

Bacchilega, Cristina. *Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007. pbk. 2013.

Chapter 1

Introduction

[W]hat constitutes "tradition" to a people is ever-changing. . . . The Hawaiian relationship to land has persisted into the present. What has changed is ownership and use of the land. . . . Hawaiians assert a "traditional" relationship to the land not for political ends, . . . but because they continue to believe in the cultural value of caring for the land. That land use is now contested makes such a belief political.

—Haunani-Kay Trask

This book focuses on the representation of Hawai'i as a legendary space in modern and contemporary narratives that, via verbal and visual translation, have adapted Native Hawaiian traditional stories. This is not a book about Hawaiian legends. It is a study of how Hawaiian stories labeled as "legends" have been translated to produce a *legendary Hawai'i* primarily for non-Hawaiian readers or audiences; and it is a study of how some historical and contemporary Hawaiian counternarratives offer an invitation to unmake this imaginary construction and re-envision Hawai'i as an indigenous "storied place." Put differently, this book documents the uses to which "legendary traditions" have been put to reinforce a tourist-oriented image of Hawai'i in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, and argues for a re-cognition of Hawai'i as sustained by indigenous conceptions of place and genre.

Narrative Tradition

My general task is to investigate narrative tradition within a framework that rejects the popular understanding that what is "traditional" is conservative and uninventive, and instead considers tradition as an ongoing "process of cultural construction"—a process situated in the preoccupations and negotiations of the present, a process where every teller engages with the past and interprets it so as to affect listeners or readers. In this view, as folklorist Henry Glassie elucidates, tradition is "the cre-

ation of the future out of the past" (395) so that both responsibility (to the past, community, audience) and creativity (the opportunity to affect change) are active ingredients of any telling.¹

Let me state from the start that this focus on change in "tradition" is not to be simply equated with the "invention of tradition," which quite apart from its scholarly genesis has in journalistic and popular usage been read as "fakelore" and as such has impacted indigenous peoples in negative ways. Rather, as Glasse points out, tradition is akin to history, both being an "assembly of materials from the past, designed for usefulness in the future"; and its "continuity" effect is a dynamic, rather than static, aspect of culture: tradition commonly operates and persists via change (395).² Tradition is thus "to be understood as a process of cultural construction" (398), an *ongoing* process rather than a naturalized inheritance, and one that hinges on the complex negotiations characterizing its individual recollections and performances—negotiations that play out both the performer's responsibility to the past as source and the performer's responsibility to the present as audience or participants.

Performance, then, whether it is the retelling of a narrative or the staging of a ritual, is the opportunity for an individual or group to "take control" (404) through an engagement with the past and to act so as to affect the future. Preventing us from reading this opportunity as unbound creativity, Glasse's language, "take control," also alerts us to the power dynamics—political, institutional, social, economic, gendered—that are inescapably at stake in the uses we make of both tradition and performance.³ It follows that the opposite of tradition "is not change but oppression" (396). Historical violence, in other words, is at the core of the rupture of tradition, a rupture that, at the hands of a new power, may take the form of translation (as recontextualization and recodification) or unequivocal suppression. In its record of continuous change, then, tradition is "a key to historical knowledge" (398), a documentable site for a "better history" that speaks "of the engagement of wills, of the interaction among traditions, each fraught with value, all driving toward their different visions of the future" (396).

What guides my investigation is this understanding of tradition, and in particular its relation to colonialism—certainly one of the most significant violent agents of change on this planet. How does colonialism rupture the (narrative) traditions of colonized and/or indigenous peoples? Clearly it others them; at times it violently seeks to erase them; but even in doing so it represents them.⁴ In rupturing tradition, colonialism then simultaneously delegitimizes the narratives of the colonized *and* constructs them as representative of the colonized "culture." Scholars in various disciplines, Edward Said, Johannes Fabian, Gayatri Chakra-

vorty Spivak, have convincingly argued that the "culture" of the colonized people is not, however, the origin of this kind of narrative representation, but its effect. To keep that reversal in mind, I believe, makes researching the simultaneously delegitimizing and creative role that colonialism plays in the retelling of tradition a significant tool for undoing the colonial fictions that still shape our social imaginaries. At the same time, researching rupture in the context of change as the operative force of tradition can be a way out of the oppressor/victim dynamic that characterizes some studies of colonialism and dispossesses colonized peoples of agency. How so? By focusing on the dynamics of multiple versions and single performances—just as a literary scholar may focus on carefully contextualized close reading—it is possible to assess change as a negotiation of the performer's position within what Glasse calls "a complex nexus of responsibility" (402) and sociopolitical constraints. In other words, we can attend to the work of resistance and contestation that can inform retelling within colonial, and thus violently conflicted, dynamics of tradition.

I have found this approach to investigating tradition—*within* history and cultural politics and with an eye to the dynamics of change and rupture—helpful as I researched the politics of staging "legendary traditions" in late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Hawai'i. Most obviously, I use the phrase "legendary traditions" to acknowledge that, like "myth" and "folktale," "legend"—a narrative that across generations articulates cultural or historical knowledge and poses questions of belief—is commonly identified (and not exclusively by Western disciplines) as a "traditional" genre.⁵ But given my preamble, "legendary traditions" is not, of course, to be read as "belonging to the past" or "unchanging." In particular, when inflected by Hawaiian scholar and activist Haunani-Kay Trask's assertion in the epigraph to this chapter, this approach entails being attentive to how the retelling of a "legend"—its performance as a social and artistic act—is not necessarily a "traditional" sign of change, but one of rupture.

This rupture for Hawai'i can be traced to—as Hawaiian historian Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio cogently writes—"a story of violence," in which colonialism "worked . . . through a long, insinuating invasion of people, ideas, and institutions" and "literally and figuratively dismembered the *lāhui* (the people) from their traditions, their lands, and ultimately their government" (*Dismembering Lāhui* 3). The "story" of colonialism in Hawai'i may not have been sudden or bloody, but Hawaiians have nevertheless suffered its "violence" and also resisted and protested it. If we focus on the nineteenth century alone, the story of this "disruption" developed through many painful sociopolitical and cultural changes, which included the continued and devastatingly massive

Native Hawaiian depopulation due to post-contact epidemics (Bushnell, *Gifts of Civilization*; Crosby; Silva, *Aloha Betrayed* 24–27; Stannard, *Before the Horror*), the spread of alcoholism, the introduction of new laws that were based on Christian morality and devalued expressions of Hawaiian religious and cultural tradition such as hula, the division and privatization of land (Kame'eleihewa, *Native Land and Foreign Desires*), the move to a representational political system, “a systematic destruction of the relationship between chiefs and people” (Osorio 13), the forceful annexation of Hawai'i to the United States at the end of the century, and the ensuing process of Americanization.

My goal then is to think through the transformations, ruptures, and negotiations of “legendary traditions” in close relation to issues of displacement in post-annexation Hawai'i, a place where to date the question of land rights is inextricably linked with Native Hawaiian sovereignty, where immigration until recently was supporting a plantation economy, and where development—as plantation, militarization, and tourism—puts into jeopardy the very survival of “local” sites.

The annexation of Hawai'i as a territory of the United States of America took place in 1898 against the will of the majority of Hawaiians, whose petitions and resistance were to no avail. This annexation followed the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, a violence for which the 1993 bill signed by President Clinton has officially apologized to the Hawaiian people. Following the overthrow of Queen Lili'uokalani, missionary descendant Sanford Dole became president of the interim republic, mostly run by Euro-American businessmen. As powerfully documented by Hawaiian political scientist Noenoe Silva in her groundbreaking and detailed study *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism*, there was strong Native resistance to this takeover, a resistance that was ignored until recently by historians and other scholars whose work relied primarily on English-language sources. In a July 3, 1894, speech that Silva translated from the Hawaiian language newspaper *Ka Leo o ka Lahui* (*The Voice of the Nation*), Hawaiian patriot Joseph Nāwahi had thus articulated his protest against the overthrow and the impending republic: “The house of government belongs to us, just as the Kamehamehas built it. We have been ousted by trespassers who entered our house and who are telling us to go and live in a lei stand that they think to build and force us all into” (“Kanaka Maoli Resistance to Annexation” 54).⁶

What had been already in many ways—cultural, racial, economic, and social—a challenging and complex interaction between the indigenous people of Hawai'i and settlers, both European and North American (along with the large numbers of Asians who had come to the islands for work), was sealed certainly by the time of annexation as an unmistakably

hierarchical power play in which Native Hawaiians were no longer considered, by the Euro-American businessmen whose interests had become dominant, to be political interlocutors. In 1896, by law the English language became “the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools” in Hawai'i (*Laws* 189; Nee-Benham and Heck 102–11), resulting in the elimination of the few remaining Hawaiian-language schools and cutting down a public debate on language and education. Hawaiian petitions against annexation had some impact on the American Senate in early 1898, but were then ignored when Congress—pressured by the volatile situation in Cuba and the Philippines—passed a joint resolution to annex Hawai'i. Hawaiian lands were ceded to the United States without any vote taken among Hawaiians or Asian immigrants, the largest population groups on the islands.⁷ “Hawaiians,” Haunani-Kay Trask writes, “suffered a unilateral redefinition of our homeland and our people, a displacement and dispossession in our country. In familial terms, our mother (and thus our heritage and our inheritance) was taken away from us. We were orphaned in our own land. . . . As a result of these actions, Hawaiians became a conquered people, our lands and culture subordinated to another nation.”⁸

Legendary Hawai'i and the Politics of Place

There is no need for me to politicize cultural production about and in Hawai'i: the colonization of Hawai'i does it for me. It follows that attending to the political and ideological dynamics of this colonization is both necessary and enabling when analyzing cultural and narrative production. Specifically, annexation politics and ideology are inextricably linked with the construction of what I am calling *legendary Hawai'i*, a cultural product that, I argue, is not to be simply equated with Hawaiian “legendary traditions.” Thus, a large part of this book documents how, after annexation, Hawaiian *mo'olelo*, or connected (hi)stories that were identified as “legends,” served—like raw materials—to imagine and market within popular and scholarly venues a new product, *legendary Hawai'i*: a space constructed for non-Hawaiians (and especially Americans) to experience, via Hawaiian legends, a Hawai'i that is exotic and primitive while beautiful and welcoming. This new product of the imagination was at the turn of the twentieth century valorized through the ubiquitous colonial practice of translation and the new technology of photography. And, most crucially, it was the budding tourist industry of the territory of Hawai'i that motivated, shaped, and sustained the production of this *legendary Hawai'i* especially for the benefit of American tourists and potential settlers. If (linguistic and media) translation is the modus operandi of the immediately post-annexation cultural phenome-

non I am calling *legendary Hawai'i*, the novelty of photography provides it with a technological edge (while visually translating many of its narrative topoi), and tourism is its economic and ideological motor.

Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century English-language translations of Hawaiian *mo'olelo* and the uses of photography in these collections of "legends" to promote Hawai'i as a tourist destination are my central focus of analysis (Introduction, Chapters 3 and 4). I do not mean to identify *legendary Hawai'i* as a cultural production exclusively by non-Hawaiians or *only for* non-Hawaiians, but to delineate how as a cultural product it served primarily non-Hawaiian interests at a crucial political juncture.

Later chapters—4 and 5 especially—raise issues of agency and performance in ways that should complicate a simple colonizer/colonized dichotomy and grapple more closely with the complex dynamics of power and knowledge as well as continuity and discontinuity in a colonial context. As Silva documents, from the eighteenth century on, Hawaiians "often took the tools of the colonizers and made use of them to secure their own national sovereignty and well-being" (*Aloha Betrayed* 15–16). I do sketch in Chapter 5 some transformations of Hawaiian "legendary traditions" in the nineteenth century to show how Hawaiians exercised agency and creativity in print: the technologies of writing and print had changed Hawaiian *mo'olelo*, but not disrupted and dislocated them in the ways that the production of *legendary Hawai'i* would. And I do examine two, very different from one another, recent twentieth-century performances of Hawai'i's "legendary traditions": Anne Kapu-lani Landgraf's Hawaiian-centered view of "storied places" and Glen Grant's representation of a multicultural "supernatural" Hawai'i—the first powerfully countering *legendary Hawai'i* and the other adapting it to the 1990s. But the core of this study is the examination of how the production of post-annexation Hawaiian legends in English delegitimizes Hawaiian narratives and traditions *and* at the same time constructs them as representative of Hawaiian "culture." This is not to say that all of these narratives simply did the bidding of the tourist industry.

To pursue a documentation of Native Hawaiians' continued resistance and contestation against their colonial representation, it is important to identify and discuss within the varied performances of *legendary Hawai'i* what Mary Louise Pratt calls "autoethnographic expression," that is, "instances in which colonized subjects undertake to represent themselves in ways that *engage with* the colonizer's own terms" (*Imperial Eyes* 7). Today, thanks to the Hawaiian Renaissance that began in the 1970s and the ongoing sovereignty movement, this resistance is more clearly in the public eye, and strong re-visionary artistic practices animate much of the Hawaiian literary, visual, and performance arts—but this resis-

tance never had subsided.⁹ Ample evidence is to be found in Hawaiian-language sources, but scholarship resting on what Marvin Pukea Nogelmeier labels a "discourse of sufficiency" has often dismissed it in favor of a very limited selection of nineteenth-century Hawaiian documents that have in English translation been canonized to represent "Hawaiian culture."¹⁰

While I discuss only a few Hawaiian-language narratives, in this study, Emma Kaili Metcalf Beckley Nakuina's stories (1904) and Anne Kapu-lani Landgraf's photography (1994) serve as the primary examples or performances of a Hawaiian autoethnographic "legendary tradition" that articulates the tradition of *mo'olelo* and centers on "storied place." *Mo'olelo* most basically is a story, or a sequence of stories, but its social uses and artistic protocols signal the workings of Hawaiian epistemology and connect it with history. As per Lorrin Andrews's 1865 *Dictionary of the Hawaiian Language*, history, connected story, and tradition are all part of a Hawaiian understanding of *mo'olelo* or *mo'ō-ōlelo*.¹¹ Today, for Osorio—a historian who articulates his project as writing *mo'olelo—mo'ōlelo* "literally, . . . means a fragment of a story" (250), not the whole story, but one located in the teller's/writer's history and yet participating in his people's larger history ("Our history owns us, shapes and contextualizes us," ix). Originating from *mo'ō* and *ōlelo* (meaning "connected story" [Andrews 399] or "succession of talk" [Pukui and Elbert, *Hawaiian Dictionary* 254]), *mo'olelo* translates into English as "story" and "history" both; "tradition" and "literature"; specific modes of storytelling including "myth," "legend," "fable," "yarn"; and specific approaches to recording events including "journal," "essay," "chronicle," and "minutes" (Pukui and Elbert *Hawaiian Dictionary* 254). The relationship between the *ōlelo* (word) and the *mo'ō*—as "succession," "generational line," "ridge" and "lizard," or "dragon," as well as "small fragment" or "narrow path" (Pukui and Elbert *Hawaiian Dictionary* 253)—is mutually constitutive and metonymically encapsulates the connection in Hawaiian thought of genealogy, land, and (hi)story. Furthermore, as the embodiment in some cases of a transformed *mo'ō*, or dragonlike lizard, "ridge" suggests the emplacement of story. In this study, Emma Nakuina's work documents the affirmation of Native genre, authority, and place-centered knowledge in a now regrettably obscure early twentieth-century English-language publication. Landgraf's bilingual and multi-media text projects "legendary traditions" into the present in artistically and politically transformative ways that bring the *mo'ō* into view. In fact, Landgraf's artistic intervention enables and frames my own readings of *legendary Hawai'i*; and this re-framing is necessary because even nowadays the dominant representations of Hawai'i are not "autoethnographic" or centered on a Hawaiian view of "storied place."

In the process of analyzing the historical production of *legendary Hawai'i* and its counternarratives, I will focus on the dynamic of "space" versus "place" as applicable to two related problematics: the making of Hawai'i itself into a legendary space for the benefit of post-annexation tourism; and the translation of narratives about Hawai'i's *wahi pana*, or "storied places," in print. By documenting the disruptive force of the former and the varied effects of the latter, I aim to work at the intersections of the politics of narrative and the politics of place.¹²

Focusing on the representation of "place" makes sense methodologically. In most, if not all Hawaiian *mo'olelo*, "place" situates events, heroes, tellers and listeners, memories and emotions in ways that connect creation and transformation of landmarks with familial or genealogical relations. Indeed, animated, specific, and emotionally charged localization is the backbone (not the descriptive ornamentation) of Native Hawaiian narrative traditions. Furthermore, place continues to be at the heart of twentieth- and twenty-first-century *mele* (poetic song) and hula compositions, contemporary Native literature—as most evident in the issues of *Oriwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal*—and, though conceptualized differently, of Hawai'i's multiethnic literatures (to the point that many refer to "local" literature). And, within a Western classification of traditional narratives, "place" is a distinctive feature of the "legend." But the focus on how "the affective bond between people and place" (Tuan 4) needs "to be understood through the lens of social and cultural conflict" (Cresswell 29) takes priority for me also because historically Hawai'i has been, since contact with the West, violently translated into an exotic landscape that has provided a (self-)redemptive site for missionaries, raw materials (sugar most prominently) for enterprising colonialists, an *aloha*-filled paradise for moderately adventurous tourists, and a real-estate playing field for both state and global economies. The post-annexation construction of a *legendary Hawai'i*, I will argue, has played an important ideological role in enabling and perpetuating this violence—a symbolic one that nevertheless has real consequences.¹³ Thus, while the process of endowing place with special meanings is universal, I believe that the charged conflictuality of meanings that continues to inform the narrative representation of *legendary Hawai'i* today calls for a historicizing and passionately intellectual—in the Gramscian sense—exploration.

Disciplinary Responsibilities: Folklore and Literature

Such an exploration involves not only explaining my use of concepts such as tradition, legend, *mo'olelo*, and place, but reflecting on my investigative framework and terminology. Is a "folklore and literature"

approach appropriate when considering Hawaiian narratives and more generally literary and cultural production about Hawai'i that purports to adapt Native genres? I intend to keep this question active throughout the book. To consider colonialism as an agent of rupture in Hawaiian narrative traditions, as I proposed in the beginning of this introduction, constitutes the first step in addressing this question. But there are specific problems with using the categories of "folklore" and "literature" that I must also take into serious consideration.

We know that, historically, both folklore and literary studies have been and are active participants in the discursive formation and consolidation of nation-states. The discipline of American folkloristics in particular—as it emerged officially in 1888 in the United States—was obviously implicated in the knowledge we have of Hawaiian culture and, almost indistinguishably, its past as a nation. The study of British and American literature in Hawai'i's educational system has just as obviously served important purposes of acculturation against which many Hawai'i-based writers have rebelled especially since the 1970s. This kind of complicity is to be productively investigated, but it does not release those of us who have been trained as scholars in European and American folkloristics and literary studies from these disciplines. This, then, is my attempt, as a scholar of folklore and literature, to take on the challenge of working from within this framework to reevaluate and reorient it.

Naming—always already a renaming—has been a powerful tool of colonial rule and cultural appropriation. From early on, Native Hawaiian narratives, or *mo'olelo*, were for the most part identified by Western travelers, scholars, and popularizers as "legends," or "myths" and "folktales" interchangeably, and thus seen as "folklore," a newly formed category in European and American nineteenth-century thought. Because "folklore" was and is often viewed in the science-centered West as an outmoded or "false" way of knowing, this classification has unfortunately also provided an opening to view the *mo'olelo* as "untrue." As belief narratives, legends and myths maintain a relationship with history for scholars, but more generally "legend" is interpreted as fanciful or undocumented history. This has resulted in erasing the meaning of "history" carried in the Hawaiian word and genre, with *mo'olelo* being translated and understood only or primarily as "story."

This dismissive use of the term "folklore" is rightly suspect among Native Hawaiians and colonized peoples in general, and my study seeks to work against it. In commenting on how nineteenth-century Hawaiian historian Samuel Mānaiaikalani Kamakau uses "*mo'olelo*," Nogelmeier notes that it "is a single concept in Hawaiian conveying multiple meanings, encompassing what in English would be considered as history, ethnography, myth, legend, account, description, tradition" (193). Within

this epistemological framework, then, it makes sense nowadays for Hawaiian historian Osorio to write his history of the “dismemberment” of the Hawaiian nation in the shape and name of *mo’olelo* as (hi)story. Similarly, Lilikala Kame’eleihiwa’s history of the privatization of land *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Peha Lā E Pono Ai?* begins with *mo’olelo* to reframe her readers’ understanding of Native Hawaiians in relation to their land. And Noenoe Silva turns to the *mo’olelo* in nineteenth-century Hawaiian-language newspapers to document how these narratives, for instance “He Moololo no Hiikaikapoliopole” (The legend of Hi’iakai-kapoliopole), asserted Hawaiian epistemology in the face of the missionaries’ dismissal of their knowledge as savagery and ignorance (*Aloha Betrayed* 58–59, 76–79, and *passim*). *Mo’olelo* tells history in ways that Western scholars like myself need to learn to recognize, hear, and listen to.

Mo’olelo is thus a significant counternarrative to “folklore” in its popularized and belittling meaning, but for me to do away with the label “folklore” entirely could entail an *a priori* dismissal of the historical role it has played in facilitating the appropriation of these *mo’olelo* narratives for what I have called *legendary Hawai’i*. For instance, as Noenoe Silva and Ku’ualoha Ho’omanawanui have pointed out, approaching Hawaiian narratives as “folklore” in the nineteenth century meant that collectors and translators like Nathaniel B. Emerson could dismiss issues of authorship and lump Hawaiian tellers as anonymous “native informants” (“This Land”).¹⁴ Though the Hi’iaka *mo’olelo* I just referred to was signed by M. J. Kapihenui of Kailua, Ko’olaupoko, O’ahu, Emerson’s 1915 *Pele and Hiiaka: A Myth from Hawaii* could rely heavily on it without crediting Kapihenui (Silva, *Aloha Betrayed* 77) precisely because the folkloric labels of “myth” and “legend” bring with them the assumption of anonymity. It is thus worth exploring such dynamics and investigating the historical role of “folklore” and amateur “folklorists” in Hawai’i.

Some Pacific writers and scholars have proposed “orature” as an alternative indigenous paradigm to “folklore” (though still highlighting “mythology” within it). Since my study deals with Western as well as Native cultural productions in a “contact zone” and my primary focus is on unmaking a *legendary Hawai’i* produced for non-Hawaiian readers or audiences, I have not done away with “folklore”; juxtaposing it to the *mo’olelo*, and “legends” to *wahi pana* (storied places), enables me to discuss narratives within both frameworks and to foreground their historical strife. I am not arguing against the frameworks of “orature” or “oral literature.”¹⁵ Rather, I want to push at the seams of “folklore”—in the case of Hawai’i both a colonial construct and a form of verbal expression that is not narrowly “literature” in its Western and dominant meaning. Perhaps I am working to turn the tools of folkloristics against some of

the expropriative uses they have been put to. Certainly, I am working to document that appropriation. And, being attentive to performance—the creative, contestatory, and at times subversive, dimensions of folklore—I am also seeking to document or recover sites of resistance to the forces of Americanization and tourism that were the engine of this appropriation in the twentieth century.

Why talk about “folklore and literature” in discussing what I have described as the multimedia production of *legendary Hawai’i* and the retelling of Hawai’i’s storied places? Some may have chosen to label all the narratives I am about to discuss as “folklore” either in its popular meaning of “untruth” or in its association with a cultural past that stands for tradition. But it is not (lack of) authenticity as such that I am pursuing. Folklorists increasingly acknowledge the “need to see how folklore is re-situated in a vast number of nonfolk contexts” (de Caro and Jordan 272) where it serves a range of interests. If as a “contact zone,” Hawai’i has been “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (Pratt, *Imperial Eyes* 6), within it the search for “authenticity” as such has been arguably more a symptom of the newcomer’s or researcher’s assumptions and anxieties than anything else.¹⁶ These are not my traditions and I have only rudimentary knowledge of the Hawaiian language.

Others may have chosen to label all the narratives I am about to discuss as “literature” either in its older European meaning of “all printed matter,” or in the framework of “oral literature” and “literature in performance.” But there is much to be gained, I hope to show, from not reaching for “literature” as an umbrella term before having *worked* the differences that mark—socially and artistically—“folklore” from “literature” and, methodologically, “folkloristics” from Western “literary studies.”

Far from suggesting the autonomy of textual fields or disciplines, I would argue for an intertextuality that does not ignore how social function and status play out in today’s predominant understanding of what makes “literature.” While marked by the creative agency and talent of individual tellers, “traditional” narratives function as part of a group (though not necessarily anonymous) repertoire and are often seen as articulating some form of accepted knowledge.¹⁷ While also belonging to historical traditions, novels, poems, and essays are “literature” that bears the copyright mark and grants a special aura to “authorship.” Thus, I am arguing for this differentiation in order to explore works of the imagination in ways that will not be limited by a strictly modern and Western definition of literature that often extols creativity as exceptional

and purely individual. Surely, it is repetition that ensures the survival of legends: this is the “traditional” dimension of folklore, its always already “secondhand” or collective status once an individual’s creativity is accepted and shared; at the same time, as noted earlier, every performance or folklore “text” is an event that plays out specific social and artistic dynamics. It is this interplay of repetition and variation, or tradition and creativity, that folklore studies have been attentive to, especially in the last thirty some years; and, when researching—as I am—changes within a legendary tradition, this experience matters and can be productively tapped into.

Two among the methodological tenets of modern Western folkloristics should be recognizable throughout this book: folklorists consider the multiplicity of versions through which any “one” narrative is experienced; and we foreground the performance and performative elements that make an individual telling “emergent, the product of the complex interplay of expressive resources, social goals, individual competence, community ground rules for performance, and culturally defined event structures” (Bauman, “Conceptions of Folklore” 13–14).¹⁸ Two among the tenets of modern literary theory equally come into play: literary scholars read a text not as an insulated creative act, but as framed by specific institutions—including that of literature itself—and more generally sociocultural and historical dynamics; and we explore fiction as an argument and the breakdown of that argument. Combined, the perspectives of folklore and literature support a consideration of texts in intertextual conversation with one another and as located in their production and (re)telling/(re)reading, that is, tradition and history. This interdisciplinary perspective works to foreground the dynamics of performance and ideology in both folklore and literature. It seeks to recognize a “web of intertextuality” where folklore is not set apart from literature and, at the same time, the social, historical, and artistic differences between folklore and literature are not erased.¹⁹

Adopting this kind of folklore and literature perspective to pursue an understanding of narrative tradition within the politics of culture then allows me to take advantage of tools offered by performance-oriented folkloristics, located theories of literary narrative, and close reading. Centered on communicative *events* as well as correcting the misconception that “folklore” is exclusively preliterate or anonymous and that “literature” is limited to Western genres and stylistics, this folklore and literature approach also makes for productive engagement with the diverse narrative media (orality, print, and image) through which *legendary Hawai‘i* and Hawaiian “storied places” have been and are claimed.

To take a self-reflexive approach to folklore & literature in a colonial context involves denaturalizing the analytical tools of the disciplinary

trade. In seeking to reach for or move toward an understanding of Hawaiian “storied place,” I problematize “visual illustration” (Chapter 2) and “localization” (Chapter 5). Another structuring category of Western narrative, “time,” comes into play in my observations of how pervasive the “ethnographic present” (Fabian) is in *legendary Hawai‘i*, but also in the realization that the “from primitivism to civilization” narrative of development that structures early promotions of *legendary Hawai‘i* is not only alien but counter to the Hawaiian perspective on the relationship of the present to the past and the future (Chapters 3). And I resist a homogenizing view of “collectivity” by insisting on a close reading of how the writer Emma Nakuna negotiates her responsibilities when it comes to ethnographic knowledge and family history (Chapter 4).

Overall, my ambition is threefold: to pursue the possibilities of reflexive folklore and literary studies as relevant to a specifically contested politics of place and tradition; to read the production of *legendary Hawai‘i* and autoethnographic representations of Hawai‘i’s “storied places” as emplaced *events* themselves so as to articulate the multiplicity of their sociopolitical meanings and artistry without falling into a dehistoricized, flattening pluralism; and to contribute an analysis of works of the imagination that can also resonate within political and struggles in Hawai‘i and more general ideological and institutional controversies, thus refusing to locate folklore or literature in an ahistorical and apolitical realm.

Translation Tales: Tourism and Photography

In the process of a historical documentation of *legendary Hawai‘i*, three modes of cultural production emerge as important sites of investigation: translation, from the Hawaiian language into English, but also from one culture to another, from one genre to another, and from one medium to another; photography, as the technology that foremost contributed to the initial formation of a Westernized imaging of *legendary Hawai‘i*; and tourism, as a determining post-annexation economic and ideological machinery of development.

Even though “translation studies” came officially into being as a discipline only in 1978, translation has been practiced and debated over for centuries, and is operative every day in our lives, often in ways that we do not stop to consider.²⁰ Translation facilitates communication, but is not synonymous with it. I may know this, but like many I find it more efficient and reassuring to go through my day as if translation and its problems were invisible. The discipline of translation studies, as described by pioneering scholars André Lefevere and Susan Bassnett, counters such a utilitarian approach to translation and considers, from a variety of perspectives, its intra- and intercultural dynamics. Since

translation studies is a rich and rather fragmented field, my focus here is on what I understand as an emergent project within it: a critical intervention into the politics of *colonial* translation, considered in its production and reception as well as its linguistic, cultural, and institutional contexts. Within this project, thanks especially to the work of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Lawrence Venuti, colonial and postcolonial uses of translation have become an important site for analysis, and this analysis in turn has affected the questions asked within the discipline at large. I will point here to three working ideas taken from these developments in translation studies that have helped me to understand post-annexation translations of *mo'olelo* into English-language "legends."

First, as Venuti synthesizes and several individual studies have shown, "Although the history of colonialism varies significantly according to place and period, it does reveal a consistent, no, an inevitable reliance on translation" (*Scandals of Translation* 165). As missionaries, administrators, educators, and anthropologists translated the texts of the colonized, these translated texts discursively strengthened colonial governments and constructed representations of the colonized subject that justified the "civilizing" project of the colonial power.²¹ Such translations "enact a process of identity formation in which colonizer and colonized . . . are positioned unequally" (Venuti, *Scandals* 165). Often perceived as faithful or innocent documentation paradoxically *because* they are translations, these texts go unquestioned in the Western context and become the dominant representations of colonized peoples. I am using the present tense because, as my reading of *legendary Hawai'i* will confirm, the power of these translations—even if they originated in the nineteenth or early twentieth centuries—is still with us. Several consequences follow: authoritative Western translators become known as "experts" in non-Western cultures—their customs or literatures—while Natives are recognized as "informants" only; texts selected for translation become canonical and determine the construction of non-Western literary traditions and, by extension, comparative literature; the translated texts that form these selective "indigenous literary traditions" are often devoid of political content or strife.²²

Second, because Western and non-Western languages are not equal, what Gayatri Spivak calls "translation-as-violation" (*Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 162) is operative in moving from the colonized or Native language to that of the colonizer. This violation operates in stark contrast with the faithfulness versus freedom debate that dominated early and Renaissance translation in Europe because on either side of the argument the authority or complexity of the original "classic" language and text was assumed. With translation from colonized languages, it is instead common for the target language—English in the cases I dis-

cuss—to dictate its cultural logic. The rewriting that all translation involves is thus driven in colonial translation by a discursive strategy of containment or domestication that requires re-writing the other in the dominant language's terms.²³ This violation is "epistemic" in that the colonized or Native world is recodified in terms of the colonizers'.²⁴ Within the discipline of folkloristics, Lee Haring has critically documented, in early twentieth-century French translations, the "reframing" of Malagasy narratives into a different generic shape. "What the west calls myth has no genre attached to it" in this region, he writes, but Western researchers took "the privilege of naming certain narratives as myth" (Haring 191 and 192). In folklore as in literature, this recoding has significant implications, and that is why I have been referring to Hawaiian "legend" in quotation marks: the early twentieth-century translation of *mo'olelo* (history and story) into "legend"—sliding into "myth" and "folktale," and away from "history" and knowledge—exemplifies this domesticating interpretive strategy.

Third, the violence of colonial translation was never successful in its totality. Translation was not a one-way street in nineteenth-century Hawai'i, where highly literate Hawaiians translated all kinds of foreign texts for Hawaiian-language newspapers. Their selections and strategies are symptomatic of a Hawaiian agency that is otherwise obfuscated. To identify the localized dynamics of translated texts and agency in colonial contexts helps to correct what Eric Cheyfitz calls "a foreign politics of forgetfulness" and undo the workings of that insidious narrative politics in the present.²⁵ Thus, attending not only to the logic, publishing history, and institutional uses, but also to the rhetoric of translations into the colonial language can be particularly productive if one's reading strategy is to seek the "remainder." This is what Venuti sees as the staging of linguistic, cultural, and generic power relationships in a translated text; it is "a clue to the workings of gendered [and indigenous] agency," what Spivak articulates as the "disruption of figuration in social practice" ("The Politics of Translation" 179, 187).²⁶

In contrast to the "fluent" one, the translation that "releases the remainder" is "demystifying" in that it opens itself to the incursion of the foreign, "the substandard and the marginal" (Venuti, *Scandals of Translation* 10, 11), even if this foreignness is *within* the "domestic" culture or language. "Cultivating a heterogeneous discourse . . . does not so much prevent the assimilation of the foreign text as aim to signify the autonomous existence of that text behind (yet by means of) the assimilative process of the translation" (*Scandals* 11). Spivak's practice and theory have for a long time now been similarly advocating a translation that, by bearing traces of "the protocols of a text—not the general laws of the language, but the laws specific to this text" ("Translating into English"

94), would invite the reader "to push through to the original" (95). The reading dynamics of intimacy, love, and responsibility that Spivak names as the core of the translator's task—and significantly for her "becoming-human is an incessant economy of translation" ("Questioned on Translation: Adrift" 14)—are hardly the stuff of "translatese," but they do work toward being "able to discriminate on the terrain of the original" ("The Politics of Translation" 189). In my understanding, Spivak and Venuti offer no guarantee for the successful communication of an indigenous or "Third World" woman's text through these translation and reading practices. Rather translation itself is further problematized, not in the service of a hopeless untranslatability but of an ethics of reading—for the translator and for the reader of translations—that reaches toward learning (from) the language and "protocols" of the other. I have found this approach particularly useful in reading *Hawai'i: Its People, Their Legends*, published by Emma Nakuina in 1904, since this Hawaiian woman's rather obscure collection bears the marks of *mo'olelo* in sharp contrast to the colonial and better-known translations of Thomas G. Thrum and William D. Westervelt. Thus, I read her translations for clues of Native and gendered agency that defy *legendary Hawai'i*.

Thinking about translation in these critical and utopian ways is useful while I seek to explore and resist the culture of tourism as it has affected the representation of Hawai'i. As Dean MacCannell put it in 1992, "tourism is not just an aggregate of merely commercial activities; it is also an ideological framing of history, nature, and tradition; a framing that has the power to reshape culture and nature to its own needs" (*Empty Meeting Grounds* 1). Tourism operates as a form of translation. Within this frame, "tourism stages the world as a museum of itself" (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture* 7) in which the tourist is encouraged to perceive everything as a sign of itself.²⁷ Through building up what makes a place different from the tourist's habitual space and often through putting on display "heritage," that mode of cultural production that Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett defines as "the transvaluation of the obsolete . . . the outmoded, the dead," tourism seeks to "convert a location into a destination" (*Destination Culture* 148, 7). This is a form of translation that, rather than attending to the protocols that are "in place," often thrives on visual and verbal performances of "hereness" or "staged authenticity" that collectively—thanks to advertisements, literature, performances—reinforce the "destination image" of that culture or place for the purposes of export.²⁸

As identified in studies of tourism, a "destination image" is "a set of visuals and ideas associated in the tourist's mind with a particular locale, and it acts both as a lure for potential customers and as a framework for perception and evaluation of the tourist's experience once she or he is

on site."²⁹ The ingredients of a "destination image" provide locations that are potential "getaways" or "escapes" with distinctive and thus competitive features (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture* 152–53). For Jane C. Desmond, whose book *Staging Tourism* focuses on the initial phases of the tourist industry in Hawai'i, that "destination image" for Hawai'i is best identified with the "hula girl," "the most ubiquitous symbol of Hawaiian culture" (xxii). It's hard to disagree, and Haunani-Kay Trask had already powerfully named this metonymy in her 1991/1992 groundbreaking essay "'Lovely Hula Hands': Corporate Tourism and the Prostitution of Hawaiian Culture."³⁰ In Trask's words: "Mostly a state of mind, Hawai'i is the image of escape from the rawness and violence of daily American life. Hawai'i—the word, the vision, the sound in the mind—is the fragrance and feel of soft kindness. Above all, Hawai'i is 'she,' the Western image of the Native 'female' in her magical allure. . . . Thus, Hawai'i, like a lovely woman, is there for the taking" (*From a Native Daughter* 136, 144). While Desmond documents the development of tourism in the early twentieth century, Trask presents striking statistics and facts to bring into view the manufacturing of a "soft" image of Hawai'i for corporate profit and its contrast with as well as impact on the "hard, ugly, and cruel" life that Native Hawaiians face in the "political, economic, and cultural reality" of the 1990s (137). She also recognizes that "many Hawaiians do not see tourism as part of their colonization" (145). Similarly I must recognize that in-class discussion of this essay has often begun with how off-putting Trask's request is: "If you are thinking of visiting my homeland, please do not" (146).³¹ But it is important for that first reaction not to be legitimized as the final one. For isn't saying "no" to corporate tourism and its sale of "heritage" and land just as right as it is for a woman or any human being to say "no" to intrusion, commodification, or rape?

I am not saying that tourism can only oppress Native peoples or that there is no room for negotiation and creative agency as Native Hawaiians participate in the display of their culture. Hardly confined to commercial venues, hula, with its many *hālau*, or schools, plays—and has played—an important role not only in preserving and cultivating Hawaiian language and narrative traditions, but in authorizing a culture of Native resistance based on the *habitus* that comes from transmission of specific cultural competencies and the practice of embodied performances.³² Nevertheless, tourists remain often ignorant of these talents and of their political edge, while the metonymic image of the "hula girl" continues to lure them into the potential of an exotic and sweet romance.³³ While she offers a complex narrative of its developments, historicizing the emergence of the "hula girl" image is only a small part of Desmond's project when she notes that "In the earliest period of the

fledgling tourist industry, natural features of the islands, like volcanoes, were most heavily promoted. The place, not the people, predominated. However, the figure of the hula girl first appeared in advertising in the teens, and, by the twenties, images of Native Hawaiians and specifically hula iconography had become an integral part of tourist promotions" (6).³⁴ Lynn A. Davis points out that in the early twentieth century, "the lei sellers were the most frequently reproduced image of Hawaiian women in promotional publications. The hula girl, although common in early postcards, was not featured until the 1930s" ("Photographically Illustrated Books About Hawai'i, 1854-1945" 290). My point, as I will make it in the ensuing chapters, is that *legendary Hawai'i*—and not simply Hawai'i's "natural features"—is the antecedent and supplement of the "hula girl," the backdrop against which her performance is loosely placed and justified as "culture" even when it is commodified "entertainment for sale."

What surely has emerged in the very language of my discussion of tourism is the role that story or narrative plays in it. As Regina Bendix puts it, "any advertisement is ultimately a quick story, offering just enough imagery and text for the viewer or reader to insert themselves as potential buyers" ("Capitalizing on Memories Past, Present, and Future" 474-75). Narration frames our expectations as tourists, anticipating our longings and constructing our experience, and offers—in the personal stories of individual tourists—the potential for unique recovery and transformation of that experience, which of course also lends itself to commodification once it is communicated.³⁵ It is important to examine the narrative component of tourism because this most powerful industry "needs to supply a great deal of material satisfaction," but "what ultimately carries the business is the *intangible experience* of the customer" (Bendix, "Capitalizing on Memories" 471). As Trask remarks of Hawai'i as a tourist destination—being on holiday is largely "a state of mind." The English-language publication of 4,000 copies of the first *Hawaiian Guide Book, for Travelers* by Henry M. Whitney dates to 1875. A "search for authenticity," to be understood here as the "probing comparison between self and Other" (Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity* 17), on the one hand, and the new political status of Hawai'i as a territory of the United States, on the other, contribute at the turn of the twentieth century to the rapid multiplying of narratives promoting Hawai'i as a destination site. These narratives were particularly prominent in the *Paradise of the Pacific* magazine and the *Hawaiian Annual* that began circulating in the late nineteenth century, and they were naturally the stuff of the booklets and advertisements of the Hawaii Promotion Committee first formed in 1903. I will be examining their role in the production of a *legendary Hawai'i* for tourists.

But stories were not alone in impacting potential tourists: it is not accidental that the first publisher of *Paradise of the Pacific* was a commercial photographer, James J. Williams, since during that period Hawai'i and Native Hawaiians were mostly introduced to people outside of Hawai'i through visual representations, especially photographic ones. Colonial photography is another form of translation, a particularly powerful one because at the time it was a novelty. If in the second half of the nineteenth century "the ability of the camera to bring the world back home astonished, excited and enthralled" Europeans and Americans, it is also true that "photography became a lynchpin in the trade in foreignness and fuelled the new discourses of the other—from anthropology and ethnography to popular accounts of travel and colonial life" (McQuire 193). During a particularly aggressive phase of European and American expansionism both south and east, photographs of Native and colonized peoples circulated in the public sphere as part of "scientific" presentations, international exhibitions, and pornographic sales, thus traveling widely but primarily one way toward the north and the west, and often ending up in private albums and collections in Europe and the United States of America. As postcards especially, they moved across oceans and social contexts to foster "civilizing" missions and later tourism via the titillation of the individual's visual imagination and desires. In *Colonial Photography & Exhibitions: Representations of the "Native" and the Making of European Identity*, Anne Maxwell has documented how, together with international exhibits, colonial photography "was in the business of confirming and reproducing the racial theories and stereotypes that assisted European expansionism" (9) and focused on how colonized peoples were represented differently depending on varying sociopolitical agendas in the colonizing countries.³⁶ She has also emphasized how in contrast to exhibitions, "photographs of the colonized encompassed a wide range of forms and genres" (*cartes-de-visite*, daguerreotypes, collotypes, postcards, stereocards, travel photos, portraiture, ethnology) and "sustained a greater variety of ideological positions" that could be a function not only of the photographer's politics, but the "consumers' interpretation of images" and "the maker's own relationship to the dominant culture" (9).

By employing "reductive tropes," most anthropological and commercial photographs of Native peoples produced during that time "up[held] the binary opposition of civility versus savagery" (Maxwell 14). This is not to say that savages or primitives were all alike, and in fact the theory of cultural evolution that was dominant then depended on their documentation and classification, but that overall these images fed Europeans' and Euro-Americans' sense of righteous superiority, erotic fantasies, and commercial or political expansionism. What is distinctive

about photography as a new technology in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries when we focus on the representation of Hawai'i and Native Hawaiians? I will in later chapters be discussing the visual topoi of this othering in photographs of Native Hawaiians that illustrate "legends" at the turn of the twentieth century. But I will note here that these photographs already project the "soft" image of Hawaiians that Trask protests and that continues to support in a number of ways the development of the tourist industry in Hawai'i.³⁷

What also matters is that these stereotypical images were accepted as "real." The wide circulation of colonial images and the excitement with which they met in the West depended not only on their novelty but their truth value: photographs "were widely believed to offer an accurate visual record of life in the colonies" (Maxwell 11).³⁸ Photographs of faraway places and peoples were thus seen to provide more powerful "evidence" than words, and their coded realism was read as mechanical or objective reproduction. The visible became a privileged source of information and representation in the new era of "visual culture" as pioneered by photography. Those who sought to promote Hawai'i to potential settlers and tourists immediately recognized the power of the image. While photographs of Hawai'i were displayed as early as in 1873 at the international exhibit in Vienna, in 1893—the year of the Hawaiian monarchy's overthrow—the World Columbian Exposition in Chicago featured a "Hawaii Exhibit" with a cyclorama, hula dancers, and picture postcards. The widely circulating magazine *Paradise of the Pacific* featured halftone reproductions starting in 1894 and so did even the earliest brochures and booklets produced by the Hawaii Promotion Committee in 1903. Since within printed texts, a certain "disjuncture between text and image" (Desmond 40) is not uncommon, I will be considering how the authority of photographic images played out in relation to the narrative text of these publications—whether and how it was articulated, what its effects in relation to the representation of Hawai'i and Hawaiians could be, and how it played a distinctive role in relation to "legends."

Lynn A. Davis has pointed out that the "politically tumultuous period" from the 1893 overthrow to 1900 when the powers of the interim republic were transferred to the annexed Territory of Hawai'i "coincided with a development of printing technology that, for the first time, made it possible to reproduce easily and cheaply continuous-tone photography by making halftone reproductions." Her bibliographic and analytical work has convincingly shown that, thanks to this technological development, "The campaign to persuade the American public to support annexation was promoted by photographically illustrated books and articles" ("Photographically Illustrated Books" 288). *Vistas of*

Hawaii: The Paradise of the Pacific and Inferno of the World; illustrated by photo-engravings from original photographs taken especially for this work, edited in 1891 by Lorin Thurston, a chief orchestrator of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, provided a model for future promotional publications, and significantly Sanford Dole's reports to Washington, D.C., in 1900 and 1901 as the new governor of the Territory of Hawai'i were "lavishly illustrated" (Davis, "Photographically Illustrated Books" 297).³⁹ Davis's extensive bibliography includes photographically illustrated books about the United States' new possessions as well as Hawaii Promotion Committee publications, pictorial magazines such as *Paradise of the Pacific*, travel books, natural histories, and ethnographies (294–304). Having surveyed this massively large number of publications, Davis pointedly remarks, "the only photographically illustrated book written by a Native Hawaiian was *Hawaii: Its People, Their Legends* by Emma Metcalf Nakuina" (289).⁴⁰ I aim to foreground Nakuina's book as contesting the pro-annexation ideological campaign and also to identify the specific role that other photographically illustrated collections of Hawaiian "legends" in English play in that campaign.

Thus, while the dominant uses of colonial photography disempowered Native peoples, they were not simply or only objects of the camera. Photographs of Hawaiian royalty and studio portraits of Hawaiians projected alternative—though clearly exceptional—images of Native Hawaiians. English viewers were impressed with the stylishness of Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma when their cameo daguerreotypes were displayed at the London Exhibition in 1862. Clearly recognizing photography's power of representation, King Kalakaua, as Maxwell's and Tiffany Lani Ing's research has indicated, made an astute political use of it. In 1875, "he commissioned Max Eckhart, Honolulu's leading engraver, to produce a fold-out book of photographs and paintings of the royal family" and then had Andreas Montano produce carte-de-visite photographic portraits of the king and his queen, Kapi'olani (Maxwell 201–202). These two portraits in particular circulated widely, presented a "modern" and European-like image of the Hawaiian monarchs, and projected their individual personalities as well as their royal dignity. Photographic portraits of the king and queen were also strategically placed within Kalakaua's 1888 book *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii*, where they wordlessly asserted his authority and worked against primitivism (Ing). But Native agency about photography was not limited to royalty.⁴¹ Studio portraits, Maxwell writes, were seen by Natives in various parts of the world as "mechanisms by which to recover pride and dignity" (13). Choosing to display themselves, many Hawaiians exercised their choice of clothing and pose in studio portraits, and some of these—not surprisingly—we find represented in Nakuina's 1904 book. Recognizing an

albeit marginalized agency of Hawaiians in the history of photography matters not only to document their resistance in the past but to provide a genealogy for Hawaiian artists in the present, like Anne Kapulani Landgraf who strongly represents and advocates a photographic vision that emerges from Hawaiian values and views.

My Ethics of Location

Documenting the Hawai'i-specific dynamics of this triangulation—translation, photography, tourism—localizes my project to what I hope will be useful ends within the growing body of literature about Hawai'i's cultural production and colonialism. As the previous sections of this chapter have already signaled, I am deeply indebted to a number of individuals and their studies, the questions they pose as well as their perspectives on Hawai'i. Since I will be in conversation with their ideas throughout this book, I want to introduce the people and writings that have shaped my thinking about Hawai'i and made serious demands on it: the passionately anti-colonial political analysis and the poetry of Haunani-Kay Trask (1993/1999); the inspiring work that Vilsoni Hereniko and Rob Wilson (1999), Paul Lyons (2005), and Albert Wendt (1993) have done to reorient scholarship on cultural politics and literature in the Pacific; the indigenous history that Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa (1992), Davianna Pomaika'i McGregor (1995), Jonathan Osorio (2002), and Noëne Silva (1998 and 2004) have recovered; the increasingly complex conceptualization of Hawai'i's literatures (Sumida 1991, Chock 1996, Fujikane 1994, 1997, and 2000; Ho'omanawanui 2005, Lum 1986 and 1998, Morales 1998, Nogelmeier 2003, Trask 1999 and 2000; Wood 1999); Lynn Davis's keen research on and through photography in Hawai'i (1980, 2001); David Forbes's formidable four volumes of *Hawaiian National Bibliography, 1780–1900*; the painstaking work on Hawaiian-language newspapers by Esther K. Mookini (1974) and Puakea Nogelmeier (2003); and, of course, studies of Hawaiian oral traditions and literature (Charlot, Ho'omanawanui, Johnson, Kame'eleihiwa, Kanahale, Kawaharada, Luomala, Mookini, Pukui, Silva [2006], Stillman). These scholars' projects and perspectives vary; in fact, there is open disagreement and debate in some cases; but I have learned from them and from the pull among them. It is thanks to the work of these scholars and to students, visual artists, writers, and storytellers who have affected my sensibility in transformative ways that I have found it possible to take on my own responsibilities as a scholar of narrative who, in addressing "traditional" and "literary" production, refuses to dismiss the history that brings Hawaiians to fight for sovereignty and self-determination today.

Not only for a "performer" or teller of traditional narratives, but also for me as scholar and teacher, then, responsibility or, better, a complex nexus of responsibilities goes hand in hand with knowledge and ambition.⁴² As a non-Hawaiian professor teaching oral narratives in the English Department at the University of Hawai'i, it is to my students that I must answer not exclusively, but perhaps first and foremost. I have asked myself what this project can offer them. I think of this study as seeking to accomplish a goal that is also central to my classroom pedagogy: making a contribution to rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai'i. I see this re-viewing as a task for myself and for my students, but also as an invitation for us—each bringing distinctive knowledge and goals—to become more active and conscious participants in the reception and production of these narratives.

For me as a feminist scholar who has had a long-term and strong interest in fairy tales, rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai'i has definitely had an impact over the years. When I first taught a course on "Women and Storytelling" at the University of Hawai'i in the 1980s, Momiala Kamehale talked in class about how Pele and other strong Hawaiian female figures had had an important role in her upbringing: no fairy-tale princess could undo that. And when in the late 1980s our interdisciplinary faculty and graduate student reading group on "Feminist Theory" met with Haunani-Kay Trask, who had just published her *Eros and Politics: The Promise of Feminist Theory* (1986), I did not fully understand why or how, but I knew that focusing on gender in Hawai'i would have to mean something different for me from what it had in Italy or New York State. Since feminism is the perspective that foremost in my intellectual and emotional formation has led me to seek social change, learning about gender issues and dynamics in Hawai'i was homework I had to do. Reading and discussing Trask's next book, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*, was an unsettling and formative experience over several years; *Women in Hawai'i: Sites, Identities, and Voices*, edited by Joyce N. Chinen, Kathleen O. Kane, and Ida M. Yoshinaga in 1997, also made a difference, and so has my exposure to poetry, hula, and visual art by women in Hawai'i—especially in their engagement with tradition. It is thus in light of a feminist perspective that requires attention to other social and political dynamics—especially colonialism in Hawai'i—that I approach a number of matters in this book: the feminization of Hawaiians and Hawaiian traditions through verbal and visual representations; the voice of Emma Nakuina countering the "authority" of a Thomas Thrum or a W. T. Brigham; the resistance strategies of colonial subjects and women as well as their creativity in the past and the present.

While gender is not a focus in this book, my changed feminist perspective certainly informs it.

To consider the value that rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai'i may have for students in Hawai'i involves seeking to be "attuned to the linguistic and cultural differences that comprise the local scene" (Venuti, *Scandals of Translation* 189) and to situate my position as teacher clearly within the uneven power relations of this local scene. Many of the English majors in my classes are women, but their relationship to larger-than-life or role-model females is not what, coming from a Euro-American framework, I had assumed it to be. Native Hawaiian students are a small minority in the classes I teach, with other Pacific Islanders being an even smaller minority; most students who are Hawai'i-born-and-raised children of immigrants from China, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, and other Asian countries self-identify as "local." A few are "local *haole*" (that is, Caucasian) students who identify with growing up in Hawai'i but also know that both class and ethnicity play an important role in "local" identity. Increasingly students from the continental United States also populate our University of Hawai'i classrooms. When I first started teaching in Hawai'i in the early 1980s, I assumed that my students would know Native Hawaiian things best of all: generally speaking I was wrong, and have had to rethink my pedagogy from the understanding that their common ground or the given was colonial education and immigrant acculturation. I still learned and learn a tremendous amount from Hawaiian and "local" students, but their lack of self-confidence within the academy brought another lesson home. At present—and this was not the case in the classroom twenty years ago—many of the Hawaiian students do know Hawaiian language and traditions thanks to the growing influence of Hawaiian Language and Hawaiian Studies programs, but this knowledge is often ghettoized in the larger academy.

Many faculty members at our university are aware of these problems and actively work to undo them in their classrooms. One of the small ways in which I intervene is to devise a course assignment for first-year writing students that pursues the same goal as this book: "rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai'i." Students are to write an essay that seeks to understand how a place-centered "legend" or "myth" works within the contemporary culture of Hawai'i. Some students select stories about "haunted" places; others focus on Hawaiian stories about the origin of an area's distinctive physical features. The students do research at the library, talk with family members, exchange stories with friends. They learn about the stories and history of a specific place that could be a cliff, a building, the dorm they are in. The focus of their inquiry, I explain, should not

be simply what these stories say, but what they *do*. Pedagogically, my first objective is for students to become aware of how legends and myths do *not* simply belong to the past. This is not to deny that myths and legends come from the past, but to attend to what these stories do in the present. Telling and retelling these "belief narratives" in today's world takes on new or situational meanings and often involves, on the part of individuals and groups, addressing a problem metaphorically or projecting into a story a current fear or desire. My second objective is for the conflicted relation that these stories, in their various versions, have with one another to become apparent to the students whose often unquestioned assumption is that "stories bring us together in our shared humanity." This is not to deny that storytelling distinguishes us as human beings, but to attend to how we tell stories to make certain arguments or lay claims that are tied to a belief, history, or perspective, whether that is announced or not.

These two pedagogical objectives, I trust, are not uncommon among teachers of narrative and culture. I doubt the third one is uncommon, but it has distinctively localized implications for students in Hawai'i: to realize that a double standard is at work in the popular use of the label "myth" and by extension in our attitude toward related traditional narratives such as legends and folktales. This double standard has to do with the issue of belief. Nowadays, when "myth" is associated with belief it is usually the story that "others," the ancient Greeks or primitive aboriginals, believe (d) or told/tell; when "myth" belongs to one's own cultural repertoire it is either a hopelessly "untrue" fiction, as in "that is a myth!" or else, as Roland Barthes showed in *Mythologies* and Jack Zipes has argued in his research on the commodification of fairy tales, it is a story "naturalized" to the extent that at least apparently it does not concern beliefs, but tells us simply "how things are" as if we were not responsible for their representation (*Fairy Tales as Myth*). "We" have evolved beyond "myth" as a belief system, or this is what Western education has led us to assume; only less advanced or enlightened "others" pay reverence to "myth." We do not in everyday life reflect much on how one people's "myth" may be another people's religion or episteme. What "we" label as "myth" from other cultures then translates into the "that's just a myth!" formula that implicitly sustains the value of our own beliefs.

Thus trivialized—though in different ways—both outside and within Western culture, "myth" in common English-language usage today is the object of exoticizing amusement or dismissal; it is deprived of its associations with history, knowledge, and vision—what has made myth culturally valuable and has most fascinated scholars of myths and traditional narratives. As Haring states describing early twentieth-century

Western research on non-Western narrative, “myth had to be discredited as irrational, but it had also to be authenticated as an indigenous product” (194). While “we,” as modern Western-educated thinkers easily distance ourselves from “myths” or apparently have no stake in them, when we encounter collections of ancient Greek or Hawaiian “myths and legends,” it is “natural” for “us” as post-enlightenment individuals or non-Hawaiians to assume that “they” all believed, in the case of the Greeks and “traditional” Hawaiians, or still believe in the case of Hawaiians today in those backward and “primitive” tales. The result is that these tales become representative of “their” collectivity, which is implicitly othered, and that they—both the people and their tales—live somehow outside of historical time, as Johannes Fabian discussed in *Time and the Other*. This *discriminating* use of “myth” discounts not only the beliefs, but the knowledge and history of the “other.”⁴³

In the context of Hawai‘i, it remains imperative to question this trivializing and discriminating understanding of “myth”—as it extends to all Hawaiian “tradition”—because it continues to affect Hawaiians and Hawaiian culture today in expropriating and demeaning ways. Because both the American education system and popular culture dismiss Hawaiian legendary traditions as “myth,” Hawaiians have been discouraged from learning or valuing them, and Hawaiian culture is implicitly primitivized and conveniently confined to the past. If those of us who live in Hawai‘i and learn about it do little to counter this repressive and ideologically pervasive function of “myth,” we participate in reproducing a fiction that perpetuates discrimination. Unmaking the naturalized fiction that is a *legendary Hawai‘i* constructed primarily for the interest of tourism is part of this necessarily questioning and demystifying project.

But attending to the ideological powers of myth or “traditional” narratives in our everyday lives means learning to recognize, in addition to the destructive uses to which we have put them, the constructive ones that narrative traditions have served and can serve. In Hawai‘i, contemporary artists, like Solomon Enos, Anne Kapulani Landgraf, and Ipo Nihipali, and poets—among them Haunani-Kay Trask, ‘Imaikalani Kalahele, Ku‘ualoha Ho‘omanawanui, and Brandy Nālani McDougall—work with an understanding of cultural memory that emerges not from nostalgia but from the reappropriation of multiple, emplaced stories. The ongoing publication of *Oiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal*—founded by the late D. Mahealani Dudoit with a *hui*, or group, of pioneering editors including Ku‘ualoha Ho‘omanawanui who has since become its editor in chief—has in recent years provided a new, politicized, and nurturing outlet for such Native Hawaiian verbal and graphic artists. Against the violent translation that Hawai‘i has been subjected to, contemporary Hawaiian writers and storytellers in multiple media are translating tradi-

tion into the forms and contexts of the present for the sake of Hawaiian and Hawai‘i’s future. I suggest in the following chapters and in class that we learn from these storytellers’ artistic eye to re-view Hawai‘i’s “storied places” in ways that their inscription into the paradigm of *legendary Hawai‘i* occluded. My experience is that this is a potentially empowering move for Hawaiian and Pacific Island students, but can be a disturbing one for others.

As I see it, rethinking the roles that traditional narratives play in our lives and especially in our lives in Hawai‘i means confronting how the asymmetrical “differences that comprise the local scene” shape our relation to Hawai‘i as a place—specifically a place that was a sovereign kingdom before its forceful takeover by and unwilling annexation to the United States of America. Confronting these power differentials, as I seek to guide myself and my students through the process, need not be confrontational, but it is undeniably grounds for discomfort, as articulating the power dynamics in which we participate often is. It matters thus in this process that I also acknowledge my position, not to pursue a politics of identity but to mark the place from which I have the privilege of teaching and writing. As an Anglo-Indian Italian woman who grew up surrounded by very different markers of cultural history in Rome, was educated within literature departments in Europe and the United States, and has by now (2005) resided in the islands for only twenty-two years, I certainly do not pretend to be a spokesperson for Hawaiian culture, history, or “sense of place.” But, as noted earlier, I mean to take to heart the responsibility of my expertise as a scholar of narrative traditions as well as to act on my passion for stories, my respect for what I have been able to understand and experience of Hawaiian culture and art, and my critique of what settlers—and I include myself in that category—have done to Hawaiians.⁴⁴ It matters that I self-identify as a settler and that I do so not in a disabling way. It is not guilt, but an invitation to taking responsibility for change that I want to communicate to those who, myself included, may feel unsettled by the realization that we are settlers.

Pursuing something akin to what Gayatri Spivak describes as the “uncoercive rearrangement of desire,” I hope that accepting the invitation to dis-locate ourselves from *legendary Hawai‘i* and to *learn* from its historicized and conflicted stories can be a small but enabling step in the process of supporting a sovereign Hawai‘i where non-Native paradigms, whether they be scholarly or economic, are not the dominant ones.⁴⁵ During a “Conversation of Indigenous Issues and Settler Viewpoints” in April 2003, Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa, historian, scholar of oral traditions, and then director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies, urged: “Don’t

become us. Honor your own ancestors. But learn about the land and the language, for there is no Hawaiian sense of place without Hawaiians.” Unmaking Western assumptions or fictions about Hawai’i is part of that learning process, unsettling as it may be for many of us. This is a story I feel responsible for telling.

Chapter 2

Hawai’i’s Storied Places: Learning from Anne Kapulani Landgraf’s “Hawaiian View”

*All'origine di ogni storia che ho scritto c'è un'immagine
[There was a visual image at the source of all my stories]*

—Italo Calvino

Anne Kapulani Landgraf’s 1994 book, *Nā Wahi Pana O Kō’olau Poho: Legendary Places of Kō’olau Poho*, presents eighty-three black-and-white photographs of the southern windward district on the island of O’ahu, Hawai’i, that were first shown in loco at the beautiful Ho’omaluhia Park in Kane’ohe (see Figure 1).¹ The photographs are displayed side by side with narrative text in both Hawaiian and English condensing traditional Hawaiian references that document the cultural and historical significance of each place.² In her introduction to *Nā Wahi Pana O Kō’olau Poho*, Haunani-Kay Trask, then director of the Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa, states: “When I first saw the exhibit, I was determined to have it as the inaugural volume in the Hawaiian Studies publication series” because in Landgraf’s photography “culture, political awareness, and a highly refined technical skill [combine] to reveal the Hawaiian view of our sacred places” (Landgraf, *Nā Wahi Pana* viii).

Landgraf’s accomplishment was indeed something new in the photography of Hawai’i and deserves critical attention as an artistic and cultural landmark that engages Native Hawaiian tradition in the present. My goals in presenting Landgraf’s “Hawaiian view” first in this volume are (a) to foreground a Native visual and narrative perspective on place that works in opposition to a tradition of landscape photography in Hawai’i; (b) to invite readers throughout the rest of this book to re-view *legendary Hawai’i* in light of this place-centered narrative and historicizing vision that entails a different epistemology and grapples with the history of land issues in Hawai’i;³ (c) to foreground the value and creativity

Notes

Chapter 1. Introduction

1. Though increasingly residual in folklore studies, well-established views of tradition present it as the passing down or transmission of a time-honored cultural practice, or as a cultural element "rooted in the past but persisting in the present in the manner of a natural object." Whether they foreground process or product, in these views tradition is bound to the past, and tracing the trajectory of its social force would seem to point one way only to an older time when that tale had a reason for being, a reason we conjure when honoring it in the present. The above definition in quotation marks is included by Richard Bauman in his article "Folklore," but it hardly reflects Bauman's position (31).

In contrast, my work is informed by an approach that Henry Glassie's article in the 1995 special issue of "Key Concepts" of the *Journal of American Folklore* crystallizes.

2. For the scholarly definition of this concept, which I will not be using in my work, see Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*: "'Invented tradition' is taken to mean a set of practices, . . . which seek to inculcate certain values and norms of behaviour by repetition, which automatically implies continuity with the past. In fact, where possible, they normally attempt to establish continuity with a suitable historic past" (1). In "Elision or Decision: Lived History and the Contextual Grounding of the Constructed Past," Laurence Marshall Carucci also makes a distinction akin to the one I am emphasizing on the grounds that "historical recollections are inherently embedded in the present" (82). Laiana Wong writes: "It would be a mistake to assume that the inability to authenticate tradition on an absolute level eliminates its role in shaping the attitudes of a community" (103). See note 16 for how the label "invented traditions" has been discussed in Hawai'i.

Richard Bauman offers a concise articulation of the role that "traditionality" has played in folklore: "The term tradition is conventionally used in a dual sense, to name both the process of transmission of an isolable cultural element through time and also the elements themselves that are transmitted in this process. To view an item of folklore as traditional is to see it as having temporal continuity. . . . There is, however, an emergent reorientation taking place among students of tradition, away from this naturalistic view of tradition as a cultural inheritance rooted in the past and toward an understanding of tradition as symbolically constituted in the present" ("Folklore" 31). See *In Search of Authenticity: The Formation of Folklore Studies* by Regina Bendix, especially 211–18, for an exemplary reflection on "tradition" within the history of the discipline of folkloristics. To mark the shift away from a naturalizing time-oriented definition, she cites Dell Hymes who had urged in 1975, "let us root the notion [of tradition] not in

time, but in social life. Let us postulate that the traditional is a functional prerequisite of social life. . . . It seems in fact that every person and group makes some effort to 'traditionalize' aspects of its experience" (211-12).

3. As Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs have theorized, contemporary folkloristics seeks to consider how the contextualized interplay of tradition and performance "bears upon the political economy of texts" ("Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life" 76).

4. I acknowledge that "colonialism" may not tell the whole story and may at times—especially when Hawai'i was a sovereign nation—obscure the role of Hawaiian agency and the difference between different types of domination; the rights of Hawaiians were eroded while Hawai'i was a sovereign nation. Some may argue that we need a new term rather than "colonialism" to describe the Hawai'i situation, but the continued dynamics of domination point to "colonialism" at this point. See Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason* for an effort to discriminate among types of colonialism (especially 172-73).

5. In Western folkloristics, a textbook definition of this genre is that "legends are stories people tell about events that purportedly really happened. However, one of the identifying marks of a legend is that, in the telling people bring up the issue of whether or not the story is true" (Adams, "Folk Narrative" 25). In contrast to tales of magic or folktales whose fictionality demands suspension of disbelief, legends are *belief narratives*, but they can be told or transmitted by non-believers; they raise the question of belief (some believe, others don't, and others are skeptics), and they have local, historical, religious, or personal "truth elements" and significance. The genre as studied by folklorists includes a wide range of belief narratives: supernatural legends, place-centered ones, and the now ubiquitous "contemporary" legends. In that they may feature supernatural beings, legends can hold religious and cultural value that is similar to that of myths, but myths—within Western classification—narrate a much more distant past and are often part of a ritual or ceremony. See Linda Dégh's *Legend and Belief* (2001) for an extended discussion of and perspective on how folklorists have defined the legend.

6. Noenoe Silva's "Kanaka Maoli Resistance to Annexation," published in the first issue of *Oiwi: A Native Hawaiian Journal* (1998), was the product of groundbreaking research that documents Hawaiian resistance to the overthrow, the republic, the imprisonment of Queen Lili'uokalani, and annexation. Particularly meaningful is her recovery of two of the three groups' anti-annexation petitions that collectively show 38,000 signatures; the Native Hawaiian population at the time was approximately 40,000. See also Tom Coffman's *Nation Within: The Story of America's Annexation of the Nation of Hawai'i* (1998), an award-winning book that is written in a refreshingly journalistic style and acknowledges its reliance on Silva's original research for documentation of resistance. More recently, Silva has published the book, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (2004), that further documents Hawaiian struggles well before and after the monarchy's overthrow.

7. As Osorio shows in *Dismembering Lāhui*, the erosion of the political rights and participation in government of Hawaiians began long before annexation. By 1887 with the Bayonet Constitution, the electorate was limited on the grounds of race (Hawaiians, Americans, and Europeans only, while Asians were implicitly excluded) and property both (Osorio 240-49), a combination that qualified only a small number of Hawaiians. The electorate was of course only male.

European and American settlers throughout the nineteenth century were certainly not all of a kind or all of one mind about Hawai'i. Osorio discusses the strife between "Hawaiianized" pro-annexation settlers and, e.g., Walter Murray Gibson, who, having arrived in Hawai'i in 1861, became King Kalakaua's closest counselor and nevertheless viewed the Hawaiian as "an interesting yet feeble younger brother, a subject of an oceanic empire" (quoted in Osorio 199 from Gibson's diary). See also Niklaus R. Schweizer's *Hawai'i and the German Speaking Peoples*.

8. Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i* 16. The first edition of this powerful book was published in 1993 (Monroe, Me.: Common Courage Press). I quote throughout from the 1999 revised text.

9. It is important to acknowledge that "rural Hawaiian communities where Hawaiians have maintained a close relationship to the land through their subsistence livelihoods have played a crucial role in the survival of Hawaiian culture" (McGregor 195). In "Waipi'o Valley, a Cultural *Kūpuka* in Early 20th Century Hawai'i," McGregor makes a strong case for cultural *kūpuka*—isolated rural Hawaiian communities that were relatively untouched by development—like Waipi'o Valley as "traditional centres of spiritual power . . . from which native Hawaiian culture can be regenerated and revitalised in the contemporary setting" (196).

10. See the first chapter of Nogelmeier's 2003 Ph.D. dissertation "Mai Pa'i ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back." Nogelmeier defines this *discourse of sufficiency* as "the longstanding recognition and acceptance of a small core of Hawaiian writings from the 19th century as being sufficient to embody nearly a hundred years of extensive Hawaiian auto-representation" (2). The canonized and translated sources Nogelmeier refers to are the selected works of Malo, Kepelino, Kamakau, and 'Ōi; but "these works make up only a fraction of one percent of the available primary materials" (3). Native ethnomusicologist Amy Ku'uiealoa Stillman's research on Hawaiian-language songs has also spoken to the importance of expanding the pool of textual documentation for Hawaiian history and of recognizing "cultural resilience and resistance to assimilation" in Hawaiian-language sources ("Of the People Who Loved the Land" 85).

11. One of the meanings for *moo* is "A history. See *mooolelo*. A connected story"; and *moo-o-lelo* is defined as "Moo and *olelo*, discourse. A continuous or connected narrative of events; a history. *Luk* 1:1. A tradition. *Mat* 15:2. In modern times, the minutes of a deliberative body; a taxation list" (Lorrin Andrews 399).

Hawaiian classification recognizes that the *mo'olelo* as (hi)story is different from the *ka'ao* that is nowadays commonly accepted as fiction, but *mo'olelo ka'ao* blurs the distinction. These storytelling modes take the form of prose but also of *mele* (song) or *oli* (chant), with much more variation in prose than in the poetic verses of *mele* and *oli*.

12. While I was not familiar with the work of cultural geographers when I started this project in the 1990s, both humanist and critical cultural constructs of "place" have played a role in the development of my perspective.

13. Osorio writes about the effects of colonialism in Hawai'i: "The mutilations were not physical only, but also psychological and spiritual. Death came not only through infection and disease, but through racial and legal discourse that crippled the will, confidence, and trust of the Kanaka Maoli [Native Hawaiian] as surely as leprosy and smallpox claimed their limbs and lives" (3). *Dismem-*

being *Lāhui* takes on the project of comprehending the story of the Bayonet Constitution—which the Hawaiian League, a group of Euro-American businessmen and missionary offsprings, forced King Kalakaua to sign in 1887—within the context of nineteenth-century changes in Hawaiian society and of foregrounding Native resistance to colonialism. His last chapter, “Ho‘oulu Lāhui,” reproposes King Kalakaua’s motto, “increase the nation,” with a strong emphasis on the Hawaiian people’s pride and identity today and, as I read it, is sustained by a sense of tradition, in Glassie’s words, as “the creation of the future out of the past.”

14. Ku‘u‘aloa Ho‘omanawanui’s manuscript “This Land Is Your Land, This Land Was My Land”: Kanaka Maoli Versus Settler Representations of ‘Āina in Contemporary Literature of Hawai‘i” is forthcoming in *Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai‘i*, ed. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Okamura. See especially pp. 4–5 of manuscript. Commenting on the more collective, rather than individual-centered, approach to authorship in Hawaiian culture, both past and present, Ho‘omanawanui writes: “there has been a presumption on the part of colonial academic authorities that mo‘olelo belong to an unowned oral tradition. Dr. Noenoe Silva says [in a personal communication to the author] that haoles scholars ‘don’t notice or credit the vast majority of mo‘olelo and mele published from 1834–1948 which are SIGNED with author and composer names. It serves the colonial project to pretend there are no authors. It facilitates both colonial theft of *kāpuna* knowledge, and it aids in perpetuating the myth of backwardness and savagery.” (5). This is not to say that the practice of not naming or acknowledging individual storytellers and poets was a *haole* exclusive; examples can be found in some Hawaiian-language newspaper *mo‘olelo* that are assumed to be transcribed or authored by Native writers, who were—whatever their politics—influenced by and “educated” in the Western ways.

15. Neither is my main point to classify certain narratives as “folklore,” but to see what results asking questions that methodologically come from folkloristics can yield. In fact, I am arguing to adopt the Hawaiian concept of *wahi pana* as a way to contest the imposition of Western genres on Hawaiian orature or narrative traditions.

16. Regina Bendix’s *In Search of Authenticity* “deconstructs authenticity as a discursive formation” that has historically marginalized folklore in the social world and folklore studies in the academy. But Bendix also states that such deconstruction “cannot simply invalidate the search for authenticity. This search arises out of a profound human longing, . . . and declaring the object of such longing nonexistent may violate the very core around which people build meaningful lives” (17). The question becomes “not ‘what is authenticity?’ but ‘who needs authenticity and why?’ and ‘how has authenticity been used?’” (21). Thus the project of “questioning ‘tradition’” becomes “an examination of the ‘tradition’ of the discipline itself” (213).

Interestingly enough, Bendix cites the anthropologist Jocelyn Linnekin’s 1983 statement “in her study of Hawaiian identity . . . that ‘the selection of what constitutes tradition is always made up in the present’” to exemplify “a challenge of both the notion and the scholarly practice of separating the genuine from the fake” (212). However, in 1990 and 1991 Linnekin was taken to task by Haunani-Kay Trask, who pointed out, within a critique of anthropology, how Linnekin’s comments on “the invention of tradition” in the case of the sacredness of Kaho‘olawe—a small Hawaiian island whose use as a site for bombing practice on the part of the United States military troops Hawaiians and other

concerned citizens were protesting at the time—was used by the U.S. Navy to “argue that the Hawaiian assertion of love and sacredness regarding Kaho‘olawe was ‘fakey’” (“Politics in the Pacific Islands: Imperialism and Native Self-Determination”). In situ, then, Linnekin’s scholarship was used to reinstitute the power of the authentic versus the fake, rather than challenging its authority. In spring 1991 *The Contemporary Pacific* published a dead-end “dialogue” featuring Trask, Roger M. Keesing, and Linnekin. Jeffrey Tobin commented on and contextualized this exchange in his 1994 essay “Cultural Construction and Native Nationalism: Report from the Hawaiian Front.”

While Linnekin protested that she was not responsible for the navy’s misuse of her work, I find this case instructive in a number of ways and bring it up to emphasize how the politics of location necessarily test disciplinary projects and ethics not so much on the basis of their statements—well-intentioned as they may be—but on their uses and effects. As scholars we cannot control these uses in absolute terms, just as storytellers cannot control their listeners turned tellers; however, we can make our best effort to ask “who needs authenticity and why?” and “how has authenticity been used?” in the framework not only of our scholarly disciplines but of the *localized*, historical and present, asymmetry of power relations outside academia. See Charles L. Briggs, “The Politics of Discursive Authority in Research on the ‘Invention of Tradition.’”

17. The discussion of normativity and consensus in folklore and literature dynamics has a long history. My point is not to recast folklore into an exclusively conservative mode, but to note how the storyteller’s “authority” is not located in “authorship.”

18. For “emergent” in relation to “pre-emergent,” “dominant,” and “residual” as I also use them in this book, see Raymond Williams, *Marrxism and Literature*.

19. The range of folklore & literature approaches in recent American folkloristics is wide; it includes work by Daniel R. Barnes, Mary Ellen Brown, Trudier Harris, Bonnie Irwin, Cathy Lynn Preston, Danielle Roemer, Bruce Rosenberg, Susan Stewart, Mark Workman. Frank de Caro and Rosan A. Jordan’s introduction in the recent *Re-Situating Folklore* provides a useful overview (1–22), though folklore in literature is their main focus.

20. The spirited Belgian scholar André Lefevere introduced the term and outlined the new tasks of “translation studies” as a discipline that deals with “the problems raised by the production and description of translations” (quoted in Susan Bassnett-McGuire’s *Translation Studies* 1).

21. Tejaswini Niranjana’s work focuses on the colonial work of translation in India (see *Siting Translation*, 1992), Kwame Anthony Appiah in Ghana (“Thick Translation,” 1993, reprinted in Venuti’s 2000 *Translation Studies Reader*). The work of Noelani Arista, Puakea Nogelmeier, and Noenoe Silva also focuses on translation as colonial tool in Hawai‘i. In addition to Spivak and Venuti’s interventions, see Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, eds., *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice* (1999) and Eric Cheyfitz, *The Poetics of Imperialism: Translation and Colonization from The Tempest to Tarzan* (1997).

22. In “Prefaced Space: Tales of the Colonial British Collectors of Indian Folklore,” Sadhana Naithani outlines how the prefaces of these late nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century collections narratively construct an Orientalized India, a heroic British collector, and a precious but valueless tradition of “Indian” tales.

23. See Niranjana’s *Siting Translation* (3, 47–86) for ample discussion of ethnographic translations as applied to colonial India.

24. Spivak, *Critique of Postcolonial Reason* 161, n. 71.

25. Eric Cheyfitz states that English colonizers could recognize cultural differences, “even as they translated these differences into their terms” and that “unless we are attentive to the repressed problem of translation,” we will continue “to forget the other side of the story” (*The Poetics of Imperialism* 8–9).

26. I realize that Venuti and Spivak are writing from different traditions, the former adapting Lecerle and Deleuze and Guattari, the latter rewriting Marx, Lacan, Derrida, Klein, and feminist thought. However, the projects of these two intellectuals seem to me to resonate together, especially in their advocacy of a politically activist and ethical task for translators and their demystifying concern for the often unrecognized role that translation plays in the “globalization” of comparative literature. Spivak’s numerous reflections on translation include the introduction to *Imaginary Maps: Three Stories by Mahasweta Devi* and specific pieces such as “The Politics of Translation” (1993); “Translation as Culture” (1999); “Questioned on Translation: Adrift” (2001); and “Translating into English” (2005), which I first read in typescript. Translation is also very much at stake in *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* (1999). *Death of a Discipline* is an exceptionally brilliant reflection on comparative literature in global and planetary terms, working against a globalizing economy of translation. For Venuti, see “Translation, Community, Utopia” in *The Translation Studies Reader*; and *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference* (1998).

27. See Jane C. Desmond’s *Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World*, especially xvii–xxi, for a synthesis of tourist research from the 1970s through the 1990s.

28. In *Staging Tourism* (15), Desmond quotes MacCannell to define “reconstructed ethnicity” as “the maintenance and preservation of ethnic forms for the persuasion or entertainment not of specific others . . . but of a ‘generalized other’ within a white cultural frame” (*Empty Meeting Grounds* 168). Kirshenblatt-Gimblett writes: “Tourism is an export industry” that functions by “import[ing] visitors to consume goods and services locally” (*Destination Culture* 153).

29. Cited in Desmond (5) from Kye-Sung Chon’s “The Role of Destination Image in Tourism: A Review and Discussion,” *Tourist Review* 2 (1990): 2–9.

30. This essay first appeared in *Border/Lines* 23 (1991/1992): 22–34 and is republished in Trask’s *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai’i*. I cite from the 1999 revised text.

31. The last words of this essay are: “If you are thinking of visiting my homeland, please do not. We do not want or need any more tourists, and we certainly do not like them. If you want to help our cause, pass this message on to your friends” (146). As Trask explains earlier in the essay, her “use of the word *tourism* in the Hawai’i context refers to a mass-based, corporately controlled industry that is both vertically and horizontally integrated such that one multinational corporation owns an airline and the tour buses that transport tourists to the corporation-owned hotel where they eat in a corporation-owned restaurant, play golf, and ‘experience’ Hawai’i on corporation-owned recreation areas and eventually consider buying a second home built on corporation land. Profits, in this case, are mostly repatriated back to the home country,” which can be “Japan, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Canada, Australia, and the United States” (139). Recognizing that, as Desmond puts it, “tourist experiences are actively constructed by the industries themselves” (*Staging Tourism* xviii) is an “off-putting,” bubble-bursting but necessary step in making choices about why and how we want to seek “the other.” For Natives, as Trask states, to become aware that they are partici-

pating in the commodification of culture for exportation is a step toward “decolonization” (145). In its refusal to perform the “soft” and willingly “for sale” image of Hawai’i, Trask’s essay is appropriately “hard” in its rhetoric.

32. Moniala Kamahale’s essay, “‘Ilio’ulaokalani: Defending Native Hawaiian Culture,” documents the political action of a coalition of *hula hālau* in the late 1990s to “defend Native Hawaiian traditional and customary rights to gather resources that ensure the practice of hula and sustain our culture” (41). Trask also mentions organizations such as the Ecumenical Coalition on Third World Tourism (Bangkok), the Center for Responsible Tourism (California), and the Third World European Network as “band[ing] together to help give voice to Native peoples in daily resistance against corporate tourism” (“‘Lovely Hula Hands’” in *From a Native Daughter* 138). And mostly referring to European tourist destinations, Regina Bendix provides documentation of “critical narrations of life with the tourists” (“Capitalizing on Memories” 478).

Furthermore, I would not want to equate cultural commerce in general with commodification, as if all cultural displays that participate in an economic exchange—and that could include museums in general as well as Native festivals, art exhibitions, concerts, or culture-related businesses—were *automatically* objectified and expropriated from their tradition bearers. See Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett’s “Mistaken Dichotomies” (1988) as a warning to folklorists against the purism that sustained an unhealthy separation between folkloristics in the academy and folklore in the applied sector. In “Tourism and Cultural Displays: Inventing Traditions for Whom?” (1989), Bendix questions the “direct, economically motivated connection between tourism and displays” (132) by examining the “affirmation of local and national cultural identity in the face of seasonal mass foreign invasion” in Interlaken, Switzerland. Bendix argues that “cultural displays require staging and thus negotiation of some sort” (143) and that European examples of cultural tourism can provide useful insights along those lines. This is a corrective to a totalizing model that leaves “local” cultures with no agency in the face of tourism, and I think it is an important point. But we must also recognize that the ways in which corporate tourism in Hawai’i contributes to the colonization of Hawaiians do not apply to Switzerland.

33. In the “marketing of heritage” that pertains to commercial hula, “the complexities of who and what are Hawaiian are lost. Hula as an enactment of attachment to the islands, or as an act of resistance to assimilation and decimation, is invisible” (Desmond, *Staging Tourism* 28). However, this invisibility may depend more on the tourist’s gaze than on the agency of the performers. For instance, Maiki Aiu, the much honored and loved “mother” of the Hawaiian hula renaissance, danced in commercial shows while at the same time teaching in the first modern *hālau*. Even in Waikiki today, some Hawaiian *kumu hula*, or teachers of hula—and I am in particular thinking of Coline Aiu, Maiki’s daughter, whose *hālau* I’ve been fortunate to attend—provide in their introductions to specific dances information that *could* prompt viewers to find out more about the history of Hawai’i and the views of those who are fighting for Hawaiian sovereignty. Resistance may be more or less adamant, but it does not automatically disappear even in a commercial or tourist-oriented context.

34. See Andria Imada’s 2004 essay “Hawaiians on Tour” for a study of hula as entertainment during territorial times.

35. Regina Bendix astutely explores the complex “interrelationship of narration with the endeavor of tourism” and the “aura of the tourist experience” in her 2002 essay, “Capitalizing on Memories” (471).

36. See also Anne McClintock's *Imperial Leather*, ed. Elizabeth Edwards, esp. 64–65; *Anthropology and Photography, 1860–1920*, Lynn Davis's *Nā Pa'i Kī'i: Photographers in the Hawaiian Islands, 1845–1900*; and Scott McQuire's *Visions of Modernity: Representation, Memory, Time and Space in the Age of the Camera* for analytical and bibliographic information on photography and colonialism.

37. Using Bernard Smith's phrase in *European Vision and the South Pacific* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985), Jane Desmond writes that the Hawaiian "native" is an example of "soft primitivism" in that it presents the tourist with "a non-threatening, alluring encounter with paradisaical exoticism" (4).

38. As Maxwell explains truth is based in the case of photography on empiricism and positivism (11–13).

39. Sanford Dole, the first governor of the Territory as of 1900, had also headed the "provisional government" that deposed Lili'uokalani in 1893 and presided over the running of the "republic" until 1900. While the American resolution to annex Hawai'i took place in 1898, President William McKinley signed the Organic Act to set up a territorial government in Hawai'i in April of 1900.

40. I believe that Davis does not mention Kalakaua's *The Legends and Myths of Hawaii: The Fables and Folk-Lore of a Strange People* because it contains only two photographic illustrations and not because R. M. Daggett was involved in its editing and production.

41. By the 1890s, the invention of the "Instamatic" camera makes it possible to have one's pictures printed without personally having darkroom equipment; women and working-class people in the West are also beginning to practice photography.

42. Lawrence Venuti eloquently discusses the "ethics of location" in his work on translation.

43. Countering these views of myth, from her early study of the Virgin Mary to her work on gender and fairy tales, and the recent *Fantastic Metamorphoses, Other Worlds*, Marina Warner's interdisciplinary and historicizing approach to myth and stories—their verbal and visual transformations, "congeners," transmigration, and pleasures—has been inspirational in many ways.

44. During the Q&A period of "Conversations on Indigenous Issues and Settler Viewpoints" (Center for Hawaiian Studies, April 15, 2003), Candace Fujikane perceptively asked Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak: "Earlier you asked the question, 'Where is there a place where people are not settlers?' What are the implications of this question for the distinction between Native and settler?" According to my notes, Spivak replied, "In this time and place, yes, I agree completely with the importance of that distinction between Native and settler," and eloquently added that, because we are "not only settlers," "we owe our children not to teach them what will burden them if we succeed."

45. As Hawaiian scholars and activists have repeatedly stated, this transformation involves Native Hawaiians and non-Natives in different ways. Ku'ualoha Ho'omanawanui strongly critiques Glen Grant's 1998 introduction to Thomas G. Thrum's *Hawaiian Folk Tales* where "sitting quietly in the vicinity of a beach" and experiencing "the transforming power of the sacred narratives which for centuries have excited the souls of Polynesians" are presented as a lasting connection that provides an immediate connection with the land ("This Land"). My goals in rereading Hawaiian legendary traditions are much more limited and, I trust, quite different from Grant's.

Chapter 2. Hawai'i's Storied Places

1. According to nineteenth-century Hawaiian historian Davida Malo (1795–1853), each *moku*, or island, was divided into *kalana*, or districts, and *Ko'olau* Poko was one of the six districts on O'ahu. Each district in turn includes many *ahupua'a*, that is, as Kame'ele'ihiwa explains, "usually wedge-shaped sections of land that followed natural geographic boundaries, such as ridge lines and rivers, and ran from mountains to sea. . . . Ideally, an *ahupua'a* would include within its borders all the materials required for sustenance—timber, thatching, and rope from the mountains, various crops from the uplands, *kalo* from the lowlands, and fish from the sea" (*Native Land and Foreign Desires* 27).

2. Marketed as an ideal gift for the holiday season, Landgraf's book was praised as "peel[ing] back layers of romanticized, urbanized Hawai'i to reveal its essence" (Jan Rose) and "giv[ing] voice to the silent places of windward Oahu" (Tenbruggencate). Having received positive reviews in Hawai'i newspapers and magazines, the book quickly became a 1995 local best seller and was awarded the 1995 Ka Palapala Po'okela Award for Excellence in Illustrative Books, administered by the Hawaii Book Publishers Association. Exploring the dynamics between the book's success and its politics would be productive in itself, especially if other Hawaiian artists' work were also to be considered, but that is not my project here. See Ty-Tomkins, Burlingame ("From a Hawaiian Point of View"), and Fulland-Leo in addition to Rose and Tenbruggencate for published reviews. Burlingame's article also reports from an interview with Landgraf. An early version of this chapter is in Davis's *Photography in Hawai'i* (2001). Landgraf has also published "E Luku Wale E . . . Devastation upon Devastation," poetry in Hawaiian and English accompanying black-and-white photographs of O'ahu places as affected by pollution, building, and redistribution of water. These images were part of her 1998 exhibit with Mark Hamasaki of photographs documenting the building of the controversial H-3 freeway and constitute a powerful statement on the devastation of Hawaiian culture and land. Landgraf's work is also exhibited at the Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

See also Cashman et al., *ReViewing Paradise*, an introduction to and discussion of the collective exhibit of photographers Kimo Cashman, Gaye Chan, Mark Hamasaki, Renee Iijima, Karen Kosasa, Stan Tomita, Ann Kalupani Landgraf, John Morita, and Kainalani Young that was held at the Honolulu Advertiser Gallery in Honolulu (April 27, 1995–June 28, 1995) [Honolulu: s.n., 1995]. The booklet includes statements by the artists (Landgraf's on 9–10) as well as the reprint of Dennis Kawaharada's essay "Toward an Authentic Local Literature of Hawai'i" (13–17), which had been presented and distributed at the 1994 conference on Hawai'i's literatures held at Kapi'olani Community College in Honolulu.

Landgraf's more recent mixed-media work, *ku'u ewe, ku'u iwi, ku'u koko/my umbilical cord, my bones, my blood*, was on view in the John Dominis and Patches Damon Holt Gallery of the Honolulu Academy of Arts from May 14 to September 21, 2003—while I was revising this chapter. Her book *Nā Wahi Kapu o Maui* also came out in 2003 with 'Ai Pohaku Press and is beautifully introduced by Kihei de Silva.

3. As discussed in Chapter 1, a number of factors have contributed to the colonization of Hawai'i: Hawaiian depopulation brought on by Western diseases, the missionary squelching of Hawaiian religion and overall culture, the