



Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference

Dean Itsuji Saranillio

To cite this article: Dean Itsuji Saranillio (2013) Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference, *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3:3-4, 280-294, DOI: [10.1080/2201473X.2013.810697](https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810697)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810697>



Published online: 13 Sep 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1395



Citing articles: 9 [View citing articles](#) [↗](#)

Why Asian settler colonialism matters: a thought piece on critiques, debates, and Indigenous difference

Dean Itsuji Saranillio*

Department of Social and Cultural Analysis, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Examining multicultural forms of settler colonialism, this essay examines settler colonialism within a transnational view of global imperial politics, pulling formations of settler colonialism and imperialism together. Responding to arguments against the critique of Asian settler colonialism, this essay argues that while migration in and of itself does not equate to colonialism, migration to a settler colonial space, where Native lands and resources are under political, ecological, and spiritual contestation, means the political agency of immigrant communities can bolster a colonial system initiated by White settlers. An analysis of White supremacy is thus argued to be critical to a settler of color critique of the US Empire. White settlers in the islands managed Kanaka ‘Ōiwi and various Asian settler differences not through one binary opposition but multiple binaries. Taken together these oppositions produced a pyramidal view of the world that helped diverse non-White settlers to see their interests as aligned with the formation of a liberal settler state. This developmental discourse was and remains framed around an alterity that disqualifies Indigenous sovereignty and histories. While not uncomplicated, placing Asian American and Native histories in conversation might create the conditions of possibility where social justice-oriented Asian Americans might conceptualize liberation in ways that are accountable to Native aims for decolonization. The essay ends with a self-critique, applying these framings through personal reflections of the author’s family history in Hawai‘i.

In his 2009 memoir titled *Ben: A Memoir, from Street Kid to Governor*, former governor of Hawai‘i Benjamin J. Cayetano (1994–2002) casts a Kanaka ‘Ōiwi movement for self-determination as an ‘exercise in futility’. Cayetano, who is celebrated by many for being the first Filipino American governor of a US state, writes:

In my opinion, further pursuit of sovereignty was like the quest for the Holy Grail – an exercise in futility, an impossible dream. It was time to move on and in the best interests of all of Hawai‘i’s people that we do so ... It was easier for a non-Hawaiian like me, of course, to close the door on the issue of sovereignty ... Politically, it was difficult for any political leader – Hawaiian or non-Hawaiian – to argue that the drive for Hawaiian sovereignty should be abandoned. Besides, many Hawaiian activists were prisoners of the revisionist history they had taught to two or perhaps three generations of young Hawaiians ...¹

In order to justify calling for the elimination of a Kanaka ‘Ōiwi movement, in predictably liberal fashion, Cayetano characterizes Kānaka ‘Ōiwi as irrational prisoners of a racist ‘revisionist history’ and describes their movement as working at the expense of ‘all of Hawai‘i’s people’.

*Email: ds3859@nyu.edu

In further passages on his view of Hawaiian sovereignty, Cayetano says that certain professors at the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai‘i teach their students to hate rather than to think critically. To counter scholars and activists, Cayetano points to ‘good’ Hawaiians, who favor a notion that to be Kanaka ‘Ōiwi is not about genealogical or, as Kahikina de Silva has noted, intimate ties to Hawai‘i, but rather about being ‘Hawaiian at heart’.² This common settler saying in Hawai‘i is one that Cayetano has often repeated publicly and in 2000, he stated that ‘I’ve lived in Hawai‘i long enough to feel I’m Hawaiian.’³ Speaking on behalf of himself and in the interests of the settler state, Cayetano insists Kanaka ‘Ōiwi existence to be of a certain kind – open to all via liberal multiculturalism, development and profit oriented, and accountable to non-Native interests while the reverse is never considered.

Cayetano’s memoir received the Ka Palapala Po‘okela Hawai‘i Book of the Year award for non-fiction in 2010 from the Hawai‘i Book Publishers Association and was hailed as the Number One Bestseller for more than four months by what was then the *Honolulu Advertiser*. Cayetano parlayed this recognition into a close but failed run for Mayor of Honolulu.⁴ The general popularity of the memoir has been attributed to what current governor of Hawai‘i Neil Abercrombie refers to as his ‘candor’.⁵ This candor is also cited as allowing Cayetano to fill a historical void by addressing a non-Hawaiian ‘reticence about a Hawaiian sovereignty movement’ in a post-statehood era.⁶ Indeed, the celebration of Cayetano’s candor acts as a gloss for celebrating, if not rewarding, his settler racism. This manifests as a general call for maintaining status quo, functioning to alleviate the increasing ambivalence and anxieties many non-Hawaiians feel around an active and vocal Kanaka ‘Ōiwi movement seeking the de-occupation of Hawai‘i from the United States.

I begin this essay with Cayetano’s memoir to illustrate the particular form of settler colonialism that shapes the political landscape of Hawai‘i, but to also offer an example of the kind of liberalism, underpinning a multicultural form of settler colonialism, that scholars examining Asian settler colonialism are responding. This is a form of settler colonialism that is obviously distinct from White settler colonialism. Cayetano is able to protect his settler innocence by narrating himself as an individual who has overcome racial and class discrimination, at the same time asserting his colonial authority by calling for a need to ‘move on’ and forget Kanaka ‘Ōiwi self-determination.⁷ This representational strategy of working through racial difference, in other words, to use a multicultural non-White face as a means to further consolidate US settler and imperial hegemony, is itself the afterlife of Hawai‘i’s movement for statehood and its ideological function in post-war US empire building during the Cold War. While not entirely unique to Hawai‘i, there is a history that sets the conditions necessary for Cayetano’s comments. For the majority of the first half of the twentieth century, Congress deemed Hawai‘i to be unqualified for statehood because it was considered a largely ‘Asiatic’ territory. In order to make Hawai‘i statehood more attractive in the eyes of Congress, proponents of statehood began to use Hawai‘i’s alterity in the service of Cold War politics. In the 1940s and 1950s, when decolonization was transforming an international order and criticism of Western imperialism was the dominant international sentiment, Cold Warrior ideologues realized that Hawai‘i’s multiracial population had ideological value in winning the ‘hearts and minds’ of newly decolonized nations – an opinion campaign developed by the ‘father of public relations’ Edward L. Bernays.⁸ This US liberal multicultural discourse – articulated through a multicultural ‘nation of immigrants’ narration – helped achieve seemingly permanent control of Hawai‘i through statehood while creating a multicultural image of the United States that facilitated US ambitions for global hegemony.⁹

Framing settler colonialism in Hawai‘i within a similar transnational view of global imperial politics in this essay, I pull formations of settler colonialism and imperialism together in order to respond to three arguments that have been repeatedly made against the critique of settler colonialism, and more specifically Asian settler colonialism in Hawai‘i. The first argues that the conceptual use of settler colonialism is a neo-racist argument that leaves the expulsion of Asian settlers as

the only resolution to settler colonialism. The second argument, tied to the first, views the use of settler colonialism as ahistorical, collapsing immigration into colonialism. Third, I challenge the notion that Kanaka 'Ōiwi nationalism is itself responsible for creating division between Asian 'Americans'¹⁰ and Kanaka 'Ōiwi, thus reaffirming binary oppositions. At the core of these arguments are different ways of conceptualizing power and alliance building around Indigenous difference. These differences are often cast as insurmountable, as though indigeneity or settler colonialism cannot be articulated without diminishing or contributing to a history of violent Asian American exploitation, exclusion, and even expulsion.

In this essay, I show that while each group is oppressed by structures of White supremacy, their historical oppressions are not the same.¹¹ In other words, these histories, while potentially transformative when assembled intersectionally, can be expressed without diminishing the complexities of each. This signals a need, as articulation theory argues, for an attempt to situate these different histories in complex unity – not flattening difference and assuming they are always in solidarity or falling into the pitfalls of difference and framing these groups as always in opposition.¹²

An analysis of White supremacy is thus critical to a settler of color critique of US Empire. Here, I show how White settlers in the islands were obsessively managing Kanaka 'Ōiwi and various Asian settler differences not through one binary opposition but multiple binaries. As Haunani-Kay Trask has argued:

The color of violence, then, is the color of white over Black, white over brown, white over red, white over yellow. It is the violence of north over south, of continents over archipelagoes, of settlers over natives and slaves. Shaping this color scheme are the labyrinths of class and gender, of geography and industry, of metropolises and peripheries, of sexual definitions and confinements. There is not just one binary opposition, but many oppositions.¹³

Taken together these multiple binary oppositions produced a pyramidal view of the world, an intricate arrangement of power relations that helped diverse non-White settlers to see their interests as aligned with the formation of a liberal settler state. This developmental discourse was and remains framed around an alterity that disqualifies and relegates Indigenous sovereignty and histories to anachronistic space, even while strategically utilizing popular images that center certain settler formulations of the 'Native'. With that said, White settlers shape and discipline but have never been able to determine the actions of non-White settlers. While not uncomplicated, placing Asian American and Native histories in conversation might create the conditions of possibility of using settler colonialism against itself, where social justice-oriented Asian Americans might conceptualize liberation in ways that are accountable to Native aims for decolonization. I thus end with a kind of self-critique, applying these framings through personal reflections on my family's history in Hawai'i.

My aim in this essay is not to argue over who is and is not a settler, but rather to question the political and pedagogical work that settler colonialism does to open one's visual world to the material consequences of aligning oneself with the settler state. Taking into account Native epistememes, histories, and knowledges can transform ways of knowing with implications for ways of observing the material force of settler colonialism, particularly injustices that are often obfuscated or ideologically invisible to settlers, the particular group who stands to benefit. Indeed, positivist discussions over who is and is not a 'settler' often dissolve into arguments where one cites their oppression like a badge of honor to shield themselves from having to contend with self-critique. Such discussions often take us everywhere but ultimately nowhere, sanitizing the critique of settler colonialism and side stepping the important questions posed. In my opinion, one's identification is one's own personal choice. I am less interested in the term settler, than in applying the critique of settler colonialism intersectionally. My simple point is that being a White settler is not a

requirement for questioning how one's choices, practices, and silences have bearing on structures of settler colonialism. Thus, I frame this essay along the lines of Scott Lauria Morgensen, where he succinctly asks in *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*, 'Who, under what conditions, inherits the power to represent or enact settler colonialism?'¹⁴

Reducing Native movements to expulsion and retribution

The first work in Asian American studies to relationally engage Indigenous history and politics is the 2000 special issue of *Amerasia Journal* titled 'Whose Vision? Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai'i' edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura. This collection was reprinted and expanded as *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* in 2008. Aiming for accountability by calling for a re-examination of Asian interests for inclusion into a US settler state, Candace Fujikane argues:

For the larger, long-term vision of Hawaiian self-determination to be made a reality, the Native and settler contributors in this volume call on Asian settlers in Hawai'i to reexamine their interests within the US settler state and to hold themselves and their communities accountable for their settler practices.¹⁵

Since the anthology, responses to the application of settler colonialism to Hawai'i and particularly to different Asian groups have been mixed. An emerging body of scholarship studying Hawai'i has begun critically theorizing and pushing the use of settler colonialism in publications and projects outside of the *Asian Settler Colonialism* anthology in multiply distinct ways.¹⁶ On the other hand, critics of this work deem the application of settler colonialism theoretically problematic and ahistorical.¹⁷

In a book review, Nandita Sharma argues that the contributors of *Asian Settler Colonialism* conflate processes of migration with colonialism through neo-racist assumptions, an argument she had previously advanced in a co-authored article with Cynthia Wright:¹⁸

The ahistorical claim that 'Asians' colonized Hawai'i (especially after U.S. statehood) relies not on historical analysis but on neo-racist assumptions about the proper relationship between 'race' and space. Neo-racist thought, rooted in the basic assumption that ethnic boundaries are 'natural' borders, posits that 'different' people should be in 'their own' places. Significantly, in such a world-view, human migration becomes, by definition, an act of colonization. In conflating migration with colonialism, contributors to this collection try to redefine the dialectics of colonialism. Colonialism is no longer a dynamic of expropriation and exploitation where the key relationship is one between expropriators and the expropriated. Instead, colonialism becomes nothing more and nothing less than the co-presence of people who are 'Native' and 'non-Native'.¹⁹

My sense is that these are common criticisms and questions posed around the use of settler colonialism in Hawai'i, and possibly elsewhere, making these important criticisms to which to respond. Accordingly, in these next two sections, I wish to unpack and respond to these comments in two parts. Here, I address the argument of neo-racism and perhaps more importantly Sharma's contention that neo-racist arguments made by those who use the term settler colonialism could ultimately lead to a move for the expulsion of Asian settlers from Hawai'i. In the following section, I contend with the criticism that settler colonialism as a concept is ahistorical and conflates migration with colonialism.

Sharma's criticism relies heavily on a concept of neo-racism, while not contending with the arguments posed in the anthology, something to which I will return. Very generally, neo-racism describes an academic derived discourse in Europe that challenges biological reasoning at the same time that it maintains the premise that groups are wholly culturally different. This creates

an insurmountable difference whereby all people are bounded by culture. Ultimately, such differences lead to polarization, giving ‘rise to defensive reactions, “interethnic” conflicts and a general rise in aggressiveness’ when these differences are attempted to be abolished. Sharma’s application of neo-racism to settler colonial sites, paints Indigenous difference as paralyzing and dangerous, as an obstacle to alliance building and tantamount to expulsion.

Sharma contends that the neo-racist arguments in *Asian Settler Colonialism* are making an implicit argument for expulsion, citing ‘a very much changed world that European colonialism engendered – changes that brought various people together into a shared field of power – changes that cannot be undone, at least not without an enormous amount of state-directed violence’.²⁰ Sharma mentions the 1972 move by Idi Amin to expel Asians from Uganda and states that while not explicitly calling for repatriation, ‘contributors to *Asian Settler Colonialism* consistently insist that “Asians” “stand behind” “Natives.”’ Citing the work of Eiko Kosasa(?),²¹ Sharma links the expulsion of Asians to Kosasa’s argument that while Japanese settlers have ‘ascended from being collaborators in a colonial system’ they currently have the ‘political and economic means to assist in terminating the U.S. imperial hold on the islands’. Kosasa is thus not calling for silence or expulsion, but rather the realization of the amount of political and economic power that Japanese Americans in Hawai‘i hold, and a need to not assert settler interests in a self-determination process for Kanaka ‘Ōiwi that has never taken place in Hawai‘i since the 1893 US military-backed overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. While the contributors have different ideas around accountability and alliance building, their arguments for alliances agree on the need to be mindful of a non-Hawaiian tendency to speak on behalf of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi through a racist presumption of an Indigenous lack of political sophistication. None of these, however, are implicit calls for repatriation of non-Natives or silence.

It is important to note, as Candace Fujikane has responded to Sharma, that Kanaka ‘Ōiwi have never called for expulsion but rather accountability for their discourses and practices that ultimately come at Native expense. Pointing to the inherent diversity within Kanaka ‘Ōiwi notions of genealogy, Fujikane references activists and scholars who have long had to argue that their movement is not calling for the expulsion of non-Hawaiians, stating that they themselves have family who are not Kanaka ‘Ōiwi. In order to dismiss Indigenous nationalisms and an Asian settler colonial critique, Sharma creates a straw man through a notion of ‘blood’ and ‘soil’ that logically extends to expulsion – something the contributors, including myself, oppose. Yet, Kanaka ‘Ōiwi scholars have painstakingly shown that Kanaka genealogies, while having to contend with the profound impact of the genocidal legal and social discourse of blood, should be understood as distinct from blood logics. As J. Kēhaulani Kauanui argues:

genealogy is a Hawaiian form of world entanglement that makes nonsense of the fractions and percentage signs that are grounded in colonial (and now neo-colonial) moves marked by exclusionary racial criteria. Blood quantum can never account for the political nature and strategic positioning of genealogical invocation.²²

As Kauanui and Fujikane show, Kanaka ‘Ōiwi notions of indigeneity via genealogy, is in Kauanui’s words an ‘expansive inclusivity’, one that does not dissolve Indigenous difference and sovereignty, nor appropriate a blood logic that argues for Asian expulsion. Fujikane argues that the irony of Sharma’s expulsion argument is that it ‘diverts our attention away from ongoing state violence against Kānaka ‘Ōiwi to a projected discrimination and violence on the part of Kanaka ‘Ōiwi’.²³

Although Sharma directs critiques of neo-racism against those who use a concept of settler colonialism, she does not interrogate the kinds of cultural differences on the part of settlers that maintain unequal power relations between them and Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. We can see this situation

illuminated amongst scholars contending with similar issues in Guatemala between ladino and Maya. Charles R. Hale's *Más Que Un Indio (More Than an Indian): Racial Ambivalence and Neo-liberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala* offers a more complicated picture of neo-racism that finds synergy with Hawai'i. Hale points out the racial ambivalence among many ladinos – who often themselves endorse a principle of equality between Mayas and ladinos, yet harbor anxieties and discriminatory cultural ideas about a growing Maya movement.²⁴ While ladinos affirm the position that Mayas should have the right to their own culture and identity, 'these egalitarian sensibilities do not require ladinos fully to acknowledge ongoing relations of racial dominance, much less to dismantle them'.²⁵ All of this is similar to the previously mentioned memoir of former governor of Hawai'i Benjamin J. Cayetano, who struggles for equality yet disqualifies a Kanaka 'Ōiwi movement as racist. Speaking specifically to such tendencies, where critiques of Native politics are often dismissals, Hale argues that neo-racism can be a useful concept for understanding such disagreements. Hale explains that critiques of Native movements can be framed with an understanding that neo-racism also exists on the part of the non-Indigenous, in the form of biological, structural, and especially cultural notions of difference that reinforce unequal power relations. To be sure, this is not to dismiss Sharma's important concerns around the potential pitfalls of both nationalism and difference. But rather to respond to another argument Sharma makes, that critiques of Native people are immediately presumed to be racist. It is not that Indigenous people are beyond reproach, but that these critiques are often cast as dismissals of Native politics that then obscures the specific forms of colonial power that Indigenous movements are forced to contend with. Yet, Hale's framing shows that critiques of Native movements should contend with the broader social formations that initiated these very movements. Hale argues that cultural difference often associates the Indigenous with 'immutable traditionalism, paternalism, and also an abiding fear that cultural difference tends inevitably toward vengeance and retribution'.²⁶ The notion that the current movement for self-determination in Hawai'i can only be resolved through an 'expulsion' of Asian settlers resonates with Hale's criticisms of a neo-racist political imagination.

Imagined violence on the part of Indigenous movements is a common trope that allows Native savagery to stand in for settler self-critique. Hale argues that the political imaginary is often limited by the insurrectionary Indian as a flashpoint, 'ignited not by physical threats, which are rare and generally implausible, but rather, by acts that call ladino people's relations of dominance with Indians into question'.²⁷ It is perhaps this critique that helps us to understand why Indigenous political aims are often reduced to an argument around expulsion. Although Sharma argues that Asian settler colonial critiques redefine the dialectics of colonialism, from expropriators and the expropriated, to 'nothing less than the co-presence of people who are "Native" and "non-Native"' this is an argument that does not reflect the work in the anthology. On the contrary, many of the articles tell the opposite story and, in fact, might offer us another way of understanding just who is being expelled from Hawai'i. Healani Sonoda's article, 'A Nation Incarcerated' shows how the state of Hawai'i's incarceration rate of Kānaka Ōiwi is one of the fastest rising in the United States, leading the Hawai'i Department of Public Safety under the directorship of Keith Kaneshiro (1996–1998) and Ted Sakai (1998–2002) to deport inmates to private prisons in Arizona and Oklahoma. Sonoda shows that a disproportionate amount of these inmates, 40%, are Kānaka 'Ōiwi. This expulsion is placed within a genealogy of the use of prisons in the colonization of Hawai'i and Sonoda further connects the high rates of Kanaka 'Ōiwi poverty to the seizure of Hawaiian national lands currently held in trust on their behalf by the state of Hawai'i. Indeed, the top offenses of adult Kanaka Ōiwi arrests are poverty-related non-violent crimes. And although Japanese Americans and Kānaka 'Ōiwi were both at 22% of the total population in Hawai'i in 2002, the Kanaka male inmate population was 38% and women at 44%, while Japanese American men were 6% and 4% of women. Sonoda argues that by deporting Kānaka 'Ōiwi to prisons on the US continent, particularly during a moment when many are

involved in a nationalist struggle for self-determination, the state of Hawai‘i, Corrections Corporation of America (CCA), and other industries have converged interests in maintaining a settler colonial system that sets the conditions for what amounts to expulsion.²⁸ Thus, Healani Sonoda’s work is not about a future state expulsion of Asian settlers, but about the present and ongoing state expulsion of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi from Hawai‘i – an expulsion that Kaneshiro and Sakai helped orchestrate. Notably, Sonoda’s essay includes a photograph of ‘Boogie’ Kealoha Kekahuna, a Kanaka ‘Ōiwi inmate who protested his forced exile from Hawai‘i by tattooing his face while in prison. Furthermore, it is Kānaka ‘Ōiwi who make up the largest numbers of those who leave Hawai‘i due to the high cost of living and rates of poverty.

Whose history determines what is ahistorical?

I now turn to Sharma’s second claim that so-called neo-racist arguments conflate immigration with colonialism, thus deeming Asian settler critiques ahistorical. While migration in and of itself does not equate to colonialism, migration to a settler colonial space, where Native lands and resources are under political, ecological, and spiritual contestation, means the political agency of immigrant communities can bolster a colonial system initiated by White settlers. This is particularly so since the avenues laid out for success and empowerment are paved over Native lands and sovereignty. In this way, Sharma privileges what Moustafa Bayoumi has critiqued as a ‘migrant’s eye-view of the world’, a way of seeing that is limited by an episteme that does not contend with an Indigenous history of dispossession of the very land beneath migrants’ feet. In paying attention to the politics of location and settlement, Shalini Puri has argued that a more productive transnationalism might instead ask: ‘How do I, even as a dissident, participate in nationally mediated structures of power and oppression?’²⁹

It is precisely this kind of historical contextualization around the specific political choices of settlers shaped by settler colonialism and imperial politics that I contend with here. Lorrin A. Thurston, a third-generation descendent of some of the first US Calvinist missionaries and architect of the 1893 overthrow, sought to dismiss Kanaka ‘Ōiwi claims to nationhood by playing to a much more recognizable international threat to White settler order than that posed by Kanaka ‘Ōiwi. This threat, the Yellow Peril, is one that Thurston learned to play-up from his dealings with US Secretary of State James Blaine who argued as early as 1881 that

the decline of the native Hawaiian element in the presence of newer studier growths must be accepted as an inevitable fact ... the replenishment of the vital forces of Hawaii presents itself for intelligent solution in an American sense – not an Asiatic or a British sense.³⁰

In 1897, Thurston similarly wrote that White settlers in Hawai‘i understood their political dilemma as a contest not between Kanaka ‘Ōiwi and White settlers, but rather between the White and the yellow race, stating: ‘It is no longer a question whether Hawaii should be controlled by the Native Hawaiian, or by some foreign people; but the question is, “*What foreign people shall control Hawaii?*”’³¹ After facing defeat at the voting polls in 1890, Lorrin A. Thurston became heavily involved in promoting tourism as a means to attract a ‘desirable population’ to replace Kanaka ‘Ōiwi. In 1911, the Hawai‘i Territorial Legislature would act on this same sentiment when it passed a bill urging Congress to pay the fares of White farmers to Hawai‘i to provide a militia to protect US interests.

As evidenced by these acts, White settlers overly presumed the Japanese to be participating in a ‘peaceful invasion’ of the islands.³² White settler anxiety over the possibility of such a large Japanese population gaining control of Hawai‘i, however, had a *tiny* sliver of merit. In *Between Two Empires* Eiichiro Azuma asserts that the exodus of laborers from Japan to Hawai‘i coincided

with a ‘branch of Japanese imperialist thought’ that viewed the western hemisphere as Japan’s own frontier to be settled.³³ Azuma explains that the Meiji government understood that in order to be considered a ‘civilized’ nation, Japan would have to ‘partake in the practice of colonization’.³⁴ Accordingly, Japan established its own form of manifest destiny by colonizing Okinawa, Taiwan, northern China, and then annexing Korea in 1910. In fact, the Meiji state’s colonization of the Ainu in Hokkaido in 1869 was modeled after the conquest of Native Americans by the United States. Meiji leaders, Azuma explains, attached a nationalist meaning to the act of migration, seeing overseas settlements as economically and politically tied to the state’s collective purpose.³⁵ At the same time, many of the Japanese who settled in Hawai‘i viewed their emigration from the standpoint of personal interests, not as imperial subjects of Japan.

It was ‘personal interest,’ however, that motivated Japanese plantation laborers to initiate a petition on 9th of April 1893, less than three months after the US military-backed overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Their petition did not oppose the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom – nor seek Japan’s colonization of Hawai‘i – but rather, demanded their electoral participation in the new settler government. The Japanese justified their inclusion by arguing that they were ‘physical and intellectual’ equals of any of the other foreigners.³⁶ Likewise in 1894, some Chinese in Hawai‘i signed a petition, signed by hundreds, seeking their right to vote in the new settler government.³⁷ This is in stark contrast to the *kū‘ē* (resistance) petitions by Kānaka ‘Ōiwi in 1897, where over 90% of the Native population opposed US citizenship throughout the islands.³⁸ The overwhelming majority of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi did not seek their incorporation into the settler state but rather opposed their forced inclusion as US citizens and the consolidation of the White settler controlled Republic of Hawai‘i with the USA through the annexation of Hawai‘i.

To be sure, during the Territorial period (1900–1959), a complex transition of White settler to a more liberal multicultural form of settler colonialism emerged.³⁹ Asians in Hawai‘i, indeed, had historical reason to agitate. Labeled ‘ineligible to citizenship’ with the passing of racist US laws, this generation would have to wait for their children to come of voting age to gain political representation. In 1936, University of Hawai‘i sociologist and proponent of the ‘immigration assimilation model,’ Romanzo Adams, predicted that, by 1944, two-thirds of Hawai‘i’s Asian population would be able to vote, consequently increasing the strength of the ‘non-caucasian majority’ and leading to a redistribution of power.⁴⁰ In order to reconsolidate and maintain a fragile and failing project of White racial power and privilege, White settlers were strategically seeking to converge their interests with certain East Asian settlers and forge a more liberal multicultural form of settler colonialism.⁴¹

Realizing that a previously closed window of political opportunity was poised to open, Asian Americans and Kanaka ‘Ōiwi helped form the Democratic Party to challenge the Republican Party’s control over the legislature. Indeed, after the attack on Pearl Harbor, many White businessmen left Hawai‘i fearing martial law consequently leading to an economic vacuum in which many Japanese American and Chinese American entrepreneurs were able to capitalize on wide open markets. World War II veterans Daniel Inouye and Sakae Takahashi opened two banks receiving financial and administrative support from banking institutions in Japan and together, they capitalized on major housing and hotel developments in Hawai‘i. By 1954, the Democratic Party, with the support of labor unions, dislodged the Republican plantation oligarchy from the legislature in what has been termed in Hawai‘i as the ‘Democratic Revolution’. In spite of a movement for genuine equality, the counter-hegemonic strategies of Asian Americans against *haole* supremacy challenged, modified, and yet renewed a hegemonic US settler colonial system.

Indigenous difference and questions around alliance building

The choices Asian settlers have historically made demonstrate how settler interests have come at the expense of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. This history has rarely been examined, as it has long been a taboo topic

that seemingly works against previous ways of organizing around shared victimization.⁴² In Dana Takagi's criticism of *Asian Settler Colonialism* she writes, 'my disagreement with the "settler" discourse is that it re-inscribes the dominant-subordinate relationship, or the landlord-tenant, capitalist-worker relationship, that is so fundamental to historical materialism'. These 'either/or' framings, Takagi contends, might instead emphasize 'through' as opposed to 'either/or'.⁴³ In my opinion, settler colonialism describes a formation of power that helps us to understand how difference does not necessarily lead to 'either/or' analyses. The constant criticism that settler colonialism reinscribes binaries, primarily an Indigenous and non-Indigenous binary, is itself often upheld by a White and non-White binarism, one that limits a conception of power in which one is *either* oppressed or oppressive. Here, an understanding that power does not simply target historically oppressed communities but also operates *through* their practices, ambitions, narratives, and silences, offers a way of examining other dynamics of power such as labor exploitation, anti-immigrant laws and sentiment, and imperialist wars that have historically shaped diverse Asian American groups without misrecognizing the context for framing Asian settlers on Native lands seized by the US settler state. That is to say, far from the 'either/or' framing that Takagi describes, settler colonialism and Asian settler colonialism in particular, allows us to see how power operates relationally such that groups are not *either* oppressed or oppressive.

Another concern of Takagi's is that settler colonialism backgrounds important historical changes including Asian and Kanaka solidarity. Pointing to the 2002–2004 debates around whether or not to officially include Pacific Islander American Studies within the Association for Asian American Studies, Takagi argues that tensions for and against the name change were conditioned by common-sense understandings of the term 'Local' in Hawai'i, a cultural identity in opposition to White supremacy with roots in Hawai'i's plantations. Takagi argues that opposition to the name change was shaped by a new 'us', not the previous Local formation of 'us' versus the 'haole', but new distinctions between 'Asian Americans and Native Hawaiians' that emerged as a result of Hawaiian nationalism.

It is not so much that a critique of settler colonialism backgrounds the category 'Local' but rather, that it directly challenges a hegemonic common sense position that assumes diverse non-White groups' interests are always aligned with Native peoples. Such critiques demonstrate how a Local category avoids difference through amalgamation while actually mystifying and upholding unequal power relations between Kanaka 'Ōiwi and Asian Americans.⁴⁴ This actually functions to background the Indigenous human rights issues of sovereignty, nationhood, and land claims that affect Kanaka 'Ōiwi in ways that do not affect Asian groups. This is attested to by the fact that Pacific Islander scholars attend the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association conferences in far greater numbers than conferences held by the Association for Asian American Studies. The assumptions underpinning the category Local, wherein non-Whites formed a united front to oppose haole supremacy by transcending race, largely traces such solidarity to the militant labor movements of Hawai'i's Territorial period. Moon-Kie Jung, in his book *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement*, argues that this assumption cannot be proven in the historical archives and that it is based in part on a mistaken post-war belief that this historical moment can be defined as a move 'toward racial democracy'. Jung argues that laborers who expressed their 'interests in racially divided terms, come to rearticulate, rather than ineluctably disarticulate, race and class'.⁴⁵ Thus, a complex rearticulation of racial difference, not the extinguishment of it, allowed laborers to form a historical bloc and gain worker rights.

Furthermore, using Ronald Takaki's *Pau Hana* as evidence of a previous 'us' that encompassed both Kānaka 'Ōiwi and Asian Americans, Takagi writes that it is after Hawaiian nationalism that 'the question of who exactly is part of us in Hawaii has changed significantly'.⁴⁶ Despite its rich histories of plantation resistance and solidarity, *Pau Hana* often utilizes Asian American immigrant narratives to conflate Asian American experiences with Kanaka 'Ōiwi. Takaki describes a moment of transcendence that begins in the 1920 strike when 'laborers were beginning to feel a new consciousness – an

identity of themselves as settlers, as locals, and an understanding of the need for a politics that transcended ethnicity'.⁴⁷ In both *Pau Hana* and *Strangers from a Different Shore*, Takaki refers to Asian Americans as 'settlers' to challenge the notion that they were 'sojourners', a term that constitutes Asian Americans as 'perpetual foreigners'. The implications of the term 'settler' for Asian Americans in relation to Native people, however, are never considered.⁴⁸ In a similar way, Takaki's celebration of the initial moments of primitive accumulation illuminates how settlers are discursively constituted as more deserving over contested lands and resources. That is to say, Takaki's narrative celebrates the process of expropriating territories and the elimination of Indigenous modes of production. In *Pau Hana*, this ability for laborers to claim responsibility for developing modern Hawai'i into a wealthy and profitable place, as opposed to the seemingly uncultivated place it was prior to their arrival, is used as a point of articulation that brings together non-White working class groups:

While Hawaiians, Chinese, Japanese, Koreans Portuguese, Filipinos, and laborers of other nationalities retained their sense of ethnicity, many of them also felt a new class awareness. As they worked together in the fields and mills, as they built working class communities in their camps sharing their different ethnic foods and speaking pidgin English, and as they struggled together against the bosses on the picket lines, they came to understand the contribution they had made as workers to the transformation of Hawaii into a wealthy and profitable place. 'When we first came to Hawaii,' they proudly observed, 'these islands were covered with ohia forests, guava fields and areas of wild grass. Day and night did we work, cutting trees and burning grass, clearing lands and cultivating fields until we made the plantations what they are today'.

Citing a strike pamphlet written by Japanese laborers as capable of speaking on behalf of all groups, the relationship between the formation of capitalism, via primitive accumulation through elimination of Kanaka 'Ōiwi economies, and its ongoing process of 'accumulation by dispossession' shows how capitalism positions Native people differently than other groups.⁴⁹

Kanaka 'Ōiwi, though instrumental in the formation of the labor unions in Hawai'i, were often confronted with primitivist ideas that cast them as unfit for modern times and as such other union workers believed they could not be depended upon. Jack Hall, labor leader of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, writes: "'The Hawaiians," they said, "are too-easy going. All they want is a little fish and poi and their liquor"'.⁵⁰ In this way, the Indigenous comes to stand in for an outmoded and dead way of life, an anachronistic mode of production that is at once repulsive and romanticized as hedonistic. Similarly, in a study conducted in the 1950s, Joseph C. Finney argued that the 'primitive stereotype' defined common views of Hawaiians as 'lazy'. As one woman listed as Japanese said: 'You see the Hawaiians are ... popularly known to be lazy, and they don't have a tradition for literacy and they're not the conscientious type, industrious type.'⁵¹ This is itself an old tale of capitalism wherein Karl Marx takes Adam Smith to task for creating a 'nursery tale' around the so-called primitive accumulation that necessitates the construction of two kinds of people, 'one, the diligent, intelligent and above all frugal elite; the other, lazy rascals, spending their substance, and more, in riotous living'. Marx goes on to argue that '[i]n actual history, it is a notorious fact that conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, in short, force, play the greatest part'.⁵² To offer a more contemporary example, in the *Asian Settler Colonialism* anthology, Momiala Kamahēle's article, "'Īlio'ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture,' traces the successful resistance on the part of mostly hula practitioners against the actions of state Senator Randy Iwase. Iwase, in the interests of powerful landowners, developers, and title insurance companies, introduced a bill in 1997 that sought to criminalize Hawaiian practitioners by requiring them to get a certificate of registration to practice gathering rights – woods, ferns, flowers, fibers, and cordage necessary for hula. Senate Bill 8 would not only have forced Native practitioners to establish proof that they were Kanaka, but also to prove through documents that their current customary practices were identifiable and continuous on

undeveloped land prior to 1892. Through this, the bill would have eased difficulties in selling, buying and financing property by criminalizing Hawaiian cultural practices as trespassing.⁵³

While I politically agree with an anti-capitalist vision, particularly in a global capitalist system that increasingly has relied on war to sustain itself, these movements should be accountable to Native people by considering a preceding moment in time, a different arrangement of land, resources and a way of life that predates the settler state. Indigenous knowledges are, in fact, grounded in both centuries old knowledges and ongoing creative practices – that are often antithetical to anthropocentric views. Not a romantic process of ‘going back’, this work is an articulation of present environmental, social, and economic problems in conjunction with ongoing Indigenous technologies and knowledges, particularly a deep historical knowledge of the specific environmental features of the interconnectedness of different parts of Hawai‘i. Viewing Indigenous knowledges and self-determination as irrelevant to present problems replicates the initial logics of colonialism that subjugated these knowledges by deeming Kanaka ‘Ōiwi culture a giant ‘wasteland of non-achievement’.⁵⁴ Or as Jodi Byrd has noted in response to Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright’s call for a global commons, indigeneity is seen as an ‘obstacle to the gaining of a commons as the means to the end of oppression within the lands that once did, but no longer can or should, belong to indigenous peoples’.⁵⁵ It is for these above reasons that to call for decolonization around the theft of the commons without accountability to Kanaka ‘Ōiwi culture and addressing settler racism presumes anti-capitalist settlers as a still more deserving power over Native lands.

Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s, *Seeds We Planted: Portrait of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*, illustrates just how Native scholarship addresses current problems through Indigenous knowledge, in ways that imagine alternative power relations to the structures of colonialism. Contrary to decolonial visions that do not take Kanaka sovereignty into account or notions that settler colonialism creates conditions for differences that ultimately lead to expulsion and violence, Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua talks about her project educating both Native and settler students through Indigenous economies at Hālau Kū Māna, stating

this story is not exclusively about Kānaka Maoli. Rather it is about how an educational community comes to understand and define itself as a collective that makes Hawaiian culture foundational to its day-to-day life, including both ‘Ōiwi and settlers as valuable members within this ‘ohana [family] without glossing over the differences between them’.⁵⁶

Such a framing, indeed, much of Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua’s work aims for non-statist forms of decolonization, sets the conditions for cultivating mutual respect through cultural difference. In this way, Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua theorizes through a Native and Pacific studies inflection to articulation theory, the rearticulation of settler and Native relations ‘in the face of the fragmenting and harmful forces of racism and settler colonialism’.⁵⁷

Conclusion

I would like to end this piece with a kind of self-critique by sharing stories of my family in order to show how we have been positioned within what Andrea Smith has termed the logics of White supremacy (labor exploitation, war, and settler colonialism) and how, ultimately, I have come to understand my family’s positionality as settlers. My family has been in Hawai‘i for five generations. On my Japanese side, we arrived to Maui in 1894, one year after the overthrow and four years prior to forced annexation. My great-grandfather Kumakichi Abe traveled from Fukushima, which recently made headlines as a result of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear disaster. While he was said to have traveled with a trunk of books that he would read over and over again, he was also considered the ‘plantation drunk’. My mother remembers walking to school and finding him

passed out in ditches but believed his alcoholism was a result of the frustration he felt for being educated yet having the job of removing the waste from the plantation's outhouses. On my father's side, my great-grandmother and great-grandfather arrived to the Ola'a plantation on the island of Hawai'i in 1919. Crispine Bibilone and Sabas Saranillio left Badian, Cebu, a place torn by the Philippine-American war during which over 2 million Filipinos died in the Philippines as a result of the US occupation. Cebu is a place noted for its fierce resistance to the US occupation.⁵⁸ Members of the family moved to the island of Lāna'i where they helped to set up the Federation Camp, a fishing village with housing structures made out of driftwood. They participated in the successful pineapple strike of 1951, which lasted 201 days leading to an increase in wages industry-wide. My grandfather, Itsuji Inouye, who I am named after, worked his entire life for the sugar plantation on Maui where he labored as a surveyor helping to route water to sugar cane fields. This water was stolen from watersheds making it impossible for lo'i kālo (taro farms) to survive, a process of primitive accumulation that Kanaka 'Ōiwi on Maui continue to fight in order to regain this water and reimplement an Indigenous mode of production. At the same time, my grandfather, who was known as Uncle Fats, was a part of another kind of commons as a healer and masseuse. I remember the house, and sometimes garage, filled in the afternoons and well into the evenings with people waiting for my grandfather to work on them. He never accepted money, so instead some brought mango, papaya, banana, and often candy for us, his grandchildren. My mother, Eloise Yamashita, grew up in McGerrow Camp in Spreckylsville, Maui and her mother, Masako Inouye, was a noted strike captain receiving recognition from labor leaders such as Jack Hall. At the age of 14, my mother was a live-in housemaid for Ray Allen, the Wailuku Sugar Company manager, and she can tell you volumes of stories about how pilau (rotten with connotations of immoral) that family was. My father, Dick Saranillio, grew up on Del Monte's CPC (California Packing Corporation) plantation camp in Wahiawa. He remembers singing songs, more like playground blues, about wars in the Philippines: 'Oh Philippines, Oh Philippines, long time fight but no can win.' He enlisted into the Air Force in 1968 at 18 in order to avoid being drafted by the Army, believing the Air Force might give him a better chance of surviving Vietnam. He was an aircraft mechanic and loaded bombs on planes that were a part of the covert bombing of Cambodia – the United States dropped 2,756,941 tons of ordnance on Cambodia, more tons than used in all of World War II, leading to a casualty rate of upwards of 150,000.⁵⁹ He returned to Hawai'i to labor as an ironworker helping to build harbors, condominiums and hotels as a part of the post-statehood economic boom. One of the hotels he helped build is the Sheraton Kapalua, where I also worked serving drinks and food to tourists who lounged poolside. This hotel is built on a sacred site called Pu'u Keka'a, which Ty Kāwika Tengan notes is the leaping point for the spirits of the departed.⁶⁰

As Candace Fujikane (my oldest sister) argues, only by learning to work in support of Indigenous peoples 'can we as Asian American settlers liberate ourselves from our positions as agents in a settler colonial system of violence'.⁶¹ Indeed, she and I come from an Asian settler genealogy of *both* resistance to and collusion with US systems of violence. I share my family stories to demonstrate that what I write is a self-critique, and more specifically to give a human element to the kinds of Asian settlers I am talking about. Some of them are barely coping and often living pay check-to-pay check, a strategy that Paul Isenberg, prominent leader of the sugar industry in the nineteenth century, argued would make controlling their workforce easier, so that the 'Chinese and Japanese had to work or be hungry'.⁶² It is for this reason that I identify myself as a settler, placing me in direct engagement with an ongoing history of settler colonialism *in* the United States one that is often deliberately obscured, while simultaneously critical of the logics of White supremacy that have impacted my family and communities. Settler states have no interests in non-Natives identifying with Native movements, as it opens their purview to processes of settler accumulation by Native dispossession, thus serving to oppose a system set by White supremacy that while *differently*, ultimately comes at the expense of *all of us*.

Notes

1. Benjamin J. Cayetano, *Ben: A Memoir, From Street Kid to Governor* (Honolulu: Watermark Publishing, 2009), 445.
2. Kahikina de Silva, 'Ka'ala, Molale I Ka Mālie: The Staying Power of Love and Poetry' (paper presented to the Native American Indigenous Studies Association Conference, Mohegan Sun, June 3–6, 2012).
3. As cited in Candace Fujikane, 'Foregrounding Native Nationalisms: A Critique of Antinationalist Sentiment in Asian American Studies', in *Asian American Studies After Critical Mass*, ed. Kent A. Ono (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 81; for an analysis of this term see Lisa Kahale'ole Hall, "'Hawaiian at Heart" and Other Fictions', *The Contemporary Pacific* 17, no. 2 (Fall 2005): 404–13.
4. While Benjamin Cayetano's bid for mayor was supported broadly by the left due to his opposition to the development of a rail transit system, he was not opposed to rail because of the desecration of Hawaiian burials, but rather the added economic costs due to a delay of the project when uncovering Hawaiian burials.
5. Neil Abercrombie, 'Preface', in *Ben: A Memoir, From Street Kid to Governor* (Honolulu: Watermark Publishing, 2009), 7–8.
6. Dan Boylan, 'Book Review: Ben: A Memoir, From Street Kid to Governor', *Hawaiian Journal of History* 44 (2010): 107.
7. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 'Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor', *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.
8. Dean Itsuji Saranillio, 'Colliding Histories: Hawai'i Statehood at the Intersection of Asians "Ineligible to Citizenship" and Hawaiians "Unfit for Self-Government"', *Journal of Asian American Studies* 13, no. 3 (2010): 283–309.
9. Christina Klein, *Cold War Orientalism: Asia in the Middlebrow Imagination, 1944–1961* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2003), 250–1.
10. I use the term Asian American here to signify Asians groups living in territories occupied by the USA. However, in the Hawai'i context, it is a term that is not a geographical marker, but rather a national one – Hawai'i is not in the Americas. As opposed to placing quotation marks such as Asian 'American' throughout the entire essay, I hope this footnote will mark my apprehension of the term.
11. Andrea Smith, 'Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy: Rethinking Women of Color Organizing', in *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2006), 67.
12. Stuart Hall, 'Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity', *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10, no. 2 (1986): 5–27; Stuart Hall, 'On Postmodernism and Articulation: An Interview with Stuart Hall', *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10, no. 2 (1986): 45–60; Andrea Smith, *Native Americans and the Christian Right: The Gendered Politics of Unlikely Alliances* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 1–8.
13. Haunani-Kay Trask, 'The Color of Violence', in *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2006), 82.
14. Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces Between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 20.
15. Candace Fujikane, 'Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai'i', *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai'i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008), 36.
16. Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); Hokulani Aikau, *Chosen People, a Promised Land: Mormonism and Race in Hawai'i* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2012); Judy Rohrer, 'Attacking Trust: Hawai'i as a Crossroads and Kamehameha Schools in the Crosshairs', *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 437–55; Hokulani Aikau, 'Indigeneity in the Diaspora: The Case of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah', *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 477–500; Bianca Isaki, 'HB 645, Settler Sexuality, and the Politics of Local Asian Domesticity in Hawai'i', *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 2 (2011): 82–103; Julie Kaomea, 'Indigenous Studies in the Elementary Curriculum: A Cautionary Hawaiian Example', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 36, no. 1 (2005): 24–42; Stephanie Nohelani Teves, 'We're All Hawaiian Now: Kanaka Maoli Performance and the Politics of Aloha' (PhD diss., University of Michigan. Ann Arbor: ProQuest/UMI, 2012); Ida Yoshinaga, 'Pacific (War) Time at Punchbowl: A Nebutsu for Unclaiming Nation', *Chain* 11 (Summer 2004): 328–43; Candace Fujikane, 'Foregrounding Native Nationalisms: A Critique of Antinationalist Sentiment in Asian American Studies', in *Asian American Studies After Critical Mass*, ed. Kent A. Ono (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 73–97; Candace Fujikane,

- ‘Asian American Critique and Moana Nui 2011: Securing a Future Beyond Empires, Militarized Capitalism and APEC’, *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 13, no. 2 (2012): 1–22; Cristina Bacchilega, *Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); Laura Lyons, ‘From the Indigenous to the Indigent: Homelessness and Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i’, in *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture*, ed. Fiona Bateman and Lionel Pilkington (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 140–52; Karen K. Kosasa, ‘Searching for the “C” Word: Museums, Art Galleries, and Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i’, in *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture*, ed. Fiona Bateman and Lionel Pilkington (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 153–68; Dean Itsuji Saranillio, ‘Colliding Histories: Hawai‘i Statehood at the Intersection of Asians “Ineligible to Citizenship” and Hawaiians “Unfit for Self-Government”’, *Journal of Asian American Studies* 13, no. 3 (2010): 283–309; Dean Itsuji Saranillio, ‘Kēwaikaliko’s *Benocide*: Reversing the Imperial Gaze of *Rice v. Cayetano* and Its Legal Progeny’, *American Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (2010): 457–76; Kim Compoc, ‘Filipinos and Statehood: Reflections on American Assimilation and Settler Complicity’ (Master’s Project, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, 2010); Roderick Labrador, *Filipino Community Building* (forthcoming); Kristy Hisako Ringor, ‘The War at Hanapepe’ (PhD diss., University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, forthcoming); Yuichiro Onishi, ‘Occupied Okinawa on the Edge: On Being Okinawan in Hawai‘i and U.S. Colonialism toward Okinawa’, *American Quarterly* 64, no. 4 (2012): 741–65; Kēhaulani Vaughn, ‘Desecration of ‘Iwi: Native Hawaiian Deracination at Kawaiiaha‘o Church’ (Dissertation Proposal, University of California, Riverside, 2012).
17. Dana Y. Takagi, ‘Faith, Race, and Nationalism’, *Journal of Asian American Studies* 7, no. 3 (2004): 277; Davianna Pomaika‘i McGregor, ‘Un-melting 20th Century Myths of the Chicago School about Hawai‘i,’ (paper presented at the Association for Asian American Studies, Chicago, IL, April 9, 2008); Gary Okihiro, *Island World: A History of Hawai‘i and the United States* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2008), 4.
 18. Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, ‘Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States’, *Social Justice* 35, no. 3 (2008–9): 120–38.
 19. Nandita Sharma, ‘Book Reviews’, *Hawaiian Journal of History* 44 (2010): 107–10.
 20. Nandita Sharma, *Hawaiian Journal of History*, 109.
 21. I am uncertain as to whether this is the specific argument that Nandita Sharma is referencing, as the page number she lists is not to Eiko Kosasa’s article. There are also two contributors with the last name Kosasa, including Karen Kosasa. Judging by the description of the work, however, I am assuming it is referencing Eiko Kosasa, ‘Ideological Images: U.S. Nationalism in Japanese Settler Photographs’, in *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008), 225–6.
 22. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 13.
 23. Candace Fujikane, ‘Mapping Mo‘olelo Against the Fragmenting Fictions of the Settler State: Protecting the Sacred Places of Lualualei, Pōhākea, and Mauna a Wākea’ (Lecture, English Department Colloquium, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, Honolulu, Hawai‘i, October 6, 2011).
 24. I thank Alex Villalpondo for alerting and helping me to better understand this debate. Charles R. Hale, *Más Que Un Indio (More Than an Indian): Racial Ambivalence and Neoliberal Multiculturalism in Guatemala* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 2009 third printing), 111–36.
 25. Charles R. Hale, *Más Que Un Indio (More Than an Indian)*, 19.
 26. *Ibid.*, 134.
 27. *Ibid.*, 139.
 28. Healani Sonoda, ‘A Nation Incarcerated’, in *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i*, ed. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008), 109.
 29. Shalini Puri, *The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post-nationalism, and Cultural Hybridity* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 24.
 30. James G. Blaine to James M. Comly, Department of State, 1 December 1881, in Thurston, Lorrin A. Miscellaneous Papers, M-144, Hawaii State Archives.
 31. Lorrin A. Thurston, *A Hand-book on the Annexation of Hawaii* (Michigan: A. B. Morse Company, Printers and Binders, 1897), 5; Also cited in Noel J. Kent, *Hawaii: Islands Under the Influence* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, reprint 1993), 61.

32. Gary Okihiro, *Cane Fires: The Anti-Japanese Movement in Hawaii, 1865–1945* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Temple Press, 1991); William Adam Russ, *The Hawaiian Republic (1894–1898): And Its Struggle to Win Annexation* (Pennsylvania, PA: Susquehanna University Press, 1961), 132.
33. Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 10–11; Akira Iriye, *Pacific Estrangement: Japanese and American Expansion, 1897–1911* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 84–90.
34. Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires*, 18.
35. *Ibid.*, 20.
36. Kathleen Dickenson Mellen, Bishop Museum Archives, MS 19, Box 3.4.
37. ‘A Petition Signed by Several Hundred Chinese will be Presented to the Councils Today, Asking that the Chinese in Hawaii be Given the Voting Franchise’, *Pacific Commercial Advertiser*, May 17, 1894.
38. Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).
39. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 67–8.
40. Romanzo C. Adams, *The Peoples of Hawaii* (Honolulu: American Council, Institute of Pacific Relations, 1935).
41. George Cooper and Gavan Daws, *Land and Power in Hawaii: The Democratic Years* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1990).
42. Andrea Smith, ‘Heterpatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy’.
43. Dana Takagi, ‘Faith, Race and Nationalism’, *Journal of Asian American Studies* 7, no. 3 (2004), 281.
44. Patrick Wolfe, ‘Nation and Miscege Nation: Discursive Continuity in the Post-Mabo Era’, *Social Analysis* 36 (October 1994): 93–152.
45. Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii’s Interracial Labor Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006).
46. Dana Takagi, ‘Faith, Race and Nationalism’ 277.
47. Ronald Takaki, *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1983), xi.
48. Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (New York: Back Bay Books, 1988); L. Ling-chi Wang, ‘A Critique of Strangers from a Different Shore’, *Amerasia Journal* 16, no. 2 (1990): 71–80; Sucheng Chan, ‘Strangers from a Different Shore as History and Historiography’, *Amerasia Journal* 16, no. 2 (1990): 81–100; Elaine H. Kim, ‘A Critique of Strangers from a Different Shore’, *Amerasia Journal* 16, no. 2 (1990): 101–11.
49. David Harvey, *The New Imperialism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 137–82.
50. As cited in Sanford Zalburg, *A Spark Is Struck!: Jack Hall & the ILWU in Hawaii* (Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1979), 40.
51. Joseph C. Finney, ‘Attitudes of Others Toward Hawaiians,’ 79, *Hawaiian and Pacific Collections* University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa; see also Ty P. Kāwika Tengan, *Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai‘i* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 45.
52. Karl Marx, *Capital: Vol. One* (New York: Penguin Classics, 1990), 873–74.
53. Momiala Kamahēle, ‘‘Īlio‘ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture’, *Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i*, 81 (2008).
54. Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemen, 1986), 3.
55. Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 204.
56. Jennifer Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).
57. *Ibid.*
58. Resil Mojares, *The War Against the Americans Resistance and Collaboration in Cebu: 1899–1906* (Manila: Ateneo De Manila University Press, 1999).
59. Taylor Owen and Ben Kiernan, ‘Bombs Over Cambodia’, *The Walrus*, October, 2006.
60. Ty Kāwika Tengan, *Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai‘i* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008), 1–3.
61. Candace Fujikane, ‘Asian American Critique and Moana Nui 2011’ 4.
62. As cited in Ralph S. Kuykendall, *Hawaiian Kingdom 1874–1893: The Kalakaua Dynasty* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1967), 637.