

Remixing Hybridity: Globalization, Native Resistance, and Cultural Production in Hawai'i

Cynthia Franklin and Laura Lyons

In the fall of 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court heard the case of *Rice v. Cayetano*. This case, filed by Freddy Rice, a white rancher from the island of Hawai'i, sought to invalidate elections for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), which, until then had been restricted to people of Hawaiian ancestry. The Court ruled in favor of Rice and his battery of lawyers, who argued that excluding non-Hawaiians from the voting poll evidenced a race-based exclusion and was therefore unconstitutional.¹ OHA, established in a 1978 state Constitutional Convention, is the state agency charged with overseeing the crown and government lands of the Kingdom of Hawai'i. After the overthrow of the Kingdom in 1893, the Republic of Hawai'i, under Sanford B. Dole, claimed title to the Kingdom's crown lands and then subsequently ceded these same lands to the United States at the time of the 1898 annexation. The United States continued to claim property title to the lands, and in 1959, the new State of Hawai'i was given beneficial title to them.² Revenues from these lands are held in a trust with a mandate to better the conditions of Native Hawaiians. The Supreme Court's ruling represented a refusal to recognize Native Hawaiians' special political status as indigenous people, who as a result of treaties signed with the United States, maintain legal claims to 1.8 million acres of land in Hawai'i.³ Instead, the Supreme Court viewed Native Hawaiians as merely one of many of the United States' racial and ethnic groups. In successfully extending

voting rights in the OHA elections to non-Hawaiians, the *Rice v. Cayetano* decision effectively opened the door to overturning all Hawaiian entitlements.⁴

In Hawai‘i, Rice’s case—funded in part by “Americans for a Color-blind Society”—articulates with and arguably was made possible by popular contemporary rhetoric on race. On the one hand, this rhetoric casts Native Hawaiians as but one part of Hawaii’s multicultural “racial paradise”—in other words, as akin to any other hyphenated American identity.⁵ On the other hand, this same rhetoric posits an essential and authentic Hawaiian identity now lost as a result of factors such as intermarriage and the inroads of American popular culture. This discourse presumes that familial mixings have so diluted the blood quantum of Native Hawaiians and American influences have so transformed their cultural practices that any claim to a separate political identity can only be spurious and invalid.

A year later, a student in one of our graduate classes wrote to a class listserv in response to Native Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani-Kay Trask’s statement in *From a Native Daughter*, “We are not Americans.” Although the student claimed ultimately to be sympathetic to Trask’s politics, she demanded answers to the following questions: “. . . if you’re not American, then why do you shave your armpits? And why do you wear cool shades?”

What the student’s questions and the *Rice* case both demonstrate is how discourses of authenticity and cultural hybridity can work to undermine native cultural and political identities and rights. Although the import of these examples differs dramatically, they are linked. In both, there is the presumption that Native Hawaiian claims depend upon “purity” and “authenticity.” Such an understanding ignores how insofar as—and to the extent that—the terms “authentic” and “nativist” are used by Native Hawaiian scholars and activists including Haunani-Kay Trask, they are not invoked in an attempt to find “Hawaiianness” in the past, but rather to mark discourses and cultural practices that are produced by and for Native Hawaiians. The student’s equating of sunglasses and shaved armpits with an American identity that somehow corrupts Trask’s claim to Hawaiianness articulates with the Court’s ruling that an American identity and a “mixed pedigree” render Native Hawaiians but one of America’s many ethnic groups. Both the student and the court elide the historical context of colonialism and state formation in Hawai‘i, and the dynamics of culture, of which change is always a part.

Postcolonial scholars like to see themselves in opposition to naïve students and dominant reactionary politics as expressed by the courts as well as popular discourse on race and ethnicity. And yet, as we argue in the following sections, a great deal of postcolonial theory, especially that concerned with “hybridity,” can be seen to bolster such naïveté and repressive politics.

Uncovering Authenticity

In order to critique and counter the unproductive binary opposition between what is often called “nativist authenticity” and diasporic or poststructuralist forms of identity and community, this essay considers two projects in Hawai‘i that depend upon cultural mixings—Joe Balaz’s spoken word album *Electric Laulau* and Hapa’s version of the U2 song, “Pride (In the Name of Love).”⁶ In our analysis of these projects, we work to recognize the important place that they hold within the broadly nationalist and multi-faceted movement for sovereignty for Native Hawaiians, while acknowledging that they do not represent the most radical cultural front in the struggle for recognized political sovereignty. We are interested in how these works, which challenge the binary opposition upon which much hybridity theory rests, show that the celebration of hybridity that characterizes a great deal of postcolonial theory is itself predicated on a reactionary and politically conservative form of essentialism. In taking Hawaiian cultural production as our subject matter, our interest is not in speaking for Native Hawaiians. Rather we aim to critique the complicity of discourses of postcolonialism in the erasure of indigenous cultural forms and political struggles. Moreover, while we recognize that it is critical to account for the flows of people and cultural forms across national borders, at the same time we argue for renewed and closer attention in postcolonial and American studies to indigenous struggles within the United States that challenge its geographic borders. In other words, postcolonial studies is the object of our critique.

The privileging of theories of diaspora and hybridity within certain strands of postcolonial studies tends to ignore, or even to oppose, the indigenous in fairly reactionary ways. At the center of much hybridity theory is an unresolvable tension that renders it unable to come to terms with the indigenous. In his seminal book *The Location of Culture*, for example, Homi Bhabha collapses the different material circumstances that characterize migration, diaspora, social displacement, exile, and refugee status to describe “the new internationalism.”⁷ He then opposes these conditions to national identity, historical tradition, and “‘organic’ ethnic communities,” all of which potentially represent, for him, “a psychosis of patriotic fervor” that belies the “overwhelming evidence of a more transnational and translational sense of the hybridity of imagined communities” (5). Bhabha celebrates hybridity in order to critique—indeed, to denounce—nationalist and/or “nativist” politics and identity. Theorizations of hybridity such as Bhabha’s tend to see all the elements of any particular cultural mixing, or “translation,” as equal and so to level the differences in power among vastly divergent national and cultural traditions. Furthermore, as Aijaz Ahmad has noted, insofar as hybridity “resides now in occupying a multiplicity of subject positions. . . not only does the writer have all cultures available to him or her as resource, for consumption, but he or she actually belongs in all of them, by virtue of belonging properly in none.”⁸ This unmooring of subjectivity from physical borders results in what Ahmad calls an “excess of belonging,” which he argues, becomes the

privileged term, and “the idea of belonging is itself now seen as bad faith, a mere *‘myth of origins’*” (129). In a 2001 article on globalization, for example, Stephen Greenblatt argues that when “hitherto marginalized groups” make use of traditional forms, they are necessarily recapitulating “the hoariest myths of origin.”⁹ This kind of analysis eradicates those indigenous elements that make concrete claims to specific land and culture.

Greenblatt’s essay comes from “Globalizing Literary Studies,” the first of a two-year (2001-02) *PMLA* double issue on globalization. Taken together, these issues illustrate how hybridity—defined over and against the indigenous—has become a theoretical foundation within discussions of globalization. In his introduction to the second of these special issues, “Mobile Citizens, Media States,” D.N. Rodowick claims,

The mobility of deterritorialized transnationals must be characterized across several levels: not only their movements but also the inventive mixing of languages in bilingual and polyglot communities, the increasing hybridization or creolization of cultures, and finally the transformation of identity as a set of complex cultural and political allegiances that unite as well as divide local communities subnationally, nationally, and transnationally. In this manner, the mobility of identity or of cultural identification must be opposed to the fixity of an identity politics.¹⁰

This statement indicates how postcolonial studies increasingly uses transnationalism, globalization, hybridity, cosmopolitanism, and diaspora in interchangeable ways that frequently insist on a “postnational” formulation of citizenship and subjectivity. Rodowick marshals such a postmodern, “Bhabhaesque” vocabulary in order to delineate how globalization “as an economic and communicative force, is eroding the territoriality and sovereignty of the nation” (20). We argue, however, that it is precisely the ways in which the indigenous insists on belonging—not simply in an abstract sense, but to specific lands—that renders globalization and hybridity theory so inadequate for dealing with cultural mixes that come out of an indigenous context.

In many discussions of globalization, language often replaces land and renders it immaterial to identity. Greenblatt reflects this tendency when he contends that language is not shaped by a “rooted sense of cultural legitimacy.” Instead, he argues, “Language is the slipperiest of human creations; like its speakers, it does not respect borders, and, like the imagination, it cannot be predicted or controlled” (62). Greenblatt’s construction of language here separates it from state forms of power and culture, and in so doing attributes to language an autonomous agency. Such a formulation naturalizes the historical processes by which English became a hegemonic language. It also overlooks

how indigenous languages continue to be tied to place and politics. Like Greenblatt, Iain Chambers privileges language over land: “If it is language rather than the localized familiarities of a circumscribed territory that provides us with a home (an extremely tentative if, given all the active countervailing examples), then a sense of abode, of being at home, occurs in a more transitory but also more resilient structure than that proposed in the inherited genealogies of blood and soil.”¹¹ In his claim “that language is our home” (30), Chambers parenthetically acknowledges, only to override, indigenous claims to land and genealogy. The *PMLA* double issue centers the indigenous only once, in an article by Thomas Foster on Guillermo Gomez-Peña, and even here the discussion similarly works to separate indigenous identity and claims to land and nation. Foster’s interest in Gomez-Peña stems from how the artist “redefines the meaning of *indigenous* so that both migrant and native groups can be understood as occupying a ‘conceptual’ rather than a material space.”¹² The *PMLA* special issues are symptomatic of how the indigenous, even when acknowledged in globalization and hybridity studies, can all too easily become dematerialized, rendered a mere trope.¹³

This problem is rendered even more visible when the indigenous is tied to a nationalist movement to regain cultural and/or political autonomy. Nationalism is most often treated as both monolithically and inherently atavistic. As the quotations from Bhabha, Greenblatt, and others have demonstrated, postcolonial critics often interpret any attempts to enlist or to recover parts of a pre-colonial culture as a search for a pristine past, nostalgia for lost origins, or an appeal to unreconstructed nativist authenticity. Such scholarship can attend neither to the complex politics of particular nationalist claims at specific moments in time, nor to the role of the state in denying native lands and identity. As such, this scholarship helps to legitimate rulings such as the one made in the case of *Rice v. Cayetano*. Like the courts, scholars cast nationalist groups, including Native Hawaiians, into a temporal stasis. As a result, claims on the part of Native Hawaiians to land or identity are read as attempts to return to an irretrievable past, rather than as contemporary responses to historical injustices and continuing dispossession.

Moreover, such an understanding wrongly attributes to Native Hawaiians a Western epistemology of preservation. Rooted in processes of modernity, the discourse of preservation is incommensurate with Native Hawaiian ideas of “perpetuation,” which see attention to the past as one necessary means of creating a livable future. Hybridity theory, when it is applied to indigenous contexts, often fails to acknowledge adequately epistemological clashes. Thus, it can end up reinstalling and naturalizing Western epistemological constructs at the expense of nationalist movements for sovereignty.

Not all critics who theorize hybridity fall into the traps that we have outlined above. In *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*, Timothy Brennan calls attention to the neglected role of the indigenous in analyses of popular culture.

In his work on Cuban music and poetry, Brennan notes that, “Cultural theory’s recent emphasis on mixed cultural formations as ‘hybridity’ . . . masks the indigenous tropes within which hybridity has actually operated. . . .”¹⁴ Unlike those who can view the indigenous as little more than “a strategy of enclosure or a static, arresting disclaimer,” Brennan insists on the importance of understanding the “intensely contemporary and mutable” nature of indigenous culture and politics (306). He further critiques a form of hybridity that appropriates the indigenous in an unacknowledged way (310). Instead, he strongly argues for the ongoing importance of nationalist struggles waged by indigenous peoples and cautions academics who would deem these obsolete.

Lines of Flight: Postmodern Theory and Hawai‘i

One of the critics Brennan castigates for engaging in “an ethics of nonbinary ‘complexity,’” a practice he finds common in postcolonial criticism, is Andrew Ross (97). In his analysis of Ross’s “Cultural Preservation in the Polynesia of the Latter-day Saints,” a study of the Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC) in Hawai‘i, Brennan notes Ross’s reliance on “circularity.” Brennan defines this critical strategy as “the demonstration of the complicity of critique in the very things it is criticizing, or of showing moments of inescapability—the reversal of roles in the drama of social good and evil” (88). Ross’s indulging in circularity, Brennan argues, renders the colonized just as bad as the colonizer (“a sort of Indians-peed-in-the-stream-too school of history” [96]). He also contends that this strategy relies upon the implicit thesis that “the third-world subaltern . . . exists only as vestigial presence already saturated by U.S. corporate culture” (91). Brennan points to how Ross’s critical approach to the PCC insists upon “a chirpy negotiation of ‘cultural and economic exchange’” that “simply makes nonsense of the lopsided power the U.S., France, and others hold in the region, with the Pacific as their nuclear playground” (94).

Like Brennan, we are interested in how Ross’s work exemplifies the ways in which postcolonial theory consistently upholds hybrid, “modern” forms at the expense of indigenous or “traditional” ones. Our own concern with Ross is both theoretical and *material*. That is, we share Brennan’s critical stance toward trends in postcolonial studies, especially those that might undermine nationalist struggles. Our discussion of Ross also seeks to outline the particular problems and political consequences that result from Ross’s representations of Hawai‘i.¹⁵

Although Ross acknowledges and seeks to work against the ways that Western representations of Hawai‘i have historically denied Native Hawaiians any agency, his own narrative simply inverts the problem by presenting Hawaiians as agents of their own destruction. Throughout the article, Ross claims that Native Hawaiian nationalism is based upon a retrogressive nativist discourse of authenticity, what Brennan refers to as “nationalism as charade” (90). Ross posits a misleading and unproductive binary between stories of Native Hawaiian resistance to colonialism, which “attribute to people a sense of historical agency

and resistance” and stories “about the relentless destruction of their culture [that] resign them to exactly the passive fate visualized only in the most powerful, near-genocidal fantasies.”¹⁶ He continues, “Faced with a choice, however, the cultural politics of most nationalist movements (and Hawai‘i is no exception) often favors the latter kind of story because it provides the most powerful anti-colonial narrative and the most likely to achieve results” (62). What ensues, he contends, is a “*Kulturekampf*” that refuses to acknowledge cultural hybridity and instead “demands more clear cut symbolism drawn from a more ‘glorious’ past, untarnished by non-indigenous traces” (63). Ross’s use of terms such as “near-genocidal *fantasies*” and “stories,” renders the loss of Native Hawaiian lives and lands as a merely discursive problem. Moreover, in a desire to restore historical agency to Hawaiians, Ross ignores how many Native Hawaiian nationalists celebrate the ways Hawaiians have resourcefully appropriated a variety of cultural influences into their own cultural and political practices. Perhaps even worse, Ross constructs a version of nativist authenticity that completely occludes the role of the state in Hawaii’s colonial past and present.

Ross’s frequent use of the terms “nature” and “blood” to describe the political agenda of Native Hawaiian sovereignty activists insidiously raises the specters of “blood and belonging” that have characterized nationalist movements in Eastern Europe. Yet in the case of Hawai‘i, as J. Kēhaulani Kauanui has so forcefully argued, it is not insurgent nationalists who have initiated a politics based on blood quantum. Rather, the state and federal governments have effectively limited the numbers of citizens eligible to lease Hawaiian Homestead Lands or to benefit from Native Hawaiian social welfare programs by enforcing a strict definition of who will be considered a “Native Hawaiian.”¹⁷ Indeed, when Ross concludes his chapter with a caution against “precarious appeals to blood and nature,” he conceals the fact that no sovereignty group in the islands has a definition stricter than the 50 percent blood quantum required for most state and federal programs for Native Hawaiians (98). Here again, as Ross ascribes American blood quantum politics to Native Hawaiians, he assumes a Western epistemology that overlooks the fact that for many Native Hawaiians, including those he references, it is not simply blood, but a genealogical connection to the land, that defines Hawaiian identity.¹⁸

Throughout the essay, Ross portrays himself as a jet-lagged academic whose access to technology and a postmodern vantage point contrasts with his depiction of the indigenous cultures that he encounters. He notes, for example, the incongruous presence of a *karaoke* machine in a local Fijian bar. The effect of his consistently ironizing indigenous use of contemporary technologies relegates the indigenous to a position that by definition must be pre-modern. This happens in two ways that, as with much hybridity theory, form a constitutive contradiction. First, he dismisses Native Hawaiian nationalists as retrogressive for their claims that they have an inherent connection to the lands in the archipelago. Second, his attitude towards their use of new technologies reveals his own essentialist

sense of the indigenous, in that it is he who insistently equates indigeneity with a form of purity that exists outside of technological advances. The problem with Ross's analysis is that he potentially equates native peoples with the stone age and thereby suggests that those who make use of contemporary technology can no longer claim native identity, culture, or land.¹⁹ In Hawai'i, in contrast to Ross's depictions, nationalist struggles for sovereignty neither rely upon pristine depictions of a pre-contact past, nor are they disconnected from the cultural mix that characterizes contemporary Hawai'i itself.

In contrast to Ross, Rob Wilson, one of Hawai'i's preeminent and committed cultural theorists, has been trying to sort through the relations of the global to the local in a way that does not repeat the problems often found in postcolonial theorizing of hybridity and globalization. However, if Ross's attempt to account for the "complexity" of Native Hawaiian politics creates a false binary between the indigenous and the hybrid, then Wilson instead conflates these categories of identity. Wilson explains his project in *Reimagining the American Pacific* as an attempt "to document [that] along the Honolulu-Taipei flight to Asia-Pacific, the cultural production of local identity takes place inside a transnational imaginary that deforms local/national agents even as we map, express, and belatedly try to explain the process."²⁰ As Wilson traces Asia-Pacific lines of flight, he privileges a "mongrel" poetics over and at times against indigenous culture.

In *Reimagining the American Pacific*, Wilson's mongrel poetics differs from hybridity theory in that it is interested in how transnational influences come to bear on a particular place.²¹ Wilson is concerned with the globally-inflected cultural products that emerge from a specific location. Thus, his work better captures than does Ross's and other postcolonial theorists' the multiple cultural influences that characterize contemporary Hawai'i. However, Wilson's primary concern is with the postmodern play of languages and identities, inflected with his own Beat sensibility.²² What Wilson exuberantly champions is "culture experienced as a process of stylistic and biological impurity, as well as the embrace of translocal mixture and spiritual adventure as 'Dharma bum'" (280). The undercurrent of postmodernism that informs Wilson's work—with its attendant focus on style—precludes a significant engagement with the different histories that the poets that he examines have in relation to Hawai'i.²³ As Wilson generously celebrates a poetics that is open to any and all and that derives its innovative energy from transnational cultural mixings—that, in other words, advances a local that is decisively global as well—every influence becomes equally important and equally "authentic." What he values is "Culture seen as quest for states and mixtures not of identity but self-transcendence, impurity, outreach" (281).

Wilson's formulation of culture sometimes diminishes and at other times erases attention to history. His analysis is predicated upon an understanding of U.S. colonialism; he is after a "line of flight" that can "mime, deform, and critique

the statist project of Manifest Destiny as this trajectory of frontier expansion alters and dissolves in ‘Asia/Pacific’” (24). However, as this statement indicates, even as Wilson references U.S. imperialism, he privileges a geography that dissolves nation-states into a transnational entity. Moreover, Hawaii’s complicated history as a formerly independent nation and as America’s fiftieth state recedes into the background. In other places, Wilson does acknowledge issues and struggles that are distinctive to Native Hawaiians. These passages, however, exist in unresolved tension with the book’s overall impetus, which is to subsume Native Hawaiians into a “local” or “Asia/Pacific” configuration.²⁴ This results in an uneven representation of the cultural and political significance that Native Hawaiians hold in relation to mongrel poetics.

Wilson’s formulation of mongrel poetics ultimately focuses on style at the expense of history. For example, he argues, “To leave, to escape, to unsettle, is to *trace a line of flight*: becoming a force of imaginative rupture and assemblage, becoming one of those experimental producers and forces for imaginary expression ‘who create through a line of flight’” (275, Wilson’s emphasis). The ahistoricity reflected in Wilson’s aesthetics enables non-Native writers to make a more comfortable place for themselves in an archipelago on which the history of colonialism remains palpably present and contested. According to Wilson, mongrel poetics is best understood through a “transnationalized cultural studies” wherein attention is given to “dismantled territories of place, identity, and community” (8). Working from the postmodernist assumption that these things have already been dismantled, Wilson’s critical vantage point presupposes dispossession as a condition of postmodernity for all human subjects. Thus, Native Hawaiians’ loss of land becomes commensurate with other forms of dispossession, and deterritorialization itself threatens to become but a trope. His aesthetics lead him to privilege “minor” over national literatures. “Minor literature,” he states, “needs, in some ways, to remain minor and other and need not aspire to national criteria and forms” (146). Extending the work of Deleuze and Guattari, Wilson posits here a literature of resistance that aims to deform and critique.²⁵ Such a perspective, however, can undermine the efforts of those arguing the need for a Native Hawaiian literature that supports the reestablishment of a Hawaiian nation.²⁶

We want to be clear about the important contributions that Wilson makes. Unlike Ross, Wilson’s work effectively theorizes and makes visible the cultural heterogeneity that characterizes Hawai‘i. In the contexts of our concerns in this essay, however, our problem with *Reimagining the American Pacific* is that Wilson, despite his eclectic and dialectically-minded work, articulates his model of mongrel poetics in too totalizing a way. Although preferable to most theories of hybridity, mongrel poetics not only does not acknowledge, but also leaves little room for, cultural production that rests upon the assertion of a grounded, historical, Native Hawaiian identity. Whereas hybridity theory too often privileges belonging nowhere, mongrel poetics and Wilson’s attendant “transnationalized

cultural studies” elide the specificity of contemporary indigenous claims by legitimating any engagement with the local. His work points to the need for a full confrontation with the indigenous in order to understand the local in all its historical and cultural complexity. Otherwise you get a local that, although it references multiple cultural influences, lacks the specificity and historicity it promises and from which it emanates. In other words, what results is a local no more grounded than the global.

Putting Popular Music into the Mix

Thus far, we have been discussing the inadequacies of much postcolonial thinking about how the indigenous figures in cultural mixes, both in general and in Hawai‘i in particular. In the next sections, we aim to show how attention to the indigenous elements in two examples of music in Hawai‘i can offer critiques of postcolonial theory. These examples also suggest how culturally-mixed music can serve as a form of resistance to repressive politics—local, national, and international—as well as an alternative to apocalyptic visions of globalization.

Studies of popular music offer a nuanced way of understanding cultural mixes. The rise of world music and the incorporation of various musical traditions and forms into mainstream rock and pop make music a particularly rich site for discussions of hybridity. As Stuart Hall notes, “The aesthetics of modern popular music is the aesthetics of the hybrid, the aesthetics of the crossover, the aesthetics of the diaspora, the aesthetics of creolization.”²⁷ The 1990s saw an explosion of studies theorizing hybridity and the world music phenomenon. Although a number of these neglect the relationship between hybridity and indigeneity, George Lipsitz, Tony Mitchell, and Timothy D. Taylor have written particularly insightful books that, to differing degrees of success, attend to the place of the indigenous within the culturally mixed forms that characterize world music.²⁸ All three eschew the language of hybridity and its evocations of blood and biology; Taylor, for example, prefers the term “polystylistic polyphony.” They instead are sensitive to how culturally mixed forms must be understood in relation to specific locations and identity formations. They understand culture as a process for indigenous as well as other modern subjects, and are critical of attempts to relegate native cultural expressions to some fixed, pre-modern, pure form. While we are in accord with these critics’ attention to contemporary forms of indigenous identity and culture, we nonetheless note that this focus on the contemporary frequently eclipses history.

Our study both shares these critics’ theorizations of hybridity at the same time as our emphasis on questions of native identity, nationalist politics, and their relationship to history differentiate our study from theirs. Although Lipsitz is always attentive to state forms of power, he is less interested in oppositional forms of nationalism. He acknowledges at various points that music can be deployed “to create a cultural basis for new nations” (151). However, his emphasis is on how cultural mixes can be used to *critique* state forms of

nationalism, global capitalism, and colonialism. He seeks instead to advance an alternative form of transnationalism, one that seeks social justice. As Lipsitz argues, “the power of transnational capital means that all of us must become transnational too” (17). The studies that follow Lipsitz’s pay less attention to connections between popular music, nationalist or indigenous politics, and forms of state power. Taylor, for example, works within the terms “global” and “local” in a way that subsumes native peoples into the local, without focusing on how local cultural expressions can be specifically nationalist ones. He concludes his book, “Just as subordinate groups in U.S. culture have always done more than the dominant groups to make radical positions available through new sounds, new forms, new styles, it looks as though it is the subordinate groups around the world who are doing the same, perhaps even showing us how to get along on this planet. If only we would listen” (204). As this quotation indicates, although Taylor highlights how local musicians can forward an oppositional politics, his concern is not with how their music can be tied to a particular set of political claims, but rather with how local expressions can further global justice.

Of these three critics, Mitchell is the least attentive to the differences in power that characterize any cultural mix. Even when he singles out how “traditional, authentic and indigenous musical forms are combined with global musical idioms,” he does so to conclude that “the local distinctiveness of ‘national popular musics’ can be preserved alongside a potential global accessibility which preserves what Frith identifies as ‘what is most interesting about music—its blurring of insider/outsider boundaries’” (6-7). Mitchell’s celebration of “preservation” is naïve and premature at best, especially when combined with his belief that the blurring of “insider/outsider boundaries” is what is most noteworthy about national popular musics. Moreover, when he looks to the “other” of globalized music, he looks to sites outside of the predominant markets of the United States, Canada, Europe, and Japan (i.e., Aotearoa/New Zealand). Our emphasis here is on how indigenous forms exist *within* a dominant site: namely, our focus is Hawaii’s relationship to the United States.

The fiftieth state in the Union is also the site of an active anti-colonial struggle. The history by which Hawai‘i became a state includes the overthrow of the sovereign Hawaiian nation, which was ruled through a native monarchy, and annexation of the islands in 1898. In the early 1990s, the U.S. government belatedly admitted that these actions were illegal, and President Clinton offered an “apology” unaccompanied by any reparations or change in the political status of these islands. Nevertheless, since the 1970s, a vigorous movement for sovereignty provides daily reminders that the archipelago remains occupied by a foreign power, and that Native Hawaiians intend to use all available national and international forums to fight for the restoration of their never-relinquished land.²⁹ In addition, Native Hawaiians and other locals are engaged in battles to protect the land and its resources in the face of a voracious global tourism industry.

American popular culture's representation of these islands has aided and abetted Hawaii's history of colonization and its role in the rise of tourism. Music, no less than movies, has been a primary vehicle for images that promote Hawai'i as a tourist destination. Long before Elvis recorded *Blue Hawaii*, popular songs such as "Little Brown Girl in the Little Grass Shack" and "Mele Kalikimaka" circulated throughout the United States and abroad, beckoning tourists to these shores. Such "beach boy" or "hapa haole" music itself was hybrid. The layers and complexity of Hawaii's history as state, colony, native nation, and tourist destination make it an especially rich site for understanding the interrelations between the indigenous and the hybrid, and for thinking about where the national fits into global/local configurations. Unfortunately, in representations of Hawai'i and its history, particularly in popular culture, the indigenous is often misrepresented in the interest of selling Hawai'i as a pristine and inviting tourist destination and in the state's need to rewrite its history as one of happy, even exemplary, multiculturalism.

In response to Hawaii's status as colony and tourist site, music has offered Native Hawaiians an important form of protest and a way to assert cultural identity. The roots of this music are deep. Native Hawaiian cosmology and history have largely been handed down through the forms of *mele* and *oli* (song and chant), both of which continue to be practiced in traditional as well as evolving forms. With the rise of the contemporary sovereignty movement beginning around the 1970s, music has become an important form of political and cultural expression. Indeed, music of this period is seen as a key element in what is often called "The Hawaiian Renaissance," and musicians have been at the forefront of anti-colonial land struggles and other decolonization efforts.³⁰

Owing to the complexity of Hawaii's history, the lines between and across various types of music in Hawai'i—traditional, contemporary, touristic, political—are not always distinct. For example, a hula performed in a Waikiki hotel at sunset will have significantly different meanings than the same hula performed for a Native Hawaiian audience. Context plays a crucial role in determining both what the performers' purpose is as well as how the hula will be understood. Moreover, musical mixings work in unpredictable directions.

In the next sections, we discuss Joe Balaz's spoken word CD *Electric Laulau* and the music group Hapa's rendition of U2's "Pride (In the Name of Love)." We have not chosen these works because they are necessarily representative, nor because they offer the best examples of anti-colonial cultural production, as might, for example, music by Big Island Conspiracy or Sudden Rush.³¹ Balaz's and Hapa's works, however, do provide a way to complicate the place of the indigenous in cultural mixtures. Through attention to the specific contexts of these works, one can see that their use of the indigenous does not necessarily exist in opposition to "hybridity," nor can it simply be subsumed under it. Other studies of musical hybridity tend to treat what is indigenous in the cultural mix primarily as an element of style, without adequately considering the site-specific

politics that such mixtures are bound to invoke. What we offer here is an attempt to think about the importance of place not as a metaphor or as a dehistoricized, globalized “anywhere” (or “everywhere”). As it draws on the dub tradition, Balaz’s *Electric Laulau* employs an anti-colonial poetics that is as distinctly local in its production and address as it is international in its forms and references. In contrast, Hapa is a more mainstream and popular band, whose politics is neither explicit nor consistent. Through an analysis of its perhaps most overtly political song, we hope to show that more commercialized forms of transnationalism can also be used in the service of an oppositional politics. At their 1993 Hula Bowl performance of “Pride (In the Name of Love),” Hapa brought U2’s song into dialogue with Hawaiian sovereignty, helping to mobilize support for this movement. Attention to the different ways that Balaz and Hapa locate themselves in relation to the culturally, historically, and politically complex place that is Hawai‘i affords us insights into how to understand the importance of indigenous nationalism and how it can disrupt glib assertions about transnationalism, globalization, and hybridity.

Reverberating Island Politics: Jamaican Dub and Hawai‘i Spoken Word Poetry

Electric Laulau is a spoken word CD produced in 1998 by Richard Hamasaki, a local resident teacher, musician, and poet of Japanese ancestry who also goes by the name of “red flea”; H. Doug Matsuoka, a Japanese local musician, producer and screenwriter; and Joe Balaz, a Native Hawaiian poet, musician, and editor.³² The CD features Balaz’s poetry with musical accompaniment by Balaz, Hamasaki, Matsuoka, and Hawai‘i musician Aziz Chadly. It is the fourth in a series of spoken word recordings initiated by Hamasaki and Matsuoka under their label Hawai‘i Dub Music.³³ The CD’s 10 tracks mix different genres of music and verse. In each, pidgin (or Hawai‘i Creole English), Hawaiian, and English converge. *Electric Laulau* is a collaborative project that, in its use of Jamaican dub poetry, suggests how culturally mixed forms of expression can support—and, indeed, through anti-colonial critiques, constitute—part of nationalist efforts towards establishing a sovereign Hawaiian nation.

Electric Laulau builds on the dub tradition. At its inception a culturally mixed form, dub poetry is a product of what Paul Gilroy calls the “Black Atlantic.” It bears the imprint of the American Black Power movement³⁴ as well as South London and Jamaican political and cultural movements (i.e., radical Ethiopianism). The name “dub poetry” was coined in the 1970s to describe the spontaneous toasts or talkovers being performed by radio DJs in Jamaica. Since the late 1970s, it has been a vital cultural force in Britain, too, and it is now used to describe poetry with reggae backing, performed by artists including Linton Kwesi Johnson, Lee Scratch Perry, Benjamin Zephaniah, Adrian Sherwood,

and Mutabaruka. Written to be read aloud, dub poetry is set down in Jamaican Creole or patois, a language also spoken by thousands in Britain. Energized by the rhythms, style and language of reggae, dub often takes as its subject anti-colonialism. It employs echo and reverb, and features an exaggerated bass line. In dub, the electronic improvisations of the record producer and studio engineer make them artists in their own right. Dub blurs questions of ownership or copyright, and its technology is simple and cheap enough for artists to issue their own recordings.

As an independently produced label, Hawai'i Dub Music draws on the dub tradition at the level of subject matter, style, and distribution. *Electric Laulau* is the result of a very local form of globalization in that Hawai'i is itself the site of production and distribution, and Hamasaki and Matsuoka maintain complete control over production rather than having to negotiate with record labels, recording studios, and their marketing apparatuses. In calling their independently made CDs "Hawai'i Dub Music productions," Hamasaki and Matsuoka draw on—and foreground connections between—Hawaiian and Jamaican cultural production, and they extend the web of trans-Atlantic exchanges to include the Pacific as well. On *Electric Laulau*, Balaz performs his anti-colonial poetry to the beat of bass and bongo. Lines of the poems echo, reverberate, undergo amplification, and are animated by Balaz's vocal sound effects (animal, human, and extraterrestrial).³⁵

In its deployment of dub, *Electric Laulau* suggests how culturally mixed forms need not promote movements that work to unfix national borders or resist nationalist identities, but may in fact be used to forward local, and specifically nationalist, identities and struggles. Indeed, Hawaii's cultural borrowings from Jamaica build upon, and are energized by, the two islands' similar histories of and struggles against colonialism. On both islands, conditions of poverty and inequality starkly contrast to—and are hidden by—the tourist literature that promotes each as island paradises. In both contexts, these present-day problems can be traced back to sugar plantation economies. Schematically put, in the case of Jamaica, white British colonialists enslaved and then transported West Africans to work the plantations; in Hawai'i, white American businessmen imported Asian laborers from Japan, China, and the Philippines to work Hawaiian land when many Hawaiians themselves proved resistant. Moreover, there is a direct and causal link between these plantation economies. U.S. businessmen began planning for sugar plantations in Hawai'i beginning around 1838, when, with the abolition of slavery in the Caribbean, they anticipated the decline of the Jamaican plantations and saw the potential to capitalize on an opening in the world's sugar market.³⁶ Plantation workers on both islands developed creoles that still flourish today in spoken and written form, often as politicized forms of resistance to colonialism. Jamaica, a British colony until 1962, has a long history of resistance and rebellion. Reggae or dub poets, who employ Jamaican creole, have used their music as a powerful form of social criticism and political protest,

and as an expression of racial and cultural pride. In both form and subject matter, then, dub poetry provides a fitting vehicle for musicians and poets working against colonialism and for sovereignty in Hawai‘i.

Electric Laulau partakes in a wider movement in Hawai‘i that takes inspiration from Jamaican cultural expression and political struggle.³⁷ Hawai‘i radio stations are as likely at present to feature reggae music, or Hawaii’s version of reggae—Jawaiian, a hybrid of Hawaiian and Jamaican music also known as “island music”—as they are to feature music by artists working in more traditionally Hawaiian forms. Reggae, popular in Hawai‘i since the 1970s, has been spreading via internationally known groups, and especially local groups such as Kapena, Ka‘au Crater Boys, and Israel Kamakawiwo‘ole. At present, Jawaiian music is regularly in the top 10 for local sales.

As is true for much Jawaiian music as well, Balaz’s poetry, though it explicitly addresses contemporary political issues and problems facing Hawaiians, resists easy identification with any one form of sovereignty or with a particular Hawaiian political organization. Nevertheless, spoken word poetry, including *Electric Laulau*, along with the development of Hawai‘i rap, provides a forum for reflecting on political and social values. As oral literature, *Electric Laulau* both utilizes new technologies and reconnects Hawai‘i poetry to Hawaiian narrative and performative traditions.

In creating Hawai‘i Dub Music production, Balaz, Hamasaki, and Matsuoka draw on a form of performance poetry, one with its cultural and political roots in Jamaica, New York, and London, as well as Hawai‘i. In *The Black Atlantic*, Paul Gilroy emphasizes how complex cultural exchanges and syncretic cultural forms are in part defined through their “desire to transcend both the structures of the nation state and the constraints of ethnicity and national particularity.”³⁸ In contrast, we argue that in Balaz’s poem “Regarding Waffles,” the use of dub works not to *transcend* national and cultural boundaries, but rather to conjoin oppositional forms of nationalism.³⁹

“Regarding Waffles,” a poem set to a reggae beat that makes extensive use of echo and reverb, goes like this:

Saluting amber fields of grain
 begin with 2 cups of flour
 4 teaspoons of baking powder
 and 1 and 1/2 teaspoons of pillar of salt taken from da outskirts of
 da new Gomorra
 (of da new Gomorra).
 For good measure
 don’t forget da 2 tablespoons of sugar
 in respect to founding plantations everywhere
 (to founding plantations).
 Mix and sift all of dese dry ingredients in wn empty bowl

while exhibiting wn thankful expression
 (wn empty bowl).
 In honor of all assimilated cows dat routinely chew der cuds
 add 1 and 1/4 cups of milk,
 1/2 cup of melted butter
 and 2 well-beaten eggs, preferably from wn apathetic chicken
 (ken ken ken).
 Pour dis combined concoction into wn blender
 and whip at extremely high speed
 (pour dis combined concoction).
 After achieving wn smooth and creamy consistency
 (high speed)
 plug in da waffle iron
 which is uniformly indented
 like da first lines in all da paragraphs that justify da recipe
 (plug in da waffle iron).
 Wen it's hot enough,
 apply batter and bake to serve
 wn heaping plate of crispy brown
 impressed by wn bunch of squares
 (apply batter)
 (impressed by wn bunch of squares)
 (wn heaping plate)
 (impressed by wn bunch of squares)
 (impressed by wn bunch of squares)⁴⁰

“Regarding Waffles”—and *Electric Laulau* as a whole—aligns itself with Hawaiian movements towards decolonization without endorsing a particular version of self-determination. In the opening line, “Saluting amber fields of grain,” Balaz evokes “America the Beautiful,” a song whose sentiments the rest of his poem satirizes as it exposes the colonial economy (the founding plantations) upon which the American nation is built. The poem mocks the complicity of people in their colonization (the assimilated cows, the thankfulness for an empty bowl, the apathetic chickens). It also comically denounces the violence of the dominant society (the beating and whipping that produce uniformity, the way in which being “impressed by wn bunch of squares” entails not only hegemonic consent but branding heat, or coercion from repressive groups, including missionaries). As the poem condemns colonialism, it also suggests the need for an unambivalent (no waffling here!) resistance to it. The mention of sugar that occasions Balaz’s reference to “founding plantations everywhere” connects the island economies of Jamaica and Hawai‘i, as the reggae beat and the use of pidgin lyrics provide an alternative to “America the Beautiful” and subtly suggest the need for a new anthem of resistance.

In taking waffles as his subject, Balaz opposes dominant American configurations of nationhood and discourses about multiculturalism, which are often figured through food. Metaphors that cast America as a melting pot, a stew, or a salad bowl render U.S. multiculturalism as happy pluralism, rather than as a hierarchized set of relations dominated by white racism. In Hawai‘i, too, food often serves as evidence of cultural diversity and tolerance. In “Regarding Waffles,” Balaz instead uses food to issue a pointed critique of U.S. colonialism. Indeed, his linking of sugar to “founding plantations everywhere” resonates with Stuart Hall’s remark that, as a black Jamaican, he is “the sugar at the bottom of the English cup of tea. I am the sweet tooth, the sugar plantations that rotted generations of English children’s teeth.”⁴¹ As Balaz calls attention to the means of production that goes into this breakfast food, he asks his audience to consider how colonial relations inform everyday life.⁴²

Accompanying Balaz’s anti-colonial critique is a celebration of Hawai‘i, an insistence that, as he proclaims in the final track of the CD, “Hawai‘i is da mainland to me.” Balaz promotes specifically Hawai‘i-centered formulations and distinctly Hawaiian values in large part through his other uses of food as metaphor. Hawai‘i literature is rife with references to food, and its multicultural dishes become celebratory metaphors for Hawaii’s ethnic diversity and multicultural harmony.⁴³ In *Electric Laulau*, Balaz plays with food in a way that is not so much multicultural as it is Hawaiian. In doing so, *Electric Laulau* contributes to a distinctly Hawaiian tradition. As Ku‘ualoha Ho‘omanawanui notes, Native Hawaiians have always celebrated food, especially the eating of food, in chants and song, and food remains a central theme in contemporary music.⁴⁴ In titling the CD after the Hawaiian dish *laulau*—a serving of meat, fish or taro wrapped and then cooked in ti or banana leaves—Balaz’s emphasis is on Hawaiian culture. The CD’s title celebrates Hawaiian culture not in the backward-looking way that Ross ascribes to those working to preserve tradition, but rather in a way that carries tradition forward into new media and packagings.

Throughout, the CD exemplifies how contemporary technologies can be employed to argue for a revitalization and perpetuation of traditional practices as well as to denounce contemporary colonialist ones. In “Gottah Eat ‘Um,” the narrator reflects on his father’s rule that, “anything you kill, you gotta eat.” The concept of taking from the land only what you need is an important tenet of “aloha ‘āina” and traditional practices of conservation.⁴⁵ The basis of this conservation is the rootedness in the land and sea, and each generation’s responsibility for future ones. That the narrator remembers his father’s words as a remnant of “small kid time” speaks to the erosion of such values, and with their decline and the acceleration of global capitalism and tourism, the decimation of Hawaii’s resources. *Electric Laulau* critiques this break with Hawaiian traditions, and implicitly works to reinvigorate and disseminate these values in new forms.



Figure 1: Cover of *Electric Laulau* CD, courtesy of Joe Balaz and Richard Hamasaki.

At the University of Hawai‘i Department of English, where we teach, signs plaster the halls that ask, “You like buy laulau?” Balaz’s website advertises the CD, and has links to work by other Hawaiian musicians and poets. Initially sold by friends of the artists to other friends or students, *Electric Laulau* is now being sold by local book and music stores, and is advertised on Hawai‘i e-mail lists. Locally produced and disseminated, *Electric Laulau* exemplifies a form of globalism that is insistently local in intent and effects. It also demonstrates that new technologies need not be employed in opposition to indigenous values, nor must the support of Native Hawaiians’ struggles for a sovereign nation rest upon “nativist” claims to purity.

From U2 to Hapa: In the Name of Nationalism and Civil Rights

In contrast to *Electric Laulau*, the music group Hapa directly engages processes of globalization in order to take its Hawaiian music to the continental United States and Japan as well as reaching out to audiences in Hawai‘i. It would be easy to think that such commercialism and interest in a broader audience renders their music politically ineffective—and that an indigenous politics must be resolutely local and not simply non-commercial but anti-capitalist. Hapa, however, demonstrates that globalization not only does not have to exist in opposition to indigenous forms of resistance, but can, in fact, be used to support efforts towards recognition of sovereignty. Hapa can neither be dismissed as solely commercialized and catering to those outside of Hawai‘i, nor can they easily be championed for their oppositional and anti-colonial politics. Indeed, the group performs beach boy songs alongside traditional *mele*, and plays both to local audiences as well as reaching “world music” consumers and receiving sponsorship from Hawaiian Airlines and Outrigger Hotels. The group’s music reflects its political unevenness. As George Lipsitz notes, “The dangerous crossroads created constantly within contemporary cultural production, distribution, and exchange require neither simple celebration nor surrender masquerading as cynical critique” (17). Analysis of Hapa’s song “Pride (In the Name of Love)” offers an opportunity to investigate how even mainstream, commodified, and culturally mixed forms can participate in anti-colonial movements that are both local and specifically nationalist.

In existence from 1983 to 2001, Hapa—which means “half” in Hawaiian and is used to refer to those of mixed blood—is a band made up of Keli‘i Kaneali‘i and Barry Flanagan. They are often accompanied by Master Hawaiian chanter Charles Ka‘upu and Kumu Hula Healani Youn. Flanagan, an Irish American from New Jersey, came to Maui in 1980 to study slack key guitar after hearing Gabby Pahinui, Hawaii’s most renowned slack key guitarist, play on a Tex-Mex Ry Cooder album. In Maui, he met Kaneali‘i, who was playing in a disco band with Gabby Pahinui’s son Martin. Kaneali‘i grew up in Papakōlea (Hawaiian Homestead land) as part of a large musical family. He and Flanagan formed Hapa, a group whose music reflects their interest in vibrant cultural mixes, and during their eighteen years together, they produced five albums and toured extensively.

Whereas *Electric Laulau* aims for a primarily local audience, Hapa has directed its music towards a wider one. Their first album, *Hapa*, swept the Na Hōkū Hano Hano awards, the Hawai‘i version of the Grammy’s, and sold over 500,000 copies, a record for a Hawai‘i album. Nearly half the sales from their first album were from the continental United States, another first for a Hawai‘i band. Riding the world music wave, Hapa has sold out tours across the United States and in Japan, and they have performed with James Taylor and Carly Simon.

Hapa often states their desire to reach a mass audience—their website includes Flanagan’s oft-quoted remark that, “We’d like to see Hapa do for Hawaiian music what the Chieftains have done for Irish music and the Gypsy Kings for flamenco . . .”⁴⁶ The comparisons that Flanagan makes suggest that Hapa is directing its work to listeners of world or international music in addition to a specifically Hawai‘i audience. In their national tours, they reach out to diasporic Hawaiians—at a Sacramento concert, during their encore, they invited hula dancers onto the stage to perform. The emphasis, in their interviews and on their website, is on reaching diasporic Hawaiians and “bringing a piece of home to them.”⁴⁷

Hapa’s interest in a wide-ranging audience neither takes the place of nor weakens their commitments to Hawai‘i. Hapa regularly plays local venues, and they have used money from their music sales to support a Maui Hawaiian language immersion school. The revival of the Hawaiian language across the islands both results from and supports the sovereignty movement in Hawai‘i, and Flanagan casts Hapa’s use of Hawaiian lyrics as supportive of this cultural and political movement. He states that they hope to inspire children to pursue Hawaiian-language music because it is “intrinsic to what is indigenous to Hawai‘i.”⁴⁸

Whereas Andrew Ross opposes an “authentic” indigenous culture in order to dismiss it in favor of a view of culture as constructed, dynamic, and constantly evolving, for Hapa, it is new musical forms that can carry, disseminate, and revitalize traditional ones. At the same time that many of Hapa’s songs are in Hawaiian and draw on traditionally Hawaiian styles and instruments, they are known for their cultural mixings—as one reviewer notes, “Their sound is unfettered by notions of anthropological purity.”⁴⁹ Flanagan contends that the “purity” traps that bedevil so many other tradition-bound groups are irrelevant with Hapa, as demonstrated in their album *In the Name of Love*, which includes Hawaiian chants, a guest appearance by Don Ho, and the cover of a Santana song. Their music also makes use of instruments from various cultures. For example, *In the Name of Love* features the Tahitian banjo, the steel guitar, the electric sitar, and synthesizers, along with instruments considered to be more traditionally Hawaiian such as drums and *‘ukulele*.⁵⁰ Although the band rejects notions of cultural authenticity, Flanagan nonetheless insists, “But we do make sure when we sing in Hawaiian that everything’s right, that the language and the pronunciation are right on.”⁵¹ Not a Hawaiian speaker, Flanagan has studied *haku mele* or composing in the Hawaiian style. He composes in English and works with Ka‘upu on the translation. As they neither disregard nor blur the distinct traditions upon which they draw, Hapa respectfully centers Hawai‘i.

In the Name of Love—the CD on which “Pride” appears—plays up the duo’s cultural mix as one that results not in the unfixing of distinct national boundaries or identities, but in complementary expressions of nationalism.⁵² Like Balaz’s, Hapa’s work is not explicitly aligned with the broad-based

sovereignty movement. Yet, by way of, rather than despite, its cultural heterogeneity, their music contributes to claims to Hawai‘i as a homeland for Native Hawaiians and to the resurgence of Hawaiian cultural forms and traditions that inform the struggle for sovereignty.

Hapa’s commitments to Hawai‘i and Native Hawaiian culture are inscribed on the cover of their CD. As Paul Gilroy notes in “Wearing Your Art on Your Sleeve: Notes Towards a Diasporic History of Black Ephemeria,” record covers carry iconic value. In his discussion of their role in black culture, Gilroy writes, “[t]he ebbs and flows in black political culture have been faithfully transcribed through the text, imagery and artwork of the record sleeve.”⁵³ While the record itself is the primary commodity, Gilroy notes that “the sleeve with its combination of text and images comprises an important, if secondary, element that so far seems to have escaped sustained consideration from cultural historians of black experience” (239). Gilroy’s insights hold true in a Hawaiian context. On Hapa’s CD cover, Flanagan appears in a family kilt; Kaneali‘i in a *lavalava*. Both of them are holding guitars and strike a pose that captures both the pride and humor that they take in embodying contemporary manifestations of Irish and Hawaiian cultural traditions. Flanagan’s skirt and bare chest at first glance render the kilt equivalent to Kaneali‘i’s *lavalava*.⁵⁴ This similarity, however, cannot be sustained—upon closer inspection Flanagan’s attire is no more “Irish” than it is Hawaiian. In contrast to Kaneali‘i—whose Hawaiian presentation seems neither parodic nor staged—Flanagan’s sunglasses and Doc Marten-style boots indicate that his Irish American identity, long established and not under attack, is one that can be manipulated, even parodied, with little consequence to other Irish Americans. Wearing the plaid kilt, he performs a version of Celtic identity, one whose signifiers have become so loose over time that the kilt, itself a Scottish tradition, here is used by the duo to call forth Irishness. In a similar way, Kaneali‘i’s Polynesian *lavalava*, while not traditionally Hawaiian, in this context signifies his Hawaiian identity to most local and non-local audiences alike. The effect of the cover photo is a form of hybridity that leaves Hawaiian identity and traditions in no way belittled or diluted, even as the photo and the group itself promote cultural mixings and exchange. In other words, the photo successfully plays out the different positions that Flanagan and Kaneali‘i occupy in relation both to Hawai‘i and to their individual ethnic and racial identities. Moreover, as the photo reminds us that Ireland and Hawai‘i share a colonial legacy, it does not elide the different stakes to the cultural identity that each performer claims.⁵⁵

In Hapa’s rendition of “Pride,” the group’s dual cultural identity is powerfully and productively realized, in part because, more than any of its other work, Hapa foregrounds nationalist struggles in both Ireland and Hawai‘i and the connections between them. This song, which reached the Top 10 in the summer of 1997 on *Billboard*’s world music charts, and remained there for three months, layers Hawaiian chant, Bono’s lyrics, and an excerpt from an address by Martin Luther King, Jr. As it puts these cultural mixings and circuits of exchange in the

HAPA

Keli Kanealii and Barry Flanagan



IN THE NAME of LOVE

Figure 2: Cover to *In the Name of Love* CD by Hapa. Courtesy of The Mountain Apple Company Hawai'i.

service of indigenous claims to Hawai'i as homeland, Hapa shows that hybrid forms, instead of articulating global citizenry or stateless identities, can, in fact, be used for specific struggles of national self-determination. U2's Bono wrote the lyrics to "Pride" in a hotel room in Waikiki, and as Hapa says in its liner notes, "We wanted to bring it home." Bono's 1984 song pays tribute to Martin Luther King, Jr. and the inspirational role that the Black Civil Rights movement played for those people in Northern Ireland whose current struggle for national self-determination first began as a civil rights campaign.⁵⁶

As Hapa brings U2's "Pride" back home, they add to the legacy of resistance offered in Bono's lyrics by further overlaying the song with and connecting it to one of the oldest-existing Hawaiian genealogy chants celebrating chiefly lines and the deeds for which the chiefs were known. Ka'upu's chanting creates a

bridge on the CD between the previous cut—"Mele a Paku'i/Ho'okumu," a traditional genealogy chant performed in the *Oli Oli* style by Ka'upu—and "Pride." In typical Hapa style, genealogical chant and U2 song are conjoined without erasing the different cultural styles, traditions, and meanings of each. Rather, they are brought together in a way that sets "Pride" within a Hawaiian cultural and political context. Ka'upu's chanting acts as the invocation for "Pride," and then Flanagan and Kaneali'i move into a rendition of the U2 song. After the final verse, describing the assassination of King, Jr., which concludes "They took your life / They could not take your pride," Ka'upu begins the genealogical chant that evidences the chiefly lines from which contemporary Hawaiians descend and which proffer to Hawaiians a strong source of pride. Such Hawaiian genealogical recitation practices, as J. Kēhaulani Kauanui explains, "serve as the key contestatory mode of identification in the context of blood quantum politics which are not only abstract but restrictive. Where blood quantum is always about individualization of particular bodies (already said to be 'diluted'), Hawaiian genealogical practices enlarge the collective and social."⁵⁷ Ka'upu's chanting accompanies and gradually overtakes Flanagan and Kaneali'i's repetitions of the chorus ("In the name of love / What more, in the name of love?"). As Flanagan and Kaneali'i's voices fade out, Ka'upu's gathers strength and volume, though it continues to be undergirded by Hapa, playing the melody to "Pride" with bass, electric, acoustic and rhythm guitars, and drums.

Flanagan tells of how Hapa's version came into being: "We were playing during half-time of the Hula Bowl (in Honolulu) and it happened to be Martin Luther King Day. It was also coincidentally, the 100th anniversary of the overthrow of the monarchy in Hawai'i to the day. So we felt it was a good time to do it (with the chanting by Charles Ka'upu)."⁵⁸ They played the song as a set-closing number for three years before recording it with the Martin Luther King, Jr. sample that concludes the song on the CD. After Ka'upu's chanting fades out, the "Pride" melody continues for a few seconds and then an excerpt on history and righteousness from a King speech is dubbed in, still accompanied by the instrumental to "Pride."⁵⁹

Flanagan describes the hours of listening that went into selecting just the right sample from the collection of MLK tapes. In King's address about history, he proclaims: "I say to you now, Lord, history is the long story of the past. Somehow righteousness is stronger than evil. History is the long story of the past. That goodness defeated is stronger than evil's triumph . . . It tells us something." In choosing this excerpt, Flanagan notes that King's words about righteousness speak to the concept of *pono*, which is central to Hawaiian identity.⁶⁰ As Flanagan states in an interview included on the Hapa website, "righteousness [is] (a concept central to Hawaiian identity, as expressed by the Hawai'i state motto: 'The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness')." Flanagan's focus in interviews on connections between the Hawaiian concept of *pono* and King's use of righteousness does not address the ways this word is

fundamental to those working towards sovereignty, who would certainly divorce *pono* from the state and its appropriation of it. Nevertheless, the song itself—and the juxtaposition of the Ka‘upu chant and the King oration with its evocation of righteousness—calls forth the rhetoric of Hawaiian efforts towards self-determination as it conjoins distinct historical and political struggles.

The cultural crossings in “Pride” foreground connections between rather than erase geo-political borders and distinctive struggles for cultural integrity. This sophisticated intermixing of different national rhetorics challenges the way scholars often cast “nativism” as dangerously reductive and simplistic as they privilege hybrid forms that celebrate belonging nowhere or characterize what Masao Miyoshi has pessimistically called “a borderless world.”⁶¹

In “Pride,” Hapa brings into alliance three distinct and particularly nationalist struggles. Reviewer Wallace Baine notes that the King addition serves “as a poignant reminder that Hawai‘i is part of the U.S. and as such shares in the legacy of MLK.” In contrast to Baine, we see “Pride” situating Hawai‘i between different forms of nationalism—Irish nationalism, which sought the political overhaul of the state, and the civil rights movement, which had a cultural nationalist base that strove for specific political remedies for black disfranchisement and social, economic, and educational exclusion. Although it is unclear where Hapa places Hawai‘i in this continuum of struggle, through its use of King’s civil rights rhetoric as well as through its more specifically nationalist links, “Pride” nevertheless resists easy assimilation into an American framework. Moreover, the song can offer inspiration to those struggling for the establishment of a Hawaiian nation as it conjoins love and struggle.

Emblazoned in the liner notes to *In the Name of Love* are the words, “A warrior’s life / is not about imagined perfection or victory / it is about love. Love is the warrior’s sword / wherever it cuts it gives life, not death.” With this message, Hapa highlights the political nature and stakes of their music as they stress that battles need not be waged with weapons alone. Following the example of Martin Luther King, Jr. and U2, Hapa shows how battles for human rights can be waged “In the Name of Love.”

“Pride” highlights Hawaiian language and culture at the same time that it suggests an alternative, but complementary, genealogy—one that places Native Hawaiian sovereignty in alliance with international struggles for human rights and decolonization.

Native Resistance in a Global Economy

The liner notes to *In the Name of Love* end with the words, “Mahalo and aloha to Outrigger Hotels and Resorts, and Hawaiian Airlines,” alongside the Outrigger insignia. It would be easy to read such corporate sponsorship simply in ironic terms, as evidence that Hapa is commodifying Hawaiian culture. Use of Hawaiian language, especially the word “aloha,” resonates with the Hawaii

Visitors and Convention Bureau's marketing of the islands and cheapening of Hawaiian values. As Haunani-Kay Trask argues in her condemnation of corporate tourism and its opportunistic use of the word "aloha," "Above all, *aloha* is a cultural feeling and practice that works among the people and between the people and their land."⁶² Hapa's "aloha" for Outrigger, a corporation that exploits local workers and puts Hawai'i-owned and controlled hotels out of business, and for Hawaiian Airlines, the conduit for tourism, surely implicates the group in the cultural degradation that Trask describes. Similarly, in first performing "Pride" accompanied by Hawaiian chanting at the Hula Bowl—a touristic event that in its very name commodifies Hawaiian culture—Hapa plays to the interests of tourism and transnational capital. However, such an understanding does not account for the ways that Hapa introduces cultural opposition into these mainstream venues.

We would like to suggest that the conjunction of the 100th anniversary of the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy and the Hula Bowl at which "Pride" was first performed provide an occasion in which Hapa's cultural production speaks back to its commodification.⁶³ The audience of the Hula Bowl is mixed; it is comprised both of tourists and Hawai'i residents. Visitors at the game come momentarily face-to-face with a Hawaiian culture that is not a remnant of the past to be performed for their pleasure, but that is itself an active force engaged in ongoing political struggle. Lipsitz speaks to this dynamic when he argues of popular musicians, "in challenging the nation state from time to time, they accept the centrality of commodity exchange to contemporary culture and politics. Yet by operating through commodities, they also acquire authority and influence far beyond the borders of their own face-to-face communities" (153). For Hawai'i viewers, the performance potentially strengthens support for Hawaiian sovereignty. Its strength in doing so derives from its uncanny ability to take a familiar pop song and to defamiliarize it in ways that call attention not only to its already-present political significance, but that also articulate that meaning with the neglected historical terrain and ongoing political conflict in Hawai'i.

In contrast to the hybridity and globalization theory that we have critiqued, our analysis suggests that too-exclusive an attention to global distribution and meanings created out of that distribution can neglect the local interventions, however ephemeral, that are made possible by "transnational" products and productions. Because hybridity theory tends to ironize processes of transnationalization, an obvious reading of Hapa from that perspective would be a cynical one that, for example, might concentrate on how people in New York City can engage in radical chic by consuming Hawaiian-flavored cultural products.⁶⁴ In his denunciation of how all cultural variants have become part of "a giant theme park or shopping mall," Masao Miyoshi states,

No matter how subversive at the beginning, variants will be appropriated aggressively by branches of consumerism, such

as entertainment and tourism, as were rap music, graffiti art, or even classical music and high arts. Cable TV and MTV dominate the world absolutely. Entertainment and tourism are huge transnational industries by themselves. The return to “authenticity” . . . is a closed route. There is nothing of the sort extant any longer in much of the world.⁶⁵

Miyoshi’s pessimism is not entirely unwarranted. However, what his condemnation of dissemination and consumption neglects—and what Hapa’s “Pride,” and, we also argue, Balaz’s “Regarding Waffles,” demonstrates—is the capacity of cultural products to elicit resistance in their localized places of production.

These works also make particular contributions to our understanding of the place of native resistance as expressed in culturally mixed forms. When postcolonial theorists neglect the culture and politics that stand behind indigenous elements, they run the risk of annexing the indigenous into dominant state formations or hip formulations of “world culture.” Postcolonialism needs to become more attentive to struggles of native people, especially in colonial sites where nation-state status has not been achieved. These sites pose distinct sets of problems and concerns. Postnational ideas about subjectivity should not be an excuse to delegitimize the political claims—or to depoliticize the cultural expressions—of those native groups working to assert their sovereignty. Native politics and culture cannot be subsumed into a globalized, heterogeneous domicile, nor equated with a naïve desire to return to a pre-contact past. If postcolonial criticism is to be responsible, if not revolutionary in its effects, the least that those of us who are non-natives can do is to recognize that what native peoples demand above all else is their right to self-determination.

Hapa’s “Pride” and *Electric Laulau* demonstrate the power of localized cultural productions that acknowledge Hawaii’s colonial past and Native Hawaiians’ aspirations for a sovereign future. Their use of cultural forms from other geo-political contexts and their brilliant use of the technologies of music and mass dissemination demonstrate a cultural mixing that insists “we’re *here* and we’re *there*” in both temporal and spatial terms. Such work represents crucial strands within a broad culture of resistance that is itself constantly theorizing its position between, on the one hand, a past that is not reified but continues to have an active presence and, on the other, the threat of annihilation in a globalized, transnational, capitalist future.

Notes

We would like to thank Purnima Bose, Andrea Feeser, Candace Fujikane, Richard Hamasaki, Ku'ualoha Ho'omanawanui, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Paul Lyons, Beth Tobin, the editors of *American Studies*, John Zuern, and the three anonymous readers for this issue for their helpful responses to this essay. All errors are our own. As well, we benefited from questions and comments from the audiences at the 1999 American Studies Association Conference and at the 2001 colloquium series for the International Cultural Studies Certificate Program at the University of Hawai'i and the East-West Center. Thanks, too, to Suzi Mechler, Vice President of the Mountain Apple Company. D. Māhealani Dudoit, editor and founding member of the collective Kuleana 'Ōiwi Press, helped us with the genealogical chant related to Hapa's "Pride (In the Name of Love)". Along with so very many others, we mourn her passing.

1. The state distinguishes between the terms "Hawaiian," "Native Hawaiian," and "native Hawaiian," each of which has a precise legal meaning based upon blood quantum. For analysis of these categories, see J. Kehaulani Kauanui's "'For Get' Hawaiian Entitlement: Configurations of Land, 'Blood,' and Americanization in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921," *Social Text* 59 v. 17, no. 2 (summer 1999): 123-144. In this essay, we use the terms "Native Hawaiian" or "Hawaiian" to refer to *any person* descended from the indigenous people inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands before 1778.

2. For a more detailed account of this history, see Mililani Trask's "The Politics of Oppression" in *Hawaii: Return to Nationhood*, eds. Ulla Hasager and Jonathan Friedman (Copenhagen: Document no. 75 of The International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1994): 71-87. For a fuller history of OHA, see their website at <http://www.OHA.org>, where they explain: "Upon statehood in 1959, the federal government returned to the State of Hawai'i all ceded lands not set aside for its own use. Section 5(f) of the Admission Act, directing the state to hold the lands in trust, listed the following five purposes: 1) The support of public education; 2) The betterment of the conditions of Native Hawaiians as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920; 3) The development of farm and home ownership; 4) The making of public improvements; and 5) The provision of lands for public use." These 1.8 million acres of ceded lands (approximately 44% of the total acreage of the State of Hawai'i) consist of crown lands that were once the private property of the Hawaiian monarchy, and the government lands of the Kingdom of Hawai'i. After the Joint Resolution of Annexation in 1898, all of these lands were considered transferred or "ceded" to the United States government "for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands." These lands, which include the grounds of Honolulu International Airport and the University of Hawai'i, legally belong to Native Hawaiians. Moreover, for the past several years, OHA has been in stalled negotiations with the state, which has refused to turn over rents due on these lands.

3. For an indigenous perspective on Native Hawaiians' relationship to ceded lands, see Haunani-Kay Trask's *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* (Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press, 1993), and Noenoe Silva's "Ke Kū'ē Kūpa'a Loa Nei Mākou (We most steadfastly protest): Various Forms of Kanaka Maoli Resistance to Colonization," Dissertation in Partial Fulfillment for the Ph. D. in Political Science, University of Hawai'i (1999). A revision of Silva's dissertation is forthcoming from Duke University Press, 2004; the working title for this book is *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke UP, 2004). See also Silva's "Kanaka Maoli Resistance to Annexation," in *'Aiwai: A Native Hawaiian Journal* 1 (1998): 40-75, and Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa's *Native Land and Foreign Desires—Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992).

4. Two cases that immediately followed in response to *Rice v. Cayetano* are *Carroll v. OHA* and all state agencies that fund OHA and *Barrett v. Cayetano*. Although both these cases recently have been dismissed, the challenges that they pose are likely to recur. Carroll claimed that all OHA funds are used for race-based programs and therefore are unconstitutional under the *Rice* decision. The *Barrett* case attempted to render illegal a number of Native Hawaiian programs and rights, including native rights to gather materials for cultural and religious purposes. This case also sought to invalidate the Hawaiian Homelands Commission Act of 1920 (HHCA). For a discussion of the importance of native gathering rights, which state Senate Bill 8 attempted to overturn in 1997, see Momiāla Kamahele's "Iio'uilaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture," in *Amerasia* 26, no. 2 (2000): 39-65.

5. Hyphenated identities are often indicative of the state's need both to demarcate and unify its citizenry. Ethnic minority groups also often assert such identities to insist upon their rights to American citizenship as well as to mark their particular histories and cultures. Interestingly, however, the term "Hawaiian American" has never gained currency or entered circulation. In general, Native Hawaiians themselves have not asserted this identity, in part because many refuse a coerced national American identity. For its part, the state apparently has felt no need to impose

the term “Hawaiian American.” As the Supreme Court’s decision indicates, Hawai‘i has been so incorporated into U.S. territory that “Hawaiian” itself appears subsumed under “American” in the way that “Californian” or “Texan” is.

6. Within American Studies, “nativism” often denotes white claims to being native-born, as opposed to immigrant. Our use here refers to how the term is used by scholars critiquing native, or indigenous, claims to authenticity.

Postcolonial critiques, coming as they so often do out of a poststructuralist understanding of identity, frequently privilege fluctuating hybrid forms of identity. These hybrid forms are then pitted against, and used to dismiss, the claims to stable ethnic or national identification. For an indication of how generally accepted such dismissals are, see the introductory note to the section on postcolonial and ethnic studies in the textbook *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, eds. Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1998); see especially 852-853.

7. Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 5. Further references occur in the body of the text.

8. Aijaz Ahmad, *In Theory: Classes, Nations, and Literature* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 130. Further references occur in the body of the text.

9. Stephen Greenblatt, “Racial Memory and Literary History,” *PMLA* 116:1 (January 2001): 58. Further references occur in the body of the text.

10. D.N. Rodowick, “Introduction: Global Citizens, Media States,” *PMLA* 117:1 (January 2002): 15. Further references occur in the body of the text.

11. Iain Chambers, “Citizenship, Language, and Modernity,” *PMLA* 117:1 (January 2002): 29-30. Further references occur in the body of the text.

12. Tom Foster, “Cyber-Aztecs and Cholo-Punks: Guernillo Gomez-Peña’s Five-Worlds Theory,” *PMLA* 117:1 (January 2002): 46. Emphasis Foster’s.

13. Even in more carefully historicized scholarship, the place of the indigenous often either drops out, or becomes simply part of the mix. For example, Paul Gilroy’s brilliant *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), which is in large part a polemic against the “lure of ethnic particularism and nationalism” (4), sometimes evidences an unreflective upholding of hybrid forms at the expense of nationalist politics. His book suggests that ideas of ethnic particularism and cultural nationalism are formulated in opposition to hybridity, diaspora, and cultural intermixture. To take another example, Lisa Lowe’s insightful writing on hybridity is exemplary for its attention to uneven material realities. However, because she is working within the field of Asian American cultural studies, Lowe’s focus is instead on how “immigrant communities encounter the violences of the US state” (82). See Lisa Lowe, *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), especially her chapter “Heterogeneity, Hybridity, Multiplicity: Asian American Differences,” 60-83.

14. Timothy Brennan, *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 290-291. Further references occur in the body of the text.

15. Andrew Ross, who directs the American Studies program at New York University, is something of a cultural studies *bon vivant*. His leftist politics have made him a favorite whipping boy for conservative commentators. His work on the Polynesian Cultural Center is in keeping with other research projects that involve sojourns to specific cultural sites. See for example his *The Celebration Chronicles: Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Property Values in Disney’s New Town* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1997), which details his year-long stay in the Disney town of Celebration, Florida, and *No Collar: The Humane Workplace and Its Hidden Costs* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), his year-long study of the Silicon Valley and the lives of its workers. Ross has a long-standing interest in labor politics; see especially his edited collection *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade, and the Rights of Garment Workers* (New York: Verso, 1997) and “The Labor Behind the Cult of Work,” his contribution to *A Yale Strike Dossier: A Special Issue of Social Text*, ed. Cary Nelson (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997). His concern with social issues also informs his book *Real Love: In Pursuit of Cultural Justice* (New York: Routledge, 1998).

16. Andrew Ross, *The Chicago Gangster Theory of Life: Nature’s Debt to Society* (New York: Verso, 1994), 62. Further references occur in the body of the text.

17. See J. Kēhaulani Kauanui’s “‘For Get’ Hawaiian Entitlement: Configurations of Land, ‘Blood,’ and Americanization in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921.”

18. In her article “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony: ‘Locals’ in Hawai‘i,” Haunani-Kay Trask discusses the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Population’s efforts to define precisely “indigenous” peoples, and to elaborate their rights. See also Mililani Trask’s “Hawaiian Sovereignty.” Both articles appear in *Amerasia* 26:2 (2000), pp. 1-24, and 27-30, respectively. Our thanks to Haunani-Kay Trask for her willingness to discuss the stakes of such definitions with us.

19. Ku‘ualoha Meyer Ho‘omanawanui forcefully comments on Native Hawaiians’ resourceful use of technology in “Editors’ Note: He Kūkākūkā ‘Ana, A Discussion”: “There is no point in history I have found where Hawaiians have denied new technology. At every point—

from finding nails on pieces of wood to the introduction of paper and pen and the printing press—Hawaiians took the new technology and ‘Hawaiian-ized’ it,” *‘Ōiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal* 1 (December 1998): 2.

20. Rob Wilson, *Reimagining the American Pacific: From South Pacific to Bamboo Ridge and Beyond* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2000), 259. All further references occur in the body of the text.

21. While *Reimagining the American Pacific* is the focus of our critique, nevertheless, Wilson’s substantial body of work has made important interventions into how Hawai‘i and geopolitical entities such as “Asia/Pacific” will be understood by American studies scholars and those in other disciplines. His work in edited collections and on the editorial boards of journals such as *boundary 2* and *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* insists upon the inclusion of indigenous voices and issues. His collections—such as *Inside/Out: Literature, Cultural Politics and Identity in the New Pacific*, co-edited with Vilsoni Hereniko (Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999) and *Asia/Pacific as Space of Cultural Production*, co-edited with Arif Dirlik (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995)—include Pacific scholars and writers who might otherwise not be known to academics outside of the Pacific. These collections are indispensable resources for many teaching in Hawai‘i, on the continent, and elsewhere.

22. For Wilson’s engagements with Hawai‘i’s relation to the postmodern, see also his chapbook *Pacific Postmodern: From the Sublime to the Devious, Writing the Experimental/Local Pacific in Hawai‘i* (Honolulu: Tinfish, 2000).

23. For example, Wilson’s work levels the differences between Balaz and white poets, who include Susan Schultz, Juliana Spahr, Bill Luoma, and Wilson himself, all of whom have different histories in these islands.

24. The chapter “Shark God on Trial: Invoking Ka-Lani-‘Ōpu‘u in the Local/Indigenous/American Struggle for Place,” which focuses on Native Hawaiian cultural production, constitutes an exception to this kind of occlusion, even as the title indicates Wilson’s propensities to submerge the indigenous into other formulations of identity.

25. Particularly important to Wilson’s work is Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).

26. See, for example, Haunani-Kay Trask’s essay “Writing in Captivity: Poetry in a Time of De-Colonization,” in *Navigating Islands and Continents*, eds. Cynthia Franklin, Ruth Hsu, and Suzanne Kosanke (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2000): 51-55. See also Trask’s book of poetry, *Light in the Crevice Never Seen* (Corvallis, Oregon: Calyx, 1994), and the Native Hawaiian journal *‘Ōiwi*, especially the editors’ note and contributions by D. Māhealani Dudoit, Ku‘ualoha Meyer Ho‘omanawanui, and ‘Īmaikalani Kalāhele.

27. Stuart Hall, “The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity,” in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, ed. Anthony D. King (Binghamton: Dept. of Art and Art History State University of New York, 1991): 38-39.

28. George Lipsitz, *Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism, and the Poetics of Place* (New York: Verso, 1994); Tony Mitchell, *Popular Music and Local Identity: Rock, Pop and Rap in Europe and Oceania* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996); Timothy D. Taylor, *Global Pop: World Music, World Markets* (New York: Routledge, 1997). Specific references to each of these texts occur in the body of the essay.

29. We do not mean to suggest that sovereignty struggles began in the 1970s. Noenoe Silva’s work testifies to a long history of resistance, including the signing of petitions opposing annexation by as much as 80 percent of the Native Hawaiian population. See her article, “Kanaka Maoli Resistance to Annexation.”

30. See, for example, Rodney Morales’ *Ho‘iho‘i Hou: A Tribute to George Helm and Kimo Mitchell* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1984). This book commemorates the lives of George Helm and Kimo Mitchell. Musicians and activists with the Protect Kaho‘olawe ‘Ōhana, Helm and Mitchell died at sea in 1977 under suspicious circumstances in an attempt to reoccupy Kaho‘olawe, the Hawaiian island used by the U. S. military for aerial target practice.

31. The Big Island Conspiracy blends Hawaiian song, chant, gospel, reggae and other musical forms; Sudden Rush employs Hawaiian chant and rap. See *Big Island Conspiracy, Reflective But Unrepentant*, compact sound disc, Deep Ka‘a Ka‘a, 1999; and Sudden Rush, *Kū‘ē*, compact sound disc, Way Out West Enterprises, 1997 and *Nation On the Rise*, compact sound disc, Way Out West Enterprises, 1994.

32. We use the term “local” here as it circulates most commonly in Hawai‘i; that is, we use it in reference to non-white people born in Hawai‘i. Exactly who is or can be considered local is much debated. See for example, Jonathan Okamura’s “Why There are No Asian Americans in Hawai‘i: The Continuing Significance of Local Identity,” *Social Process in Hawai‘i* 35 (1994): 161-178. See also essays in *Amerasia* 26:2 (2000), a special issue co-edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura, entitled *Whose Vision? Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i*. In particular, see Haunani-Kay Trask’s “Settlers of Color and ‘Immigrant’ Hegemony: ‘Locals’ in Hawai‘i,” 1-

24, and Fujikane's "Sweeping Racism under the Rug of 'Censorship': The Controversy over Lois-Ann Yamanaka's *Blu's Hanging*," 158-194.

33. Their first spoken word and song recording is Hawai'i Amplified Poetry Ensemble's *Most Powerful Nation* (1989), featuring Hamasaki, Matsuoka, Shinichi Takahashi, and Matt Barnett; the second recording, titled *Hawai'i Reggae International*, vol. 1 (1991), includes song and poetry; the third, *virtual flectivity* (1996), features red flea and Matsuoka. Following *Electric Laulau*, Hamasaki and Matsuoka produced *Terenesia* (2000), which consists of amplified poetry by Sāmoan writer Sia Figiel and Teresia Teaiwa, a writer of Gilbertese, Banaban, and African American descent. Both *Electric Laulau* and *Terenesia* are co-productions with Hawai'i Dub Music, which is Matsuoka's entity, and 'Elepaio Press, which is run by Richard and Mark Hamasaki. For information about purchasing these CDs, e-mail Richard Hamasaki at redflea@hawaii.rr.com. For information about *Electric Laulau*, contact Joe Balaz at Box 44, Ka'a'awa, HI 96730, or go to the website <http://joebalaz.iuma.com>. Matsuoka's other cultural work includes his recently published ebooks, *Immortal Khan* and *Living Midnight*; Hamasaki's includes *From the Spider Diaries: Poems and Songs* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2001), a work that further documents non-native solidarity with Native Hawaiian self-determination.

In addition to *Electric Laulau*, Balaz's work includes *Ho'omānoa: An Anthology of Contemporary Hawaiian Literature* (Honolulu: Kū Pa'a, 1989), one of the first literary collections comprised entirely of Native Hawaiian writers.

34. Dub poets such as Linton Kwesi Johnson received their political education as Black Panthers.

35. Balaz's satire and off-the-wall humor resonate with work by Jamaican Dub artists such as U Roy, the first big talkover star, whose recordings are full of acerbic asides, "bad man" poses, and jokey insults and putdowns. For a discussion of dub and talkover, including U Roy's contributions to talkover, see Dick Hebdige, *Cut 'N' Mix: Culture, Identity and Caribbean Music* (New York: Methuen, 1987), especially 82-89.

36. For a brief account of the development of sugar plantations in Hawai'i, see Ronald Takaki's *Strangers From a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (New York: Penguin Books, 1989), especially 21-22. We thank Beth Tobin for bringing the connection between Hawaiian and Jamaican sugar plantations to our attention.

37. For a detailed historical account of Jamaican music, see Lloyd Bradley's *Bass Culture: When Reggae Was King* (New York: Viking Press, 2000).

38. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic*, 19.

39. "Regarding Waffles" stands in interesting contrast to Balaz's poem "Junior Is One Rasta." In this poem, Balaz points out the potential danger of a Hawaiian cultural focus being lost through an over-identification with reggae; Balaz suggests that Junior allows his Hawaiian identity to be subsumed by Rasta culture. For a reading of this poem that emphasizes its style, see Rob Wilson's *Pacific Postmodern*: 10-11.

40. Words, voices, vocals and voice sound effects by Joe Balaz. Music by H. Doug Matsuoka, Richard Hamasaki, Aziz Chadly and Joe Balaz. Our parentheticals mark the use of echo and reverb, and attempt to convey the synergetic way in which the poem was mixed. Our transcription follows Balaz's spelling of HCE (i.e., "wn" for "one"). Thanks to Joe Balaz for his help with the transcription. An earlier version of "Regarding Waffles" appears, in Standard American English, in *Chaminade Literary Review* 2 (1988).

41. Stuart Hall, "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities," in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, ed. Anthony King (Binghamton: Department of Art and Art History, State University of New York, 1991), 48.

42. Similarly, in the opening track, "Urgency Test," Balaz, in his wildly inventive way, expostulates upon the purpose and effects of the Emergency Broadcast System tests heard monthly around the state. As reviewer Paul Lyons notes, Balaz "ridicules the glossy Hollywood cataclysmic imagination ('What if one asteroid way out there in space wen suddenly crash into da earth,' etc.) as itself a disastrous cultural imperialism that obscures real, everyday issues in Hawai'i that constitute a state emergency, such as the high cost of housing and food, corrupt politicians and developers, and the ongoing effects of American colonialism." "Review of Joe Balaz's *Electric Laulau*," *Tinfish*, 8 (August 1999): 49.

43. Examples include Darrell Lum's well-known essay "Local Literature and Lunch," where the plate lunch stands in for Hawai'i's democratic and distinctive cultural mix, or Wing Tek Lum's poem "Chinese Hot Pot," itself a re-writing of the American melting pot, both in *The Best of Bamboo Ridge* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1986). See also *Sister Stew: Fiction and Poetry by Women*, eds. Juliet S. Kono and Cathy Song (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1991).

44. See Ku'ualoha Meyer Ho'omanawanui's article, "Yo Brah, It's Hip Hop Jawaian Style: The Influence of Reggae and Rap on Contemporary Hawaiian Music," in *Hawai'i Review* 56 (Spring 2001): 137-175.

45. For a discussion of *aloha 'āina*, see Kame'eleihiwa's *Native Land and Foreign Desires*, 25.

46. Hapa's website address is www.hapa.com.

47. Given the Hawaiian sovereignty movement, what it means to bring "a piece of home" to a diasporic audience is quite complex. For a discussion of off-island Hawaiians and the sovereignty movement, see J. Kēhaulani Kauanui's "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A (Gendered) Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum* 21, no. 6 (1 Nov. 1998): 681+.

48. www.hapa.com. As in other places where colonialism has all but eradicated an indigenous language, struggles for sovereignty and moves to reclaim the Hawaiian language do not necessarily go hand in hand, though it can be argued that they ultimately support one another. For example, not all Native Hawaiians who speak the language support sovereignty, just as different sovereignty leaders and groups give different importance to recovering the language. Nevertheless, the renaissance of the Hawaiian language contributes to efforts to legitimize claims to Hawai'i as a nation.

49. www.hapa.com.

50. Some instruments that are considered native to Hawai'i, in fact, have other cultural origins. For example, the *'ukelele* is an adaptation of the *braguinha*, an instrument brought over from Portugal. For a discussion of musical adaptations in the Hawaiian context see George Kanahahe, *Hawaiian Music and Musicians* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1979). Hapa's eclecticism eschews forcing different musical instruments and styles into an "authentic" framework. As with the use of any other form of technology, what makes something Hawaiian is its use by Native Hawaiians. Ku'ualoha Ho'omanawanui discusses Native Hawaiian adaptation of various musical traditions in "Yo Brah, It's Hip Hop Jawaiiian Style."

51. www.hapa.com.

52. Hapa, *In the Name of Love*, The Mountain Apple Company, 1997.

53. Paul Gilroy, *Small Acts: Thoughts on the Politics of Black Culture* (London: Serpent's Tail, 1994), 244. Further references occur in the body of the text.

54. Hapa's presentation on this CD cover is emphatically masculine. The performance of masculinity here and its intersection with nationalism belie the fact that the Hawaiian sovereignty movement has been led largely by women. See Haunani-Kay Trask's *From a Native Daughter*, especially the chapter "Women's *Mana* and Hawaiian Sovereignty," 111-130. The revised edition (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1999) also includes a discussion of Native Hawaiian women leaders in student government at the University of Hawai'i—see 191-192. Hapa's show of muscular masculinity may have more to do with the playing out of a kind of rock star persona than it does with the embodiment of a nationalist politics. Balaz's CD also is highly masculinist. An analysis of how gender and sexuality articulate with nationalism in these works would certainly be worthwhile but is beyond the scope of this essay. Thanks to Ty Kawika Tengan for bringing these questions to our attention.

55. Although on this CD cover Hapa stages the inequalities of these identities, in their performances and interviews, Flanagan acts as spokesperson for the group without signaling or acknowledging the inequalities that this role creates. In this way, Hapa's mix is a decidedly unequal one that can resonate with existing colonial power dynamics between the "articulate" white man and the "silent" native. We thank Noenoe Silva for pointing out this dynamic, which could fall into a "Tonto and Lone Ranger" relationship. In the spring of 2001, Hapa broke up. It bears noting that in his post-Hapa performances, Kaneali'i remains equally reticent, indicating that his silence cannot simply be read in terms of a colonial encounter.

56. The Northern Irish Civil Rights Association fought, for example, for complete voting enfranchisement for adult citizens of the state, better housing, educational and occupational opportunities, and an end to religious discrimination. For a compelling account of the connections between the civil rights struggles in Northern Ireland and the Black civil rights movement in the United States, see Brian Dooley's *Black and Green: The Fight for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland and Black America* (London: Pluto Press, 1998). Many nationalists in Northern Ireland switched from a civil rights rhetoric to a more explicitly human rights emphasis when reformation of the state proved an inadequate solution. This change in strategy does not, however, mean that civil rights and human rights are unconnected or exist in opposition to one another.

57. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "'For Get' Hawaiian Entitlement," 138.

58. www.hapa.com.

59. Flanagan was given permission to use tapes of King's speeches by his friend Reverend Samuel B. Kyles of the Monumental Baptist Church in Memphis, Tennessee.

60. According to Kame'eleihiwa in *Native Land and Foreign Desires*, "pono" "is often translated in English as 'righteous,' but actually denoted a universe in perfect harmony" (25). Although *pono* is not the same as King's Christian "righteousness," Hapa's song is suggestive of the possible connections between these concepts.

61. Masao Miyoshi, "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State," in *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*, eds. Rob Wilson and Wimal Dissanayake, 78-106.

62. Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter*, 187.

63. The use of a popular venue does not always, of course, have such oppositional force. Playing in the aftermath of 9-11, U2 performed at halftime of the 2002 Super Bowl. As they played, the names of those killed in the World Trade Center and Pentagon bombings appeared in lit columns. During the final song, Bono opened his jacket to reveal its lining—an American flag—which he then wrapped around himself. On February 1, 2002 at the World Economic Forum, Bono spoke on behalf of the United States forgiving Third World debt, sitting on the same panel as Archbishop Desmond Tutu and U.S. Treasury secretary Paul O’Neill. It is difficult to read anything progressive into Bono’s Super Bowl performance—itsself another national crossing, but one that we contend ultimately supports the United States as superpower. Bono, however, uses his celebrity status to better effect at the WEF. As with Hapa, U2 and Bono do not evidence a consistently counter-hegemonic politics. Nonetheless, for non-Natives to dismiss any performance that makes use of a highly commercialized venue or cynically to discount performers willing to broker their power can be counter-productive.

64. Sometimes such critiques are necessary and important rather than simply ironic or cynical. See, for example, Shuhei Hosokawa’s “‘Salsa No Tiene Frontier’: Orquesta de la Luz and the Globalization of Popular Music,” *Cultural Studies* 13:3 (1999): 509-534. In this article, Hosokawa persuasively analyzes how a popular Japanese salsa band depoliticizes salsa. We thank Mari Yoshihara for bringing this article to our attention.

65. Masao Miyoshi, “A Borderless World?,” 94-95. Although Miyoshi works to qualify his pessimism in a later essay, “Sites of Resistance in the Global Economy,” *boundary 2* 22 (1995): 61-84, his focus there is primarily on the interventions that can be made in the academy.