Vincenzo Bavaro

Satisfied with the Stones: Notes on Masculinity, Land, and Family in Alani Apio's *Kāmau*

We do not value
the government's sums of money.
We are satisfied with the stones,
astonishing food of the land.
(Prendergast, "Kaulana Nā Pua")

MOM: *(pause)* You see these pebbles…
ALIKA: Mom, I don't need you to tell me about rocks. I need you here.
MOM: You don't know what you need, Alika. That's the problem. All I have is my stories. You will listen to them.
(Apio, *Kāmau*)

"Kaulana Nā Pua" is one of the most popular *mele* (song or poem) in Hawai'i; written at the end of the nineteenth century, its title means 'Famous are the Flowers', but it is also known as "Mele Aloha 'Āina" (song for the people who love the land) or "Mele 'Ai Pōhaku" (stone-eating song). In 1893, during the provisional government in Hawai'i – after the overthrow of the kingdom and before the establishment of the republic – the Royal Hawaiian Band was required to sign an oath of loyalty, to renounce any allegiance to the Queen and the Kingdom. Otherwise they would have been fired and, as the historian Noenoe Silva reports, "they would soon be eating rocks". The members of the band refused to sign and "they walked away from their jobs and their paychecks".[1] The song was written by Ellen Kekoaohiwaikalani Prendergast when the band members told her their story, and it captures the heroic quality of the anti-annexationist struggle at the end of the nineteenth century. It bespeaks a heroism born out of sacrifice, political conviction, and moral integrity, which for too long has been erased from the historical accounts, and deleted from the memories of a people, but which continues to inspire later generations of Hawaiian activists.

At the center of this essay is a play that tells a very different contemporary story: there are no heroes, sacrifice has the bitter taste of compromise, and a sense of loss and defeat seems to cloud any possibility of redemption. In other words, the stones and the stories they tell seem to have lost their aura. *Pōhaku* is the Hawaiian word for stones and rocks, and as with most Hawaiian words it has multiple layers of signification and several symbolic connotations: it points to the phenomenon of being petrified or hardened, or else of being stubborn, and it may finally mean "weighted with rocks, hence stationary, not moving".[2] The idea of belonging and of home is thus already *heavily* embedded in the definition of 'stones', and from the outset it shows the weight of the contradictions that this play intends to explore. But most of all, the stones, as both the symbol of the

---

[1] Noenoe K. Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 135.

[2] See the online Hawaiian electronic library <http://ulukau.org/> and the definition in its dictionary <http://www.wehewehe.org/>.

Anglistica 14. 2 (2010), 67-77 ISSN: 2035-8504

land and of generations of Hawaiians who invested them with sacred and secular meanings, are still at odds with the logic of the market, and in this play they seem to be losing the fight.

In 1994, Alani Apio's play *Kāmau*[3] premiered at Kumu Kahua Theater in Honolulu, about a year after the *‘Onipa‘a* march to commemorate the centennial of the overthrow, "the single largest and most influential gathering of Hawaiian in the 20th century" in which over 15,000 people marched.[4] At the center of this play, as in much of Native Hawaiian cultural production and history, lies a story of land expropriation. What is dramatized and explored is precisely the relation between the members of a family and the land they live on. The play, together with its sequel *Kāmau A‘e* (1998),[5] the second part of an intended trilogy, stages the life of a contemporary *‘ohana*, a Hawaiian extended family, focusing specifically on the lives of three men: Alika, the protagonist of the first play, and his cousins George and Michael, the latter of whom takes center-stage in the second play. The three men encounter three diverging destinies, which seem to reflect some of the most controversial social and political options available to young Hawaiian men. Alika works as a tour guide, Michael survives by fishing, and his brother George committed suicide a few years earlier, leaving behind his *haole* (white) partner Lisa and a young daughter, Stevie.[6]

From the second scene of *Kāmau* forward, the characters (and the audience) are confronted with a central question and the ensuing drama that will powerfully lead to the rapid unfolding of the play. The tourist company Alika works for, Aloha Tours, is expanding and Alika has been offered a promotion. Central to the company's expansion is the fact that it has purchased a vast coastal area and plans to build a new tourist resort there; said area, however, includes the beach on which Alika's family has been living for generations. The family will have to move and be relocated to a downtown condo.

Apio's play provides an interesting point of entry into an exploration of the issues of land and community I evoked above. More specifically, I intend to follow the lead of two crucial concepts in Hawaiian culture, as reflected in *Kāmau*: the notion of *‘āina* (land, earth) and the notion of *‘ohana* (family, kin group). To some extent, the protagonist's inner struggle, and the engine of the dramatic action, emerges primarily from a tragic conflict between a responsibility, a *kuleana* (which can be translated as both ‘responsibility' and ‘right') towards the land and a *kuleana* towards the family. This conflict, I will argue, has to do with the impact of capitalism and colonialism on traditional Native Hawaiian culture – in which the notions of *‘āina* and *‘ohana* seem to be intricately connected to each other and overlapping. In my exploration of this cultural tension I will pay particular attention to the dynamics of gender and masculinity, primarily because this is a play that explicitly focuses on male subjectivity in the contemporary social context of Hawai‘i, but also because tracing the intricacies and contradictions of male identity formation in a Native Hawaiian context means to highlight the impact of capitalism and western individualism on the significance of land and family.

[3] Alani Apio, *Kāmau* (Honolulu: Palila Books, 1994).

[4] Ty P. Kāwika Tengan, *Native Men Remade: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Hawai‘i* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008), 64.

[5] Apio, *Kāmau A‘e* (Honolulu: Palila Books, 1998).

[6] All references to the first play will henceforth be included parenthetically as *K*. The first play was also published in the collection *He Leo Hou. A New Voice. Hawaiian Playwrights* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 2003). The two versions differ slightly: the Palila edition is divided into 12 scenes; the Bamboo Ridge into 10.

Kumu Kahua, the Community, and its Languages

Before I proceed to an analysis of the play, let me introduce the author and the specific conditions that made the writing and the staging of the play possible. Alani Apio grew up in ʻEwa Beach on Oʻahu, in a family of modest circumstances. As the author puts it: "we were poor in a Western sense".[7] He studied at the Kamehameha Schools (a school for Native Hawaiians founded by Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop) and graduated in Drama and Theater at the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa. He worked as a TV and theater actor, and in 1988 wrote a play for young adults, *Nā Keiki ʻO* [sic] *ka ʻāina* (*The Child* [sic] *of the Land*)*,* produced by the Maui Youth Theatre.[8] He published poems in the *Hawaiʻi Review*; a short story, "Ka Hoʻi ʻAna: The Returning", in *The Best of Honolulu Fiction*;[9] and a series of articles on Hawaiian sovereignty published in *The Honolulu Advertiser*.[10] However, "writing is not the major focus of Apio's professional career"[11]: while his hobbies include wood carving in the Hawaiian tradition, he is one of the founders and the current board president of Kanu Hawaii, an association "committed to protect and promote island living" with projects of sustainability and community building.[12]

Both *Kāmau* and *Kāmau Aʻe* were directed by Harry L. Wong III and produced by the Kumu Kahua Theater. Kumu Kahua, 'Original Stage',[13] is a small theater of 130 seats in downtown Honolulu, located in a former Post Office built in 1872 – two decades before the overthrow – and which underwent major restoration right before *Kāmau*'s premiere (1992–94). The theater was founded in 1971 by Dennis Carroll and eight graduates of the Theater Department of UHM (University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa), with the explicit objective of promoting local playwrights and building a place in which the local audience could recognize itself, its problems, aspirations, and fantasies.[14] Founded explicitly as a community theater, in 1981 Kumu Kahua became independent from the Theater and Dance Department of the University and began its most prolific activity.

The play reflects the linguistic diversity of the archipelago, since it is written and performed partly in standard American English (which Alika speaks at work and with "mainlanders"), partly in Hawaiian, and partly in Hawaiian Creole English (HCE), colloquially known as Pidgin. Pidgin developed in the plantations as a lingua franca among settlers of disparate linguistic and national origins, and also as a coded language that protected the information exchange of the plantation workers from being understood by the landowners. With its influences mostly from Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, and Tagalog, it is still the most common vernacular spoken on the islands, especially among 'locals'. In his *Native Men Remade*, Hawaiian scholar Ty Kāwika Tengan writes that "Pidgin has become a marker of 'local' (typically nonwhite, working-class) identity for people who were raised in Hawaiʻi, and for men a similarly ethnic and 'tough' vision of masculinity".[15] In 1999, Pidgin was criticized by the influential Hawaiian activist Haunani-Kay Trask for being "a gloss for the absence of authentic sounds and authentic voices",[16] a falsification that pretends to be Hawaiian. Trask's attack on a prominent cultural production in

---

[7] Cit. in Meredith Desha, "Kāmau: Sacrifice and Collaboration", in *He Leo Hou,* 13.

[8] See Dennis Carroll, "Hawaiʻi's 'Local' Theatre", *The Drama Review,* 44.2 (Summer 2000), 138.

[9] Eric Chock and Darrell Lum, eds., *The Best of Honolulu Fiction. Stories from the Honolulu Magazine Fiction Contest* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1999), 21-31.

[10] Apio, "A thousand little cuts to genocide", *Honolulu Advertiser* (25 February 2001); "Kanaka lament: Once a proud nation, Hawaiians today are defined as just a race", *Honolulu Advertiser* (25 March 2001); "New Hopes Arise for Ancestral Culture", *Honolulu Advertiser* (19 January 2003).

[11] Desha, *He Leo Hou*, 13.

[12] This information is partly taken from a private correspondence with the author. See also <www.kanuhawaii.org>

[13] 'Kumu' also means foundation, model, or teacher, as in 'Kumu Hula', a master and teacher of hula dance.

[14] See the editor's introduction in Dennis Carroll, ed., *Kumu Kahua Plays* (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1983).

[15] Tengan, *Native Men*, xi.

[16] Haunani-Kay Trask, "Decolonizing Hawaiian Literature", in Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson, eds., *Inside Out: Literature, Cultural Politics and Identity in the New Pacific* (Honolulu: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1999), 167-182, 170.

Pidgin is in part a response to a tense historical relation between Locals and Hawaiians – two communities with different claims of 'belonging' and rights to the archipelago – and to the fact that the dominance of Pidgin among the Native Hawaiian population was not yet counterbalanced at the time by a collective effort to preserve and revive the Hawaiian language.[17]

The Hawaiian language, *'ōlelo Hawai'i,* has been central to the revival of Hawaiian culture and to the current sovereignty movement begun in the early Seventies. Alani Apio's decision to make his characters speak in Pidgin aims at reproducing a social reality, while at the same time dramatizing a sense of cultural displacement and stressing the cultural significance of language in the definition of identity on the islands. In Scene 7 of the play, to focus on a specific passage, Michael and Alika are on their beach teaching their niece Stevie how to throw a fishing-net. Alika has not yet informed Michael of the company's purchase of the land, and when a security guard tells them to leave that area, Michael is puzzled and reacts aggressively, calling him a "fagget haole" – a slur that significantly conflates a racial denomination with a homophobic one. The guard replies that he is in fact a Hawaiian, too.

> MICHAEL: … Dis guy, he says he's one Hawaiian. So I like know, Bully, what makes you Hawaiian?
> SECURITY GUARD: 'O ko'u Na'au, ko'u 'ohana a me ka 'ōlelo Hawai'i. 'Ae, 'ōlelo au i ka 'ōlelo makuahine. A 'o 'oe?
> (Michael cannot answer. He turns away and starts to go. The others follow.)
> MICHAEL: Fuck! (*K*, 40)

"My guts, my family and the Hawaiian language"; this is what the guard replies in Hawaiian, confronting Michael on the terrain of language proficiency as a signifier of Hawaiian identity. "Yes, I speak the Mother tongue. What about you?" Michael cannot reply, and curses in English.

Using a strategy that is common throughout the play, Apio complicates any easy dichotomy. While acknowledging the significance of *'ōlelo Hawai'i*, he is dissociating it from a politically engaged position: fluency in Hawaiian does not necessarily mean an alignment with the nationalist movement, or a default feeling of unity among Hawaiians. More broadly, Apio forces the audience to consider the complexity and ambivalence of each of the staged conflicts, without any easy route of identification. The director defines the play as an "unsafe play", and a reviewer wrote that Apio successfully prevents the play from being a "feel-good experience" for the supporters of any cause.[18] Along the same lines, the expropriation of the land is made possible because Alika's family was renting it from the Chong family – a paradoxical legacy and sign of unequal power relations between Natives and Asian American settlers – and Alika had stopped paying rent some two years before. Therefore even the Chongs' gesture of selling the land is not presented as a purposefully wicked action but instead, within a capitalist frame, it is a reasonable and even relatively generous behavior: "dey said as long as I keep da place clean an' quiet dey not goin' bodda. But dey said dey was goin' fo'try an'sell da place" (*K*, 42). A similar dynamic is articulated when we learn that Alika's boss is apparently

[17] On the complex political and cultural relation between Locals (mainly Asian Americans) and Hawaiians, see Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds., *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawaii* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2008).

[18] John Berger, "Shades of Gray: Playwright refuses to treat Hawaiian issues as matters of black and white", *Honolulu Star Bulletin* (November 7, 1997), D 1–3. Berger is discussing *Kāmau A'e*, but his analysis can be applied to both plays.

negotiating strenuously with the agency in order to guarantee a decent solution for Alika and his cousin. This happens again when a white male tourist, Mr. Clemens, verbally attacks Alika for spoiling his and his wife’s dream holiday, and we learn that the man has much more in common with the young Hawaiian than the two of them would be willing to admit (a story of land expropriation in the South, labor in the coal mines to support his family, a life on the verge of poverty).

It is very hard to tell the bad guys from the good ones in *Kāmau*, and indeed we are faced with the possibility that there may be none on either side. This is where the devastating process that will drive Alika to his choice begins. This ambivalence is both the strongest quality of the play and its weakest feature. On the one hand, we appreciate its ability to emotionally impact the audience and position it in a field in which there is no easy, nor right, choice. On the other hand, all the characters are granted both complexity and a certain degree of innocence. They are all relatively fair players in a predetermined game, and no possibility of transformation, no possibility of imagining new rules and new trajectories of behavior – in short, no available political change – is ever evoked as within reach.

The choice of the title is aligned with the very idea that the characters are players entrapped in a game whose rules exceed their control. *Kāmau* is a polysemic Hawaiian word and means primarily to keep on, to persevere, or to bear the burden. It also means to drink alcohol, and to cheer when drinking, an invitation to ‘add a little more’. Throughout the play Alika is often heavily drunk, and the meaning of resistance and perseverance (to be faithful to one’s own goals) is, so to speak, polluted by the imagery related to alcohol and by Alika’s continuous drinking. Finally, the idea of a burden and of carrying it is more explicitly connected to the notion of responsibility that I mentioned before and to definitions of masculinity and gender identification.

Tourism, Resistance, and the Gendering of Hawaiian Nationalism

Apio has stated that behind his first impulse of writing the play were some personal experiences concerning the suicides of a “number of [his] friends”[19] and his reflections on the conditions of life of many Hawaiian men: “Young Kanaka males have had the highest rate of suicide in Hawai‘i since the overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation. Likewise, Kanaka have had the largest percentage of population imprisoned”.[20] While these data and the emphasis on unemployment, poverty, alcoholism, and incarceration mirror similar data concerning both the indigenous population of North America and ethnic minorities in the United States and their legacies of colonialism and homicidal cultural and economic policies, the gendering that is behind the Hawaiian data requires some analysis. In order to understand the peculiar situation of Hawaiian men we might first need to highlight a few crucial points related to the gendering of the land in Hawai‘i, both in a traditional (and later activist) and in a colonial/touristic perspective.

Haunani-Kay Trask’s foundational work *From a Native Daughter* highlights that the relation between Hawaiians and the archipelago is a familial one, as the title

[19] Desha, *He Leo Hou*, 13.

[20] Apio, “Kanaka Lament”.

suggests. The land, *ʻāina*, is seen as the mother, and the natives are her children. In the Hawaiian language, Trask continues, the word *ʻāina* grammatically takes up a possessive structure akin to that of the body or of parents, showing that the land is inherent to the people, which in turn cannot exist without her, as the *ʻāina* cannot exist without the people.[21] Furthermore, and this complicates an established capitalist norm, land cannot be 'owned', private property being a foreign concept in traditional Hawaiian culture, as in many other indigenous cultures. As Apio writes in one of his articles, "Who 'owns' this 'aina? What a ridiculous notion. No one 'owns' this land: not America, not Na Kanaka. Our aliʻi never pretended to own this land. We didn't even have the concept of ownership until foreigners imported it".[22] Talking about the ever evolving situation of expropriation, Trask writes, "in familial terms, our mother (and thus our heritage and our inheritance) was taken from us. We were orphaned in our own land".[23] This image of Hawaiians as "orphans" can be useful in conceptualizing Alika as representative of the sense of 'loss' of the Hawaiian people – and again, not as in loss of a property, but as in loss of one's family, since the young man is orphaned of both parents. However, the spirit/ghost (*ʻuhane*) of his mother, as we often see on the Hawaiian stage and in Hawaiian culture,[24] continues to be both a constant presence in Alika's mind and an actual walking and talking presence in his life.

Whereas the genealogical understanding of the land produces a gendering of it, a far more devastating discourse produced by tourism is actively engaged in a parallel, though antithetical, production of a feminized archipelago. In the touristic iconography of Hawaiʻi and in the western imagery related to the archipelago, the key figure at the center of the scene is almost always a woman; as Trask puts it, "above all, Hawaiʻi is 'she,' the Western image of the Native 'female'".[25] Jane Desmond notices that Hawaiian men, when they rarely appear on postcards and photographs associated to the touristic circuit, are never with women. They are rather alone, or in the company of other men in fishing scenes. The absence of men is constitutive of the visual iconography, Desmond suggests, and has the intended effect of producing a feminized image of the islands, displaying Hawaiian women as available to the visual consumption of white males.[26]

The notion of the maternal figure of the *ʻāina* in Hawaiian culture shares with the touristic fantasy the centrality of the feminine figure; the thesis of cultural prostitution articulated by sovereignty activists is the product of the overlapping and clash of both visual constructs. In the complex political context of contemporary Hawaiʻi, tourism is promoted by the State, which is the target of much of the criticism of Native organizations. The idea of cultural prostitution embodied in the tourist industry evokes a scenario in which the masculinized State is the pimp, and the feminized archipelago is the prostitute.

The Hawaiian cultural renaissance has been characterized by a "strong leadership of women, in the fields of politics, scholarship, literature".[27] The role of Hawaiian men in politics has been famously criticized by Trask, who wrote that while men "sought power in the Americanized political system ... they internalized the value of that system", and that overall, "male leaders in our movement ... are not the most visible, the most articulate, nor the most creative".[28] Trask emphasized what she saw as an overwhelming tendency of men to collaborate with the State – the names of Governor John Waiheʻe (from 1986 to 1994) and of controversial Senator Daniel Akaka come to mind – evoking the much too popular spectre of the 'sell-out'.

---

[21] Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaiʻi* (Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press, 1999), 116.

[22] Apio, "New Hopes". *Aliʻi* is the word to indicate the Hawaiian 'chiefs'. However, as even this brief passage shows, they were far from analogous to feudal European Lords, to which they have been historically compared by Euro-American historiography.

[23] Trask, *Native Daughter*, 16.

[24] For a brief exploration of Hawaiian 'ghost' stories and their relation to multiculturalism see Cristina Bacchilega, *Legendary Hawaiʻi and the Politics of Place* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007), 154–167.

[25] Trask, *Native Daughter,* 136.

[26] Jane C. Desmond, *Staging Tourism. Bodies on Display from Waikiki to the Sea World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 45-46, 122.

[27] Tengan, *Native Men*, 10.

The past few decades have seen the rise of several *kāne* groups (Hawaiian men's collectives). Hawaiian scholar Kāwika Tengan contextualizes Hale Mua, one of these groups, within the deeply gendered political context of Hawaiian nationalist movements.[29] These men are reacting to historical emasculation by both colonialism and tourism; as Tengan reports, this emasculation has been perpetuated within the sovereignty movement itself. The members of Hale Mua articulate a problematic rhetoric of crisis, dominant in many all-male groups throughout the United States and western Europe, that is rooted in a nostalgia for a sort of idealized 'golden age of masculinity' – in their case, a warrior ideal profoundly inspired by the Māori of Aotearoa/ New Zealand.

The choice of placing a tour bus guide as an anti-hero at the center of this drama is thus extremely productive and enables the audience to think through the interconnections between the tourist industry and the specter of the emasculation of the Hawaiian man. Besides being responsible for increasing environmental damages, the tourist industry is the primary cause of the stellar speculations on the real estate market. Furthermore, while tourism perpetuates a paradisiacal image of the islands, it promotes a service economy that selectively limits job opportunities and perpetuates homelessness and poverty.[30] Tourism thus consolidates into the only game in town, promoting the cultural prostitution of Hawaiʻi and creating what Trask defined as a "hostage economy" at the mercy of foreign (non-Hawaiian) investments, while the people held hostage are forced to attend – and many, like Alika, to participate – in their collective spectacularization as a touristic artifact for the First World.

Kāmau's protagonist, in his role as tour guide, is performing to some extent what Desmond defines as "the ideal native", "native enough to remain primitively alluring and exotic, yet intelligent, warmly welcoming and gracious, that is, feminized and most often female".[31] Alika is, in fact, praised by his clients for being "gracious" and "helpful" and is encouraged by his boss to teach that attitude to the other workers (*K*, 9). Apio is not only showing that the hospitality and graciousness displayed for the tourist industry may well be a *mise-en-scène*, but in a somewhat Brechtian fashion he is, at least for the 'tour guide moments' of the play, employing a defamiliarization effect, a didactic distancing of the viewer from the performed action that is aimed at enhancing the audience's critical evaluation of its own condition. Alika's tour guide moments present the local audience of Kumu Kahua with the spectacle of their own touristic commodification, and underline in an implicit way what Noenoe Silva defines as "the process of writing Kanaka out of their own history".[32]

---

[28] Trask, *Native Daughter,* 93-94.

[29] Tengan, *Native Men*, 10-13.

[30] Trask, "Lovely Hula Hands", in *Native Daughter*, 136-147.

[31] Desmond, "Picturing Hawaiʻi: The 'Ideal' Native and the Origins of Tourism, 1880–1915", *Positions: east asia cultures critique,* 7.2 (1999), 459–501*,* 493.

[32] Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 121.

In fact, the role for which Alika is being paid by Aloha Tours is to reinforce and justify the hegemonic narration of the paradise scenario, to produce a non-threatening and pleasant version of Hawaiian history and identity for the mainland tourists' consumption. In this version pre-annexation Hawai'i was a feudal country, Queen Lili'uokalani "gave up her throne" and the archipelago was eager to be "admitted" as a State (24–25).

> ALIKA: I can't do dis fo' da res' of my life. I hate it. I hate da lies I havta tell. I hate da smell of coconut oil and da burned skin. I hate da cheap plastic leis, and da stupid assholes calling me one Indian and wanting fo' take my pitcha. (46)

As the play unfolds, Alika's disgust for his job and for the speeches he has to memorize and perform increases to the breaking point, when he refuses to recite his script and decides to tell a modified version, closer to the historical facts (*K*, 52). Central to his job is the performance of the spirit of *aloha*, which has been vastly co-opted and commodified by the tourist industry. In the compulsive industrial ethos it has become a controlling image, a repressive myth able to "disparage Native resistance to the tourist industry".[33] This oppressive, monetary connotation of *aloha* is well known to Alika: "My boss tells me fo work hard, spread da aloha, it's gonna pay off" (*K*, 49). It is also known to his mother, who is both pointing to the commercialization of the concept and to the necessity for Hawaiians to cherish it and embrace it: "You have to carry the burden, and to do that you have to keep your aloha for life. I know it sounds stupid, our aloha's been sold and used, but for us Hawaiians it's all we got" (*K*, 47–48).

Familial Geographies and Territorial Genealogies, or the Interdependence of Land and Family

The play is rich in monetary metaphors and to some extent the central struggle of the protagonist originates explicitly from issues of employment, money, and economic evaluation. Many western theorists of masculinity studies have highlighted that dominant performances of masculinity, "hegemonic masculinities" to borrow from Robert Connell,[34] are connected with the management of privilege and power, where economic status is one of the central concerns. Michael Kimmel in his *Manhood in America* locates a primary arena for the performance of masculinity in the public sphere, in the realm of marketplace competition.[35] According to Kimmel, the defining feature of the dominant version of contemporary masculinity is that it is not verified or certified once and for all, as was the case for the earlier tradition of the "Genteel Patriarch" whose masculinity was validated by his possession of the land, and of the "Heroic Artisan" whose gender identity was securely tied to his artisan republican virtues.[36] The new masculine identity that emerged in the nineteenth century and became dominant in the twentieth century is for Kimmel the self-made man. The self-made man is defined by his "successful participation in marketplace competition";[37] deprived of an essential status, he is the product of his continuous and compulsive economic performance and he is crucially bound to notions of competition and success.

---

[33] Trask, *Native Daughter,* 42.

[34] Robert W. Connell, *Masculinities* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

[35] Michael Kimmel, *Manhood in America: A Cultural History* (New York: Free Press, 1996).

[36] Michael Kimmel, "Masculinity as Homophobia", in Paula S. Rothenberg, ed., *Race, Class, and Gender in the United States* (New York: Worth Publishers, 2007), 80-92.

[37] Ibid, 83.

Since in a capitalist system the objective is profit and upward mobility, and since Alika’s promotion to a managerial position could be simply a success story from a capitalist standpoint, most of what happens in *Kāmau* and the violent contradictions the young man faces take place outside the ideological frame evoked by the notion of the self-made man. In other words, Alika’s story explodes definitions of male identity fashioned exclusively along the lines of economic success; in fact, uncritically accepting the promotion will question Alika’s identity as a Hawaiian man, even as it will enable him to maintain and strengthen his role as economic supporter of his extended family.

There are many points in the play in which we see the dominance and pervasiveness of the capitalist system of investment, accumulation, and profit, but there are also other examples in which the market logic is defied, especially in the evocation of traditional Hawaiian fishing practice. Here the first fish is spared and thrown back into the ocean (*K,* 20), or fish are given away as a gift (*K,* 42), or again the very abundance of tuna is spiritualized, cherished, and preserved, untouched (*K,* 50). It is in relation to the *‘āina* that the market logic is utterly challenged.

Near the end of the play, Michael tells Alika a story that powerfully illustrates this point. Years earlier, their grandfather Tūtū Man had brought a young Michael to an area of the bay in which a multitude of tuna were mating. The grandfather invested the young nephew with the responsibility of taking care of that bay and the shrine (*ko‘a*) it hosted and to protect the fish, like his ancestors had been doing for generations. After Tūtū Man’s death, however, tourist boats found the bay and Michael was powerless in the face of the hysterical slaughter the *haole* enacted on the mass of tuna. The scene highlights the structures of feeling that are inherent in Hawaiian nationalism and illustrates how, as Tengan also notices, “the remaking of the self ... proceeds through the reconnection with and retelling of mo‘olelo”,[38] legends, personal stories, and histories.

The words Tūtū Man told the young Michael in this memory capture a fundamental tension that pervades the entire play: “Nāu e mālama i kēia kai a me kēia ‘āina, i ola ku‘u ‘ohana” (*K,* 50), or as Apio translates at the end of his published play, “Yours is the responsibility to care for this ocean and this land, (and if you do) your family will thrive”. In other words, taking care (*mālama*) of the land (*‘āina*) is inseparable from taking care of one’s family (*‘ohana*). Significantly, however, in Alika’s dilemma we can trace these two terms as the opposite poles of a dichotomy: if the young Kanaka accepts the job and its consequences, he will be able to take care of his family as he will have secured the economic means for doing so. On the other hand, only by refusing the job will he be faithful to his responsibility to the land. The conflict is structured around these two ideals which – and this is the main point of rupture with Hawaiian traditions – seem to be antithetical.

The care for the land, *mālama ‘āina*, is the most traditional focus of nationalist claims. In its more popular formulation as “love for the land”, *aloha ‘āina*, it was

[38] Tengan, *Native Men*, 14.

also central to the anti-annexation struggle. The two words function approximately as "nationalism" or even "patriotism", with the radical differences that I discussed above regarding the gendering of the archipelago and the fact that this 'nation' evokes not a people or a race, as Noenoe Silva's *Aloha Betrayed* powerfully documents, but primarily the *land*. Besides being part of the name of an activist group and the name of a late nineteenth century newspaper, the term indicated the nationalist movement: "throughout the struggle Kanaka Maoli who worked to retain the sovereignty of their own nation called themselves '*ka poʻe aloha ʻāina*'", the people who love the land.[39] The character of Michael is, especially in the sequel *Kāmau Aʻe*, an explicit embodiment of this nationalist ethos, with his connection to the masculine genealogy of Tūtū Man, which occupies in that play an analogous position to Mom's character in *Kāmau*.

Alika, instead, seems to prioritize his responsibility to his family: "All I like do is keep my 'ohana togedda – four peopo'. I tell everybody dis is paradise – how frickin' hard could it be fo' keep four peopo' togedda in paradise?" (*K,* 49). The character of Mom, in her often confusing lines, endorses the need for Alika to accept the job as necessary for the survival of his family. However, the inextricability of the two concepts of *ʻohana* and *ʻāina* that is so clearly exemplified in their grandfather's words can be traced throughout the play from the words of a young Michael who exclaims that "when you in da ocean, you wit' youa 'ohana" (*K,* 31) to Alika's overall realization that moving away from the beach will mean to "sell out my cousin, my brudda, my 'ohana" (*K,* 47). The overlapping of these two Hawaiian concepts is the result of particular ways of defining the relationship between people and land. It is also primarily connected with the pivotal importance of genealogy for Hawaiian culture and its conflation of time and space. In fact, as the Hawaiian scholar Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa writes, "genealogies *are* the Hawaiian concept of time, and they order the space around us .... genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe".[40]

The final scene of the play was born from the improvisations of the actors and constitutes an anxiety-inducing crescendo in which the offstage voices of the characters interpellate the protagonist with a wide range of expectations, evoked responsibilities, and things that he should be doing or not be doing. At the apex of this crescendo, Alika grabs his Aloha shirt and wears it, and in the same way the play began, he addresses the audience introducing it to another Aloha Tour. The conclusion of the play provoked strong reactions from the members of the audience "who were actually calling out to him ... not to go back to his job".[41] It was also criticized for being the product of a defeatist attitude by many activists who were instead hoping for a more positive ending.[42]

The play articulates a unique perspective on the life of Hawaiian men in the contemporary political and social context of the archipelago. It refuses the clear-cut dichotomies commonly associated with nationalist militancy and cannot fully embrace the heroism of Hawaiian resistance invoked by many activists. Apio is staging a complex struggle that keeps unfolding in the present: the dark tones of

---

[39] Silva, *Aloha Betrayed*, 131.

[40] Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1992), 19-20.

[41] Desha, *He Leo Hou*, 15.

[42] Carroll, "Local Theater", 138.

Kāmau's conclusion are a consequence of this logic. In a private correspondence about the 2007 restaging of the play and about its past and future staging in other Pacific Islands (New Caledonia and Solomon Islands), Apio noticed how critical it was that in 2007 and to this day, "with respect to our ability to govern ourselves and more independently chart our own future, not much had changed since '94. At least in '94 … we had the sense that change was indeed possible".[43] However, *Kāmau* is not meant to be a feel-good experience, a testament to Hawaiian courage and determination, but rather an invitation to debate; its foremost interest lies in exploring the feeling of loss and the everyday struggle of Hawaiian men while evoking the wider sociopolitical connotations of their situation.

[43] Private correspondence with the author, 25 Aug 2010.