

A Narrative of Kuki'iahu and its Erasures

Stephen H. Sumida

When the announcement was made that V. S. Naipaul had won the 2001 Nobel Prize for Literature, the head of the Swedish Academy said that “What he’s really attacking in Islam is a particular trait that it has in common with all cultures that conquerors bring along, that it tends to obliterate the preceding culture” (Horace Engdahl, quoted in *The Daily Yomiuri*, 12 October 2001, Edition D, front page). While what Mr. Engdahl said may seem to be an obvious truism to anyone who studies conquest, imperialism, and colonization, it reminded me of a distinct and particular event that has nearly been obliterated from history. In my following remarks about America and the Pacific I try first to recall an event in Native Hawaiian history and to demonstrate how powerful its erasure has been. The particular history, narrative, or story is about Kuki'iahu, a war that took place in 1794. The likelihood that you have not yet heard of this Hawaiian war is already a sign of its erasure. I go on to discuss literary works of Hawai'i to exemplify cultural agency, its loss, and its attempted recovery under conditions of colonialism, and to indicate one way by which multiculturalism in Hawai'i and the rest of the United States may itself be considered an agent of colonialism.

I must retell the story of Kuki'iahu in order to go on to make its loss felt.

My source for the history of Kuki'iahu is Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau's collected historical writings, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawai'i* (1866).¹ Kamakau's narratives are Hawaiian-centered, written as they are during the century when Hawaiians—meaning Native Hawaiians—ruled their own lands. For example, when telling of the arrival of Captain James Cook and his two ships in 1778, Kamakau is at Chapter VIII of his history of the ruling chiefs of Hawai'i. Captain Cook is not the beginning of Hawaiian history in Kamakau's narration. That chapter is preceded by narratives about historical figures who acted long before Cook arrived and who are the historical foundation of the Hawaiian nation. Kamakau's historiography demonstrates his cultural agency: he is able, as a Hawaiian subject in the middle of the nineteenth century, to speak, write, and act with powers of self-definition and self-determination.

According to Kamakau, on 16 November 1794 a series of battles or “war” called Kuki'iahu began, and it culminated ferociously on 12 December 1794. It was at the place called Kalauao, meaning “abundant clouds,” of the 'Ewa district of O'ahu. The leaders of the armies in conflict were Ka-lani-ku-pule, the ruler of O'ahu, fighting against Ka-'eo-ku-lani, the ruler of Kauai who in the preceding year had also become the ruling chief of Maui, Molokai, and Lanai

¹ Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii* (Honolulu: 1866; rpt. Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools Press, 1961).

upon the death of Ka-hekili of Maui. The battles of Kuki'iahu came about when Ka-'eo, home-sick, was journeying back from Maui and Molokai to Kauai. O'ahu was to be a stop along the way. Hearing of this, Kalanikupule and his counselors and warriors prepared for possible battle in anticipation of hostilities. When Ka-'eo did land on the windward side of O'ahu, a "severe battle" was fought. Yet afterward, the warring chiefs "had a friendly meeting at Kalapawai in Kailua, Ko'olaupoko" (168). Kamakau writes that "It was a day of mingled joy and weeping—joy for the ending of war, weeping for the dead in battle and also for the death of Ka-hekili," the late ruler of Maui (168).

Ka-'eo set off with his fleet of canoes up the windward coast to Waimea and Waialua, in the direction of his home island of Kauai. But en route he discovered treachery among his own chiefs, who allegedly conspired to throw Ka-'eo overboard at sea. Deciding to die in battle on land rather than alone at sea if death were to be his imminent fate, Ka-'eo ordered further attacks on Kalanikupule and the armies of O'ahu. Warriors of Waialua and Wai'anae joined Ka-'eo's side. Ready to fight, in November 1794 the opposing armies and their ruling chiefs engaged each other in the war of Kuki'iahu.

Ka-'eo achieved the early victories. The war ended a month later "on the ground of Kalani-manuia between Kalauao and 'Aiea in 'Ewa" (169). Kalanikupule deployed his army to hem Ka-'eo's army in. At the seashore margin of the battlefields, Kalanikupule placed a mercenary he employed when this soldier of fortune, a Captain Brown, had arrived at O'ahu with two heavily armed gunships, the *Jackal* and the *Prince Lee Boo*. Brown shelled the Kauai army and prevented escape by sea. When Ka-'eo attempted to change his own position to better advantage and possibly to escape altogether into the valley on the 'Ewa side of 'Aiea, "the red of his feather cloak [was seen from Captain Brown's boats] and their shots [at Ka-'eo drew] the attention of those on land" (169). Ka-'eo "was killed fighting bravely," and with him his wives, chiefs, and warriors. His young son, under the regency of his *kahu*, or care-giver, became Ka-'eo's successor on Kauai. This was George Ka-umu-ali'i, who would go on to be the ruling chief with whom Kamehameha would negotiate to bring Kauai into the Kingdom without further military conquest.

There are two further events in Kamakau's plot of his narrative that I need to retell. He tells about Ka-hulu-nui-ka-'aumoku, "a daughter of Ku-'ohu, the leading kahuna of Kauai" (169). Taken for dead, a fighter on the side of Ka-'eo, she was thrown onto a great heap of corpses. That was at about 1 : 00 on the afternoon of 12 December 1794. At about 10 : 00 that night an owl revived her by beating its wings against her head. Ka-hulu "opened her eyes as from a deep sleep," and, avoiding a sentry guarding the dead, she followed the owl seaward. She crawled to the sea, then swam, despite her many wounds, to the opposite shore "and landed at 'Aiea, where the owl led her up Halawa valley into the mountains," where Ka-hulu found a cave and again collapsed. The owl went on to find a former *kahu* (care-giver) of hers, who, led by the owl to the cave, restored some strength to Ka-hulu. Two days later Kalanikupule, the victorious chief of O'ahu, declared an amnesty, on pain of death to any chief or commoner who would break it, to allow the defeated warriors to leave the land.

So Ka-hulu returned to Kauai with her life. She was among Kamakau's sources for his narrative, his history of Kuki'iahu. She died in 1834, when Kamakau was nineteen years old, Kuki'iahu having occurred twenty-one years before his birth. To verify his source, Kamakau writes that "I have seen with my own eyes the scars of the wounds with which her body was covered" (170).

All this occurs in the opening three pages of Kamakau's Chapter XIV, "Kamehameha's Conquest of Maui and Oahu." It is noteworthy, I think, that despite the title of the chapter, in these opening pages Kamakau not once mentions the great chief and warrior Kamehameha, who would complete his conquest of the Hawaiian islands the next year and inaugurate the Hawaiian Kingdom. Further, Kamakau's interest and sympathies evidently lie more with the defeated and killed Ka-'eo and the survivor Ka-hulu, on the losing side, than with Kalanikupule. But his narrative builds upon the month-long battle, after which Captain Brown the mercenary quarreled with Kalanikupule his employer over his payment of 400 hogs for his work. Kalanikupule devised a way to get rid of Brown, who with most of his crew was killed, leaving Kalanikupule in possession of the two gunboats and all the weapons and ammunition they contained. Further treacheries involving arguments about the body odor of white men, however, resulted in Kalanikupule's loss of the gunboats, which remnants of Brown's gang turned over to Kamehameha at his military base on the island of Hawai'i. With this arsenal, a year later, in 1795, Kamehameha vanquished Kalanikupule's army at the battle of La'imi, in Nu'uaniu valley, O'ahu. Kamakau states that these "ships belonged to the United States of America," and "Had Ka-lani-ku-pule not lost these arms, Kamehameha might not have been successful in bringing the whole group [of islands] under his rule" (171). Thus in Kamakau's view and narration, the gains and losses of Kalanikupule in 1794 were to be consequential in Kamehameha's establishment of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Kuki'iahu was a big event.

By the time Kamakau published this event in history, and probably even earlier, he must have felt concern for verifying facts and details, in that he tells, to an audience already distant from firsthand experience, of how Ka-hulu showed him her wounds from Kuki'iahu to authenticate her story. The minute details Kamakau inscribes into his narrative—even if not necessarily by intention—bridge the gap between the event and the retelling, with a familiarity assumed to be shared still by his Hawaiian audience. The small, as if merely incidental, detail that Kamakau seems most familiarly to share with his audience is about eating a fish at its best at that certain place and time: on Maui, Ka-'eo "grew homesick for his friends on Kauai and set out with his chiefs and warriors to return to his own people, stopping at Molokai to enjoy its fat fish and *kukui*-nut relish" (168). A Hawaiian would know the reputation of these fish of Molokai, and this shared knowledge would stand for the truth of the history Kamakau is telling.

I said earlier that in the opening three pages of the chapter Kamakau does not tell about Kamehameha, though he goes on immediately afterward to tie Kuki'iahu directly to the ultimate conquests by the Lonely One (the meaning of the name, Ka-mehameha). On these pages Kamakau tells his story of Captain Brown but does not mention Captain Cook. The Hawaiian history here is far more powerful than the *haole* (foreign) one. Kamakau could have stated, but

does not, that Ka-‘eo was the very chief who first greeted James Cook at Waimea on the island of Kauai upon Cook’s first arrival in 1778. Kamakau could have stated, but does not, that Ku-‘ohu, the father of Ka-hulu the survivor of Kuki‘iahu in 1794, was the very priest of the god Lono who had ceremonially enabled Cook to enter Hawai‘i on that occasion in 1778. In Kamakau’s account, that priest of Lono also maneuvered to enlist Cook to serve in ways Cook could not know in the Hawaiian chiefs’ struggles for power that continued to 1795 and beyond. Haole (foreigner’s) history of Hawai‘i in Kamakau is at the service of Hawaiian history.

What has become of Kuki‘iahu? At this moment, you know this name. But before and beyond this moment, and by other names, does it have a place in history?

The final historical battlefield of Kuki‘iahu is bounded on the ‘Ewa or sunset side by what was then the taro fields of Kalauao fed by the spring called Huawai. These taro fields were what today is Sumida Watercress Farm. There is a history not yet written, as detailed as Kamakau’s, that can narrate how the taro fields became watercress patches, with some taro still being grown there. The battle flanks that trapped Ka-‘eo on that side were deployed on what are now the shopping complexes of Pearl Ridge Mall. The sea where Captain Brown stationed his fiery gunboats and where Ka-hulu swam toward safety is today Pearl Harbor. Even in Kamakau’s time, new histories of Pearl Harbor have all but erased the history of Kuki‘iahu. No wonder Kamakau relished proofs of that older history. A half-century after it occurred Kuki‘iahu was already in history’s wake.

Pearl Harbor, formerly called Pu‘uloa (a name also nearly forgotten in Hawai‘i of today), of course continues through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to be an important historical site. But from one century to the next, from Hawai‘i as a sovereign nation to its subordination as a colony, there are provocative differences in regard to who owns history, who tells history, and who are the subjects, who the objects, of history.

Queen Lili‘uokalani’s *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen* (1898) is an appeal for the recognition of the sovereignty of Hawai‘i and against the annexation of the islands by the United States.²⁾ The Queen continues Kamakau’s tradition, as John Dominis Holt would go on to put it, of telling about “our people, our history.” Hers, like Kamakau’s, is an extended narrative, a departure from the genre in which Lili‘uokalani was preeminent, her composing of *mele*, lyrical poetry. The narrative genre enables her to develop the continuities as well as reveal and narrate the fissures that characterize the lineages, heritage, and legitimacy of the Hawaiian kingdom and monarchy. Among the fissures or the most questionable *discontinuities* is the transition from the Kamehameha dynasty to the monarchy of Kalākaua and the lineage of Keawe-a-Heulu from which Queen Lili‘uokalani and her brother, her predecessor King David

²⁾ Lili‘uokalani, *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen* (Boston: Lothrop, Lee @ Shepard, 1898; rpt. Rutland, VT: Charles E. Tuttle, 1964; rpt. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 1990). A committee of American businessmen overthrew the Queen in 1893 with the unauthorized help of American Marines. President Grover Cleveland refused to annex Hawai‘i because it was taken by an illegal act of war. His successor President William McKinley, however, pushed ahead for annexation in 1898. The Queen undertook the writing of *Hawaii’s Story* under the duress of making a final appeal.

Kalākaua descended. The narrative—this record of a lineage of rulership and therefore of the Hawaiian nation—is as seamless as Lili‘uokalani could make it. Another historical fissure is the act of the foreigners in Kalākaua’s cabinet who forced upon Hawai‘i the bayonet constitution of 1887. This constitution weakened the power of Native Hawaiians in their own nation and strengthened the power of certain foreigners, Americans in particular. In her book Lili‘uokalani takes great care to explain her respect for the constitutional and moral requirement that the rulers listen to the voices of the people. She aims to demonstrate through her narrative that she was illegally overthrown by Americans because of how she intended to redress what the Hawaiian people considered the wrongs of the foreigners’ bayonet constitution.

In Lili‘uokalani’s time, Pearl Harbor is Hawaiian. Here is how Pearl Harbor appears in her story. At one point Lili‘uokalani alludes to “the Pearl Harbor scheme of 1873,” a plan to gain favor for the sugar produced by foreign owners in Hawai‘i. The plan was aimed to remove United States tariffs against Hawaiian sugar in exchange for the United States naval use of Pearl Harbor for colonial and imperial purposes in and across the Pacific. Someone’s plan went further than that. The queen states that “There is a gentleman still [in 1898] living at Honolulu whose boast is that he was the father of the project to annex Hawaii to the American Union” (38). She names this man as the originator of the Pearl Harbor scheme of 1873: Dr. John S. McGrew. He openly advocated that the scheme be preliminary to the obliteration of the native government, according to Lili‘uokalani. And of course today Pearl Harbor is not Hawaiian. Its now-dominant history (another event of war), the Japanese attack on 7 December 1941, relates to the United States possession of the islands. Today a point of land, from whose shore, I believe, Ka-hulu swam to safety, a small peninsula now owned by the United States Navy, is named McGrew Point after that alleged gentleman. Visitors to Hawai‘i no doubt find street and place names of Hawai‘i, in the Hawaiian language, remarkable, here meaning “exotic.” As remarkable I think would be a knowledge and understanding of the histories of those like McGrew whose names are not Hawaiian but have been applied all over the landscape, city maps, and shores.

Given the main purposes of *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen*—to appeal to and to persuade readers in 1898 to believe in and support the restoration of the monarchy—this narrative is as highly and as concentrated a Hawaiian-centered one as there ever was, constructed as it was in a context of opposition that called for distinction between “Hawaiian” and “foreign” more than Kamakau had to deal with in his time, when the monarchy itself was not so threatened. The sometimes breathtaking changes that took place in Hawai‘i of the nineteenth century, in the Queen’s narrative, vivify Hawaiian history: this is not simply a preserved culture, but a living one. Lili‘uokalani’s Hawai‘i is neither the backwater nor the retreat from the contemporary, modern world, history, and time. It is modern among modern nations, with all the attendant merits and demerits of being so. Her narrative of the Hawaiian delegation’s participation in Queen Victoria’s Jubilee in 1887 is splendid with displays of how the Hawaiians were received in England and seated among the royalty from around the world. Modern Hawai‘i was a nation among the *leading* nations of the time. And yet in one telling instance Lili‘uokalani

remarks about how, upon the party's visit to Mt. Vernon on the tour en route to London, she notices that Americans have come to call the mistress of that estate, the first First Lady of the United States, "Martha Washington" instead of "Lady Washington," a term she prefers out of respect for title. What might American readers of the narrative have thought, when Lili'uokalani tried very hard, with an extraordinarily deep sensibility pertaining to such matters, to explicate how the Hawaiian monarch is tied to the Hawaiian people and how the monarch thus is Hawai'i? How could the Queen possibly appeal successfully to a people whose vehemence against monarchy and whose loud championing of their republic form of government were central and professedly defining features of their American nation, character, and citizenship? To those Americans who read Lili'uokalani in that desperate year of 1898, how did it sound when she denounced and proved the *illegitimacy* of something called the "Republic" of Hawai'i erected by Americans after they illegally overthrew her? The seemingly light and naive question of why the mistress of Mt. Vernon is called Martha Washington and not Lady Washington evokes vast questions about differing sympathies and antipathies between Lili'uokalani's writing of her story and the audience she had to address.

John Dominis Holt's novel, *Waimea Summer*, published in 1976, is set in the early-1930s at Waimea on the island of Hawai'i.³ That setting and the novel's 14-year-old protagonist in it occur only three decades after Lili'uokalani wrote her appeal to humanity to honor the sovereignty of her land. Judging by a comparison of these works, those three decades brought extraordinarily swift cultural disruption, dislocation, and discontinuity. Mark Hull the young protagonist is a prodigy when it comes to knowing Hawaii's history. Interestingly, like Kamakau a century before Holt, now and then Mark comments about the food he and others are eating and he sometimes prepares from his precocious knowledge of dishes historically passed down through the generations of gentry, the storied, land-owning families of Hawaiians and *haole*. By remembered details that inform present practice and his ability to recite historical facts, history is continuous for Mark. But in a profoundly disturbing sense Hawaiian *culture* has discontinued, preserved like the dusty oddities that his host has collected and displayed around his gloomy house. For the young Mark, a still-beloved Hawaiian culture ceased living, in the past, in Lili'uokalani's time, in other words with the time of the overthrow of the Hawaiian kingdom three decades earlier. *Mele*, Hawaiian song lyrics, as much as he loves them, to Mark are melancholy, reminding him of loss and death of culture. He seems to know Hawaiian culture but cannot live it, until he meets a sage in Waipi'o valley, Mr. Hanohano, who tries to give Mark a one-night, crash course in what it means not only to live in Hawaiian culture but also to live with Hawaiian spirits still alive.

Coming between Lili'uokalani and Holt's fictive Mark Hull is the annexation of Hawai'i in 1898. Lili'uokalani's great statement to the United States did not prevent the takeover. John

³ John Dominis Holt, *Waimea Summer* (Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing, 1976). In *And the View from the Shore: Literary Traditions of Hawai'i* (Seattle: U of Washington P, 1991), I present an early reading of mine of Holt's novel (137-163).

Dominis Holt has been drawn to the Queen in his writings.⁴⁾ In the first-person narration of an older Mark Hull, of Holt's novel, recalling the events of that Waimea summer of his youth, certain themes emerge concerning the American overthrow of the monarchy and the erasure of Native Hawaiian history, agency, and culture. Colonization has cast the United States and its culture, now in power, in the role of the "modern." And this characterization casts Hawaiian culture in the role—a static, forever backward role—of representing the "primitive." In *Hawaii's Story*, 1898, these roles and their opposition against each other do not occur. In the fictional Waimea summer of the early 1930s, American modernity versus Hawaiian primitivism is not openly questioned but is assumed, except that the narrator's later, mature reflections on his youthful experience (including at least two first-time sexual encounters) expose the ways that the Hawaiian youth has believed in his own disempowerment and the "primitive" nature of the culture he mourns.

Today in Hawaii's literary arts I think of Gary Pak as a writer of Hawai'i who, having studied works of Kamakau, Lili'uokalani, Holt, and numerous other Native Hawaiians, has tried to intervene to critique the loss of culture that Holt's young Mark Hull suffers. Mark Hull as the adult narrator of *Waimea Summer* implicitly restores a narrative continuity from cultural past to present by revisiting and telling of that summer, however rich the narrative is with questions, mysteries, and the inexplicable. While Pak's short stories are ostensibly separate from one another, they also are joined by shared or repeated narrative details of setting, character, and theme. In his stories the Hawaiian-centered past and culture affect characters and settings in Hawaii's multicultural, colonial present. Thus Hawaiian history continues to effect change.

Pak's *The Watcher of Waipuna and Other Stories* (1992) is at times playful, grim, cautionary, and fantastical, with abundant allusions or intertextual references to works of Hawaii's verbal culture.⁵⁾ There is for instance, in the title story or novella, the lawyer Fogarty, whose name Gilbert Sanchez the protagonist confuses for "Mr. Frogtree," as in the misnaming of the hapless tourist in Rap Reiplinger's comic piece, "Room Service."⁶⁾ There is too the ending of the story, "The Watcher of Waipuna," where a frightened Gilbert runs away from his Hawaiian home site, the central setting of the narrative and symbol for Hawaiian lands forever being taken over by intruders. Gilbert's flight is reminiscent of Mark Hull's running away from the Pu'u Kohola *hei'au* (temple) and the central Hawaiian history it represents at the ending of Holt's novel. These literary and popular cultural allusions contribute to Pak's themes and explorations about the dynamics of Hawaiian history past and present.

Pak joins Native Hawaiian storytellers in using certain narrative devices. Nearly every one of Pak's stories in his collection contains some fantastical element. I call it this, rather than "supernatural," because what is assumed to be "natural" in these stories is under question anyway. The fantastical elements are among Pak's deliberate narrative strategies, usually em-

⁴⁾ See also Holt's *Kaulana na Pua: Queen Liliuokalani and the Throne of Hawaii: A Play in Three Acts* (Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing, 1974) and *Hanai: A Poem for Queen Liliuokalani* (Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing, 1986).

⁵⁾ Gary Pak, *The Watcher of Waipuna and Other Stories* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1991).

ployed to disrupt or to transform our ways of reading his stories and to evoke something that he may well consider Hawaiian. Remember Kamakau and his story of how the owl, the *pu'eo*, led Ka-hulu away from the pile of corpses. There is no break between Kamakau's telling of the date and time of Ka-'eo's death in battle, his succession by his son George Ka-umu-ali'i, and the wondrous deeds of the owl. In Holt's *Waimea Summer*, one of young Mark's profound problems is that there is a break between ways of perceiving reality. So, unable to understand "signs" and "omens" because he lacks a system for interpreting them, Mark is superstitious rather than believing. Pak attempts to bring the fantastic in line with the realistic by not explaining away the stench that suffocates the people of the valley in the first story, "The Valley of the Dead Air," or the appearance of his dead mother's best cooking on Gilbert's porch in "The Watcher of Waipuna," or the frightening sight of thousands of frogs in Gilbert's house suddenly one day, or the vision of tiny laughing children in the cups of blooming flowers in old man Jiro's garden at the very end of the book, in "The Garden of Jiro Tanaka." Pak's is an experiment with writing and echoing a culture that he has studied with great devotion, in his study of Native Hawaiian texts.⁷

My third theme in this paper, that Kuki'iahu (as an example of Native Hawaiian-centered history) is erased by multiculturalism or Local culture in Hawai'i, can be contemplated in Lois-Ann Yamanaka's first novel, *Wild Meat and the Bully Burgers* (1996).⁸ Yamanaka's novel has almost nothing explicitly to do with Native Hawaiian culture.⁹ The one place, however, where on further reflection I feel that something Native is being evoked in the novel is its ending. There, the protagonist—like Mark Hull a young teenager—realizes a deep reverence for the land that her father considers his original home. Lovey Nariyoshi the protagonist and narrator

⁶ Rap Reiplinger, "Room Service," *Poi Dog* (Mountain Apple Company, MAC 1002, 1978). Reiplinger was a brilliant comedian whose nightclub act and recording, *Poi Dog* (i. e., mongrel), encouraged many people in Hawai'i to feel bold, creative, and joyful about using Hawai'i Creole loudly. In "Room Service" Mr. Fogarty, a guest in a tourist hotel, calls Room Service to order food. The woman who commands the Room Service office takes Mr. Fogarty's name and calls him "Mr. Frogtree" instead. These names—Fogarty and Frogtree—became widely known and were terms of much humor for a while.

⁷ Another writer in Hawai'i who is studying and incorporating Native Hawaiian materials into his works, Rodney Morales is the author of *The Speed of Darkness* (Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press, 1988). See especially his story in that volume, "Daybreak Over Haleakala/Heartbreak Memories (A Two-Sided Hit)" (86-105).

⁸ Lois-Ann Yamanaka, *Wild Meat and the Bully Burgers* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace, 1996).

⁹ Yamanaka is a prolific novelist, and in 2001 she clearly departed from basing her novels on her own experience and the unresolved issues that troubled her from her past. In 1998 she told me some of her thoughts about Native Hawaiian subjects, thoughts so serious that she was not ready to work them into her novels as yet. So the lack of recognition of Native Hawaiian matters in her early works is not a sign of her ignoring the subject. In 2001 she told audiences that she was researching early twentieth-century Hawai'i for the setting of one her novels-in-progress. Yamanaka's departure from an autobiographical base announces an important new stage in her career and her contributions to Hawai'i's literatures. About the narrator Lovey Nariyoshi's reverence for the plantation homeland, it would be unwise to assume that Yamanaka herself has that attitude. Yamanaka has gained notoriety over the question of what if anything she herself believes or endorses in what the naive narrators present and represent in her novels.

flies to Kaua'i to find the place her father calls Kipu in his tales of his childhood. She brings a Ziploc bagful of its soil back to her blinded, hospitalized father, whose hunting rifle has back-fired in his face. Lovey enacts a flight filled with desire for a homeland, a desire made explicit in the pages of the novel where the father tells Lovey at great length about his longing for the "heaven" of his childhood, Kipu. Insofar as Lovey flies toward and reaches close to Kipu rather than runs away from that mythical site, the novel reverses the flights of Mark Hull and Gilbert Sanchez at the end of Holt's and Pak's stories. The entire incident of Kipu seems to dramatize a deep love of the land, in Yamanaka's novel.

Here it is the sugar plantation that is the "heaven," the home, and the origin of history and culture for the Japanese American and other Asian American and diverse families whose forebears were brought to Hawai'i to work. This same sugar industry backed the overthrow of Lili'uokalani, and thus brought about the *end* of Hawaiian-centered history. This thought gives me an opportunity to voice a question that I've been asking myself for some years. Natasha Barnes, who worked and studied with me when she was a graduate student at the University of Michigan, saw me wearing a Hawai'i T-shirt one day that celebrated "plantation days" and listed every sugar plantation by name. "You do that?," she said. "In Hawai'i people are nostalgic about the plantations?" In Trinidad and Jamaica where she is from, she said, the historical plantations are hated. Why celebrate what oppressed you? And indeed in *Wild Meat and the Bully Burgers*, too, Lovey's father tells woeful stories about how hard life was for workers and their families on the plantation at Kipu. Why then is the plantation loved?

The nostalgia for roots in Hawai'i, no matter that those origins involved the severest sufferings and deprivations that plantation workers and their children ever experienced in their lives, is an indication that Hawaii's Asian American writers of the third generation and beyond have learned a profoundly motivated nostalgia that substitutes for the historical struggles and the complex histories of their forebears. Multiculturalism in this sense has taught us but rather superficially to look to our respective ethnic roots and histories in Hawai'i—in other words, to the cultures of Hawai'i *since* the colonization of Hawai'i—in order to satisfy this nostalgia. The nostalgia also situates Hawaii's multicultural population within a paradigm of immigration that is predominant in the rest of the United States and that, as in Hawai'i, does not and cannot directly apply to indigenous peoples.¹⁰ When the origin of multicultural and working-class immigrant history is simultaneously the point of erasure of indigenous history, a conflict between "immigrant" and "indigenous" is constructed and is imposed with unequal oppressiveness upon the latter, whose land this land once was, and this imposition is an aspect of colonization.

At the University of Washington where I work, the American Indian Studies Center (AIS) has not been a part of the Department of American Ethnic Studies (AES), which comprises

¹⁰ See *Amerasia Journal* 26 (number 2, 2000). This issue is titled, "Whose Vision? Asian Settler Colonialism in Hawai'i" and is edited by Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura. The authors of the articles published here raise and address questions about how working immigrants, principally on the plantations, and their descendants and their heritages play roles or are complicit in the colonizing of Hawai'i.

African American, Chicano/Chicana, and Asian/Pacific American Studies. Among a variety of historical, intellectual, and political reasons that have been respected and have kept AIS and AES apart, there is a provocative point that I heard expressed in this way. I had included Leslie Marmon Silko's *Ceremony* and Linda Hogan's *Mean Spirit* in a display of literary texts for an information fair on our campus. A woman (she might have been Native American) questioned why we exhibited Native American literature under the label, "ethnic," which, she explained, is associated with cultures introduced by immigrants in the United States. In her view, "ethnic studies" and multiculturalism deflect our academic attention away from indigenous-centered studies and its possibilities. American Indian Studies as a unit by itself is therefore the site where such studies are developed. Indigenous studies should not be mistaken for being somehow narrowly "monocultural." The native peoples of the Americas, including those in the Pacific, are greatly varied in culture. Multiculturalism is transformed when shifted from "ethnic" to "indigenous-centered" studies. Lili'uokalani's Hawai'i was demographically and culturally diverse. In the sovereign, Hawaiian-centered view she took immense care and thought to envision and construct, all diverse peoples of her land were subjects of the sovereign Hawaiian nation. No matter that the issues embedded in any such discussion of indigenous and immigrant relations, colonized and colonizer conflicts, preceded the founding of the United States, the fields of American Ethnic Studies and American Studies need to be challenged anew by indigenous studies. This paper has been my attempt to begin taking my earlier published studies in new directions or further than I could when my colleagues and I, working with abandon to establish the category of Local, multicultural literature of and in Hawai'i, appreciated Native Hawaiian poetry, chant, music, and narratives without raising such questions as these that concern me here.

クキアフの物語とその抹消

〈Summary〉

スティーブン・H・スミダ

本稿では、1794年にハワイで起こったクキアフという戦いを例に、抹消されていたネイティブ・ハワイアン（先住民）の歴史上の出来事を再現し、その出来事を抹消した力がどれだけ強力なものであり続けてきたかを示していく。この作業は、サミュエル・マナイアカラニ・カマカウが著した *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii'i* (1866) を基に行う。この本はネイティブ・ハワイアンが自らの土地を支配していた時代の著書であり、ネイティブ・ハワイアン中心の記述となっている。クキアフとは、1794年にオアフ島で起こった、オアフ島の支配者カラニクブレと、カウアイ島・マウイ島・モロカイ島・ラナイ島の支配者であったカエオクラニとの間の戦いである。結果は、白人傭兵と彼らの軍艦の力を借りたカラニクブレの勝利に終わった。後のカメハメハ王のハワイ諸島統一にも影響を及ぼした、ネイティブ・ハワイアンの歴史上、重要な戦いである。戦いの舞台の一つとなったのは現在のパール・ハーバーであり、この地名はリリウオカラニの時代に別な事件で登場し、さらに1941年の日本軍の攻撃で有名になっているが、クキアフについて知っている者は、今や殆どいない。歴史は誰のものなのか、誰が語り伝えていくのか、また誰が主体なのか、その根底にある。ハワイの歴史が、ネイティブ・ハワイアンの手から別な者たちの手に移っていく過程で、クキアフの抹消が起こった。

本稿ではさらに、リリウオカラニの著書 *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen* (1898)、ジョン・ドミニス・ホルトの *Waimea Summer* (1976)、ゲーリー・パクの *The Watcher of Waipuna and Other Stories* (1992)、ロイス・アン・ヤマナカの *Wild Meat and the Bully Burgers* (1996) を題材として、ハワイの文学作品を論じていくことで、植民地支配という状況下での文化的な作用、先住民の文化の喪失、自らの文化を取り戻していこうという試みなどについて明らかにしていく。また、多文化主義あるいはハワイの地元文化と、ネイティブ・ハワイアン中心の歴史抹消との関係についても検証する。