

WHOSE KAKA‘AKO:
CAPITALISM, SETTLER COLONIALISM, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT IN
HONOLULU

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
HAWAI‘I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

POLITICAL SCIENCE

MAY 2015

By

Tina Grandinetti

Thesis Committee:

Hokulani Aikau, Chairperson

Sankaran Krishna

Noenoe Silva

Keywords: Settler Colonialism, Urban Development, Hawai‘i, Kaka‘ako

Abstract

The common lament that Honolulu is becoming a 'playground for the rich', reflects David Harvey's argument that in a neoliberal world, capital is allowed to shape the city through the process of 'accumulation by dispossession'. Importantly, in the context of settler colonialism, accumulation by dispossession is always predicated upon the dispossession of the native, whether directly or historically. Recognizing that various logics of oppression and exploitation are constantly in motion, this project aims to critically examine the collusion of capitalism, urban development, and settler colonialism in Hawai'i, using the district of Kaka'ako as a case study. Engaging critical urban theory, as well as the insights of indigenous theory and its critiques of settler colonialism, this project addresses corporate-led urban development in Hawai'i as an ongoing mechanism of violence which works to superimpose a settler colonial geography upon the landscape, render indigenous geographies unintelligible in dominant discourses, and displace indigenous and other marginalized peoples in order to facilitate the accumulation of capital.

Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of professors, family, friends, and classmates who have helped me on this journey. That there are too many to name speaks to how fortunate I have been during this process.

I owe a huge debt of gratitude to the University of Hawai'i Indigenous Politics (UHIP) program. I thank my UHIP peers for the chance to work through difficult and often painful questions together. We read, debated, cried, discussed, laughed and held hands together, and all that in one day! Our brilliant professors Hokulani Aikau, Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, and Noenoe Silva taught me invaluable lessons about what it takes to be an academic who seeks to contribute to community. My classmates and professors allowed me the immense privilege of thinking about my positionality and my kuleana as a settler who holds a deep love for Hawai'i. My time in UHIP has changed the way I see the world, and has altered the way I move within it.

I would also specifically like to thank Katherine Xian for her work with the houseless in Kaka'ako, and her fight to end the criminalization of the houseless by the urban growth machine in Hawaii. She helped me to see the extent of injustice in Kaka'ako. Thank you, as well, to Kyle Kajihiro and Terri Keko'olani for taking me on a tour of O'ahu that allowed me to see how settler colonial oppression is embedded in our everyday geographies. Each of these tireless activists have inspired me and have shaped the course of my research.

Of course, I would also like to thank my family for their unwavering support through every aspect of this process. My sister always inspires me with her commitment to activism and her fiery dedication to social justice. And most of all I would like to thank my parents. In my childhood, they helped to cultivate my curious mind, and now, in adulthood, they have supported that curiosity in so many ways. Thank you to my dad for providing me with so much

encouragement and empathy during the hardest parts of the writing process. *Ippē nijē dēbiru* to my mother, a powerful indigenous woman from Okinawa, for inspiring my sister and I to be strong in our convictions. Most importantly, my parents take my work seriously, and believe that I can make a difference. I am grateful for that.

Last but not least, mahalo nui to my thesis committee; Noenoe Silva, Sankaran Krishna, and my advisor Hokulani Aikau. They have provided me with guidance and encouragement, and have each helped me to challenge myself as an academic. In my classes and conversations with them, I felt electrified and eager to learn more, write more, do more. I am so grateful to have had the opportunity to learn from them.

Mahalo nui to everyone who has supported me in this endeavor.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
CHAPTER ONE	7
INTRODUCTION: INDIGENOUS THEORY AND CRITICAL URBANISM.....	7
INSIGHTS FROM CRITICAL URBAN THEORY.....	10
INDIGENOUS CRITIQUES OF CAPITALISM AND CRITICAL THEORY	12
CHALLENGING THE LIMITATIONS OF WESTERN CRITIQUES	15
UNDERSTANDING THE URBAN IN INDIGENOUS THEORY	18
LAND AS COMMODITY, POLITICS, 'ĀINA.....	19
URBAN HONOLULU: CAPITALISM AND THE LOGIC OF ELIMINATION	22
PARADOXICAL SPACE.....	28
UNMAPPING SETTLER GEOGRAPHIES, UNSETTLING SETTLER COLONIALISM	29
LOCATING POSITIONALITY IN COLONIAL CARTOGRAPHIES	30
METHODOLOGY.....	32
OBJECTIVES AND CHAPTER OVERVIEW.....	34
CHAPTER TWO	37
KAKA'AKO: DISRUPTING COLONIAL CARTOGRAPHIES.....	37
KA'ĀKAUKUKUI AND KUKULUĀE'O: THE ERASURE OF INDIGENOUS GEOGRAPHIES	40
URBANIZATION AND COMMUNITY	41
FROM PLANTATION ECONOMY TO URBAN GROWTH MACHINE.....	43
THE BIRTH OF THE HCDA: PROPERTY MARKETS VS. SOCIO-ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	46
THE FIRST PLAN: URBAN SPACE AS A COMMODITY	49
URBAN RENEWAL OR KAMA'ĀINA REMOVAL?	51
SAVE OUR KAKA'AKO: RESISTANCE TO THE URBAN GROWTH MACHINE	53
TODAY: THE RIGHT TO KAKA'AKO.....	54
INDIGENOUS URBANISM? KAMEHAMEHA AND OHA IN KAKA'AKO.....	57
BRINGING THE MARGINS TO THE CENTER.....	60
CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS	62
CHAPTER THREE	64
URBAN RENEWAL OR KAMA'ĀINA REMOVAL? KAKA'AKO AS GENTRIFICATION	64
DEFINING GENTRIFICATION	65
GENTRIFICATION ACROSS THE URBAN SCALE.....	69
<i>TERRA NULLIUS/URBS NULLIUS</i> : GENTRIFICATION ON INDIGENOUS LANDS	71
KAKA'AKO AS GENTRIFICATION.....	75
LIBERALISM AND NEOLIBERALISM IN HAWAI'I HOUSING	77
CURATING COMMUNITY IN KAKA'AKO	80
CHAPTER CONCLUSION	89
CHAPTER 4	91
SYMBOLIC GENTRIFICATION: INCLUSION AS ELIMINATION	91
BRANDING CITIES FOR CONSUMPTION.....	94
OUR KAKA'AKO: CREATIVE CITY.....	97
SETTLER COLONIAL HISTORY AS A MARK OF DISTINCTION	100
CULTURAL BRANDING AS A ERASURE AND INNOCENCE.....	104
CHAPTER CONCLUSIONS.....	107

CHAPTER 5	109
CONCLUSION: THE RIGHT TO THE CITY AS ALOHA 'ĀINA	109
SPATIAL BOUNDARIES OF ALOHA 'ĀINA	111
URBAN ALOHA 'ĀINA: (RE)MAPPING HONOLULU	112
BIBLIOGRAPHY	114

Chapter One

Introduction: Indigenous Theory and Critical Urbanism

On the streets of Kaka‘ako, an urban redevelopment district in Honolulu, the contrasts and contradictions that so often characterize urban space are glaringly pronounced. Along the main thoroughfare—Auahi Street—shopping centers and trendy new businesses thrive. Hip, edgy murals by local and international street artists grace the walls of the more derelict buildings awaiting renovation and redevelopment. Residential high-rise buildings climb into the skyline, complete with all the amenities needed to ensure that Kaka‘ako fulfills its promise of being a neighborhood where residents can “live, work and play”. The district, and its ongoing renewal, is a vision of Honolulu’s new urban future: global, creative, sophisticated. But on the other side of Ala Moana Boulevard, Kaka‘ako is something else entirely. Next to the impressive John A. Burns School of Medicine, and the proposed waterfront site of the Obama Presidential Center, a houseless encampment of roughly 400 men, women, and children lines the sidewalks. Most of the community is made up of working families, and the majority of the residents are Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) or Pacific Islander. The community is subject to city raids and sweeps, when their tents, and all of the personal belongings inside of them, are confiscated and often disposed of by city workers. Applied to this community, the motto, “live, work, and play,” has a cruel irony to it.

It is this violent exclusion; but also, its more subtle manifestations, that motivate the

following exploration of the collusion of capitalism and settler colonialism in Honolulu's urban built environment. In Kaka'ako, less than 8 percent of residential units built since 2005 are affordable for low-income households, despite the fact that a 2011 State housing study predicted, "about 70 percent of Honolulu's housing demand from 2012-2016 would come from low-income residents." Meanwhile, the median price of a Kaka'ako condo has leapt 75 percent (from 335,000 to \$585,500) from July 2013- July 2014. The startling disparity between the necessities of social reproduction and corporate development poses several questions about urban process in Honolulu. Who is benefiting from the redevelopment of Kaka'ako, and who is being excluded? How are these urban processes experienced and articulated in different, and conflicting ways within the context of settler colonialism? What are the possibilities for creating a decolonial urban future?

In an attempt to answer these questions, this study seeks to examine the ongoing processes of urban redevelopment in Kaka'ako through the lens of critical urban theory, as well as the insights of indigenous theory and its critiques of settler colonialism. In doing so, I acknowledge that space is political, and take seriously Margaret Kohn's assertion that, "the social dimensions of space reflect the way in which places encourage or inhibit contact between people... They aggregate or exclude, and they determine the form and scope of interactions" (Kohn, 4). In other words, urban spaces are political, and they help to create and recreate the kinds of subjects they were built for. Just as we are shaping our environment, our environment proceeds to shape us. Recognizing that various logics of oppression and exploitation are constantly in motion, this project aims to critically examine the collusion of capitalism, urban development, and settler colonialism in Hawai'i, using the district of Kaka'ako as a case study. Ultimately, given that urban development in Hawai'i takes place within the context of

occupation and settler colonialism, I argue that it serves as an ongoing mechanism of violence by superimposing a settler colonial geography upon the landscape, rendering indigenous geographies unintelligible in dominant discourses, and displacing indigenous and other marginalized peoples in order to facilitate the accumulation of capital.

However, I argue that because this process of erasure and epistemic violence is a dialogical one, it is never completed; the hidden layers never fully erased, but in fact, selectively utilized in the ongoing commodification of the city (Rose 1993). Recognizing that indigenous geographies persist within a settler colonial system, I contend that corporate development must be problematized not simply in terms of local residency rights, conservation, or sustainable planning, but as the further expansion and entrenchment of this settler colonial system (Perkins 2013). By reframing these developments within the context of a history of colonialism and occupation, we are then compelled to frame opposition to these developments not simply as a threat to local residency rights, but as an ongoing act of violence that exerts itself differently upon different communities. The common lament that Honolulu is becoming a ‘playground for the rich’, reflects Harvey’s argument that in a neoliberal world, capital is allowed to shape the city through the process of ‘accumulation by dispossession,’ and calls for an analysis of settler colonial urban processes in Hawai‘i through the insights provided by critical urban theory (Harvey 2003). However, the fact that displacement most often impacts marginalized communities suggests that a critique of settler colonialism is equally necessary in order to understand how accumulation by dispossession operates in the context of settler colonialism in Hawai‘i. Finally, the presence of both settler and native landowning entities engaging in luxury development in Kaka‘ako demonstrates that we must better understand how capitalist exploitation can operate across the settler-native binary. Recognizing the importance of both a

class and settler colonial critique of urban development in Hawai‘i, this thesis seeks to engage productively with critical urban theory and indigenous theory in order to better understand urban processes in a settler colonial context. The rest of this introduction will provide an overview of my use of these bodies of work, as well as a discussion of my positionality, objectives, and methodology in the remaining chapters.

Insights from Critical Urban Theory

Connections between urbanism and capitalism have been developed in the fields of critical geography and urban studies, filling the theoretical void that existed between capitalism and its embodiment in the built environment (Harvey 2003, Lefebvre 1996, Purcell 2002). Traditional Marxist thinking viewed rent exploitation and urban dispossession as "secondary forms of exploitation visited upon the working class in their living places by merchant capitalists and landlords" (Harvey 2013, 35). However, critical urban theory argues that these urban processes are foundational to the general theory of laws of motion of capital. Recognizing that urban space is deeply imbued with political meaning, critical urban theory "emphasizes the politically and ideologically mediated, socially contested and therefore malleable character of urban space-- that is, its continual reconstruction as a site, medium, and outcome of historically specific relations of social power" (Brenner 2011). The importance of these connections was highlighted in 1967 by Henri Lefebvre, whose seminal work, "The Right to the City" signaled an important provocation to Marxist thinking by asserting the significance of space, and more specifically, urban space, in critiques of capital. For Lefebvre, in centering the factory and its workers as the vanguards of revolution, Marx had discounted the revolutionary potential of urban workers. It is these urban workers, disorganized, fragmented and dispersed throughout the city,

who can challenge the role of capitalism by claiming their "right to the city"-- a "transformed and renewed *right to urban life*" (Lefebvre 1996, 158).

The power of the urban working class is immense because the urban built environment has historically served as an important mechanism for absorbing capital surplus—an integral part of the process of capital accumulation (Smith 1982, Harvey 2003). Smith argues, "the logic behind uneven development is that the development of one area creates barriers to further development, thus leading to underdevelopment, and that the underdevelopment of that area creates opportunities for a new phase of development" (Smith 1982, 149). At the urban scale, this uneven development shapes the built environment through the cyclical valorization and devalorization of capital, immobilized in material form. When capital is invested (and immobilized) in the built environment, it produces a barrier to further investment in that space. The need for capital accumulation means that large-scale developments attract capital much more than smaller reinvestments in maintenance and repair. So, capital in the built environment is systematically devalorized, creating a rent gap that eventually creates the conditions needed for another phase of valorization. In order to create these stores of capital flow, the urban masses must be cleared out through the processes of creative destruction and accumulation through dispossession (Harvey 2003). The neoliberal state enforces this dispossession in order to facilitate rapid accumulation of capital, and simultaneously, the requirements for social reproduction are shifted more and more into the private sector. In doing so, "the right to the city" is reserved for capitalist interests, and ripped away from those who cannot validate their use of urban space through the production of profit.

The processes of uneven development are an inherent element of capitalism. However, in the era of neoliberal urban policy, gentrification becomes a "global urban strategy" for capital

accumulation. As Smith argues, "urban policy no longer aspires to guide or regulate the direction of economic growth so much as to fit itself to the grooves already established by the market in search of the highest returns" (Smith 2002, 441). The intensification of this accumulation of dispossession exacerbates the need to wrest the right to the city from capitalist interests. Drawing from this idea, Harvey argues that the right to the city is "a collective rather than an individual right, since reinventing the city inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power over the process of urbanization" (Harvey 2012; 4). The question, for Harvey, is *who* is included in this exercise of collective power, and who in fact holds the right shape the city. Answering this question brings us back to the issue of class; for, as Harvey explains, urbanization has always been "class phenomenon of some sort, since surpluses have been extracted from somewhere and somebody, while control over the use of the surplus typically lies in the hands of the few" (Harvey 2013, 5). The classed nature of this dispossession is well understood by critical urban theorists. However, little work has been done to understand the ways that both urbanism and capitalism are founded upon ongoing settler colonial violence, or the ways that neoliberalism—the economic ideology that views "the self regulating free market as the model for proper government"—has intensified this violence (Steger 2010, 12; Clarno 2009; Weizman 2007).

Indigenous Critiques of Capitalism and Critical Theory

Importantly, in the context of settler colonialism, accumulation by dispossession is always predicated upon the dispossession of the native, whether directly or historically. Like uneven development, this is a foundational element of capitalism. Patrick Wolfe theorizes settler colonialism as operating through the logic of elimination of indigenous peoples, but clarifies that, "elimination refers to more than the summary liquidation of indigenous people, though it includes that" (Wolfe 2006, 390). In other words, this logic entails both negative and positive

dimensions. Wolfe elaborates, "Negatively, it strives for the dissolution of native societies. Positively, it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base" (388). By acknowledging the positive dimension of the logic of elimination, Wolfe asserts, "the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler-colonial society" (390). Settler colonization is thus characterized as "a structure rather than an event," and it is with this in mind that we must recognize that the logic of elimination continues to undergird settler society (390). In the case of large scale, corporate developments in Hawai'i, both positive and negative dimensions of the settler colonial logic of elimination can be observed. Negatively, elimination is enacted not through overt physical violence but through the violence of dispossession, as many families are priced out of Hawai'i by corporate developers who prioritize profits over the right to housing and indigenous claims to land. While many "local" families are also subject to this displacement, the socioeconomic status of many Hawaiian families often means that they are particularly vulnerable. On a discursive level, the negative dimension of elimination works to delineate the boundaries of discourse surrounding these developments, limiting it to an intra-settler discussion and neglecting—or actively seeking to erase—native claims to land and sovereignty. Positively, these developments create spaces for new settlers; spaces that replicate the middle class American aesthetic and render Hawaiian geographies invisible within mainstream settler society. Thus, while critical urban theorists understand urban geographies as places of class-based capitalist dispossession, viewed through an indigenous perspective, urban space in settler colonial society is built directly upon histories of violence and dispossession against native peoples (Perkins 2013; Landgraf 2008; Wolfe 2006; Tuck and Yang 2012). Space, in the settler colonial relation, continues to be structured by, and help to maintain, racial hierarchy under a system of white supremacy (Razack 2002, 1). The effects of this racist

expropriation of resources continue to shape settler society today, and as Indigenous ways of being present the largest challenge to settler claims, they have also perhaps suffered the most from the violence of economic marginalization and displacement.

Viewing colonialism as a form of "structured oppression," Coulthard identifies a fruitful terrain for theorizing dispossession in the intersection of Marxist and indigenous theory (2014). As Coulthard points out in his reading of the first volume of *Capital*, "Marx's historical excavation of the birth of the capitalist mode of production identifies a host of colonial-like state practices that served to violently strip—through 'conquest, enslavement, robbery, and murder'-- non capitalist producers, communities, and societies from their means of production and subsistence" (Coulthard 2014, 7). These formative acts of violence were not only essential for the first emergence of capitalist accumulation, but for the continued reproduction of capitalist growth. However, while capitalism and colonialism are intrinsically intertwined through structured dispossession, Coulthard makes an important distinction between the ways that this dispossession is differentially enacted upon peoples. Whereas non-indigenous workers experience oppression through the exploitation of their labor (a theft of time), for the colonized it is registered first through the dispossession of land (a theft of space and place). Coulthard's work provides an important framework through which I hope to integrate critiques of settler colonial and capitalist exploitation, displacement, and violence within Honolulu's urban core. Coulthard identifies three transformations that are must occur in order to make a Marxist theoretical framework relevant to an indigenous resistance. First, Marx's temporal framing of the violence of capitalism must be rejected in order to account for the "persistent role that unconcealed, violent dispossession continues to play in the reproduction of capitalist social relations in both domestic and global contexts" (Coulthard, 9). Second, the assumption of normative developmentalism,

which views capitalist dispossession and violence as a historically inevitable phase in human progress must be rejected. Third, Marx's understanding of violent sovereign power as the driving force between capitalist dispossession and accumulation must be reworked to include the "asymmetrical exchange of mediated forms of state recognition and accommodation." With these three transformations, Marxist thought can be engaged productively in the emerging theory and praxis of indigenous resurgence. Leanne Simpson articulates indigenous resurgence as a rejection of the need to seek recognition from settler society, and a reorientation of indigenous struggle to decolonize indigenous terms, "without the sanction, permission, or engagement of the state, western theory, or the opinions of [settlers]" (Simpson 2011, 17).

Challenging the Limitations of Western Critiques

Coulthard's work opens up the possibility of a more productive conversation between historical materialist and indigenous theory. I see his work as an invitation to the field of critical theory, to recalibrate its focus towards the centrality of land and space as opposed to time and history, as primary means of understanding ontologies of power and dispossession. This is something that critical geographers have been crying out for, as a means of moving beyond the historicism of traditional Marxist thought. As Edward Soja writes:

Understanding how history is made has been the primary source of emancipatory insight and practical political consciousness, the great variable container for a critical interpretation of social life and practice. Today, however, it may be space more than time that hides consequences from us, the 'making of geography' more than the 'making of history' that provides the most revealing tactical and theoretical world. (Soja 2010, 1)

A temporal understanding of the world too easily privileges the current relations of power as an inevitable outcome of the progression of time and history. This historicism in part, explains the

secondary position of land exploitation in Marxist theory. To Marx, after capitalism moved out of the phase of primitive accumulation and successfully created a reserve of wageworkers by dispossessing peasants from the land and enclosing the commons, dispossession was, and continues to be experienced primarily through labor. Thus, the emphasis of the extraction of surplus through the exploitation of labor becomes the fundamental concern of Marxist understandings of capital. Spatial dispossession generally, and predatory urban practices specifically, are relegated to the margins of Marxist thinking. Critical urban theory however, challenges this marginalization as a major oversight, arguing instead, that such forms of exploitation "constitute, at least in the advanced capitalist economies, a vast terrain of accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey 2013, 53).

Indigenous theory provides a deeper critique of this historicism and its tendency to overlook the way that power and capital are embodied in space and perpetuate themselves by dispossessing unwanted, unprofitable people from land. This tendency is not just a reflection of the normative developmentalism of traditional Marxism, but of a fundamental disconnect between man, nature, and place within Western theology. As Vine Deloria Jr. writes, the most foundational element of this theology holds that after the fall of man, "the natural world is thereafter considered as corrupted, and it becomes theoretically beyond redemption" (Deloria Jr. 2003, 79). Through a time-centered worldview, the fall of man from Eden is understood as a singular event that changed man and nature forever, much like Marx's conception of an initial period of primitive accumulation. In contrast, Deloria looks to indigenous creation stories, which often "consider creation as an ecosystem present in a definable space," to argue that indigenous theologies are often rooted in a spaces/place centered worldview. These very different theological worldviews have vast implications, because the way we understand our relation to

the world around us, whether spatially or teleologically, affects the way we move within it. Here, I believe that Coulthard's grounded normativity provides an important recalibration of Marxist thought that addresses its theoretical limitations as well as its deeper roots in the Western worldview. Coulthard defines grounded normativity as "the modalities of indigenous land-connected practices and longstanding experiential knowledge that inform and structure our ethical engagements with the world and our relationships with human and nonhuman others over time" (2014, 13). This place-based foundation for indigenous decolonial thought is "oriented around the question of land-- a struggle not only *for* land in the material sense, but also deeply *informed* by what the land *as a system of reciprocal relations and obligations* can teach us about living our lives in relation to each other and the natural world in nondominating and nonexploitative terms" (Coulthard's emphasis, 2014, 13). Thus, grounded normativity asks critical urban theorists to not only change their understanding of land, but also, their relationship to it-- allowing the potential for much more radical and transformative insights and politics to emerge.

Importantly, this intervention also prevents critical urban theory from overlooking the indigenous and thereby perpetuating the settler colonial logic of elimination. This is particularly relevant to the growing body of scholarship that readily mobilizes a "frontier" metaphor in critiques of gentrification (Smith 1996; Colomb 2012). Though the portrayal of gentrification as a contemporary form of colonialism is fitting in many respects, in the settler colonial context, it risks turning colonization and decolonization into a metaphor that is disconnected from the real, lived experiences of violence against indigenous peoples (Tuck and Yang 2012). Anchoring critical urban theory in an understanding of indigenous dispossession as the "originary violence" of capitalism in settler colonies is a crucial step in avoiding the replication of this violence

(Coulthard 2015). Without this, anti-gentrification scholarship risks anchoring its critique in “a decontextualized notion of the commons which threatens to treat settler-colonial cities as *urbs nullius*—urban space void of Indigenous sovereign presence and land rights” (Coulthard 2015). This is a salient criticism, as critical urban theory often retreats too easily to liberal notions of the state and the commons in its efforts to reel in the power of capitalism, indigenous theory problematizes the dynamics of state power, and the idea of a universal commons. By taking indigenous critiques seriously, critical urban theory may find productive avenues for the exploration of radical alternatives to capitalism.

Understanding the Urban in Indigenous Theory

On the other hand, critical urban theory also offers important insights for indigenous understandings of dispossession. As Coulthard writes in his five theses of indigenous resurgence and decolonization, though indigenous peoples are increasingly residing in urban areas, cities are imagined as explicitly non-indigenous spaces. Just as the settler colonial imaginary has been dependent upon the idea of *terra nullius*-- "the racist legal fiction that declared Indigenous people too 'primitive' to bear rights to land and sovereignty when they first encountered European powers on the continent, thus rendering their territories legally "empty" and therefore open to colonial settlement and development"-- the settler city, particularly in its neoliberal incarnation, is dependent on idea of *urbs nullius* (Coulthard 2014, 175). The notion that low-income, Indigenous, and minority urban populations are lazy, unproductive, even criminal, and that their neighborhoods must be revitalized and made productive--gentrified--is used as justification for their displacement. The settler city, built upon indigenous geographies, is conceived as "civilized space" unfit for native ways of life, and continues to be accepted as a settler space. Whereas rural spaces are more easily conceived as contested sites where

indigenous resurgence is embodied on the land, in urban areas, the sociological and geographical imagination are confined largely to an "intra-settler discourse" that deems indigenous issues as marginal rather than foundational. While indigenous rhetoric and aesthetics may be co-opted by capital as a means of producing a distinct, desirable, and unique product, indigenous peoples themselves are denied the right to shape the city. Fanon recognized the strategic importance of urban spaces in his insistence on the need to connect the city and countryside in an integrated project for decolonization (Fanon 1963, Kipfer 2005). However, the absencing of indigenous geographies from urban spaces precludes the radical potential of urban spaces as sites of indigenous resistance. Better understanding how indigenous peoples are urban, and how urban spaces are indigenous, can help to recover this radical potential and upset the civilizational discourse that pushes indigenous voices to the margins of settler society.

Land as Commodity, Politics, 'Āina

As Deloria argues, at the heart of the settler colonial relation is a conflict between two opposing worldviews, two vastly different ideas of how human beings should live on this planet (Deloria Jr. 2003). Under the hegemony of capitalism, human beings hold dominion over the earth, and are meant to extract its resources in the name of progress and profit. Land is a commodity, to be bought, sold, stripped, and put to its highest-order use. However, for many indigenous societies, land and people are entwined in a reciprocal, even familial relationship. In Hawai'i, the creation story of Papa and Wākea, defines the genealogical relationship between kanaka maoli and the land, or 'āina. As Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa writes in *Native Land, Foreign Desires*, "genealogies anchor Hawaiians to our place in the universe" (Kame'eleihiwa 1992, 2). She continues; "the 'modern' concepts of *aloha 'āina*, or love of the land, and *Malama 'Āina*, or serving and caring for the land, stem from the traditional model established at the time of Wākea.

The Hawaiian does not desire to conquer his elder female sibling, the 'Āina, but to take care of her, to cultivate her properly." The relationship is not only familial, but also, reciprocal; "It is the duty of Hawaiians to *Malama* 'Āina, and as a result, the 'Āina, will *mālama* Hawaiians" (25). Importantly, this worldview shapes an ontological relationship to land, space, and place that is at odds with the capitalist mode of production. Indigenous peoples, then, have always posed a fundamental challenge to the continued maintenance of the capitalist system. As Tuck and Yang write:

For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous people's claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource.

Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts. (Tuck and Yang 2012, 6)

The theme of ghosts emerges in John Dominis Holt's novel, *Waimea Summer*. Set in the 1930's as the threat, fear, or awe of spirits in Waimea preoccupies the protagonist, a young, hapa (half-Caucasian, half-Hawaiian) boy from the urban Honolulu to the point of driving him to return to Honolulu as an escape. I find the metaphor of the ghost to be helpful in thinking about the presence of indigenous geographies in urban space. Like the spirits of Waimea, indigenous geographies--ghosts--are never erased, but are ever present under the surface, so that settler society must constantly negotiate, manipulate, and discipline this presence in order to render it nonthreatening (Holt 1976). The ghosts can be called upon to lend a level of intrigue, to bequeath settler society with a unique identity and a claim to the past-- but their power to evoke fear must always be mediated by settler discourses. However, they always pose a quiet, yet persistent and existential threat to settler claims to legitimacy, particularly, when they call attention to the fissures of Euro-American capitalist hegemony; when they command us to recall the

genealogical connection of kanaka maoli to the 'āina and the fundamental differences between viewing land as 'āina and family, or viewing it as production and commodity. Often times, this threat is met with an impulse to more thoroughly erase indigenous claims to land, but there are instances when these geographies become reluctantly incorporated into our political system. For example, State of Hawai'i laws permit Native Hawaiians to access private property if they can demonstrate that this access is a traditional and customary right. This accepted element of State law challenges Western conceptions of private property. As David L. Callies writes in *Regulating Paradise*, "the right to exclude others from one's land is a fundamental attribute of the fee simple right of ownership of land, and it has three times in the past twenty-five years been held by the U.S. Supreme Court to be a fundamental U.S. Constitutional right" (7). However, in this instance, the persistence of indigenous geographies based on reciprocal relationships of mālama 'āina supersedes and disrupts the hegemony of settler geographies based on land as private property.

Even in radical Western critiques of capitalism, this hegemonic view of land prevails. As Harvey writes, "land is a fictitious form of capital" dominated by monopoly rent and employed in the exploitation of the masses. This instrumentalist view of land, as a tool to be wielded by the powerful or the powerless, still fails to bridge the schism between Western and Indigenous conceptions of land. This is important to note because it reveals a profound weakness in critical urban theory's understanding of the relationship between the state and the urban social landscape. While critical urban theory can too readily retreat to the state as an arbiter of urban spatial justice, indigenous theory problematizes this assertion by revealing that the state, in the liberal era of capitalism, was no friend of indigenous peoples, and in fact, played an active role in their alienation from the land. In Hawai'i, while the liberalism of the 1950's and 1960's may

have produced large public housing inventories to meet the immediate needs of the urban poor, it also produced the very conditions that necessitated these cinder-block compounds. The urban growth machine, led by the new State government, defined progress *vis-à-vis* urbanization and the paving over of 'underutilized' land for profit. To focus on the neoliberal era and the intensification of the role of private interests then, is not meant to suggest a retreat to the liberalism of the post-statehood era, but simply to note the changing relationship between the state and the private sector.

The need to address this schism is evident in Hawaii's history of resistance in the 1970's, as it contributed to a wedge between members of an activist organization called Kōkua Hawai'i. Kōkua Hawai'i played an instrumental role in land struggles across the islands and fought against the structural violence of capitalist development that was alienating Kanaka Maoli and the local working class from the land in the post-statehood era. However, as Kanaka Maoli scholar Noelani Goodyear-Ka'opua writes, "For Kōkua Hawaii, tension developed between hardline Marxists, who emphasized the need to build a working class, proletarian movement, and emergent Hawaiian nationalists, who were asserting the need for Native Hawaiian leadership, for cultural revitalization, and for recognition of the distinctive genealogical relationship that Native Hawaiians have to the islands" (Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013, 10). The uneasy tension that has existed between class analyses rooted in Western epistemologies, and indigenous analysis, rooted in Kanaka Maoli epistemologies can perhaps, be attributed to this difference in worldviews.

Urban Honolulu: Capitalism and the Logic of Elimination

Drawing from the insights of critical urban theory and indigenous critiques of settler colonialism, I argue that the commercial and residential development of Hawai'i plays an

important role in maintaining the hegemony of settler geographies and in physically creating spaces for settler expansion. Therefore, the current urban development paradigm functions as an agent of both capitalist and settler colonial expansion on native lands. Identifying capitalism as a major driver in Hawaii's history of occupation is an important element in pinpointing strategic arenas of struggle. Rather than collapsing the distinctions between settler and native in favor of the distinctions between workers and capitalists, I intend to highlight how, in its drive to secure Hawai'i as a space for capital accumulation, global capitalism has an interest in displacing and replacing the 'undesirable' masses of Hawai'i, and is most threatened by indigenous presence because of the conflict between indigenous and capitalist worldviews.

Development as Settler Colonialism

Drawing upon Latin American scholars from the 1960's, Noel Kent (1993) applies a dependency analysis to Hawai'i's economic development. Kent posits that Hawai'i's economy, like that of developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, emerged as a peripheral economy within the global capitalist system, distorted and dictated by the needs of the core. Essentially, each economic period in modern Hawai'i's history--from sandalwood to whaling, to sugar to tourism and militarism--has received its impetus not from the needs of the people, but from expansionist demands from the capitalist center. Thus, development has been synonymous with "modern processes of enclosure" which are achieved "through the relentless drive to transform what remains of the commons into exploitable resources and thus into new markets" (Bowers 2006, 4). In this case, the commons belonged, and continue to belong to, the indigenous people of Hawaii, and their persistence on the land positions them as a fundamental challenge to the capitalist state. The processes of enclosure thus reflected the settler colonial logic of

elimination. As settler society constructed itself along racist lines, Euro-American settlers "established a system of economics that generally seized Hawaiian land and exploited Asian labor to create haole property" (Saranillio, 198).

The effects of this racist expropriation of resources continue to shape settler society today, and as Indigenous ways of being present a fundamental challenge to settler claims, they have been the definitive target of the violence of economic marginalization and displacement. Rooting this class analysis within a settler colonial context, it is apparent that the classed dimensions of development also reflect the settler colonial logic of elimination. The high cost of living in Hawai'i exerts the negative dimension of the logic of elimination, forcing many Kanaka off of Hawaiian lands. According to the 2000 census, "40 percent of all Hawaiians counted in the United States were residing outside of Hawaii" (Kauanui 2007 citing Ishibashi). While data is difficult to measure because this outmigration does not cross national boundaries, it has occurred in at least three significant waves caused largely by increases in the cost of living that coincided with periods of economic boom. During the territorial period, the migration was largely the result of military service and postwar settlement. The second wave followed statehood, and the most recent wave came as a result of rapid development in the 1970's (Kauanui 2007, 144). As tourism boomed and multinational and foreign investment flooded the islands, "developers evicted, dispossessed, and displaced many Hawaiians and other locals to make way for the building of residential subdivisions, hotel complexes, and golf courses," while military expansion resulted in additional land grabs. Of course, this dispersal did not solely affect Hawaiians, as demonstrated by the multi-ethnic anti-eviction struggles in Kalama Valley and Waiāhole-Waikāne. However, among local people who left Hawai'i during this wave, "Hawaiians were more dispersed than other groups" (Wright 1983, 18). Continuing out-

migration has accompanied growing economic pressures and alarmingly, those who remain in Hawai‘i are more likely to be unemployed, less likely to have a college degree, and except for those aged 65 and older, "Hawaiians living in Hawai‘i--especially families with children--are more likely than those on the continent to live in poverty" (Kauanui 145).

Disarticulating Native and Settler Oppression

Importantly, in the case of Hawai‘i, the settler colonial analysis is complicated by the fact that the settler population is comprised in large part by Asians who were brought to Hawai‘i as laborers during the plantation era. The history of the plantation era and the exploitation of Asian settler labor is illustrative of the ways in which the US, as a colonizing power *as well* as an imperial power, has brought dispossessed people into seized Indigenous land through other imperialist projects (Tuck and Yang 2012, 7). The multi-ethnic, working class history of this settler population coalesced into a "local identity" that has, in many ways, become a hegemonic force in Hawaii. As Haunani Kay Trask argues, it is through this identity that settler colonialism in Hawai‘i is naturalized as another "telling illustration of the uniqueness of America's 'nation of immigrants,' through a narrative in which "exploitative plantation conditions thus underpin a master narrative of hard work, and the endlessly celebrated triumph over anti-Asian racism" (Trask 1999, 47). The working class background of Asian settlers who arrived during the plantation era justifies this local identity and supports claims to belonging and ownership in Hawai‘i, while distancing Asian settlers from the dispossession of Hawaiians--the responsibility of which falls to imperialist haole. Indeed, as Trask writes, the politicization of the term "local" was "primarily a defense against categorization with haole" (50). However, as Wolfe reminds us, settler colonial invasion is not limited to a single event, and while Asian settlers were not

responsible for the immediate act of overthrow and occupation, their eventual political and economic ascendancy "was made possible by the continued national oppression of Hawaiians" (Trask, 48).

Importantly, in *From A Native Daughter*, Trask notes that early anti-development struggles were articulated through "residency rights" associated with a local identity, and framed "in opposition to the development rights of property owners like the state, corporations, and private estates" (Trask 1999, 67). Jacqueline Lasky cautiously complicates the settler-native binary by noting the ways that the politics of a "local" identity have changed, and how it has been used differently to meet different social needs and aims. In movements such as Kalama Valley and Waiāhole-Waikāne, anti-eviction battles were fought by multi-ethnic communities and were defined by "Localism", which Lasky defines as, "a uniquely Hawai'i identity category for multiethnic, long-time residents (this in contradistinction to local, with a lower case 'l' as a contextual place-based designation)" (Lasky 2010, 3). In her analysis of the anti-eviction struggles of the Waiāhole-Waikāne community, Lasky argues, "the worker-based Localism in this moment functioned less as an alibi for settler colonialism and more as a form of resistance to larger forces of American empire" (102). The Localism of the 1970's can be interpreted as having been recruited for "an avowedly pro-Hawaiian, anti-American project," which, perhaps, had more in common with indigenous reciprocal relationships with land (Lasky, 103).

However, Lasky continues on to argue that while a working-class identification helped "weld together Local subjectivity with emerging issues and identities of Hawaiian indigeneity/nationalism," (250), Localism has since "lost its usefulness because it has come to be articulated in ways that divide Local issues from Hawaiian issues" (11). Thus, in the late seventies, "the assertion of indigenous Hawaiian claims as historically and culturally unique in

Hawai'i began to characterize more community struggles" (Trask, 67). This shift allowed for a stronger assertion of Hawaiian historic, cultural, and political claims, and birthed a growing movement for Hawaiian sovereignty. However, the shift meant that for the most part, there is a center-margin division within mainstream discourse, as even progressive elements of settler society fail to apply this indigenous critique to their understandings of Hawai'i's social issues. In subsequent decades, the increasing divide between Local and Hawaiian has resulted in civil society itself becoming defined as an intra-settler discussion, while Hawaiian issues and counter-hegemonic efforts are designated as outside of this civic discourse and applicable only to certain arenas of struggle. This mechanism is readily apparent in capitalist settler expansion and development, but can also be seen in more nuanced ways in the articulation of settler social justice movements regarding development. Though many Asian settlers and other more recent immigrants share a history of being oppressed, exploited, and displaced by global capitalist expansion, they "will continue to benefit from and be a part of the larger system of US settler colonialism until Hawaiians regain their lands and nation" (Fujikane, 8). Thus, even social justice movements within settler society must actively work to address settler colonial power dynamics. This is important to discuss before continuing with a discussion of urban development and dispossession in Kaka'ako, because the issue affects Kanaka Maoli as well as economically and socially marginalized working class or migrant settlers. How can we talk across these differences while still anchoring the issue firmly within a critique of settler colonialism, and recognizing the legitimacy and significance of Kanaka Maoli claims to land, sovereignty, and nationhood?

Paradoxical Space

Here, Rose's notion of paradoxical space provides a useful alternative to the settler-native/center-margin binary that characterizes the location of Hawaiian counter-hegemonic discourses within settler society. Referencing bell hooks' argument that the margin is a problematic alternative because it is seen only in relation to the center, Rose argues that 'speaking the margins' requires a conception of paradoxical space "where theorizing is grounded in a felt sense of history and geography" (Rose 1993, 156). Indeed, if a felt sense of history and geography is incorporated into our theorizing of settler colonialism in Hawaii, it becomes evident that a cohesive "center" is illusory, and that the margin is always present within, and constitutive of, the center. As Perkins argues in his dissertation, the fractured geographies of land use and land tenure in Hawai'i (settler and native, private and communal, profitable and productive) are the result of the legal pluralism that emerges when a settler system is imposed upon a native one (Perkins 2013). By putting Perkins and Rose's work in conversation with each other, we see how this legal pluralism--in other words, the layered existence of multiple spatial regimes--renders the center-margin binary insufficient for theorizing land use in Hawaii. In this sense, every inch of land in Hawai'i is paradoxical, as it exists within two competing systems. This point is further illustrated by Landgraf's visual artwork which inscribes photos of long paved-over heiau sites on 'Oahu with text and images that evoke the hidden sacred history of these spaces (Landgraf 2008). Perkins' and Landgraf's works serve to remind us that the settler system's dominance over the indigenous does nothing to justify or legitimize the current occupation and exploitation of Hawaiian lands. Rather, the refusal to map indigenous peoples within settler geographies constitutes a mechanism of control. In other words, so long as settler society remains "blind to its own coloniality," the structural violence of colonialism will continue to plague Hawai'i

(Goodyear-Ka'opua 2013, 23). Urban centers, then, are sites of continuing erasure, but also present opportunities to disrupt the settler narrative by challenging what constitutes the "margins" and the "center". The concept of paradoxical space allows us to conceptualize Kaka'ako through otherwise conflicting frameworks: settler/native geographies and settler colonialism/capitalism.

Unmapping Settler Geographies, Unsettling Settler Colonialism

In order to understand the layered and paradoxical geography of Hawai'i, I find it necessary to "unmap" the settler geographies that currently define and construct our understandings of urban Honolulu. Richard Phillips writes, "To fundamentally unmap colonial geographies and identities, it is necessary to destabilize the terrain upon which colonialism is normalized and naturalized" (Phillips, 152). Writing in regards to unmapping colonial adventure narratives, he elaborates that it is not enough to contest the narratives, "but also to contest the terms- the language and geography- in which those narratives are constructed." In this study, I draw from this idea, but importantly, I recognize narratives and geography as *co-productive*. Thus, in engaging critically with the narrative discourses of landowners and developers in Kaka'ako, I am attentive to the ways in which Hawai'i's geographies produce and enable these narratives, while also being attentive to the ways that these narratives produce, maintain, and reproduce, settler colonial geographies. Particularly in the city, settler geographies often appear unchallenged as distinctly non-indigenous space. I argue that this constitutes a colonial cartography of recognition, which selectively maps indigenous peoples in permitted spaces that are often rural and undeveloped, while excluding indigenous claims from places that are marked as "modern" and developed. I consciously choose to use the framework of unmapping, rather than Mishuana Goeman's concept of (re)mapping, which she defines as "the labor Native authors

and the communities they write within and about undertake, in the simultaneously metaphoric and material capacities of map making, to generate new possibilities,” because of my positionality as a settler. I feel that at this point on my journey, my kuleana as a settler, born and raised in Hawai‘i, is to unmap and contest the legitimacy of the settler state, but I also feel strongly that to presume that I can (re)map would be replicating the violence of settler colonialism. I discuss the possibilities for (re)mapping in my concluding chapter, but consider my work to be a distinctly different project. Through unmapping, I hope to “unsettle” the geographies of settler colonialism, and highlight the fault-lines through which indigenous geographies disrupt the veneer of legitimacy produced by the settler project (Regan and Alfred 2011).

Locating Positionality in Colonial Cartographies

Recognizing the persistence of indigenous geographies and the paradoxical nature of urban space in Kaka‘ako, also provides an avenue through which we can critique classed oppression, while remaining anchored in the knowledge that this violence is connected to, and originates from, the violence of the settler state enacted upon Kanaka Maoli. Drawing from Smith’s “Three Pillars of White Supremacy,” we can begin to tease out the ways that racism and white supremacy are enacted not uniformly, but differentially, so that we are not only victims of white supremacy, but “complicit in it as well”. Rather than organizing (or analyzing) around *shared* victimhood, we look instead for the ways that “we are complicit in the victimization of others.” This is important for me as an academic, because, in unmapping the geographies of Kaka‘ako, I am also aware that I am unmapping my own geographies, and unsettling my own positionality as a settler in Hawai‘i. My mother is an indigenous woman from Okinawa, another colonized island ravaged by the power of the United States military. My father is a haole, of Irish

and Italian descent, born and raised on the US mainland. I am not genealogically connected to the ‘āina, and my family history reflects the larger history of settler colonialism in Hawai‘i in more ways than one. My parents moved to Hawai‘i while the islands were experiencing tumultuous changes to create spaces for new settlers from the US mainland. While their individual stories seem innocent enough, they are implicated in this history of settlement. At times, they were directly involved in it. For example, I recently learned that when I was a child, my mother worked for the Japanese real estate company that eventually triumphed over community resistance and developed what is now the Ko‘olina resort. As an academic and more importantly, as an activist, I am ever aware of the ways that I am embedded in the ugly side of the settler-colonial relation. However, I wasn’t always. I grew up in Mililani, a large, master-planned sub-urban community owned by Castle & Cooke, a Big Five corporation that holds an unsavory place in Hawai‘i’s history. For me, the history of my town started with the pineapple plantations that preceded its construction. Before that, I heard somewhere that it was home to a sandalwood forest. But the geographies of my childhood were those of Anywhereville, USA, in fact, Mililani won a distinction as an “All-America City” in 1986. It wasn’t until I went away to the continent that I realized the radical difference that indigenous culture created in my lived experience. I immediately became aware of the ways that American exceptionalism and white supremacy cast me as an “other”.

When I came home for the holidays, my “Uncle” would ask “Eh! So, what did you learn in America?” and I began to see my home in a different light. I also began to question my role in it. When I returned to Hawai‘i for graduate school, I began to interrogate that question seriously—a luxury that most settlers do not have. I also began to learn more about the powerful histories of aloha ‘āina resistance that continue to shape Hawai‘i today; histories that unsettle my

place in Hawai‘i while simultaneously opening possibilities for solidarity and challenging me to understand my kuleana as a settler. As I began asking these questions, I met old classmates from Mililani, both settler and ‘Ōiwi, who were embarking on a similar journey. Occasionally, we would discuss the ways that our community hid certain histories from us. One Kanaka from Mililani told me, as we sat pounding pa‘i‘ai, that as a Hawaiian Studies major at the Kamakākūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, he was searching for his cultural identity because, growing up in Mililani, he didn’t know what a kalo plant looked like until his late teens. As he spoke, I watched as he skillfully folded over a thick, smooth mound of pa‘i‘ai. Perhaps moments like these are what sparked my interest in the way that space is implicated in colonial and decolonial projects. If the geographies of my hometown served to privilege an American identity and create a space where settlers do not have to be confronted by the violence of colonialism and occupation that brought them here, what does it mean that so much of Hawai‘i’s development is being carried out in the same way? Understanding that the production of space is political, how can we produce spaces that contribute to decolonization and displace the geographies of power that uphold settler colonialism?

Methodology

This study combines methods from the traditions of critical urban theory, indigenous research, and critical discourse analysis in order to 'unmap' Kaka‘ako. I apply this analysis to redevelopment plans in Kaka‘ako, where the presence of both settler and native landowning entities engaging in luxury development demonstrates that critiques of capitalism and corporate development must be situated in the context of settler colonial violence, and vice versa. Using primary documents released by developers, regulatory documents dealing with reserved and low-income housing quotas, and State reports on housing and population, I seek to illustrate that

large-scale corporate developments in Hawai'i operate along what Wolfe calls a settler colonial "logic of elimination," while simultaneously capitalizing upon native culture in order to create a more marketable product. Finally, I use critical discourse analysis to engage with marketing materials produced and disseminated by Kamehameha Schools and Howard Hughes Corporation, in order to understand, contest, and unsettle the terms upon which capitalist urban development and the settler colonial relation continue to structure the built environment. Though the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is also a major landowner in Kaka'ako, I do not substantively engage with OHA's role in Kaka'ako. This is partially in order to limit the scope of this project to a manageable size, and also because the Master Plan is still in a community outreach stage and much of it is yet to be determined. However, as the plan moves forward with extensive community input and discussion about the potential to create a culturally rooted urban community, I anticipate many more questions to arise and many more avenues of research to open up.

In carrying out and presenting this research, I draw upon bell hooks' idea of "bringing the margins to the center". In choosing to analyze and interpret material produced and disseminated by developers, I do not intend to privilege the voices and narratives of developers and landowners as 'expert' or more legitimate than others, though I recognize the potential for this interpretation and effect. Instead, I select this corpus of text because I find it valuable in examining the ways that hegemonic ideologies are produced and reproduced through the "urban growth regime". How do these narratives shape the urban form in Honolulu, and how do they shape our collective imagination of what it means to be urban in Hawaii. Who is included in these narratives, and who is excluded (whether explicitly or implicitly)?

Objectives and Chapter Overview

On a practical level, this line of inquiry seeks to think about the ways that we can fundamentally challenge the overdevelopment and capitalist exploitation of Hawai'i. How can we work towards a socially conscious movement rooted in a sense of place and history that recognizes class politics as well as varying claims to land? On a theoretical level, it asks how we insert the issue of occupation and decolonization into the settler social imaginary and put critiques of capitalist and settler colonial violence in conversation with each other, without losing sense of the particularity of positionality within the context of occupation and colonization. On a personal level, these questions are my attempt at wrestling with my role as a settler in Hawaii, my responsibilities as a settler supporter of Hawaiian self-determination, my deep love for the place I was born and raised, and my profound and growing respect for the genealogical, familial, and spiritual relationship that my Kanaka friends and colleagues share with this 'āina.

In Chapter 2, I provide a brief history of Kaka'ako in relation to larger changes in urban Honolulu. This history is by no means comprehensive. My hope is that quick glimpses of the vastly different eras of life and community in Kaka'ako will come together like a flipbook, to illustrate the changes that have taken place in the district in order to unmap it, and begin to uncover the layered geographies that lay beneath the towering high-rises that dominate the landscape today.

In Chapters 3 and 4, I interrogate the marketing materials of two major Kaka'ako landowners, Kamehameha Schools (KS) and Howard Hughes Corporation. Because both of these developers claim to be building communities, their marketing materials can lend insights into what kind of community they are creating, and who is included, or excluded in this vision. As businesses, KS and Howards Hughes both sell the idea of community, transforming it into a

commodity that can be purchased. Thus, their promotional materials tell us more about the product they are selling, and whom they are trying to sell it to.

In Chapter 3, I explore the work of critical urban theorists on the topic of gentrification and uneven development. I then examine the current development in Kaka‘ako to demonstrate that what is taking place can in fact be characterized as gentrification of the district, and that this gentrification disproportionately affects Kanaka Maoli, constituting another form of settler colonial displacement. Finally, I use critical discourse analysis to examine the master plans of two major developments, Howard Hughes's Ward Village and Kamehameha Schools' Our Kaka‘ako to demonstrate who is included and excluded in the imagined community that is being marketed in Kaka‘ako, and how this settler violence is veiled in the discourse of neoliberal corporate development.

Chapter 4 takes a similar approach to explore the issue of symbolic gentrification. I engage with the scholarship that has emerged around the idea of symbolic gentrification, the "creative class" and the role of artists in the gentrification of neoliberal cities, and apply this analysis to Kaka‘ako. This is important because both major developments in Kaka‘ako have been marketed heavily as creative bastions in Honolulu, and have utilized indigenous culture and aesthetics as important marks of distinction. To better understand the role of the creative sector in Kaka‘ako, I analyze two promotional videos for Ward Village and Our Kaka‘ako. I demonstrate that the role of artists in Kaka‘ako's gentrification closely mirrors that of arts communities in other "creative cities" around the world. More complicated perhaps, is the way that indigenous culture is similarly employed by corporate developers. In order to understand how Kaka‘ako's developers are capitalizing on indigenous culture, I examine the promotional

video of Ward Village, which relies heavily upon the discourse of an indigenous "past" as a means of marketing Ward Village as a uniquely Hawaiian product.

Finally, Chapter 5 concludes this study with a discussion of the potential for conceptualizing the Kanaka Maoli demand for the right to the city as an act of urban aloha 'āina. Drawing upon Mishuana Goeman's concept of (re)mapping, I argue that an urban aloha 'āina would challenge romanticized and oversimplified notions of indigenous connections to land and place, and allow the potential to reimagine urban Hawai'i and (re)map urban spaces as distinctly indigenous spaces (Goeman 2013).

Chapter Two

Kaka‘ako: Disrupting Colonial Cartographies

In January 2015, Howard Hughes Corporation, one of the three major landowners in Kaka‘ako, announced that an ‘auwai, or traditional irrigation waterway, had been uncovered during the construction of one of Howard Hughes' development sites. A fishpond once thrived where the Neil Blaisdell Center currently stands, fed by an artesian well. Overflow from the fishpond was diverted into the ‘auwai and used to irrigate lo‘i kalo (taro fields) along its path. Records indicate that in 1931, as Honolulu urbanized, culverts were built over the ‘auwai, and eventually, the memory of this flowing water was lost. Beneath concrete and towering construction cranes, a quiet rush of water flowed from mauka to makai, forgotten, until an old map of Kaka‘ako led Race Randle, senior development director for HHC, to lift the manhole cover that kept it hidden from the hot Honolulu sun. Today, Howard Hughes is considering raising the ‘auwai and making it a central feature of the development's four acre "privately-held public park". As Randle said in an advertorial covering the park and the larger development, "It would bring back a bit of old Hawai‘i to the urban area" (Hitt and McGregor 2015).

Coincidentally, much of the ‘auwai runs along the area where Hughes Corp. was already planning to construct a promenade connecting two of its main properties, and had planned to build a body of water alongside it. Where the water diverges from this path, the corporation is considering the possibility of rerouting the water so that it can flow alongside the promenade.

The ‘auwai speaks to the layered, and indeed paradoxical geography of urban Honolulu. Layered, because in both a physical and temporal sense, the histories of Hawai‘i are still present

in the built environment, though sometimes, buried under a few layers of soil and concrete. Paradoxical, because these layers often disturb and challenge our understandings and assumptions of the space around us. While 'modern,' industrialized urban space is imagined as a distinctly Western creation—a product of Euro-American industry no matter where it occurs in the world—the presence of the ‘auwai is an unexpected reminder that the city is built atop the removal and replacement of an entirely different mode of life. Though Randle characterized the flowing water as a "bit of old Hawai‘i", replicating the usual language of normative developmentalism, the water itself challenges his assertion of temporality. If the symbolic power of the ‘auwai is not contained by the settler city, it threatens to challenge the legitimacy of the settler project. This, however, is the genius of capitalism, which allows the developer to harness the power of the ‘auwai in service of the profit motive. Once the life force of an indigenous agricultural land management system, the ‘auwai is disciplined and appropriated, as the "central unifying element," of a privately-held pseudo-public space; however, its persistence speaks to the survival of indigenous peoples.

Though Howard Hughes depoliticizes the ‘auwai, Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua's article “Rebuilding the ‘auwai: Connecting ecology, economy, and education in Hawaiian schools,” demonstrates how the decline of these waterways was a result of settler colonial dispossession, and how the restoration of these waterways have served as projects of indigenous resurgence. Writing about the Hawaiian charter school Hālau Kū Māna’s efforts to rebuild the lo‘i and ‘auwai at ‘Aihualama, Goodyear Ka‘ōpua argues:

The project of rebuilding ‘auwai and lo‘i at ‘Aihualama can be seen as part of a larger effort to rebuild indigenous Hawaiian agricultural and educational systems. The process is instructive for thinking about how Kanaka Hawai‘i and other indigenous people might

work for the resurgence of our cultures and institutions in a context of continuing imperialism and colonialism (Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2011, 60)

The restoration of 'auwai by Howard Hughes, and by the students and teachers of Hālau Kū Māna are thus two vastly different projects. But in each, the 'auwai holds both symbolic and material power. These conflicting geographies of indigenous knowledge systems and corporate urban development thus represent a space where settler colonialism is contested, and where indigenous self-determination can be asserted.

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the history of the Kaka'ako, and the trajectory of development in the district. This historical 'unmapping' is an effort to uncover other, metaphorical 'auwai and to assert that the geography of Kaka'ako is not "settled", but in fact, embedded in, produced by, and productive of, conflict and contestation over land and power. It is an opportunity to challenge development discourse that positions Kaka'ako as a new space by paving over and building on top of the history and geographies indigenous peoples. This unmapping also seeks to demonstrate how Kaka'ako's role in urban Honolulu has changed along with broader shifts in the global economic system, and how the space within its boundaries has been utilized in a capitalist settler colonial project. As Brenner writes, "the urban can no longer be viewed as a distinct, relatively bounded site; it has instead become a generalized, planetary condition" albeit, grounded in the historically and geographically specific context of place (Brenner 21). In charting the history of Kaka'ako, I seek to highlight the varied geographies that remain present and contested in current renewal plans. Like the 'auwai, these realms of contestation present themselves in the physical and discursive formation of the Kaka'ako community.

Ka‘ākaukukui and Kukuluāe‘o: The Erasure of Indigenous Geographies

Mapped within the dominant geographies of urban Honolulu, Kaka‘ako is a special district within Honolulu's urban core. It is bounded by the Kewalo Basin and King Street, and stretches from Punchbowl to Pi‘ikoi Streets. However, according to indigenous systems of land division and management, the area now known as Kaka‘ako sits in the moku of Kona, in the ahupua‘a of Waikīkī, and along the coastal edge of the neighboring ‘ili of Ka‘ākaukukui and Kukuluāe‘o. Prior to the late 1800's, the area, along with as much as one-third of the Honolulu Plain was made up of wetland environments, which made it a major site for fishponds and wetland food production. Native and settler accounts of the Ka‘ākaukukui and Kukuluāe‘o ‘ili report that the area was an important site of agricultural production and salt harvesting. Records from Land Commission Awards during the Māhele of 1848 show that the ‘ili of Ka‘ākaukukui was home to four fishponds, and the ‘ili of Kukuluāe‘o was comprised of fishing grounds and salt beds (Group 70 International, 2013).

At around the same time that the Māhele ushered in a transformation in the system of land ownership in Hawaii, massive dredging and infill projects began drastically transforming the physical landscape of the Honolulu plain to make way for wharves, harbors, and warehouses. In the 1840's dredging projects deepened Honolulu Harbor. By the 1850's Kaka‘ako, once a place of abundance, had become associated with sickness, housing a quarantine station during the 1853 smallpox epidemic, and a hospital for Hansen's disease patients in the late 1800's. Kaka‘ako also received a large influx of displaced peoples in 1899, when the government opted to deal with a bubonic plague outbreak by burning down infected tenements in Chinatown. The area also played a role in the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. The Hawaiian League, a secret society of American businessmen that played a pivotal role in undermining King

Kalākaua's government, formed a militia in 1887, based out of Kewalo Basin and Kukuluāe‘o (Group 70 International 2013). The militia used the threat of force to pressure King Kalākaua to sign the Bayonet Constitution, which effectively rendered Kalākaua as a mere figurehead at the will of American sugar interests.

Then, in 1896, three years after the illegal overthrow and subsequent occupation of the Kingdom of Hawaii, Sanford B. Dole, president of the illegal provisional government passed Act 61, which authorized the Board of Health to determine whether Waikiki's wetland environment was a health hazard. Subsequent in-fill projects transformed the former wetland agricultural landscape, which the Board of Health found to be a breeding ground for mosquitos, and thus, a public health concern. The decades-long project served to generate capital for Hawai‘i's construction industry, but also irreversibly altered the physical and cultural landscape of the area, displacing *lo‘i kalo* and rice field which provided the livelihoods for Hawaiian and Asian immigrant families (White and Kraus 2007). In 1905, as the ongoing in-fill projects facilitated increasing urbanization and industrialization across Honolulu, the Kaka‘ako area was used to incinerate waste from the surrounding urban area (Gibson 2011). Ash from the incinerator was used for more infill, including 29 acres within the Ka‘ākaukui seawall. The landfill continued until the State mandated that the City and County stop depositing ash at Kewalo Basin in 1971 and the Kaka‘ako Waterfront Park was built atop the site.

Urbanization and Community

Meanwhile, in the first half of the 20th century, Kaka‘ako grew into a thriving multi-ethnic, working class community. However, the growth of the urban population corresponded to the dispossession of many rural communities during this same period. As Davianna McGregor

recounts, the growth of the sugar industry demanded vast irrigation systems that diverted water from rural farmers and redirected it to the plantations:

“The impact of these irrigation systems upon rural Hawaiian taro farmers reverberated throughout the twentieth century. Cut off from the free flow of stream waters into their lo‘i kalo or taro pond fields, many kua‘āina gave up taro farming and moved into the city to find new livelihoods. Some of these families stopped paying taxes on their rural lands when they moved into the city and as a result eventually lost ownership of their ancestral lands through adverse possession by plantations and ranches. (McGregor 2007, 43)

Thus the processes of urbanization were predicated upon the dispossession of indigenous peoples from their ancestral lands.

By the 1920’s Kaka‘ako had become “one of the city's earliest residential districts housing the poor, pauper, working class, laborers, seamen, cannery workers, laundry people, ironworkers, longshoremen, truck drivers, fishermen and county workers. Portuguese, Hawaiians, Chinese, Japanese, and a few Filipinos resided in Kaka‘ako" (*Remembering Kaka‘ako 1910-1950* 1978). Census records indicate a population of roughly 2,640 in 1920. Oral histories suggest that most of the residents had never lived in an urban setting before; many Hawaiians had previously lived in rural areas, and most households of other ethnic backgrounds had moved to the area from the plantations, transitioning from plantation work to industrial jobs at the iron works or tuna cannery. People lived in clusters of small houses called 'camps,' which were named after their landlords, the street they were located on, or sometimes, the dominant ethnic group.

The district had a reputation as a rough-and-tumble area. One former resident explained in an oral history interview, "They thought Kaka‘ako is a rubbish pile place because they have an

incinerator... "Oh, you Kaka'ako? Oh, you rubbish pile." However, oral histories also point consistently to a strong sense of community, a place where workers in urban Honolulu could live affordably and in community with each other. Another former Kaka'ako resident who reflected on his childhood elaborates, "I don't care who that lived in Kaka'ako, all say they love Kaka'ako... Because we knew all the people. It was—we knew the place. I don't know, we'd sort of got a feeling that that's where we belong." Oral history testimonies often described a strong sense of community and personal ties between residents in Kaka'ako; community associations, usually organized around ethnic identity, would provide financial support for workers who fell ill, and the area attracted lively political activity, as "South Queen Street was often closed by crowds listening to their favorite candidates." The working class community produced an impressive number of respected public figures, from musicians like Gabby Pahinui and Don Ho, to District judges like Frank Takao and Kenneth Harada.

From Plantation Economy to Urban Growth Machine

By 1940, Kaka'ako's population had swelled to more than 5,000 people. However, in the post-war era, urban Honolulu was swelling as well. As land prices increased in downtown Honolulu, many businesses were forced out of the central business district and into neighboring areas. In the 1950's (cite HCDA), this transition was further facilitated by the Territorial government, which rezoned the district as industrial. Residents were evicted, or leases were simply not renewed, and properties were razed as warehouses popped up eagerly in their place. As one oral history demonstrates, though some people left the area because they found better jobs and eventually moved into better neighborhoods, many left because they had no other choice. "They cannot stay because the Ward Estate and Bishop Estate, they like throw 'em out, because they like... On account they change to the industrial zone, see. They won't lease 'em any

more... even the Japanese School was there but knock 'em down. They build up new warehouses." Another former resident writes, "In 1957 we were informed that the Aoki camp and others would be taken over by the Territory of Hawai'i for a redevelopment project and that all residents had to vacate the premises" (Gibson 2011, 139).

These changes reflected sweeping transformations in Hawai'i's sociopolitical landscape as the economy transitioned away from the plantation to one based heavily on tourism, and the Democratic "revolution" saw Asian settlers, primarily of Japanese descent, rise to political power in 1954. Though the election of 1954 was called a "revolution by ballot," the postwar Asian political elite, unlike its contemporaries in the labor movement of the time, did not levy harsh criticisms against capitalism. As Noel Kent writes, this class, "despite its working-class background and the sufferings of the pre-war years, never questioned the morality or viability of capitalism, especially a capitalism that had sufficient resiliency to provide them with the kind of wealth and position they could not have even imagined achieving during their younger, leaner days" (Kent 130). When statehood came in 1959, a prolonged and intense economic boom stifled and coaxed calls for populist reforms into more timid political gestures. Promises like breaking up the landed estates and redistributing 'āina to the landless were abandoned as the links between new political elite and land developers strengthened along with their political power. Politicians personally invested in speculative properties, and the merging of interests between politicians and land developers became a major factor in Hawai'i's post-war transformation; "It is simply no exaggeration to say that almost every political figure to emerge out of the Democratic revolution, or at least, most of his or her close advisors, invested in the boom by the 1970's. Every key institution of political power was dominated by or contained many who were investors" (Cooper 132). In fact, between 1955 and 1984, only 7 out of 43 legislative leaders (e.g.: Senate president,

House speaker, and chairmen of committees) had "no simultaneous involvement with real estate or the development business" (56). As monoagriculture industries gave way to the global market and hotels became the new plantations, the government sought to attract capital from mainland and foreign investment through the virtually unlimited expansion of a tourism development sector which encouraged land speculation and made it increasingly difficult for local families to afford to provide for their basic needs.

The wedding of political and corporate interests in Hawai'i's development constituted the formation of what Harvey Molotoch termed, an "urban growth machine;" a cooperation of local political and economic elite whose shared interests drive the ever-intensive development of urban land for profit (Darrah 2010; Molotoch 1976). Jennifer Darrah goes further to characterize this machine as operating within and driving the production of an urban growth 'regime,' a hegemonic project that helps to frame the meaning of land. Growth regimes are driven by the profit motive of private interests, but "succeed by propagating signs and symbols that frame land development as a public good" (Darrah 46). The growth regime in Hawai'i was fueled by a kind of colonial mentality that saw the value of Hawai'i as emanating not from the place and the people themselves, but from recognition from the United States and other foreign investors. In 1964, five years after the statehood plebiscite that saw Hawai'i become the 50th state, Governor John A. Burns reported:

The measure of the strength of our economy and the character of our society may be found, however, not so much in the claims we make but with demonstrations of confidence which others have in our state. An expression of this confidence is the fact that foreign and mainland investments in Hawai'i have increased from approximately

\$900 million in 1959 to an estimated total of more than \$1.5 billion today..." (Kent, quoting Star Bulletin 141)

Growth was viewed as both a driver and indicator of the strength of the economy, as well as the very character of society in Hawai‘i. That Burns referred to 1959 as a reference point in the shift towards increased "confidence" in Hawai‘i, is telling, as it gestures towards the relationship between the pursuit of statehood, and the pursuit of capitalist growth. Though Kaka‘ako was transformed without organized resistance, by 1970, as more and more land was besieged by the influx of newcomers from the American continent, a growing critical consciousness among Hawaiians and local residents led to powerful movement against development and exploitation of the ‘āina. Beginning in Kalama Valley and continuing on in places like Sand Island, Waiāhole-Waikāne, He‘eia, and West Beach, communities fought with varying success, against the relentless urban growth regime. The urban growth machine had swallowed much of the island, but also sparked a vibrant resistance movement that sought to protect more rural lands from being developed and more rural families from being displaced. This parallel history of struggle remains an important driver of resistance and aloha ‘āina in Hawai‘i today.

The Birth of the HCDA: Property Markets vs. Socio-Economic Development

The deterioration of the multi-ethnic, working class community in Kaka‘ako thus coincided with the formation of an urban growth regime that pursued urban development as a means of capital accumulation. After the district was rezoned as industrial, it gradually transformed into a hub for light industrial services in Honolulu. Kaka‘ako was dominated by small businesses such as auto-repair shops and small manufacturing companies. By the 1970's very few families remained as holdouts in the industrial district. By 1978, there were fewer than 2,000 residents in the area, and 93 percent of them were renters. According to a 1975 University

of Hawai'i study, 88 percent of them paid \$150 per month or less in rent (Observer). However, it wasn't long before these businesses, like the communities before them, became viewed as inefficient uses of urban space, particularly as O'ahu began to feel the burden of urban sprawl and accompanying traffic congestion (Observer 1978). In 1976, at the end of the post-statehood boom that saw rapid development across O'ahu, and a doubling of the island's population between 1950-1975, the legislature passed Act 153, defining Kaka'ako as a special district slated for renewal and redevelopment. The Act broke precedent by removing the district from City and County jurisdiction, and giving it to the State-created Hawai'i Community Development Association, a public corporation with an appointed board sanctioned to redevelop Kaka'ako as a "new center of community life, residence, employment, and recreation" by joining the "strengths of private enterprise, public development, and regulation" (Act 153).

On the surface, Act 153 was a response to the increased need for housing in a rapidly growing Honolulu, as well as a growing awareness of the impacts of urban sprawl. The Act specifically stipulated "the integration of residents of varying incomes, ages, and family groups; and an increased supply of housing for residents of low- or moderate- income shall be required as a condition of redevelopment in residential use" (Act 153). The HCDA was granted the power to implement inclusionary zoning that would create a reserved housing policy in order to mandate that developers provide housing units for low- to moderate- income households. However, from the outset, the district's three major landowners, Bishop Estate, Victoria Ward Estate, and the Dillingham Corporation, were wary of the reserved housing program. "They want prestige buildings and don't want the stigma of public housing," said Ali Sheybani, a planner with the Office of Council Services, in an article by the Honolulu Observer in 1978.

Still, in its early years, the rhetoric of the HCDA echoed its mandate to create a new, model city for Honolulu's various income groups. Its first director, Raymond Suefuji, articulated the role of the HCDA as one that would take an active role in shaping the district on behalf of the people of Honolulu: "The mission of the authority is to guide it [Kaka'ako] so it becomes a new city—new in so many ways, not only in buildings but in a new way to do a city" (Weekly). But the Act was part of a much broader ideological shift that was occurring in the US and the UK. Urban policy saw an emphasis on public development corporations, which were meant to encourage private sector development and attract investment to economically underdeveloped urban areas. As Allan Cochrane writes about the UK's 'urban development corporations,' these entities reflected an ideological shift in which inner city development was conceived of first and foremost in terms of property development, rather than economic or social development. He writes, "The corporations defined the urban—or inner city—problem almost entirely in terms of land and property, dereliction and a lack of development, rather than poverty, unemployment, or even, strictly, economic decline... The focus on property development meant that success could be measured in terms of the construction of buildings and their occupation at market rents" (Cochrane, 249). Ironically, and in the case of Kaka'ako, "attempts at the attraction or maintenance of traditional industry might interfere with this strategy, making it more difficult to market property to the new growth sectors in services and high tech industry" (249). Light industrial uses of Kaka'ako were thus seen as obstacles towards efficient development, and a focus on luxury developments that would command price points at the high-end of the market began to take shape.

The First Plan: Urban Space as a Commodity

In 1981, the same year that the Reagan administration began drastically cutting federal subsidies for low-income housing, the HCDA released its first development plan for Kaka‘ako (Keating 1989). The plan envisioned a city of towering high rises, connected by elevated walkways above the streets. Importantly the plan’s reserved housing program defined affordable housing as those units priced at a rate affordable to households making 80-175 percent of area median income. This meant that reserved housing was now designed to serve primarily those who made significantly more than median income, while those in the low-income bracket were now effectively removed as a serious component of the plan for the district. Incredibly, the Environmental Impact Statement completed by the State in regards to the plan actually stated that a staggering 75 percent of O‘ahu households at the time could not buy housing without some kind of assistance. The plan also stated that 70 percent of Kaka‘ako's existing building stock was in good shape, with only 7 percent of the structures in the district being in poor or dilapidated condition. The EIS went on to state that in calling for soaring high-rises, the plan would be inherently expensive, and would inevitably lead to high prices and a growing luxury condo market in order to ensure that projects remained viable and profitable. Thus, the plan subscribed to a very narrow vision of what it meant to efficiently and effectively develop Kaka‘ako; the objective was not to reinvigorate the urban core by providing housing for the working class, but to provide better financial returns to developers and thus attract more direct investment to Honolulu. It also signaled the HCDA's whole-hearted embrace of urban space as a not only a site of commodification, but as a commodity it itself; space becomes exchange value, and the "very general object of production, and hence of the formation of surplus value" (Schmid 2012, 55).

In fact, the final EIS bluntly stated that the growing market for luxury condos was already producing drastic changes in the neighborhood demographics, and that displacement was occurring along ethnic and class lines. It stated that while the predominant ethnic groups in Kaka‘ako were "Japanese, Chinese, Part-Hawaiian, and Filipino," the two large condominiums already constructed in the district "contain predominately Caucasian residents, although Japanese are well represented" (III-17). Importantly, the EIS also predicted that this trend would only continue:

"New Kaka‘ako residents are expected to be predominately Caucasian and Japanese... Because they tend to have lower incomes, part-Hawaiians, Filipinos, and most other ethnic groups are *not expected to be represented in proportion to their share of Oahu's population*" (emphasis added, IV-29).

Thus, the plan not only sought to transform the urban built environment into one that could more effectively produce surplus value; it actually sought to transform the social environment—down to the people themselves—into one that could facilitate the accumulation of capital in the urban core. Though the stated goal of the HCDA was to more efficiently develop the district in order to meet the increasing pressures of social reproduction in a rapidly growing population, the plan instead worked to cherry-pick what kinds of populations would be most conducive to the needs of capital. It is important to note that the boundary between who was excluded and included in this plan fall along settler colonial lines, explicitly privileging White settlers in the vision of a new Kaka‘ako, and thus reflecting the intersectionality of classed and raced violence that has shaped urban Honolulu.

Public comments included in the EIS levied harsh criticisms against the HCDA and its new plan for Kaka‘ako. Among a multitude of other community voices, the Consumer Housing Task Force wrote a letter to the HCDA stating,

"The Legislation [Act 153] definitely establishes the mandate that the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako will ensure the development of low-moderate income housing. However, throughout the EIS most of the "affordable" housing described is moderate-income housing, not low income housing. Low to moderate-income housing is described as 80-175 percent of the median income as published by the Department of Housing and Urban Development... In no programs that I know has moderate income ever been described as 175 percent of the median income" (V-85).

The HCDA's written response to the above criticism and the subsequent suggestion to require a 25 percent housing reserve for households making 51-80 percent AMI was that "given present economic conditions, it is unrealistic to appropriate sufficient funds to subsidize 25 percent of future Kaka‘ako housing units to be affordable by families with 51 percent to 80 percent of median income" (V-86). It continued, "the Kaka‘ako plan could stifle development of housing in Kaka‘ako if it required excessive private sales of new housing units at less than cost" (V-86). The response echoed the neoliberal mantra of austerity, which was growing louder and louder around the world, starving the public sector of funds with which to provide for social needs, and then arguing that these conditions of austerity are precisely the reason that we cannot ask too much of corporate interests for fear of scaring away much needed revenue.

Urban Renewal or Kama‘āina Removal?

When Rex Johnson, a former construction industry executive, replaced Suefuji as director of the HCDA in 1983, the power of the profit motive was made clear. Whereas Suefuji's rhetoric

described the role of the HCDA in terms of "guiding" development and directing capital to ensure the creation of a model city, Johnson explicitly prioritized the HCDA's role in ensuring active private sector investment and development, stating that he was against forcing developers to provide lower income housing through inclusionary zoning. When asked about the HCDA's mission, he stated, "to give people the incentive to develop, that in my judgement is what the HCDA is set up to do" (Steele 1990, 6). In the years that followed, affordable housing became a point of controversy in Kaka'ako. In November 1990, the Honolulu Weekly's cover read, "Kaka'ako: Urban Renewal or Kama'āina Removal," with an accompanying illustration depicting sinister looking black high-rises, their windows shaped into crazed grins, with dollar signs in their eyes. Flags waved from the tops of the buildings, reading, "Sky's the Limit!" "Penthouse Luxury? Not 4 U," and "AFFORDABLE! But Not 4 U". The article stated that most developers had been allowed to buy out of their reserved housing requirements with a cash in-lieu payment of just two percent of gross receipts. The payments were meant to provide the state with revenue to produce more public-led affordable housing projects, however, cash in-lieu payments were so low that the two state affordable housing projects slated at the time were 90 percent dependent on public funding. To make matters worse, because developers opted to pay cash in-lieu of their reserved requirements for so many projects, only 2 percent of the 1,430 newly developed units in Kaka'ako were affordable. With 98 percent of units out of reach for 75 percent of local residents, approximately 50 percent of apartment owners in Kaka'ako in 1990 were foreign nationals, and many more were from the mainland United States (Steele 1990, 6).

The neoliberal imperative of employing city space as an incubator for capitalist growth became increasingly hegemonic and emboldened developers in their calls for uninhibited control over development in the district. As Colin DeSilva, developer of the Imperial Plaza argued at an

HCDA hearing, the public needed to be "bold enough" to reject the enforcement of a mixed-income neighborhood. "Your challenge," he told community members, "is to allow people to live where they are comfortable" (Steele 1990, 6). Though the district was once promised to low- to moderate-income working class residents, it was in fact, being used for investment and tax purposes by a capitalist elite with largely disconnected from the island elite. And, while the rapid development of Kaka'ako envisioned by the urban growth machine was stifled by a recession in the early 1990's, the basic plan for Kaka'ako remained the same, with large landowners simply awaiting an inevitable upturn in the real estate market.

Save Our Kaka'ako: Resistance to the Urban Growth Machine

Today, the rush to develop Kaka'ako has been revived, and the district has again become a site of contestation between the urban growth regime and local residents. A reinvigorated HCDA again seeks to fuel the urban growth machine through the "orchestration of investment process dynamics and the provision of key public investments at the right place and time to promote success in inter-urban and inter-regional competition" (Harvey 2013, 102). The latest conflict began in 2005, when the HCDA put out a request for proposals to develop the waterfront at Kaka'ako, eventually selecting Alexander & Baldwin, a multinational corporation that traces its roots to the "Big Five" of Hawai'i's sugarcane industry, to overhaul the 36.5 acres of waterfront property in Kaka'ako Makai. In exchange for development rights to the state-owned land, A&B would be responsible for providing public amenities and performing environmental remediation of the site, which was in fact, a landfill until 1971. However, the corporation also planned to build a complex of residential and commercial properties alongside the waterfront promenade. This sparked a coalition of small businesses, residents, surfers, bodyboarders, and boaters to rise up to challenge the enclosure of one of the few stretches of water in urban

Honolulu that had evaded the grip of commercial tourism and private development. Though Kaka‘ako no longer boasted a large and tight-knit residential community, it was initially a connection to the ocean as a public commons that brought the Save Our Kaka‘ako Coalition together. The Coalition fought for the preservation of public space, and against privatization of the coastline. A&B tried to appease the movement by offering to decrease building density and add more parking for public access to the beach. But the movement made clear that their opposition was also rooted in a class critique of the kind of corporate development that was proposed. As one member of the Coalition articulated, "it was local people going, 'Stop, we want something that is ours. And that Point Panic surf spot is ours. And damn it we're going to make sure it stays ours. And don't start building these things for rich people, because those high-rises were not for us" (Darrah 2010, 324). These claims to place and belonging, articulated in terms of a working-class "Local" identity, challenged the paradigm that prioritized land as a commodity for development by providing a different narrative of the value of this urban space. Eventually, the Coalition succeeded in passing House Bill 2555, which prohibited the sale of the state property to a private developer and banned residential development in Kaka‘ako Makai. It also formalized a certain level of citizen control over the area by requiring the HCDA to consult with a citizen's coalition called the Community Planning Advisory Council.

Today: The Right to Kaka‘ako

While the Save Our Kaka‘ako Coalition won a major victory in Kaka‘ako Makai, the conflict was just the beginning of the latest incarnation of the struggle over the district. In the midst of a real estate boom, the HCDA and the district's three major landowners have brought sweeping changes to Kaka‘ako. Howard Hughes Corporation has begun developing Ward Village, Kamehameha Schools is creating Our Kaka‘ako, and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs is

currently in the process of creating a master plan for its property in Kaka‘ako Makai. All in all, the current plans for Kaka‘ako are fairly similar to the vision that the HCDA set forth in 1981, but this time, they are more consciously dressed up in the rhetoric of 'smart growth' and its catchphrase "live, work, play." Smart growth, a set of principles that emphasizes mixed-use development with a variety of housing and transportation options, has become almost dogmatic in the discourse of urban planning. Intended to create livable, walkable communities that provide an alternative to suburban sprawl, the widespread acceptance of smart growth as a "new" paradigm for urban development rests perhaps, on the fact that while the inevitability of "growth" is taken as an assumption, "smart" remains an empty signifier. Thus, the term smart growth can be applied as easily to development projects in urban Kaka‘ako as it can be to residential development projects on prime agricultural lands in Ho‘opili and Koa Ridge. The rhetoric of smart growth thus represents a neoliberal approach to local and regional planning; "Smart growth, it would seem, brings together those who want a new paradigm for suburban development and those who seek a housing market unfettered by governmental intervention" (Krueger and Gibbs 2008, 1264).

The intimate connection between neoliberal capitalism and settler colonialism is demonstrated in the HCDA's close ties to real estate development interest. An April 2014 *Star Advertiser* article noted that then-governor Neil Abercrombie’s biggest campaign contributors were "individuals with ties to development-related firms with interests in Kaka‘ako," and the HCDA's three community board member posts were all held by businessmen representing development or construction firms (Gomes, 2014). Brian Tamamoto of Kobayashi Group (which has interests in condominium tower development and is Abercrombie's second-biggest contributor) was chosen over Kaka‘ako resident Mat D'Ascoli and Henry Jin Yoon of Café Duck

Butt, a small business in the neighborhood (Gomes). The collusion between the state and corporate developers, and worries of unchecked development prompted public outcry that resulted in the drafting of 17 legislative bills aimed at reeling in the HCDA. The Save Our Kaka‘ako Coalition swelled to include the Friends of Kewalos, Save Our Surf, Da Hui, Hawai‘i State Bodysurfing Association, Surfrider Foundation, CPAC, Kaka‘ako United, Kaka‘ako Small Business Association, Life of the Land, Na Kūpuna Moku O Keawe, Na Kūpuna Moku O Kakuhihewa and Hawai‘i Thousand Friends. The Coalition has rallied against the HCDA, while making clear that they are not anti-development, but rather, question whether the HCDA's guidelines for affordable housing are truly affordable to working families, whether there is enough infrastructure to support Kaka‘ako's rapid growth, and whether the HCDA has facilitated development for Hawai‘i's people, or for the sake of the developers. Interestingly, while the concern for housing for the people of Hawai‘i is central to the opposition of current development efforts in Kaka‘ako, the list of organizations in the Save Our Kaka‘ako Coalition highlights the potential of alternative narratives of place to disrupt capitalist claims to urban space. Many of them, such as Da Hui, Hawai‘i State Body Boarding Association, and Surfrider Foundation are centered around a relationship to the ocean—recreational or environmental, but not commercial. Others, like Save our Surf, are intimately tied to the history of resistance to land development on O‘ahu, while Na Kūpuna Moku o Keawe and Na Kūpuna Moku O Kakuhihewa are tied to genealogical relationships to land. Understanding land through a connection to the ocean or a connection to ancestors perhaps contributes to a stronger claim to the "right to the city" as it exposes the fault lines in the capitalist narrative as land and urban space as a commodity. It posits this right based on notions other than private property, and confronts the state with the

assertion that these claims are as legitimate, if not *more* legitimate, than the ability to extract profit from the land.

Indigenous Urbanism? Kamehameha and OHA in Kaka‘ako

Complicating the preceding description of competing narratives of place in Kaka‘ako, is the role that indigenous institutions play in development efforts. Two powerful Native Hawaiian institutions, Kamehameha Schools and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, are a part of the rush to capitalize on Kaka‘ako's rising land value. Kamehameha Schools, a charitable trust that also operates as an educational institution for Native Hawaiians, owns 52 acres in Kaka‘ako, and plans to develop on 29 of those. The trust's master plan--called Our Kaka‘ako--includes adding 2,750 new residential units in seven high-rises, as well as commercial centers for art and shopping. Kamehameha Schools' influence in Kaka‘ako has already been tremendous; it has provided funding for many of the artists and small businesses that first began changing the face of the area, and it hosts regular community events like Honolulu Night Market, Eat the Street, and Pow!Wow! Hawai‘i. However, the trust's development plans have not always been welcomed. One proposed development, consisting of high-rise and mid-rise buildings met fierce public resistance, "inciting a community group called Kaka‘ako Ūnited (KŪ) to file a petition with HCDA to contest the state's decision to approve it" (Hofschneider 2014). Importantly, criticism has also come from the Hawaiian community. At a panel session hosted by Civil Beat, Kamehameha alumni posed several questions about how the development plans serve Kamehameha's mission "to fulfill Pauahi's desire to create educational opportunities in perpetuity to improve the capability and well-being of people of Hawaiian ancestry." One Kamehameha graduate brought this mission statement into relation with the houseless on the streets of Kaka‘ako, asking how the development--whose rental units are reserved for those making 100%

of the AMI (roughly \$57,000 for a single person) provides for the underserved within the Hawaiian community. The answer offered by Vice President for Endowment, Elizabeth Hokada was that the projects of the school are supported "approximately 98 percent, by the returns from the endowment fund. So the endowment fund produces returns through activities like renting space, developing real estate, and we also have a global portfolio, so that Pauahi's money is put to work around the world to earn money to support the mission of Kamehameha Schools" (*Civil Cafe with Kamehameha Schools* 2014). An audience member added in support of Hokada, "Hawaiians are graduating now from Kamehameha Schools, going to some of the best schools in the country, and they're coming back and working for some of the largest corporations, and they're in the development business... I think those who are able to go to the school and benefit from it are going to be the beneficiaries because they are going to be able to afford it, and twenty years ago they wouldn't have been able to afford it" (*Civil Cafe*). Both of these statements, while expressing support for Hawaiians, also ascribe to the hegemonic model of neoliberal success, where participation in the global economy, and particularly the corporate economy, is an indicator of success and modernization for settler and native alike. The question of who gets to be included in the Kaka'ako community then becomes a question of who can function and succeed according to this neoliberal model. This model fails to identify capitalism as one of the driving forces behind settler colonialism and Hawai'i's occupation, and conceptualizes capitalism as friendly, rather than antagonistic, towards indigenous peoples and their self-determination, as well as to community building.

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) also has stakes in Kaka'ako development. In 2012, the State of Hawai'i transferred 10 parcels of land in Kaka'ako Makai valued at roughly \$200 million to OHA in order to settle "ceded" land revenue claims that date back to 1978

("OHA-State Settlement Agreement" 2012). While OHA stated that it would have preferred cash from the state, it acknowledged that the current economic environment did not make that a viable option, and that Kaka‘ako Makai instead presented an opportunity to generate revenue and expand OHA's portfolio ("Public Land Trust Proposed Settlement" 2012). When the agreement was being drafted, Senator Malama Solomon criticized the settlement, arguing that it did not do enough to empower the Hawaiian people because regulatory control of the land would remain in the hands of the HCDA. Solomon stated, "We feel that there should be some talk of entitlement, so when the Hawaiians do get the ‘āina they can immediately go, take that ‘āina to the bank and start turning it around however they see fit" (Reyes 2012). The final agreement stipulated that "the properties are and shall remain (even after conveyance to OHA) under the jurisdiction and authority of the Hawai‘i Community Development Authority, with respect to zoning, land use conditions and/or other matters within the authority of HCDA" ("OHA-State Settlement Agreement"). Solomon's concerns proved to be valid; the transferred land was zoned for commercial use, but in 2014, OHA asked lawmakers to amend the law and allow for residential development on Kaka‘ako Makai after a study commissioned by OHA "concluded that achieving a market-rate annual income of \$14 million to \$16 million from \$200 million of real estate isn't possible with retail and commercial development" that lacks residents within the immediate vicinity (Gomes 2014b). The study concluded that the land could generate nearly twice as much revenue with four or five condominium towers than with commercial development (Gomes 2014a). Senate Bill 3122 proposed allowing residential towers on three OHA parcels, but died after OHA backed off from its push for the bill when Rep Cindy Evans proposed amending the bill by creating a residential block in Kaka‘ako Makai consisting of 8 parcels owned by OHA, Kamehameha, and the state. OHA trustee Peter Apo said OHA backed down because "we do not

want to be stigmatized and branded as being responsible for what we believe would be a travesty of the public trust and would rather stand down" (Gomes 2014c). The development conundrum faced by OHA in Kaka‘ako Makai demonstrates the complexities that emerge when attempting to negotiate indigenous values with a capitalist model of economic development.

Bringing the Margins to the Center

On April 8, 2014, The Save Kaka‘ako Coalition rallied at the state capitol, dressed in red t-shirts and waving signs that read "Aloha ‘Āina". The group had gathered to voice their opposition to SB 3122, which would allow the Office of Hawaiian Affairs to build residential high rises on the makai side of Ala Moana Boulevard ("Kaka‘ako Group Rallies against OHA High Rises" 2014). Eight years ago, coalition members had fought to pass the legislation that blocked private developer Alexander and Baldwin from building condominium towers in Kaka‘ako Makai. A few weeks later, OHA supporters donned similar red shirts, this time waving signs that read "Everyone gets to live in Kaka‘ako except for Hawaiians" (Staff 2014). OHA sought an exemption to the law that barred residential development in Kaka‘ako Makai, so that it could maximize its \$200 million settlement with the state over crown lands. According to OHA, the legislation was needed to help Native Hawaiians through revenue that would be produced through higher order use of the plot (Gomes 2014a).

In this exchange between local community groups and a quasi-state agency for indigenous governance, the need to further flesh out the role of capitalism in settler colonialism becomes apparent. The hegemonic nature of neoliberal capitalism demands that we cautiously and self-reflexively disturb the settler-native binary to better understand the ways that global capitalism manipulates these subjectivities in its effort to maximize profit. Under this hegemonic system, land is seen as a commodity, and is regarded as productive only when it is producing

profit. Under this system, the landfill that OHA won in its settlement with the state is valuable because it had the potential to produce revenue in a booming real estate market, and Kamehameha's mission is fulfilled through a robust global portfolio that generates funds for other educational endeavors. However, this metaphor of land, as Kame'elehiwa calls it, stands in stark opposition to the indigenous metaphor of 'āina, land that is family, land that can feed its people, land that produces not profit, but waiwai. This alternative metaphor emerges in opposition from both natives *and* settlers concerned for the houseless in Kaka'ako, or calling for "aloha 'āina". In this sense, the settler-native binary does not capture the complexities of capitalism and US imperialism, and perhaps precludes alliances between the worker and the native.

In recognizing Kaka'ako as operating within a settler colonial context, we must find a way to effectively engage and confront capitalist development in Hawai'i without collapsing the distinction between settler and native, local and Hawaiian, malihini and kama'āina--for all of these binaries remind us of our positionality in relation to the land and to each other. In the Kaka'ako Makai rallies at the state capitol, we see how approaching development without being conscious of the occupation of Hawai'i and the role of the settler state can lead to an unproductive, and divisive discourse. Settlers protested with signs reading "Aloha 'Āina", perhaps without recognizing their own role in alienating Hawaiians from the land, without understanding that for those invested in building the lāhui, aloha 'āina is a far more charged statement that rests on returning Hawaiian lands to the Hawaiian people. OHA's interest in Kaka'ako Makai resulted from a decades-long suit over crown lands; yet, its autonomy over that land continues to be restricted by the settler state. The settler protestors then, were not only rallying against the over-development of Kaka'ako Makai, but were also rallying to constrict and

limit indigenous autonomy, and to encourage the state to exert its will upon efforts towards indigenous nation-building--all while calling upon a fundamental value of Hawaiian culture, "aloha 'āina". It is the ability of capitalism to foster these contradictions and manipulate the liberatory goals of the marginalized, that demands further exploration, particularly in Hawai'i, where capitalist expansion is in a constant rush to subsume more and more of our limited island resources.

Chapter Conclusions

This chapter sought to unmap the geographies of Kaka'ako, asserting that there is a colonial cartography of control that asserts a settler monopoly on urban spaces. Returning to the 'auwai, it is important to understand the urban as a site of contestation, a space where Kanaka Maoli demands for the right to the city must be acknowledged and recognized within a larger history of colonialism. If the 'auwai is understood as a fault-line in the settler geography of urban Honolulu, then it poses a significant challenge to the development paradigm in Kaka'ako. As Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua writes of Hālau Kū Māna's work at 'Aihualama:

The work of rebuilding the 'auwai—of restoring indigenous waterways—provides a metaphor for efforts to transmit indigenous cultural in the context of continued imperialism, and in a landscape already radically altered by “development” and foreign species. At a macro level, this practice represents the rebuilding of indigenous educational institutions in an environment shaped by political and economic forces that still aim to choke us out or confine us. At a micro level, the ongoing work of maintaining and cleaning 'auwai to allow for balanced water flow represents the internal work individuals do to stay healthy and prepare themselves for learning.

Howard Hughes Corporations appropriation of the 'auwai is an effort to domesticate and pacify the dangerous power of this symbol of indigenous knowledge. What would it mean for Kaka'ako if the project of rebuilding the 'auwai at Kaka'ako were instead undertaken as a project of indigenous resurgence, rather than as a means of beautifying a luxury neighborhood? Perhaps by understanding Kaka'ako's current redevelopment through the metaphor of the 'auwai can prepare us to undertake the work of creating an urban space that nurtures and builds upon, rather than inhibits and builds over, the "structures that feed us" (Goodyear-Ka'ōpua 2011)

Chapter Three

Urban Renewal or Kama‘āina Removal? Kaka‘ako as Gentrification

In the Ward Village information center, the climate-controlled air is cold and crisp. A refined silence hangs overhead; the kind that coaxes voices into whispers and turns footsteps into quiet echoes. At the entrance, a touchscreen display greets visitors with information about the building, and around the corner, architectural models of Kaka‘ako light up on as prospective buyers use an interactive iPad app to navigate through the miniature master-planned communities. In a circular nook adorned with a bright yellow mural, a promotional film loops, sending calm, collected voices drifting across the room, all of them praising the vision of Ward Village and its developer, Howard Hughes Corporation. Save for a few holograms, the atmosphere evokes images of a museum from the future.

This is the face of development in Kaka‘ako: slick, seductive, cutting edge, global—in the sense that it looks very much like similar building booms for the rich in cities around the world. It is a specific vision carved out by capital, with a particular aesthetic, designed for a particular class of people, who look and live a certain way. Yet, it is rhetorically positioned as a kind of universal urban future. The neoliberal city, sterilized of its grit and of its humanity, becomes a factory for capital, and a beautiful one at that; no longer tainted by the sight of the poor and the unproductive. But while neoliberalism strives for a kind of homogeneity, it also depends on the differentiation of certain people and places, as unwelcome and in fact, detrimental to the functioning of the city. It does not work around these people, but instead,

pushes them to the margins and the outskirts, just as it has pushed families out of Kaka‘ako, off of the island, or sometimes, onto the streets. This produces a kind of anxiety in Hawai‘i’s middle class, reflected in a myriad of articles discussing the high cost of living in Hawai‘i and the necessity of moving to the American continent to make ends meet.

In this chapter, I argue that the urban processes taking place in Kaka‘ako constitute a project of racialized gentrification, veiled in the rhetoric of urban renewal and revitalization. First, I explore the body of scholarship developed around processes of gentrification. Then, I argue that this analysis can be applied across the urban landscape of Oahu (from urban core to rural periphery), as demonstrated by the racialized effects of the island’s crippling affordable housing crisis. Next, I examine the master plans for Ward Village (Howard Hughes) and Our Kaka‘ako (Kamehameha Schools) in order to analyze how the structural and discursive structuring of these developments reflect and facilitate processes of gentrification. Who is included and excluded in these developments? How do these developments negotiate the needs of capital with the needs of the people? How is uneven development racialized and enacted differentially in the settler colonial context? I argue that as capital seeks to homogenize the city in its own image, it always presupposes geographically uneven development, and that the radical difference of indigeneity positions indigenous peoples as outside of the development of the urban form.

Defining Gentrification

The term 'gentrification' was coined in 1964 by Ruth Glass, a British sociologist who, watching the city of London change around her, wrote:

One by one, many of the working-class quarters of London have been invaded by the middle classes—upper and lower. Shabby, modest mews and cottages—two rooms up

and two down—have been taken over, when their leases have expired, and have become elegant, expensive residences. Larger Victorian houses, downgraded in an earlier or recent period—which were used as lodging houses or were otherwise in multiple occupation—have been upgraded once again... Once this process of “gentrification” starts in a district it goes on rapidly until all or most of the original working-class occupiers are displaced and the whole social character of the district is changed. (Smith 2002, quoting Glass 1964: xvii)

The term then, is inherently classed, referring to the “gentry”, the petit bourgeois, the not-quite-noble. Put simply, gentrification is the physical and social transformation of a working-class area into a middle class neighborhood. However, in the decades since Glass made this poetic observation, the processes of gentrification, as well as the scholarship surrounding them, have increased in complexity and subtlety.

Ultimately, gentrification can no longer be dismissed as a peculiar tendency in the housing market. While the main figures in Glass’ characterization are middle- and upper-middle-class households moving into a new urban territory, claiming a neighborhood “one by one”, critical urban theory argues that the key drivers of gentrification are in fact, state and capital interests. Engels made the assertion that gentrification was an inherent process in capitalist urban spaces as early as 1872, though he did not use the term. He wrote:

In reality, the bourgeoisie has only one method of solving the housing question after its fashion—that is to say, of solving it in such a way that the solution perpetually renews the question anew... No matter how different the reasons may be, the result is always the same; the scandalous alleys disappear to the accompaniment of lavish self-praise by the bourgeoisie on account of this tremendous success, but they appear again immediately

somewhere else... The same economic necessity that produced them in the first place, produces them in the next place. (Engels 1872, as quoted in Harvey 2012, 17)

The “economic necessity” that Engels referred to is now understood as an inherent element in the laws of capital motion. It creates the very conditions needed for capital accumulation. Just as capitalism produces and is produced by cycles of boom and crises, capitalism in the built environment is subject to the same cycles, though they occur over much longer time horizons because of the long lifespans of physical infrastructure. The valorization and devalorization of capital in the built environment facilitates this cycle in the urban environment. An urban neighborhood attracts capital, which is subsequently trapped in material form within the built environment. This creates a barrier to new investment in certain areas of the city. Through use, existing investments are gradually returned and exhausted, until devalorization of capital in the urban built environment produces a “rent gap,” where the actual ground rent extracted is less than the potential rent that could be collected if the building or neighborhood were to undergo renovation. The market price of the land is low, but the potential ground rent of the land is high, because of its location in the urban core. Importantly, the devalorization and physical degradation of urban land lowers the market price of the land on which these physical structures stand on, increasing the potential profit margin. Because the profit motive makes it more attractive to invest in large-scale renovations or new developments, it is often not until buildings and infrastructure degrade enough to warrant a new rush of investment, that the cycle of valorization begins again. Therefore, declining neighborhoods in the urban core present an opportunity for immense capital accumulation, if capital interests are able to close the rent gap by changing the way that the land is used, and thus, how much rent can be extracted from it.

In the neoliberal incarnation of global capitalism, this dynamic of uneven development has been mobilized as a generalized urban policy agenda that seeks to “revitalize” the city through its class transformation. No longer a sporadic and spontaneous occurrence, gentrification is meticulously planned and facilitated by large-scale “revitalization” projects. This strategy reflects the capitalist impulse to remake the city after its own image and for its own aims; it endeavors towards nothing less than the “class remake of the central urban landscape” (Smith 1996, 37). Gentrification is no longer distinguished by the “gentrifier-performed practice of habitus,” but by “capital actors working within the context of a neoliberal global city”. Thus, while Smith originally found it useful to make a theoretical distinction between gentrification (specifically, the rehabilitation of existing residential buildings) and redevelopment (new build urban development), he later wrote, “It would be anachronistic now to exclude redevelopment from the rubric of gentrification, to assume that the gentrification of the city was restricted to the recovery of an elegant history in the quaint mews and alleys of old cities, rather than bound up with a larger restructuring” . Similarly, Tom Slater defines gentrification as “the transformation of a working-class or *vacant area* of a city into middle-class residential and/or commercial uses” (Slater 2011, 173). Davidson’s description of the process of new-build gentrification of marginalized urban spaces along the River Thames in London can be fittingly applied to Kaka‘ako:

“Gentrification in this form is not about the redevelopment and restoration of old, devalorized housing stock by members of the middle classes who are rich in social and cultural capital, yet (relatively) poor in economic capital. Rather, it consists of the development of large, luxurious apartment complexes by corporate developers and their consumption by the professional middle classes” (Davidson 2007, 493).

While this contemporary neoliberal form of gentrification looks different from the kind that Glass described in 1964, it nonetheless results in the class transformation of the urban core. As Davidson argues, new-build developments involve the reinvestment of capital into devalored space, and produce significant changes in the physical and social landscape, “motivated by a demonstration of cultural identity,” resulting in “processes of replacement and displacement,” though primarily by indirect means (Davidson 2007, 494). I use this broader conceptualization of gentrification as class transformation to understand Kaka’ako as a project of class restructuring which takes place along the racialized lines of settler colonialism.

Gentrification Across the Urban Scale

Importantly, Smith argues that the “global urban strategy” of gentrification can be understood in terms of five interrelated characteristics: the intensification of partnerships between private capital and the local state, the increased penetration of global finance into the local scale, the outward diffusion of gentrification from the urban center, changing levels of political opposition, and increasing coordination of corporate and state powers across varying sectors of the economy (Smith 2002, 441). Smith’s conception of gentrification allows us to interrogate these processes of creative destruction as they operate on a global scale, extending beyond state borders, but also as they operate across the local scale, extending beyond the urban core. This is important because the capitalist city operates much the same way capital itself does, always seeking new markets or new spaces in which to expand. This complicates the rural-urban dichotomy, recognizing that both are implicated in the processes of uneven development. Lefebvre also disturbed the boundary between urban and rural in order to understand the movement of capital. He argued; “The expanding city attacks the countryside, corrodes and dissolves it” (Lefebvre 1996, 119). Harvey expands on this concept, arguing that the urban

process has worked to eliminate the distinction between town and country through the production of space, so that the peri-urban (those areas immediately surrounding the urban area) as well as the rural, fade into “a set of porous spaces of uneven development under the hegemonic command of capital and the state” (Harvey 2003, 11).

Critiques of gentrification borne out of Hawai‘i have long understood that the urban-rural divide is far from impervious, and that the movement of capital and the impulses of urbanization are well able to permeate through and across the boundary between city and country. In an island context, with a finite amount of land on which to develop, the outward expansion of urban capital is felt in the lived experience of Hawai‘i’s people. Importantly, the movement for Kanaka Maoli resurgence was shaped, from the beginning, by opposition to the bulldozer of urban progress as it transformed the physical and social landscape of Hawai‘i in the post-statehood era. The anti-eviction struggle in Kalama Valley, often considered one of the moments of resistance that birthed the Hawaiian movement, made the assertion that urban expansion on O‘ahu was facilitating not only the eviction and displacement of Hawai‘i’s rural families, but in doing so, was facilitating their replacement with a “flood of ‘rich guys from the mainland’ seeking high-cost homes” (Trask 2015, 17). In Kalama Valley, and later in Waiāhole-Waikāne, rural communities challenged the primacy of urbanization and the sanctity of private property as vehicles for the dispossession of local and Kanaka Maoli people and ways of life. The power of the urban growth machine was recognized as reaching much farther than the urban core. The machine was hungry to devour any “under-developed” space that could be put to its “highest and best use” in the pursuit of profit, and it justified this hunger by framing rural and subsistence lifestyles as unproductive and barren (Milner 2006, 162).

Terra Nullius/Urbs Nullius: Gentrification on Indigenous Lands

That Hawai‘i’s history of resistance to urbanization quickly led to the development of a Kanaka Maoli movement for political and cultural resurgence is not surprising. The struggle to stop unchecked development and gentrification became a contestation over the right to Hawai‘i, and an assertion of indigenous claims to land and place. The dynamics of urbanization exposed the settler colonial logic of erasure, making it increasingly clear that indigenous ways of living and knowing would not be willingly accommodated in the settler states vision of “progress”. Throughout the history of development in Hawai‘i, communities targeted for eviction and displacement in the wake of a rapid urbanization were framed as relics of a bygone era, stubbornly clinging to their rural lifestyles while the rest of Hawai‘i was ready to move into the future. As the post-statehood government embraced development and urbanization as indicators of linear progress through time—a natural evolution of island society—the people who persisted in a rural, indigenous lifestyle were cast as embodying anachronistic space, out of time with the rest of the island and the rest of the modern world (McClintock 1995). In Kalama Valley, the Bishop Estate evicted Hawaiian and local farmers to make room for an Americanized sub-urban community made up of high-priced homes that would be financially out of reach for many Kanaka (Goodyear-Ka’opua 2014). In Waiāhole-Waikāne, landlord Elizabeth Marks rejected the conceptions of land and connection to place that were articulated by Kanaka Maoli, Filipino, and Okinawan residents, and sought to exercise her right to develop on her privately owned property (Lasky 2010). On Sand Island, in 1979, the Department of Land and Natural Resources forcefully evicted Sand Island residents, who had built a subsistence fishing community. As one resident said “They didn’t like to see people taking back the land, even if it was only a garbage dump” (Puhipau 2014). In West Beach, developers jumped on the chance to build up a non-

residential area, dismissing the fact resort development would significantly alter the coastline that countless families on the Waianae Coast depended on for food, recreation, and cultural practice. In all of these struggles, indigenous ways of life were viewed as unsuited to a “modern” Hawai‘i. Yet, in each of these struggles, indigenous values provided the backbone for rural communities to contest the settler state, even in cases where communities were composed of a multi-ethnic population. The striking and perhaps irreconcilable schism between indigenous ontologies and the settler state was made clear through this history of struggle, and eventually evolved from a struggle over land, to a renewed struggle for indigenous nationhood. But it was the dispossession of rural lands that motivated this political consciousness.

In Kaka‘ako, we see an urban variation of this colonial dispossession. Glen Coulthard calls this *urbs nullius*—a willful blindness to the continued presence of indigenous peoples in urban space. The term is a rearticulation of the racist legal fiction of *terra nullius* which was enshrined in eighteenth-century European law and legitimized the annexation and colonization of inhabited lands by claiming that existing inhabitants were too ‘primitive,’ and ‘uncivilized’ to warrant political rights or recognition. This legal rationalization was instrumental in the dispossession of indigenous peoples in settler colonies. In the United States it was reflected in the “doctrine of discovery” which held that the United Kingdom gained sovereignty to the lands of the American colonies at the moment of discovery because they were the first civilized nation to claim them, and that this sovereignty was passed to the United States when they won independence from Britain. In Australia, *terra nullius* remained a legal justification for the rejection of Aboriginal land title until 1992, when a court ruled that the doctrine was discriminatory and land title was and continues to be valid. The notion of *urbs nullius* is not legally codified in the same way that *terra nullius* was, yet, it reflects a similarly racist notion

that defines indigenous peoples as undeserving of the right to their lands or “right to the city”. The rapid pace of urban development is fueled by the assertion that there is no existing community in the area, or that the people who do reside there (such as the houseless) are too poor, lazy, and unproductive to constitute a real community. At the heart of this assertion, is the racist notion that urban space is white space, and that indigenous peoples and other people of color are not fully capable of functioning within it (Shaw 2007). Here, I use whiteness not to indicate ethnicity, but to name the racialized processes of privilege and domination that work to structure power within society. Whiteness can be a flexible category, as can the boundaries of membership that permit certain groups to benefit from it. As Shaw writes of her Sydney neighborhood near the Aboriginal urban neighborhood called ‘The Block,’ “even though distinctly racialized spaces operated in my neighborhood, the range of ethnicities present is always more complex than a simple rendering of ‘black’ and ‘white’. The population that utilizes ‘white’ space includes individuals from a myriad of backgrounds” (Shaw 2007, 39). This is important to note in Hawai‘i, where settler colonialism enlists settlers, regardless of ethnicity, in the erasure of indigenous peoples through a system of white supremacy.

The colonial mentality that paints urban space as white space also paints urban indigenous communities as inauthentic and impure because they have been dispossessed from land and engage in urban spaces. But it simultaneously paints them as ill suited to urban life. This rationalization occurs through the settler logic of elimination: urbanization results in the dispossession of indigenous people’s from their land, forcing them into the city and the market economy, however, once they are there, they are considered as degraded and inauthentic, no longer purely “indigenous”. In settler colonial cities, this has historically served as a justification for the “frequent removal of Indigenous residents from towns” to counter the supposedly

“corrupting and demoralizing effect on indigenous peoples of a civilization with which, as people at a more 'primitive' level of social development, they were not fitted to cope”(Andersen and Peters 2013, 4). In Hawaii, The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921 served a similar purpose of saving Kanaka Maoli from the urban life that they simply could not handle. As J. Kehaulani Kauanui writes, “the initial aim of the HHCA proposal was to rehabilitate urban Kanaka Maoli ‘for their own good’”(Kauanui 2008, 87). The HHCA sought to remove Hawaiians from the city and return them to the land, but only after collective rural life and culture had been disrupted. Importantly, the beneficiaries were designated as those Hawaiians who had 50 percent blood quantum or more, as it was racialized notions of indigeneity that positioned Kanaka as lacking the capacity for modernity.

Terra nullius and *urbs nullius* have thus historically worked together, in tandem, to marginalize indigenous communities and displace native peoples from their lands while simultaneously keeping them excluded from urban life. Today, the geographies of the settler colonial state continue to be shaped by these two racist rationalizations, both undergirded by the larger settler colonial logic of elimination. Urban sprawl continues to threaten the viability of rural ways of life, while urban development continues to exclude indigenous peoples from the right to the city and the ability to create indigenous spaces that could reimagine urbanism according to native ontologies. Importantly, the periods of economic growth that resulted in large corporate development booms in the post-statehood era and the first half of the 2000’s, do not solely represent the negative aspect of the settler colonial logic of elimination by displacing indigenous peoples from the urban periphery, but also constitute the positive aspect of the logic elimination by facilitating an influx of in-migration—in other words, a new wave of settlement. For example the 2011 State of Hawai‘i Housing Study stated that “during the growth years 2002-

2007, natural increase seems to have slowed and the number of people moving to the Aloha State expanded notably,” during this same period, “out-of-state demand [for real estate] increased dramatically,” helping to move Hawai‘i home prices to “record highs.” While 21.4 percent of Hawai‘i households were crowded or doubled up in 2011, 13.7 percent of all single-family units and 27.1 percent of condominium units were owned by out-of-state buyers (SMS Research and Marketing Services 2011, 12). By allowing capital actors to produce and sell a pre-packaged, global urban product, the corporate development of Kaka‘ako represents an erasure of Hawaiian epistemological and ontological presence in urban Honolulu.

Kaka‘ako as Gentrification

In Kaka‘ako the rhetoric of *urbs nullius* has allowed for the rapid redevelopment of Kaka‘ako. The presence of a predominately Kanaka Maoli and Pacific Islander houseless encampment is overshadowed and made invisible by the towering construction cranes jutting into the skyline, and their houselessness is portrayed as a result of their own incapacity to function in a modern, urban Honolulu. At sunset the cranes are silhouetted against the bright pink sky, foreshadowing the skyscrapers that will soon follow in their place. The sounds of construction communicate the urgency with which the redevelopment is taking place—there is money to be made. Capital in Kaka‘ako, long immobilized in warehouses and low-rise cinderblock buildings, is ready for a new round of valorization, ready to propel a new circuit of accumulation. The rent gap in Kaka‘ako has widened, so that now, low-density industrial use of such a prime urban location seems ludicrous. Landowners are eager to close the rent gap, and are doing so with alarming speed. A report by real estate company Prudential Locations found that the median price of a condo in Kaka‘ako rose 76.4% (from 335,000 to 585,500) in the one-year period from June 2013 to June 2014, largely because of new luxury apartments and penthouses

that sold for record amounts. One penthouse in Howard Hughes Corporation's Waiea tower is priced at \$50 million, a record for the highest asking-price for a condominium unit ever in Hawai'i (Shimogawa 2013). The steep increase in Kaka'ako also contributed to a 10.8% increase in condo prices across Oahu during that time (Hofschneider 2014). These increases occurred in an already inflated housing market; average rents in Hawai'i increased by 45 percent during 2005-2012, while average wages increased only 21 percent during the same period (*Hawai'i's Affordable Housing Crisis* 2014)

While the HCDA points to its inclusionary zoning measures to ameliorate concerns about affordable housing, the reserved housing quotas are set at a very high threshold. Inclusionary zoning is implemented through a mandatory set-aside ordinance. The ordinance requires that all new developments on parcels bigger than 20,000 square feet reserve 20% of units as affordable. Rental units must be affordable to households at 100 percent of area median income (AMI), while for-sale units must be affordable to households at 140 percent of AMI. Developments that reserve 70% of units for those earning between 100-140% AMI are also designated as 'workforce housing', receiving a 100% density bonus and the right to ask for rule modifications ("HCDA Reserved and Workforce Housing" 2015). The reserved housing program essentially compels private developers to carry the cost of affordable housing development in exchange for development rights. But, a closer examination of the numbers has led many to question the effectiveness of these measures.

Firstly, while the conventional measure of affordability is that housing costs amount to no more than 30% of household income, HCDA defines affordability at 33% of a household's income. This slight increase, which seems minimal on paper, can be a substantial weight on households that are already struggling to make ends meet. Secondly, by setting the reserved

housing requirement to target households earning between 100-140% AMI, the HCDA effectively excludes a large portion of Hawai‘i’s population that is in desperate need of housing. For a family of four, 100% AMI amounts to \$86,900, and 140% AMI amounts to \$121,650. Meanwhile, many essential workers, from rookie police officers to experienced teachers, fall decidedly within the low-income category, which goes unaccounted for in HCDA’s requirements. In fact, 46 percent of Hawai‘i households earn 80 percent of area median income or less, meaning they are not served by the HCDA’s reserved housing program, and are effectively neglected and excluded from the growing community in Kaka‘ako (Cassidy 2015). While the reserved housing program is framed as a major restriction on developers, in reality, the HCDA gives developers a pat on the back, simply for keeping a fraction of their units out of the luxury market. The HCDA has responded to critiques of its lax reserved housing policy as targeting a “gap group” of households whose income does not qualify them for government housing assistance such as Section 8, but cannot afford market priced housing on their own. Additionally, developers who build units that serve households at or below 60% AMI can access Federal, State, and County subsidies, so the HCDA argues that it should focus its reserved housing program on the development of housing that is priced at a rate that is neither market-rate nor eligible for subsidies. However, Section 8 and public housing in Hawai‘i are both completely maxed out, with waitlists of upwards of 10 years, and federal subsidies do not provide enough incentives for developers seeking to rake in windfall profits.

Liberalism and Neoliberalism in Hawai‘i Housing

The deterioration of state-led housing assistance combined with increased dependence on private sector development reflects the changing role of the state under neoliberalism. The role of the neoliberal state is no longer understood as providing support for the needs of social

reproduction, but rather, to provide incentive for the private sector to do so. This is evidenced by the relative withdrawal of government subsidies to affordable housing needs, and the increasing reliance on incentivized inclusionary zoning measures to facilitate the private sector development of affordable housing. This shift warrants a discussion, particularly in respect to the racialized effects of the affordable housing crisis and its implications for the gentrification of Kaka‘ako.

Neoliberalism actively seeks to shrink the state in order to consolidate the power of capital, and claims to replace the inefficiency of the state with the innovation of the market. However, under the neoliberal paradigm, the private sector must be incentivized to provide for the needs of the people. This tendency is reflected not just in the HCDA’s role in encouraging private investment in Kaka‘ako, but also in the transition away from public housing in Hawai‘i, and towards privately developed affordable housing units (that often serve a higher income bracket). For example, in February 2015, Governor David Ige cut the Hawai‘i Public Housing Authority’s annual budget request from \$180 million (still drastically short of the \$275 million needed to address the public housing repair and maintenance backlog) to \$5 million. While HPHA budget requests have been consistently cut over the years (down to \$9 million in 2014), the 2015 budget was an all time low (Hofschneider 2015). A spokeswoman for Ige stated that the reason for budget decision was that the Governor hoped to put \$100 million into the Rental Housing Trust Fund, which subsidizes the development of low-income rentals to private owners and developers. This decision reflects the neoliberal consensus that a state-led safety net for housing and other basic needs is better and more efficiently provided for by the private sector. The rationale is that the state’s fiscal reality has led to a ten-year waitlist and deteriorating conditions in public housing (much of which was build in the 1950’s and 1960’s) and

incentivizing developers would better address the need for low-income housing. However, while public housing serves families making 30% or less of the area median income (AMI), the RHTF provides subsidies to units that are affordable to families making up to 140% AMI. To add insult to injury, House Finance Committee Chairwoman Sylvia Luke said that the public infrastructure support for Kaka‘ako’s private construction boom, combined with the city’s Rapid Transit elevated rail project created pressure on the state to cut back spending in other public projects.

Under the HCDA’s reserved housing quota, less than 8 percent of all Kaka‘ako units build since 2005 have been affordable to those making 80% AMI, despite the fact that Hawai‘i needs 19,000 low-income housing units by 2016. (*Hawai‘i Community Development Authority Housing Development Projects 2015*). Importantly, as Lefebvre and Harvey have argued, the processes of urban development cannot be viewed in localized isolation, because the movement of capital works across scales. Development in Kaka‘ako, therefore, cannot be viewed independently of the severe affordable housing crisis on O‘ahu. Between 2005 (when the building boom began in Kaka‘ako) and 2012, average rents in Hawai‘i increased by 45%, while average wages increased by only 21 percent—leaving nearly one out of three households facing a severe cost burden (defined as spending more than 30% of their income on housing). As a result, nearly 30% of households that moved away from Hawai‘i cited housing costs as a primary reason for relocation (SMS Research and Marketing Services 2011). Though the resident population facing displacement in Kaka‘ako is minimal, indirect displacement pressures remain a real and felt threat to vulnerable households in Hawai‘i. ‘Indirect displacement’ occurs when commercial and industrial gentrification elevates rental and sales prices in surrounding areas, resulting in fewer affordable housing choices across the tightening housing market. Gentrification of the urban core in Honolulu neglects the housing needs of a vast majority of

O‘ahu households. Additionally, by failing to address the affordable housing crisis within the urban core, the luxury redevelopment of Kaka‘ako encourages urban sprawl by contributing to the need for more new-build, low-density suburban tracts in places like Ewa, Kapolei, and Central O‘ahu. This results in a further loss of agricultural and rural lands, and a continued homogenization of the settler colonial geography of O‘ahu.

By neglecting the urgent need for low-income housing for a majority of Hawai‘i’s existing population, I argue that redevelopment in Kaka‘ako constitutes a project of displacement by placing indirect pressure on the residents of Hawai‘i, whether or not they live in Kaka‘ako. When the racialized effects of this displacement are considered within the context of settler colonialism, then, this project of displacement can be understood as a project of settler colonial erasure. This was evident in the 1970’s when the first Environmental Impact Statement predicted the displacement of Hawaiians and other low-income groups with the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako, and it remains true today. What is important to note, is that this displacement and erasure is not coincidental, but rather, corresponds to the global urban strategy of gentrification, which consistently features “the privileging of whiteness, as well as the more class-based identities and preferences of urban living” (Atkinson and Bridge 2005, 2).

Curating Community in Kaka‘ako

As gentrification and real estate capital become increasingly important to the global processes and flows of capital, global narratives of identity and community are fostered and proliferated by developers and capital interests. These narratives seek to create and attract consumer subjectivities that can facilitate the accumulation of capital. These capital-led narratives seek to colonize urban space with a homogenized, global, yet distinctly white aesthetic, in order to facilitate investment and profit. Thus, they actively seek to marginalize and

displace those populations who are viewed as detrimental to the marketability of urban space. Whether or not the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako results in the direct displacement of Kanaka Maoli, the articulation of Honolulu’s urban future as one dictated by corporate development works to deprive indigenous peoples, working-class communities, and other marginalized populations from the right to shape the city, and even the right to feel a sense of belonging within it. Thus, beyond the bureaucratic violence of reserved housing quotas and public housing cutbacks, there is an ever-present epistemological violence taking place in Kaka‘ako’s redevelopment.

In the following section, I will explore the Master Plans put forth by the Howard Hughes Corporation and Kamehameha Schools, in order to identify the ways in which these global narratives of urbanism work to curate a community that is 1) defined by individualist consumption rather than collective place-making, 2) global and future-oriented rather than place-based and historically rooted, and 3) accessible to a global professional class regardless of locational specificity. I discuss these three motifs with the explicit conviction that in defining the desired community of Kaka‘ako on these terms, developers are simultaneously excluding those who do not fit into their vision. By designing the built environment in a way that makes its spaces accessible only to those who belong to a certain class of people, the developers are able to “curate” and “program” the community that they wish to inhabit the space, with serious implications for marginalized peoples.

“Urban Village”: Community as consumption

In both Howard Hughes Corporation’s *Ward Neighborhood Master Plan*, and Kamehameha Schools’ *Kaiāulu ‘o Kaka‘ako Master Plan*, the developments in Ward Village

and Our Kaka‘ako are framed as “urban villages” where residents can live, work and play. Howard Hughes Corp. writes that it will “develop urban neighborhoods”, and Kamehameha Schools states that Kaka‘ako will be “an urban village for the 21st century”. While the word ‘village’ connotes a kind of collective community, the term “urban village” comes from a very specific liberal discourse rooted in the New Urbanism movement in urban planning. The urban village is typically characterized by; medium density development, mixed-use zoning, walkability, and transit oriented communities. The idea of the village is that all of your needs for “live, work, and play,” can be met within the confines of your neighborhood. However, urban village strategies have been carried out in tandem with the neoliberal branding of urban spaces to “improve the visual appeal of places, attract tourists, lead to rises in property values, and ultimately fuel gentrification” (K. Barnes et al. 338). The rhetorical and aesthetic power of the “urban village” has thus become enmeshed in the reconfiguration of the role of the state in the urban sphere; away from supporting social reproduction and public needs, and towards the facilitation of capital accumulation and consumer subjects. The kinds of communities created by this kind of “entrepreneurial planning” downplay citizenship and collective identities in order to promote capitalist ideologies and consumption-based identities. The Ward Village Master plan states:

Auahi Street [envisioned as a pedestrian promenade and public space corridor] could be transformed into a thoroughfare that is both intimate and grand, ideal for strolling, window shopping and outdoor dining, shaded by a large canopy of street trees. These are the corner stones of a community that can become favorite gathering places and create connections with surrounding neighborhoods. (5)

Kaiāulu ‘o Kaka‘ako similarly states:

At the heart of the crossroads, a community gathering place is envisioned. This central area is designed as a large public plaza surrounded by unique and interesting retailing.

Programming will be determined as development progresses. (ii)

By equating community with “window shopping,” and “retailing,” Kamehameha Schools and Howard Hughes Corp. align public space with purchase power and community with consumption. Community and sense of place are experiences to be consumed, rather than built, by visitors and residents. In fact, place-making is not attributed to the users of space at all, but is instead framed as something that is pre-packaged and ready-made by the developer. Public space, rather than being a heterogeneous site for spontaneity and the convergence of divergent interests, is “programmed” by the developer in a way that supplements commercial and retail activities. In fact, public space is not public at all—it is privately owned space that is designated as pseudo-public in order to represent a nostalgic and idealized urban commons.

In the context of indigenous resurgence in the face of settler colonialism and occupation, the reorientation of communities and subjectivities away from collective relationships and towards individual consumption also represents the further alienation and marginalization of indigeneity. The primacy of consumption and profit not only alienates lifestyles that do not prioritize the market, but also redefines community as something that is entirely depoliticized. In the case of Kamehameha Schools in Kaka’ako, the privileging of capitalist renderings of community and accountability over indigenous ways of being is made particularly evident. Because Kamehameha Schools is an ali’i trust whose beneficiaries are the Hawaiian people, the master plan speaks directly to the contradiction of serving indigenous needs through a capitalist framework. The Master Plan states:

KS manages its lands across the State as a dynamic portfolio to optimize Cultural, Environmental, Educational, community, and economic values and returns that support the Mission of Kamehameha Schools... The plan presented... embodies our values as an organization and optimizes the multiple returns we seek in a manner that fully supports the vision and mission of KS. (1-1).

Community, environmental, educational, and cultural needs are all subsumed under the corporate “portfolio” and, like any other investment, must produce “returns”. Though Kamehameha Schools plays a vital role in the Hawaiian community and supports countless programs that aim to meet the social, political, and cultural needs of the Hawaiian lāhui, Kamehameha Schools’ role as an indigenous institution is dependent upon the ability of this “portfolio” to produce adequate return on investment. The possibilities of a distinctly indigenous re-envisioning of urbanism are thus precluded from the planning of Our Kaka‘ako. Where space could be created for innovative new ways of approaching the urban built environment and the communities that use these spaces, the Master Plan instead employs a corporate model that sees Kaka‘ako as a site to raise revenue for indigenous practices in other spaces. Unfortunately, this means a further entrenchment of the idea that urban space is not indigenous space, and that indigenous knowledge and people do not have a valid contribution to make in the creation of urban communities.

“Roots and Wings”: Corporate-led urbanism as global future

The creation of a new urban future is another motif that arises in the discourse surrounding the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako. The idea of a global, future-oriented urban community has been the subject of much excitement, as Honolulu excitedly awaits a new urban

identity. But with this forward-thinking rhetoric comes an implicit, and often explicit reference to a romanticized and yet ultimately rejected past that must be left behind. Meanwhile, Kaka‘ako is in a transition phase, being led into a new urban future by corporate developers. This past-future dichotomy structures much of the language surrounding Kaka‘ako. The Ward Village Master Plan states, “by honoring what has come before, Ward Neighborhood will blossom into a vibrant, energetic, authentic urban village” (9). In the KKMP, this binary is identified as one of the three “Vision Elements” for Kaka‘ako: “roots and wings”. The Master Plan states:

The roots aspect looks back and reflects a deep understanding and commitment to the surrounding community, its history and evolution over time, and the stake of the existing residents, workers, business people and institutions within it. Wings represents a forward looking attitude and how the district can embrace the latest in tech, creativity, innovation and cultural trending so that it propels the community forward in both economic and social viability. 3-2

While this is framed as a way of paying respect to history and heritage, and fostering a kind of historical continuity in the development, the incessant contrast of past and future is a repetition of the master narrative of normative developmentalism and the inevitability of capitalism. The only future imaginable is a settler future. When discussing public spaces within Kaka‘ako, both developers present plans for gathering places and accompany them with photographs of similar public spaces around the world. Photos of pedestrian promenades, city squares, and public parks in San Jose, Chicago, San Francisco, Santa Monica, and Barcelona provide real-life “character examples” of the artists’ renderings of Kaka‘ako’s proposed public spaces. The vision of these corporate developers in Kaka‘ako is presented as a universally appealing urban future that is enjoyed and consumed by people around the world, yet sensitive to the uniqueness of place. This

schizophrenic need to portray Kaka‘ako as both legible to a contemporary global culture and recognizable within Hawai‘i’s specific sense of place is reconciled by portraying one as the logical and progressive evolution of the other.

This works to frame settler geographies as not only inevitable, but necessary in the modern world. Indigenous geographies are not viewed as ontological and existing in real space, but as historical—existing only in the past. In the settler colonial context, history is ultimately marked as indigenous and parochial while innovation is marked as a kind of globalized whiteness. Indigenous culture is continually referred to as performance or historical artifact, such as in the statement:

A plan for the future without acknowledging the past is incomplete... Because the Ward Neighborhood Master Plan makes a commitment to honor the people and culture of Hawai‘i, it has devoted significant thought and public outreach to shaping a plan for preserving and honoring the cultural resources of the area. (22)

This statement, accompanied with images of people wearing lei and performing hula, relegate indigeneity to the past, furthering the settler myth of indigeneity as museum culture. In doing so, the thriving and living culture that is very much present in the Hawaiian lāhui today is neglected, and the injustices in the present are divorced from their historically rooted sources. Importantly, the violence of dispossession that is currently enacted on a daily basis in the form of raids, harassment, and criminalization of a largely indigenous or Pacific Islander community is thus disconnected from a much longer process of settler colonial displacement of indigenous peoples.

“Live, Work, and Play”: Privileging a Global Consumer Citizen

Urban villages have been criticized as social engineering projects, which exclude elements of society that do not fit into the economic, social, cultural, and aesthetic parameters of the community. By appealing so heavily to capital interests, corporate activities, and a refined, upper class aesthetic, “the idea of the 'urban village' provides a spatial fixity that suggests that the uncertainties, the undesirables, and the unsightly are vanquished” (Barnes et al. 2006, 337). In Kaka‘ako, the need to vanquish the undesirables and the unsightly is matched by the need to distinguish the community from them. The need to draw boundaries between Kaka‘ako and the surrounding area can take material form, as demonstrated by the incorporation of “gateways”. The Ward Neighborhood Master Plan states that “Art, architectural features, and special paving” will “serve as gateways to Ward Neighborhood, welcoming people on each edge of the property”. However, these gateways simultaneously map the boundaries of this exclusive community for those who do not belong. Boundaries are also enforced through the fiscal disciplining of the neighborhood. For example, the Ward Village Master states, “this is what it takes to build a neighborhood—offer a variety of housing styles that will appeal to families, couples, and singles of all ages and incomes” (21). This statement seems to claim that Howard Hughes Corp. views households from all income groups as valuable members of a thriving urban village. However, it follows immediately by stating that “the HCDA Mauka Area Rules require that 20 percent of residential units be set aside as Reserved Housing units, targeting families of up to 140 percent AMI” (21). What is the proper income mix needed to “build a neighborhood” and how much of each income group is desirable?

Undeniably, in order to ensure project viability and an adequate return on investments, developers appeal to the “aesthetics and consumption practices of a predominately professional, managerial, and service class” (Barnes et al. 2006, 338). Thus, the construction of Kaka‘ako as a

place for a community of consumers with a global urban future is inherently classed. To belong in a community defined by consumption, and valued on the basis of its ability to produce returns on investment, one must have the financial means to participate in the corporate, retail, dining, and entertainment activities of the district. These restrictive qualifications set the boundaries of “community” in Kaka‘ako, and these boundaries are policed through housing and affordability. Implicit in this fiscal disciplining, is the notion that there is a hierarchy of consumption in Kaka‘ako’s “live, work, and play” community. Those who cannot afford to “live” in Kaka‘ako do not belong in the glass towers anyway, but may be able to participate by working or playing there instead. Those who cannot afford to work or play in Kaka‘ako however, are seen as disruptions to this curated space—they are the ‘unsightly’.

Meanwhile, the boundaries of indigenous identity are opened up to anyone with the means to participate in the Kaka‘ako community. The Ward Neighborhood Master Plan states:

How Ward Neighborhood creates connections to the history, people, arts, and culture of Hawai‘i will help define its legacy. They can range from permanent displays honoring the heritage of Kaka‘ako to cultural performances of hula or slack key guitar. These cultural touch points can become a part of everyone who lives visits, or works in Ward Neighborhood.

This is important, because as gentrification has become a global urban strategy, “gentrification related identities” are seen to have become “globally mobile forces.” The privileging of whiteness and of a hyper-mobile, global class of consumers is dependent on the ease with which all aspects of urban life can be experienced and enjoyed by this class. Cultural difference is thus integrated into the settler myth of multiculturalism, to ensure that indigenous culture (as well as other marginalized cultures) are rendered accessible for consumption. When indigenous,

migrant, subaltern, or working class identities are included in urban villages, they are invoked as “cleansed versions of marginal(ised) identities” (Barnes et al. 2006, 338). They are “cleansed” of the elements that may call race or class privilege into question. In the settler colonial context, this means that indigeneity is subsumed as yet another ethnic flavor in a vibrant multi-cultural, liberal, democratic society. In fact, only once in the Ward Neighborhood Master Plan, are the people behind the “hula or slack key guitar” explicitly named as the “native Hawaiian community”, and nowhere are they named as Indigenous, Kanaka Maoli, or Kanaka ‘Ōiwi, let alone as a lāhui (nation) with lasting claims to political sovereignty and land. Of the twelve other times the word “Hawaiian” is used, four are in reference to nature (as in Hawaiian plant species, warm Hawaiian sun), six are in the names of utility companies (Hawaiian Electric and Hawaiian Telecom), and one is in reference to language. To suggest indigenous nationhood touches too firmly upon a settler-colonial relation that is supposed to remain unspoken and invisible.

Chapter Conclusion

The “right to the city,” has a powerful ring to it, but upon closer examination, it is an entirely empty signifier, waiting to be filled with meaning. As Peter Marcuse asks, the demand for the right to the city begs the question “Whose right(s) to what city?” (Marcuse 2011). The contestation surrounding gentrification is a struggle for the political power to shape the urban future, and at a more basic level, to claim a space in that future. Development interests in Kaka‘ako seek to build an urban environment that is conducive to capital accumulation. It does this through urban planning policy, physical infrastructure and the production of space that can attract global capital. However, it also works discursively, to nurture and encourage the production of the consumer subjectivities that contribute to the kind of community that can effectively inhabit this kind of urban space. In the settler colonial context, this means the

privileging of whiteness and settler colonialism, and the marginalization of indigenous ways of being in the world, and in the city. Indigenous peoples are not only subject to structural displacement, but also discursive exclusion from the social imaginary of the city.

Chapter 4

Symbolic Gentrification: Inclusion as Elimination

“If claims to uniqueness, authenticity, particularity, and specialty underlie the ability to capture monopoly rents, then on what better terrain is it possible to make such claims than in the field of historically constituted cultural artifacts and practices and special environmental characteristics?”

In June 2014, Howard Hughes Corporation broke ground on a 36-story, 171 unit ultra-luxury residential tower. While each of the building’s 171 units is targeted at luxury buyers, one penthouse in particular broke the record for the highest asking price ever for a new Hawai‘i condominium, at \$50 million dollars. The name of this new residence, which Ward Village calls its “flagship building” and hails as “an entirely new level of luxury in Hawai‘i” is Waiea, which means “the water of life” in ‘olelo Hawai‘i. Artists’ renderings of the architectural design similarly evoke the coolness of water; shimmering blue glass curves around the building’s façade like water draping across stones in a gentle stream. According to Rob Iopa, president of the architectural firm that played a major role in Waiea’s design, the design is inspired by “a story of two Hawaiian fishing gods, a father and son from Kauai, who stopped on every island to teach everyone to fish. They stopped in Kaka‘ako and found this as their home”. Romanticizing the

incineration and landfill that occurred in Kaka‘ako in the 19th and 20th century, Iopa says, “This land was part of the ocean. The former shoreline was right where Ala Moana Boulevard is.”

The use of Hawaiian names, references to mo‘olelo, and invocations of indigenous cultural heritage are a notable part of Kaka‘ako’s new character. However, these gestures towards indigeneity occur at a purely aesthetic level. Though Iopa refers to a mo‘olelo about two fishing gods, they remain nameless—irrelevant except for their role in shrouding this luxury tower in native intrigue. Though the tower’s name and architectural design is inspired by water it disregards the fact that before capitalism, neither wai, nor waiwai (meaning value and true wealth) were commodified, and many Kanaka continue to fight against their commodification today. This veneer of cultural respect and sensitivity is thin, but prominent in Kaka‘ako. All around Kaka‘ako, barriers adorned with images of Hawai‘i’s natural beauty enclose construction sites. In Our Kaka‘ako, a new development called Salt is named after the salt pans that dominated the Kaka‘ako landscape in the past. This “celebration” of Hawaiian culture is framed as an act of recognition and inclusion in a multicultural and global city. According to the developers, the global orientation of Kaka‘ako’s urban redevelopment is what will put Honolulu on par with other global cities, but Hawai‘i’s unique past and “host culture” are the ‘secret ingredients’ that make Kaka‘ako stand out above the rest to create an unparalleled urban experience. However, the question remains: Does the presence of Kanaka Maoli culture in the vision for Kaka‘ako equate to the right to the city for Kanaka?

In this chapter, I begin with a brief overview of the literature on cultural and symbolic gentrification to explore the ways that the creative and cultural sector has been co-opted for the branding of consumable cities. Then I examine the ways that this strategy has been deployed in the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako. The cultural strategy in Kaka‘ako is reflective of the way that

cities are increasingly being “branded” as consumer experiences for visitors and residents alike. In many cities, this branding revolves around the idea of the “creative city”, and it is the creative sector of artists, tech innovators, and start up entrepreneurs who are both the subjects and the targets of this urban marketing. This creative sector is productive of a vibrant city life that is recognizable and attractive to a mobile and global cultural consumer, but also of providing a mark of distinction that allows the city to be recognizable and desirable as a unique consumer experience. Developers in Kaka‘ako, especially Kamehameha Schools, have embraced this kind of creative branding, along with the night markets, pop-up galleries, work/live spaces for artists, and loft-living aesthetic, that have been used in cities around the world to ‘revitalize’ urban space, raise real estate value, and attract capital investment.

However, the settler colonial context of Kaka‘ako enables another version of this branding, as the commodification of indigenous culture provides a new, unique way to distinguish the 'product' being sold by corporate developers. By analyzing a promotional video featured prominently in Howard Hughes Corporation’s marketing strategy, I examine the ways that indigenous culture has been used to create the symbolic preconditions for gentrification in Kaka‘ako. In the video, well-known Kanaka Maoli are put in the spotlight, and Hawaiian culture is framed as central to the development. This inclusion seems to contradict Patrick Wolfe’s notion of the logic of elimination, because indigenous peoples are not absented, but in fact highlighted in the video and in many aspect of Ward Village’s development. However, I argue that despite this appropriation of native culture, the neglect of the political nature of indigenous cultural revitalization under occupation and settler colonialism constitutes an act of settler colonial erasure and a settler move to innocence that further entrenches the settler colonial hold over land.

Branding Cities for Consumption

One of the great enigmas of capitalism is its “dialectical tension between differentiation and equalization” (Soja 2010, 108). Capitalism presupposes geographically uneven development, but at the same time, there is a tendency towards increasing homogenization. As capital seeks to commodify difference in order to make it marketable, it inevitably produces a far-reaching homogeneity. In turn, these commodities must be again marked as unique and different, in order to compete in the market. In the urban built environment, this dialectical tension is evident; neoliberalism has produced developments in cities around the world that tend to look remarkably similar, whether they are in Istanbul or New York City, and yet the branding of these cities seeks to market each of these urban spaces as distinct. David Harvey identifies this branding of cities as an effect of the pursuit of “monopoly rent,” or the “monopoly power of private owners over certain assets.” Importantly, monopoly rents arise when “social actors can realize an enhanced income stream over an extended period of time by virtue of their exclusive control over some directly or indirectly tradable item which is in some respects unique and non-replicable” (Harvey 2013, 90). Thus, the tendency of commodification to homogenize is always countered by an attempt to recapture something non-replicable, something that can only be found, achieved, or enjoyed through the consumption of that singular product. The pursuit of monopoly rent through homogenization is an economic force behind gentrification, but it is enabled through the marketing of distinction and particularly, the branding of cities. In order to attract interest, raise real estate value, and claim monopoly rent, there must be some promise of uniqueness and particularity.

Cities capitalize on the power of “collective symbolic capital”—in the form of culture, subcultures, history etc.—in order to claim special marks of distinction and better attract the

flows of capital to their centers (Harvey 2013, 104). As Sharon Zukin writes, “in recent years image has become the important part of the city branding process. Just as image helps to market individual buildings and places, so it also markets cities as, if not productive, at least creative, interesting and attractive.” Importantly, she continues, “branding tries to make each city appear different from and better than the competition” (Zukin 2011, 231). Gentrification can be seen as both a cause and effect of this place marketing, in that it is reflective of the inter-urban competition that positions cities as products to be marketed and consumed. Urban space therefore, must be designed and curated in order to best compete in a market that demands both homogenization and differentiation.

This demands discussion of one of the most prominent debates surrounding gentrification, that between “consumption-side” and “production-side” arguments. Consumption-side arguments stress cultural and individual choice as the drivers of gentrification; consumers prefer a middle class aesthetic and neighborhood change reflects this demand (Hughes and Sternlieb 1987; Berry 1985). These arguments are typically put forth by more conservative voices that frame gentrification as “revitalization” and “renewal”. This is problematic because it implies that the communities that are displaced by this change lack vitality and worth, and because it neglects the role of capitalism and the state in these processes. It privileges the “demands” of a particular class as being worthy of producing responses from the market. The demands of these market-consumers are placed above those who have fewer financial resources, clearly determining the right to shape the city based on the ability to buy it. On the other hand, production-side arguments are most often put forth by Marxists and radical social theorists who view gentrification as rooted in the capitalist mode of production, and as a key feature of a wider, classed urban geography. Of course, this runs the risk of being reductive and viewing culture as

always already captured in the service of capital. As Lefebvre argued, it is important to note the interplay between space, capital, social movements, and everyday life practices in the production of space. Geographies respond to multiple, fractured, and diffused sources of power, and cannot be understood reductively, as the product of solely state or consumer power. Zukin recognizes the relationship between developers, consumers, and the state, when she points out that, “The process of branding always merges developers’ interests and consumers’ desires with officials’ rhetoric of growth” (Zukin, 231). Ultimately however, the consumption and production are both subsumed in the larger ideology of the urban growth machine.

The *coproduction* of complementary urban spaces and consumer subjectivities is key to the intensification of processes of neoliberal gentrification. As Smith writes, “the relationship between production and consumption is symbiotic, but it is a symbiosis in which the movement of capital in pursuit of profit predominates” (Smith 1996, 55). Consumption is certainly not a passive effect of production, and claims to monopoly rents are “as much an outcome of discursive constructions and struggles as they are grounded in material fact” (Harvey 2013, 103). Discursive tensions arise between the forces of consumption and production, capital and culture, and homogeneity and differentiation. Nevertheless, consumer preference and the demand for gentrified spaces can be actively encouraged through marketing and branding. Media images and the consumer tastes that they cultivate “anchor today’s technology of power in our individual yearnings, persuading us that consuming the authentic city has everything to do with aesthetics and nothing to do with power” (Zukin 2011, 227). Capitalism has succeeded not just in the commodification of ‘space’ through the extraction of profit through rent, but has begun to excel in the commodification of ‘place’ through the marketing of cities for consumption.

The question at hand, then, is what this commodification and branding of place means

when applied to a context where indigenous struggles are centered on land and place-based knowledge. We know that when ‘space’ is commodified, indigenous land is expropriated and indigenous peoples are displaced. When ‘place’ is commodified, I argue that indigenous culture is expropriated and indigenous politics and geographies are displaced and absented from the urban imaginary. In the following pages, I examine how the commodification of place, and the branding of Kaka‘ako are enacted by Kamehameha Schools in Our Kaka‘ako through the discourse of the “creative city,” and by Howard Hughes Corp., through the framing of Ward Village as a modern city that can translate anachronistic indigenous culture into a new global aesthetic. In doing so, I do not intend to criticize or pass judgment on the artists, musicians, entrepreneurs, or cultural practitioners who contribute to the growing community in Kaka‘ako (though I do think that engagement with these corporate developers and the contradictions that arise from participation demand thoughtful reflection). Instead, I seek to critique the ways in which these creative energies and cultural expressions are co-opted and manipulated by capitalist interests towards the aim of increasing real estate values and reaping profits. I choose to do so primarily through two promotional videos, because this allows an analysis of the ways that these engagements are translated into a Kaka‘ako “brand” that is ultimately designed in order to attract the flow of capital.

Our Kaka‘ako: Creative City

Around the world the branding of cities as spaces for consumption has resulted in a kind of corporate place-making that seeks to imbue urban spaces with the individualist, consumer ethos that is conducive to lively, and profitable cities. The idea of the “creative city” based on thriving “creative” industries has been identified as an efficient way to achieve this, by curating cities to the consumption preferences of a new “creative class” that will bring economic growth

and innovation. In a short promotional video entitled, *Our Kaka'ako. Our Art and Culture*. Kamehameha Schools articulates a creative city identity for Our Kaka'ako, positioning the development as an oasis for the hip, island urbanite (2013). The film opens with a montage of street art from Pow!Wow!Hawaii, an annual street art festival that brings international artists to Kaka'ako to paint murals around the district. Jasper Wong, lead director of Pow!Wow! explains, "basically we just bring in all these artists from all over the world to come to Hawai'i and paint, to beautify the neighborhood." He continues, "You drive through Kaka'ako, and you're going to an art show." The beautification of Kaka'ako is therefore, a way to transform the entire district into a cultural exhibit, a canvas for the enjoyment and entertainment of this urban community. Our Kaka'ako has become a staple in Honolulu's nightlife and art scene, hosting monthly pop-up events like Night+Market and Art+Flea. But what started out feeling like a grassroots and authentic community of artists has begun to feel calculated as Kamehameha Schools pours money into these projects. The film continues by interviewing the owner of R/D, a co-working space that has since closed, and the co-director of 808urban, a youth arts organization. Jasper Wong says later in the film, "Right now Kaka'ako is transitioning to a new phase. As things are changing we as artists are coming in to help it find its identity." Kamehameha Schools thus positions Our Kaka'ako as a community with a distinctly creative identity. However, the reason that Kamehameha Schools invests in this identity is that there is a carefully crafted linkage between these temporary artistic uses and the growth agenda. Creative sector uses of space are "perceived by public authorities as an intermediary, second-best option for vacant urban spaces in the absence of other development options or as a prelude to more profitable ventures to be launched by the initial users themselves or by external investors".

This subtle yet detectable shift is reflective of the “creative city” branding strategy that has been embraced by cities around the world. Robert Florida, an American urban studies theorist who is hotly criticized by urban theorists but well-loved in public policy, argues that in cities with a successful “creative class” we can expect to see high economic growth, and therefore, public policy should seek to make cities attractive for this “class” of people (Florida 2004). For Florida, the creative class includes a “super creative core” (scientists, engineers, academics, economists, and related occupations), a "bohemian" group (artists, writers, musicians, designers, etc.), and “creative professionals” (managers, financial and real estate brokers, and organizational experts). While Florida is criticized for his simplistic characterization of a disparate and diverse global class of people, as well as for his privileging of their societal value, his theories have had immense influence on city policies around the world. The Honolulu Community Development Authority has embraced this agenda, emphasizing Kaka‘ako’s roots in the creative class, and even agreeing to lease a plot of land for a dollar a year to support a live-and-work loft development that will provide 84 rentals to low income artists making up to 60 percent AMI (Wallace 2015).

Ironically, whereas the creative sector had long been ignored or downplayed in capitalist cities as unprofitable and irrelevant to capital accumulation, urban planning and marketing strategies now seek to specifically highlight and encourage cultural entrepreneurship. Subversive tactics used by sub- and counter-culture groups, like the temporary use of space (for art and work spaces, living spaces, public spaces, and music venues), are no longer viewed as signs of market weakness, but are promoted as a way to attract creative entrepreneurs, tourists, and consumers to urban spaces.). Creative industries are enlisted in the “symbolic gentrification” of industrial and working class neighborhoods, generating the preconditions for

commercial redevelopment and physical gentrification (Colomb 2012, Holm and Kuhn 2011, Zukin 1996). The result again, is homogenization. Returning to the video, the camera pans across the interior of large warehouse spaces, one converted into a cluttered and pleasantly chaotic artist's studio space, the other into sterile, minimalist art gallery. The spaces could easily be from New York, or Paris, were it not for the sea of predominately brown faces that occupy them. Each scene shows spaces in which a "global style" is replicated in a way that puts Kaka'ako on par with certain urban landscapes that have "become seen as tangible manifestations of globalization" (Davidson 2007, 492). This loft aesthetic is part of the homogenizing impulse of capital—creative sectors in "creative cities", after experiencing a burst of investment and innovation, often lament the "Manhattanization" of their urban enclaves soon after (Shaw 2007; Zukin 2011). The subversive nature of the arts has itself been turned into a "niche market" for the new urban consumer.

As Kratke writes, the toolkit of creative strategies are readily subsumed by a neoliberal agenda—encouraging "interurban competition, gentrification, middle class consumption, and place-marketing". This tool kit includes the use of public art, artists live/work lofts, pop-up markets, festivals, and temporary use spaces to restructure the urban environment to better compete for capital. Once these "urban pioneers" have facilitated the "symbolic gentrification" of the area, producing the aesthetic precursor to more intensified capitalist development, they too, are priced out by the upper strata of the creative class (Kratke 2011; Zukin 1996)

Settler Colonial History as a Mark of Distinction

The settler colonial context of Kaka'ako enables another version of this creative branding, as the commodification of indigenous culture provides a new, unique way to distinguish the 'branding' being sold by corporate developers—one I argue is important to

understand. The branding of Kaka‘ako with a cultural aesthetic satisfies the cravings for heritage and history for a hypermobile elite, without demanding accountability to place or community (Shaw 2007). Expressions of indigenous culture and history are reduced to aesthetic elements in the branding of Kaka‘ako as a unique, non-replicable urban experience, and are enlisted in service of capital. Yet, this forced enlistment is expertly framed as inclusion and respect. In the Ward Village Information Center, where potential buyers can meet with sales representatives to learn more about purchasing a luxury unit in the flagship Waiea residence, a promotional film titled *Ward Village* plays on loop in a lux “cinema room”. In the cinema room, the centrality of the indigenous culture and values contrasts the wealth and capitalist hunger in the rest of the information center.

The film begins as the camera pans high above Kaka‘ako, flanked by the Ko‘olau Mountains on one side, and the Pacific Ocean on the other. Diamond Head emerges in the background as a mele (song) recounts the birth of each island in Hawai‘i. A bikini-clad surfer rides a longboard across a wave off the shoreline from Kaka‘ako. The scene is paradisiacal, a modern version of the classic tourist image of Diamond Head and Waikīkī. Already, Ward is distinguished as a uniquely tropical urban island experience. In subsequent scenes, David Striph and Nick Vanderboom, Senior Vice Presidents of Howard Hughes Corporation, each talk about the various attributes that make Ward Village an innovative and desirable urban community. As they speak, artists’ renderings provide elegant depictions and sweeping views of the future face of urban Honolulu—sleek, shiny, pristine, and undeniably cutting edge. Importantly, Kanaka Maoli cultural practitioners, who elaborate on the ways that Howard Hughes has delicately crafted Ward Village in a way that is sensitive to Hawai‘i’s unique culture, dominate the last two thirds of the film. As Paulette Ka‘anoki Kalekini speaks about the pono (balanced and righteous)

way that Howards Hughes has approached development, her scene is spliced with footage of lauhala and other native plants. When Kumu Hinaleimoana Wong-Kalu says, “I feel that they truly have gone out of their way to make sure that accommodations were not only been made, but that true respect has been given to our people,” her words are accompanied with drone footage of two surfers paddling across the reef at Kewalo Basin. And when Solomon Enos shares “a wonderful Hawaiian saying, 'nānā imua, nānā i hope', looking forward, looking back” an artist’s rendering of a glass encased condominium building slowly fades away to an old black and white photograph of a small hut nestled between coconut fronds on the edge of a lo‘i kalo (wetland taro patch). In each scene, whiteness is paired with modernity, innovation, and steel-reinforced permanence, while indigenous bodies and words are paired with delicate images of nature and plant life.

Referring to indigeneity as a historical cultural heritage allows Howard Hughes to draw inspiration from a romanticized past while still retaining a monopoly over the present and the future. The native plant life, the reef, and the historical imagery of old Hawai‘i are all swiftly subsumed by Howard Hughes’ pre-packaged image of a beautified and cleansed Kaka‘ako. It is a way to retain this urban space as a globally accessible and marketable commodity, while embellishing it with the images of unmatched beauty and exoticism that Hawai‘i has long conjured in the Western imagination. This is of course, nothing new. As Houston Wood writes in *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai‘i*, Waikīkī is built upon the appropriation of Hawaiian culture “conceived without Hawaiian people”. The incorporation of Hawaiian motifs, place names, entertainment, and “village” exhibits, is an important tourist industry strategy forwarded by George Kanahale in his controversial report “Restoring Hawaiianness to Waikiki” (Kanahale 1994). Referencing Spencer Lieneweber, Wood calls this

echo tourism, which “fetishizes echoes of a supposed authenticity now available mostly to those with the ability to pay” (Wood 1999, 93). This master narrative of nostalgia identifies Hawaiians with an exotic past and a time without modernity. It appropriates Hawaiian culture in a way that renders the presence of actual Kanaka Maoli as unnecessary, and in a manner that does not guarantee that Kanaka will “acquire more power or have any of their lands or traditional rights restored as a result” (Wood 93).

Wood adds that “hotels in Waikīkī aspire to represent themselves as 'heroes' in this echo narrative” (Wood 1999, 93). In Kaka‘ako, where the desired consumer is not the parochial tourist, but the global elite, the developers cast themselves as the heroes, restoring Kaka‘ako’s sense of Hawaianness while bringing the neighborhood into modernity. In the final scene of the film, a computer-generated image shows Waiea and Anaha (the two ultra-luxury flagship residential towers of Ward Village) glistening pink as the setting sun is reflected on their glass façade. The sun sets over the ocean behind them, as Nick Vanderboom says, “While Ward Village is firmly grounded in the past, its also about looking forward to the future of Honolulu.” His closing words are cast as prolific, and his vision is portrayed as the force that will move Hawai‘i into the future. Orange clouds move swiftly across the sky, not from the direction of the Ko‘olau’s as they are usually pushed by the tradewinds, but instead, from the direction of the setting sun. Their altered movement gives the distinct illusion that Ward Village is moving slowly and steadily towards the horizon. This visual imagery suggests moving forward, reconciling the indigenous 'past' with the settler future rather than recognizing that settler colonialism renders the two incommensurable (Tuck and Yang 2012, 17). Though Vanderboom and Howard Hughes Corporation are portrayed as the heroes of urban Honolulu and the vanguards of Kanaka modernity, their project of indigenous appropriation maintains the

constant, but quiet threat of leaving indigenous peoples behind if they do not comply.

Cultural branding as a Erasure and Innocence

This appropriation is more than just an exploitation of indigenous culture for profit, though it is, that as well. Ultimately, it constitutes yet another act of erasure. To provide an established example of this contradictory inclusion and erasure, I turn to Eyal Weizman's analysis of how the appropriation of Palestinian vernacular architecture was a deliberate strategy in the Israeli settler colonial project in Jerusalem. In constructing the settler built environment, Israel deliberately sought to "Orientalize" architecture, in a way that would stimulate "collective memory" of belonging in Jerusalem, as well as build collective identity as a Mediterranean country. Palestinian aesthetics were framed as appropriations of biblical Hebrew cultural expressions that had been altered by latecomer Palestinians and were ready to be reclaimed by Israeli settlers. The commitment to Orientalize Israeli architecture through the cooptation of Palestinian vernacular architecture was in keeping with the broader urban development principles of "colonial regionalism" which were encouraged by the British Empire to retain regional characteristics in colonial holdings while "dissolv[ing] 'old' with new, archeology with living fabric" (Weizman 2007, 27). Importantly, this colonial regionalism allowed Israel to negotiate "the contradictory desires to either imitate or even inhabit the stereotypical Arab vernacular, and to define itself sharply and contrastingly against it" (Weizman 43). This hijacking of Palestinian architectural culture, and the broader strategy of colonial regionalism that was deployed across the British Empire, demonstrates how aesthetic theft and inclusion can be used as a way to validate settler presence on expropriated land, to "indigenize" colonial culture and ensure that settler colonialism remains settled.

Returning to Kaka‘ako, the appropriation of Kanaka Maoli culture in the branding of the district serves as a project of erasure by removing the histories of resistance that are enmeshed and fused with Kanaka Maoli cultural resurgence. As Noelani Goodyear Ka‘ōpua writes, for Kanaka Maoli resurgence, “culture is political, and politics are cultural” (Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2014, 12). Cultural revitalization as well as fierce challenges to corporate development have both been inseparable from the reassertion of indigenous political sovereignty since the 1970’s. The practice of indigenous culture in a settler society that seeks the elimination of native ontologies is a contestation over political power. While capital interests want indigenous culture to remain available for exploitation as a mark of distinction, indigenous difference can only be recognized, as long as it “highly ordered... glorification of the past as long as it is safely brought into the present” (Smith 1996, 111).

Thus, to exploit, depoliticize and commodify indigenous culture in a pseudo-public space curated and programmed by a corporation, requires the pacification of indigenous resurgence by removing the class and political analysis that has long been embedded in Kanaka Maoli struggles for culture and land. As Tuck and Yang powerfully contend, “this kind of inclusion is a form of enclosure, dangerous in how it domesticates decolonization” (Tuck and Yang 2012, 3). The presence of indigenous *politics* is an unsettling paradox for settlers, but the presence of indigenous *culture* can be subsumed by the rhetoric of multiculturalism and allow settlers to claim it without questioning their own positionality and claims to land in Hawai‘i. In fact, it is reflective of a larger effort to reduce indigenous critiques of settler colonialism to demands for cultural inclusion, rather than demands for political sovereignty that fundamentally challenges the presence of the settlers, their state, and their institutions.

Removing the political from indigenous culture is a settler move to innocence, an attempt

to “relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all” (Tuck and Yang 2012, 10). Though Tuck and Yang direct their criticisms at academics, writing, “settler moves to innocence are hollow, they only serve the settler,” this same criticism can be levied against the rhetoric of cultural sensitivity deployed by Howard Hughes Corporation (10). When Nick Vanderboom, Senior Vice President of the Howard Hughes Corporation comes on screen, he says solemnly, “It’s a great opportunity but also a great responsibility to be good stewards of the land.” For many people in Hawai‘i, this statement immediately brings to mind kuleana (a deep sense of responsibility often tied to specific areas of land) as well as aloha ‘āina (a reciprocal love and stewardship of land and people). Vanderboom’s rhetoric is easily recognizable as a self-conscious admission of guilt and acknowledgement of indigeneity. Luckily for Vanderboom, it is immediately followed by a scene in which Paulette Ka’anoki Kalekini (who is identified as a descendent of Kaka’ako ‘ili) says:

“You have developers like Howard Hughes coming in that can do the job, and do it respectfully and with pono intentions. I praise them for that. And this is one way they can do it, by getting, by incorporating the mana‘o of Hawaiians to support. For me that is a pono way, and when you do things pono, the path will open up.”

While native peoples who call attention to settler colonialism are often admonished for dwelling on the past, as Tuck and Yang write, settlers “may gain professional kudos or a boost in their reputations for being so sensitive or self-aware” (10). In answering Vanderboom’s invocation of kuleana and aloha ‘āina with a reassurance that Howard Hughes is doing what is pono, meaning balanced, righteous, and in harmony with the way things should be, the video rewards Vanderboom’s move to innocence. The path forward, once again paved with acts of

reconciliation and understanding, means that despite a regrettable past, the only way into the future is through the settler.

Chapter conclusions

The branding of Kaka‘ako is not purely discursive, though I have only discussed it as such. To the contrary, it comes with significant monetary investments. Kamehameha Schools has provided funding and support to many small business owners, even as it reiterates their temporary place in the neighborhood with short term, month-to-month leases. Howard Hughes has committed an impressive \$1 million to the community through the Ward Village Foundation, and has funded important cultural initiatives like the Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement’s annual exhibition for Kanaka Maoli artists. Recently, funding from the Ward Village Foundation helped to make possible Kānehūnāmoku Voyaging Society’s project to bring the Hawaiian and Micronesian communities together to build a Micronesian sailing canoe. All of these contributions enable community actors to do valuable work.

However, regardless of the community support or cultural inclusion that is provided by developers in Kaka‘ako, these investments are part of a larger project of class transformation in Honolulu. Without a class analysis, they may pass as benevolent efforts to empower and revitalize a community, but understanding the market imperative, it becomes apparent that promoting these cultural projects is a way of enlisting the community in its own displacement. The appropriation of indigenous culture in Ward Village speaks particularly clearly to the necessity of a class analysis in indigenous movements. When indigenous resurgence is framed as a set of cultural demands, inclusion can be offered as a solution and an act of reconciliation. A class critique illuminates the ways that capitalism can co-opt native culture itself, within the logic of elimination.

On the other hand, as developers brand their neighborhoods according to a subversive, transgressive, or resistance communities (be it an arts community or, in the case of Ward Village, an indigenous movement), the subversive power of these subcultures can strengthen (Harvey 2013). The power over space is not only financial or monetary. It is cultural, collective power. Harvey provides some hope when he points out that as capital seeks to escape the monotony that destroys marketability, it must often “support a form of differentiation and allow of divergent and to some degree uncontrollable local cultural developments that can be antagonistic to its own smooth function” (Harvey 2013, 110). This points to the potential for an insurgent indigenous urbanism that can challenge the hegemonic power of settler colonialism in urban spaces.

Chapter 5

Conclusion: The Right to the City as Aloha ‘Āina

In 2014, I participated in two actions that were part of campaigns to challenge proposed developments on O‘ahu. The first was a City and County hearing to approve or deny plans to build a master planned community on Koa Ridge in Central Oahu, adjacent to the town where I was raised. My testimony began:

People are tired of fighting every step of the way, against rich developers who don't care about our vision for a sustainable future. I beg you to fight with us; for me, my peers, and the families we one day hope to raise here. We grew up in a beautiful place and we want to keep it that way.

As I testified, I was acutely aware of the contradictions and complications that I embodied, standing before an institution of the settler state, which I understand to be illegitimate and illegal, and yet am undeniably a part of. I was expressing an attachment to ‘āina in which my roots are relatively shallow. I was testifying against a development paradigm that I was a product of. And yet, somehow, I was angered by the fact that proponents of the Koa Ridge Development could not envision land as having any value if it were not producing profit or creating jobs. Even opponents of development were trapped in the discourse of a powerful urban growth regime. Their talking points centered oddly, around how the new development would put more cars on the road and add hours to the daily commute from Central Oahu to Downtown Honolulu. My hands shook as I spoke, already knowing that my words would not be heard, and that the people before me had already made up their mind. Unsurprisingly, the development was approved a few

hours later, and I was left thinking about how that area of land would become just another master planned community, the ridge lined with cookie cutter houses.

A few months later, in February 2014, a silent march was held in Mālaekahana to protest Envision Lā‘ie, another large-scale development, this time proposed by the corporate arm of the Church of Latter Day Saints. The march was organized by an ad hoc community organization called Aloha ‘Āina No Ko‘olau Loa. For about an hour, protestors marched silently Kamehameha Highway blocking traffic, as a couple hundred people walked with signs and upside-down Hawaiian flags. The speeches that followed the march articulated indigenous values such as aloha ‘āina, and defended the rights of kuleana landowners. Residents from the community spoke about their love for not only the land they lived on, but also the way they lived upon it. Uncle Walter Ritte, a longtime activist and kupuna to many aloha ‘āina across the state, spoke about Hawai‘i’s unrelinquished sovereignty and the need to protect Hawaiian ways of life. Organizer and Hau‘ula resident Joshua Noga addressed the marchers:

It gives me great joy to see everyone here today, standing in unity to say ‘a‘ole to this massive urbanization development, to the gentrification of our Ko‘olauloa community, and a displacement of our Hawaiian community.

The event was firmly rooted in expressions of indigenous political and cultural identity, and in articulation of aloha ‘āina that emphasized a love for, and relationship to, the land. A year later, the struggle continued, but a significant victory came when the community organized to block language from the Ko‘olau Loa Sustainable Communities Plan that would have expanded O‘ahu’s urban growth boundary and paved the way for the Envision Lāi‘e development. After more than four hours of testimony, the City Council’s Zoning and Planning Committee approved the removal of language from the bill. Later, Ikaika Anderson, chairman of the committee, said

in an interview, “To me its not pono to develop in this certain area, regardless if it’s 1 acre or 300 acres or 500 acres.”

Spatial Boundaries of Aloha ‘Āina

Reflecting on the very different ways in which these land struggles were articulated, and the different outcomes that they produced, I asked why one was framed in the context of convenience, while the other was expressed as a conflict within the context of occupation and colonialism. Settler colonialism, in its never-ending effort to minimize and bind indigenous peoples, presence, and geographies, is spatialized in a way that designates only certain spaces as “indigenous” (though these spaces as well, are always subject to settler incursions). Indigenous relationships to land “are presumed and oversimplified as natural, and even worse, romanticized,” so that only spaces with natural and cultural “integrity” are permitted to be claimed by indigenous people. As Mishuana Goeman argues, this colonial cartography of recognition coaxes us into forgetting that the mapping of “ceded” lands, or public trust lands, or land use zones, or urban growth boundaries are all constructed upon indigenous peoples and places. This cartography is internalized, and it affects the ways that people are able to mobilize as aloha ‘āina. Rural spaces are more easily understood as worthy of conservation, or as spaces where an indigenous way of being in the world should be permitted to persist. Urban and sub-urban spaces are constructed as “settled” settler spaces, where development and colonialism are inevitable and already agreed upon. As such, they are used as geographic nodes to which settler colonialism can anchor itself as immovable and permanent. In Kaka‘ako, like Koa Ridge, this colonial cartography seeks to strip us of our ability to demand the right to the city, or to protect ‘āina against urban sprawl, or to challenge to legitimacy of the urban growth machine.

This study has sought to reclaim this ability, and to unsettle this spatial regime. Development in Kaka‘ako, and the entirety of the pae‘āina, is deeply entangled with the structural violence of settler colonialism. It privileges a capitalist worldview that is dependent on an extractive relationship with land as a natural resource and a commodity, and continues the project of pushing indigenous geographies to the past and to the periphery. In resting the future of Honolulu’s urban landscape in the hands of corporate developers, settler society is granted a monopoly on the urban, and settler futurity is cemented. By denying the value and validity of indigenous knowledge in urban spaces, the possibilities for a decolonial urban future are precluded.

Urban Aloha ‘Āina: (Re)Mapping Honolulu

The aim of this project was to unmap settler geographies in order to unsettle assumptions about urban space in the settler colonial context. However decolonizing Hawai‘i also demands a project of “remapping”. Goeman defines (re)mapping as “the labor Native authors and the communities they write within and about undertake, in the simultaneously metaphoric and material capacities of map making, to generate new possibilities” (Goeman, location 88). Importantly, Goeman uses the parentheses in (re)mapping to “avoid the pitfalls of recovery or a seeming return of the past to the present. In this way, she recognizes indigenous relationships to land as evolving and changing in response to occupation and colonization, and opens the boundless possibilities of reimagining urban spaces and disrupting the restrictive and limiting colonial cartography.

Urban Honolulu is a paradoxical space, its present-day built environment dominated by settler colonial violence and dispossession, but also, shaped by indigenous histories, culture, knowledge, and experience. Though developers seek to claim the urban environment in Honolulu

in general, and Kaka‘ako in particular, as the domain of Western progress, to do so is to ignore the ways that indigenous peoples have created urban networks and communities, and shaped the urban landscape through persistence and resistance. Though the redevelopment of Kaka‘ako has thus far been a project of gentrification, there is still time to demand a different kind of urbanism—one that can be produced through practices of indigenous self-determination and resurgence.

I argue that an indigenous demand for the right to the city is an act of aloha ‘āina that rejects the romanticized, oversimplification of indigenous relationships to land and asserts that all lands in Hawai‘i, whether urban or rural, must be protected from capitalist greed and extractivism. An urban aloha ‘āina would acknowledge and take seriously the fact that all development in Hawai‘i occurs on indigenous land, and that the economic displacement of Hawai‘i residents through gentrification is predicated on the dispossession of indigenous people, knowledge, and ways of life. It would acknowledge that settler colonialism has employed property as a way of expropriating indigenous lands along racist lines. This urban aloha ‘āina would demand that we approach the issue of development by understanding where we are complicit in the victimization of others; whether it be the middle class displacing the poor, business owners displacing the houseless, settlers displacing Kanaka Maoli, or development displacing rural communities. As Joshua Noga said in his speech at the Silent March for Aloha ‘Āina No Ko‘olau Loa, “We stand in unity, both Kanaka Maoli, kama‘āina, malihini, we all know why we’re here.” Perhaps aloha ‘āina can provide an avenue for solidarity that takes seriously the implications of vastly different positionalities and claims to land, but also works toward a shared vision that seeks to unmap the capitalist geographies of the settler state, and (re)map possibilities for a decolonial future.

Bibliography

- Andersen, Chris, Evelyn Peters, and Inc ebrary. 2013. *Indigenous in the City Contemporary Identities and Cultural Innovation*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Anderson, James. 1990. "The 'new Right', Enterprise Zones and Urban Development Corporations." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 14 (3): 468–89. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2427.1990.tb00151.x.
- Anderson, Mark. 1978. "Kakaako Redevelopment: Pitfalls and Promises of Urban Renewal." *Hawaii Observer*, February 23.
- Atkinson, Rowland, and Gary Bridge. 2005. *Gentrification in a Global Context: The New Urban Colonialism*. Routledge.
- Avrich, Paul. 2005. *The Modern School Movement: Anarchism and Education in the United States*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Barnes, Kendall, Gordon Waitt, Nicholas Gill, and Chris Gibson. 2006. "Community and Nostalgia in Urban Revitalisation: A Critique of Urban Village and Creative Class Strategies as Remedies for Social 'problems.'" *Australian Geographer* 37 (3): 335–54.
- Benson, David J. 1969. "Bonus or Incentive Zoning--Legal Implications." *Syracuse Law Review* 21: 895.
- Berry, Brian JL. 1985. "Islands of Renewal in Seas of Decay." *The New Urban Reality*, 69–96.
- Brenner, Neil. 2011. "What Is Critical Urban Theory?" In *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, edited by Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer, 1 edition, 11–23. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2013. *The Gentrification Debates: A Reader*. Routledge.

- Burchell, Robert, and Catherine Galley. 2000. "Inclusionary Zoning Pros & Cons." *New Century Housing* 1 (2). <http://ginsler.com/sites/ginsler/files/NHC-2.html>.
- Callies, David L. 2010. *Regulating Paradise: Land Use Controls in Hawai'i*. 2nd ed. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Cassidy, Rick. 2015. "Overview of the Statewide Housing Need." Briefing for Senate Committee on Human Services & Housing and House Committee on Housing presented at the Informational Briefing on statewide need for housing in Hawaii, Hawaii State Capitol, January 27.
http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2015/testimony/INFO_TESTIMONY_HSH-HSG_01-27-15_HOUSING.pdf.
- Clarno, Andrew James. 2009. "The Empire's New Walls: Sovereignty, Neo-Liberalism, and the Production of Space in Post-Apartheid South Africa and Post-Oslo Palestine/Israel." ProQuest.
http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=z5QzkJ0vpKYC&oi=fnd&pg=PR2&dq=%22extends+far+and%22+%22It+has+been+a+great+privilege+to+join+their+community+of+scholars,%22+%22about+their+struggles.+I+am+deeply+grateful+for+the+welcome+that+I+received.%22+&ots=NFCINop0Xc&sig=Se8aeQnieIer7EQ_lpKxGUVrcsg.
- Cochran, Allan. 1999. "Just Another Passing Trend." In *British Urban Policy: An Evaluation of the Urban Development Corporations*, edited by Rob Imrie and Huw Thomas. SAGE.
- Cooper, Davina. 2013. *Everyday Utopias: The Conceptual Life of Promising Spaces*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

- Coulthard, Glen. 2015. "Urbs Nullius: Gentrification and Indigenous Sovereignty in the City." In *Settler Colonialism and the City: Gentrification, Urban Dispossession, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Chicago, Illinois.
- Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press.
- Darrah, Jennifer Rene. 2010. "Contested Land Development in Hawai'i: Regime Change in a Tourism Economy." Ph.D., United States -- Rhode Island: Brown University.
<http://search.proquest.com.eres.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/pqdtglobal/docview/763144304/abstract/DAFCCEEB30CE481BPQ/1?accountid=27140>.
- Davidson, Mark. 2007. "Gentrification as Global Habitat: A Process of Class Formation or Corporate Creation?" *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (4): 490–506.
- Florida, Richard. 2004. *Cities and the Creative Class*. 1 edition. New York: Routledge.
- Freeman, Jo. 2012. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness." In *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader*, edited by Dark Star Collective, Third Edition edition. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Freeman, Lance, and Frank Braconi. 2004. "Gentrification and Displacement New York City in the 1990s." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (1): 39–52.
doi:10.1080/01944360408976337.
- George S. Kanaha. 1994a. *Restoring Hawaiianness to Waikiki*. Honolulu: Queen Emma Foundation.
- . 1994b. *Restoring Hawaiianness to Waikiki*. Honolulu: Queen Emma Foundation.
- Gibson, Marsha. 2011. *Kakaako As We Knew It*. 1 edition. Honolulu, Hawaii: Mutual Publishing.
- Goeman, Mishuana. 2013. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press.

- Goldman, Emma. 1924. *My Further Disillusionment in Russia*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, Page and Co.
- Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani. 2011. "Rebuilding the 'Auwai: Connecting Ecology, Economy and Education in Hawaiian Schools." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 5 (2). <http://www.content.alternative.ac.nz/index.php/alternative/article/view/36>.
- Goodyear-Ka'opua, Noelani. 2014. "Introduction." In *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, edited by Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika'ala Wright. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Grandinetti, Tina. 2015. "The Palestinian Middle Class in Rawabi Depoliticizing the Occupation." *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, April, 0304375415581259. doi:10.1177/0304375415581259.
- Group 70 International. 2013. *Cultural Landscape and Ancestral Connectivity Analysis*. Office of Hawaiian Affairs Strategic Management Framework Kaka'ako Makai. Office of Hawaiian Affairs.
- Guerin, Daniel, ed. 2005. *No Gods No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism*. Translated by Paul Sharkey. Edinburgh, Scotland ; Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Hardman, Jesse. 2015. "In Hawaii, Locals Feel the Pinch of Retirees' Cash." *NPR.org*. Accessed April 3. <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=5579023>.
- Harvey, David. 2013. *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution*. 1 edition. Verso.
- Hawaii Community Development Authority Housing Development Projects*. 2015. Honolulu: Hawaii Community Development Authority.
- "HCDA Reserved and Workforce Housing." 2015. Hawaii Community Development Authority.

- Hitt, Christine, and Lurline McGregor. 2015. "Unpaving Paradise." *Kakaako Magazine*.
- Hofschneider, Anita. 2014a. "Living Hawaii: Priced Out of Paradise — Where \$600K Is a Bargain Home." *Civil Beat*. January 7. <http://www.civilbeat.com/articles/2014/01/08/20844-living-hawaii-priced-out-of-paradise-where-600k-is-a-bargain-home/>.
- — —. 2014b. "Kakaako Condo Prices Jumped 75 Percent Since Last Year, Report Finds." *Civil Beat*. July 17. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2014/07/kakaako-condo-prices-jumped-75-percent-since-last-year-report-finds/>.
- — —. 2014c. "Conference to Explore Hawaii's Lack of Affordable Housing." *Civil Beat*. November 11. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2014/11/conference-to-explore-hawaiis-lack-of-affordable-housing/>.
- — —. 2014d. "Here's What You Should Know About Mayor Caldwell's New Housing Strategy." *Civil Beat*. November 18. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2014/11/heres-what-you-should-know-about-mayor-caldwells-new-housing-strategy/>.
- — —. 2015. "Public Housing Is Crumbling, So What's State Doing About It?" *Civil Beat*. Accessed May 4. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2015/02/public-housing-is-crumbling-so-whats-the-state-doing-about-it/>.
- Hollier, Dennis. 2015. "'Smart Growth' | Hawaii Business Magazine." Accessed March 9. <http://www.hawaiibusiness.com/smart-growth/>.
- Hughes, James W., and George Sternlieb. 1987. *The Dynamics of America's Housing*. Rutgers Univ Center for Urban.
- Imrie, Rob, and Huw Thomas. 1999. *British Urban Policy: An Evaluation of the Urban Development Corporations*. SAGE.

- Kakesako, Gregg. 2013. "State and City Officials Sweeping Kakaako Homeless Camp Sites - Hawaii News - Honolulu Star-Advertiser." *Honolulu Star-Advertiser - Hawaii Newspaper*. July 18.
http://www.staradvertiser.com/news/breaking/20130718_State_and_City_officials_sweeping_Kakaako_homeless_sites.html?id=216051011.
- Kanahele, George S. 1993. *RESTORING HAWAIIANNESS TO WAIKIKI*. The Queen Emma Foundation.
- Kauanui, J. Kehaulani. 2008. *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Keating, W. Dennis. 1989. "Emergence of Community Development Corporations: Their Impact on Housing and Neighborhoods." *Law Faculty Articles and Essays*, 8–14.
- Kido, Pamela S. 2008. *Becoming Local: Social Movement and Literary Production in Late-Twentieth Century Hawai'i*. ProQuest.
http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=r0H5rJG_Bz8C&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=%22effort,+Local+movement,+was+instrumental+in+sowing%22+%22community+activists+mainly,+had+spent+the+last+few%22+%22at+the+valley+on+May+11,+shortly+after+7+a.m.,%22+&ots=W6EN31I6UT&sig=ACIIWNO4Uz2mPImJGXmGuSt7Xus.
- Knaup, Horand, and Alexander Neubacher. 2013. "Squeezed Out: Declines in Subsidized Housing." *Spiegel Online*, February 1. <http://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/german-renters-pinched-by-rising-costs-and-decreasing-supply-a-875224-2.html>.
- Kratke, Stefan. 2011. "The New Urban Ideology of 'Creative Cities.'" In *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, edited by Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer, 1 edition. London ; New York: Routledge.

- Krueger, Rob, and David Gibbs. 2008. "'Third Wave' Sustainability? Smart Growth and Regional Development in the USA." *Regional Studies* 42 (9): 1263–74.
doi:10.1080/00343400801968403.
- Lasky, Jackie. 2011. "Indigenism, Anarchism, Feminism: An Emerging Framework for Exploring Post-Imperial Futures." *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, and Action* 5 (1). <http://affinitiesjournal.org/affinities/index.php/affinities/article/view/72/231>.
- Lasky, Jacqueline. 2010. "Community Struggles, Struggling Communities : Land, Water and Self-Determination in Waiahole-Waikane, Hawai`i."
- Lees, Loretta. 1994. "Gentrification in London and New York: An Atlantic Gap?" *Housing Studies* 9 (2): 199–217.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1996. *Writings on Cities*. Edited by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. 1 edition. Cambridge, Mass, USA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Let's All Be Part of the Solution*. 2014. Honolulu HI: Hawaii Community Development Authority. <http://dbedt.hawaii.gov/hcda/files/2014/11/Final-Reserved-Housing-Report-112414.pdf>.
- Marcuse, Peter. 2011. "Whose Right(s) to What City?" In *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, edited by Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer, 1 edition, 11–23. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Mcclintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. 1st edition. New York: Routledge.
- Milner, Neal. 2006. "Home, Homelessness, and Homeland in Kalama Valley: Re-Imagining a Hawaiian Nation through a Property Dispute."
<https://evols.library.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10524/483>.

- Morgan, Jennifer M. 1995. "Zoning for All: Using Inclusionary Zoning Techniques to Promote Affordable Housing." *Emory Law Journal* 44: 359.
- New Organizing Institute. 2014. "Leading Change Network Community Organizing Training." *Our Kakaako. Our Art and Culture*. 2013. Honolulu Hawaii. <https://vimeo.com/53476866>.
- Overmeyer, Klaus, and others. 2007. "Urban Pioneers: Temporary Use and Urban Development in Berlin." *Berlin: Jovis*.
- Pape, Eric. 2014a. "Living Hawaii: Where the Rent Is Too Damn High." *Civil Beat*. November 25. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2014/11/living-hawaii-where-the-rent-is-too-damn-high/>.
- — —. 2014b. "Living Hawaii: One Solution for Out-of-Control Rents." *Civil Beat*. December 3. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2014/12/living-hawaii-one-solution-for-out-of-control-rents/>.
- Peirce, Neal R., and Carol Steinbach. 1987. *Corrective Capitalism: The Rise of America's Community Development Corporations*. Ford Foundation New York.
- http://archive.wilsonquarterly.com/sites/default/files/articles/WQ_VOL12_SU_1988_Research.pdf.
- Phillips, Richard. 2013. *Mapping Men and Empire: Geographies of Adventure*. Routledge.
- Puhipau. 2014. "(Self-)Portrait. Puhipai: The Ice Man Looks Back at the Sand Island Eviction." In *A Nation Rising: Hawaiian Movements for Life, Land, and Sovereignty*, edited by Noelani Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Ikaika Hussey, and Erin Kahunawaika'ala Wright. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Ramnath, Maia. 2012. *Decolonizing Anarchism: An Antiauthoritarian History of India's Liberation Struggle*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Razack, Sherene. 2002. *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*. Between The Lines.

- Red, Rosa, and Maria Black. 2012. "Anarcha-Feminism: Two Statements." In *Quiet Rumours: An Anarcha-Feminist Reader*, Third Edition edition. Edinburgh: AK Press.
- Regan, Paulette, and Taiaiake Alfred. 2011. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: University of Washington Press.
- Remembering Kaka'ako 1910-1950*. 1978. Honolulu HI: Social Science Research Network University of Hawaii at Mānoa. <http://scholarspace.manoa.hawaii.edu/handle/10125/30142>.
- Shaw, Wendy S. 2007. *Cities of Whiteness*. 1 edition. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Shimogawa, Duane. 2013. "Penthouse in Howard Hughes' Ward Project in Honolulu Priced at Record \$50M." December 12.
<http://www.bizjournals.com/pacific/news/2013/12/12/penthouse-in-howard-hughes-ward.html>.
- Simpson, Leanne. 2011. *Dancing On Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabeg Re-Creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing.
- Slater, Tom. 2011. "Missing Marcuse: On Gentrification and Displacement." In *Cities for People, Not for Profit: Critical Urban Theory and the Right to the City*, edited by Neil Brenner, Peter Marcuse, and Margit Mayer, 1 edition, 171–96. London ; New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Andrea. 2006. "Heteropatriarchy and the Three Pillars of White Supremacy." In *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, 66–73. South End Press.
http://www.iamsocialjustice.com/images/Color_of_Violence.pdf.
- Smith, Neil. 1996. *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London ; New York: Routledge.

- Smith, Neil, and P Williams, eds. 1986. *Gentrification of the City*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- SMS Research and Marketing Services. 2011. *Hawai'i Housing Planning Study, 2011*. Hawai'i Housing Finance and Development Corporation.
<http://files.hawaii.gov/dbedt/hhfdc/resources/HHPS2011%20study.pdf>.
- Soja, Edward W. 2010. *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press.
- State of Hawaii Databook 2013*. 2013. Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism.
- Steele, Julia. 1990. "Kaka'ako: Urban Renewal or Kama'aina Removal?" *Honolulu Weekly*, November.
- Steger, Manfred B. 2010. *Neoliberalism a Very Short Introduction*. Very Short Introductions ; 222. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. 2015. "The Birth of the Modern Hawaiian Movement: Kalama Valley, O'ahu." *Hawaiian Journal of History* 21 (1987): 126–52. Accessed April 7.
- "Unpacking Settler Colonialism's Urban Strategies: Indigenous Peoples in Victoria, British Columbia, and the Transition to a Settler-Colonial City'." 2015. Accessed March 1.
https://www.academia.edu/2659807/Unpacking_Settler_Colonialisms_Urban_Strategies_Indigenous_Peoples_in_Victoria_British_Columbia_and_the_Transition_to_a_Settler-Colonial_City.
- Vine Deloria Jr. 2003. *God Is Red: A Native View of Religion, 30th Anniversary Edition*. 30th Anniversary Edition edition. Golden, Colo: Fulcrum Publishing.
- Wallace, Don. 2015. "Urban Hawaii: Are Lofty Ambitions for Artists in Kakaako a Good Idea?" *Civil Beat*. Accessed April 23. <http://www.civilbeat.com/2015/01/urban-hawaii-are-lofty-ambitions-for-artists-in-kakaako-a-good-idea/>.

Ward Village. 2015. Accessed May 8. <https://vimeo.com/85415941>.

Weizman, Eyal. 2007. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. London ; New York: Verso.

White, Kai, and Jim Kraus. 2007. *Waikiki*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing.

Wood, Houston. 1999. *Displacing Natives: The Rhetorical Production of Hawai'i*. KDenn edition. Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Zukin, Sharon. 1987. "Gentrification: Culture and Capital in the Urban Core." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13 (January): 129–47.

— — — . 1996. "Cultural Strategies of Economic Development and the Hegemony of Vision." In *The Urbanization of Injustice*, edited by Andy Merrifield and Erik Swyngedouw, 223–43. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

— — — . 2011. *Naked City: The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places*. Reprint edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.