
BOOK REVIEW FORUM

Glenn Wharton. *The Painted King: Art, Activism, and Authenticity in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2012. Pp. 216. ISBN 978-0-8248-3612-2. US\$19.00 paperback.

Review: STACY L. KAMEHIRO,
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ
MAILE ARVIN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

Beyond Conservation: Modeling Meaningful Community Collaboration in Hawai'i

GLENN WHARTON'S *THE PAINTED KING: ART, ACTIVISM, AND AUTHENTICITY IN HAWAII* (2012) provides illuminating insight into decolonizing conservation practices. Focused on the restoration of the *Kamehameha* statue in North Kohala on Hawai'i island, the book's careful attention to the process of sharing decision making with diverse communities provides a striking example, relevant to many beyond conservationists, of how to ethically bridge divides between institutions, experts, and laypeople. The book demonstrates how, despite challenges that must be patiently worked through, heritage conservation projects founded in participation and dialogue can effectively address complex social, cultural, and political identities in Hawai'i as well as generate civic dialogue and social change. This essay highlights several rich connections between this conservation project and other art, preservation, and state-directed projects that resonate with or could benefit from the lessons shared in *The Painted King*.

Challenges to Heritage Preservation in Hawai'i

Heritage scholars and professionals have directed increasing attention to the colonial roots and assumptions of their fields, particularly in the context of managing cultural objects and sites related to indigenous communities. Colonial relationships endure in Western systems and institutions of knowledge, in which Euro-American cultural values, research methods, and understandings of history inhere and disempower “other” people (Tuliwai Smith 1999). Within heritage conservation, the primary goal of restoring the authenticity (typically defined as the artist’s original intent) and physical integrity of an object through “objective” scientific means marginalizes indigenous epistemologies and the ongoing historical relationships between source communities and things (Clavir 1998: 1–4; Sully 2007: 27–38). Moreover, the centering of Western knowledge systems tends to a stewardship model that promotes unilateral decision making on the part of state and private institutions about how to identify and preserve forms of heritage, without serious and sustained consultation with descendant communities (Hollowell and Nicholas 2009, 142). In a global context, international organizations such as the International Council on Monuments and Sites and UNESCO World Heritage Centre, in an effort to develop culturally sensitive policies and systems of administration, nevertheless rely on Western assumptions about object-value and governance structures that extend the reach of centralized and homogenized control over preservation practices through universal definitions and criteria (Barkan 2002: 24–28).¹

Responding to these recent considerations, conservation professionals have encouraged a shift away from object-based practice centered on physical preservation to a peoples-based approach that respects cultural concerns about the meaning, use, and care of objects (Clavir 1996: 100–03; Clavir 2009; Sully 2013). As Wharton’s project to conserve the *Kamehameha* statue in North Kohala demonstrates, collaborating with local communities underscores how preserving an object’s cultural integrity, as a living, historical process, redirects traditional conservation practice to facilitate community-based self-representations and validate local knowledge and culturally appropriate ways to preserve objects. Yet, the *Kamehameha* sculpture conservation project appears exceptional. Despite strides in theorizing cross-cultural approaches to cultural preservation and revising practice guidelines, there remains a gap between theory and actual practice that gives source communities real decision-making power (Wharton 2005: 200–202; cf. Hollowell and Nicholas 2009, 143).

In Hawai'i, archaeologists Peter Mills and Kathleen Kawelu (2013) detail the historical relationship between cultural resource management

professionals (particularly archaeologists) and indigenous communities. In 1976, the State of Hawai'i enacted Chapter 6E of Hawai'i Revised Statutes, declaring the state's responsibility to develop "a comprehensive program of historic preservation" and "to ensure the administration of such historical and cultural property in a spirit of stewardship and trusteeship for future generations."² The passage of this statute coincided with Native Hawaiian cultural revitalization movements that sought to protect cultural sites (e.g., halting the use of the island of Kaho'olawe as a US military training ground and bombing site) and protest development projects that damaged culturally sensitive sites (e.g., the 1986 excavation of hundreds of burial sites at Honokahua, Maui, to construct a tourist resort). Skepticism about archaeological work in Native Hawaiian communities, coupled with the state's added requirement in 2002 that primary investigators of archaeological and heritage preservation projects possess graduate degrees, discouraged Native Hawaiians from meaningful participation in cultural management work. By the twenty-first century, the authors describe a crisis in Hawaiian heritage management; Senate Bill 2906, presented in 2008, characterized Hawaiian historic preservation to be "in a condition of unprecedented confusion and disarray" and, in 2012, the State Historic Preservation Division faced the loss of federal funding (nearly half of its budget) (Mills and Kawelu 2013: 129–30).

The state's refusal to support the North Kohala *Kamehameha* sculpture conservation effort illustrates the lack of clear objectives and rationales guiding heritage policy. Wharton reports that the state discontinued maintenance of the sculpture in 1988, and after several unsuccessful attempts to contact the State Foundation for Culture and the Arts in 1997, he finally received a response that the foundation would not support the project because the sculpture was not under the agency's jurisdiction. Wharton (2012: 9–13, cf. 98–101) had to turn to a local organization, the Hawai'i Arts Alliance, for administrative and planning support; together they secured funding from national and nongovernmental sources and identified local and indigenous community groups to develop and execute the project.³ And yet, as Wharton points out, the state continues to maintain the replica cast of the sculpture that is located in Honolulu. State support for the Honolulu sculpture betrays its commercial interests, because the sculpture draws visitors year-round and also forms the center of the King Kamehameha Day annual celebration. Preferring to support the Honolulu sculpture in its 1883 brass and gilt form, and not the painted version in North Kohala, privileges a conservation for tourism rather than for living communities (cf. Brown 2009: 154–55) and fixes Native Hawaiian history in the past, pushing out of sight the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893, annexation by the United States in

1898, statehood in 1959, and the social, economic, and political issues facing Native Hawaiian communities today. The suggestion that the Honolulu sculpture reflects the state's vision of Hawai'i does not negate or qualify in any way the meaning this artwork holds for indigenous groups who celebrate the famed chief Kamehameha and Kalākaua, the monarch who commissioned the statue, as representing the independent monarchy, Hawaiian history, and indigenous values. The point is that the state opts to promote a profitable vision of Hawai'i's history and culture and exerts its authority over what constitutes heritage and how it should, or should not, be cared for.⁴

The local decision to keep painting the North Kohala sculpture rather than restoring its 1883 brass and gilt form presents a retort to the touristic commodification of Hawaiian culture. Wharton discusses residents' growing concerns about land rights, tourism, and development in North Kohala (2012: 92–97). As former plantation properties are subdivided and sold, bringing new waves of *haole* (white) settlers and diminishing access to ocean and mountain areas, and luxury hotels and golf courses are established in neighboring regions, North Kohalans express anxiety about the impact of “the wrong kind of development” and the growing rift between long-term residents and EuroAmerican newcomers (Wharton 2012: 60–66).

Decolonizing Community and Institutional Divides in Preservation and Beyond

A major strength of the North Kohala community project was its thoughtful attention to the wide distance between the directives of the state government located in Honolulu and the desires and traditions of the so-called outer-island North Kohala communities. Wharton and his collaborators structured the project in such a way that the local communities were empowered to make significant decisions about what was to be done with the statue. This required Wharton to go against both the conventional wisdom of the conservation field and the original mandate he received from the state to simply “research the original appearance and recommend methods for removing the paint” (Wharton 2012, 3). The project offers a compelling model for meaningful community-based cultural preservation practices.⁵ A vital step in decolonizing practice is restructuring and balancing power relationships—moving away from the authority of (typically Euro-American) “experts” and Western knowledge systems—to engage source communities as true partners in decision making and to acknowledge their ultimate control over their own representation and ownership of their heritage.⁶

Wharton is open about how unprepared he felt, given his background as a researcher and technical restorer, to “share research and decision making

outside of professional circles” (2012, 11). He also notes that, despite ample encouragement, some of his colleagues warned him against community collaboration in North Kohala because of expected difficulties in bridging the divide between conservation experts and laypeople. Yet, the project persevered because of the patient commitment to building strong ties with local residents. Wharton collaborated with local communities and organizations in the various development and implementation stages of the project. He shared his scientific expertise and historical research, and the people of North Kohala shared their opinions about their history and future, the significance of the statue, and their understanding of their community. Wharton reserved his own views on how the sculpture should be conserved; the community had the authority to determine who would make the final decision and how the decision would be made.⁷

Emphasis on collaboration and community engagement in heritage management leads to questions of what qualifies as real power sharing—moving beyond mere consultation or disengaged forms of obtaining community input. Because of wide variation in collaborative practice and because lack of meaningful engagement can result in heightened cynicism on the part of descendant communities toward heritage organizations and professionals, David Guilfoyle and Erin Hogg (2015) urge careful comparative analysis of project design to determine what types of collaboration meet legal, ethical, and professional standards. They aim to “develop a structured theoretical and methodological framework for collaborative projects so that the notion of collaboration becomes something more concrete than just a general philosophy shared by community-oriented practitioners” (Guilfoyle and Hogg 2015: 107–08). Some heritage professionals see ethnography as an essential component of community-based heritage management. Archaeologists Julie Hollowell and George Nicholas (2009) suggest that ethnographic methods not only provide nuanced cross-cultural understanding but can also help communities articulate their own conceptions of heritage and define their roles in its protection.⁸ Ethnographic research was a key component of the North Kohala project (Wharton 2012: 59, 128ff., 172). In addition to loosening professional authority and facilitating collaboration, Wharton’s ethnographic research led to insights about communication practices specific to the region. Organizers came to understand the limited efficacy of formal town hall meetings that would draw primarily haole newcomers or relying on open balloting in a post-plantation community that bears the effects of the settler colonial hierarchy in which laborers were not socialized to publicly express their views or participate in democratic processes (Wharton 2012, 75). Instead, organizers recognized the value of initiating school and community arts projects, engaging the local media, addressing smaller gatherings

of local organizations, and conducting one-on-one conversations, in addition to holding public meetings (Wharton 2012: 103–08).

The Painted King is instructive in its detailed reflection upon Wharton's process of building trust, hearing the opinions of multiple stakeholders in North Kohala, and cultivating approaches to gain wide interest and engagement from local communities. Indeed, the project's fairly successful negotiation between state-funded agencies based in Honolulu and Native Hawaiian and other communities in North Kohala offers a potential model for other projects and processes that must straddle this divide. There is often a serious lack of sustained dialogue and collaboration between state or federal agencies and Native Hawaiian communities, which results in policies and laws that are widely contested and unsatisfactory to the very people they intend to benefit and protect. Lack of community engagement was especially clear in June 2014 when the US Department of Interior (DOI) announced with only a week's notice that they would hold public hearings about a proposed rule change to "re-establish a government-to-government relationship with the Native Hawaiian community."⁹ Many have long criticized policies that would confer federal recognition upon Native Hawaiians in a manner roughly analogous to federally recognized Native American tribes largely because the federal government appears unwilling to grant significant land rights in Hawai'i.¹⁰

Yet DOI officials appeared surprised, even shocked, to hear the majority of people who came to testify at the hearings soundly rejecting the proposed rule change. Public testimonies were limited to two minutes per person, resulting in many passionate speakers being cut off and widespread audience frustration. The DOI was not prepared to truly engage the breadth of questions and arguments Native Hawaiians and allies presented, spanning issues of international treaty law and the impact of federal recognition on preexisting programs and policies, such as the Hawaiian Homesteads governed by the 1921 Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (Sai 2011; Kauanui 2008). More fundamentally, the DOI was not open to relinquishing the conventions of an American-styled public hearing, which was ill-fitting in the Hawaiian context, nor were they open to deviating from their agenda about federal recognition to truly engage the diverse issues Native Hawaiian communities testified were important to them.¹¹ By contrast, Wharton and his collaborators spent much time and thought on ethically engaging local communities about the *Kamehameha* statue. Reflecting on the various opinions they received from the community, project leaders solicited the advice of a respected Native Hawaiian elder, Marie Solomon, and took a democratic vote of all North Kohala residents (Wharton 2012, 134). Even after the local decision was made to keep the statue painted and approved by the

committee in Honolulu, the project continued to work with the community, involving residents in the actual restoration and continuing to interface with local schools about the restoration work.

The sustained community engagement reflects many of the issues and processes that should ideally occur around other decisions for Hawai'i communities, including decisions to pursue either federal recognition or Hawaiian independence. Although extending similar processes across the state holds many challenges, it is inspiring to imagine communities across Hawai'i being able to engage in sincere, patient, and ongoing dialogue about Hawai'i's political status as simultaneously a US state and occupied Hawaiian Kingdom. North Kohala's example suggests that communities at the periphery of state and federal power may be able to lead the way in modeling successful forms of open engagement, and other public projects would do well to more consciously include or even center communities outside the usual focus on urban O'ahu. In fact, in some ways, the distance of North Kohala from the urban center and seat of state government in Honolulu seems to have allowed the multiple local communities to have a say over the statue. In part, precisely because the Honolulu agencies seemed to dismiss North Kohala's statue as unimportant and distant, the state did not try to manage every aspect of the statue, in contrast to the *Kamehameha* statue in Honolulu. Rather the project embodied the community's deep feeling that "the king is not state property, but part of North Kohala's local history and 'ohana'" (Wharton 2012, 85). This example potentially suggests that significant change for Native Hawaiians and other residents of Hawai'i will likely never originate from the state or federal governments but in local community organizing.

Public Art and Civic Engagement in Oceania

Wharton's study does not forego the object in its community-based conservation practice. It illustrates how careful analysis of the material properties of the statue (e.g., determining damage in the brass cast, its original gilding, the alteration of the eyes, and the layers of paint accumulated over the decades), in combination with historical and ethnographic research and community collaboration, led to a meaningful reflection on local histories, identities, and understandings of the sculpture as a conservation object. As conservator Dean Sully notes, "Investigative conservation can expose traces of past practice within the object itself, which has the potential to reveal social relationships around the manufacture and use of conserved objects" (Sully 2013, 302). He warns of placing sole emphasis on context to the extent that it neglects materiality and stresses how objects, contexts, and communities are mutually constituted (Sully 2007: 40–41).¹²

The *Kamehameha* sculpture as a “hybrid” object—commissioned by a Native Hawaiian monarch in collaboration with his haole advisor, Walter Murray Gibson, to commemorate the arrival of James Cook as well as the reign of Kamehameha I in a Euro-American neo-classical style featuring indigenous cultural symbols—stimulated reflection on the various significances the sculpture held for the North Kohala community (Wharton 2008, 160). The range of residents’ identifications with the syncretic statue speaks to the complexities of relationships between Native Hawaiians, plantation-era immigrants and their descendants, newcomer haole, tourists, and government agencies. Although some postcolonial analysts might celebrate hybrid cultural forms as articulating “postnational” subjectivities, scholars such as Michael Brown (2009, 160), following Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006), recognize the crucial place of “local loyalties” in global citizenship. In Hawai‘i, cultural studies scholars Cynthia Franklin and Laura Lyons analyze culturally mixed forms of music and poetry and argue that indigeneity does not have to be situated in opposition to hybridity nor replaced by it. They suggest that contemporary Hawaiian performances that engage a variety of local and global genres “instead of articulating global citizenry or stateless identities, can, in fact, be used for specific struggles of national self-determination” (2004, 70).¹³ This continues the tradition of the nineteenth-century Hawaiian monarch, David Kalākaua, who commissioned the *Kamehameha* statue by Thomas R. Gould, an American sculptor working in Italy, to make visible Hawai‘i’s distinguished tradition of Native leadership in an international context.¹⁴

Although Franklin and Lyons explore the ways hybrid cultural forms express indigenous Hawaiian values, they sidestep, to some degree, the issue of migrant cultures in Hawai‘i, which the North Kohala conservation project more directly addresses.¹⁵ Similarly, much of the literature on decolonizing cultural resource management focuses on the relationships between indigenous groups and heritage institutions. Nondominant migrant communities are largely neglected. Social justice scholar John Pugliese (2002), writing on Australian heritage policies, notes that migrant cultural sites have only recently been incorporated into the predominantly Anglocentric national landscape. He warns, however, that without consulting with Aboriginal communities to understand the indigenous significance of sites being identified as migrant heritage sites, migrant groups risk reproducing colonial national narratives and marginalizing indigenous histories. The *Kamehameha* conservation project achieved a breadth of participation in North Kohala through which residents arrived at a decision-making process about how to conserve the sculpture that privileged Native Hawaiian perspectives but also included the broader community.

Although Franklin, Lyons, and Pugliese complicate hybridity and the relationships between indigenous, migrant, and settler groups, they favor coherent and distinct ethnic/racial categories and do not address the intricacies of cultural and ethnic fusions. The transcultural nature of the *Kamehameha* sculpture and the layers of paint that have enveloped it and transformed it for more than a century are comparable to the layered history of cultural and ethnic blending in Hawai'i. Together, the sculpture's cross-cultural references and the inclusivity of the conservation process seem to have encouraged dialogue and reflection on the complex history of cultural and ethnic mixtures in Hawai'i. The initial organizing team and the conservation advisory group were primarily comprised of multiethnic descendants of Native Hawaiians, Asian immigrants, and haole, in addition to Sharon Hayden, a haole from New York who had lived in the area for thirty years, and Wharton, who gradually earned the trust of the community (Wharton 2012: 67–75). It is noteworthy that Wharton gently uses the term “local,” an identity marker in Hawai'i that emerged among Native Hawaiian and migrant laborers in response to class- and race-based exclusion by politically, socially, and economically dominant haole in the early twentieth century. However, toward the end of the century, the local has become “highly contested terrain, the site on which cultures clash over the terms of inclusion” (Chang 1996, 10). There have been various challenges to local belonging by descendants of indigenous and nonwhite plantation-era groups who object to haole appropriation of “localness”; by those who recognize ethnic stratification within the local; and by Native Hawaiians who see local identity as a colonial settler identity (see Chang 1996; Trask 2000; Reed 2001; Edles 2004; Fujikane and Okamura 2008). As Wharton notes, North Kohala shares these potentially conflicting identity constructions as reflected in the diversity of opinions voiced regarding what the *Kamehameha* statue meant and how it should be conserved: “The religious and cultural strands of the Hawaiian past persist and reveal themselves, but their presence scatters across different elements of the community, sometimes intermixing within individuals who are ambivalent about how elements of their very own identity can be honored through the presence of the sculpture” (2012: 122–23).

In addition to consideration of ethnic identities, planners were equally concerned with consulting elders (most of whom were not Native Hawaiians) and engaging community youth. Ultimately, project leaders wanted to promote a democratic culture (Wharton 2012, 133). In pursuing a multifaceted education, consultation, and decision-making approach, the planning committee encouraged the expression and exchange of diverse perspectives stemming from ethnic and class differences, historical and generational experiences, divergent levels of national allegiance (e.g., valuing war veterans

compared with distrust of the state), and religious beliefs (e.g., Native spiritual traditions, Buddhism, and Christianity). The fundamentally collaborative nature of the project was effectively formative; it generated conversation and activated a public space, creating a conscious community that considered its own composition as a public and its role in history making and shaping the future (see Deutsch 1996, 259; Baca 2009; Hamlin 2012). Dissolving the hierarchical boundaries separating heritage professional, artwork, and audience, the North Kohala case illustrates what art historian Grant Kester, writing on artworks that foster social engagement, describes as projects that “typically involve extended interactions that unfold in ways that lie, quite deliberately, outside the artist’s [or conservator’s] original control or intention and that evolve in concert with the particular intelligence of participants or collaborators” (2013, 116). The *Kamehameha* conservation process demonstrates the core principles of the Animating Democracy Initiative (supported by Americans for the Arts and the Ford Foundation): art is vital to society; civic dialogue is vital to democracy; and both create unique opportunities for mutual understanding. The initiative highlights the role of art and the humanities in addressing civic issues through their capacity to create a physical, psychological, and intellectual space for civic dialogue; engage people who might not otherwise participate; and invite participants to reflect in new ways (Korza et al. 2002: 1–7; see also Romney n.d.; McCoy 1997; Lee 2013). Open collaboration, therefore, facilitated shared understandings and transformed consciousness for all participants (cf. Kester 2013: 119, 122–23). Residents became aware of other community members’ views; Wharton arrived at a new awareness of his responsibility and capacities as an art conservator; and partner agencies, such as Animating Democracy, learned about culturally specific forms of generating public dialogue and engagement (Korza n.d.).

Similar efforts have taken place elsewhere in communities comprised of indigenous, migrant, and settler populations in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand. Drawing on the transformative capacity of art, Shigeyuki Kihara, an artist of Samoan and Japanese descent, produced a series of collaborative performances titled *Talanoa: Walk the talk* (2009–10). Each partnership brought together culturally diverse groups to engage in the Samoan concept of *talanoa*, a process of finding common ground through the exchange of ideas (akin to Hawaiian concepts of *‘ae like* [coming to an agreement], *kūkā*, [consultation], and *ho‘oponopono* [putting things right through mutual understanding and forgiveness] that were considered for decision-making models in North Kohala; Wharton 2012: 131–32). Kihara organized collaborations between Hindu and Samoan Christian singers (Sydney 2009), Japanese *taiko* drummers and a Maori cultural performance group (Auckland 2010), Chinese dragon dancers and Cook Island drummers (Sydney 2010;



FIGURE 1. Shigeyuki Kihara, *Talanoa: Walk the Talk V*. Documentation of Public Performance by the Australian Yau Kung Mun Association and Sydney Cook Islands Dance Group. Held on January 14, 2010. Staged at Dixon St. Mall, Chinatown, Sydney Australia. Commissioned by 4A Center for Contemporary Asian Art and Campbelltown Arts Center for Sydney Festival 2010. Photograph by Susannah Wimberley. Courtesy of the Artist, 4A Center for Contemporary Asian Art and Campbelltown Arts Center for Sydney Festival 2010.

Fig. 1), and others. Each project involved consultation between the artist, community leaders, and elders; extended gatherings between participant groups; a performance; and video documentation.¹⁶ The process was rather open-ended, allowing for moments of uncertainty, awkwardness, resolution, and creative engagement. The artist, participants, and audience (which formed a key component of the work) witnessing an unlikely alliance were transformed through the project as they arrived at new understandings of themselves, each other, and their relationships within the larger community (Kihara and Teaiwa 2011: 9–11; De Almeida 2012).

The North Kohala and Kihara projects demonstrate the vital link between culture and civic life and the capacity of communities to address other pressing issues. But the forming of publics and shaping of public spaces can also be contentious. Public art creates a site of struggle to define, in a given place



FIGURE 2. Carl F. K. Pao, West-facing bas-reliefs at Disney’s Aulani Resort and Spa, O’ahu. Photograph by Marata Tamaira, 2012. Courtesy of the Artist and the Photographer.

and time, what a community is and, more generally, what democracy is. As art historian Rosalind Deutsche writes, “a democratic public space must be understood as a realm not of unity but of divisions, conflicts, and differences resistant to regulatory power” (1996, 267). Marata Tamaira’s (2015) analysis of Native Hawaiian involvement in the design of Disney’s Aulani family resort on O’ahu highlights the fraught negotiation of place and identity in a context of disparate power. After receiving strong opposition to developing a theme-resort in Virginia in the 1990s, Disney selected to proceed more sensitively in creating its Hawaiian tourist venue in 2008, consulting with indigenous cultural representatives who, in the end, felt they were genuinely included in the conversation (Tamaira 2015: 167–69, 182). Over sixty Native Hawaiian artists contributed to Aulani’s public art, music, interior design, and landscape design (Figs. 2, 3). Despite Disney’s editing process and the unreality of the resort environment, artists aimed to affirm indigenous history and presence, educate tourists about indigenous viewpoints, and enact claims to place, not only to the Aulani site, but to the larger *‘āina* (land)



FIGURE 3. Carl F. K. Pao, Phallus/Cloak Panel from the *Kū* Mural at Disney's Aulani Resort and Spa, O'ahu. Photograph by Marata Tamaira, 2012. Courtesy of the Artist and Photographer.

(Tamaira 2015: 174–78). Countering a history of displacement, Tamaira suggests Native Hawaiian participation functioned as “strategic *emplacement*” of indigenous culture (Tamaira 2015: 168–69).

The Disney collaboration is compelling because it is situated on contested ground. Deutsche explains that “site specific works become part of their sites precisely by restructuring them, fostering . . . the viewer's ability to apprehend the conflicts and indeterminacy represented in the supposedly coherent spatial totalities” (1996, 262). Tamaira richly describes the culturally meaningful forms of material culture, integration of social and religious concepts,

REFERENCES

- Anthony
politanism: *Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- memory. *Public Art Review* 20 (2): 28–29.
- ling historical injustices: The restitution of cultural property—An over-
n *Claiming the stones/naming the bones*, ed. Elazar Barkan and Ronald
16–46. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.
- F.
ting indigenous heritage in the age of cultural property. In *Whose cul-
The promise of museums and the debate over antiquities*, ed. James Cuno,
4. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press.
- knowledge(s): Notes on race relations, panethnicity and history in Hawai‘i.
Asia Journal 22 (2): 1–29.
- tions on changes in museums and the conservation of collections from
nous peoples. *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation* 35 (2):
7.
- ocial and historic construction of professional values in conservation.
s in Conservation 43 (1): 1–8.
- rvation and cultural significance. In *Conservation principles: Dilemmas
ncomfortable truths*, ed. Alison Richmond and Alison Bracker, 139–49.
l: Butterwork-Heinemann.
- Deborah Poole
opology in the margins of the state. Santa Fe, NM: School of American
rch Press.
- lro
to fold, when to reveal your hand. [http://www.pedro-de-almeida.com.au/
z/shigeyuki-kihara-edge-of-elsewhere/](http://www.pedro-de-almeida.com.au/z/shigeyuki-kihara-edge-of-elsewhere/). Accessed July 10, 2015.
- yn
ns: Art and spatial politics. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- lking “race,” “ethnicity” and “culture”: Is Hawai‘i the “model minority”
Ethnic and Racial Studies 27 (1): 37–68.
- ve images that
orporation, the
hameha statue,
es of constantly
ities that inter-
on the instabil-
urages viewers
derstanding of
ted critique by
sold out to cor-
oning a public
4–67).
and the Aulani
ipants—artists,
ly engaged art
- //files.hawaii.gov/
te.hi.us/dlnr/hpd/
ord Foundation,
wai‘i Community
mily Foundation.
- poole (2004), Ran-
al conservation in
al to the working
ideria 2007, 14).
- ling on the herit-
ory, and the per-
201; Krekel et al.
- ilfoyle and Hogg
, a state agency
n, it would have

Franklin, Cynthia, and Laura Lyons

- 2004 Remixing hybridity: Globalization, native resistance, and cultural production in Hawai'i. *American Studies* 45 (3): 49–80.

Fujikane, Candace, and Jonathan Y. Okamura, eds.

- 2008 *Asian settler colonialism: From local governance to the habits of everyday life in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Guilfoyle, David R., and Erin A. Hogg

- 2015 Towards an evaluation-based framework of collaborative archaeology. *Advances in Archaeological Practice* 3 (2): 107–23.

Hamlin, Darrell A.

- 2012 Review of *The painted king: Art, activism, and authenticity in Hawai'i*, by Glenn Wharton. *e-Journal for Public Affairs* (Missouri State Univ.). <http://ejournal.missouristate.edu/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/PaintedKingReview.pdf>. Accessed April 9, 2013.

Hollowell, Julie, and George Nicholas

- 2009 Using ethnographic methods to articulate community-based conceptions of cultural heritage management. *Public Archaeology: Archaeological Ethnographies* 8 (2–3): 141–60.

Kamehiro, Stacy L.

- 2009 *The arts of kingship: Hawaiian art and national culture of the Kalākaua Era*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani

- 2008 *Hawaiian blood: Colonialism and the politics of sovereignty and indigeneity*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Kester, Grant

- 2013 Temporary coalitions, mobilized communities, and dialogue as art. In *What we made: Conversations on art and social cooperation*, ed. Tom Finkelpearl, 114–31. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press.

Kihara, Shigeyuki, and Katerina M. Teaiwa

- 2011 An interview with interdisciplinary artist Shigeyuki Kihara. *Intersections: Gender and Sexuality in Asia and the Pacific* 27:1–23.

Korza, Pam

- n.d. The *Kamehameha I* statue conservation project case study: Hawai'i Alliance for Arts Education. *Animating Democracy*. http://animatingdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/documents/labs/hawaii_case_study.pdf. Accessed February 6, 2008.

Korza, Pam, Andrea Assaf, and Barbara Schaffer Bacon

- 2002 Inroads: The intersection of art & civic dialogue. *Animating Democracy*. Saxapahaw, NC: Community Arts Network. http://animatingdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/documents/reading_room/INROADS%202.28.05.pdf. Accessed April 9, 2013.

Krekel, Christoph, Niclas Hein, and Heide Skowranek

- 2014 Preservation of cultural heritage: The bridge between inspection and conservation. In *Fringe 2013: 7th international workshop on advanced optical imaging and metrology*, ed. Wolfgang Osten, 721–28. Heidelberg: Springer Berlin.

Lee, Dahyun

- 2013 How the arts generate social capital to foster intergroup social cohesion. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society* 43:4–17.

McCoy, Martha

- 1997 Art for democracy's sake. *Public Art Review* 9:4–9.

Mills, Peter R., and Kathleen L. Kawelu

- 2013 Decolonizing heritage management in Hawai'i. *Advances in Anthropology* 3 (3): 127–32.

Pugliese, Joseph

- 2002 Migrant heritage in an indigenous context: For a decolonizing migrant historiography. *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 23 (1): 5–18.

Randeria, Shalini

- 2007 Global designs and local lifeworlds: Colonial legacies of conservation, disenfranchisement and environmental governance in postcolonial India. *Interventions: International Journal of Postcolonial Studies* 9 (1): 12–30.

Reed, Gay Garland

- 2001 Fastening and unfastening identities: Negotiating identity in Hawai'i. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 22 (3): 327–39.

Romney, Patricia

- n.d. The art of dialogue. *Animating Democracy*. http://animatingdemocracy.org/sites/default/files/documents/reading_room/art_of_dialogue.pdf. Accessed April 9, 2013.

Sai, David Keanu

- 2011 *Ua mau ke ea sovereignty endures: An overview of the political and legal history of the Hawaiian Islands*. Honolulu: Pua'a Foundation.

Sully, Dean

- 2007 Colonizing and conservation. In *Decolonizing conservation: Caring for Maori meeting houses outside New Zealand*, ed. Dean Sully, 27–43. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

- 2013 Conservation theory and practice: Materials, values, and people in heritage conservation. In *The international handbooks of museum studies, vol. II: Museum practice*, ed. Conal McCarthy, 293–314. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Tamaira, Andrea Marata
- 2015 Frames and counterframes: Envisioning Kanaka Maoli art in Hawai'i. PhD diss., Australian National Univ.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay
- 2000 Settlers of color and "immigrant" hegemony: "Locals" in Hawai'i. *Amerasia Journal* 26 (2): 1–24.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda
- 1999 *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. New York: Zed Books.
- Wharton, Glenn
- 2005 Indigenous claims and heritage conservation: An opportunity for critical dialogue. *Public Archaeology* 4:199–204.
- 2008 Dynamics of participatory conservation: The *Kamehameha I* sculpture project. *Journal of the American Institute for Conservation* 47 (3): 159–73.
- 2012 *The painted king: Art, activism, and authenticity in Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.