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Abstract

In this study, I propose the concept of heterotopic postmemory as a theoretical reworking of Michel Foucault’s method of heterotopology and Tonya K. Davidson’s elaboration of postmemories of lost or virtual spaces. Although postmemory is often used in conjunction with lost or virtual spaces of diasporic populations, Hawaiians encounter postmemories of an actual space while residing within it. My thesis formulates the theoretical-methodological device of heterotopic postmemory by considering the program of Kamehameha Schools as well as their Annual Song Contest, the Royal Hawaiian Center, hula, place names, and photographic renderings of Hawai‘i as motivated by heterotopic postmemory; such postmemory attempts to contest and reverse colonial understandings of Hawai‘i as an American, Anglophone, and tourist site. The concept of heterotopic postmemory contributes to memory studies by spatializing postmemory and it enables the study of colonial and post-colonial spaces where memory is a crucial site of social struggle.
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**Introduction**

Drawing on Marianne Hirsch’s (2012b) concept of postmemory, Tonya K. Davidson (2011) questions whether or not it is possible to have memories of a place never visited, or a place that has become lost and unknown. Her own virtual homeland is Kapetanovo, Croatia. She has never visited, yet experiences it; did not grow up there, yet remembers it; and knows little more than her family members, yet recognizes the faces of many townsfolk. Kapetanovo has become accessible to Davidson through her grandfather’s stories, memories from her family members’ vacations, and the residual culture of the Kapetanovers who, like Davidson’s grandparents, fled to Canada due to World War II. Davidson’s memories of her virtual homeland are postmemories produced from instruction and relationships, rather than geographically situated ones.

In *Different Spaces*, Foucault (2004) explains that there is a tendency to understand history in terms of time, but emphasizes the significance of spatial analysis. He coins the term heterotopology, the study of heterotopias, sites that are heterogeneous and not reducible to a singular space.

I argue that Foucault’s heterotopology and Davidson’s reworking of postmemory to explore the notion of a virtual homeland can provide insight into Hawai’i while inviting the extension of these theoretical concepts to posit the theoretical formulation of “heterotopic postmemory.” Heterotopic postmemory is thus a theoretical concept that brings together Foucault’s method of heterotopology and Tonya K. Davidson’s elaboration of postmemories of lost or virtual places.

It is important to note that although Davidson was influenced by places that are lost or uninhabitable, Hawaiians actually encounter postmemories of an actual,
geographical\textsuperscript{1} space while residing within it, rather than experiencing postmemories of a lost or virtual homeland from which they or their families were displaced. Combining Davidson’s theory of postmemories of a virtual homeland and Foucault’s concept of heterotopia, my thesis will formulate the theoretical-methodological device of heterotopic postmemory by considering the program of Kamehameha Schools as well as their Annual Song Contest, the Royal Hawaiian Center, hula, place names, and photographic renderings of Hawai‘i as motivated by heterotopic postmemory; such postmemory attempts to contest and reverse colonial understandings of Hawai‘i as an American, Anglophone, and tourist site. With this study, which spatializes postmemory within a geographical location, I propose that heterotopic postmemory enables the study of colonial and post-colonial spaces where memory is a crucial site of social struggle.

After reviewing relevant contributions to memory studies, I will begin by addressing the history of Hawai‘i, starting from ancient Hawai‘i, Euro-American contact, and the creation of and movement through the Kingdom of Hawai‘i into the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, and the resulting shift from the Territory of Hawai‘i to the Republic of Hawai‘i through annexation to the United States. As a result, a number of sovereignty groups protesting the overthrow and annexation currently exist. One of the most prominent groups is Ka Lahui Hawai‘i, led by Mililani B. Trask, an attorney and former trustee member of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) and Haunani Kay Trask, a former Hawaiian Studies professor through the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa. I will then examine Kamehameha Schools, a private school system in Hawai‘i established by a descendant of the Kamehameha royal

\textsuperscript{1} Aspects of a geographical space can still be lost, even when there are attempts to construct the space as historically undisrupted or continuous.
family. The Schools integrate Hawaiian history, culture, tradition, and language in its curriculum, including an application process that prefers children of Native Hawaiian ancestry. Since 1921, Kamehameha Schools has held an Annual Song Contest, with each grade led by student-voted student directors. The Annual Song Contest was highlighted in the 2010 PBS documentary *One Voice*, directed by Lisette Marie Flanary. *One Voice* follows the student directors and fellow students as they prepare for the 88th annual song contest, which was held on March 12, 2008. Also of significance are place names within the Kamehameha Schools Kapālama campus as well as how various places in Hawai’i were (re)named and the difference between Westernized and Hawaiian place names.

In the next chapter, I explore the Royal Hawaiian Center, formerly known as the Royal Hawaiian Shopping Center. The Center boasts over 110 shops and restaurants over 310,000 square feet spread across three blocks of Waikiki, the central tourist hub of O’ahu. I will contrast its current space with Helumoa, its historical site. For entertainment, the Royal Hawaiian Center often displays music and hula performances both in the style of kahiko (traditional Hawaiian) and ‘auana (Western-influenced). The Center also offers Mo’omeheu Hawai’i, complimentary classes such as how to create a lei, or the garland of flowers worn around the neck. Also of interest is the tourism and hospitality culture of Hawai’i and its influence within Hawaiian history taught in public schools.

The final chapter will be an analysis of various photos taken of Hawai’i through the use of digital archives and social media sites such as Flickr, Instagram, and Reddit. I will compare how Hawai’i is viewed through a tourist lens (postcards, brochures,
advertisements, tourists’ images) compared to how Hawai`i is viewed within everyday life, through photos that were taken by residents of Hawai`i.

**Memory**

First termed by Maurice Halbwachs, collective memory refers to the memories that are reminisced and recollected by a group. These memories are often (re)constructed through traditions, customs, or narratives and help foster a sense of identity and cohesion within social groups. In *The Collective Memory*, Halbwachs (2001) begins by describing the misconception people make when considering their thoughts, ideas, and feelings. He questions how often you feel that someone, through the media, has so accurately described a thought you had, or a feeling you wanted to express. They perfectly encapsulate your ideas or feelings because they are merely echoes of the collective: “in one way or another, each social group endeavours to maintain a similar persuasion over its members” (p. 140). We do not easily realize these social influences because they are a part of us, or more accurately, what we think or feel is a reflection of collective thought.

Halbwachs critiques history by posing a distinction between collective memory and history. In history, time is separated into segments, which “gives the impression that everything—the interplay of interests, general orientations, modes of studying men and events, traditions, and perspectives of the future—is transformed from one period to another” (p. 143). According to Halbwachs, history is thus a succession of events that are independent from each other. Viewed as a whole, history is arranged into “successive and distinct configurations, each period having a beginning, middle, and an end” (p. 144). Not all historians would agree with Halbwachs, as there are struggles and tensions within
practices of historiography. Halbwachs describes these periods as simple demarcations, ones that historians are not able to take seriously because these events are often viewed from afar as distinct “facts” instead of instances influenced by or relative to each other.

Unlike history, collective memories do not have clearly marked boundaries because “the memory of society extends as far as the memory of the groups composing it” (p. 144). As time moves ahead and people begin to pass away, social memory begins to fade at the fringes because it is created, lived, and transformed within that group. Halbwachs explains that there are numerous collective memories rather than a single history. For example, he describes European history as without differing national viewpoints because historians synthesize occurrences as face-value facts as they are rather than include those varying viewpoints in order to be impartial. Thus, history is a universal memory of humanity, although a universal memory does not exist. Halbwachs writes, “every collective memory requires the support of a group delimited in space and time” (p. 145). By condensing a certain group into a single event in history, much is lost since this will merely record the collective memory through a chronological and spatial context that is presented as one-dimensional. In doing so, this will end up “separating them from the memory of the groups that preserved them and by severing the bonds that held them close to the psychological life of the social milieus where they occurred” (p. 145).

In Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire, Pierre Nora (1989) takes a very nostalgic approach when making a distinction between memory and history, terming lieux de mémoire as “sites of memory” and milieux de mémoire as “real environments of memory” (p. 7). Modernity, or the acceleration of history, creates the
distinction of real and true memory, “social and unviolated” (p. 8), and history, which
(re)constructs memories not as recollections, but by reorganizing and representing the
past. The lieux de mémoire are produced through institutions, museums, and archives
because he insists that no longer are there instances of spontaneous memory. Nora very
solemnly writes it is the “the push and pull [of history and memory] that produces lieux
de mémoire – the moments of history torn away from the movement of history, then
returned…like shells on the shore when the sea of living memory has receded” (p. 12).
This suggests milieux de mémoire is Nora’s elaboration of Halbwachs’ notion that
collective memory ceases when living connections are severed.

Nora reflects on history being privileged information implying that
“actualizations” of history have been lost or more likely ignored because sometimes
memories are not absent or missing, but are often set aside in favor of selected
information that fits within certain frameworks, as “modern memory, is above all,
archival” (p. 13). In this manner, history as a discipline can be considered an abstract
structure or cultural system. However, Nora may be too critical, too nostalgic, and too
nationalistic in his approach. Nora explains, “in the classical period, the three main
producers of archives were the great families, the church, and the state” (p. 14). He
laments the fact that modern memory focuses on the individual rather than the collective
and that any individual can record their experiences, thus having agency in the production
of memory. Nora believes the three main producers have been wrongly displaced,
implicitly stating that not everything matters enough to be remembered – which
contradicts the spirit of his own distinction between lieux de mémoire and milieux de
mémoire. The great families, the church, and the state will only memorialize, establish,
and fund certain facets of “actual” lived experience through the very institutions Nora has grown to abhor: archives, museums, and monuments, when they solidify events as a part of the collective consciousness and separate them from the spontaneous ritual experience of collectives.

Nora continues, “the indiscriminate production of archives is the acute effect of a new consciousness, the clearest expression of the terrorism of historicized memory” (p. 14). Nora is obviously very passionate throughout this piece, but the accusation of violence in that line is a bit confounding. One could argue that Nora could have learned to appreciate the individual’s perspective within the collective, because the multiplicity of individuals’ experiences could lead to experiences and memories that are truly lived instead of favoring one as dictated by the state. This shows that Nora privileges certain experiences, events, and incidences, and prefers that those are what configure and structure the singular, nationalistic French consciousness. Nora assumes there are certain experiences that are more authentically French, thus more crucial for remembering, therefore he makes a distinction between an imagined collective and a state-constructed national identity. By excluding certain productions of memories, Nora seems to produce a privileged space that contests all other productions of place, within the same geographical space.

The concept of the collective from Nora and Halbwachs perhaps stems from Émile Durkheim’s notion of concepts and collective representations. In the conclusion of *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim (1995) describes concepts as “the basic material of logical thought” (p. 434). Concepts have the ability to be universal because concepts are common and are exchanged between individuals. Concepts are
common between individuals because they are collective, structured through their relations to other concepts. To Durkheim, “concepts are collective representations” (p. 436) because language and speech are the products of the collective and provide a way society as a whole conceives and perceives concepts. For Durkheim, conceptual thought and collective representations are valuable as “[thinking] with concepts is not merely to see the real in its most general characteristics but to turn upon sensation a beam that lights, penetrates, and transforms it” (p. 437). What has been a part of the collective throughout history can add to and (re)structure personal experience, and personal experience, in turn, can influence collective representations.

However, Nora seems to target his critique towards a privileged, “pure” and nationalistic memory rather than the concept of the collective consciousness or collective memories, but Durkheim alludes to the collective representation as having a semblance of truth because it is only considered true by being a part of the collective. Halbwachs says although “we demand its credentials before giving it credence…the great majority of the concepts that we use are not methodically constructed; we come by them from language, that is, from common experience” (p. 439). The collective representation does undergo tests, not necessarily of methodology, or history, but through lived experience, or memory, that is repeated indefinitely over time. These collective representations do not pop in and out of consciousness and our existence, but are imposed and are imposing onto us. In his inconsistent and contradictory argument, Nora considers the collective as more of a stain on “pure” and “true” memory because it is an informal site of memory (lieux de mémoire), which he believes only exist because the real environments of memory (milieux de mémoire) no longer exist. Varying attempts to define the collective
result in Durkheim’s suggestion that beliefs are held in common, while Nora assumes there is a rightful collective whose authenticity justifies the production of certain interpretations and understandings. Various collective histories, such as a tourist production of Hawaiian history, culture, and practices as compared to Hawaiian history taught at Kamehameha Schools, will contest the other, producing multiple depictions of Hawai‘i within the same geographical space.

In *The Localization of Memories*, Halbwachs (1992) describes memories as “part of a totality of thoughts common to a group, the group of people with whom we have a relation at this moment, or with whom we have had a relation on the preceding day or days” (p. 52). In the process of recollection, individuals place themselves in the context and perspective of a group. To Halbwachs, memories are a part of a system within the mind that recalls and reconstructs through those specific contexts, “understanding each memory as it occurs in individual thought only if we locate each within the thought of the corresponding group” (p. 53). Halbwachs does say that individuals are able to have their own ways of producing memory and remembering, but individual memory is drawn from group memory that originates from the social milieu.

Halbwachs describes memories as continually reproduced in *The Reconstruction of the Past* (1992). He considers memory as repetitions that are engaged in various contexts at various stages in life, each repetition influencing and reconstructing the past. He refers to memory as nostalgic, “a retrospective mirage by which a great number of us persuade ourselves that the world of today has less color and is less interesting than it was in the past” (p. 47), further describing recollection and memory as a “faraway world” with an “illusory appearance” (p. 48).
Although there are numerous texts and heightening interest in collective memories, some scholars object to Halbwach’s concept of collective memory. Aleida Assmann (2008) discusses Susan Sontag’s insistence that collective memories are impossible given the fact that memory belongs to and dies with an individual. However, Assmann reiterates that memories can be shared between individuals through photographs or narratives. She writes, “by encoding [memories] in the common medium of language, they can be exchanged, shared, corroborated, confirmed, corrected, disputed, and even appropriated” (p. 50). Even within the individual, recollections may end up as a variety of representations, further clouding the line between individual memories and external material signs. Assmann acknowledges Halbwachs’ introduction of “collective memory” although Halbwachs later used another term, “social frame,” due to his thought that collective memory could not “be understood without referring to the concept of ‘social frames’” (p. 51). Halbwachs’ constructivist standpoint places the individual in relation to, and a part of, social groups with shared values and experiences. These collective experiences are beyond the lifespan of the individual, who “participates in the group’s vision of its past by means of cognitive learning and emotional acts of identification and commemoration. The past cannot be ‘remembered’; it has to be memorized” (p. 52).

Sontag, according to Assmann, considers collective memory as an ideology because rather than remembering, groups are stipulating, “defin[ing] themselves by agreeing upon what they hold to be important, to which story they accord eminence, which anxieties and values they share” (p. 52). Similar to Sontag, German historian Reinhart Kosselleck defined “truth” as either subjective or objective. Subjective truth
involves the individual’s specific, authentic, firsthand experiences of memories while objective truth is a reconstructed interpretation of the “truth” as debated between historians. Kosselleck thus considered “ideology” as what lay between subjective and objective truth. To Assmann, there is a difference between the individual and collective memory, because “institutions and larger social groups…do not ‘have’ a memory—they ‘make’ one for themselves with the aid of memorial signs such as symbols, texts, images, rites, ceremonies, places, and monuments” (p. 55, as cited from Assmann, 2006), thus producing and constructing memory and identity through filtering events by considering whether or not these events are relevant or significant.

To Assmann, the flaw in the term “collective memory” is less about Sontag and Kosselleck’s arguments and more about how it is used as a singular term encompassing various and distinct types of memories, including but not limited to “family memory, interactive group memory, and social, political, national, and cultural memory” (p. 55). Assmann describes interactive and social memory as short-term because they are lived experiences that disappear as individuals pass away. On the other hand, political and cultural memory is long-term because of its intent to be conveyed to later generations.

There is a misconception that although humans are always changing, the past was etched in stone. However, Assmann considers the past as written in water rather than on granite because it is “continually reclaimed as an important resource for power and identity politics” (p. 57) in what she considers an entanglement between history and memory. Assmann explains that the relationship between history and memory has developed over time and involves three stages: the identity between history and memory,
the polarization between history and memory, and the interaction between history and memory (p. 57).

During the first stage, there was no distinction between history and memory. In post-Roman Europe, prior to the eighteenth and nineteenth century, the point of recording was to maintain and uphold institutions such as the church or state in order to root, memorialize, and sustain its power for the future. Records were created because of the present, “serv[ing] specific functions for the state or community such as justifying the institutions of the ruling class, legitimizing the authority of traditions, and controlling the future” (p. 57). Due to the influence of identity and power in history and memory, only selected achievements and specific people were memorialized. Other people and events were then excluded because history-making was “guaranteed by the reference to a collective identity enforced by a specific power structure that was itself confirmed, legitimated, and perpetuated in the process” (p. 58).

The polarization between memory and history is the result of “a long process of intellectual and institutional evolution” (p. 58) and the conflict between power, authority, and tradition in regards to truth-telling. During the Renaissance, scholars such as Lorenzo Valla displayed how writings constructed history in order to produce and preserve power, leading to the break between history and memory once historiography developed into its own discipline during the 19th century. Historiography thus “defin[ed] its own standards of truth telling, including specific rules for verification and intersubjective argumentation” (p. 59) severing the link between identity and history. Assmann, quoting Ernest Renan, explains how history becomes a problem in terms of collective memory because historians either support or oppose political power and, in turn, create or dispute
reported truths in the construction of a national memory. Assmann then describes Halbwachs’ social memory and how, for Halbwachs, ‘‘histor(iograph)y is the universal memory of humanity, while collective memories are embodied by specific groups and therefore always partial and biased’’ (p. 60). To Halbwachs, memory must be split from social milieus in order to be incorporated into history. Nora, using Halbwachs’ social memory, contrasts collective memory (lieux de mémoire) and history. Assmann explains that critical historiographers once opposed memory because it competed with history, but scholars such as Halbwachs and Nora prefer and stress the importance of the real and lived aspects of memory, or milieux de mémoire in Nora’s terms, as opposed to a constructed history that is ‘‘disconnected from the identity of individuals groups, or institutions…searches for truth and tries to suspend values, disconnected from action’’ (p. 61).

The third stage, which Assmann refers to as the postmodern stage, focuses on interactions between memory and history. Lived experience and living memories began to emerge front and center, due to the realization that history is not as objective as previously thought, but often constructed and influenced by power and politics. She considers history and memory as self-reflexive because of the interconnection between the two: memory involves having a history while history is a formation of memory. The interconnection developed into mnemohistory, a new branch of historiography that realizes the importance of both history and memory and is ‘‘interested in the constructive as well as the distorting effects of memory; it takes into account the ambivalence of the past both as a conscious choice and as an unconscious burden, tracking the voluntary and involuntary paths of memory’’ (p. 62). Assmann explains history and memory should not
be used interchangeably because “memory complements history, history corrects memory” (p. 63). Memory complements history because history is influenced by lived experience and oral histories, while history corrects memory because historical scholarship can be used to either confirm or critique memory.

However, what about the voices that are excluded and unheard within history? What about memories that are beyond the scope of traditionally accepted narratives of history and remembrance? What about memories that are real, but not actual?

*Postmemory*

Marianne Hirsch (2012b) is concerned with an “evolving ethical and theoretical discussion about the workings of trauma, memory, and intergenerational acts of transfer” (p. 2) in *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. To Hirsch, historians have been largely ignoring embodied knowledge such as testimony projects, oral history archives, or photographs and how these artifacts of a living connection move from one generation to the next. Citing Susan Sontag’s concern about how to evoke the “pain of others,” Hirsch questions how memory can be moved through generations without appropriating, displacing, or replacing memories from this living connection. Similar to Assmann, Hirsch considers in the recent development of memory studies the incorrect usage of the umbrella term “memory.” For Hirsch, a “living connection” is an important affective experience, which is attributed to memory rather than history, given that Hirsch focuses on “a *generational* structure of transmission embedded in multiple forms of mediation” (p. 35). Hirsch forwarded the term “postmemory” while doing her own research and work involving the Holocaust. Hirsch’s
own parents often told stories involving their experiences during World War II, and she experienced her childhood in postwar Bucharest. Hirsch began to question why she was able to clearly recall instances of her parents’ wartime experiences while unable to do the same with her own experience in Bucharest. By reading the work of other second-generation writers or speaking with other children of Auschwitz survivors, Hirsch realized they were all members of a postgeneration, having similar experiences, recollections, and (post)memories. These postmemories involve “the relationship that the ‘generation after’ bears to the personal, collective, and cultural trauma of those who came before—to experiences they ‘remember’ only by means of the stories, images, and behaviors among which they grew up” (p. 5).

Hirsch begins by including an image of *The First Maus* by Art Spiegelman, “his father’s story of survival in Auschwitz, and his own childhood reception of that story” (p. 29) through the form of bedtime stories. Hirsch questions whether or not children of survivors have “memories” of their parents’ experiences and analyzes Spiegelman’s retelling in comics and how it turns history into memory that is then passed within individuals and to future generations. Hirsch explains that postmemories are not literal memories but can be a form of memory. Citing Eva Hoffman’s description of memories as “flashes of imagery” or “broken refrains,” Hirsch explains that these are what depict postmemory of trauma or suffering. Hoffman also refers to the “living connection” that is further described by Jan and Aleida Assmann and their work on memory. Aleida Assmann describes memory as individual yet influenced by the particular social group. Hirsch, however, notes the Assmanns’ work on memory does not focus on traumatic experiences, such as war, refugeehood, or specific instances of historical trauma such as
the Holocaust. For Hirsch, postmemory “strives to reactivate and re-embody more distant political and cultural memorial structures by reinvesting them with resonant individual and familial forms of mediation and aesthetic expression” (p. 33). Postmemorial work will also be able to involve other members of future generations long after direct participants and their descendants have passed.

In *Maus*, transmission occurs between father and son in the form of bedtime stories, thus occupying a familial space. Children of survivors inherit the collective trauma from their parents, and their own memoirs, writings, and art are influenced by the pain of their parents’ experiences, their own confusion surrounding those experiences, and of the sense of loss. Public experiences, imagery, and understandings, blend and become a part of the second generation’s own experience. However, Hirsch argues that as public and private understandings begin to blend, it gets more and more difficult to distinguish between the two. This results in a persistence to distinguish a familial identity. For Hirsch, “postmemory is not an identity position but a generational structure of transmission embedded in multiple forms of mediation” (p. 34). As personal as family life is, these memories are a part of a collective recollection influenced by and taken from the public archive. Hirsch wants to clarify the difference and distinctions between “affiliative” and “familial” postmemory, and argues that affiliative postmemory “is the result of contemporaneity and generational connection with the literal second generation, combined with a set of structures of mediation that would be broadly available, appropriable, and, indeed, compelling enough to encompass a larger collective in an organic web of transmission” (p. 36).
Postmemories: From the Virtual to the Heterotopic

In Nostalgia and Postmemories of a Lost Place: Actualizing “My Virtual Homeland” (2011) Tonya K. Davidson questions whether or not it is possible to have memories of a place that was never visited, or a place that is lost and unknown. Davidson uses reflective nostalgia, which “cherishes shattered fragments of memory and temporalizes space” (Boym, 2001, p. 49) in order to describe what her particular virtual homeland encompasses. For Davidson, her virtual homeland is Kapetanovo, Croatia and it is “assessable through actualizations, through the residue that gathers, collects, and reconstitutes places” (p. 44) which she was able to access through her grandfather’s stories, other people’s memories from their vacations to Kapetanovo, and the residual culture of the “Kapetanovers” who, like Davidson’s grandparents, fled to Canada from Croatia after World War II. Davidson considers her work as a form of narrative ethnography in order to tell her own story of how she sought out the faint hints and whispers of Kapetanovo that linger through postmemory, object survivors, and memory texts.

Davidson describes objects and stories as having a reciprocal relationship as one is able to inspire the other. Objects such as photos and family heirlooms are “transferential sites” of postmemories and they can endure long after places and people disappear. Object survivors are objects given value not only because they are treasured artifacts, but also because they help construct as well as reaffirm memories. They are also “central to postmemory…exist[ing] in part because of deliberate decisions, acts of constructing memory that result from attachments to things” (p. 51). Davidson’s grandparents lost three children in Croatia and Austria prior to their arrival in Canada.
Davidson’s mother often asked her parents about her brothers and sister that had passed and, in response, was shown a box of baby clothes that belonged to them. These baby clothes are object survivors and were able to connect Davidson’s mother to her lost siblings as “the unbridgeable distance between my mother and her deceased siblings is mediated through these object survivors” (p. 53).

Davidson encounters memory texts as well. Unlike object survivors that are specifically chosen to be preserved, memory texts are reflexive and “are a concrete, portable form of memory and postmemory making, inscribed at both primary and post levels of remembering” (p. 54). Davidson’s memory texts consist of her great-oma Katharina Bauer’s bible, a photograph in Kapetanovo with notations, post-mortem maps, and her own pink notebook. In her bible, Katharina Bauer had recorded the births and deaths of her children, noted the names and details of her parents and grandparents, and included a short autobiography of their eviction by Josef Tito’s partisans in 1944 and their arrival in Canada in 1949 for her family to know what happened and why they immigrated to Canada.

In the photograph, a group of boys are in front of a tavern in Kapetanovo, one of which Davidson is able to identify as her grandfather. The caption describes Kapetanovo as a memorial site and describes Kapetanovo as the home that had become lost. These texts “induce the readers to perform, in new articulations, the memory of their exile…offer a form of objectified narrative, a means of transforming an uneasy life into a more coherent narrative” (p. 56).

Examples of postmortem maps include one made by Davidson’s mother on a visit to her grandfather in 1997 that details the sixty houses of Kapetanovo in the 1940s and
another map of Leamington in the 1950s. Davidson explains that these maps were created by her mother with the desire to remember these places not only for herself but for Davidson as well. She writes, “implicit in these overlaid maps are the differences, the spaces between places that are the salient meaning and memory-making gaps—the subtle beyond of what is lost in postmemories” (p. 59). The making of these maps highlight place, identity, and history and the relationships between them, as well as revealing the places in the shadows that were lost to history.

When Davidson was fifteen, she compiled information on Kapetanovo in a pink notebook, which details how she actualized her postmemories and how she encountered the multiplicities in order to create her own sense of belonging. Through these object survivors and memory texts, Davidson is able to both know and not know Kapetanovo as virtual places are “always partial, in-between, simultaneously here and never there” (p. 60). However, she understands her knowledge is partial and is made up of traces that reveal what was lost, able to mark her own autobiography and identity within history, and is able to actualize her virtual homeland.

Michel Foucault (1994) explained that in the nineteenth century the production of history privileged linear time as an organizing category. Foucault recognizes the significance of space and how “space itself, in the Western experience, has a history, and one cannot fail to take note of this inevitable interlocking of time with space” (p. 176). He considers the Middle Ages and categorizations of spaces (sacred or profane), geography (urban or country), cosmological (celestial or supracelestial), and even the lack thereof (displacement). Interrelationships between these spaces are what Foucault considers a space of localization. Noting the work of Gaston Bachelard, space is not
homogenous but “laden with qualities, a space that may also be haunted with fantasy” (p. 177).

Utopias and heterotopias are two types of emplacement. Utopias are places that do not occupy a real space. Foucault uses the example of a mirror to describe a placeless place by describing his reflection as a view of himself where he is not physically located. Heterotopias are heterogeneous spaces that are “realized utopias in which the real emplacements…are, at the same time, represented, contested, and reversed, sorts of places that are outside all places, although they are actually localizable” (p. 178). The mirror is also a heterotopia as it is an actual object that influences how you view yourself. Viewing the reflection of yourself causes your existence in that space to be realized because you can see yourself occupying that space, although being in that space is not actualized since you physically occupy the space outside of the mirror. The study of heterotopias constitutes Foucault’s concept of heterotopology, existent in every civilization as “there is probably not a single culture in the world that does not establish heterotopias: that is a constant of every human group” (p. 179). Although constant, they are varied in form because a universal heterotopia does not exist.

The crisis heterotopias are “privileged or sacred or forbidden places reserved for individuals who are in a state of crisis with respect to society and the human milieu in which they live” (p. 179), examples of which include women who are menstruating, women in labor, and the elderly. Foucault explains although crisis heterotopias have seemed to vanish, there are traces of them that exist today, such as a private secondary school or a honeymoon trip. Replacing the crisis heterotopias are heterotopias of deviation, spaces in which individuals are placed if they deviate from the norm, such as
psychiatric hospitals or prisons. Each society is able to influence how heterotopias operate, having “a precise and specific operation with the society…the same heterotopia can have one operation or another, depending on the synchrony of the culture in which it is found” (p. 180). Foucault explains this by describing the functions of cemeteries and how these have changed over time. Cemeteries used to exist in the center of a city next to churches, sharing the notion of a sacred space. Once cemeteries began to be associated with disease and fear that these diseases would infect the living, they were moved from the city center to the outskirts. This relocation suggests contestation of the cemetery’s status as a sacred or immortal space.

Another principle of heterotopia involves the capacity to “juxtapose in a single real space several emplacements that are incompatible in themselves” (p. 181). Foucault describes the juxtaposition heterotopia as a garden that is able to consist of a variety of plant species that would have never coexisted otherwise. There are also spaces that are not susceptible to time, or heterochronias. Museums and libraries are heterotopias that exist within and without temporality because their function is to archive and preserve various objects such as texts or artefacts, while they themselves are preserved as objects as well.

Heterotopias also “presuppose a system of opening and closing that isolates them and makes them penetrable at the same time” (p. 183). These heterotopias involve the necessary steps in order to enter a space but what looks like an opening or offer of inclusion could actually be the result of exclusion. A purification ritual might be necessary in a religious aspect to enter a holy place, in the case of a Muslim bath, or for hygiene such as the case of a public bathhouse or sauna. The final principle of heterotopia
involves “a function in relation to the remaining space” (p. 184). These heterotopias have either the ability to perceive a deceptive space that displaces real space or create a different space, or compensate for a real space in another space. For this reason, heterotopology is a crucial methodological device for the study of postmemory in colonial space, where the economy of memory production is vital to political discourse and everyday lived experience.

The Heterotopic Postmemory of Native Hawaiians

Colonization created a displacement of Hawaiian culture and language that was only recently revived. In 1893, the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown and turned the Kingdom of Hawai‘i into the Republic of Hawai‘i. Beginning in 1896, the Republic passed a law stating schools must instruct in English in order to be recognized as an official institution and receive funding. Due to the new law, “the number of Hawaiian-medium schools dropped drastically from a high of 150 in 1880 to zero in 1902” (Lucas, 2000, p. 9). No longer a mother tongue, the Hawaiian language continually dwindled until revitalization efforts during the 1970s and 1980s reinvigorated the use and instruction of Hawaiian in public and private schools. Similar to Maori-language programs used in New Zealand, an organization called ‘Aha Pūnana Leo established Pūnana Leo preschools across the state. In 1987, the Hawaiian Language Immersion Project was established by the Board of Education, “a two-year pilot program for children who wished to continue their education in Hawaiian after graduating from Pūnana Leo” (Lucas, 2000, p. 11).

In a sense, traditional Hawai‘i has become a lost, unknown space. Hawai‘i in the present day is a mixture of various ethnicities and cultures so although a person may be
native Hawaiian and grow up in Hawai‘i, they may know very little of the history of Hawai‘i and traditional Hawaiian culture. Through Kamehameha Schools and the teaching or re-teaching of Hawaiiana, Hawai‘i becomes a virtual homeland that contains postmemories of the lost, pre-colonial culture of native Hawaiians. With the aid of literature, memories, oral tradition, photographs, and various object survivors, Kamehameha Schools help their students remember traditional Hawai‘i and Hawaiian culture just as Davidson is able to remember Kapetanovo.

Heterotoplogy applies to specific spaces within Hawai‘i. Kamehameha Schools, a private school with preference to children of Native Hawaiian ancestry retains traditional Hawaiian culture through teaching various history, language, and literature classes in order to prepare students to “practice and perpetuate the Hawaiian values and traditions of Ke Ali‘i Pauahi [Bishop]” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015g). Kamehameha Schools also perpetuates Hawaiian culture through assigning Hawaiian names to buildings within campus as well as the creation of a Hawaiian cultural center on campus. However, as instructed by Bernice Pauahi Bishop in her will, Kamehameha Schools must also promote Christian values rather than the traditional Hawaiian mythology, which was polytheistic and animistic. Nearly all instruction is in English because it is the mother tongue of most, if not all, students at Kamehameha Schools.

There is a juxtaposition of multiple spaces produced in creating a space for native Hawaiians to be Hawaiian while also within a space perpetuating the traditional American school system. Additionally, students enter that space with the intention of being or learning to be Hawaiian while having to embrace a multitude of differing
ethnicities because, although students are Hawaiian and intend to learn and preserve Hawaiian culture, the students themselves are ethnically diverse.

Although heterochronias usually refer to spaces like museums or similar institutions that preserve specific slices of time, Kamehameha Schools does this as well since they focus on the traditional Hawaiian culture, emphasizing the language and culture prior to Euro-American contact in a way to reclaim their culture that was lost to colonization. For example, Kamehameha Schools holds an annual song contest with one of the awards recognizing how well the use of Hawaiian language is employed into the song. During the song contest, time is held still not only because songs are sung in the old Hawaiian language, but because similar songs that evoke and utilize traditional Hawaiian culture have always been sung every year for decades.

Kamehameha Schools can also arguably be a heterotopia of ritual or purification. Within these heterotopias, “one can enter only with certain permission and after a certain number of gestures have been performed” (Foucault, 1994, p. 183). Kamehameha Schools have a controversial admissions policy due to two factors: the first being its status as a private school so prospective students must apply for admission and the second being Bishop’s request in her will that preference be given to children of native Hawaiian descent. Since there are more students of native Hawaiian origin applying to the school than the school can accept, there is little opportunity for non-Hawaiian students to attend Kamehameha Schools. Due to this policy, there have been multiple lawsuits against Kamehameha for racial discrimination on behalf of non-Hawaiians seeking admittance.
In terms of Davidson’s personal experience, Hawai‘i is not a virtual homeland in the same sense of Kapetanovo because native Hawaiians still occupy the same land in which their ancestors lived. Rather than having populations and their scattered descendants experiencing postmemories of a lost or virtual homeland, Hawaiians actually encounter postmemories of an actual space within that actual space. Combining Davidson’s postmemories of a virtual homeland and Foucault’s heterotopia, Kamehameha Schools can be described as a heterotopic postmemory; such postmemory does not produce space so much as contest and reverse it.

Through its curriculum of *lieux de mémoire* object survivors, Kamehameha Schools is an example of an opportunity to extend on both Davidson’s postmemories of a virtual homeland and Foucault’s principles of heterotopia as a theoretical concept and methodological device. I will conceptually reformulate these concepts in order to provide nuanced insight into emplaced memory practices and elaborate the various complexities of institutions that reclaim (or repackage) places and practices such as the hula performances at the Royal Hawaiian Center.

The combination of traditional American education, the unique culture of Hawai‘i, and multiculturalism of students within Kamehameha Schools with *lieux de mémoire* object survivors can be used in a more positive note compared to Pierre Nora’s concern of history colonizing memory. Students of varying ethnicities not only learn about the history and culture of Hawai‘i, but also learn about what it is like to have a unique blend of Hawaiian with their own backgrounds. Students have the opportunity to commemorate being Hawaiian and reconstruct the most relevant traditional customs in terms of the present-day. Tourism, displays of traditional Hawaiian culture, and the fact
that a few non-Hawaiian children are given the chance to attend might influence other non-Hawaiians within Hawai`i or even outside of Hawai`i to have an interest in traditional Hawaiian culture and history.

As a theoretical concept with methodological implications, heterotopic postmemory spatializes memory because it acknowledges that memory is in part an ongoing collective production, but this collective memory work involves both consensus and struggle in which place and space are implicated. Heterotopic postmemory enables recognition of the multiple places (consisting of different uses, different coded meanings, and different practices) that are made on the same geopolitically designated space. Contestations over memory are implicated in place-making, therefore, heterotopic postmemory concerns both spaces and times, in the plural. The contribution that it stands to make is primarily useful for approaching colonial and postcolonial contexts. In the case of Hawai`i, which is a tourist destination space, the concept of heterotopic postmemory is particularly productive. As will be shown, in Hawai`i, postmemory must always confront colonial tourist time and place memory that incorporates a re-worked performance of pre-colonial Hawai`i to produce a smooth time-space chronotope of eternal place, where nature and luxury co-exist in abundance. The Royal Hawaiian Center and tourist industry maps provide examples of this production of eternal time-space. Juxtaposed with this are local resistances in formal and informal practices. The Kamehameha Schools and the revitalization of language and culture is an example of formal resistance addressed in this study and local photographs are an example of informal resistance. These resistances appeal both to the past and to the complex chronotope of the everyday lived rhythm of Hawai`i in the here and the now.
Chapter 1: Nalowale (Lost, Forgotten)

He Kumulipo – Origins

O ke au i kahuli wela ka honua
O ke au i kahuli lole ka lani
O ke au i kukaʻiaka ka la
E hoʻomalalamama i ka malama
O ke au o Makaliʻi ka po
O ka walewale hoʻokumu honua ia
O ke kumu o ka lipo. i lopo ai
O ke kumu o ka Po, i po ai
O ka lipolipo, o ka lipolipo
O k alp o ka la, o ka lipo o ka po
Po wale hoʻi

At the time when the heat of the earth,
At the time when the heavens turned and changed,
At the time when the light of the sun was subdued
To cause light to break forth,
The time of the night of Makalii (winter)
Then began the slime which established the earth,
The source of deepest darkness.
Of the depth of darkness, of the depth of darkness,
Of the darkness of the sun, in the depth of night,

It was night,
So was night born.²

Ancient Hawaiian History

The Hawaiian creation chant, known as the Kumulipo, consists of sixteen waʻa, or sections that describe the development and progression of life as “species emerge in pairs from the primordial ooze, increasing in complexity from the smallest visible organism, the coral polyp” (Herman, 2009, p. 108). Beckwith (1949) explains how the first seven sections of the Kumulipo describe the beginnings of plant and animal life, the eighth describing the emergence of light, gods, and men, while the final eight sections refer to

² Queen Liliʻuokalani (1857). The Kumulipo.
the genealogy of Hawaiian gods and demigods. Ku’ualoha Ho’omanawanui (2005) explains that the *Kumu lipo* was “painstakingly memorized and verbally passed down in *hui* (collectives) of *ipu mo’okū’auhau* (genealogists for the chiefs), the *Kumu lipo* was not written down until 1881” (p. 36). Queen Liliuokalani then translated the chant into English in 1897.

Herman (2009) writes about the *akua*, commonly referred to as “gods” or “active consciousness” that is more prominent the more species become more complex throughout the *Kumu lipo*. There is also mana, a force imbibed in all living things that “can be stored, and channelled or transferred…pervad[ing]—hence unit[ing]—all things, and circulates among them” (p. 108). For instance, the Hawaiian word for “prayer” is *ho’omanamana*, to move mana. Within the *Kumu lipo* is the story of Wakea and Papa, deities that create some of the Hawaiian Islands and a daughter. Wakea and his daughter first produce a stillborn fetus that results in the creation of the taro plant, and then another child that turns into the first human. Wakea and Papa unite again to create the rest of the islands, signifying the relationships between gods, human beings, the islands, and taro. The term *kinolau*, or “many bodies” describes how plants, weather, or animals are not representations of deities, but are actually the deities themselves. Herman, through Johnson (1987) and Kamakau (1964), explains how “gods become nature, and humans become demigods, which in turn become nature. The circle between divinity, humanity, and nature is complete, and the boundaries among them permeable” (p. 109).
Hawai`i

“It has been suggested to me that the American general reader is not well informed regarding the social and political conditions which have come about in the Sandwich Islands, and that it would be well here to give some expression to my own observation of them…”

The Polynesian Triangle encompasses Hawai`i at the northern point, New Zealand at the eastern point, Rapa Nui at the western point, and everything in-between. As Polynesians were accomplished navigators, they may have settled in Hawai`i as early as 300 CE. Over time, Hawai`i became densely populated with as many as a million people. Hawaiian society developed into a caste system, led by ali`i (high chiefs), kahuna (priests and experienced craftsmen), and maka`āinana (commoners). There was no sense of land ownership because it was considered the property of deities. “The administrative hierarchy was mirrored in spatial order. Hawaiian land divisions ran from the islands’ mountainous centres to the sea like slices of a pie” (Herman, 2009, p. 106). Land was entrusted to the ali`i nui (highest chiefs) by the gods Kane and Lono. The ali`i nui were in charge of moku (sections) that were further divided into smaller sections called ahupua`a. Moku was supervised by the ali`i and were distributed to konohiki (lesser chiefs), and then further divided for maka`āinana.

However, Haunani Kay Trask (1993) writes that Hawaiian society has been incorrectly identified as similar to the political and economic system of feudal Europe. Rather, there was interdependence as “maka`āinana were free to move with their ohana [family] to live under an ali`i of their choosing, while the ali`i increased their status and material prosperity by having more people living within their moku or domain” (p. 6).

3 Queen Liliuokalani (1898), chapter LVII
The ali‘i provided for maka’āinana and made sure their inhabitants were well-taken care of, otherwise they would lose mana as well as their status as ali‘i. Ancient Hawaiians (ka po‘e kahiko) were completely self-sufficient and although Hawaiian society was strictly hierarchical, “society was organized to ensure that the common people thrived…the common people had gathering rights and access to means of sustenance” (Marshall, 2011, p. 23-24).

Hawaiians adhered to kapu (forbidden or “taboo”), a system of laws and regulations that were strictly followed as breaking kapu resulted in death. Hawaiians believed in mana, spiritual energy that exists and imbues all things, including people, places, and objects. In a sense, breaking kapu insinuated a contempt of sanctity. For example, kapuhili, or kapu relating to ali‘i, required maka’āinana to not look directly at or be too close to ali‘i as even being in the presence of the shadow of an ali‘i meant certain death. Kapu was rooted in the belief of akua, familial relations, and that all living things possessed a spirit. “Nature was not objectified but personified, resulting in an extraordinary respect….for the life of the sea, the heavens, and the earth” (Trask, 1993, p. 6).

*Discovered and the Kingdom of Hawai‘i*

“But will it also be thought strange that education and knowledge of the world have enabled us to perceive that as a race we have some special mental and physical requirements not shared by the other races…that certain habits and modes of living are better for our health and happiness than others?”

---

The first documented Western contact with Hawai`i was in 1778 when British explorer Captain James Cook landed in Kaua`i during his third voyage. Cook named the islands the “Sandwich Islands” after John Montagu, the fourth Earl of Sandwich. In his writing on place names and anti-conquest in post-colonial Hawai`i, Douglas Herman (2009) described Hawai`i as given an identity produced through Western ideals of classification after Cook’s documented discovery. Although the “Sandwich Islands” would later be called Hawai`i, “this too is a colonial by-product; there was no overarching name for the entire archipelago prior to Western contact. Occupied by up to 1 million Polynesians who had been in residence for at least 1000 years, it was not, in effect, one place, but several places” (p. 101).

While leaving the islands after his second visit, fights broke out between crew and Hawaiians. A boat had been stolen and Cook demanded that boat to be repaired, but it had already been broken down for parts. Cook then blockaded the harbor, “resulting in the killing of a prominent chief who attempted to enter it, and then landed with an armed boat’s crew with the view of seizing and holding the king [Kalani`ōpu`u] as security for the return of the missing boat” (Kalakaua, 1888, p. 391). A scuffle occurred and Cook ended up dying in the conflict. Due to Cook’s visit, multiple publications about Hawaii led to an influx of explorers and merchants. Unfortunately, these visitors brought diseases Hawaiians were vulnerable to, including smallpox, measles, and influenza. The lack of resistance to European diseases led to the population decline of Hawaiians during the late 19th century.

After Kalani`ōpu`u’s death, his nephew, Kamehameha, established the Kingdom of Hawai`i in 1795 through conquering and gaining allegiance from the heads of the other
islands. Ruled by Kamehameha the Great, unification shifted ancient Hawaii into a monarchy until the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i in 1893.

Kamehameha the Great built a royal residence known as the Brick Palace, which was a Western-influenced building. It was originally built for Kamehameha’s favorite wife, Ka‘ahumanu, but she preferred a traditional Hawaiian building. The Brick Palace thus became the seat of government for the Kingdom of Hawai‘i until 1845. After Kamehameha’s death in 1819, his son Liholiho with his wife Keōpūolani, became Kamehameha II. As Liholiho was young, Ka‘ahumanu took on the role of kuhina nui, or co-ruler, in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. Under Kamehameha II’s rule, ‘ai noa, or “free eating” occurred when he sat and had a meal with Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani. This was considered breaking kapu as men and women were not permitted to eat together. However, Ka‘ahumanu and Keōpūolani believed “the complex pattern of restraints kept them from moving about with freedom…[they] felt the restraints to be no longer consistent with the glimpses Hawaiians were having of life in other countries” (Sinclair, 1971, p. 9). Hawaiian society began to shift away from the kapu system and the use of traditional temples. Kamehameha the Great’s cousin Kekuaokalani had requested Kamehameha II to allow temples to be rebuilt, allow priests to resume their roles, and take full reign of Hawai‘i without the influence of Ka‘ahumanu. Kamehameha II refused and destroyed the remaining pagan Hawaiians, opening the islands to the influence of Christian missionaries that arrived within the year.

Against the wishes of his mother and Queen Ka‘ahumanu, Kamehameha II wished to travel to England. After touring London, attending a performance at the Royal Opera House, and having their portraits painted, members of the Hawaiian court began to
fall ill. Queen Kamāmalu passed away during their trip in 1824, “the immediate cause of her Majesty’s death is reported to be inflammation of the lungs, a result of the measles” (Corley, 2008, p. 91). Within a few days, Kamehameha II would pass away as well. His twelve year old brother, Kauikeaouli, would succeed as Kamehameha III.

Education was important to Kamehameha III as he intended to balance new Western influences with traditional Hawaiian customs, believing “education would prepare his people for the changes taking place in Hawai‘i” (Cachola, 1995, p. 45). Missionary teachers created schools, teaching Hawaiians how to read and write, as well as translating the Bible into Hawaiian, influencing many Hawaiians to become Protestant. After an attempt by a British Lord to have Kamehameha III surrender Hawai‘i to England, Kamehameha III is said to have spoken the phrase, “ua mau ke ea o ka ʻāina i ka pono,” or “the life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness,” what would eventually become the state motto of Hawai‘i. During his reign, Kamehameha III would be influenced by British government and create a cabinet to legislate, replacing the chiefs formerly in the position into the House of Nobles, taken after the British House of Lords. Under a new constitution in 1852, the court system was integrated, no longer separating Hawaiians and foreigners, and the voting system was updated and formalized. After Kamehameha III’s death in 1854, Alexander Liholiho, his adopted nephew and grandson of Kamehameha I, succeeded as Kamehameha IV.

Kamehameha IV and his wife, Queen Emma built a hospital in order to help Native Hawaiians, as distance in the vast ocean “protected Pacific Island populations from deadly pathogens until the arrival of Europeans and Americans in the late eighteenth century” (Marshall, 2011, p. 34). Indeed, the Native Hawaiian population was
on a steady decline due to the lack of resistance to Western diseases such as influenza, tuberculosis, measles, and smallpox. Leprosy was prominent as well, with many Hawaiians being removed from their homes and placed in a leprosy colony on the island of Molokaʻi. The Queen’s Hospital was built in 1859 and still operates today as the largest private hospital in Hawai’i under the name of the Queen’s Medical Center (although still referred to colloquially under its former name). Concerned about the influence of American merchants both economically and politically, Kamehameha IV attempted to draft a treaty regulating commerce between the United States and Hawai’i. Upon his death in 1863, his brother Lot succeeded as Kamehameha V and would be the final ruler of the Kamehameha dynasty.

Kamehameha V reintroduced traditional Hawaiian customs with the creation of a Hawaiian Board of Medicine that allowed kahuna (priests) to practice traditional Hawaiian medicine and treatments. Due to increasing numbers of visitors to Hawai’i, Kamehameha V facilitated numerous building projects, including Aliʻiʻōlani Hale (currently used as the State Supreme Court), the Royal Mausoleum, as well as other buildings such as schools and additional government buildings. As his only heir apparent Crown Princess Victoria Kamāmalu (named after Kamehameha III’s favorite wife) predeceased him, he had no successors. He offered the throne to his cousin Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the future founder of Kamehameha Schools, but she refused. Through winning an election, his cousin William Lunalilo became the new king.

As Hawai’i fell into debt due to an economic depression, hindered further by the ambitious projects of Kamehameha V, Lunalilo sought to improve the Hawaiian sugar market within the United States, but there were concerns similar to those during
Kamehameha IV’s reign. Although Lunalilo spoke of Queen Dowager Emma succeeding him, he did not formally name an heir apparent. David Kalākaua was voted as the next ruler.

King Kalākaua travelled to countless countries in order to develop foreign relations as well as observe how other kingdoms reigned, setting up a “foreign policy designed to emphasize the status of Hawai‘i as a fully independent nation” (Schweizer, 1991, p. 108). He was also aware of the complaints from the Americans that owned sugar plantations and set up a reciprocity treaty in order to expedite the sugar trade with the United States.

Kalākaua was also known as the “Merrie Monarch” as he enjoyed and revitalized traditional Hawaiian arts and customs. He “established the policy of ho‘iulu i ka lāhui, to make the nation grow, and initiated a revival of the hula, the ‘life-blood of his people,’ as he called it” (Schweizer, 1991, p. 108), which was previously banned by Queen Ka‘ahumanu when she converted to Christianity. The Merrie Monarch festival is named after Kalākaua and is a yearly hula festival and competition that takes place in Hilo on the Big Island. He also wrote the future state song of Hawai‘i, Hawai‘i Pono‘i (also formerly known as the national anthem of the Republic of Hawai‘i).

During his term, he built a statue of Kamehameha I and constructed the new ‘Iolani Palace that still stands today. Many missionaries began to resent Kalākaua, blaming him for overspending as he had invested a fortune on ‘Iolani Palace, which included “telephones and electricity built into [‘Iolani]…before the White House had such technology (Laenui, 2010, p. 121). A group of people who wanted Hawai‘i to be annexed to the United States forced Kalākaua at gunpoint in 1887 to sign a new
constitution, known as the Bayonet Constitution. The new constitution stripped Kalākaua of most of his power and changed voting privileges to only allow people who owned more than $3000 worth of land and had an income greater than $600 a year to vote. “The intended and immediate result was that missionary descendants, whose parents had benefitted from the land division of 1848, captured the legislature” (Trask, 1993, p. 15) as the changes preventing a majority of Native Hawaiians from having voting rights. Kalākaua died in San Francisco in 1891 and since he and his wife Queen Kapi‘olani were childless, Kalākaua’s sister and heir apparent, Crown Princess Lydia Kamaka‘eha, inherited the throne as Queen Lili‘uokalani, the last monarch of Hawai‘i.

Overthrow, Annexation, and Statehood

“And while we sought by peaceful political means to maintain the dignity of the throne, and to advance national feeling among the native people, we never sought to rob any citizen, wherever born, of either property, franchise, or social standing...”

Queen Lili‘uokalani attempted to abolish the Bayonet Constitution by attempting to write a new constitution that would reinstate voting rights and reestablish power to the monarchy. In addition to stripping the monarchy of power and preventing Native Hawaiians from voting, the Bayonet Constitution allowed Americans and Europeans to keep their citizenship yet vote as Hawaiian citizens, run for office without relinquishing their original citizenship, and further prevented Asian immigrants from obtaining Hawaiian citizenship and voting rights. Those behind the Bayonet Constitution were a part of a secret society known as the Hawaiian League. On January 16, 1893, Charles B. Wilson, Marshal of the Kingdom, heard about the plans for a coup d’état and attempted

5 Ibid.
to issue warrants to arrest the members of the Hawaiian League, then operating as the Committee of Safety, led by Lorrin A. Thurston, grandson of the first wave of American missionaries Asa Thurston and Lorrin Andrews. Since the members of the Committee of Safety had ties with John L. Stevens, the United States Government Minister, the warrants were denied. Although Wilson had made an unsuccessful effort to negotiate with Thurston, he refused to surrender as he had “a sizeable enough force to regain control of the government building: 272 guards of the household, 500 or so royalist volunteers, and 30,000 rounds of ammunition” (Siler, 2012, p. 220-221) in order to defend Queen Lili‘uokalani.

The next day, a police officer was shot while preventing a wagon holding weapons meant for the Honolulu Rifles, a voluntary military group associated with the Committee of Safety. Worried it would result in the coup ending before it even began, Thurston and the rest of the Committee of Safety proceeded with the overthrow by setting up the Honolulu Rifles in Ali‘iōlani Hale, across from 'Iolani Palace while also appealing to the United States over their concerns that American residents may no longer be safe. Supported by John L. Stevens, U.S. Marines were dispatched from the USS Boston. As Queen Lili‘uokalani did not want to risk injury or death, she asked the Royal Guard to surrender but “Lili‘uokalani was never restored…imprisoned for some five months by the haole [foreign] planters after a failed effort by Hawaiians to re-establish their sovereignty” (Trask, 1993, p. 20). Hawai‘i was then placed into a Provincial Government led by Sanford B. Dole, backed by the Committee of Safety and the Honolulu Rifles.

Under the Provincial Government, the Kingdom of Hawai‘i became the Republic of Hawai‘i and moved forward with plans to be annexed into the United States. President
William McKinley signed the Newlands Resolution in 1898, officially changing the Republic of Hawai‘i to the Territory of Hawai‘i. Hawai‘i would then become the 50th official state in the United States on August 21, 1959. Hawaiians thus became Americans and “the term Hawaiian was redefined as a racial rather than a national term” (Laenui, 2010, p. 125).

Sovereignty

“It is enough that I am able to say, and with absolute authority, that the native people of Hawaii are entirely faithful to their own chiefs, and are deeply attached to their own customs and mode of government; that they either do not understand, or bitterly oppose, the scheme of annexation.”

Poka Laenui (2010) terms a “cultural rejuvenation” during the 1960s, influenced by the civil rights movement, prompting Hawaiians to focus on their identity, pride, and tradition. “The issue of Hawaiian sovereignty and self-determination was a natural outgrowth of the disenchantment with Hawaiian social and economic conditions” (p. 126) prompting Native Hawaiians to establish separate and independent groups in order to push for sovereignty, such as The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i, The Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry (ALOHA), Nation of Hawai‘i, and Ka Pakaukau. Trask (1993) writes, “even for the many residents of Hawai‘i, the conditions and status of Native Hawaiians are little known and intentionally obscured” (p. 24) and she hopes to lift the veil colonization has placed over the distinctive history, traditions, customs, as well as the presence and self-determination of Native Hawaiians.
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The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) was “born of a collective and compassionate effort on the part of the delegates to the state Constitutional Convention of 1978” (OHA, 2014). Created in order to protect and improve the welfare and safety of Native Hawaiians, OHA consists of a Board of Trustees comprising nine elected members. Unlike Aboriginal groups in Australia and New Zealand “OHA is composed of trustees who are directly elected by the Indigenous people…they answer to no one but their Hawaiian constituents” (Laenui, 2010, p. 127). In order to assist Native Hawaiians, OHA provides scholarships to attend university, facilitates loans in order for Hawaiians to create businesses, purchase homes, pay debts, and be able to further their education. In their strategic plan, OHA also outlines six aspects to improve the lives of Native Hawaiians: ‘āina (land), culture, economic self-sufficiency, education, governance, and health (OHA 2013b).

OHA explains that as the 13th largest landowner in Hawai‘i with 27,000 acres, they use ‘āina in order to maintain and protect cultural and agricultural activities that are rooted in traditional Hawaiian values. OHA also preserves Hawaiian culture by creating opportunities for Native Hawaiians to learn and appreciate traditional Hawaiian customs. Economic self-sufficiency, also known as the Ho’okahua Waiwai initiative, involves the ability for Native Hawaiians to purchase property for homes and businesses in order for economic stability and viability. OHA also stresses the importance of education with a desire to increase the number of Native Hawaiian children graduating from high school and continuing education at the post-secondary level, as well as focusing on exceeding testing standards from elementary through middle school. OHA’s governance initiative “facilitate[s] a process that would give Hawaiians the opportunity to create a governing
entity that would define Native Hawaiians as a political rather than racial group” (OHA 2013b). Lastly, OHA’s research determined 75% of Native Hawaiians were at risk of obesity, initiating OHA’s efforts in reducing the obesity rate and health concerns through promoting nutrition and physical activity among Native Hawaiians.

One of the most prominent sovereignty groups is Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi, founded by the Trask sisters: Mililani, an attorney and former OHA trustee member, and Haunani, a former Hawaiian Studies professor through the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawaiʻi-Mānoa. Ka Lāhui’s efforts focus on sovereign recognition from the United States, land control and development, restitution, and decolonization. Trask (1993) describes Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi, founded in 1987, as “currently the only organization whose structure, constitution, and political agenda approximate the ‘nation-within-a-nation’ model…an alternative to the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) and its nonrepresentative structure as an agency of the State of Hawaiʻi” (p. 48). Trask writes that many Hawaiians do not consider OHA a viable means of support, most likely because of scandals, funding that goes back into the administration itself rather than supporting Hawaiians, or some trustees mismanaging funds, perhaps for their own personal use. To Trask, the large membership increases of Ka Lāhui Hawaiʻi as an alternative to OHA suggest that Hawaiians prefer self-government rather than compensations or restitutions. Trask notes that “without funding, office, or paid staff, Ka Lāhui had increased its membership…defeat[ing] OHA in community organizing, and most critically, in how the issue of sovereignty was framed, presented, and publicly debated” (p. 102).
Laenui (2010) echoes Trask’s disappointment in OHA, as it is “still seen as an organization of limited scope, unable to grasp the full sense of decolonization, since its very existence is dependent on the colonial constitutional regime in Hawai‘i” (p. 127). Laenui also notes that OHA’s motivator is solely race, thus not able to focus on all possible citizens of Hawai‘i, and OHA’s belief that Native Hawaiians should be a tribal nation equivalent to Aboriginal nations in the continental United States.

Marshall (2011) writes, “Native Hawaiians have a long history of resistance to the imposition of Western systems of being and knowing” (p. 170) through revitalizing ʻōlelo Hawai‘i (the Hawaiian language) and the use of Hawaiian names, reclaiming traditional Hawaiian tradition through education and the arts, and with the creation of sovereignty groups.

**Kamehameha Schools**

*But for the Hawaiian people, for the forty thousand of my own race and blood...it is for them that I would give the last drop of my blood; it is for them that I would spend, nay, am spending, everything belonging to me. Will it be in vain?* 

Bernice Pauahi Bishop was born Pauahi Pākī in 1831 and was the great-granddaughter of Kamehameha the Great. At the time of her birth, the Native Hawaiian population was 124,000 and drastically fell while she wrote her will in 1883. Through her cousin, Princess Ruth Keʻelikōlani, Pauahi Bishop inherited enough land to make her the largest landholder in Hawai‘i. Hawaiian culture, tradition, history, and even its population was diminishing over time, prompting Bishop’s desire to preserve it. Through
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her will and codicils, Pauahi Bishop bequeathed a trust in order to “to erect and maintain in the Hawaiian Islands two schools, each for boarding and day scholars, one for boys and one for girls, to be known as, and called the Kamehameha Schools” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015h). Her husband, Charles Reed Bishop, was one of five trustees managing her will. Although land-rich, Pauahi Bishop’s will did not have the funds for construction, so Bishop contributed the funding necessary to create the Preparatory Department facilities in 1888, Bishop Hall in 1891, the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Memorial Chapel in 1897, and the Bishop Museum in 1889 (Kamehameha Schools, 2015c).

In 1887, Kamehameha School for Boys opened, while the school for girls opened seven years later in 1894. Eventually, the schools were moved to its current site in Kapālama Heights, Honolulu. In 1996, the Schools opened a location on Maui, as well as a campus on the Big Island in 2001. Kamehameha Schools states, “the princess knew that education would be key to the survival of her people, so in an enduring act of aloha, she left them a precious gift upon her passing – 375,000 acres of ancestral land” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015a). Pauahi’s contribution allowed Kamehameha Schools to become the largest landowner in Hawai‘i, the majority of it being used for agricultural conservation and the three campuses as well as a smaller portion of it used for commercial properties. Today, the Schools service nearly 7,000 students from kindergarten through grade 12 in addition to operating a variety of preschools and supporting public schools through aiding charter schools and literacy enhancement.

In the mission and vision statement, Kamehameha Schools seeks to “fulfill Pauahi’s desire to create educational opportunities in perpetuity to improve the capability and well-being of people of Hawaiian ancestry” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015g) through
both Christian and Hawaiian standards. As Pauahi Bishop herself was Protestant, she requested “the teachers of said schools shall forever be persons of the Protestant religion” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015h). This decision was brought to a lawsuit in 1991 by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), stating the request violated the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as it was religious discrimination. In order to fulfill Pauahi Bishop’s request, Kamehameha Schools bid a request for an applicable exemption to the Civil Rights Act. The United States District Court for the District of Hawai’i initially granted the request, but the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit overturned the judgment, stating the Schools were not principally a religious institution.

In her will, Pauahi Bishop also requested trustees “support and education of orphans, and others in indigent circumstances, giving the preference to Hawaiians of pure or part aboriginal blood” (Kamehameha Schools, 2015h). As Kamehameha Schools is a private school, admission is based on application, thus allowing the Schools to be selective with admittance. More students with Native Hawaiian ancestry apply than the Schools can admit, therefore it is not likely a non-Hawaiian student would receive an offer for admission. In 2002, Kamehameha Schools Maui accepted a non-Hawaiian student named Kalani Rosell after all qualified Native Hawaiian applicants had been accepted. Although non-Hawaiians have attended the schools in the 1920s, 1950s, and 1960s, Rosell’s admission sparked controversy at an open forum. In a 2002 article in the Star Bulletin, many Native Hawaiians called for trustees’ resignations and changes in the admission policy. Lilikalā Kame’eleihiwa, director and professor at the University of Hawai’i-Mānoa, was quoted as saying, "I haven't been able to sleep for days, I've been angry, so, so very angry…we've got a big problem, and we've got to find a solution"
A former trustee, Oswald Stender, requested the cancellation of Rosell’s admittance, but retracted the request to avoid a potential lawsuit. Stender commented on how Rosell’s admittance was unfair for Native Hawaiian children, suggesting children would think they were not good enough for admission. Jonathan Osorio, who was an assistant professor at UH Mānoa at the time, stated "whether it was a mistake or a plan…they should resign” (Antone, 2002).

Following Rosell’s admission, a petition was created by an attorney named Patrick Wong and co-authored by Dr. Maile Jachowski in order to create changes in the admission policy of Kamehameha Schools. Dr. Jachowski, a 1977 graduate of Kamehameha Schools, explained, "we're not asking them to admit all Hawaiians or provide for all Hawaiians…what we're asking for is to have (more) Hawaiians considered for admission" (Daysog, 2002). As a result of the backlash, Kamehameha Schools’ estate apologized to Native Hawaiians and assured an improvement in recruiting Native Hawaiian students and review criterion for admission. However, the estate also decided they would not reconsider Rosell’s acceptance as it was final.

In 2003, a student named Brayden Mohica-Cummings was admitted to Kamehameha Schools. His mother, Kalena Santos, was the hānai (adopted) daughter of a Hawaiian family, and stated Mohica-Cummings was Hawaiian. Because Santos could not prove her son’s Hawaiian ancestry, the Schools withdrew his offer of admission, resulting in a lawsuit by Santos and Mohica-Cummings in August of 2003. However, since the offer was withdrawn a week before the start of school, the court upheld admission for the child’s best interest. This case took an interest in hānai (adoptions), and District Judge David Ezra used a Supreme Court decision from 1958 regarding “kingdom law” and in
terms of hānai relationships. In ancient Hawai‘i, there were often informal adoptions and in this case, Ezra highlighted hānai relationships as sacred bonds and emphasized, “this was the law of Hawai‘i at the time Bernice Pauahi Bishop made her will…she was a brilliant woman [and] understood the law” (Viotti & Gordon, 2003).

Pat Namaka Bacon, born in 1920, is the hānai, or adopted, daughter of Mary Kawena Pukui, a Native Hawaiian scholar. Following in her mother’s footsteps, Bacon had been working in the Bishop Museum translating and transcribing Hawaiian oral histories as well as sharing her knowledge of Hawaiian language and hula. Although an expert in Hawaiian language, history, and culture, Bacon herself was not admitted to Kamehameha Schools. Pukui had requested her daughter be admitted, but was told there was preference for blood rather than hānai relationships. Bacon stated, “I think that people want to break Pauahi's will…we have a lot of Hawaiian children who need an education, and you can't let everyone in” (Viotti & Gordon, 2003). Frank Kawaikapuokalani Hewett, a kumu hula (teacher of hula), described hānai relationships as equal to blood and questioned, “if Hawaiians are not honoring our traditions, then are we Hawaiians?” (Viotti & Gordon). Conversely, Hawaiian sovereignty activist and graduate from Kamehameha Schools Kekuni Blaisdell spoke of his blood daughter attending Kamehameha Schools, but not his hānai Japanese-born son out of respect for the admission standards. Blaisdell explained that as Mohica-Cummings’ mother was the hānai daughter of a Hawaiian family, the claim did not extend to her son. However, Blaisell said Mohica-Cummings should attend out of fairness because admission had already been extended. Realizing this was a special circumstance, Blaisdell was surprised at the response and said, "I thought it was a very special case but I'm not going to march
Kamehameha Schools allowed Mohica-Cummings to be a student in exchange of Santos dropping her lawsuit, with both parties settling out of court in November 2003.

In June of 2003, a lawsuit was filed on behalf of a John Doe, a non-Hawaiian unidentified student, arguing against the admissions policy as he was not offered admission. Losch (2007) outlines five arguments in favor of the admissions policy having a preference of admitting Native Hawaiian students. First, Kamehameha Schools is a private school, thus it does not receive federal funding. Second, the admissions policy was created in order for Native Hawaiian children to receive education as a result of socioeconomic imbalances resulting from Western contact and colonization. Third, the Schools was founded prior to annexation and established in order to preserve Native Hawaiian culture and history. Fourth, the United States admitted fault in historical wrongdoings and attempted to provide various forms of restitution and compensation to Native Hawaiians. Finally, graduates from Kamehameha Schools have become successful and, in turn, provided support and assistance to the Native Hawaiian community. That November, District Judge Alan Cooke Kay dismissed the lawsuit, “[upholding] the Kamehameha Schools’ century-old admission policy, saying the ‘race-conscious’ policy has the legitimate purpose of addressing economic woes and past injustices suffered by Hawaiians” (Daysog & Barayuga, 2003). However, in August 2005, the dismissal was reversed by a three-judge panel and then re-reversed in December 2006 by a 15-judge en banc panel in favor of Kay’s original ruling. Attorneys on behalf of John Doe attempted to take the case to the United States Supreme Court, but Kamehameha Schools decided to settle. Attorneys announced the settlement was for $7
million USD, which led to another lawsuit from Kamehameha Schools for releasing the settlement amount. In response, the attorneys filed another lawsuit against Kamehameha Schools on behalf of four more non-Hawaiian students seeking acceptance.

**Heterotopology of Kamehameha Schools**

Although Hawai’i has a distinctive culture and contested history, Foucault (1994) explains that within every society, there are heterotopias: real emplacements that are “represented, contested, and reversed, sorts of places that are outside all places, although they are actually localizable” (p. 178). Although Foucault insists heterotopias are a constant within cultures, they are not universal as they take on diverse and relational forms.

The structure and operation of a heterotopia can transform over time, which Foucault explains by using the example of a cemetery in order to describe how the function of spaces change. Until the end of the 18th century, cemeteries were known as a sacred space, built next to churches and were considered the heart of the town. However, when communities began to fear that death could bring disease to the living, people no longer wished to have cemeteries within close proximity to the center of town. Thus, cemeteries began to be built on the edges of towns, “no longer constitut[ing] the sacred and immortal wind of the city, but the ‘other city’ where each family possessed its dark dwelling” (p. 181). This change of the function of space applies to Hawai’i as well, as it was formerly a space of Native Hawaiians, a caste system, no land ownership, and polytheism. Hawai’i has now developed into a fusion of cultural diversity, is less Hawaiian and more American, and is a goldmine for prime real estate. Hawai’i,
Heterotopias also have the “ability to juxtapose in a single real space several emplacements that are incompatible in themselves” (p. 181). Foucault uses theatres and cinemas as examples of juxtaposition heterotopia. Stages in theatre performances are always changing, incorporating multiple places within that singular space while at cinemas, the two-dimensional screen displays the three-dimensional films projected onto it. Kamehameha Schools itself is a juxtaposition heterotopia, consisting of multiple and conflicting histories, cultures, languages, and theologies. Kamehameha Schools is a place for Native Hawaiian children to (re)learn and (re)claim Native Hawaiian culture. However, Kamehameha Schools is structured as an American private school and thus follows an American college-preparatory curriculum with honors and advanced placement courses.

According to the Catalog of Courses 2014-2015 for high school on the Kapālama (Honolulu) campus, graduation requirements are as follows: four credits of English; one credit in Speech; three credits in Mathematics, three credits in Science, half a credit in Hawaiian Culture; one credit of World History; one credit in U.S. History; half a credit in Hawaiian History; half a credit in Economics; two credits in Language that must be the same language for each credit; half a credit in Performing Arts; one and a half credits in Physical Education; half a credit in Health; and half a credit in Visual Arts. In addition, students must have non-credit requirements: Christian Education; Guidance; Hawaiian Language Proficiency; Keyboarding/Word Processing; Aerobics
Maintenance/Proficiency; Swimming Proficiency; School Service; Senior Service Project; and Special Events (including the Annual Song Contest).

The Language component does not specify which language students must take and the Kapālama campus offers Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, and Japanese in addition to Hawaiian for the language requirement. Additionally, the Kapālama campus offers an introductory conversational French course as an option for an elective course. However, all students starting with the class of 2017 must pass a Hawaiian language proficiency test in order to graduate. As this requirement begins with the class of 2017, it is unknown whether or not any sort of Hawaiian language proficiency was previously required. The Catalog of Courses states:

All Kamehameha students, beginning with the class of 2017, must demonstrate a level of Hawaiian language proficiency equivalent to that which could be acquired in the High School’s Hawaiian I Language course. Passing this proficiency is required of all students from the class of 2017 and beyond regardless if they have had prior Hawaiian Language study before entering the High School. Those entering the High School without prior Hawaiian Language study will need to take Hawaiian I in order to prepare for the proficiency (Kamehameha Schools Kapālama High School, 2015, p. 11).

Native Hawaiian religion was polytheistic consisting of the akua, or the four main deities: Kāne, the creation god; Kū, god of war; Lono, god of fertility, music, and rainfall; and Kanaloa, mainly associated with and complimentary to Kāne, but is sometimes depicted as the god of the underworld. There are also kupua, lesser deities that are each associated with various professions, or ‘aumakua, family gods that were mostly manifested as animals but could also be manifested in nature (places, rocks, or trees) or as people (deified ancestors). However, Kamehameha Schools, like its founder Bernice Pauahi Bishop, is rooted in the Protestant faith. Christian Education is a non-credit requirement at Kamehameha Schools and students at the Kapālama campus partake in the
‘Ekalesia Christian Education Program, described in the Catalog of Courses 2014-2015 as “acknowledging that spiritual growth is paramount to life’s experiences, Christian Education equips our Kamehameha Schools ‘ohana [family] to begin in Christ, to grow in Christ, to mature in Christ and to minister to others through Christ” (Kamehameha Schools Kapālama High School, 2015, p. 8). The ‘Ekalesia Christian Education Program includes Christian Education courses in all four years of high school. In addition to the courses, students must also attend ‘Ekalesia Devotions, forty-minute services that include Bible readings and prayers once every other week.

In this juxtaposition heterotopia, Native Hawaiian students are enveloped in an American and Anglophone curriculum, rather than a purely Native Hawaiian and Hawaiian-speaking prospectus. Additionally, rather than learning and embracing the Native Hawaiian mythology and religious practices, students are immersed in and practice the Christian faith. Kamehameha Schools contests the space as Hawai‘i, for Native Hawaiians students rather than an American institution within the United States. However, the Schools also re-contests the uniquely Hawaiian space as an American one, as an American private high school that prepares students to further their studies in the American university system.

Foucault also uses the analogy of a garden in order to describe juxtaposition heterotopias, as a garden can hold numerous types of plants that grown in a variety of places within a single space. Kamehameha Schools is similar to a garden that is “the smallest parcel of the world and the whole world at the same time” (p. 182). Although established for Native Hawaiian children, most Native Hawaiians in Hawai‘i are ethnically diverse. In Hawai‘i, the word *hapa* refers to people who have mixed
ethnicities. Terms like hapa kanaka, part Hawaiian, and hapa haole, part white, exist as Hawaiian Creole English, more commonly known as Hawaiian Pidgin English, a dialect used in everyday conversation by many people living in Hawai‘i. It is common to meet a person in Hawaii with varying ethnicities. For example, I can remember a commercial for the public library in the mid-1990s that featured multiple hapa kanana children describing themselves as Hawaiian-Chinese, Hawaiian-Filipino, Hawaiian-African, etc. before proclaiming, “We are Hawaiian! Use your library!” Due to the multiculturalism in Hawai‘i, students are rarely singularly Hawaiian, but mixed with other ethnicities. Students at Kamehameha Schools will look ethnically diverse and embrace varying histories, cultures, and traditions in addition to being Native Hawaiian. Similar to Foucault’s description to the garden, students at Kamehameha Schools comprise a microcosm that, at the same time, is a small part of the world yet the whole world as well.

Another type of heterotopia are heterochronias, or heterotopias that are connected with temporal discontinuities. One type of heterochronia consist of museums and libraries which continually accumulates, “constituting a sort of general archive… the idea of constituting a place of all times that is itself outside time and protected from its erosion, the project of thus organizing a kind of perpetual and indefinite accumulation of time in a place that will not move” (Foucault, 1994, p. 182). The other type of heterochronia are linked to certain aspects of time, rather than an archival type that accumulates indefinitely. Foucault describes these as fairs that are set up in regular intervals with booths that display curiosities, such as those that would be on display at a circus. Interestingly, Foucault notes a tourist display of a Polynesian village as an example of heterochronia and writes, “rediscovering Polynesian life one abolishes time, but time is
also regained, the whole history of humanity goes back to its source as if in a kind of grand immediate knowledge” (p. 183). The Annual Song Contest that Kamehameha Schools displays is an example of a heterochronia as it is an event rooted in tradition, replicating itself every year as it follows the same format and premise, presenting the same awards, presumably using similar songs from prior contests, the creation of friendly rivalries between each graduating class, and celebrating the roots of Kamehameha Schools’ history and Native Hawaiian culture.

*One Voice: Annual Song Contest*

In 1921, students from the Kamehameha School for Boys held a singing contest, with the prize being the George Alanson Andrus trophy in honor and memory of Andrus, a former director of music at the school. The School for Girls decided to hold one the next year, and it has been tradition every year since. The initial format of the song contest consisted of “two Hawaiian songs, a choice song which the class selects and the prize song selected by the music department of the school” (The Kamehameha Schools Archives), all led by a student director chosen by each class. The annual song contest eventually combined boys and girls and has been held at the Neil Blaisdell Center since 1964. Additionally, *Hōʻike*, or the combination of *mele* and *hula* began to be included as “a highlight of the evening…a show to entertain and inform the audience while the judges’ score sheets are tallied” (Kamehameha Schools, 2014, p. 19).

Today, there are six awards: Outstanding Student Director, known as the Louise Aʻoe McGregor Award; ‘Ōlelo MakuaHine Award, known as the Richard Lyman, Jr. Trophy; Kamehameha Schools Boys' Award, known as the George Alanson Andrus Cup;
Kamehameha Schools Girls’ Award, known as the New England Mothers’ Cup; Best Musical Performance Helen Desha Beamer Award; and the Kamehameha Schools Combined Class Award, known as the Charles E. King Cup (Kamehameha Schools, 2014, p. 17).

The Louise A’oe McGregor Award is named after McGregor, who was in the first graduating class of the Kamehameha School for Girls in 1897, and is presented to the student director who best demonstrates leadership. The Richard Lyman, Jr. Trophy is named after Lyman, Jr., a former trustee to the Schools, and is awarded to the class best exemplifying the use of the Hawaiian language in song. The George Alanson Andrus Cup recognizes the best class in the Boys’ category while the New England Mothers’ Cup is given to the best in the Girls’ category. The New England Mothers’ Cup was donated by Mrs. E. G. Scoville, a visitor to Hawai‘i from Connecticut who heard and adored a 1922 performance by the School for Girls. The Helen Desha Beamer Award is named after Beamer, a 1900 graduate of the Schools and accomplished Hawaiian language musician and composer. It is presented to the class displaying the best musical performance and is donated by the Kamehameha Schools Alumni Association. Finally, the Charles E. King Cup is named after King, who graduated from the School for Boys in 1891, and recognizes the best performance in the co-ed competition.

Although Foucault describes the two types of heterochronia as opposites of each other, Kamehameha Schools and its Annual Song Contest represent both types of heterochronia and are situated in the other. As described, the Annual Song Contest is the type of heterochronia linked “to time in its most futile, most transitory and precarious aspect, and in the form of the festival” (p. 182) that is positioned within Kamehameha
Schools itself as an archival heterochronia that accumulates indefinitely. Kamehameha Schools, similar to a library or museum, seeks to contain Native Hawaiian culture, language, and traditions within itself. The archiving of the Annual Song Contests are performed through the contests themselves as it recalls and recollects historical references, which are further incorporated into future contests.

_One Voice_, directed by Lisette Marie Flanary and produced by Heather Haunani Giugni and Ruth Bolan, is a PBS documentary that focuses on Kamehameha Schools’ Annual Song Contest. The documentary shows how each graduating class votes for a fellow class member to represent them as the student song director and then follows the students and song director as they prepare for the Annual Song contest and shows “Hawaiian culture as it has survived, flourished, and grown through the universal power of music and song” (PBS).

The competition featured in _One Voice_ was the 88th annual song contest, which was held on March 12, 2008. The theme of the competition that year was celebrating the revitalization of the Hawaiian language and was titled _Ola Ka ʻŌlelo ʻŌiwi O Ka ʻĀina_, “the native language of the land lives” and attributes the revival of the Hawaiian language to Hawaiian immersgence schools, the ability to learn the Hawaiian language at institutions such as Kamehameha Schools and the Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian language at the University of Hawaiʻi-Mānoa, as well as online resources such as websites archiving Hawaiian-language newspapers or online dictionaries. The program emphasizes that “Hawaiian has the most developed computer system of any indigenous language in the world. Every Apple computer ships with a Hawaiian language keyboard setting” (Kamehameha Schools, 2008, p.2).
Student directors, as well as their teachers, expressed that although the basis of the annual song contest is a competition, it is more than the spectacle of a televised broadcast. The president and headmaster of the Kapālama campus, Dr. Michael Chun, reflected on his experience growing up as a student in Hawai‘i, prior to the resurgence of Hawaiian language and culture in the 1970’s. He explained that education was more Western-oriented and solely focused on learning American history rather than the Hawaiian language, history, and culture. Although he learned Hawaiian songs and sung in the Hawaiian language, he did not have an opportunity to learn what the lyrics he sang actually meant. Les Caballos, the choral music director and arranger, stated there is more to singing the Hawaiian words in the song. While helping students in the song contest, he explained that his purpose is to understand the Hawaiian words they are singing and to realize the beauty and expression from their use of the Hawaiian language. Ka’ai, the grade 10 director, explains that the song contest is less about being in front of the camera but is an opportunity to show people the Hawaiian culture and language. Sienna, the grade 11 director, states that “even though the songs in song contest are Western-style, the poetry that we sing are from the generations before us” (Giugni, Bolan, & Flanary, 2010).

Hawaiian songs have multiple layers of meaning throughout the lyrics. Ka’ai mentions although the songs at the surface sound like they are describing how pretty flowers are or how beautiful a landscape is. Due the songs being more like stories, there are deeper meanings and variation in how the songs are interpreted. Extending beyond the surface-level meanings, songs are a method of internal communication. For example, the grade 10 co-ed director Zachary talks about how the songs also represent coded...
political communication due to the ban on speaking the Hawaiian language. Hawaiians still had songs and chants, which they were able to publish in the newspaper and were thus able to communicate with others. Max, song director for the grade 10 boys, explains that during the time of the overthrow and annexation, Hawaiians could express their emotions through mele. He explains that “at the time, [Hawaiians] didn’t have guns, they didn’t really have anything to fight back. The only weapons they had [were] the words and through the mele that they wrote” (Giugni, Bolan, & Flanary, 2010).

Ka’ai, the grade 10 girls’ director, has family originating from Moloka’i, across the Kaiwi Channel east of O’ahu. She questions how she would be able to direct the girls on what to sing if she didn’t even know what they would be singing about, especially as the grade 10 girls’ song is titled Aloha Ko’olau, which was written by Dennis Kamakahi and is about the Ko’olau Mountains on Moloka’i. She describes that area of Moloka’i as untouched since there are no buildings and the landscape is still lush and green. Ka’ai performs a chant she wrote herself to her ancestors, which translates to, “here I am, I am searching for knowledge. And here I am, asking with a humble voice, please let us in.” One of the members, leading a chant welcoming her to the area, tells an emotional Ka’ai, “these are your ancestors, only [they] will understand your needs…call upon our ancestors, ask them, ‘Kūpuna kahiko, kōkua.’ And they will help you. Welcome, e komo mai” (Giugni, Bolan, & Flanary, 2010). The chants on Moloka’i are examples of heterotopia that uses a system of opening and closing. Ka’ai is formally welcomed to Moloka’i after performing the chant for her ancestors in her homeland and example of how “postmemories emerge and produce place” (Davidson, 2011, p. 45).
Place Names

Heterotopias also have “a system of opening and closing that isolates them and makes them penetrable at the same time” (p. 183). Foucault describes prisons and barracks as an example of places that will “open” through sentence or service. There are other places that have permissive access through rituals or purifications, such as Muslim baths, whereupon individuals must partake in religious and hygienic gestures in order to enter. There are also openings that actually disguise “closings” and exclusions. Foucault describes the rooms in houses used by travelers in Brazilian farmland. The room was easily accessed by travelers needing a place to stay, yet that entrance did not allow access to the rest of the house, creating a distinction between being a guest and being an invited guest.

Kamehameha Schools also have a system of opening and closing that is inclusive yet exclusive. Due to the preference for Native Hawaiian students, applicants must verify their Hawaiian ancestry through the Schools’ Hoʻoulu Hawaiian Data Center. This simultaneously allows access for students with Hawaiian ancestry to attend Kamehameha Schools and restricts access for students without Hawaiian ancestry, especially given that not all Native Hawaiian students who apply are accepted. However, albeit very small, an opening still exists for non-Hawaiian students being accepted as students because Hawaiian ancestry is simply a preference, as in the case of Kalani Rosell. Kamehameha Schools’ preference policy is an interesting example of a heterotopia that displays permissive openings via performing certain gestures (verifying Hawaiian ancestry through data center registration) yet is also an “opening” that works to conceal exclusions (allowing non-Hawaiian students to apply in the first place).
Foucault ends with how the heterotopias function within space, as “either the heterotopias have the role of creating a space of illusion that denounces all real space…or, on the contrary, creating a different space, a different real space as perfect” (p. 184). He uses Puritan colonies established by the English when they began to colonize the United States and Jesuit colonies in South America and how Christianity influenced the production and organization of space as well a schedule. He notes how bells signaled the start of work for everyone within the colony and how meals were set at specific times. He also explains that ships are “a placeless place, that lives by its own devices, that is self-enclosed, and, at the same time, delivered over to the boundless expanse of the ocean…the heterotopia par excellence” (p. 185).

Most educational institutions follow the convention that uses bells as a signal of structure, movement, and organization. I consider Kamehameha Schools similar to the ship as a placeless place as it also lives by its own devices and is self-enclosed. It is a part of, yet apart from, the space it occupies and is surrounded by. It seeks to reinstate and reclaim the Hawai‘i of the past by teaching and promoting Hawaiian history, culture, and language. At the same time, the space operates as an American school within the United States. Similar to the rest of O‘ahu, many buildings and street names of the Kapālama campus are in Hawaiian. Unlike the rest of O‘ahu, the campus map of the Kapālama campus states the bus drop off and pick up as Kūna Ka‘a, which translates to “vehicle stopping place” from Hawaiian. Likewise, the Grounds Facility is called Hale Mālama Kahua, which translates to “Ground Caring Facility” and the Operations Physical Plant Building is Hale Kahua Ola, which translates to “House of the Living Foundation” from Hawaiian. Buildings themselves are memorials, often named after important people in
Hawaiian history, such as the high school administration building named *Ke Ali‘i Bernice Pauahi Bishop* or the high school library and media center as *Keku‘iapoiwa*, the mother of Kamehameha.

Most street names reflect Hawaiian plants and animals, such as the ‘ōhi’a lehua, the state flower of the Big Island. It is a type of evergreen tree with the scientific name *Metrosideros polymorpha* and has the ability to easily grow over new lava flow. The volcano goddess Pele is said to have fallen in love with a man named ʻŌhi’a, but was turned down because he had already fallen in love with a woman named Lehua. The spurned Pele changed ʻŌhi’a into a tree in an act of vengeance, much to the dismay of a distraught Lehua. Unable to change ʻŌhi’a back, a regretful Pele changed Lehua into a flower in order to adorn her former lover. According to legend, it will begin to rain when a flower is plucked from the tree, embodying the tears that will shed from the lovers being separated.

Street names in Kamehameha Schools are also named with a symbolic purpose, such as Na‘auao Road. The main road through the Kapālama campus is named as such because *na‘auao* means wisdom and knowledge in Hawaiian. This suggests students enter Kamehameha Schools to “embrace the quest for knowledge and wisdom upon arrival…a reminder that their education is a gift from Ke Ali‘i Pauahi and that they should be grateful” (Kamehameha Schools Hawai‘i, Campus Map, 2014). Likewise, Lanakila Road between the stadium and swimming pool on the Kapālama campus is named to motivate Kamehameha student athletes due to *lanakila* meaning victory and triumph in Hawaiian.
Although many street names and buildings outside of the Kapālama campus are in Hawaiian, many are colloquially referred to with a generic or Anglophone name. Bus stops are simply called bus stops while places like Ala Moana ("path to the sea"), the large shopping center in Honolulu, is referred to as “Alaz” (pronounced ah-lahz). In fact, Kamehameha Schools itself is often known colloquially as “Kam” or “Kam Schools” to many Hawaiian residents.

Katrina-Ann Oliveira (2009), a professor at within the Kawaihuelani Center for Hawaiian Language at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa, explains that Hawaiians maintained a close relationship with the land, so much so that it was considered an older sibling to Native Hawaiians. She entwines the geography of Hawai‘i to Native Hawaiian history through their production of space and how the naming of places evoke meaning and significance. Place names are tied to how Native Hawaiians narrate their identity as “the study of place provides an opportunity to interpret the sentiment and spiritual attachment of people to their claimed place. In spite of their absence, through their words, we learn about their lifestyles, traditions, customs and values” (p. 102). Oliveira explains that place names have an important history as well as the place itself. She considers a genealogical aspect through tracing the various names of a certain space.

While cartographers created maps that marked a certain moment in time, Hawaiians created oral maps that were extremely detailed and noted who lived in what area, where taro gardens were located, and the history and stories behind how places were named. Hawaiian maps were constantly changing or being updated as necessary. Many places are named in order to memorialize important events while others described physical features of that particular place.
Hawaiians are thus able to recollect the history and story of various places, as well as of those nearby. Oliveira, citing Davis et al. (1990), explains that “place names serve as ‘survey pegs’ that trigger the memory and recall the events, history and traditions of a place” (p. 105) recording and remembering history through oral traditions for future generations, connecting themselves to their history as well as giving meaning to space. Oliveira stresses the importance of knowing Hawaiian language, history, and culture as she considers that knowledge as the key in forming a Hawaiian identity. She writes, “by naming a place we are able to claim a space; by living in a place, we are able to humanize a place” (p. 107) and this process is able to provide familiarity with the people who created the meaning behind the events that lead to how places are named.

The English and colloquial names in Hawai‘i are examples of Western influence. Certain places have been renamed to honor non-Hawaiian people, what Oliveira explains is an appropriation of space due to the effects of colonization. An example is Barber’s Point Naval Air Station, named by Captain Henry Barber. Although named Kalaeloa, the United States Navy renamed the place Barber’s Point. Another place is Wailupe, or “kite water” in Hawaiian due to the location being a space for kite flying. A dairy owner named Robert Hind renamed the area ‘Āina Haina, or “Hind’s land” by “Hawaiianizing” his name. Oliveira also explains the importance of using the Hawaiian language in order to reclaim history, place, and identity. Through the use of Hawaiian language, history is understood, culture is recovered, and place names are given meaning. She writes, “language is power; place names link us to the past. Without our place names we lose our identity. We lose our symbols, our ‘survey pegs’ to the past, and our means to legitimize our existence and hegemony in Hawai‘i” (p. 111).
Douglas Herman (2009) explains that the use of Western names on the Hawaiian landscape in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i was an attempt to transform Hawai‘i into a Western space. The use of Western names “served as one additional means by which the resident foreigners asserted their control over a territory not their own, but of which they desperately sought to gain control” (p. 116). After annexation, the use of Western names imposed a sense of authority through establishing “official” names of various places.

Herman describes an account of Hawaiians written by T. Blake Clark, in which Clark explained how Hawaiians were reckless, destroying newly built fences and buildings. Herman elaborates on the “cartoonish” description of Hawaiians, with Clark’s account attempting to “[reinforce] the idea that Honolulu was built by and for Westerners, who constitute the progressive, productive members of society—in fact, who are the society” (p. 118). The gentrification project that turned simple housing and trails into an urban center with organized roads with a system of streets brought Hawai‘i into the Western world. It was decided that it would only make sense for non-Hawaiian street names in the United States as they sounded too similar or were too challenging to pronounce, thus Clark’s insistence that “Hawai‘i is a place for English-speaking Americans, and that it is they who should encode this landscape” (p. 119).

After annexation, the Hawaiian language dwindled as schools taught in English and thus, the use of the Hawaiian language signaled a person as uneducated. By the 1980s, there were only an estimated 2000 people who could speak the language. The loss of the Hawaiian language not only tarnished the relationships between Hawaiians and the land, but also the cultural and social aspects of Hawaiians because the English language “does not have the sensitivity to the subtleties of light and colour, wind and rain, and
emotive landscape that these islands present” (p. 124). In 1966, Mary Kawena Pukui and Samuel H. Elbert wrote *Place Names of Hawai‘i*, which covers Hawaiian place names, their meanings, and influence by Hawaiian culture. This influenced other books, such as Budnick and Wise’s (1989) *Honolulu Street Names*, which does not include non-Hawaiian names. Herman considers this re-conquest rather than anti-conquest as “its elimination of Western street names from consideration or even mention...is part of the reclaiming of meaning engaged in the reclaiming of Hawaiian identity and land from the colonial past and present” (p. 125).

Similar to Oliveira writing that the revival of Hawaiian language is necessary to understand history, culture, identity, and place, Herman describes a modern Hawaiian proverb: *O ka ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i ka wehi o ka ‘āina*, or “Hawaiian language is the adornment of the land” (p. 128). Although Hawaiian language and culture dwindled after the movement of Hawai‘i, the Kingdom, to Hawai‘i, the 50th state, Herman considers the resurgence of the Hawaiian language as re-conquest. He writes, “place names...are again becoming an intelligible vocabulary from which Hawaiian environmental discourse may re-emerge: a re-conquest, the adornment of the land” (p. 129).

Tonya K. Davidson (2011) describes object survivors and memory texts as essential to postmemory. Object survivors “in their material tangibility stand in for both the unrepresentability of the trauma and the human loss” (p. 51) and exist due to the need to construct memory to certain items. Davidson describes object survivors as what is hurriedly packed in the face of exile in order to remember the sense of home. Object survivors “allow some physical, literal connection while reconfirming distance” (p. 52) as holding the object makes one feel nostalgic and brings them closer to the memories.
instilled within the object while simultaneously creating distance between the bearer and the experience.

Memory texts are “reflexive inscriptions of memory-as-texts…a concrete, portable form of memory and postmemory making, inscribed at both primary and post levels of remembering” (p. 54). One of the examples Davidson uses to describe memory texts are postmortem maps. In her case, it is a map her mother drew while visiting Davidson’s grandfather. During World War II, Davidson’s family had fled their home in Kapetanovo, Croatia to the safety of Canada. As Kapetanovo no longer exists due to being moved and renamed, Davidson’s mother and grandfather felt nostalgic about his hometown. While Davidson’s grandfather reflected, her mother began to draw a map on a piece of paper. After a few corrections and revisions, “his Kapetanovo has been recovered, actualized…two sets of desires are present in this map, my grandfather’s and my mother’s, representing both the need to tell and the need to know” (p. 57).

Although mapping “ghost towns” or remembering places that were left so long ago, Oliveira’s description of oral maps is an example of memory texts that describe the ghost names of places forgotten or renamed. This memory text evokes the survey pegs that “aid in jarring the memory of people so that their history may be passed down from one generation to the next” (Oliveira, 2009, p. 105). Davidson describes the ghost map of Kapetanovo her mother created as highlighting the relationships between identity, history, culture, and place and how the map can “trace shadows, making visible the places erased by history and dominant forms of cartography” (p. 59). This difference is emphasized by Oliveira as she describes the difference between the maps of Western cartographers and Hawaiians. Rather than a flat drawing of a specific place at a specific
time, the ever-changing oral map marks detailed information of meaning and history behind place names.

Although Hawaiian place names are similar to Davidson’s iteration of object survivors and postmortem maps, Hawai‘i is not a virtual homeland. While Hawaiian place names are archival, they are also fluid and active as “place names are also indicators of the future” (Oliveira, 2009, p. 107). Through memorialization we often commemorate certain people, places, or practices that have disappeared, replaced or displaced. In Hawai‘i, place names actively make future distributions of space and memory, especially given how “Hawaiian place names are deeply embedded with kaona (layers of multiple meaning)” (p. 108). Through knowledge of the Hawaiian language and the history of space, Hawaiians can reclaim place as what Oliveira describes as a “decolonization process” or what Douglas Herman (2009) terms as “anti-conquest.”

Kamehameha Schools is a space of illusion in that it is simultaneously a place that is truly and uniquely Hawaiian but is a standard American educational institution that operates the way most American schools would operate. Similar to the ship, Kamehameha Schools occupies a placeless place, neither a part of ancient Hawai‘i, the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, nor does it exist as a part of Hawai‘i, the 50th state in the United States of America. It sets itself apart from the rest of Hawai‘i by implementing and memorializing Hawaiian people, names, language, culture, and history in its curriculum as well as in its production and organization of space. It seeks to grasp Hawai‘i prior to Western contact and influence, in the times when cities were ahupua’a, when ka po‘e kahiko were self-sufficient and lived off the land given to them by the gods, traces of which was evident in nature, passed on through oral histories, and honored through
dance. Kamehameha Schools’ histories are conflicted, as it: is a Western institution, operating within Western standards; is devoted to teaching the American students to worship and live within the Protestant faith; and is one of the largest landowners in all of Hawai’i. Kamehameha Schools’ land ownership includes Helumoa, where many members of the royal family had lived. Today, Helumoa is now known as the Royal Hawaiian Center, four-levels and 310,000 square feet of commercial retail spanning three blocks as prime real estate of Waikiki, a “must see” on many tourists’ itineraries.
Chapter 2: Aloha Means “Hello” and “Goodbye”

The Royal Hawaiian Center/Helumoa

The Royal Hawaiian Center is located in the middle of Waikiki on the island of O’ahu. Covering three blocks on Kalakaua Avenue, the main street through Waikiki, the Center consists of four levels occupying 310,000 square feet of retail and entertainment. Formerly known as the Royal Hawaiian Shopping Center, the Center, as well as the rest of Waikiki, underwent significant renovations. Approximately $1 billion went into renovating Lewers Street “as part of the eight-acre Waikiki Beach Walk retail and hotel redevelopment, and overhaul of the resort’s biggest mall, Royal Hawaiian Shopping Center” (Gomes, 2007).

Along with a physical change, the Royal Hawaiian Center also made changes to its very identity, attempting to produce a space not only for tourists to enjoy, but for the local population as well. In an article in the Honolulu Star Bulletin, the general manager of the Royal Hawaiian Center explained that the upgrade was intended to pinpoint the Center as the “true” center of Waikiki and to “find natural settings for warm interactions to mingle and share the aloha spirit, perpetuate the Hawaiian culture and strengthen our bonds with our guests” (Schaefer, 2008) by the removal of the word “shopping” from its name.

The land where the Royal Hawaiian Center stands was formerly known as Helumoa, a historic site. Ma’ilikūkahi, who ruled O’ahu in the 15th century, opted to create his court in Waikiki because the amount of fresh water available was essential for cultivation. His descendant, Kakuhihewa, observed Ka’auhelemoa, a supernatural rooster that scratched into the earth before disappearing. Kakuhihewa decided to name the land
Helumoa, or “chicken scratch” in Hawaiian, in honor of Ka’auhelelema and began to plant coconut trees that eventually flourished into over 10,000 trees. After conquering and uniting the islands, King Kamehameha the Great occasionally lived on the grounds, as well as Kamehameha III and V. Helumoa also housed Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, who spent time there drafting her will. Kamehameha Schools is the current landowner of Helumoa, as bequeathed in Pauahi Bishop’s will, no longer housing the royal family in favor of a royal shopping center.

The Center, in its efforts to be less of a tourist site, created a bronze statue of Pauahi Bishop in order to celebrate the site on which “Ke Ali’i Pauahi spent her last days and wrote the final codicil to her will that provided for the establishment of Kamehameha Schools” (Dingeman, 2007). In order to promote traditional Native Hawaiian culture, the Center graciously offers Mo’omeheu Hawai’i, complimentary classes through which one may be able to learn the art of lomilomi (Hawaiian massage), hula (Hawaiian dance), or how to create a lei (garland of flowers worn around the neck). One may even partake in an ‘ukulele (a four-stringed lute instrument) class as well. Although the Center kindly provides a limited number of instruments, not to worry if they are all taken as the Center suggests one may easily head over to Bob’s, an ‘ukulele shop within the Center. The Center also offers hula as well as musical performances displayed in an area called the Royal Grove in the middle of the Center.

Similar to Kamehameha Schools, the Royal Hawaiian Center displays many heterotopic traits and is a shining example of how “a society can make a heterotopia that exists and has not ceased to exist operate in a very different way” (Foucault, 1994, p. 180). Helumoa was the regal site of legend, of the Kamehameha family, and with a grove
of over 10,000 trees. The Royal Hawaiian Center today is still regal in its title and still houses a member of the Kamehameha royal family. The bronze Pauahi Bishop now sits in the middle of the Royal Grove, a tiny oasis amidst the shops. Although nowhere close to 10,000 trees, she is surrounded by few trees, a small area of grass, and a tiny pond with a waterfall. As stated before, Foucault’s example of how the function of a heterotopic space changes relative to a society is the space and function of a cemetery. Prior to the 19th century, the cemetery was placed at the heart of the city next to a church and was considered a sacred space. Once societies began to associate death with disease, cemeteries began to be moved as far as possible from the city center. Helumoa and the Royal Hawaiian Center captures the relative heterotopical changes although the physical place remains the same. Helumoa, like the cemetery, lost its function as a sacred place for commemoration or memorialization and gained function as a sacred place relative to real estate. Waikiki is now extremely commercialized, filled to the brim with tourist attractions and souvenir shops. Rather than being coveted for Helumoa, it began to be desirable for its property value and investment opportunity under the guise of operating as a space “both physically and operationally as a more uniquely Hawaiian place” (Dingeman, 2007).

The Royal Hawaiian Center also operates as a juxtaposition heterotopia, housing “in a single real place several emplacements that are incompatible in themselves” (Foucault, 1994, p. 181). Although Helumoa and the Royal Hawaiian Center exist in the same location, it is impossible to use them interchangeably as they are strictly incompatible. Helumoa is a historical site, a sacred Hawaiian space, and now, a place of legend. The Royal Hawaiian Center is a commercialized site, a potential American
business to invest in, and now, a place of tourism. In Foucault’s analogy of the garden as a juxtaposition heterotopia, he described it as a microcosm with its ability to house the whole world although merely a fragment of it. If the public relations department of the Royal Hawaiian Center was versed in heterotopology, they might attempt to describe it as a juxtaposition heterotopia as they seek to blend tourists and locals alike by encouraging local residents to “share the aloha spirit, perpetuate the Hawaiian culture and strengthen our bonds with our guests” (Schaefers, 2008), the encouragement for locals to attend the Center, the memorialization of Pauahi Bishop, and displays of traditional Hawaiian culture and performances are strategic marketing moves for one of the largest tourist sites on O’ahu.

Svetlana Boym (2001) makes a distinction between two types of nostalgia: restorative and reflective. Restorative nostalgia “manifests itself in total reconstructions of monuments of the past, while reflective nostalgia lingers on ruins, the patina of time and history, in the dreams of another place and another time” (p. 41). Restorative nostalgia places importance on nostos, filling gaps of memory and seeking to rebuild what was lost. Boym describes restorative nostalgics as not thinking they are nostalgic at all because they are concerned with the “truth,” focusing on nationalism by returning to national symbols and myths through reconstructing monuments of the past. Reflective nostalgia emphasizes algia, focusing on longing, loss, and remembrance. Rather than rebuilding the past from the ruins, these nostalgics reflect on the remains by dreaming of that “other” time and place. Boym analyzes the Sistine Chapel, the work of Michelangelo and his depiction of God and Adam, and how the Chapel made an attempt to restore the art from its current time-worn form to an “original Michelangelo” masterpiece. Boym
notes that rather than restoring the piece, it is a new representation of Michelangelo’s work. Art historians made the claim that the work lost Michelangelo’s “l’ultima mano” or “final touch” because the work was manipulated through technology to remove actual material traces, or the “patina of time” that accumulated in the work.

Reflective nostalgia is apparent in the Royal Hawaiian Center, with faint traces of Helumoa barely visible in between retail and the endless stream of tourists walking back and forth. Tucked away and almost hidden in the Royal Grove, the bronze Pauahi Bishop sits amongst a few trees. This is a far cry from Helumoa with its 10,000 trees, but serves as a silent reminder of the former space and “cherishes shattered fragments of memory and temporalizes space” (p. 49) as she sits and reads to the child sitting next to her. Similar to the Sistine Chapel, the bronze representation of Pauahi Bishop lacks the “l’ultima mano” as the Royal Hawaiian Center intent was to memorialize the former land owner and her gracious gift to not only educate Hawaiian children, but the land on which the Center stands. Instead, Pauahi Bishop seems to represent resistance, attempting to call attention to the indistinct traces of Helumoa,

Just as Tonya K. Davidson’s Kapetanovo, Croatia developed into a virtual homeland constructed through object survivors and memory texts, Helumoa is a virtual homeland that is “accessible through actualizations, through the residue that gathers, collects, and reconstitutes places” (p. 44). Additionally, the space that the Royal Hawaiian Center occupies is also a juxtaposition heterotopia because although it is a single space, several emplacements exist within it, all of which could not exist on its own within that particular space. The Royal Hawaiian Center places value in the fact that it is a historic site, named as such due to the royal Hawaiian family. However, one will find it
difficult to find the traces of Helumoa and its 10,000 trees amongst the crowds moving through four levels of retail. The Royal Hawaiian Center is also a tourist area, although they insist the space is for locals to enjoy as well. It is a site of history and memorialization, yet boasts of its renovation and modernization with Pauahi Bishop tucked away, hidden in the Royal Grove. The Royal Hawaiian Center is no longer Helumoa, it is a shopping center filled with high-end shops, with workshops and performances continually broadcasting a simulacra of Hawaiian culture.

_Simulacra and Representation_

In The Procession of Simulacra, Jean Baudrillard (1994) is convinced that we merely exist in hyperreality because the blurring of the real and unreal has obfuscated to the point that the notion of “reality” has become completely ambiguous. Baudrillard writes that we exist in a simulation of reality versus actually living in reality because society has begun to rely and exist on symbols and signs. Rather than mimic reality or attempt to confuse people with the notion of an alternate reality, Baudrillard explains that reality no longer exists. He illustrates this point by examining a fable by Borges that uses an example of an empire that had created a map which replicated the empire in scale. As the empire conquered enemy lands, cartographers would add the new land to the replica in the map. Conversely, if the empire lost land, cartographers would reflect the loss as well. After the fall of the empire, all that remained of it was the map. There is the suggestion that rather than live in the actual empire, people lived for the changes that were produced through the map. The map was the simulated version of the empire, detailed, protected, and preserved while the actual empire itself diminished in ruins.
Baudrillard also uses the example of the Lascaux caves in south-western France, containing paintings from the Paleolithic Era. He describes how visitors were not allowed to go inside the caves because of the insistence that the paintings needed to be preserved. An exact replica of the Lascaux caves ended up being built just outside of the actual one, allowing visitors to look through a peephole at the real paintings before walking through the reconstructed caves. He writes, “from now on there is no longer any difference: the duplication suffices to render both artificial” (p. 9).

Baudrillard’s favorite example of simulacra is Disneyland, the happiest place on Earth. He describes Disneyland as “a perfect model for all the entangled orders of simulacra…a play of illusions and phantasms” (p. 12). Disneyland incorporates different “worlds” within the park, such as Frontierland, a stylized version of the old-west, prominently featuring Mark Twain’s character Tom Sawyer and riverboats. Disney features its own characters in Fantasyland with different sections given to princesses such as Snow White and Sleeping Beauty as well as other characters such as Dumbo the Flying Elephant, Peter Pan, and Alice in Wonderland. Baudrillard writes, “what attracts the crowds the most is without a doubt the social microcosm, the religious, miniaturized pleasure of real America, of its constraints and joys” (p. 12). Baudrillard is most likely writing about Main Street, U.S.A. that stereotypes the golden age of American culture by including horse-drawn streetcars, old-fashioned ice cream parlours, and the Disneyland Railroad. He explains that Disneyland is shown as an imaginary place to convince us that outside of Disneyland exists reality. However, Baudrillard is adamant that Los Angeles and the rest of the United States is hyperreal and a simulation, explaining, “it is no longer
a question of a false representation of reality (ideology) but of concealing the fact that the real is no longer real” (p. 13).

The tourism culture of Hawaii has created a simulation of Native Hawaiian culture in present day, colonial Hawaii. One of the more famous examples of Hawaiian culture is the hula, or a dance that originated in Hawaii that included chants or songs. Chants, or oli, were the original way Hawaiians would tell ancient stories, a form of oral history before a written language existed. Hula involves the telling of stories as well because the body becomes the interpreter of emotion, a descriptor of nature, and translator from spoken language. Most commonly, hula also incorporates songs, or mele, along with the dance. Hula is usually categorized as kahiko, in the ancient style, or ‘auana, hula that is Western-influenced. In hula kahiko, traditional Hawaiian instruments such as gourd drums (ipu) and split bamboo sticks (pū‘ili) are used and involve oli (chants) more heavily than mele (songs). The most popular form of hula is hula ‘auana, commonly seen in tourist sites in Hawaii and is often reproduced in popular culture. The term ‘auana is translated as “to wander” in Hawaiian and reflects the movement away from the traditional way hula was performed in ancient Hawaii. Today, hula focuses on women and women’s bodies through dance when, traditionally, men often performed hula. Popular songs are used along with guitars, steel guitars, drums, and other Western instruments. Hula ‘auana can incorporate stories much like traditional hula did, but often speak of events from post Euro-American contact and involve wearing skirts or long dresses, such as the mu‘umu‘u.

The type of dances seen today at tourist sites are representations of hula once performed in ancient Hawaii and can be used as an example of simulacra. Baudrillard
writes, “whereas representation attempts to absorb simulation by interpreting it as a false representation, simulation envelops the whole edifice of representation itself as a simulacrum” (p. 6). What I take this to mean essentially in this context, is that the blurring of the traditional versus the tourist versions of hula has been (mis)represented and the latter has often been stylized as the former, but the blurring has become so significant that the representation of the traditional itself has become simulacra within the simulacra that a particular version of hula incorporates all forms of hula. A concept I use in conjunction with simulacra is Roland Barthes’ use of myth. According to Barthes, myths are established when signs take the place of the signifier, generating a new meaning for the signified. Baudrillard explains, “when the real is no longer what it was, nostalgia assumes its full meaning” (p. 6). Rather than hula ai kahiko, celebrating and honoring the gods or ali‘i, hula is an act of nostalgia. This nostalgia either is an attempt to reclaim or relearn what has become lost, or is a performance that stirs the fond memory of a vacation in paradise.

This is a photo I took of the performance and spectators during a performance at the Royal Grove within the Royal Hawaiian Center in 2012. I overheard people who were
fascinated with the performance, remarking how Hawaii is lush with the foliage and the culture, as well as how nice it is that Hawaiians today incorporate tradition in the present. Arguably, this performance is not Hawaiian tradition because it is in the style of hula ‘auana and it incorporated songs that were sung in both Hawaiian and English. Instruments used were a guitar, bass, and ukulele that were amplified and hooked up to sound systems. The dancers did incorporate instruments such as the ipu, pūʻili, and ulīʻulī (the feathered instruments the dancers are holding) but these were integrated more as accessories than actual instruments. The hula is more of a performance for the benefit of tourists rather than locals, is a performance that repackages traditional Hawaiian culture, and is a snapshot of simulacra experienced in everyday Hawai`i.

What exactly do the Center’s managers refer to when they describe the Center as “uniquely Hawaiian” or as a site to “perpetuate Hawaiian culture”? It is difficult to create a singular Hawaiian identity because Hawaiians often operate through and within Western institutions in colonial Hawaii. Stuart Hall (1996) considers identity as “constructed within, not outside discourse, [needing] to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies” (p. 4). Using Michel Foucault’s concept of discourse and discursive formations, Hall considers identity as a construction that operates through and within discourse. He mentions that identity is constructed in specific historical and institutional sites and thus, “Hawaiianess” has become a (re)construction of Hawaiian identity. To Hall, identity itself is complicated because the very concept of identity is situated in comparison. In the process of identification, there is the assumption that it renders inclusion, but Hall explains that identification is formulated
through difference. Hall explains, “identities can function as points of identification and attachment only because their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render ‘outside’, abjected” (p. 5). Rather than through unity, which is most commonly referred to when considering identity, Hall considers it a constructed form of closure (p. 5); constructed through closure, power relationships, and exclusion. When we identify ourselves, we compare ourselves to others and remark on the differences, inherently othering those we cannot ‘identify’ with.

Although Kamehameha Schools works towards formulating a Hawaiian identity for its students and the Royal Hawaiian Center seeks to reinvigorate Hawaiian culture for its patrons, they are operating through and within discourses of Hawaiianess. Kamehameha Schools seeks to protect, memorialize, preserve, and uphold Hawaiian culture through a simulacrum of the Hawai’i once untouched by traffic, developments, high rises, and tourists. At the same time, Kamehameha Schools is the landowner of many sites in Hawaii that are for visitors and that promote the tourism industry. Even though the message of the Schools is to perpetuate Hawaiian history, culture, and tradition, the Schools were former business operators of the Royal Hawaiian Center. Kamehameha Schools eventually sold the buildings to J.P. Morgan Asset Management in 2014, although retaining ownership to the land the Center sits on.

*Commodified Aloha*

Hawaiian tourism might interestingly tie into Hawaiian history that is taught in public schools in Hawai’i. In her analysis of textbooks used in Hawaiian studies, Julie Kaomea (2000) describes too many similarities between the books and tourism advertising. A text called *Hawaii: the Aloha State* by Bauer published in 1982, outlined
each island separately, common to most tour books. In explaining Waikiki, the text describes shopping as a must for tourists and the importance of experiencing a luau, where tourists can enjoy dinner and entertainment. The text also uses idyllic photos from the Hawai‘i Visitors Bureau which Kaomea likens to postcards.

Another text, *Hawaii Our Island State*, was written by three residents and educators in Hawai‘i. However, like Bauer’s text, it includes a separate depiction of each island, which includes tourist destinations. When describing Hawaiian language and place names, the pages ask whether or not students have visited any of the places. The texts are written with tourists in mind, possibly a recent development as the tourism industry flourished. However, Kaomea argues “this tourist-catering mentality has been with us for hundreds of years, ever since it was first taught to us by Hawai‘i’s very first tourist, Captain James Cook” (p. 332).

In *Hawaii the Aloha State* (Bauer, 1982) the book describes Cook’s discovery of Hawai‘i with his journal entry that detailed how happy Hawaiians seemed to be at his arrival, paddling out on canoes to meet the approaching ship. Kaomea uses Freud’s notion of the uncanny, finding it odd that the happy tone of the text disregards colonization, disease and death, and the decline of Hawaiian language and culture. However, she also realizes that the happy portrayal is familiar, the result of “happy natives rushing out to greet visiting foreigners…represented and re-enacted countless times since the arrival of that first tourist” (p. 332).

The notion of Hawaiian hospitality and the “*aloha* spirit” is deeply rooted in everyday life as well as tourism marketing. The scene of natives welcoming the arrival of Western influence is prevalent in tourism materials such as postcards. There are
numerous vintage postcards from airline companies that display Hawaiian women as exotic, sexualized Others by posing them as pin-up models or depicting images of nearly-nude women, adorned with flowers and grass skirts, greeting the disembarking visitors with lei (flower garlands) or seductively dancing hula. The narrow-waisted and large-breasted women are adorned with flowers, long hair, are usually smiling, and seem eager to welcome. Hawai‘i is truly a paradise, with postcard after postcard illustrating a beautiful sunny day on the beach, with the bright and clear blue water meeting the palm tree-lined shore. Even in television shows, such as the *Hawaii Five-0* reboot, there are panoramic shots and cut scenes of the landscapes that showcase the lush hills and countryside or bikini-clad women walking along a beach.

Although millions of dollars go into the School of Travel Industry Management at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa, Haunani Kay Trask (1993) describes jobs within the tourism industry as one of the most lowest-paying jobs available. Trask considers the tourism industry as cultural prostitution, using prostitution as a metaphor for the tourism economy degrading and demeaning Hawaiian culture, writing “our ‘āina, or lands, are not any longer the source of food and shelter, but the source of money. Land is now called real estate; rather than our mother, Papa” (p. 189). Growing up in Hawai‘i, children are taught to “live aloha” and to display such traits as *ho‘okipa* (hospitality), *lokomaikai‘i* (generosity), and to always *kōkua* (help).

In *Local Motions: Surfing and the Politics of Wave Sliding*, Eric Ishiwata (2002) writes about the politics behind sovereignty and tourism through the metaphor of surfing, which he describes as a “heterotopic site of agency” (p. 257). He writes, “Hawai‘i’s touristic order works to mediate all local—tourist encounters through the rigorous
inscription of a commodified aloha” (p. 263) and also uses the term “porno-tropics” to describe how Hawai`i has been consumed by the tourism industry. Ishiwata, citing Furguson and Turnbull (1999), describes how Hawai`i has become known as a “welcoming feminine place, waiting with open arms to embrace those who come to penetrate, protect, mold, and develop” (p. 263). As “hula girls” became a sexualized Other, Furguson and Turnbull also write that the role of Hawaiian men also changed to accommodate tourism. Rather than throwing nets in order to catch fish or riding in outrigger canoes in the ocean, Hawaiian men became known as gentle giants, working in the ocean to keep the tourists safe. Ishiwata presses further, describing the change in immigrant workers that used to work on the plantations, but now work in service and hospitality roles due to the onset of tourism, “thus, the feminization of Hawaiian men, the desexualization of Asian immigrants, and the exotic/eroticization of women as waiting-and-wanting hula girls, reconfigured the entirety of Hawai`i into servants to the touristic order” (p. 264).

However, Ishiwata points out that the ocean is not made safe for tourists, as evidenced through the anti-aloha interactions between local and visiting surfers, which often escalate to fights. Outside of the tourist-haven of Waikiki, Ishiwata describes the surfbreaks beyond a space of resistance, but as a place where local surfers actually reclaim the space. The surfbreaks are a heterotopia, “creat[ing] an open and infinite space that erodes and reorganizes the fixedness of onshore identities and spatial arrangements” (p. 264). This, along with other instances of resistance in the relationship between tourists and locals such as fistfights on the beach or intentionally giving tourists incorrect
directions are contrary to “normative codes of commodified aloha…nonetheless work to alter the conditions and power relations of everyday life” (p. 265).

The ocean itself presumes a system of closing even though it is viewed as a public and vastly open space. Although anyone is welcome to surf and swim, the openness of the ocean “is only an illusion: one believes he is going inside and, by the very fact of entering, one is excluded” (Foucault, 1994, p. 183). Ishiwata describes the surfers as hyper-masculine and hyper-territorial, “flexing their agency not only against the foreign intrusions of their surfbreaks, but also against Hawai‘i’s state government and the tourism industry” (p. 265). While spaces like the Royal Hawaiian Center and practices such as entertainment-based hula attempt to bring locals and tourists together, other spaces such as the ocean, surfbreaks, and traces of Helumoa, with practices in reclaiming and renaming place, resist the commodified aloha. The revival of Hawaiian language and identity is rooted in the feeling of aloha, the relationship between people and place. Trask (1993) writes, “language had tremendous power, thus the phrase, i ka ‘ōlelo ke ola; i ka ‘ōlelo ka make-in language is life, in language is death” (p. 187).
Chapter 3: The Eternal Space, or the Here and the Now, of Heterotopic Postmemory

*The "Five-0 Effect"

Although O’ahu is a dream vacation to many who seek to sip a Mai Tai garnished with pineapple on sunny beach overlooking crystal waters, it is a dangerous place with a treacherous underworld. Ambassadors to other countries are mysteriously found deceased, masked assailants are robbing armored cars in broad daylight, crime organizations are pulling off diamond heists and trafficking drugs, terrorists are using Hawai’i as their base of operations, ties between Hawai’i and North Korea require Navy SEALs to investigate, and international criminals wanted by Interpol are dealing weapons on the island. It’s a good thing the governor of O’ahu created a dedicated task force to investigate crimes requiring specialized skills beyond those the state police force.

Those were, hopefully obviously, a few examples of plots to the Hawaii Five-0 remake, starring Alex O’Loughlin as Steve McGarrett and Scott Caan as Danno Williams. The police procedural show portrays Hawai’i, more often than not, in the throes of action and drama with elaborate heists, strenuous chase-down scenes, and our heroes leaping away from massive explosions. Product placement throughout the show, which is sometimes painfully conspicuous, has helped not only larger companies’ brand advertising throughout the show, but local businesses as well. A casual conversation about coco puffs from Liliha Bakery, one of the characters being the “face” of Waiola Shave Ice, references of Steve McGarrett’s favorite beer being from Kona Brewing Co., and a scene at the Battleship Missouri Memorial have all garnered interest and boosted sales. Jerry Lee, owner of Waiola Shave Ice, does not know why the show highlighted his business. Lee sells t-shirts with the character Kamekona on it, as he is the face of Waiola
Shave Ice on the show. Lee is quoted as saying he would like to meet Teila Tuli, billed as Taylor Wily, remarking, “I want to invite him here, have a shave ice, take a picture and we can hang it on the wall here…I always tell people he’s the owner, and I’m the brother” (Uyehara 2011). The so-called “Five-0 effect” has led to an increase in visitors to Pearl Harbor to see the Battle Ship Missouri Memorial and overall tourism in Hawai’i, but it has also constructed an imaginary place that simultaneously holds the realist markers of quotidian locality (e.g. a real dessert from an existing bakery) and the fictive markers of a twenty-four hour adventure-thriller. The Hawai’i of the “Five-0 effect” combines the realism of location with adventure fantasy that captures the tourist desire to be close to nature, whether that of the Diamond Head or the lawlessness of Hawaii Five-0 crime-ring villains, and yet it still promises the ready indulgences of commodity forms.

In this chapter, I will analyze both formal tourist paraphernalia and informal photographs of Hawai’i in order to discuss the differences between local photography and the touristic interpretation and production of Hawaiian space. The photographs taken by Hawai’i residents are heterotopic counter-images that disrupt the smooth tourist space as produced through formal tourist maps and images. Prior to examining photography, I will consider tourist maps and how they construct and produce sites and space.

Tourist Maps

The tourism industry produces maps and other materials that serve as practical guides to visitors to a place, but this paraphernalia, in the forms of flyers, guidebooks, and brochures, may actually produce, rather than reflect, places. Ignacio Farías (2011), points out that tourist materials and maps are not addressed in tourism studies as scholars
in this field tend to view them either as merely a part of the industry’s advertising or as naïve documents that simply show or describe the places they depict in unproblematic tourist representations of the particular spaces. Farías suggests that “the study of tourist maps has relied on an implicit distinction between space as a social and symbolic construction and space as extension” (p. 399). Since tourist representations and maps are often overlooked in how they affect the production of space, Farías’ intent is to examine tourist maps and reconceptualize the maps as diagrams in order to show how they produce destination spaces that are virtual; they are real but neither purely physical nor social.

Tourist maps are more than maps that contain signs showing distinctions between the signified and the significant. Although Farías acknowledges that maps do operate as indexes that show tourists where to go, or as icons that can stand in for a place (e.g. they can also be used as souvenirs), he explains that merely understanding maps as indexes or icons does not show how these maps can generate or transform the spaces they represent, as “tourist maps are not ex post operation of tourism, indexical or iconic representations of an already constituted tourist space, but they perform generative operations that produce tourist spatial extensions” (p. 400).

Farías’ analysis focuses on a map of Berlin from a Lonely Planet guidebook. This map seemingly shows the overview of Berlin, a simple representation of the city. He acknowledges that the Lonely Planet map, compared to a tourist map, would not be of interest to analysis because the map is not as descriptive in terms of city marketing, nor does it present a relationship between how locals versus tourists would interpret the space. Farías considers this problematic because, at first glance, the map simply reflects
Berlin as it is, rather than a marked tourist space, although it displays symbols, pictures, and drawings that visually represent tourist spaces. In fact, the map is of further interest to Farías “precisely because this map does not say much about social and tourist identities that it is a particularly useful starting point for our investigation into maps as spatial devices or technologies” (p. 401).

Upon first glance, Farías notes the space is represented as homogenous, not making a color-coded distinction between various neighborhoods and without obvious graphics denoting tourist attractions. The map does feature main streets and the U-Bahn, Berlin’s underground railway, within the urban space. The S-Bahn, or transit system above ground, although shown, is not emphasized. Farías notes that how the map is placed on the page assumes a continuous, homogenous space, with borders or page restrictions cutting into the continuous physical space, proof of which is displayed in the fact that the map does not show all of Berlin. By drawing attention to the lack of tourist attractions and that the map includes areas of little interest to tourists, he shows how this map operates in concert with the tourist-centric ones by reorienting these maps onto an abstract grid that stands in for the real world, or a Kantian space, whose borders are arbitrary (determined by the size of the page) but necessary, since this homogenous space is continuous. He writes, “by defining the limits of the other tourist maps of the guidebook, which do include tourist information, attractions, and even routes, it reinforces the notion that tourist space is constructed on an absolute space ‘out there’” (p. 402).

Farías focuses on the work of Edward S. Casey (1998) and his challenge to Kant’s insistence that knowledge and experience of the general, or space, comes before the
knowledge and experience of the particular, or place. In his later work, Casey (2008) also centers on “edges” of human experience and that “while the notion of instants, as it refers only to a temporal dimension, remains too abstract for understanding human experience, edges are constitutive of events, the spatiotemporal carriers of human experience” (p. 403). To build upon this, Farías then draws upon Rob Shields’ (2006) distinction between borders and boundaries, with the former indicating territories or properties in their physical form while the latter refers to what marks the edge of a border, or the “bounds” of a region. In other words, the former is the material territory, the latter is the symbol that marks its end. Farías thus describes the role through which tourist maps can “spatially edge” tourist experience through the production of borders from boundaries; places from symbols.

Farías mentions through the analysis of tourist maps, it is easy to see how boundaries affect the demarcation of tourist space as distinct and separated from local places. Although typical “tourist spaces” mostly refers to places such as cruise-ships and resorts, urban tourist spaces are also enveloped in tourist boundaries as “tourist areas are constantly fixed in maps and other visual materials, such as guidebooks, brochures, manual sketches made by locals, and certainly tourist maps” (p. 404). Therefore, tourist maps have the ability to transform the area. Maps may only display certain tourist attractions, signifying the space as singularly a destination space rather than an urban one. Maps may also extend the destination space, seemingly spread throughout a city rather than densely populated in the city center. Farías also notes that the photographic portrayal of tourist attractions tends to remove the attraction from the rest of the urban space.
To bring these considerations to the present study, I will consider trolley routes that service tourists. The Waikiki Trolley is a trolley service established in 1986 that shuttles tourists to and from major attractions and shopping centers on Oahu. They also describe their service as convenient, with its “hop on, hop off” service as well as educational, encouraging interested parties to reserve their tickets in order to “journey back through time and learn more about the history of Hawaii” (Waikiki Trolley, 2015).

There are multiple, color-coded trolley routes, available for download on the Waikiki Trolley website. Amongst the 32-page map guide, I have selected one route for examination.

The pink line of the Waikiki Trolley is a large map that is separated into two parts, due to the page restrictions of the map guide. Similar to Farías’ analysis of Berlin, the pink line maps assume a continuous, homogenous space extending past the borders and page restrictions that cut off the rest of the space outside of the pink line route.

By highlighting certain hotels, shopping centers, and restaurants, the pink line map and route display how the urban space of Waikiki is reformulated into a destination space oriented towards tourists and relevant sites for the tourism industry. In the first photo, the Waikiki Trolley maps produce the tourist space by shifting the orienting axis that is more commonly seen most maps of Honolulu.
Pink Line map via Waikiki Trolley Map Guide, p. 10-11

Pink Line map via Waikiki Trolley Map Guide

---

9 Ibid.
On most O‘ahu-oriented maps, the angle of the Ala Wai Canal slopes slightly upward from left to right before gradually sloping downward, as seen below from Google Maps.

Google Map: Waikiki

The second image of the pink line route is also oriented differently from most maps of O‘ahu. Ala Wai Boulevard is perceived as at the top, displayed straight from left to right, whereas on other maps, Ala Wai Boulevard is at an angle, following the Ala Wai Canal. Not displayed are indicators pointing out schools, houses, or grocery stores.

Tourist maps have the effect of producing tourists’ interests, therefore the maps themselves make visible and legible the sites and flows of the tourist subjects they aim to produce. In doing so, they produce a specific “destination” space that, ontologically, lies

---

somewhere between materiality and abstraction (Farias, 411). Although displaying major hotels and Ala Moana Shopping Center as well, Google Maps also points out other areas of significance of everyday life in Hawai‘i by including ‘Iolani School.

The maps from the Waikiki Trolley routes display a distorted Hawai‘i, different from the Hawai‘i locals would come to know. The Royal Hawaiian Center is described as a sightseeing location great for shopping. There is no indication of the Royal Hawaiian Center and its former space, Helumoa. There is no indication that the Royal Hawaiian Center is a space for locals and tourists alike. Rather than described in terms of its historical richness, the Royal Hawaiian Center is advertised as a day’s worth of shopping, dining, and complimentary entertainment. Therefore, the multiplicity of signification attached to this site, which brings attention to the struggle over Hawaiian land and culture, is made singular on the map.

Farías explains that maps create a destination space rather than an urban one by displaying tourist attractions within the space, with the addition of photographs displaying the attractions. Visually, photographs present in maps, guidebooks, and other paraphernalia produced by the tourism industry produce a particular place. Photographs highlighting the beauty of hula dancers, the white beaches and crystal blue water, and lush, green landscapes produce Hawai‘i as a destination space rather than a lived one, which must combine beauty with the utility of infrastructures often rendered invisible in tourist imagery. In her elaborations on the concept of postmemory, Marianne Hirsch (2012a) has given particular attention to photographs and their arrangements, suggesting they are an “illusion of being a simple transcription of the real, a trace touched directly by the event it records…naturalizing cultural practices and of disguising their stereotyped
and coded characteristics” (p. 7). Drawing from Hirsch’s observations, I will examine informal local photography and its juxtaposition with the smooth tourist space produced in tourist imagery of Hawai’i. One of the striking characteristics of local photography is the spatial imposition of the “here” and the temporal imposition of the “now”. While it may seem that the immediacy of some of these images stands in sharp contradiction to the exploration of postmemory, I suggest that this aesthetic presents a place “here right now” against the “there always” of the colonial tourist industry’s Hawai’i as a singular, knowable, and eternal destination space.

Photographs

Hirsch and Leo Spitzer (2009) recall the process of Hirsch’s parents donating photos to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. They elaborate on the potential photo donations and the ones historians and archivists select, showing public places photographed before the Holocaust and World War II. However, Hirsch and Spitzer write that photographs “may refuse to fit expected narratives and interpretations, revealing both more and less than we expect” (p. 9). Hirsch’s mother, Lotte, was described as hesitant when it came to looking through photos and picking ones for donation. She questioned why anyone would care to see low-quality, private photos meant for herself, her family, and her friends. At the museum, the archivist conducted a donation interview with her parents, asking for a family history, recalling their experience during World War II, and descriptions of the photographs. Hirsch, a bit surprised at the archivist’s confidence in selecting some photos while passing over others, asked what went behind making the decision. What interested Hirsch, beyond the fact that the physical quality of photos was
important, was the “speed and confidence with which the archivist seemed to have
chosen the photos for the archive, and about her preference for public and institutional
over personal and familial images” (p. 13). Hirsch and Spitzer point out that the street
photographs reveal, yet conceal, typical Jewish life both before and throughout the war.
The photographs, although complementing the interpretation of history per museums and
archives, can also challenge it.

Through the photographs, museums and archives seek to document typical life
that was suddenly and violently damaged with the onset of war and persecution. Other
viewers will see different contexts, outside of those from the person taking the photo and
the subjects of the photo. Hirsch and Spitzer point out that family members can view
photographs in an affiliative, transgenerational context by seeing an aspect of familial life
all too familiar to them or recalling stories of their own family members in a similar
space and time. Hirsch and Spitzer explain, “through such a look, viewers can project
familiar faces and scenes onto them, adopt them into their own repertoire of familial
images, and, in this way, use them to re-embody memory in a ‘postmemorial’ way” (p.
15).

The variation in narrative and interpretations of what photos represent perhaps
rests in viewing photographs in the postmemorial way, evoking feelings of recognition,
recall, and familiarity. Without the affiliative, familial context, a photograph will simply
remain a generic photograph. In Hirsch’s later work in Family Frames: Photography,
Narrative, and Postmemory (2012a), she explores Roland Barthes’ Camera Lucida and
analysis of family photos of his mother. Most of the photos show certain facets of his
mother, unable to “yield her essence and return him to the Sisyphean task of trying, again
and again, to find one that captures her fundamental core” (p. 1). However, the photo he finds of her at five years old seems to be the only one able to grasp her essence at the core. Hirsch writes that the “familial looks” are essential to Barthes’ searching for resemblances and identity. The photo Barthes cherishes and discusses the most is not a part of the text, about this Hirsch speculates that “Barthes cannot show us the photograph because we stand outside the familial network of looks and thus cannot see the picture in the way that Barthes must” (p. 2). As we do not have the familial gaze, it would mean nothing more to us than a random, dated family photograph. To Barthes, the photograph is intimate, a process of self-discovery and recognition.

In his discussion of viewers’ reception of photographs, Barthes introduces the terms *punctum* and *studium*. The *punctum* is what “disturbs the flat and immobile surface of the image, embedding it in an affective relationship of viewing and thus the narrative; on the other, it arrests and interrupts the contextual and therefore narrative reading” (p. 4) of the *studium*. The *punctum* is the sting of a shock, detailing the recognition and the personal relationship of photograph to the person viewing it. The *studium* is the cultural or political context of the photograph itself that informs how it is interpreted. To viewers in the postmemorial and affiliative context, the *punctum* is the shock that confronts the viewer and, in Barthes’ case, photographs can “reflect him, draw him in, pierce and shock him, yet they continue to wound, repel, and exclude him…and they are opaque as they are transparent” (p. 4).

Hirsch (2012a) also considers Walter Benjamin’s analogy between the technical capacity of the camera to register and make visible things that are not evident to the human eye and the process by which psychoanalysis penetrates the unconscious. Similar
to how psychoanalysis can expose and uncover unconscious thought, “there are optical processes that are invisible to the eye: they can be exposed by the mechanical processes of photography. The camera can reveal what we see without realizing that we do” (p. 118). To Benjamin, unconscious optics are the things we do not know that we see, and these are similar to the things that are repressed by the mind and its processes. The complexities and multiplicities of unconscious optics “disturb and disrupt our conscious acts of looking” (p. 118). Hirsch explains that unconscious optics relates heavily to the affiliative and familial field, of the familial gaze and of punctum in how “familiality” affects “the tension between the photograph’s flatness and its illusion of depth, between the little a photograph reveals and all that it promises to reveal but cannot” (p. 119).

Following Hirsch’s examination on familial photography, I would like to apply some of her observations to photographs that produce and contest narratives of place and reference the geographical space of Hawai’i. Although Hirsch focuses on familial mythology, I extend the concept of mythology to the production of Hawai’i as a destination space through the filtering of images selected by the tourism industry. Hirsch writes, “this myth or image…dominates lived reality, even though it can exist in conflict with it and can be ruled by different interests” (p. 8). This familial mythology has an imaginary power and a narrative picked up by photographs, and Hirsch suggests that the photographs themselves belie the myth between the ideal and the actual reality of family life. The heterotopic mythology of photographs in Hawai’i produce images of multiple spaces, one example being the “Five-0 effect” that depicts Hawai’i as paradise not only for tourists, but for international weapon dealers on the run from Interpol as well. Similar to how photographs occupy contested space between the actual and ideal reality of family
life, the photographs also produce Hawai‘i as a contested space between tourist paradise versus the “here and now” of everyday life in the urban space.

*The Here and the Now*

In this section, I consider photographs taken by locals and compare them to images taken from the tourist industry or by tourists themselves. Similar to the archivist’s filtering of images in order to reproduce a certain narrative, the tourist industry filters images of Hawai‘i and creates a representation that is marketed as a lush, tropical paradise with commodified aloha. However, the images of Hawai‘i taken by locals evoke a sense of postmemorial familiality, possibly *punctum*. Just as Hirsch explained that we could not see the photograph because we were beyond the familial scope, we could not see the photo of his mother in the way Barthes did, similarly, tourists and the tourism industry do not see Hawai‘i the way locals would, resulting in complexities and multiplicities of Hawai‘i relative to *studium*. Furthermore, what are the unconscious optics at work in the photographs taken of Hawai‘i? What is missed in the taking of the photographs that is revealed due to the camera’s mechanical process? What do we perceive, recall, or are attracted to? What do we overlook, forget, or by what are we repelled?

Reddit is a website consisting of member-posted content that is either “upvoted” or “downvoted” in order to determine the ranking on various pages. “Subreddits” are the various subjects organized as separate pages. Hawai‘i has its own subreddit, which I accessed to view pictures posted by locals. One of the entries referred to an album called Locals and Tourists, by Flickr user Eric Fischer. Fischer uses public Flickr and Picasa
search APIs in order to map where locals take photos versus where tourists would take a photo. In the Locals and Tourists album description, Fischer (n.d.) writes:

Some people interpreted the Geotaggers' World Atlas maps to be maps of tourism. This set is an attempt to figure out if that is really true. Some cities (for example Las Vegas and Venice) do seem to be photographed almost entirely by tourists. Others seem to have many pictures taken in [places] that tourists don't visit.

Blue points on the map are pictures taken by locals (people who have taken pictures in this city dated over a range of a month or more).

Red points are pictures taken by tourists (people who seem to be a local of a different city and who took pictures in this city for less than a month).

Yellow points are pictures where it can't be determined whether or not the photographer was a tourist (because they haven't taken pictures anywhere for over a month). They are probably tourists but might just not post many pictures at all.

The maps are ordered by the number of pictures taken by locals.

Fischer’s image of O’ahu mostly focuses from Pearl Harbor on the west and extends east just beyond Diamond Head. The image goes north, showing Kahaluu extending eastward towards Kailua.
Eric Fischer: “Blue pictures are by locals. Red pictures are by tourists. Yellow pictures might be by either.”\textsuperscript{11}

The second image is the modified map I created, labelling the sites pictured. Most locals’ photos were taken in Downtown Honolulu, around neighborhoods such as Ka’a’ako, Makiki, Ala Moana, McCully, a cluster at the University of Hawai’i- Mānoa, as well as into Waikiki. There are clusters of local-taken photos in Aliamanu, Kapalu’u, Kaneohe and Kailua. Unsurprisingly, the majority of photos taken by tourists clustered at the Pearl Harbor Visitor Center and Waikiki through Diamond Head.

\[\text{Modified image with place names added}^{12}\]

---

12 Ibid. Modified version.
I compiled various pictures from the Hawai`i Subreddit, Instagram,\textsuperscript{13} and included some of my own photos in order to contrast them from tourist images in a gallery-style viewing. The major themes the photographs portray are: the everyday, ordinary, and residential aesthetic of Hawai`i compared to the exotic paradise of tourist luxury; the here and the now that focuses on place, time, and the ‘we’ – the ordinary existence as experienced right now by Hawai`i residents; and “this ain’t the mainland!” depicting Hawai`i as its own place rather than the mythical space of the colonial imagination.

\textsuperscript{13} One possible limitation to this is that there is no way of knowing how individuals posting on these sites are situated with respect to Hawai`i.
This is a photo of Diamond Head as viewed from behind and within a residential area, showing the crater. It is a volcanic cone east of Waikiki and is known as Lēʻahi, most likely named after a tuna because it is similar in shape to a dorsal fin. In the 19th century, British sailors named the area “Diamond Head” because they mistakenly thought the calcite crystals on the beach were diamonds. Visitors are allowed to embark on the 0.75 mile steep hike consisting of unpaved trails and steps to the rim of the crater.

---

These are still shots of Diamond Head from the television series *Hawaii Five-0*, the modern remake of the show starring Jack Lord in beginning in 1968.

This photo uses Diamond Head as the backdrop. On the left are a few Waikiki hotels along with the Ala Wai Boat Harbor in front of it.

---

Closer up version of Diamond Head along the Ala Wai Canal and Ala Wai Boulevard to the left, with condominiums and hotels in the middle and houses to the middle left.

\[\text{Diamond Head}^{16}\]

\[\text{Diamond Head}^{17}\]

\[16\text{ Ibid.}\]
\[17\text{ Ibid.}\]
Diamond Head is in the background of this action shot. They are on a rooftop of the Hilton Hawaiian Village Waikiki Beach Resort. In the episode, a suspect they were chasing had been shot and ran to the rooftop to hide.

This is a photo of Diamond Head as displayed by the Instagram of one of many hotels in Waikiki, the Sheraton Waikiki. The hotel suggests enjoying some “liquid aloha” with a side of Diamond Head view.

Kīlauea is an active volcano on the Big Island, its name meaning “spewing” or “spreading” due to its frequent lava outpour. The eruption, which began on January 3, 1983, is still in effect. The photos refer to the lava flow from December 2014 that slowly began to threaten the town of Pahoa, in the Puna district of the Big Island.

Reddit user gaseouspartdeux: Remember that guy building a Berm of dirt and rock to protect his home from the lava flow in Pahoa? Here are pics of what transpired: Pahoa 1

---

One of the residents of Pahoa decided to build a berm using dirt and rocks in order to protect his home from the lava flow; this intervention reportedly worked. The Reddit user who posted the photos, gaseouspartdeux, made a remark in the second photo that it looked like Pele wanted an orange. In Hawaiian mythology, Pele is the volcano goddess.

---

\(^{20}\) Ibid.
Pahoa 3\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
Reddit user maalco is also the person who set up this particular swing. Unfortunately, it was gone within 24 hours, either cut down or broken. However, there are various other swings around the island, most of them tucked away on small roads or trails away from the public. The Reddit user maalco explains the creation of this swing was influenced by other ones seen while hiking.
Reddit user Aventurine_808 took a photo of the sunset and suggested fellow users to go outside to view the sunset as well. Other commenters agreed at how beautiful the sunset was, adding photos that they also took themselves. Most of the other comments in the thread talked about how beautiful the sunset was that night, with a few users uploading their own photographs as well, including one while driving home on the H2 Freeway and another as soon as they got home.

This Reddit user posted an album of photos taken from 7-Eleven, a chain of convenience stores in Hawai‘i. This photo shows, on the top shelf, bento in a warmer. Bento refers to a Japanese lunchbox meal, either prepared at home or purchased for takeout. Borrowing from the Japanese, bento are known in Hawai‘i as plate of takeout food. In the bottom shelf of the warmer are spam musubi. This is also borrowed from Japanese omusubi or onigiri, a ball of rice wrapped with seaweed. In Hawai‘i, the spam musubi was created by the Japanese after World War II due to spam being consumed by troops during the war. Today, spam musubi is one of the most popular foods in Hawai‘i. It is made by grilling spam with soy sauce or teriyaki sauce, placing it on top of a block

of rice, and wrapping it with a piece of seaweed. To the right of the *spam musubi* is a version with spicy sausage.

Also taken in 7-Eleven, this is a warmer with Chinese *baozi*, or steamed bun filled with meat. In Hawai‘i, the *baozi* is known as *manapua*, which is a shortened version of *mea ‘ono pua’a*. The top rack is *char siu*, or roasted pork. The second rack is teriyaki

---

25 Ibid.
chicken and curry chicken. The third rack is lup cheong, or Chinese sausage. The bottom rack holds shumai, or dumplings filled with meat. Shumai can be boiled or fried, both of which are displayed.

Sandwiches, sushi, and other assorted food

---

Ibid.
These photos display refrigerated food. The top photo is a sandwich display, typical in convenience stores in the United States and Canada. The bottom photo shows a display of *musubi, bento*, and other assorted food.

---

27 Ibid.
This photo is the Reddit user aking14 with their purchase, a bento with pork, sausage, and egg. In the album of photos, aking14 described 7-Eleven as “the best fast food place” as the variety of food is surprising for a convenience store. Most comments in the Reddit thread expressed disbelief as to why someone would take 7-Eleven photos and make a thread online, with some even suspecting it was a public relations stunt by a social media representative of 7-Eleven. This speaks to how this food is an everyday occurrence and nothing particularly special for locals.

---

28 Ibid.
The bike paths along King Street in Honolulu have been a source of frustration for drivers and bicyclists alike. In this particular area, the bike path is between a lane for parking and the sidewalk. In other areas, the lane for parking is between the sidewalk and bike path. Although there are people for bicycle infrastructure, a lot of divers are against it due to traffic, congestion, and unsafe turns or merges into traffic.

---

This picture is the furthest away we can get from the sunny, warm, and tropical beaches of Hawai’i. Mauna Kea is actually a spot with a lot of snow, skiing, and snowboarding. Mostly housing observatories, managed by the University of Hawai’i Institute for Astronomy, there are no ski lifts or lodges. Most participants will hike up, ride down, and hike back up again.

---

This photo of Mauna Kea was submitted to Reddit the day before the prior photo. Both photos present similar angles of the snow-topped Mauna Kea. This photograph might pass as a snowy landscape outside of Hawai‘i, whereas the prior photograph includes a palm tree that may signal being within Hawai‘i.

---

“Dawn patrol” refers to surfers out in the water and ready to go by sunrise. Kuilei Cliffs Beach Park lies right within Diamond Head. The user, alohamikey, most likely hiked to the lookout before sunrise and snapped a photo of surfers on dawn patrol.

---

This Redditor’s child is a *spam musubi* for Halloween. Other people commented that the bottom should be white instead of black for accuracy, to which CreepygENT replied they found white shorts for the actual night of trick-or-treating.

---

Most tourist photographs include panoramic shots of the ocean while this user simply states that the hike was complete. The photo was of their feet and the trail leading up to where they are sitting, with glimpses of the neighborhoods between the branches on the upper right.

---

It’s a common occurrence to highlight the difference between Hawai‘i and the rest of the United States. This bumper sticker alludes to speeding, telling drivers to slow down because this isn’t the mainland. Honking is also something that most locals don’t do as often. I’ve personally been told not to honk so much because it sounds too impatient, plus “this isn’t the mainland.”
This Redditor was stuck on a road on the island of Kaua‘i because of the nēnē, or Hawaiian goose. The nēnē is the state bird of Hawai‘i and is thought to be evolved from the Canada goose after landing in Hawai‘i 500,000 years ago.

The nēnē is the world’s most rare goose. Approximately 25,000 geese lived prior to Captain James Cook’s arrival to Hawai‘i in 1778. Due to the introduction of pigs, cats, and mongoose, the nēnē population dwindled to merely 30 in 1952. Conservation efforts allowed the reintroduction of the geese in the wild as well as in captivity.

---

Barely visible are the signs that read, on the left, “H1 East Honolulu” and, on the right, “H1 West Waianae Exit Only.” Falconiamaxima mentioned their friends thought of Hawai‘i simply as a paradise with beautiful weather all year. Redditors mentioned a few of the things about Hawai‘i that pulls away from a destination space, such as heavy traffic

---

37 Falconiamaxima. (2015, Feb 20). After years of trying to prove to my friends that Hawaii doesn’t look like paradise all the time, I finally managed to take a picture that doesn’t look even a little perfect [Online forum posting]. Retrieved from http://en.reddit.com/r/Hawaii/comments/2wkv5o/after_years_of_trying_to_prove_to_my_friends_that/
or the “vog” (volcano smog or fog). Falconiamaxima stated that no matter what they mentioned, their friends were insistent Hawai’i was a paradise with beautiful weather.

This Redditor is in westbound traffic on the Interstate H-201, more commonly referred to as Moanalua Freeway, a four mile (6.4 kilometer) loop connecting two points

---

of the Interstate H-1, the busiest highway in all of Hawai‘i. In the distance on the right is Aloha Stadium, home of the University of Hawai‘i football team, also housing professional football games such as the Pro and Hula Bowls. On the left is the United States Air Force Hickam Field and the United States Navy Naval Station Pearl Harbor.

This Instagram user took a photo of breakfast at McDonald’s. Although McDonald’s is an American chain with restaurants around the world, each franchise will have its own menu based on the location. In Hawai‘i, one can order breakfast with Portuguese sausage (or linguiça, a smoky, cured sausage flavored with garlic and spices from Portugal, which is a common breakfast item in Hawai‘i) or spam along with

---

39 vtanzerhoy. (2015, May 12). You can start the day off right if you know what to order: Portuguese sausage, rice and egg with a haupia pie. #imlovinit #onlyinhawaii #mcdonalds #luckyyoulivehawaii [Photograph]. Retrieved from https://instagram.com/p/2l6zSGB5Z5/
standard North-American breakfast options such as sausage and ham, along with rice and eggs. *Haupia* is a Hawaiian dessert traditionally made with coconut milk and *pia*, or ground Polynesian arrowroot (or cornstarch, if *pia* is unavailable). It is similar in consistency to gelatin, although a touch more dense, and is cut into blocks and served. In addition to McDonald’s apple pie, in Hawai’i they offer *haupia* and *taro* pie. *Taro*, or *kalo* in Hawaiian, are plants mostly grown for the root vegetable, although the leaves and stem can be used as well. Grown in *lo‘i*, or pondfields, the root of taro plants are used to make *poi*, the staple Hawaiian food made from cooking the root and then mashing it, while adding water, until it is in a viscous, liquid form. *Poi* is purple in color, due to the color of the taro corm. Fresh *poi* will taste sweet but will begin to ferment and taste more and more sour, perfect for being eaten with fish or *lomi salmon*, or raw salmon made into a salad with various vegetables such as tomato, cucumber, Maui onion, and green onion.
Lychee are fruits from the evergreen family of trees that grow in bunches, looking similar to grapes but larger. Lychee have a hard and textured pink-red rind that is peeled off to eat the soft, milky white contents. Although native to China, lychee has been popularized in other parts of the world, including Hawai‘i. One of the comments, saying not to mess with Mr. Sun Cho Lee, refers to a song called Mr. Sun Cho Lee released in 1976 by brothers Keola and Kapono Beamer. The song parodies racial stereotypes in Hawai‘i, making fun of people who are pake (Chinese), haole (white), Filipino, Japanese, and Hawaiian. In the song, although Mr. Sun Cho Lee has a bunch of lychee, he doesn’t share it, making him a mean and old pake man. The brothers conclude the song by saying although everyone makes fun of each other, they are all able to live together in Hawai‘i.

---

The Hula Grill Waikiki is a restaurant located in the Outrigger Waikiki hotel. The photos from their Instagram depict a Hawaiian luau in the tourist perspective, suggesting this lunch would be an excellent way to enjoy the weekend. The Hula Grill Waikiki uses the hashtag to describe this meal as Hawaiian food, as well as using “travel” as a hashtag.

41 hulagrillwaikiki. (2015, Mar 6). Happy Aloha Friday! Repost @outriggerwaikiki • • • The Aloha Friday lunch luau @hulagrillwaikiki is the perfect way to start the weekend! #outriggerwaikiki #hulagrill #hawaiianfood #travel #hawaii [Photograph]. Retrieved from https://instagram.com/p/z5atT9upPa/
Instagram user hulagrillwaikiki: Friday Lunch Luau! See you at 12pm for local food, smooth sounds of Hawaiian music and beautiful hula! #Repost @thomasohhh ・・・ I love Hawaiian Food! #HGWALOHAFRIDAY

This is another photograph of the “Aloha Friday Lunch Luau” that was reposted by another Instagram user that had dined at the Hula Grill Waikiki. The following photos depict nearly the same food, without the glimmer of Waikiki and the promise of “smooth sounds of Hawaiian music and beautiful hula.”

---

42 hulagrillwaikiki. (2015, Jan 16). Friday Lunch Luau! See you at 12pm for local food, smooth sounds of Hawaiian music and beautiful hula! #Repost @thomasohhh ・・・ I love Hawaiian Food! #HGWALOHAFRIDAY [Photograph]. Retrieved from https://instagram.com/p/x7dTD5upGl/
The use of “808” in usernames is common, as 808 is the area code for Hawai’i. The use of “broke da mouth” is a “pidgin” or colloquial term in Hawai’i meaning the food was so delicious, it broke your mouth.
Instagram user kingkeola1 refers to “kanak attack,” referring to the feeling of feeling satiated and being ready to take a nap, as referenced in his next hashtag that says he is ready to sleep like a baby. Both carol_808 and kingkeola1 seemed to purchase these meals, as they are served in plastic containers and served on disposable plates. However, the placement of food in the latter two photographs suggest casual meals while the Hula Grill Waikiki is a restaurant more focused on aesthetics. For example, the tomatoes used in the Hula Grill Waikiki look to be multicolored grape tomatoes cut into half as a side dish whereas the tomatoes in the latter two photographs are clearly lomi salmon.

---

44 kingkeola1. (2015, May 19). Breakfast of Champions! #HAWAIIAN #ahipoke #lomisalmon #poi #kanakattack #sleeplikebaby #gnig #ALOHA [Photograph]. Retrieved from https://instagram.com/p/236ztFuAAT/
I visited my parents during Reading Week in 2014. Between spending time with my parents, seeing old friends, and enjoying the lack of snow, I had to find time to write my final paper for Qualitative Interviewing.

“You’re a tourist now,” my Mom joked. “How many tourists stay at home on their computer?” I scoffed.

This is a photo I took while my Dad was driving us to Chun Wah Kam (one of my favorite manapua places) in Waimalu.

“Or should we go to Aiea for pizza manapua and chicken katsu musubi?” “No, parking is a bit tight and we can’t eat in there,” Dad replied.

I couldn’t believe the amount of traffic on the H-1, especially going westbound just before noon on a weekday. When I was growing up, my Mom lived in Kaneohe and my Dad lived in Pearl City, so when he picked me up for the weekend, we’d often stop by because my favorite manapua is sweet potato (Okinawan purple-colored sweet potato
rather than the yellow/orange yam) and I love their seven-layer rice cake. Even though there is a location downtown near Ala Moana, we drove out to Waimalu just because.

Spending time with my Mom, Samchun (Korean for “uncle”), and my Auntie Joy, all of whom are Korean. This is our favorite Korean restaurant, and here we eat the things that are too time-consuming to make at home. Spicy bean paste soup in dolso (stone pots) with assorted vegetables and tofu, grilling meat at the table, and lots of banchan (side dishes).
This is the view from the roof of my Mom’s apartment in downtown Honolulu. The bridge is across the Ala Wai Canal and is Kalakaua Avenue, the main road through Waikiki. The bottom left is the Hawai’i Convention Center. Not as interested in the makai (ocean) side, this photo is facing the mauka (mountain) side. I always liked how you could see all the houses going up the hill in Mānoa/Palolo. The building with the “hole” in it is the Waikiki Landmark, a very expensive condominium that is Japanese-invested (I saw a 9 bedroom unit on the 35th floor listed for $12,500,000).
This is a shot from the third episode of the first season of Hawaii Five-0. In the background towards the right, you can see the houses going up the hill.

Although taken in the same place, the photographs produce very different spaces. Rather than being Hawai‘i: the destination space, locals have taken photographs in the here and the now. In one of the photos, a Redditor says, “get outside right NOW and look at the sunset,” with a photo of a beautiful sunset. Rather than accenting the sunset with palm trees, rolling waves, or a green Diamond Head, the photograph captures a sunset over an industrial space by a Lowe’s Hardware store. Food is also an important aspect of living in Hawai‘i. How Hawaiian food is presented within the destination space begins with a luau, with garnishes of orchids or pineapple, presented with a side of hula or contemporary Hawaiian music. It is exotic, looks expensive, and is a spectacle. The same components of the Aloha Friday Lunch Luau, taken within the urban space, are not plated

and garnished in a particular way. They are often “plate lunches” using material that is thrown away, or leftovers in tupperware. Poke, or the raw fish salad, is purchased from a grocery store and eaten out of the plastic container on the beach. Poi, created from the corm of the kalo plant, is simply poured out of a bag or homemade, being pounded at home. A variety of food can easily be picked up at convenience stores and the word “spam” used in conjunction with food will not turn up noses.

Hirsch (2012a) describes looking as “[occurring] in the interface between the imaginary and the symbolic…mediated by complex cultural, historical, and social screens” (p. 119). The unconscious optics are at play, revealing things other than what we initially saw. The multiplicities of Hawai‘i given in these photographs produce a palimpsest of different places contesting and conflicting each other within the same space. By looking at various photographs depicting various versions of Hawai‘i, the layers between the sense of everyday life and the here and now versus the repetitious and static image of vacations in paradise are made visible. If postmemory is, as Tonya K. Davidson (2011) has observed, “a sense of feeling and knowing a place that is considerably ‘unknowable’” (p. 45), then the heterotopic postmemory that is animated in the photographic palimpsest of the here and the now could be described as the activity of unknowing a place, and therefore making complex, a place that has been rendered ostensibly knowable.

Palimpsests are commonly known as parchments or vellums that were previously written on, washed or scraped off, and then rewritten upon. Although continually recycled, the faint traces of previous work lingered on the pages. The history of Hawai‘i itself consists of many palimpsests that are continually recorded, appropriated, and
revised. As an example, one version of history is structured through the academic organization of time, while another is structured by the mythology and genealogy of space. The photographs depict Hawai‘i as a palimpsest, displaying the multiple layers of Hawai‘i as a relaxing tourist getaway, an action-packed experience under the gaze of the Five-0 Effect, or as the everyday, lived-in here and now.

The living connection of postmemory offers a version of Hawai‘i attributed from memory rather than official history, scratching away at colonial history in favor of tracing what lingers beneath and making visible what was left behind and written over. Oliveira’s (2009) notion of survey pegs is an example of chasing shadows and formulating a Hawaiian identity, history, and evoking memories that can be passed on from one generation to the next.

When I was in elementary school, I was enrolled in dance classes, specifically ballet and hula. Our kumu hula, or instructor, was patient and soft-spoken, yet firm. One of our dances was to the song “White Sandy Beach of Hawai‘i” by Israel Kamakawiwo’ole. Another song on that particular album was “Maui Hawaiian Sup’pa Man,” that detailed the legend of Maui, with a lyric stating: “Before there was a Clark Kent, there was a Hawaiian Superman.”

Kumu told us legends and stories from Hawaiian mythology, which gives another way of knowing, including the legend of Maui before letting us listen to the Bruddah Iz song. However, rather than stating these were mythologies, she began by asking us, “Remember when Maui pulled up the islands with his hook?” She would then tell us how Maui tricked his brothers into thinking he caught a large fish when he was really fishing up all of the islands. By asking us if we remembered rather than prefacing the narrative as
a myth, there was a resistance to the production of official history as a hegemonic and colonial form of knowing that displayed an example of contested memory production in Hawai‘i.
Conclusion

In memory studies, memory is often compared and contrasted to history. To Maurice Halbwachs, there is a difference between history and collective memory. History is comprised of segments, each with a beginning, middle, and end, while collective memory does not have marked boundaries. While history is created through institutions and is singular, collective memories are lived, experienced, and passed from one generation to the next. Pierre Nora creates a distinction between “real” or “true” memory and history, which restructures and reorganizes the past. Interestingly, although against institutions such as museums, archives, and monuments, Nora feels the great families, the church, and the state were wrongly disposed as the producers. He privileges certain events and prefers that those are what configure and structure the singular, nationalistic French consciousness. Although scholars such as Susan Sontag write that collective memories are not possible because memory belongs to an individual, Aleida Assmann insists memories are exchanged through language or preserved through photographs. Not only are these memories exchanged, but can be filtered, corrected, forgotten, or appropriated through institutions. Assmann also contends that there is a distinction between history and memory. Memory complements history because history is influenced by lived experience and oral histories, while history corrects memory because historical scholarship can be used to either confirm or critique memory.

Marianne Hirsch forwarded the term “postmemory” through her research involving the Holocaust. She, herself, is a member of the postgeneration, or children of those subjected to Auschwitz. Through photographs, her parents’ narratives, and work of other members of the postgeneration, Hirsch began to question why she was able to
clearly recall instances of her parents’ wartime experiences while unable to do the same with her own experience in Bucharest. She realized that the members of the postgeneration, through narratives and photographs, had similar affects, recollections, and (post)memories of their parents’ experiences.

Extending on Hirsch’ work, Tonya K. Davidson applied postmemory to her own virtual homeland, a city named Kapetanovo in Croatia that no longer exists. Her grandparents fled from Kapetanovo to Canada during World War II, living with other Kapetanovers who had done the same. Through her grandfather’s stories, residual culture of the Kapetanovers, Davidson considers her work as a form of narrative ethnography in order to tell her own story of how she sought out the faint hints and whispers of Kapetanovo that linger through postmemory, object survivors, and memory texts. Although her knowledge is partial and is made up of traces that reveal what was lost, she is able to mark her own autobiography and identity within history, and is able to actualize her virtual homeland.

Michel Foucault uses the term heterotopology, or the study of heterotopias, sites that are heterogeneous and not reducible to a singular space. He highlights six systems of heterotopias: crisis/deviation, changes in the function of a space, juxtaposition, temporal discontinuities, opening/closing, and function in relation to remaining space. Foucault uses the cemetery as an example of a deviation heterotopia as the cemetery used to be a sacred space located next to the church in the center of a town. Once cemeteries began to be associated with disease and fear that these diseases would infect the living, they were moved from the city center to the outskirts. This relocation suggests contestation of the cemetery’s status as a sacred or immortal space. The juxtaposition heterotopia
encapsulates multiple emplacements within a single space, such as a garden with a variety of flowers that would not grow together otherwise. Temporal discontinuities, or heterochronia, refer to spaces not susceptible to time such as a museum or a library. The system of opening or closing supposes spaces that seem to have an opening or offer of inclusion, but could actually be the result of exclusion. A ritual of purification may be necessary to enter, such as a bathhouse open to the public that requires members to be washed prior to use for hygienic reasons. The final example are heterotopias that either have the ability to perceive a deceptive space that displaces real space or create a different space, or compensate for a real space in another space.

Heterotopic postmemory is my theoretical reworking that combines Michel Foucault’s method of heterotopology and Tonya K. Davidson’s elaboration of postmemories of lost or virtual spaces to spatialize postmemory. I have elaborated this emergent concept through the study of spatialized and contested memory production in Hawai‘i.

Since Captain James Cook’s arrival to Hawai‘i in 1778, there was a steady decline of Hawaiian culture, language, and practices, accelerated with the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy, annexation, and statehood in 1959. A descendant of the royal family, Bernice Pauahi Bishop, bequeathed a trust through her will and codicils in order to establish a Protestant school for children of Native Hawaiian ancestry called the Kamehameha Schools. Influenced by the civil rights movement, Hawaiians began to focus on their identity, pride, and tradition. As a result, the formation of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and various sovereignty groups emerged. Institutions such as Kamehameha Schools and the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the
University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa seek to preserve and reclaim Hawaiian language, history, and customs although balancing between the rules and regulations of the American school system.

Within a singular space there are multiple places produced simultaneously, such as the Royal Hawaiian Center and Helumoa discussed in the second chapter. The Royal Hawaiian Center today is a large shopping center along three blocks of Kalakaua Avenue in Waikiki. Helumoa is the historic site that stood where the Royal Hawaiian Center is today. Members of the Kamehameha family lived in Helumoa, including Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the founder of Kamehameha Schools. The living connection that Hawaiians have to their land differs from historical context, as the tourism industry seems to fit itself within history in Hawaiian public schools. Students seem to be groomed to exemplify hospitality through having the “aloha spirit” and learn separate depictions of each island, similar to how the islands are portrayed in tourist guides.

Through the selection of images on social media sites such as Instagram, Flickr, and Reddit, I analyzed photographs submitted by residents of Hawai‘i and compared them to photographs commonly used in the tourism industry. These differences centered on the multiplicity of Hawai‘i as a homeland and a place of everyday life versus a destination space and tourist paradise. Food is an important aspect of Hawai‘i and the contrast between the food consumed by locals, which is localized global fusion, and the version of ostensibly ‘authentic’ Hawaiian food that is presented to tourists demonstrated how striking the difference is between lived Hawai‘i and the production of it as eternal destination space, which renders both differences and contradictions invisible.
The concept of heterotopic postmemory is well poised to study culture and memory in colonial contexts because it captures the simultaneous productions of contrasting time-places in the same space. Rather than having a lost or virtual space with diasporic populations, Hawaiians encounter postmemories of an actual space while residing within it. My methodology was derived from Foucault’s notion of heterotopology. Methodology was implicit within the text, with Foucault providing the tools to apply heterotopology to space. Davidson began to spatialize postmemory in terms of her own experience of Kapetanovo, but I firmly extend postmemory into space by using heterotopology as a methodological device. Rather than focusing on homelands that are lost or virtual, I focused on a homeland that is an actual, lived-in space. I was interested in how heterotopic postmemories of an actual place may provide a unique analysis within memory and postmemory studies, as most work focuses on the postgenerational memory of World War II. One of the major differences between the colonial and touristic context of Hawai’i and post-Holocaust diasporic postmemory is the way in which silences operate and what they have to confront. Hawai’i is known as a tourist paradise and an eternal destination space. The everyday, lived experience is thus made invisible in the present. Hawaiians also have difficulty in making claim to the lived experience of the pre-colonial past as certain customs have been appropriated and reworked (hula at the Royal Hawaiian Center) while other traditional aspects are lost and forgotten (the use of Western place names rather than Hawaiian ones) through the tourist production of Hawai’i as a destination space. These are examples of what the heterotopic spatialization of postmemory helps to uncover.
A possible methodological extension of this work could be produced through the use of interviews. One style of interviewing that would be relevant to the present work is photo elicitation, which is a form of interview that uses photographs in order to elicit responses.

Clark-Ibáñez (2004) writes that the use of photographs supplements the interviewing process for three main reasons: “first, photographs are used as visual inventories…second, photographs depict events that are a part of collective or institutional pants…third, photos are intimate dimensions of the social” (p. 1511). In Clark-Ibáñez’s case, not only did she find it easier to use photographs in order to communicate with children but also explains how photographs can also make the interviewing process easier with other ages as well, because the photographs can help with prompts, building rapport, and lessen the discomfort participants may feel in being in what they perceive as a formal, face-to-face interview. Beyond simply having photos and gauging responses, it would be interesting to ask graduates of Kamehameha Schools to take pictures of what Hawai`i means to them and then to compare their photos to the representation of Hawai`i produced by the tourism industry. However, there are different epistemological and ontological assumptions that my own approach makes that differs from conducting either face-to-face interviews or photo elicitation. In the creation of heterotopic postmemory, I take on a more discursive approach that is able to locate meaning and power within historical and collective practices. Nonetheless, it would be quite interesting to uncover the heterotopic postmemories of Hawaiians who have participated in language and cultural revitalization movements within their actual homeland.
The main contribution that this thesis makes to scholarship is its introduction of the concept of heterotopic postmemory. Drawing from Hirsch’s (2012a; 2012b) and Davidson’s (2011) work with postmemory, this concept adds to the literature in memory studies by acknowledging that memory is not merely biological or directly biographical on an individual level. Memory is collective, and its agents consist not only of persons but of objects, narratives, and places as well. Following from Foucault’s (1994) insistence that we give attention to space and not just time, heterotopic postmemory assumes that spaces do things and make differences. In this respect, the concept stands to make a contribution to scholarship in areas such as spatial studies and cultural geography. Therefore, even without the physical loss of a homeland, postmemory can be at work. Particularly in colonial contexts, such as in Hawai‘i, it is crucial to give attention to the ways in which multiple places overlap and collide in the same space through active struggles over collective memory-making.
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