A BREATH OF EA

Submergent Strategies for Deepening the Hawaiian Diaspora

[Received December 2nd 2021; accepted February 11th 2022 – DOI: DOI: 10.21463/shima.155]

Mahealani Ahia

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Hawai'i <mahea9@hawaii.edu>

Kahala Johnson

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Hawai'i <kahalajo@gmail.com>

ABSTRACT: Kanaka Maoli diasporic transmotions have often been imagined as diluted impersonations of Hawaiian indigeneity that fluctuate between settler elimination and Native perpetuation. When interpreted solely by the ebb and flow of this conflict, Hawaiian diasporaneity can be problematically perceived as entirely dependent on settler removal and on-islander permanence for fathomability. This torrential relation between settlers and on-islanders can produce a dialectic that drags the off-islander beneath undercurrents of invasion and resistance, attempting to drown the ea of the diaspora in its depths. In this article, we ask how the settler and on-islander tidalectic might be transformed through unsettling memories of movement that draw Hawaiian indigeneity into the depths of the diaspora. In exploring this question, we suggest that the conception of Hawaiian diasporaneity need not be limited by the antagonism between settler removal and on-island permanence. We argue instead that Hawaiian diasporaneity can be traced to our cosmogonic genealogy chant *He Kumulipo* and the submergent strategies and adaptations our pre-human ancestors used to navigate the sea, land, and sky for millions of years.

NOTE: This article does not italicise – or otherwise differentiate – indigenous language terms from standard English language ones in order to avoid the "othering" of these terms within the hegemony of English Language discourse that has served to marginalise and delegitimise indigenous cultures and languages.

KEYWORDS: Diaspora, Feminism, Hawaiian, Indigenous, Kumulipo

O Papahulihonua. O Papahulilani. O Papahānaumoku (Kalākaua, 1888/1951, ln 1792–1794). In Hawaiian origin stories, Papahānaumoku is the land on which we live. As an akua or deity, she gives birth to a majority of the Hawaiian islands, becoming the foremost parent of the archipelago. Kanaka Maoli claim descent from Papa through our ancestors Hāloanakalaukapalili and Hāloa—the first kalo and first Kanaka, respectively—who are born to her daughter Hoʻohōkūkalani. Together, Papahānaumoku, Hoʻohōkūkalani, and their children provide Hawaiians today with our connection to the islands as the maternal origins of our identity and indigeneity, as illustrated in Wā ʻUmikumāmālua within *He Kumulipo* (ln. 1734).

We initiate our article with the story of Papahānaumoku in order to explore submergent strategies of islandness and feminism that might deepen our relations to Hawaiian identity, indigeneity, and diasporaneity. Papa is the foundation upon which we unravel our concept of islandness as moku from a Hawaiian perspective. The word moku describes the state or quality that exists when something is divided, cut, or severed in two or more distinct parts. Islands are moku since they are lands separated from each other by the ocean; islands are also moku because they are lands cut by the sea. Curiously, this shared condition of separation is an aspect that joins Hawai'i together as an archipelago, a paradox that generates enigmatic liminality at the epicentre of Hawaiian islandness.

In addition to the concept of moku, Papa's ability to hānau moku—to birth islands—is another basal foundation for us to ponder islandness from a mana wahine perspective to increase ea. The term ea can express sovereignty, breath, and rising motion, and our ancestral stories honour our wāhine progenitors as a source of this powerful mana. Hānau moku comes from a tectonic, volcanic, and oceanic potency that exceeds the strictly gendered, biological, and reproductive norms of cisheteropatriarchal binaries. The words hānau and moku are connected to a third term that unifies Hawaiian land and people through separation: piko, which designates the umbilical cord of humans as well as the summit of mountains. The summits of mountains are the natal evidence and sacred places tying our islands to Papahānaumoku. The umbilical cords of Hawaiian infants are severed and often buried or hidden on the child's birth lands with the belief that doing so will reconnect them to those ancestral places. Though separate, the piko of the moku and the piko of Kanaka nonetheless conjoin us all to Papa as her children through the process of hānau.

Together with moku and hānau, we contemplate the journey of Papa to Hawai'i as an enigmatic story where Hawaiian diasporaneity can be incubated. As the earthly progenitor of both the Hawaiian islands and the Hawaiian people, Papahānaumoku is the natal axis of Hawaiian identity and indigeneity attaching 'āina and Kanaka together. However, Papa is from the foreign lands of Kahiki, and her arrival from Kahiki places her origins in an off-island elsewhere prior to, beyond, and even beneath the archipelago she birthed. Papahānaumoku's story thus presents current regenerations of Kanaka Maoli identity with another curious enigma: namely, that the genealogical piko of Hawaiian indigeneity today is predicated on a woman who gave birth to—but was not born in—the archipelago of Hawai'i.

Settling the Indigenous, Drowning the Diaspora

While these enigmas could possibly be dissolved by expanding Kānaka Maoli indigeneities to encompass older connections to Kahiki, we find value in exploring instead what these paradoxes can mean for deepening the mana of the Hawaiian diaspora from an island feminist standpoint.

According to Marina Karides:

> *Island feminism (Karides, 2016a) is a theoretical orientation that understands 'islands on their own terms' (see Baldacchino, 2008) and draws from feminisms of intersectionality, geography, and coloniality and queer theory.*

> *Whether as systems of power or the basis of identities, race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation intersect with living on and being from an island.* (Karides, 2017, p. 31)

As a tectonic ancestor in perpetual transmotion, Papahānaumoku's movement from Kahiki to Hawai'i fractures the cementation of Hawaiian identities by settler colonialism which dialectically demands an indigeneity based on an inert, rigid, rootedness to land. As the genealogical source of Kanaka Maoli, her story actually unsettles Hawaiian indigeneity by forcing us to encounter these memories of motion as an axiomatic counterpart of who we are.

Rather than retreat from this unsettling paradox, we believe Papahānaumoku's enigmatic narrative actually asks us to decolonise our indigeneity by remembering and imagining transmotional relations beneath the demand for grounded permanence required by Native resistance to colonisation. Furthermore, her mo'olelo urges us to confront how the antagonism between settlers and on-islanders in Hawai'i can create anti-diasporic sentiments in our struggle against invasion and removal by unfortunately channelling the logics of elimination against our off-island kin. Nevertheless, we are determined that these paradoxes are more than contradictions, they are gestures toward a diasporic world of transmotion wanting to be reborn, futures of Hawaiian kinship from the past that urge us to birth relations where the diaspora can move and thrive.

Unfortunately, Hawaiian diasporaneity has often been imagined by on-islanders as a diluted impersonation of Hawaiian indigeneity caught in the tidal antagonism between settler colonial elimination and Native on-island resistance. Following Atlantic diasporic writing by Kamau Brathwaite (1999), we identify this conflict as a tidalectic: an ongoing, cyclical, non-linear struggle between colonising movement (i.e., settler invasion), Native responses (i.e., on-island persistence), and the back-and-forth relationship between them. While Brathwaite's original tidalectic created room for movement, migration, and the diaspora in the Caribbean, we instead explore how the process applies to settler and Indigenous relations in Hawai'i (Brathwaite et al., 1999).

On the one hand, the refusal of on-islanders to be subsumed by colonial invasions prevents the dialectical process from resolving in favour of settlers. At the same time, settler colonial relations can mutate in response to this antagonism, leading to a multiplication of strategies that eliminate and assimilate Natives in order to possess the land. While the nationalist anchoring of on-islander identities to Hawai'i as a homeland might itself be considered a tidalectical evolution on the part of Hawaiians, this adaptation can nonetheless result in a settled indigeneity that severs and removes off-islanders. Indeed, the fluctuating relation between settlers and on-islanders can drag the Hawaiian diaspora beneath the undercurrents of a struggle that privileges permanence in the homeland as the grounds for Hawaiian indigeneity. When interpreted solely by the ebb and flow of this conflict, Hawaiian diasporaneity can be problematically perceived as entirely dependent on settler colonial and on-islander determinations to be fathomable, drowning the self-determining ea of the diaspora in its depths.

The drowning of diasporic ea under settler and on-islander tidalectics can affect how diasporaneity is circumscribed. On the surface, the mere existence of the diaspora is often contemplated as the result of a successful settler displacement and/or as the evidence of Native failure to persist on the land. The former characterises the diaspora primarily as an outcome of settlement and expulsion, leaving the potential for exploring unsettled

Hawaiian diasporaneities an elusive endeavour. The latter assumes the abandonment of land and nation as castaway descriptors for diasporic identity, ignoring the transmotional struggles engaged by off-island Hawaiian communities working with Black, Indigenous, and People of Colour everywhere to unsettle the colonised world. Placed together, the diaspora becomes transfixed by the tidalectic between the settler and the on-islander, with diasporic ea and identity always already predetermined in advance by the pair's exchanges.

Under this tidalectic, diasporic identities are further drowned as their relations become spatially defined by a waning distance from the Native and a waxing proximity to the settler. When diasporaneity is engulfed by associations with failure and abandonment, off-islander distance to ancestral homelands becomes perceived by on-islanders as an ever-expanding trench of loss that widens with each diasporic generation. Accompanying this perception is the belief that the Hawaiian diaspora is increasingly vulnerable to settler assimilation and colonial amnesia caused by a decreasing proximity to on-islanders and the homeland. When accepted, these assumptions encourage distrust and anxiety toward the diaspora as a people and place where indigeneity fails to breathe or transpire, turning on-island resistance to settler dislocation as the only means of escaping a diasporic fate.

Settler Strategies of Erasure and Domestication

Consequently, these suspicions transform Hawaiian diasporaneity in on-islander imaginaries into a benthic abyss of absence, alienation, forgetting, abandonment, lack, loss, and promiscuous movement which must be avoided at all cost if decolonisation is to prevail and the land retained. The fear, anxiety, dismissal, and distrust felt toward the Hawaiian diaspora by on-islanders augments what Lisa Kahaleole Hall (2009) calls settler strategies of erasure. Emphasising the specific erasure of Hawaiian women by U.S. imperialism, Hall describes settler strategies of erasure as rendering invisible or obscure historical and ongoing Indigenous presence and resistance to colonisation (Hall, 2009, p. 17). Appropriating this critique, we call attention to the ways that Hawaiian diaspora too can be erased, made invisible, or obscured, counterintuitively, by Indigenous resistance itself as on-islanders respond to colonial removal. Specifically, we gesture to how the antagonism between settlers and on-islanders can, when not attentive to the Hawaiian diaspora, end up erasing the ea of the latter through a settlement of Hawaiian indigeneity that privileges a domestic, permanent resistance to colonisation in the homeland.

These strategies of erasure are analysed by J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (1999). She discusses how off-island descendants of Papahānaumoku assert self-determination against ongoing racism, settler colonialism, and patriarchy. In her article, Kauanui examines how Kanaka Maoli identity, indigeneity, and diasporaneity are domesticated by U.S. blood quantum laws, Hawaiian nationalism, colonial displacement, and proximity to homeland. Diving into this context, she provides a feminist description of home-making, nation-building, and diasporic return as gendered projects affected by patriarchal preconceptions of the off-island Hawaiian that harmfully reduce off-islandness to experiences of abandonment and absence. Refusing this reduction while simultaneously urging diasporic self-determination, Kauanui states that "self-definition is part of the Hawaiian struggle for sovereignty" and that "the re-articulation of Hawaiian sovereignty on-island continues to be interrupted by off-island Hawaiians who problematize the definition of nation and the defining of indigeneity" (p. 691).

Kauanui's call for diasporic self-determination invokes a defiance against domesticated imaginations of Hawaiian diasporaneity as well as a need to refuse erasure by settler and on-islander antagonisms that uproot off-islander kinships. She further addresses these concerns in the article 'Diasporic deracination and off-island Hawaiians' (2007), where she confronts family and community judgements of her Hawaiian identity based on blood quantum, phenotype, and length of time and distance from the homeland. Kauanui also traces the erasure of Hawaiian diasporic identity in three particular ways: invisibility due to a lack of knowledge regarding Hawaiian history and presence outside of Hawai'i, appropriation of Hawaiianness by non-Hawaiians, and deracination due to racial mixing and blood quantum logics (p. 139). At the conclusion of her article, she states:

> *We need multiple diasporic frameworks that reckon with indigeneity, the persistence of homeland, and Hawaiian connections to other people who have their own claims to Hawai'i as home, to illuminate Hawaiians' off-island subjectivities. In addition, Hawaiians who have had experiences outside of Hawai'i can and should incorporate their histories of mobility into their genealogical recitations as part of their personal heritage to reclaim those travels and movements as part of their Hawaiianness.* (Kauanui, 2007, p. 154)

Arguing for the necessity of diasporic self-determination in the pursuit of sovereignty and Hawaiian nationalism, Kauanui reflects upon the term transplant and the story of Hāloa, suggesting the use of huli, 'ohā, and acts of replanting as alternative identities for off-island Hawaiians that recognise both their indigeneity and their diasporaneity (1999, p. 690). By invoking the embodiments of kalo as a source for diasporic self-determination, Kauanui empowers the genealogy of Papahānaumoku through Hāloa and places Hawaiian on-islanders and off-islanders in an umbilical relationship that defies the racial, gendered, domesticated, and settled notions of indigeneity prescribed by colonisation. We recognise this defiance as an act of diasporic ea that refuses to be drowned in the tidalectic between settlers and on-islanders, one that provides a site for our own exploration of diasporaneity beyond permanence in the homeland.

Transmotional Tidalectics for a Defiant Diasporaneity

In her book *Defiant Indigeneity: The politics of Hawaiian performance* (2018), Lani Teves writes about the effect of on-islander suspicions and perceptions toward off-island Hawaiians, calling for the need to defy discourses that domesticate indigeneity and erase the diaspora. She argues:

> *My intention is to disrupt the perception that Natives who do not live on their ancestral lands are somehow inauthentic, suffer from cultural loss, and do not have a place in the lāhui. To combat this perception, it is necessary to change our discussion of indigeneity as something always bounded by and to the land. Our genealogies and responsibilities to the land should be prioritized, but we should not lose sight of the diversity of experiences that exist within Native communities. We need to have a more robust conversation about how ideas of 'the Native' are constrained by discourses that privilege presence on the land in contrast to living in the diaspora, and the impact these discourses have on belonging within our nations, communities, and 'ohanas. Ranging from economic dislocation, to land struggles, to the forms of exclusion that we internalize among ourselves,*

> *place-based forms of indigeneity tend to take precedence over the Indigenous histories of movement and travel*. (pp. 145–146)

Acknowledging the labour of ongoing Native resistance to settler colonialism in Hawai'i, we nevertheless echo Kauanui and Teves, whose defiant refusals and self-determinations reject the manipulative settlement of indigeneity by settler tidalectics and the dilution of diasporic ea into dependency, assimilation, and approximate loss. The diaspora has gills, the diaspora has fins, the diaspora breathes sovereignty in the saltwater fathoms flowing beneath Indigenous connections to land. And there in the depths of Oceania our submerged ancestors wait, spiralling in the darkness, where the settlement of Hawaiian indigeneity can be drowned.

Affirming off-islander ea, we therefore ask how the settler and on-islander tidalectic might be transformed through unsettling memories of movement that draw Hawaiian indigeneity into the depths of the diaspora. In exploring this question, we suggest that the conception of Hawaiian diasporaneity need not be limited by the antagonism between settler removal and on-island permanence. We argue instead that Hawaiian diasporaneity can be traced to our cosmogonic genealogy chant *He Kumulipo* and to the submergent strategies and adaptations our pre-human ancestors used to navigate the sea, land, and sky for millions of years.

Submergent Strategies: Diasporising *He Kumulipo*

He Kumulipo is a ko'ihonua, a cosmogonic genealogy for the chief Kalaninuiamamao that was recorded and published by King David Kalākaua in the 19th century. The chant is divided into two parts: the Pō—which describes the rise of prehuman ancestors from the sea and the night—and the Ao—which recounts the emergence of humanity and the mo'okū'auhau or genealogical succession of chiefs down to Kalaninuiamamao. *He Kumulipo* was composed to remind Kanaka Maoli rulers of their mo'okū'auhau connectivity to our ancestors from the sea and the night, and it is echoed today as a source of grounded indigeneity and Hawaiian nationalism in the struggle against U.S. colonialism and occupation.

In *Theorizing Pō: Embodied cosmogony and Polynesian national narratives* (2017), Joyce Pualani Warren discusses the importance of mo'okū'auhau and connections to ancestral darkness as illustrated through *He Kumulipo*, pointing to the transmotions at the foundation of the chant:

> *Pō is the darkness, a chaotic yet generative space from which life emerges. Predicated on the absence of stasis, Pō is a liminal space. It is also imagined as a vortex, spiraled and expansive. In addition to its spatial characteristics Pō is temporally expansive, producing a view of time that is spiral rather than linear. Within Pō, time and space are not necessarily discrete categories… Thus, Pō affords one access to all points of time and space in discussions of cosmogony, genealogy, ontology, and epistemology. Pō is a site of temporal and spatial expansiveness that accommodates, but does not necessarily attempt to order, all of existence*. (p. 2)

Warren's nocturnal ponderings of the Pō provide us with a dynamic, spiralling alternative to tidalectic from which to engage the Hawaiian diaspora. *He Kumulipo* has been a vital

moʻokūʻauhau for innovating Hawaiian indigeneity but we are most interested in the ways the cosmogonic chant might be used to deepen the Hawaiian diaspora, especially in the wake of the ongoing tidalectic between settlers and on-islanders. Consequently, the purpose of our research is to immerse ourselves in a different tidalectic between Hawaiian diasporaneity and indigeneity, one that suspends the settler in order to discover submergent strategies of transmotion from our prehuman ancestors in the chant. A new tidalectic encourages us to sink deeper beneath the severed-connected, inside-outside, on-off island relations transpiring between Hawaiian indigeneity and diasporaneity, so that we can breathe the dark ebb and flow of ea circulating below the surface. Following Kauanui's turn towards Hāloa and Papahānaumoku and Teves' gesture toward diasporic histories of movement and travel, we navigate currents of survival and transmotion in *He Kumulipo* to delve into the diasporaneity beneath our Indigenous connections to homeland.

Answering Kauanui's (2007) call to articulate diasporic frameworks, we approach *He Kumulipo* as part of an off-island, on-island collaboration seeking to empower the moʻokūʻauhau of the Hawaiian diaspora. In this article, we follow the framework of moʻokūʻauhau explored by Marie Alohalani Brown, Nālani Wilson-Hokowhitu, and David Chang (2019), with an express focus on genealogies of the Hawaiian off-islander. Brown opens this collection of writing diasporically, saying:

> *Nearly two thousand years ago, our seafaring Polynesian ancestors left their homeland, navigating the ocean until they reached the archipelago known today as Hawai'i. As centuries passed, our language and culture evolved to the point that we became a distinct people—the 'Ōiwi (one of several descriptors for ourselves). Two critical points here bear reiterating. First, our islands shaped us physically, intellectually, and spiritually: our 'ike (knowledge, experience, perspective) is grounded in the realities of our island existence. Second, our culture has always been dynamic and thus always evolving. Crucially, past, present, and future are tightly woven in 'Ōiwi theory and practice. We adapt to whatever historical challenges we face so that we can continue to survive and thrive*. (Brown, 2019, p. vii)

We read Brown's quote through the lens of transmotion, particularly the ways that our ancestry rises from an islandness reflective of Papahānaumoku's story. We also recognise the transmotion Brown emphasises in terms of adaptation and survival, as well as the tidalectic she identifies between tradition and innovation (Brown, 2019, p. viii). Placing her words in relation to our desire for new tidalectics between Hawaiian indigeneity and diasporaneity, we hope to use moʻokūʻauhau from *He Kumulipo* as a tradition to recall memories of transmotion from which to ponder innovative diasporaneities.

We conceive of diasporic, transmotional moʻokūʻauhau not only as collective memories of motion but also as collectives moving our memories. As Wilson-Hokowhitu writes in 'Moʻokūʻauhau as methodology' regarding her positionality as a diasporic Hawaiian:

> *When we go far enough back into our genealogies and the Kumulipo we find that we are all a part of the beginnings of existence and that our relations extend far beyond our indigeneity and our human bonds to the Earth, Sky, Stars, Sun, Moon, Wind, Water, Trees, Ocean, Rocks, and into all and everything*. (Wilson-Hokowhitu, 2019, p. 121)

If, as Wilson-Hokowhitu suggests, genealogies from *He Kumulipo* can move us beyond indigeneity and humanity to encompass a range of prehuman ancestors, we turn to them as transmotional kūpuna or elders who might offer strategies for deepening the diaspora. Moreover, we hope to contemplate *He Kumulipo* itself as a diasporic genealogy that can move a new tidalectic between on-island and off-island Hawaiians.

Reading *He Kumulipo* as a diasporic moʻokūʻauhau is an act of defiant self-determination and ea that transgresses how the cosmogonic chant is often used to centre Hawaiian place-based connections to land. Following the insights of David Chang (2019), we diasporise the cosmogonic chant to refuse the individualistic, heteronormative, nation-state kinships of settler genealogies that domesticate indigeneity and erase diasporaneity by binding both to concepts of homeland. As a diasporic Hawaiian, Chang turns to moʻokūʻauhau to transgress these limitations:

> *Because moʻokūʻauhau reveals the diasporic kinship networks that connect individuals across territorial boundaries, it has the power to give the lie to notions of the atomized individual and the coherent and bounded settler nation-state*. (Chang, 2019, p. 97)

Focusing on the reciprocal, queered, transmotional elements of the cosmogonic chant, we extend Chang's transgressive approach to moʻokūʻauhau by crossing the temporal boundaries limiting diasporaneity to a castaway origin in settler colonialism and the heteronormative nation-state, reconnecting ourselves to memories of motion in *He Kumulipo* as a way to unsettle our indigeneity today.

In the following sections, we read *He Kumulipo* from a transgressive island feminism approach that interprets the cosmogonic chant as a diasporic moʻokūʻauhau of submergent strategies. Here, we adapt adrienne maree brown's (2017) concept of emergent strategy to imagine and ponder Hawaiian diasporaneity in *He Kumulipo*, immersing ourselves in the subtle evolutions our prehuman ancestors developed to survive and thrive underwater. According to brown, emergent strategies are:

> *Ways for humans to practice being in right relationship to our home and each other, to practice complexity, and grow a compelling future together through relatively simple interactions. Emergent strategy is how we intentionally change in ways that grow our capacity to embody the just and liberated worlds we long for.* (brown, 2017, p. 24)

We turn to two kuleana kinships—the limu and lāʻau, the ʻoʻopukai and ʻoʻopuwai—to explore submergent strategies for deepening diasporaneity. We drift in the undertow of each of these kuleana kinships and submergent strategies as if they were ancestral whirlpools for further ponderings and contemplations by off-island and diasporic Hawaiians. Finally, we conclude our article by sharing our stories as on-island and off-island Hawaiians tidalectically returning to the Pō.

Photosynthesising our Ea: Ka Limu Me Ka Lāʻau

Hānau ka limu kele noho i kai / The limu kele gives birth, dwelling in the sea
Kiaʻi ʻia e ka ʻekele noho i uka / Protected by the ʻekele, dwelling on land
(*He Kumulipo*, Wā ʻEkahi, ln. 76–77)

Our first reading of *He Kumulipo* as a diasporic moʻokūʻauhau tells us how limu and lāʻau—algal and plant nations—collectively birthed kuleana between ʻāina and kai that are vital for generating interdependence and balance. In the passages below, we discuss metagenesis, fragmentation, and photosynthesis as submergent strategies that recall memories of motion integral to these ancestors' survival. Observing how limu and lāʻau live in tidalectical kuleana kinships today provides us with a basal understanding of Hawaiian diasporaneity thriving in the depths beneath settler colonialism.

The first ancestors mentioned in *He Kumulipo* were transmotional, tidalectical, adaptable algal life that originally bloomed in the ocean under the protection of ancestral deities: Hina, Kanaloa, and Nāmakaokahaʻi. The descendants of limu growing in the kai are the lāʻau living on the ʻāina, our prehuman ancestors who crossed seashores and shoals seeking ea and ola. The cosmogonic chant names several limu (coral, seaweed, moss, lichen) and lāʻau (plant) born as pairs in the depths of the Pō, including: the ʻēkaha and the ʻēkahakaha (ln. 35–36) the ʻakiʻaki and the mānienie ʻakiʻaki (ln. 41–42), the ʻaʻalaʻula and the ʻaʻalawainui (ln. 47–48), the manauea and the kalo manauea (ln. 53–54) the kōʻeleʻele and the punapuna kōʻeleʻele (ln. 59–60), the puakī and the laukī (ln. 65–66), the kākalamoa and the moamoa (ln. 71–72), the kele and the ʻekele (ln. 77–78), the kala and the ʻākala (ln. 83–84), the līpuʻupuʻu and the līpuʻu (ln. 89–90), the loloa and the kalamaloloa (ln. 95–96), the nē and the neneleau (ln. 101–102), the huluwaena and the huluhuluiʻeiʻe (ln. 107–108). These limu and lāʻau elders composed and tended kuleana kinships with each other, creating the atmospheric oxygen required for other life forms to emerge.

We observe and interpret these kuleana kinships as transmotional relations, owing to the movement of certain limu nations in the distant past from the kai to the ʻāina. A non-linear process involving multiple crossings to and from the ocean and the land, these algal ancestors eventually developed the critical adaptations necessary for terrestrial life: roots, cellular walls, vascular systems, leaves, branches, spores, seeds. In turn, these differentiations allowed their descendants to form communities and ecologies on the ʻāina that Kanaka Maoli would later depend on for survival.

Departing from settled perspectives of Hawaiian indigeneity and diasporaneity, we submerge ourselves in a deeper desire for transmotion found in these journeys of limu from kai to ʻāina. Relating to lāʻau as the diasporic descendants of limu, ancestors name diasporaneity as a basal precursor to Hawaiian identities from *He Kumulipo*. Tracing these memories of movement allows us to re-story the kuleana kinships between on-island and off-island Hawaiians today in a way that empowers the tidalectic relations between sea and land, limu and lāʻau, diasporaneity and indigeneity.

With very few exceptions, the limu and lāʻau paired in these kuleana kinships currently lack the adaptations needed to survive in their complementing pair's realm. For lāʻau living on land, this means a prohibition on returning to the sea that renders their relation to their ancestors moku, i.e., severed yet connected. Despite separation, lāʻau descendants are still pili to their kūpuna, fulfilling their tidalectical kuleana by practicing submergent strategies in common with their algal ancestors.

The first of these is fragmentation, an asexual strategy of reproduction that is also practiced by coral in the sea and kalo on land. Fragmentation allows many limu and lāʻau the ability to reproduce themselves when severed by oceanic currents and waves.

Whenever these limu or lāʻau become moku by the actions of the sea, their fragments grow entirely new bodies and communities capable of proliferating in abundance.

For diasporic human descendants, how might these fragmented adaptations inspire us to reframe our relations to land and sea? How might we continue the tradition of transmotion through multiple terrains, through embracing the creative impulse to make life, make kin, make art through, not in spite of, severing. How might we reconsider predominant views of fragmentation as an experience of loss or an accompanying longing for restoration and wholeness? What if we imagined separation as a strategy to connect, allowing ourselves to embrace limu characteristics to glide, flow, bend, and stretch new tendrils of curiosity and exploration?

Like the pūkoʻa or coral polyps born before them, limu and lāʻau also practice fluid sexual strategies for reproduction that trouble the cisgender binary, expanding the means by which we understand hānau and piko. Limu and lāʻau pairs like the ʻēkaha and ʻēkahakaha practice metagenesis or the alternation of generations which allow them to transform into different kinolau or body forms for the purpose of sexual reproduction. Assisting metagenetic reproduction is the fact that a majority of limu and lāʻau share intersexual, bisexual, asexual, māhū qualities that allow them to hānau in adaptable ways.

While life on land often required drastic changes for survival, it is significant that a majority of lāʻau nations today continue to keep and embody the metagenetic and māhū qualities their oceanic ancestors developed in the kai. For trans, queered, nonbinary, māhū off-island Hawaiians in the diaspora, how might these embodied traditions still practiced by lāʻau nations today be a source of trans, queer, nonbinary, diasporic ea? How might they provide trans, queer, nonbinary, māhū, diasporic embodiments of moku? How might we feel moving, returning, altering, separating, surviving, and transitioning when our bodies are homelands and homewaters in transmotion? How might we create queer, trans, nonbinary, māhū communities between on and off islanders?

The last submergent strategy is photosynthesis through chloroplasts, which allows a limu and lāʻau pairing like the ʻēkaha and the ʻēkahakaha to respire and produce food from sunlight. The ability to photosynthesise is based on an earlier endosymbiotic relationship formed by the ancestors of limu and lāʻau, a eukaryotic cell that assimilated a cyanobacteria in the ocean. The latter became a chloroplast residing in the former's body, granting them the ability to photosynthesise and produce oxygenated ea, a trait passed on to later limu and lāʻau descendants. Lāʻau today continue to maintain this kuleana despite their ancestors having migrated to a vastly different terrestrial locale. The connection to each other via photosynthesis is a welo, a highly valued inherited characteristic, and although most limu cannot survive living on the land and most lāʻau cannot survive living in the sea, this welo continues to burn on across the ʻāina and the kai.

Photosynthesis is an example of the kuleana kinship formed by limu and lāʻau nations in *He Kumulipo*, and is responsible for producing over 98% of the earth's ea. Despite their separation, how can the continued use of photosynthesis by limu and lāʻau to generate ea teach us about ancestral practices continued in the diaspora that connect off-islanders? How might the ancestral symbiotic origin of photosynthesis be used to understand diasporic relations formed with Native peoples in the lands where off-island Hawaiians dwell? What might the triple relation between limu, lāʻau, and chloroplasts mean for developing diasporic kinships across ʻāina and kai?

The kuleana kinship formed between lāʻau and limu nations is not just a story of biological evolution with species moving from sea to land; rather it is a genealogy of transmotion and movement that places Hawaiian diasporaneity and indigeneity in flux. In other words, the names and meanings of words hold as much power in shaping the view of the world in this cosmogonic chant as does the scientific exploration. Thus, the slipperiness of a limu nation like the kele seaweed can be imagined in character traits which can glide easily. Despite a capacity to sink deeply into the sea, limu tendrils can also slip and slide through colonial entanglements, with bodies limber enough to bend and flow within often hostile currents. Whether branched, bushy, bladed, fine, felted or fuzzy, limu offer their photosynthetic filaments in symbiosis, living collectively toward mutual protection and nourishment. On land, lāʻau have differentiated to take the form of moss on rainforest trees, catching and holding water in their lushness. Despite the dangers of moving into an unknown environment, the limu's successful motion has allowed it to build new reciprocal relations with tree families as the moss and lichen nations and expanding ea for all involved. If we consider lāʻau as the diasporic ancestors of limu who moved to land, what does this mean for Kanaka Maoli concepts of indigeneity developed in relation with those limu and lāʻau nations? How might we think of lāʻau and limu kuleana kinships in relation to a new tidalectic between Hawaiian diasporaneity and indigeneity?

Clinging to the Currents: Ka Oʻopu Kai me ka Oʻopu Wai

Hānau ka ʻOʻopukai noho i kai / Born is the ʻoʻopu kai who dwell in the sea
Kiaʻi ʻia e ka ʻOʻopuwai noho i uka / Protected by the ʻoʻopu wai who dwell on the land
(*He Kumulipo*, Wā ʻElua, ln. 191–192)

In the second wā of the Kumulipo, a plethora of fish nations are born in the currents of the sea paired with lāʻau nations growing on land. One of these pairings is the ʻoʻopu kai and the ʻoʻopu wai, which are names given for various fish (gobies, blennies, puffers) and types of taro in a kuleana kinship with each other. In our second reading of the cosmogonic chant, we focus on the ʻoʻopu species that travel between wai and kai as part of their amphidromous life cycle.

ʻOʻopu live the majority of their life in freshwater streams, pools, and estuaries, with species being found in various elevations on the islands, from muliwai to waterfall founts. Adults will reproduce in streams and pools when they sense an increase in storm surges and floods, depositing their eggs on rocky substrates that either develop into larvae or are washed down to the sea. In the kai, the ʻoʻopu grow into juveniles, developing the strength to return to the wai where they will metamorphose and travel upstream to eventually repeat the process.

This amphidromous transmotion is an adaptation and submergent strategy allowing ʻoʻopu to traverse the wai and kai. Expulsion out to sea allows ʻoʻopu to disperse themselves beyond their original birthplace, increasing their range and habitat. Importantly, ʻoʻopu do not return to the spawning grounds of their parents, seeking instead new freshwater environments to live and reproduce. This behaviour renders them moku from their homewaters, and is an adaptation to seasonal changes in river flows that may make a return more perilous to their survival. ʻOʻopu amphidromy thus emphasises the centrality of motion and dispersal as well as of cyclical returns that move away from streams of origin. Indeed, what is returned to in each successive generation is not a birthplace or homewater but the wai, the kai, and the movement between them.

Amphidromous transmotion as a submergent strategy thus generates a tidalectic between fresh and salt waters, as well as a kuleana kinship that draws Kanaka and kalo into the cycle. ʻOʻopu often select loʻi kalo tended by Kanaka as places to live and spawn, the patches offering shelter and food as ʻoʻopu clean the kalo of parasites and rot. In turn, ʻoʻopu and kalo are raised by Kanaka for food; at the same time, the ʻoʻopu would be declared periodically kapu, protected from consumption so that their nation could increase.

Kanaka, kalo, and ʻoʻopu thus enter into interdependent kuleana kinships with each other, expanding the nature and influence of the latter's amphidromous, tidalectical cycle to the ʻāina. Claiming the journey of ʻoʻopu between wai and kai as diasporic renders their relationship with Kanaka and kalo a collaboration with diasporic nations. Recalling this memory of transmotion potentially transforms how we view Kanaka culture and its connection to kalo by emphasising the role that an amphidromous nation like the ʻoʻopu play in tending to both as their descendants. How might notions of diasporic return be rethought using the amphidromous life cycle of ʻoʻopu who return to wai and kai, but not to their original homewaters? What might this expanded moʻolelo offer as a microcosm of Hawaiian diasporic and Indigenous identities? How might this kuleana kinship between ʻoʻopu, kalo, and Kanaka be considered alongside the moʻolelo of Hāloa? How does a Kanaka Maoli indigeneity grounded in kalo culture transform when tending to and tended by the diasporic movements of ʻoʻopu nations? Where are our next homewaters?

The next submergent strategy involving the ʻoʻopu includes an amazing adaptation of the pelvic fins. During their development in the kai, some ʻoʻopu nations transform to possess an ʻōpiko, a suction cup on their lower midsection developed from the fusion of their pelvic fins. The ʻōpiko allows these ʻoʻopu to climb cliffs and waterfalls to higher, more pristine freshwater streams and pools. Interestingly, the ʻōpiko provides the ʻoʻopu with a direct physiological attachment to the ʻāina substrate that can be interpreted in a similar manner to how Kanaka perceive our own piko as umbilical connections to land.

However, there are key differences that make the ʻōpiko a submergent strategy suited for Hawaiian diasporaneity. First, the ʻōpiko is created from pelvic fins that are initially used to traverse the wai and kai. When they are transformed to provide attachment to ʻāina, this connection functions to increase the movement and dispersal of ʻoʻopu on their journey upstream. Furthermore, unlike the piko of Kanaka that ties us to our birthplace or origin, the ʻōpiko of ʻoʻopu connects them to an amphidromous cycle and the birthing of new origins. The ʻōpiko, then, connects to ʻāina for the purpose of creating generational, umbilical spirals back and forth between wai and kai. How does this piko, developed expressly for movement by our ancestors, expand ideas of piko connections and adaptations? Considering this piko is intended to facilitate movement to regions that are increasingly remote, isolated, and cut off from access to other species, how might we rethink notions of diaspora as displaced, lost, and unwillingly exiled or abandoning? Using the ʻōpiko, how might we rethink relations to ʻāina as a means—not an end—for exploring transmotional diasporic relations based on clinging to currents in the wai and kai? How might the fusing of the ʻōpiko help us remember Hawaiian concepts of moku as a severed connection?

In order to travel between wai and kai, ʻoʻopu must develop the capacity to regulate their internal bodies in relation with the external water around them, and, in this process, we discuss a third submergent strategy of osmoregulation. Ancestors of the ʻoʻopu developed

osmoregulatory traits to survive in both the wai and the kai. In the wai, ʻoʻopu are threatened with salt loss and hyperhydration. In the kai, the situation is reversed: an excess of salt and a lack of freshwater can damage their tissues. Osmoregulatory mechanisms in the ʻoʻopu gills and kidneys work to resolve this dilemma by balancing the salt to water ratios in the fish and their environment. These adaptations continue to allow the ʻoʻopu to cross water boundaries and to process levels of salinity as they move, engaging their breath and ea in multiple environments. How might we think of the diasporic movement of Kanaka today adapting to multiple environments to express their ea? What can an osmoregulatory diasporaneity mean for doubling our capacity to breathe ea? Thinking with ʻoʻopu nations, how might wai and kai be seen as dual reservoirs of ea for diasporic relations? How might we conceive of hydration and dehydration to express the experiences of the Hawaiian diaspora?

He Hoʻi Koe: On and Off Islanders Returning

In 'Indigeneity in the diaspora' (2021), Hōkūlani K. Aikau asked how Hawaiian indigeneity is grounded not only in relation to the on-island but also through relations grown with the Native nations whose lands an off-islander may dwell upon. Adapting Aikau's research inquiry for our present investigation of the diasporic in indigeneity, we have had to constantly ask a mirrored question: How is Hawaiian diasporaneity sustained not only in relation to the off-island but also through the relations developed with the diasporic nations whose lands the on-islander may dwell upon? Answering them simultaneously has helped us to suspend the settler and consider a new tidalectic between Hawaiian indigeneity and diasporaneity, one we hope can circulate both in a coiling, spiraling kuleana kinship.

Circulating a new tidalectic between Hawaiian indigeneity and diasporaneity is an act of ea and submergence, one that allows both indigeneity and diasporaneity to be collectively determined by Hawaiians. Descending into the swirling currents beneath the tidalectics of settler colonialism, we echo Hawaiian diasporic artist and scholar Joy Lehuanani Enomoto (2017) when she says, "They tried to drown us. They did not know we were the sea" (Teaiwa et al., p. 145). Affirming Hawaiian diasporaneity, we discovered that exploring submergent strategies of transmotion and survivance from *He Kumulipo* could deepen our connections to our diasporic ancestors from the Pō to the Ao. Dig deep enough beneath indigeneity and the diasporic will rise out. Like the saltwater currents moving our moku, our diasporic ancestors from *He Kumulipo* continue to move us—to move among us—in this world of islands.

When we consider the many ways our ancestors in *He Kumulipo* adapted to their changing environments, moving from kai to wai and from kai to ʻāina, we may re-story our transmotions of ea. Kanaka today are (re)mapping these genealogies which travel not in a unidirectional or circular current, but ones which spiral around and across Oceania through and to multiple piko. We conclude this examination of diasporaneity by drawing on our ancestral lessons of reciprocal ea between off-island and on-island collaboration by honouring these multiple moku and piko.

We are currently writing from Mahealani's childhood southern California hometown, on the unceded lands of the Acjachemen (Juaneño Band of Indians). As a diaspora-born Kanaka ʻŌiwi now living near the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, Mahealani maintains a tradition of oceanic crossings and connections built upon the adaptations of our ancestral

journeys. As an on-island Hawaiian and diasporic Filipinx, Kahala empowers the diverse articulations of J. Kēhaulani Kauanui and David Chang, by spiralling their tidalectics to consider on-island kuleana to off-island Hawaiians and our prehuman diasporic ancestors. Our collective moʻolelo of traversing Oceania resemble our pre-human ancestor survivance as well as prefigure a politics of diasporic ea.

Answering Kauanui's (2007) call to name our diasporic movements as part of our moʻokūʻauhau, I, Mahealani, share this moʻolelo of multiple re/generative re/turns. As a direct descendant of Kalaninuiamamao, to whom this chant *He Kumulipo* was originally composed and dedicated, I extend his legacy by returning the honour to our eldest relatives in the sea, who remind us that our movements mimic their initial journeys. From our first life forms birthed in our oceanic home, to the diasporic explorations of limu, ʻoʻopu, and innumerable other species who ventured onto land to moku near and far, I extend this genealogy through the ebb and flow of my own time and space by collecting new stories in this tide. I connect to our collective moku and piko like the separations that connect us all beyond temporal and spatial boundaries. These movements spiral in ever new directions seeking ea and ola.

While pursuing my masters degree in Santa Barbara, I had a series of dreams in which I could ʻōlelo and oli, or speak and chant, in Hawaiian. Since I could do neither at that time, I took the dreams as a hōʻailona, or sign, that it was time to return to my father's homeland to learn my mother tongue and cultural protocols. Dreams and ceremonies are believed to be important points of access to the ancestral realm of Pō. Around the same time, my sister Jennifer Noelani Ahia spent time with her hānai mom who ceremonially 'adopted' her into Native American traditions in upstate New York. While in the ceremonial sweat lodge, my sister received a clear message from our kūpuna in the Pō that she needed to go to Hawaiʻi and re/connect with our people. Soon after, we both moved to Maui. Yet, more than a story depicting how our kūpuna 'called' us home, as if 'returning' is the ideal or expected outcome, both of our moʻolelo remind us how we are already and constantly connected, if we will only deeply listen within, and be willing to move with the currents. I continue to travel back and forth between Moku Honu and Hawaiʻi. My spatial-temporal journey is not unidirectional, but spirals through the seas that interconnect so many moku. This diasporic movement is the tradition that I inherited from my oceanic non-human ancestors of *He Kumulipo* and which calls me to continuously journey and carries me through connective currents spiralling from moku to moku.

REFERENCES:

Aikau, H. K. (2021). Indigeneity in the diaspora: The case of Native Hawaiians at Iosepa, Utah. *American Quarterly*, *62*(3), 477–500.

Aikau, H. K. (Ed.). (2019). *The past before us: Moʻokūʻauhau as methodology*. University of Hawaii Press.

Brathwaite, K., Mackey, N., & Funkhouser, C. (1999). *Conversations with Nathaniel Mackey*. We Press.

brown, a. m. (2017). *Emergent strategy*. AK Press.

Chang, D. A. (2019). Transcending settler colonial boundaries with moʻokūʻauhau: Genealogy as transgressive methodology. In H. K. Aikau (Ed.), *The past before us*: *Moʻokūʻauhau as methodology* (pp. 94-105). University of Hawaii Press.

Hall, L. K. (2009). Navigating our own 'Sea of islands': Remapping a theoretical space for Hawaiian women and Indigenous feminism. *Wicazo Sa Review*, *24*(2), 15–38.

Kalākaua (1951). He pule hoʻolaʻa aliʻi he Kumulipo no KaʻIʻimamao a ia Alapai Wahine. *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian creation chant*, (M. W. Beckwith, Trans.) (Original work published 1888). University of Chicago Press, 187–240.

Karides, M. (2016). Why island feminism? *Shima*, *11*(1), 30-39.

Kauanui, J. K. (1998). Off-island Hawaiians "making" ourselves at "home": A [gendered] contradiction in terms? *Women's Studies International Forum*, *21*(6), 681–693**.**

Kauanui, J. K. (2007). Diasporic deracination and "off-island" Hawaiians. *The Contemporary Pacific*, *19*(1), 138–160**.**

Reckon, A. (2003). Tidalectic lectures: Kamau Brathwaite's prose/poetry as sound-space. *Anthurium, 1*(1), 5.

Teaiwa, T., Banks, O. C., Enomoto, J. L., Andrews, C.-S. L., Teaiwa, T., Jones, A. L., Henderson, A. K., Cruz-Banks, O., Enomoto, J., Andrews, C.-S. L., & Jones, A. L. (2017). Black and blue in the Pacific: Afro-Diasporic women artists on history and blackness. *Amerasia Journal*, 43(1), 145–193.

Teves, S. N. (2018). *Defiant Indigeneity: The politics of Hawaiian performance*. The University of North Carolina Press.

Vizenor, G. R. (2008). *Survivance: Narratives of Native presence*. University of Nebraska Press.

Vizenor, G. (2015). The unmissable: Transmotion in Native stories and literature. *Transmotion*, *1*(1), 63.

Warren, J. L. P. (2017). *Theorizing Pō: Embodied cosmogony and Polynesian national narratives.* ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

GLOSSARY:

Akua
Deity or god.
Ao
Ancestral light, the period in the Kumulipo following the Pō marked by imbalance and the emergence of human ancestors.
Diasporaneity
A defiant diasporic and off-island Hawaiian term for transmotional relations flowing beneath settler and Native antagonisms. Diasporaneity rises from prehuman ancestors in *He Kumulipo* to their descendants today
Ea
To rise, respiration, interdependence, sovereignty.
Hāloa
Younger human sibling of Hāloanakalaukapalili and progenitor to Kanaka Maoli. The relationship between Papahānaumoku, Hoʻohōkūkalani, Hāloanakalaukapalili, and Hāloa create kinships of reciprocity and responsibility between ʻāina and Kanaka.
Hāloanakalaukapalili
Stillborn child of Papahānaumoku and Hoʻohōkūkalani who is buried and transforms into the elder kalo sibling of Haloa. The relationship between Papahānaumoku, Hoʻohōkūkalani, Hāloanakalaukapalili, and Hāloa create kinships of reciprocity and responsibility between ʻāina and Kanaka.
Hānau
Birth, to give birth.
Hina
Ancestor and deity associated with femininity, the moon, lunar phenomenon, seaweed, medicine, death, failure, and the basal regions of the sea.

Hoʻohōkūkalani
One of the mothers of Kanaka Maoli along with Papahānaumoku. An ancestor and deity associated with the stars and stellar phenomenon.
Huli
A kalo stalk planted to grow new kalo, to overturn or reverse, to search or investigate.
Kahiki
Tahiti, any foreign place.
Kai
Seawater, seaside, sea current, tide, lowlands.
Kalaninuiamamao
The chief for whom He Kumulipo was composed and dedicated to.
Kalo
The taro plant and staple food for Hawaiians. Kalo connects all Kanaka Maoli to our lands via Hāloa.
Kanaka
Kanaka singular human, Kānaka plural humans
Kanaka Maoli
Hawaiians
Kanaloa
Ancestor and deity associated with saltwater, the ocean, and the subterranean.
Kele
A type of limu and kalo, to navigate
Koʻihonua
Genealogical chant
Kuleana
Reciprocal and genealogical responsibility traced to He Kumulipo
Kumulipo
A koʻihonua and cosmogonic chant composed for and dedicated to Kalaninuiamamao.
Kupuna
Elder, ancestor
Lāhui
Nation, species
Lāʻau
Tree, plant, forest, medicine,
Limu
Algae, seaweed, lichen, moss, liverwort, soft coral
Moku
State of being cut or separated in two; district, island, forest, fragment, grove, clump
Moʻokūʻauhau
Genealogy, story, history of the ancestors for the purpose of tribute
Moʻolelo
Genealogy, story, history
Moku Honu
Literally 'Turtle Island'. All lands belonging to Indigenous and First Nations peoples of North, Middle, and South America.
Nāmakaokahaʻi
Ancestor and deity of the sea. A sister and rival of Pele, the deity of fire and volcanism.
Papahānaumoku
One of the mothers of Kanaka Maoli along with Papahānaumoku. An ancestor and deity associated with the land and geological phenomenon.

Piko
Fontanel, umbilical cord, genitalia, summit of mountains
Pili
Stickiness, relationship, kinship
Pō
Ancestral darkness, the period in the *Kumulipo* preceding the Ao marked by balance and the emergence of pre-human ancestors.
Pūkoʻa
Coral head, to rise up as coral from the sea
Wai
Fresh water
ʻĀina
Land, that which feeds and is fed
ʻĒkaha
Bird nest fern, black coral, a moss, a fern
ʻĒkahakaha
Bird nest fern, a seaweed, a moss, red seaweed
ʻOhā
Taro corm, offshoots of taro
ʻŌiwi
Indigenous, aboriginal
ʻŌpiko
Suction cup
ʻOʻopukai
Goby-like diadromous fish living in salt water, a taro species named after this fish
ʻOʻopuwai
Goby-like diadromous fish living in fresh water, a kalo species named after this fish