

**LAND AGENDAS VIS À VIS A MAKANI (WIND) DISCOURSE:
DECONSTRUCTING SPACE/PLACE POLITICAL AGENDAS
IN HAWAII**

Sydney Lehua Iaukea

Mellon–Hawaii Postdoctoral Fellow 2008–2009

The University of Hawaii at Mānoa

This paper analyzes conservation and tourism agendas in Hawaii as they progressed together in the late 1950s. The two are interconnected and positioned land, people, and culture in particular ways. The silencing of other ways of knowing and interpreting *‘āina* were intrinsic in the promotion of industry. This paper discusses a “wind discourse” with *The Wind Gourd of La‘amaomao* to interject indigenous readings of space and place in Hawaii. A reorientation to native recollections of *‘āina* breaks contemporary social constructs and encourages the resurgence of other ways of knowing self and environment. Herein a Hawaiian wellbeing and identity is strengthened and allowed to flourish.

Ukiu is the name of the chilly north wind that
blows through Makawao on the island of Maui.¹

IF YOU KNEW the name of the *makani* (wind) that blew through a particular area, you were never lost, both geographically and perhaps epistemologically as well.² In the 1700s, a Hawaiian wellbeing was directed in large part by knowing one’s *wahi* (place) as regulated by both geographical features and genealogy. In this epistemology, physical features informed one’s universe. This intimate relationship between self and place was altered and eventually rewritten dramatically during the Territorial era in Hawaii. In the early 1900s in Hawaii, a Territorial national citizenry and landscape was closely

Pacific Studies, Vol. 32, No. 1—March 2009

aligned with American perceptions of landscape and national terrain. And in this process, Hawaiian understandings of *‘āina* continued to be buried under layers of Western empirical thought.³

This paper examines and intends to demonstrate how land policies, like conservation and tourism agendas that the Territorial Government (1900–1959) enacted, helped to rewrite and reorganize a Hawaiian Kingdom national citizenry and landscape. The methodology for this paper recounts space and place genealogy, examines the Territory of Hawai‘i’s conservation plans, and also juxtaposes these plans with a literature review of Hawaiian wind *mo‘olelo* (narratives) from the 1700s. In these instances, it is interesting to note how perceptions toward land shape the being.⁴ And, by resurrecting and remembering these other ways of being and these other relationships to *‘āina*, as exemplified through a *makani* discourse, we can close an epistemic gap and continue the resurrection of a Hawaiian wellbeing that supersedes contemporary social constructs. There are multiple ways to see space and therefore multiple ways to exist in place. This alone is radical in its implications.

Makani in Hawai‘i in the 1700s played a vital role for informing *kanaka maoli* (literally full-blooded Hawaiian person) of space and place. To know the winds of a particular place was to know one’s precise location, to understand the deities that existed therein, and to be sensitive to the differences in landscape and seascape in that space. In other words, to know the names and movements of the winds was to know where one was both geographically and epistemologically. Understanding the wind was one way of understanding the general social framework in Hawai‘i. A particular wind discourse⁵ as enunciated through the translations of the *mo‘olelo*, *The Wind Gourd of La‘amaomao*, organized life and spoke of the close association with the natural environment for those with the *kuleana* (responsibility) to share the movements and nuances of *makani* (Nakuina 1992). In this sense, there were no separations between the physical environments and the ideological terrains. This made knowledge of the winds highly political as a form of social resistance later in the 20th century. As a political expression in the early 1900s and during the formation of the Territorial Government in Hawai‘i, *The Wind Gourd of La‘amaomao* was edited and printed by Moses K. Nakuina so that Hawaiians could reorient themselves and “remember their true leaders, nation, and culture” (Nakuina 1992, vii).

Knowing the land through a *kanaka maoli* understanding of *makani* challenges contemporary constructs of space and encourages us to analyze the importance of placial understandings.⁶ In the process of reorienting ourselves ideologically, a Hawaiian sense of place⁷ and identity is strengthened when expanded to include the *mo‘olelo* and cultural understanding of our *kupuna* (ancestors). And in these understandings, there is no separation

between nature and self as an integrated worldview is lived. In comparison, conservation and tourism agendas that progressed in Hawai'i in the late 1950s reinforced interpretations of *landscape* that were contrary to aboriginal⁸ understandings. And in the process of renaming geography and privileging the institutions therein, *kanaka maoli* continued to be reinscribed according to these new spatial orders that reinforced a separation of people from place.

Conservation and tourism, which privilege consumer and capitalist interpretations of land, act and continue to position people and culture in particular ways that mostly separate people from place and encourage the consumption of both. By doing so, questions as to the changing social relations and the manner in which we as inhabitants are implicated in discursive practices and shifts in ideological terrains are raised. Also implicated in this discussion is the question of how *'āina* is constructed and produced as land and landscape, and subsequently the manner in which *ka po'e kahiko* are naturalized and neutralized within the geopolitical juridical discourse of the state. In other words, how are we separated from the natural environment, both physically and ideologically, through contemporary spatial orders? And, how can something like *knowing the wind* close this gap by recovering a Hawaiian sense of place and wellbeing? This essay looks at these epistemic issues.

Spatial Understandings

Because there are various ways to conceptualize and ascribe meaning to the land, land becomes the physical space wherein multiple groups contest their particular epistemologies. The contested views of land are vast and varied. For this paper, I look at the differences between native and Western perceptions of land as enunciated by *landscape* and *wilderness* discourses. These Western methods of viewing *'āina* support and facilitate both conservation and tourism agendas. Western thought would have us believe that there is only one way of seeing land, one route to the truth. Here, intrinsic in Western geography is the landscape genealogy that privileges sight over multisensory perception and separates out people and culture from nature.⁹ "Landscape constitutes a discourse through which identifiable social groups historically have framed themselves and their relations with both the land and with other human groups, and this discourse is closely related epistemically and technically to ways of seeing" (Cosgrove 1998, xiv).

Spatial practices, like mapping and surveying, and the agents of modernity condensed land to the notion of *landscape*. Denis Cosgrove traces the genealogy of landscape to the social formation of land and labor in Renaissance

Italy. With the transformation of feudalism to capitalism in Italy, land transformed as the state and town transformed. Underlying this genealogy of landscape was one based on the politics of power and industry. And in doing so, “the separation of subject and object, insider and outsider, the personal and the social are already apparent at the birth of the landscape idea” (Cosgrove 1998, 26).

This landscape ideology stems from the European Enlightenment era and the Italian Renaissance of the 1400s that privileged *perspective* and *representation*. This is briefly explained as the privileging of sight and the recognition of a separation between the observer and the observed, with nature as the visual imagery *out there* and therefore distinct and separate from self. Paul Carter (1987), in *The Road to Botany Bay*, calls this aspect of seeing the *satellite eye*, that “looks down a telescope” to dissect the “real,” which is similar to what Dennis Cosgrove (1998) refers to as modernity’s “disembodied eye” with its subject centeredness.

In the process of seeing place as space, the positioning of sight over multi-sensory perception is privileged. Viewing as a biological priority further leads to the classifying and enframing of nature as privileged space in Western empirical thought. “Enframing is a method of dividing up and containing, as in the construction of barracks or the rebuilding of villages, which operates by conjuring up a neutral surface or volume called ‘space’” (Mitchell 1988, 44). “Plans and dimensions introduce space as something apparently abstract and neutral, a series of inert frames or containers” (Mitchell 1988, 45).¹⁰ With this understanding, space is “a priori” to place, it is preexisting and abstract, and can be ordered into being. Further, Western constructs of land are heavily coded in power dynamics and are reinforced by institutions that view and articulate land as a spatial entity. In comparison, a “placial” perspective of land recognizes place as a primary site that exists with and through the interactions of local communities and indigenous thought worlds.

As the landscape idea separates the viewer from the viewed and privileges spatial orders, the concept of *wilderness* again separates human habitation from the natural but through slightly different tropes. The wilderness notion comes from nineteenth-century English romantic traditions that viewed sublime nature as a source of aesthetic value. The vastness and grandeur of nature is appreciated for its aesthetic qualities alone and can only be recognized to exist through an assumed moral and cultural superiority by particular classes. Therefore, appreciation of such was not available to the simple laborer, and once again a separation from nature was emphasized. As shown in paintings during this era, laborers working on the landscape needed to be emptied, and then other bodies were reentered in specific ways, so that *wilderness* (and industry) could be appreciated.¹¹

Geographer Bruce Braun relates that in general, nature is constructed as a “space of visibility” so that economic and political investments in nature may be constituted (1997). The space of visibility in conservation agendas is legitimized and institutionalized in a landscape discourse that empties people from space. Conservation lands rely on myths of the *landscape* and *wilderness*. Both myths position nature as independent and void of human contact. While in reality, conservation lands are “created out of lands with long histories of occupancy and use” (Neumann 1998, 2). However, ignoring occupancy is one necessary ingredient in the externalization of nature whereby nature is *seen* as something out there as opposed to that which is implicit in and with human contact. Herein, “dispossession did not hinge on ignoring Natives; it hinged on *how they were described and incorporated within orders of knowledge*” (Braun 2002, 61).

Further developments during the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries also created the distinctive discourse that is referred to as the “visual consumption” of nature (Macnaghten and Urry 1998, 113). In the various social interpretations of land, conservation agendas originated with notions of *nature* and *empty space*. These notions not only served as nation-building projects by emptying peopled places and reasserting new meanings to land and nature, but such agendas were also useful for the encouragement of the “visual consumption” of space. By doing so, these sites that sought to preserve instead became sites of consumption because of the various avenues of human interaction as people come to observe and interact with nature in preimagined ways. Nature then became “a place to which one goes—the site of ‘resources’, a stage for ‘recreation’, a source for ‘spiritual renewal’, and a scene for ‘aesthetic reflection’” (Braun 2002, ix). These interactions with nature can only occur when indigenous readings of land are either silenced and/or contained.

Conservation and Tourism in Hawai‘i: Land and Otherness

In Hawai‘i conservation and tourism go hand in hand to epistemologically and physically remove us from the ‘āina. Today Hawai‘i has the eleventh largest state-owned forest and natural reserve area in the United States. Conservation here began in 1892, one year before the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom, as a Bureau of Agriculture and Forestry was established. In 1903 a Division of Forestry was created primarily to set aside forestlands for the protection of streams, springs, and other water supply sources. “The first decade (1904–1913) saw the establishment of 37 forest reserves totaling nearly 800,000 acres of state and private land.” And for the forests “a primary management goal was the exclusion of livestock from the

native forests. Along with the fencing and elimination of feral livestock came tree planting and fire control programs. Reforestation began before 1900 in the valleys behind Honolulu and reached a peak during 1934–41, when an average of nearly two million introduced trees were planted annually in the forest reserves.”¹² The Territorial Government in the early 1900s borrowed the newly implemented conservation policy of the United States to further restructure use, function, and meaning to ‘āina.

Preservation and conservation is a creation of U.S. state-making policy that secured land and nature for a “national good.” This occurred with the violent and aggressive removal of Indians from the land. With the establishment of Yellowstone and Yosemite in the late 1870s, a national good was reimagined in the physical terrain, while the desire for *open spaces* and *grand views* facilitated and enhanced the myth of the frontier. “In North America, the national parks were intended to, among other things, preserve the memory of an idealized pioneer history as an encounter with ‘wilderness’ that was conquered by enterprising Europeans” (Neumann 2002, 18). In this manner, the need for a national park went beyond the European appreciation of sublime nature and instead homogenized a national unity as it clarified national myths.

Likewise, the Territorial Government in Hawai‘i foresaw a long history of conservation and preservation in 1903. It was a way to legitimize their presence through the landscape.¹³ The conservation premise set the stage for the tourism industry, whereby wide-open spaces were needed to enhance the *tourist gaze*.¹⁴ The backdrop for landscaping agendas in Hawai‘i also consisted of imagining Hawaiians along similar lines of consumerism and capitalism.¹⁵ The Territorial Government in Hawai‘i relied upon myths of the *landscape* and myths of *wilderness* to enact their landscaping orders both on the land and the emerging U.S. citizen.¹⁶ In this emerging geographic order, Hawaiians were represented and delegated to both anachronistic and feminized spaces.¹⁷

This process allowed the Territory and the State to speak for nature as the guardian, possessed to do so in the role of Enlightened man¹⁸ and as a function of nation building.¹⁹ In this era, a “policy for recreation” was formally created and fashioned after conservation efforts in the United States:

In these words by the President the recreation needs which apply to the country as a whole and to Hawaii in particular are aptly expressed. The federal government recognizes its duty in this important field of public welfare by stressing recreational development through various federal agencies such as the National Park Service, the US Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, etc.

The furtherance of these ideals by states and local governments has brought about the recognition that each of these levels has a specific duty to perform according to its jurisdiction and responsibility. *In Hawaii, the latter defines its scope of recreation development as being directed towards local residents, while the responsibility of the territorial government in recreation should extend to all the people of the Islands, including our visitors from afar, and should also include the proper conservation and development of our manifold natural, scenic and historic resources in the interest of the public and the nation as a whole.* (Territorial Planning Office 1959, 42; italics mine)

Such agendas helped to solidify the implementation and coherence of a U.S. national consciousness with the use of land as the vehicle. That which would be preserved should be developed for and in the interest of *the public and the nation as a whole*. Which nation? Whose public? Silenced were Hawaiian Kingdom land-use practices and social dimensions of *‘āina*, and in the process, a linear and homogenized U.S. narrative was validated. As practiced in Yosemite and Yellowstone, “with the aid of national parks, the history of the conquest of humans was transformed into the conquest of nature. Parks help to conceal the violence of conquest and in so doing not only deny the Other their history, but also create a new history in which the Other literally has no place” (Neumann 2002, 31). Herein, “the question is not whether we should or should not preserve the past, but what kind of past we have chosen to preserve” (Ferguson and Turnbull 1999, 99).

By the middle 1950s the need for *open spaces* as a backdrop for tourism was expressed both in legislation and in the public opinion of the relatively few with political and economic power in Hawai‘i. The few in political power consisted primarily of the Big Five land holders and their influences with local government and land legislation.²⁰ The Democratic Party that came into power in the middle 1950s rallied for the importance of making fee simple land ownership available to the majority of the people. They promised another land division that would break up the Big Five land holdings.²¹ Since this never transpired, the continued consolidation of Big Five interests and the manipulation of land laws for personal profit and financial gain were maintained at the cost of the continued dispossession of native Hawaiians. One clear example of such biased management was evident in the land tax laws and the designation of forestry (conservation) land.

The use of forestry land to hide large land holdings and keep land taxes either low or at zero is talked about at length in Cooper and Daws (1990), *Land and Power in Hawai‘i*. Primarily, land taxes were kept low to favor

the landed minority, who also happened to be the same people serving in governance. “As long as Republicans in power kept real property tax rates low for the perpetual benefit of an already wealthy landed minority, Hawai‘i would never have the public money to fund large-scale social programs for the benefit of the great un-landed, un-wealthy majority” (Cooper and Daws 1990, 37). Secondly, the landed removed any taxes on land as long as it was named a Forest Reserve. “[A big landowner] could put appropriate land into ‘forest reserve’, on which no property tax was at all levied” (Cooper and Daws 1990, 36). This resulted in the continued land consolidation of the landed by 1956 where “65% of the 122,000 acres in forest reserve belonged to large private owners” (Cooper and Daws 1990, 36).

Despite the economic benefits, the official rhetoric from government was that conservation areas were needed for scenic opportunities as well as for the preservation of Hawai‘i’s natural environment. Open spaces were also needed to juxtapose the growing urbanization of a newly implemented tourism industry. Attention was brought to the fact that after much development to the landscapes in the early 1900s, a more centralized and better structured plan for preservation was needed in order to both preserve and conserve land and culture. The Planning Office of the Territory of Hawai‘i wrote in 1959: “Over and above the need to develop a coordinated and comprehensive Territorial park system per se is the additional requirement that the Territory conserve and preserve valuable but rapidly disappearing historic sites, monuments, and scenic area throughout Hawai‘i” (Territorial Planning Office 1959, 12).

The Hawaiian Trail and Mountain Club wrote in the late 1950s of the “GROWING NEED for POPULATION DISPERSAL AREAS where people can hike, camp, or just relax and escape from crowds, noise, smoke, and the rush of modern life” (1959, 1; capital letters as quoted directly from the text). In their short five-page report urging the Legislature to implement a parks system, the need for “open space” was stressed. Also emphasized was the need for categories in order to dictate management of lands to be divided based on historic, educational, and scientific usage. A few years later in 1959, the Territorial Planning Office set forth a plan of conservation in a report titled *A Territorial Parks System for Hawaii*. This plan continued the narrative that stressed the enormous need for “open spaces” and the complete necessity of allocating more conservation sites.

While conservation agendas are regarded as primarily a positive use of space for one epistemic order, the line that is often drawn in the case of conservation lands is usually between nature and culture as if the two are independent of one another. In this aspect, we are conditioned to see cultural features, or place, as separate from geographic features, or space. Indigenous connections to the land are therefore disqualified through the

landscape rhetoric, and these other ways of existing on the land may be criminalized if they fall outside of this mythical national good. In this scope, physical interactions with the landscape can be judged in a binary manner as either *good* or *bad* behavior.

In 2004, the Department of Land and Natural Resources hinted at good/bad behavior toward the land as follows:

The native forest is of great cultural significance as the home of plants and animals important in Hawaiian culture and of folklore and traditions based on ancient relationships with the land. Hunting of feral pigs, deer, and goats is a popular sport and source of food for some of Hawaii's residents. While these animals represent a valuable resource to the hunting community, if left uncontrolled, can seriously damage the watershed. Hiking, mountain biking, fishing, photography, and nature study are [instead] popular recreation activities in many of Hawaii's watersheds. (Division of Forestry and Wildlife 2004, 3)

In this process binary categories of citizen are legitimized and native social relations to the land are either silenced or criminalized, such as evidenced with the categories of visitor/trespasser, tourist/squatter, and destroyer/lover of nature.²²

Roderick Neumann (2002) makes the argument that landscape and wilderness ideas were important aspects of the national and imperial identity for Europeans when encountering the space of the *other*. Because of the otherness of new natures, like in Africa Oceania, landscaping agendas became dominant forces in the formation of national and imperial identities.²³ For Hawai'i and other Pacific Islands, the manner in which land in the Pacific was encountered was varied. James Michener, as a fiction writer yet an influential voice for describing the Pacific, wrote about an aspect of the encounter with *otherness* in his book *Hawaii*:

These beautiful islands, waiting in the sun and storm, how much they seemed like beautiful women waiting for their men to come home at dusk, waiting with open arms and warm bodies and consolation. All that would be accomplished in these islands, as in these women, would be generated solely by the will and puissance of some man. I think the islands always knew this. (1982, 16)

Besides the obvious feminizing aspects of this perceived encounter, the space of islands and the *otherness* of nature can be that of "regular ontological shock. It is filled with competing indigenous meaning, a foreign semiotics

that does not accommodate class and gender distinctions in the same way, [and] which must consequently be rewritten” (W.J.T. Mitchell 2002, 129). This sexualized reading of *otherness* extends beyond the geography to the inhabitants as well. The Edenic myth of the noble savage, as natives in harmony with nature, or of the ignoble savage as those living in disharmony with nature becomes an important aspect to forming the national identity of the state as the container of both wilderness and native peoples. The control over these bodies and sites is an important aspect of the hypermasculine state apparatus (Ferguson and Turnbull 1999). For Haunani Kay Trask, the gendered and sexualized Hawai‘i is the intrinsic avenue used to sell tourism in Hawai‘i; “above all, Hawai‘i is ‘she’, the Western image of the Native ‘female’ in her magical allure. And if luck prevails, some of ‘her’ will rub off on you, the visitor” (Trask 1993, 137). And, “tropical settings are often conflated with femininity and sexuality, the naturalism and eroticism of at least some of these islands are a cultural theme” (Lutz and Collins 1993: 152–153).²⁴

The Territorial Government wrote in 1959: “Hawaii is fortunate in that it possesses not only many heiaus, historic monuments, and other cultural sites but *she* also possesses scenic areas which, in their natural unspoiled beauty, also represent a great potential economic resource as far as visitor satisfaction is concerned” (Territorial Planning Office 1959, 6; italics mine). In this report, Hawai‘i is clearly *she* and her cultural sites are named and positioned as sites and economic sources precisely for *visitor satisfaction*.

As the availability of land and people in tourism is read through a feminizing lens meant for consumption, so too does conservation promote consumerism. Neumann says, “a national park is the quintessential landscape of consumption for modern society” (2002, 24; italics mine). Tourism in Hawai‘i, as with other places that require and promote conservation, elicits consumption of such in the form of paying a fee “to get back to nature.” This search for authenticity is modernity’s very necessary other culture and is important but *only* insofar as particular bodies and their actions, and the historic sites as well, can be read and represented in precise and already pre-negotiated ways. It is also the erasure of one type of human consumption, like those found in these peopled places, and the commencement with other means of consumption, like through tourism. Also implicit in the process is that culture *needs* to be read as hegemonic, mystical, and exotic for economic purposes.²⁵ People do not come to Hawai‘i to gaze at one another alone, but to see that which is “Hawaiian.” The irony of the 1959 Territorial report on Conservation is that out of this twenty-page report, only two sentences refer to conservation, and the rest of the report focuses on tourism and ponders what visual aspects the visitor will need for “visitor satisfaction” (Territorial Planning Office 1959, 6). (Although the benefits to residents of the lands are

also put in throughout the text in parentheses, much like with this sentence.)

Some other examples from this report of promoting conservation for its impact on tourism include

At this point, it is only necessary to indicate that the responsibility for developing and maintaining a park program to supplement existing county and federal facilities, as well as to increase our tourist attractions, is inescapably a Territorial responsibility.

Oahu, which is widely advertised as the mecca of Pacific tourism, has only two Territorial parks, representing a total of 17.2 acres, to “service” some 175,000 tourists!

The lesson is clear: tourists and local residents will visit parks if they are of sufficient interest educationally, scenically, or historically, *and are properly developed*.

Parks *do* compromise a significant tourist attraction if properly developed—clearly indicate the direction the Territory should follow if it desires to assist in maintaining the pace of tourism to Hawaii, and to help disperse such tourists (and local residents seeking new recreational experiences) to the Neighbor Islands.

And finally

The advertising program of the Hawaii Visitors Bureau, which emphasizes the Polynesian atmosphere and attributes of life in the islands, also contributes to the illusion of space and availability of recreational facilities; we have, in a sense, become victims of our own sales and promotion program.²⁶ (Territorial Planning Office 1959, 6; all italics, quotes, and parentheses are taken directly from the text.)

In general, tourism relies on exotic imagery as well as exits and entrances into extraordinary experiences. “Central to much tourism is some notion of departure. Escape to the ‘extraordinary’” (Ferguson and Turnbull 1999, 124). According to John Urry (2002) in *The Tourist Gaze*, the tourist experience seeks an inversion from the everyday and instead imagines and wishes to experience the extraordinary. In the process, the sacralization of the site or object occurs for economic purposes alone. The site is only a site because it has been named, framed, and elevated from the everyday and enshrined as a sacred object and a social reproduction (Urry 2002: 10–11). In this rhetoric, culture and the people that inhabit that culture are read as cohesive and as part of a *community*. This construction of a core community or a core culture

is vital to conservation agendas because these are the bodies and sites that are to be gazed upon. And ironically in this process, this core community is more than likely separated both geographically and epistemologically from the environments they inhabit(ed).

Placial Understandings

All of these notions of conservation and tourism insist on insider/outsider encounters with nature, the natural, and with one another. But for native peoples, there may not be a way to epistemologically divorce oneself from the land. “One traveled through the landscape as an observer ‘taking in’ (consuming) the scenery, rather than traveled in the landscape. In contrast, for the insider, there is no firm distinction between herself or himself and the land, no way to simply step out of the picture or the landscape” (Neumann 2002, 20). “Placial” understandings, for indigenous peoples, are related to living and surviving within the environment. It is that “intimate experience” that Yi-Fu Tuan (1977) speaks about.²⁷ And in this experience, learning is dynamic and active. Manu Meyer (1998) sees the dynamics of interacting with place as active. In her works, she notes an interlapping continuum between people and place, and notes one’s active relationship with place as shaping Hawaiian knowledge and experience.

Our history is rich with the stories of an alive and interactive universe. Examples of local knowledge or placial connections between people and space in Hawai‘i can be found in many narratives. *The Wind Gourd of La‘amaomao* is a mo‘olelo about relationships and social structure, as read through the story of the winds. *The Wind Gourd of La‘amaomao* is a translated text from the Hawaiian legend *Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i o Paka‘a a me Kuapaka‘a, na Kahu Iwikuamo‘o o Keawenuiaumi, ke Ali‘i o Hawai‘i, a na mo‘opuna hoi a La‘amaomao*.²⁸ This legend speaks of the personal attendants to Keawenuiaumi, Chief of Hawai‘i, and the descendants of *La‘amaomao* (the Hawaiian wind goddess). The legend relates the close relationship between the *Ali‘i Nui* and his attendants and the responsibilities of one for the other.

“The wind gourd referred to in the title of this legend was believed to contain all the winds of Hawai‘i, which could be called forth by chanting their names. According to Handy and Handy (1972), the gourd is an embodiment of *Lono*, the Hawaiian god of agriculture and fertility. In the *Paka‘a* legend, the gourd, along with the wind chants naming dozens of local winds, is passed down from *La‘amaomao*, the Hawaiian wind goddess to her granddaughter *La‘amaomao*; to her granddaughter’s son *Paka‘a*, to *Paka‘a*’s son, *Kuapaka‘a*” (Nakuina 1992: viii–ix). In this mo‘olelo, the winds are chanted first by primary *akua* (gods) and passed down through the *‘aumakua* (family

gods) to the kupuna (grandparents) and then passed down to the Paka'a (son) and Kuapaka'a (grandson). The winds, upward of 100 and far too many to recount for this paper, are memorized generationally because of kuleana of the descendants to continue that memory.

These chants, which speak not only of the winds, but also of the ocean currents, land masses, animals such as birds, dreams, and other signs from the wahi, situated Hawaiians both geographically and ideologically. If it was your kuleana, you knew where you were based on the name of the wind, the type of the wind, and the particular relationship that that wind had with birds, swells, and other aspects in nature. It was not simply naming the spot, but knowing the spot, based on these other factors, that served as a general knowing of space and one's place within that space. And, in effect, it formed a *co-active* existence between self and one's relationship with nature. According to the legend of La'amaomao, access to the knowledge of the winds was granted by genealogy and carried down through family lines.²⁹ The wind chanter not only knew the names of winds and the directions they blew, but also had control over the winds and was able to use the winds to serve his *ali'i*. This wind discourse is exemplified in the story of the wind gourd.³⁰

According to this mo'olelo, the island of O'ahu has over forty makani alone. Each wind is attached to a particular area and named for the different qualities of the wind itself and for the part of the island it passes through. In the legend, Kuapaka'a learned the winds from his father Paka'a, a descendant of La'amaomao the Hawaiian wind goddess. In one section of the mo'olelo, Kuapaka'a's genealogy was challenged by the attendants of Keawe. In response to this challenge for Kuapaka'a, he recited all of the names of the winds, for all of the islands in Hawai'i, in order to prove his heritage. In the mo'olelo he also taunts the attendants of Keawe:

The small canoe will be swamped,
 Destroyed with the large canoe,
 The ali'i will die, the kahuna will die,
 The weak will die, the strong will die,
 The dark wisemen, the bright wisemen,
 They will search out, they will confer
 To locate the stars of the wave,
 O Hokule'a, O Hokulei,
 They will swim singly, they will swim by twos,
 Yesterday was a calm day,
 A crowd of fishermen was at sea,
 The paddling of the good canoes,

The strength of the hoewa'a,
 The wisdom of the ho'okele,
 Don't go far out to sea, ē dear ones,
 Stop here over the sea surface,
 You will be possessed on O'ahu,
 There will be darkness only on calm O'ahu,
 Yesterday was calm, today will be stormy;
 Keawenuia'umi, come ashore, a storm is coming.

Kuapaka'a follows this taunting with a partial list of some of the winds of O'ahu:

From the sea, the storm comes sweeping toward shore,
 The windward Kuilua wind churns up the sea,
 While you're fishing and sailing,
 The Ihiihilauakea wind blows,
 It's the wind that blows inside Hanauma,
 A wind from the mountains that darkens the sea,
 It's the wind that tosses the kapa of Paukua,
 Puuokona is of Kuli'ou'ou,
 Maua is the wind of Niu,
 Holouha is of Kekaha,
 Maunuunu is of Wai'alao,
 The wind of Le'ahi turns here and there,
 'Olauniu is of Kahaloa,
 Wai'oma'o is of Palolo,
 Kuehulepo is of Kahua,
 Kukalahale is of Honolulu,
 'Ao'aoa is of Mamala,
 'Olauniu is of Kapalama,
 Haupe'pe'e is of Kalihi,
 Komomona is of Kahauiki,
 Ho'e'o is of Moanalua,
 Moa'eku is of Ewaloa,
 Kehau is of Waopua,
 Waikoloa is of Lihu'e,
 Kona is of Pu'uokapolei. . . (Nakuina 1992: 43–44)

And on and on the makani are called, systematically going around the island of O'ahu in a clockwise direction and ending at Makapu'u on the eastern edge of O'ahu. In this legend, Kuapaka'a also has control over

the direction the winds blow. During this particular chant, he created a storm and was trying to trick the enemies of his father, Paka'a, in order that they would dock their canoes for the night. This mo'olelo is one of honor and revenge as Kuapaka'a finally destroys his father's enemies and their family lands are returned to them by the ali'i nui Keawenuiaumi. In this manner, responsibility and ancestry intercept dramatically with natural elements. This is an extremely colorful narrative with an entire array of cunning characters and extraordinary exploits and adventure between and on the Hawaiian Islands.

The Wind Gourd of La'amaomao is also a tale of female *mana* (power). In general, Hawaiian genealogy is one of female power. The *Kumulipo*, the Hawaiian Creation Chant, begins with the ancient Hawaiian world wherein *Po* (the unfathomable and mysterious female night) gives birth by herself, and without any male impregnating element, to a son and daughter, Kumulipo and Po'ele, who by their incestuous mating create the world (Beckwith 1951). The Hawaiian conception of the universe is recounted in a cosmogenic genealogy that spans sixteen *wa*, or time periods, eight in the night and eight in the day, wherein the 40,000 Akua, or gods, are born (Beckwith 1951). "By this cosmogenic genealogy, known as the Kumulipo, Po, the female night, is ancestor of all Akua; she is the source of life, of divinity, and of ancestral wisdom" (Beckwith 1951, 3). The female deity is the darkness that is the beginning of creation. *She* is the primary source of consciousness and reality. La'amaomao, as well, is noted to be the Hawaiian wind *goddess*, as opposed to readings of wind deities in other Polynesian locations as being male.³¹ *Na mana wahine* (female power) sharply contrasts with contemporary prescribed Polynesian feminine space where *she* is *passive*.

As evidenced, *makani* is one element in distinguishing social status and structure. Besides this mo'olelo, *makani* is also mentioned in numerous *'olelo no'eau* (Hawaiian proverbs). The mentioning of *makani* ranges from descriptive elements that refer to land and sea mass, as well as to the more personal descriptions of emotions and human relations.

'Ano kaiko'o lalo o Kealahula, ua puhia ke 'ala ma Puahinahina.

It is somewhat rough down at Kealahula, for the fragrance (of Seaweed) is being wafted hither from the direction of Puahinahina. There is a disturbance over there, and we are noticing signs of it here.

The breeze carries the smell of seaweed when the water is rough. (Pukui 1983, 15)

Ho'i ke ao o ke kuahiwi, ho'i ka makani ia Kumukahi.

The cloud returns to the mountain, the wind returns to Kumukahi.

Said of a group of people dispersed, each going to his own abode.
(Pukui 1983, 111)

Ke mokomoko la me ka makani.

He is boxing the wind.

Said of one who is being disagreeable. (Pukui 1983, 190)

Ke Hau o Ma'ihi.

The Hau (breeze) of Ma'ihi.

Refers to Ma'ihi, Kona, Hawai'i. Because the locality was named for Ma'ihialakapuolono, daughter of the Lonoaipu,

This wind was regarded as sacred and did not blow beyond Kainaliu and Keauhou. (Pukui 1983, 142)

These short examples of 'olelo no'eau regarding makani point to the different manners in which wind can be evoked and used to explain elements of Hawaiian thought. These are referred to as "placial" understandings of self and the environment because place intersects with human experience. This sense of cooperation with the environment is invoked in Keith Basso's *Wisdom Sits in Places*. "Relationships to place are lived most often in the company of other people—when places are sensed together and enacted—daily, monthly, seasonally, annually—places and their meanings are continually woven into the fabric of social life, anchoring it to features of the landscape and blanketing it with layers of significance that few can fail to appreciate" (Basso 1996, 57). In storied places, according to Basso and other indigenous thinkers, things happen. The stories that are told about the happenings in places are told in order that lessons might be learned. By recounting the stories, one is made wiser and that particular memory is reinforced and valued. In such cases, wisdom literally *sits* in places because the stories of the place contain the wisdom that is passed down through one's ancestors.

Another important aspect of indigenous thought is the active participation with the environment. A "participation mystic" speaks of the interaction with place as affecting identity. "Native languages are verb based, and the words that describe the world emerge directly from actively perceived experience. In a sense, language 'choreographs' and/or facilitates the continual orientation of Native thought and perception toward active participation, active imagination, and active engagement with all that makes up natural reality" (Cajete 2000, 27). The *coparticipation* with the natural world is simultaneously a type of "perceptual phenomenology"³² and constitutes a sensory type of experience because of the close intimacy. This close intimacy consists of no space or no separation between a people and their place. This relationship fosters a cultural identity and wellbeing that flows with the natural elements and other relationships.

Conclusion

In Hawai'i, land has gone through massive epistemological transformations. These changes include the Hawaiian reading of land as *'āina*, or literally that which feeds and sustains an intimate connection between people, their *ali'i*, and the cosmos, as one reading, to land as real estate, private property, and that which can be bought and sold without cultural/emotional attachments. Over time, *'āina* has come to reflect the multiple discourses of power as a site of the "visual experience and social production" (Cosgrove 1998, 14) contingent in the act of Western landscaping, thereby fulfilling preconceived roles that conform to both the "tourist gaze" and "conservation agendas." In the process, native ways of *knowing* the land were in large part silenced and/or erased from contemporary state discourse, except as those spaces imagined to represent the authentic and anachronistic native and place.

In the middle 1950s in Hawai'i, the Territorial Government and those that had been in power for over 50 years began to reemphasize the need for an entity called "conservation land," or that which would "preserve" the "natural" Hawai'i. Subsequent laws were passed in order to solidify a land base that would set land aside for activities such as recreation, viewing the natural vista, and preserving Hawai'i's natural landscape and culture. An underlying motive for conservation by the Territorial Government was at least partially evoked by economic reasons. An already-booming tourism industry and an eye toward the future of this industry necessitated "conservation land" so that tourism could continue and more importantly, could continue to prosper as well.

"This new order revalued certain kinds of land. While it still needed to be 'empty', it was no longer measured by its productivity in metric tons or contiguous acres, but by its proximity to sandy beaches and clean bays" (Ferguson and Turnbull 1999, 40). No one wanted, or I suppose wants, to come to Hawai'i to see only hotels and other tourists. The myth of Hawai'i as a destination spot relies in large part on the continued existence of the natural beauty and access to that which is *natural* and *wild*. The social construction of these categories still continues to rely upon preconceived ideas of both, as well as the institutional power that informs and constructs these realities. In contrast, "landscape thinking" on indigenous communities has been one of displacement and erasure.³³ Landscape agendas are linked to nation creating endeavors wherein particular ideological constructs, such as the industrialized nation, are made to appear natural and all other relations made to appear unusual. In effect, aboriginal understandings of land and place were further silenced in the process.³⁴ These "epistemic erasures are not innocent; they justify political and territorial erasures" (Braun 2002, 8, quoting Gregory 2001).

The particular discourse positioned around wind, land, and ocean, like that recounted in *The Wind Gourd of La'amaomao*, was interrupted periodically and eventually stifled in its original form by many events in Hawai'i's history. But, by reorienting ourselves to a Hawaiian epistemology through mo'olelo and 'olelo no'eau, cultural connections are revitalized and revalued for their wisdom. Such practices evoke the usage of a whole different set of understandings. Even knowing that a particular wind blows through a particular area invigorates Hawaiian knowledge and encourages these other ways of seeing and being in place.

And with these recognitions and further understandings of place in Hawaiian thought, we might continue to "remember (our) true leaders, nation, and culture" (Nakuina 1992, vii). The closing of the ideological gap through a shared memory of space strengthens a Hawaiian sense of place and self. As we continue the revitalization of these understandings through our actions and memories, the contemporary state structure that depends on separation is further challenged. And in this process, a Hawaiian well-being can only be enhanced by these active participations and shared understandings.

NOTES

1. 'Ukiu is just one of the many winds named in *The Wind Gourd of La'amaomao*, the mo'olelo about the Wind Goddess La'amaomao and her descendents—resurrected and published by Moses Nakuina in the early 1900s. I chose the wind of Makawao to begin this paper since that is the area I am from.

2. Epistemology, according to Michel Foucault (1980, 1998), consists of the structures, institutions, and systems that inform individuals of the genealogy of knowledge. These are the knowledge bases that tell us what we know.

3. "Buried epistemologies" is a term used by geographer Bruce Braum to describe the power of the state apparatus to neutralize indigenous concepts regarding lands. Here "'land' was made to appear as 'nature': a space that held no signs of 'culture' and therefore could be appropriated into the administrative space of the 'nation'" (Braun 1997, 12). In this process, indigenous voices and relationships to the natural world were dislocated by administrative power.

4. Geoff Park in *Nga Uruora* recognizes the colonial relationship between land and nation building in New Zealand. The introduction of the book speaks to the European imagination of New Zealand as "a garden and pasture in which the best elements of British society might grow into an ideal nation" (Park 1995, 13). This was the manner in which New Zealand enters the European imagination. Further, the dairy industry in New Zealand reinforced other ways of relating and being in the landscape as "privatized, ordered into rectangles and given over to uniformity, the production of milk and the control of the wild water, this ground is saturated with conquest" (Park 1995, 22). Here, the nation was

built through dairy, and this industry shaped the economy and society as an “ordinary landscape” was created. This in turn silenced other ways of understanding the landscape. Park notes the manners in which the land “works on us” and poses the question of what happens with this interaction when the soils are lost to European settlers.

5. Discourse, according to Foucault, relies on power to disseminate knowledge because “it is through discourse (through knowledge) that we are created” (Michigan State University n.d.). Therefore, those in control of discourse also control every aspect of being. One needs to ask *whose* knowledge is being evoked at any particular time.

6. Space and place terminology, in cultural geography and political theory, acknowledges the differences of *space* as being the scientific, measured, nonemotional landscape, while *place* connotes the social relations and lived experiences that cannot be scientifically measured on the land but only reinforced through social relations.

7. *Sense of place* for Hawaiians, as referred to by George Kanahale (1986), encompasses a holistic and limitless worldview.

8. Aboriginal is a term used during the eighteenth and nineteenth century to describe Hawaiians of native blood. See Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Trust Deed when describing her beneficiaries as “the preference to be given to Hawaiian children of pure or part aboriginal blood” (Queen Lili‘uokalani’s Trust Deed 1911). Many other documents during the Hawaiian Kingdom era name Hawaiians as aboriginal, as opposed to the Hawaiian Kingdom Subjects, which could be citizens of any race. *Aboriginal* will be interchanged with *native* throughout this text. Note: indigenous is a term coined in the 1990s by the United Nations in describing “stateless” peoples. In comparison, *indigenous* appears in this text to designate native, aboriginal people as those being of a place, as opposed to the definition of statelessness.

9. See Denis Cosgrove (1998) for the genealogical breakdown of these primary geographical terms and ideas.

10. Mitchell (1998, 45), taken from Michel Foucault (1977).

11. Cosgrove discusses the concept of *perspective* that came about with landscape painting in Italy and refers to Leonardo da Vinci’s idea that the artist has control over nature in landscape painting (Cosgrove 1998, 25). By maintaining creative control, “the idea of landscape itself offer(s) the *illusion* of an affinity with the insider’s world, the world we do experience as a collective product of people subjectively engaged with their milieu” (Cosgrove 1998, 27). In other words, the landscape is a world separate yet in fusion with a world far removed from reality. Here the view could be manipulated to create a reality where workers were removed from the view. This was the preface for later concepts used by the English to distinguish *wilderness* and to empty peopled places as presented in paintings. The English put people back in the paintings later with drawings of the gentry class. “The English countryside became the ‘other’ to the urban areas, full of landscaped estates, capitalist agriculture, concentrated wealth and rural leisure pursuits” (Macnaghten and Urry 1998, 177).

12. Information from this paragraph comes from the web page of the Division of Forestry and Wildlife (2004, 2).

13. Understanding the insecure legal stance of the Territorial Government, i.e., no Treaty of Annexation in 1898 and only a Joint Resolution of Congress with the prior instance of the Illegal Overthrow of Queen Lili'uokalani, a way to realign a national citizenry was through landscaping agendas that legitimized themselves with their own institutions. One rather glaring example is the renaming of the Crown Lands to Public Lands. This imagined entity now called Public Lands helped to reorganize land use and perception of these lands to some mythical entity called *Public*, while it simultaneously disposed Queen Lili'uokalani of revenue from the Crown Lands at the turn of the last century (see *Lili'uokalani v. United States of America* 1909).

14. *The Tourist Gaze* is the title of a book by John Urry (2002), as well as his primary premise in the book, being that in regard to tourism one needs to be trained and told where to gaze and how to gaze, and that this gaze has already been constructed by those in control of the discourse.

15. Photos during the early and middle 1900s show a gradual consumption of *nativeness* as evidenced in the evolution of hula in photography. An example is the Kodak's Free Hula Shows in 1941, where it was advertised

Music, Dancing, Coconut Tree Climbing, Poi Making
 Every Thursday, Waikiki Natatorium 10 A.M.
 Especially arranged to permit picture takers to get truly
 Hawaiian movies and stills in a lovely island setting
 Under perfect photographic conditions.
 EVERYBODY IS WELCOME
 KODAK, HAWAII, LIMITED (*Hawaiian Hula Kodak Show*
Advertising Card 1941)

The *other* is brought into view so that the viewing subject can better see and understand self and *other*. Representation of the *other* is experienced in conjunction with the representation of land (*lovely island setting*), as well as displaced from that land, as nature is read to exist without culture and therefore not tied emotionally to the *other*. Photography is one medium where the rediscovery of the modern self is captured through print.

16. Later juridical tools—like the naming of native Hawaiians in 1921 with the Hawaiian Homelands Commission Act—further shaped citizens along U.S. Territorial claims as opposed to Hawaiian Kingdom subjecthood because of the racial element used by the U.S. to designate ethnicities. See Benedict Anderson's (1983) section on Census, Map, Museum for complete discussion of the racializing of populations by the State.

17. Anne McClintock describes the “anachronistic space” as a realm that remains anterior and, thus, has no place in the unfolding history of the modern nation (1995, 61).

18. “Enlightened man” is a term associated with the European Renaissance movement where, according to Cosgrove, “central to this progressive narrative of human achievement has been the figure of the individual European male, conceived as a universal subject, exercising rational self-consciousness within a largely disembodied mind, and endowed with a will to power: thus the sovereign subject of history” (1998, xvii).

19. *Nation building* refers to ideas put forth by Benedict Anderson (1983) in *Imagined Communities* whereby nations are consciously constructed for the primary purpose of control and the homogenization of its citizens.

20. Noel Kent (1983) documents widely the Big Five (Alexander and Baldwin, Hackfield and Co., C. Brewer and Co, Theo Davies and Co., and Castle and Cook) business interests and their monopolization of industry and land use in the 1950s to present.

21. Kent (1983, 125) referred to the "Second Mahele" that sought to break up the large landholdings in Hawai'i; however, this legislation never passed.

22. Binaries are instituted in classificatory systems to denote *good* vs. *bad* behavior of citizens in regard to land-use operations. In these contexts, anything outside of state sanctioned behavior (like engaging in cultural practices) may be read as a derelict usage of land. An example would be Mahealani Pai (Otaguro 1996), who defended his native rights at the Hawai'i Supreme Court against developers when he wanted to continue to harvest the ponds at Kohanaiki, Kona. His rights, protected by the Kuleana Act, held in the Supreme Court and upheld an earlier 1978 court ruling that protected native Hawaiian customary rights for traditional purposes.

23. Neumann (2002) discusses spaces of *otherness* throughout his analysis of nature preservation in Africa.

24. In *Reading National Geographic*, Lutz and Collins (1993) expose the fact that bare-breasted women are the most photographed body in the Pacific region and the most sexualized body in any region.

25. Culture and hegemony sharply contrasts accounts from Hawai'i's history, such as Samuel Kamakau's *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai'i* (1961), where warring chiefs between islands and *'ohana* are the norm.

26. Quotes from the report titled *A Territorial Parks System for Hawaii*, Territorial Planning Office (1959).

27. Yi-Fu Tuan in *Space and place: The perspective of experience*, relates how intimacy is linked to place. "Landscape is personal and tribal history made visible. The native's identity—his place in the total scheme of things—is not in doubt, because the myths that support it are as real as the rocks and waterholes he can see and touch" (Tuan 1977, 158).

28. This traditional legend was collected by various sources, edited and expanded by Moses Kuaea Nakuina, and published in 1902.

29. The legend speaks continually of kuleana and genealogy as an intertwined and unavoidable social construct.

30. Borrowing Foucault's notion of *discourse*, a wind discourse is read as the power that wind has in structuring social and political relations.

31. Female power and wind as noted in Nakuina (1992, ix).

32. Martin Heidegger's (2001) *Phenomenological interpretations of Aristotle: initiation into phenomenological research* addresses phenomenology and the idea that lived experience constitutes knowledge.

33. Michael J. Shapiro looks at the recoding of the landscape in the continental United States: "Euro American representational practices played a role in the historical displacement of the Native American from the continent's landscape" (2004, 182). And, "they participated in the expansionist process through which the West was settled, 'tamed', and effectively inscribed, as the state recorded the landscape, turning it into a white provenance and a resource that would aid in the process of industrialization" (Shapiro 2004, 182).

34. It is important to note that there has not been a complete silence of native thought in regard to 'aina, as evidenced by the many Hawaiians that continue to practice cultural activities in their daily lives and livelihoods. These instances connote what Foucault would name counterpower discursive practices because of the inability of the state to completely contain these endeavors—even with regulations pertaining to such.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Benedict

1983 *Imagined communities*. London: Verso.

Basso, Keith

1996 *Wisdom sits in places*. New Mexico: School of American Research Press.

Beckwith, M. W.

1951 *The Kumulipo: A Hawaiian creation chant*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Braun, Bruce

1997 Buried epistemologies: The politics of nature in (post)colonial British Columbia. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 87:3–31.

2002 *The intemperate rainforest: Nature, culture, and power on Canada's west coast*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Cajete, G.

2000 *Native science: Natural laws of interdependence*. New Mexico: Clear Light Publishers.

Carter, Paul

1987 *The road to Botany Bay: An exploration of landscape and history*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Cooper, G., and G. Daws

1990 *Land and power in Hawai'i: The democratic years*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Cosgrove, Denis

1998 *Social formation and symbolic landscape*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

Division of Forestry and Wildlife

2004 *Watershed protection and management program*. <http://www.state.hi.us/dlwr/dofaw/wmpt/qanda.htm>.

Ferguson, Kathy, and Phyllis Turnbull

1999 *Oh, say, can you see? The semiotics of the military in Hawai'i*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Foucault, Michel

1977 *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.

1980 *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon Books.

1998 *Aesthetics, method and epistemology: Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984*. Vol. 2. Ed. James Faubion. New York: New Press.

Gregory, Derek

2001 *Social nature: Theory, practice, and politics*. Ed. Noel Castree and Bruce Braun. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Handy, E. S. Craighill, and Elizabeth Green Handy

1972 *Native planters in old Hawai'i: Their life, lore, and environment*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Hawaiian Hula Kodak Show Advertising Card

1941 Waikiki, Honolulu, Hawai'i: Bishop Museum Archives.

Hawaiian Trail and Mountain Club

1959 *State park system in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Trail and Mountain Club.

Heidegger, Martin

2001 *Phenomenological interpretations of Aristotle: Initiation into phenomenological research*. Trans. Richard Rojcewicz. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press.

Kamakau, Samuel

1961 *Ruling chiefs of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools Press.

Kanahele, George

1986 *Ku Kanaka stand tall: A search for Hawaiian values*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Kent, Noel

1983 *Hawai'i: Islands under the influence*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Lili'uokalani v. United States of America

1909 Petition, filed in the Court of Claims, United States of America House of Representatives, November 20.

Lutz, Catherine and Jane Collins

1993 *Reading* National Geographic. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Macnaghten, P. and John Urry

1998 *Contested natures*. London: Sage Publications.

McClintock, Anne

1995 *Imperial leather: Race, gender, and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York: Routledge.

Meyer, Manu

1998 Native Hawaiian epistemology: Sites of empowerment and resistance. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 31 (1): 22–28.

Michener, James

1982 *Hawaii*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Michigan State Univ.

n.d. *Discourse, or power/knowledge (a rough definition)*. www.msu.edu/~comertod/courses/foucault.htm.

Mitchell, Timothy

1988 *Colonising Egypt*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Mitchell, W. J. T.

2002 *Landscape and power*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Nakuina, Moses K.

1992 *The wind gourd of La'amaomao*. 2nd ed. Trans. Esther T. Mookini and Sarah [1902] Nakoia. Honolulu: Kalamaku Press.

Neumann, Roderick

1998 *Imposing wilderness: Struggles over livelihood and nature preservation in Africa*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Otaguro, Janice.

1996 Islander of the year—Mahealani Pai. *Honolulu Magazine*. January.

Park, Geoff

1995 *Nga Uruora: The groves of life, ecology and history in a New Zealand landscape*. Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press.

Pukui, Mary Kawena

- 1983 *'Ōlelo Nō'ēau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Queen Lili'uokalani's Trust Deed

- 1911 October 11, Appendix B, p. 4, recorded in Liber 350, pp. 369–77, Amendments to Trust Deed.

Shapiro, Michael J.

- 2004 States. In *Patterned ground: Entanglements of nature and culture*, ed. Stephan Harrison, Steve Pile, and Nigel Thrift, 181–85. London: Reaktion Books.

Territorial Planning Office, Territory of Hawai'i

- 1959 *A Territorial Parks System for Hawaii*.

Trask, Haunani Kay

- 1993 *From a native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Tuan, Yi-Fu

- 1977 *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Urry, John

- 2002 *The tourist gaze*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications.