, 3. Furthermore, capitalism's devouring of life is not confined to labor. Writing specifically about capitalism's depletion of the natural environment in Hawai'i, Candace Fujikane states that "capital expands its domain through the evisceration of the living earth into the inanimacies of non-life, depicting abundant lands as wastelands to condemn them." Fujikane, *Mapping Abundance*, 3.

60 "*As much Land* as a Man Tills, Plants, *Improves*, Cultivates, and can use the Product of, so much is his *Property*. He by his Labour does, as it were, enclose it from the Common." Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*, 291.

61 Federici understands capitalism to be perpetually incomplete and precarious: "If capitalism has been able to reproduce itself it is only because of the web of inequalities that it has built into the body of the world proletariat, and because of its capacity to globalize exploitation." Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 17. David Harvey posits the dynamic "accumulation by dispossession" as one that interrogates "the continuous role and persistence of the predatory practices of 'primitive' or 'original' accumulation within the long historical geography of capital accumulation," exploring how capitalism requires a preexisting or manufactured "other" or "outside" in order to stabilize itself. Harvey, *New Imperialism*, 141–44. However, although Harvey acknowledges the "original" and continuing roles of colonialism and slavery within the history of capitalist accumulation, his analysis primarily focuses on neoliberalism, financialization, and privatization in the 1970s onward—within both the so-called core and periphery—as the "cutting edge" example of accumulation by dispossession. Harvey, *New Imperialism*, 152–61. This characterization overlooks how racialized, gendered, and colonial forms of primitive accumulation have never ceased to undergird capitalist state building and empire building. For example, whereas Giovanni Arrighi differentiates between "territorialist" and "capitalist" logics of power, he argues that within settler colonial contexts like that of the United States, capitalism and territorialism are "indistinguishable from one other" and, further, form the conditions of possibility for the existence of the settler state. Thus, throughout history the continental and overseas territorial expansion of the United States has been an expression of *both* capitalist accumulation and settler colonial state and empire building. Arrighi, *Long Twentieth Century*, 59–60. As Alyosha Goldstein

notes, "Colonialism in this context is not or not only a process of expansion and incorporation, but is a primary social, economic, and political feature of the United States itself." Goldstein, "'In the Constant Flux,'" 67. See also Nichols, *Theft Is Property!*, 67–68; and Kosher, Cacho, Byrd, and Jefferson, "Introduction." Writing specifically about Hawai'i, Saranillio analyzes "unsustainable empire" in Hawai'i through the dynamic of "settler accumulation by Native dispossession," which figures as continual the process by which capitalism "fails forward" toward an aspirational settler future via the continuation of primitive accumulation and its appropriation of Indigenous lands and means of subsistence. Saranillio, *Unsustainable Empire*, 22. On how we cannot separate neoliberal financialization from the ongoing and historical process of colonialism, see Byrd, Goldstein, Melamed, and Reddy, "Predatory Value," 7. Nikhil Pal Singh analyzes the reiterative nature of primitive accumulation and its role in territorial expansion through the dynamic of war capitalism, which creates "exceptional zones of armed appropriation," which are "not only domains for enacting 'plunder'—that is, primitive accumulation (or accumulation by dispossession)—but also for developing cutting-edge procedures, calculations, and fungible systems of commercial and military infrastructure . . . that are able to proceed insofar as they are unfettered by legally protected human beings, thus advancing new prejudices that build upon the old." Singh, "On Race, Violence," 55.

62 Fujitani discusses the US state's biopolitical impulse during World War II amid labor scarcity in Fujitani, "Right to Kill." On the extreme labor requirements for the US military empire, see Bender and Lipman, *Making the Empire Work*; and Friedman, "US Empire."

63 Scheiber and Scheiber, *Bayonets in Paradise*, 80, 81–83, 84.

64 "The HSPA reported at the war's end that, from December 1941 to the end of 1944, Hawaii's sugar and pineapple plantations had loaned out 514,130 person-days of labor to the military." Jung, *Reworking Race*, 134.

65 Scheiber and Scheiber, *Bayonets in Paradise*, 82.

66 Scheiber and Scheiber, *Bayonets in Paradise*, 87, 84.

67 Evelyn Nakano Glenn defines reproductive labor as "activities that recreate the labor force: the physical and emotional maintenance of current workers and the nurturing and socializing of future workers. In other words, people as well as things have to be produced." Nakano Glenn, "Racial Ethnic Women's Labor," 104. Both Nakano Glenn and Rhacel Salazar Parreñas further analyze an international and racialized division of reproductive labor in which "class-privileged women free themselves of the 'mental, emotional, and manual labor' needed for the 'creation and recreation of people as cultural and social, as well as physical beings' by hiring low-paid women of color," and immigrant women's domestic labor "connects systems of gender inequality in both sending and receiving nations to global capitalism." Parreñas, "Migrant Filipina," 562. Here, Parreñas draws from Nakano Glenn, "From Servitude to Service Work." Following Michael Hardt, we might also consider affective labor—e.g., care labor, health care, teaching,

mothering—as the labor of biopower. He writes that "its products are intangible: a feeling of ease, well-being, satisfaction, excitement, passion—even a sense of connectedness or community." Hardt, "Affective Labor," 96. Yet as Silvia Federici reminds us, affective and reproductive labor should be considered both immaterial *and* material in order to avoid making an artificial distinction that privileges the waged productive laborer as revolutionary subject and reproduces the sexual and colonial division of labor that devalues racialized and gendered work. Federici, "Silvia Federici," 157. Kalindi Vora analyzes how this dynamic has continued to structure the context of contemporary global capitalism: "In transmitting vital energy to US residents, they enter into a history of US capitalist accumulation in relation to conquest, racial slavery, and immigration, where the reproductive labor of working-class women of color continues to support the value of whiteness and class privilege that does not include them." Vora, "Limits of 'Labor,'" 698. Recent Marxist feminist work has contributed understandings of "social reproduction theory": Bhattacharya theorizes that social reproduction encompasses the "'production of goods and services and the production of life [as] part of one integrated process.'" Bhattacharya, *Social Reproduction Theory*, 3.

68 Oren E. Long, "War Records Project," Department of Public Instruction, Territory of Hawaii, December 1944, 24.01 Department of Public Instruction, HWRD, 4, emphasis in original.

69 Federici argues that "state control over every aspect of [social] reproduction, became the cornerstones of primitive accumulation." Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*, 22.

70 We can consider this a part of the longer history in which certain bodies and lands—in this case, multiracial plantation workers and Indigenous lives and landscapes—have historically been more available and disposable, and in which race and colonialism make primitive accumulation invisible. As Vora states, "the legacies of imperialism continue to affect the hyperavailability of racialized and gendered bodies" (694). Vora, "Limits of 'Labor,'" 694–97.

71 As Vora writes of contemporary regimes of biocapital and labor outsourcing, "Labor, like human vital organs, can be understood as a specific portion of a person's body and life that can be made free to travel." Vora, *Life Support*, 2.

CHAPTER 1. "NATIONAL DEFENSE IS BASED ON LAND": LANDSCAPES OF SETTLER MILITARISM IN HAWAIʻI

Epigraph: Norman Littell, quoted in "U.S. Acquires 757 Tracts in Year," August 14, 1941, *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, microfilm, Newspapers in Hawai'i, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (HNM).

1 "U.S. Acquires 757 Tracts in Year."

2 In these cases the United States transferred lands from territorial to federal possession via presidential executive order. McKinley, "Proclamation