

Mourning the Land:

Kanikau in Noho Hewa: The Wrongful Occupation of Hawai‘i

Anne Keala Kelly’s *Noho Hewa*¹: *The Wrongful Occupation of Hawai‘i* is a filmic narrative and testimony organized around and about Native Hawaiian resistance to three different (and all too similar) abuses of the land: U.S. military occupation of Hawai‘i, settler colonialism, and corporate tourism. Kelly brings together different aspects of these issues in a meaningful way to form a coherent testimony that contradicts the colonial and neocolonial re-imagining² of Hawai‘i as a peaceful Paradise. By depicting Kānaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian)³ struggles in a format that layers auditory truth telling over backgrounds that visually represent the issues being discussed, Kelly has created something akin to a contemporary multimedia *kanikau* (mourning chant). My analysis of *Noho Hewa* examines the ways in which mourning acts as a central cohesive element that relates many of the issues portrayed in the film. The theme of mourning speaks to intergenerational trauma from which many Native Hawaiians suffer in the aftermath of the U.S. backed overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Kelly draws upon elements of the *kanikau* to create a documentary that tells the story of the U.S. occupation of Hawai‘i through the desecration and destruction of sacred sites.

I teach this documentary in my first year English Composition section: “Hawai‘i—Writing Place, Writing Culture.”⁴

I observe my freshmen students as they watch Kelly’s *Noho Hewa*. I warn them that the content of this film will provoke feelings of discomfort. They become absorbed in what they are seeing and their facial expressions and body language clearly reflect their unease. When the film ends, I turn on the lights. Twenty faces stare at me in silence. Normally exuberant, these students are clearly disturbed by the film. *Noho Hewa* is a documentary that provokes. During the period

that I have used this film as a pedagogical tool, no one walks away untouched: whether they are angry or hurt, whether they are Native Hawaiian or not, everyone reacts to this film. Their reactions form the basis for class discussions and papers about the politics of place in Hawai‘i.

Before showing my students *Noho Hewa*, I have them watch another well-known documentary, *Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation*, which was released in 1993—one hundred years after the 1893 U.S. backed overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation. *Act of War* served as a *kāhea* (a call to action): “Today, after another century of dispossession, we are asserting our independence and sovereignty. We invite you to see Hawaiian history through Hawaiian eyes” (*Act of War*). *Noho Hewa* fills a different need than *Act of War*. Nearly twenty years later, *Noho Hewa* is also a *kāhea*—but the stakes are higher now—settler hostility towards Kanaka Maoli, expressed vis-à-vis the colonizer’s legal and institutional apparatus, appropriates human rights discourse as a strategy to negate Native Hawaiian claims, countering every political move we make. Lisa Kahaleole Hall explains:

The ignorance of the US public about issues of sovereignty and the trust lands of the Hawaiian people, the miscategorization of indigenous issues as “racial,” and the right-wing resistance to “minority rights” have brought us to a point where Hawaiians are in great danger of losing the limited entitlements that already exist, much less the immensely greater resources and rights to which we are legally entitled and do not currently receive.

Class discussions before viewing these films revealed that the large majority of my students knew very little, or nothing, about the circumstances that led to Hawai‘i becoming the Fiftieth State, or why so many Native Hawaiians are opposed to the U.S. military’s presence in and

militarization of Hawai‘i. Combined, these two documentaries provide answers to my students’ questions. *Noho Hewa* continues where *Act of War* left off.

Noho Hewa examines sensitive, complex issues arising from the ongoing illegal occupation of Hawai‘i, which include (but are not limited to) Kanaka Maoli struggles for self-determination, militarization of the Islands, dispossession and homelessness, destruction of cultural and natural resources, desecration of Native Hawaiian burial sites, and genetically modified organisms (GMO). *Noho Hewa* brings these issues into dialogue with each other, showing the ways that they intersect and overlap; how they are all linked to the occupation of Hawai‘i and competing ideologies on the value of ‘āina (land). To achieve this, the film makes use of formal and informal truth telling processes: people are protesting—literally testifying—and even disrupting testimony. *Noho Hewa* also calls upon Native Hawaiian experts.⁵ Their testimonies, which elaborate on positions and provide greater context, give a counter story to the ones that the military, corporations, and developers present. Through abrupt visual cuts between these performances, Kelly creates a powerful narrative about neocolonialism in Hawai‘i—a narrative that not only makes visible corporate and governmental strategies of erasure, but also documents Kanaka Maoli testimony to indigenous human rights abuses as well as resistance to that history of abuse.

Kanikau

A *kanikau* is a compelling example of Native Hawaiian speech performance; it expresses grief and honors that which has been lost. Preeminent Native Hawaiian scholar, Mary Kawena Pukui calls *kanikau* “poetic funeral odes.”⁶ Pukui describes the circumstances in which *kanikau* were produced and performed, “As the usual day and night of the wake wore on, relatives composed *na mele kanikau* (chants of mourning) or dirges. These were recited beside the coffin”

(Pukui, Haertig and Lee 1: 136). These chants included prolonged, piercing cries of grief. Pukui describes the reaction of non-Hawaiians to *kanikau*, “Foreigners who thought that it was all mere acting, did not understand that the feelings in the wailing cries were very real. It was one expression of grief” (Handy and Pukui 154). This telling statement emphasizes the fervor with which *kanikau* are performed, but it also speaks to how foreigners react to that which they do not understand—to their ethnocentric perspective that dismisses Native Hawaiian expressions of grief overly emotional. As I will show in this paper, this ethnocentric perspective is replicated today in other ways, especially in regard to Native Hawaiian laments over the (ab)use of the ‘āina.

While *kanikau* was originally an oral genre, with the advent of literacy and the publication of Hawaiian newspapers, it gradually gained popularity as a written genre, as is evident from the vast number that were published. The earliest example belongs to Hawaiian historian David Malo who published a *kanikau* for Ka‘ahumanu in the missionary-run newspaper *Ka Lama Hawaii* on August 8, 1834. According to Pukui, “Up until 1894, newspapers carried whole columns of mourning chants” (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 1: 136). However, *kanikau* were not only composed for the dead. The *uē helu* is a “wailing call of grief and love, recounting deeds of a loved one and shared experiences” (Pukui and Elbert 363). Pukui explains that an *uē helu* “might also be addressed to a departing friend, or by a mother as an expression of her grief over an ungrateful child or the loss of a prized possession, or upon the return of a relative who has been away long and far” (Handy and Pukui 155). *Kanikau* often included poetic references to gods, fauna and flora, wahi pana (places made famous in stories, sayings and songs), and even natural elements. However, these references were not always literal; the composer might be alluding to a person (Pukui “Songs” 248).

Kanikau were not only written for people. A *kanikau* was written in 1842 for the seminary Lahainaluna: “He kanikau ia oe, e Lahainaluna, a me ko aloha i ka manawa, a me ka hoi ana o na haumana [An expression of care for you, O Lahainaluna, and your compassion in the heart, and the return of the students]” (“He Mele”). In 1845, when the newspaper *Ka Nonanona* announced that its four years of publication life had come to an end, it asked its readers, “Owai ka mea nana e haku i wahi mele kanikau no‘u, i malamaia ko‘u inoa maikai?” [Who is the person who will compose a dirge for me to preserve my good name?] (*Ka Nonanona*). On January 14, 1857, a subscriber to *Ka Hae Hawaii* offered a *kanikau* for the year 1856. The writer urges readers to be grateful for the many blessings that Hawaiians received in 1856, including the marriage of King Kamehameha IV to Emma Rooke and the birth of the newspaper *Ka Hae Hawai‘i* (Kanaka Hawaii). The examples from nineteenth-century newspapers demonstrate the wide range of the occasions that gave rise to *kanikau*. *Kanikau* not only commemorated people, but also things and events. Furthermore, although they were primarily funeral dirges, they could also be directed at the living.

Great care was taken in the composition of chants and songs because in Native Hawaiian epistemology, language has agency—it is imbued with the power to heal or to destroy (Pukui “Songs” 247). A well-known poetical expression attests to this belief, “I ka ‘ōlelo no ke ola; i ka ‘ōlelo no ka make—*Life is in speech; death is in speech*” (Pukui “‘Ōlelo No‘eau” 129; ‘ōlelo no‘eau 1191). The Native Hawaiian philosophy encapsulated in this saying has a correlation in speech act theory. In her discourse on the capacity of language to injure, Judith Butler asserts, “We claim that language acts, and acts against us, and the claim we make is a further instance of language, one which seeks to arrest the force of the prior instance. Thus, we exercise the force of language even as we seek to counter its force, caught up in a bind that no act of censorship can

undo” (8). Inversely, if language has the power to injure, as Butler and others claim, then it follows, as Hawaiian belief holds, that language also has the power to heal.

‘Āina

To those persons unfamiliar with Native Hawaiian understandings of the *‘āina*, the idea of mourning the land may seem incomprehensible. In the western perspective, land is inanimate and to be exploited. In the Native Hawaiian perspective, the land is sentient and to be respected. While the land everywhere is undeniably a crucial resource for all of humanity as our very existence relies on its resources, all too often the former view leads to the destruction and depletion of those resources, while the latter seeks to protect them, thus ensuring our survival.

Traditionally, Native Hawaiians feel a close connection to the *‘āina* that goes beyond the love people might feel for the physical place and space they occupy. This relationship to the *‘āina* is a core concept in our epistemology and derives from our genealogical connection to the *‘āina*. Historian Lilikalā Kame‘eleihiwa explains:

Hawaiian identity is, in fact, derived from the Kumulipo, the great cosmogonic genealogy. Its essential lesson is that every aspect of the world is related by birth, and as such, all parts of the Hawaiian world are one indivisible lineage.

Conceived this way, the genealogy of the Land, the Gods, the Chiefs, and people intertwine with each other, and with all the myriad aspects of the universe” (2).

Understanding that the land has a genealogy is crucial to understanding Native Hawaiian attachment to the *‘āina*. Not only does the land have a genealogy in our worldview; it is both our ancestress and our elder sibling. The last scene in *Noho Hewa* documents activist and educator Kaleikoa Ka‘eo chanting an excerpt from the Kumulipo. After his performance, he explains, “That’s our mo‘olelo⁷.” He adds, “We, the Kānaka, go back to Wākea and Papa, over 120

generations, and in the Kumulipo, we add on a thousand more.” His performance is a powerful reminder of Native Hawaiian *kuleana*, our set of rights and responsibilities that are informed by our genealogy.

Because this genealogical connection to the *‘āina* is an important theme in *Noho Hewa*, a brief explanation regarding Papa and Wākea is important in an analysis of the documentary.

The Kumulipo records that the goddess Papahānaumoku, Island-birthing Papa, is a transfiguration of the earth goddess Haumea. According to the creation chant *Mele a Paku‘i*,⁸ Papahānaumoku mated with Wākea, the sky father and she gave birth to Hawai‘i, Maui, Kaho‘olawe—Ni‘ihau, Lehua, and Kaula were the afterbirth. From the union of Kaulawahine and Wākea, Lāna‘i was born. From the union of Hina and Wākea, Molokai was born. Papa mated with Lua and O‘ahu was born. Also born to Papa and Wākea was a daughter, Ho‘ohōkūlani. Wākea slept with Ho‘ohōkūlani and Hāloanakalaukapalili, a stillborn child was born. From his body grew the first *kalo*, or taro plant. Ho‘ohōkūlani gave birth to a second child, who was named after his elder, stillborn brother. This child, Hāloa is said to be the first human and from him, all Hawaiians are thought to descend. Clearly, the Native Hawaiian understanding of place differs from non-indigenous (especially Western) understandings of Hawai‘i. As respected *kumu hula* (hula teacher) and Kanaka Maoli intellectual, Dr. Pualani Kanahele, declares: “I Am This Land and This Land is Me” (21).

The Native Hawaiian perspective regarding the *‘āina* is also embedded in terminology denoting place and relationship to place. Preeminent Hawaiian historian and cultural expert Mary Kawena Pukui, explains that *kula iwi* means “land of bones” with the understanding that “here my bones began” and thus, “birthplace” (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 1: 112). *‘Ōiwi*, which includes the root word *iwi*, or bones, means “native son; native of the land” (112). Furthermore, as Pukui

explains, *maka ʻāinana*, or “common people” is “a contraction of *lunamaka ʻāinana*, meaning ‘caring of the land’ and “included not only farmers, but craftsmen, fishers, and sea-faring men as well” (Pukui, Haertig and Lee 2: 287). Pukui adds that these practitioners were all “*ʻōiwi*, the ‘backbone’ of the people, close and strongly linked to their land” (287). This connection between Native Hawaiians, *ʻāina*, and bones is an important part of Hawaiian epistemology. The testimonies in *Noho Hewa* attest to the fact Native Hawaiians continue to revere the *ʻāina* and hold sacred the bones of our kūpuna. From this perspective, mourning the damage to or loss of land and the desecration of burial sites is unsurprising.⁹

Noho Hewa opens with an excerpt from the poem “Hawai‘i” by Haunani Kay Trask: “Haole plover / plundering the archipelagoes / of our world. / And we, gorging ourselves / on lost shells / blowing a tourist conch / into the wounds / of catastrophe.” Trask’s poem references a Native Hawaiian cultural understanding of the Pacific Golden Plover, which is known in Hawai‘i as *kōlea*. The *kōlea* is “a migratory bird which comes to Hawai‘i about the end of August and leaves early in May for Siberia and Alaska (Pukui and Elbert 162). There are several *ʻōlelo no ʻeau*¹⁰ that mention *kōlea*, usually in a disparaging sense. Pukui explains that *kōlea* is “a scornful reference to foreigners . . . who come to Hawaii and become prosperous, and then leave with their wealth, just as the plover arrives thin in the fall each year, fattens up, and leaves” (Kelekona qtd. in Pukui and Elbert 162). Today, the *kōlea* is an apt metaphor for colonialism and neo-colonialism.

Trask’s poem echoes the *ʻōlelo no ʻeau*, “Aia kēkē na hulu o ka umaumau ho‘i ke kōlea i Kahiki e hānau ai. / *When the feathers on the breast darken (because of fatness) the plover goes back to Kahiki to breed.* / A person comes here, grows prosperous, and goes away without a thought to the source of his prosperity” (Pukui 56, *ʻōlelo no ʻeau* 56). There is a long history in

Hawai‘i of *kōlea* who “grow fat” in Hawai‘i, taking from the *‘āina*, but not giving back—so much so in fact that there are *‘ōlelo no ‘eau* that testify to this practice. These *‘ōlelo no ‘eau* are testimonies to the historical resentment that Native Hawaiians feel towards foreigners who (ab)use the *‘āina*.

Luku Wale ‘ia Mākua- Mourning the Land (Ab)used by the Military

Luku means, “Massacre, slaughter, destruction; to massacre, destroy, slaughter, lay waste, devastate, exterminate, ravage” (Pukui and Elbert 214). The use of *wale* adds the idea of “useless” or “without cause” to destruction (214). The opening scene of *Noho Hewa* begins with a *kanikau* performed by a group of Native Hawaiians at Mākua to mourn the destruction and desecration of the valley:

Au—ē!

U—ē.

U—ē.

Mai poina i ke ahi i ke kino o ko mākou makua, ō makuahine!

U—ē.

U—ē.

U—ē.

Ala—s!

[We—ep.

We—ep.

Never forget the fire that ravaged the body of our parent, endure mother!

We—ep.

We—ep.

We—ep.]

An epigraph explains that these chanters are praying for the recovery of Mākua Valley after an army munitions burn raged out of control and “engulfed half the valley, sacred sites and endangered species habitats.” In this case, the *kanikau* not only laments the damage caused to Mākua, but it also works to repair it. This is not the first time that a fire has ravaged the valley. The military has been using Mākua for live-fire training since the 1920s (Cole). As a child growing up in that area during the 1970s, I remember hearing the echo of explosions and seeing the occasional black expanse of charred mountainside.

Another important aspect of this *kanikau* is that it can be understood as both a testimony and a protest against the U.S. military occupation of Hawai‘i and its use of the land it appropriated. The *kanikau* is also an eloquent reminder of the Native Hawaiian presence. It is apparent from the soldiers in the scene that the chanters had requested and were granted access to a restricted area to perform their *kanikau*. This small victory, as well as their performance, is empowering for the Native Hawaiian community. Additionally, because of our relationship with the ‘āina, praying for its recovery also works to ease our own pain. Furthermore, this *kanikau* underscores the Native Hawaiian perspective of the ‘āina as a living entity. These chanters are acting as witnesses for Mākua Valley. They are not only speaking to her; they are speaking for her. Because the ‘āina cannot speak for itself, it cannot offer its own testimony, at least not in ways that have import juridically or politically, this group is doing for her. Their *kanikau* recognizes that she has been ravaged. And while there were few actual witnesses to the events that inspired the *kanikau*, and its actual performance, the number of witnesses grows as more and more people see the documentary.

Mourning the Land (Ab)used to Grow Genetically Modified Corn

The documentary's role as a contemporary multimedia *kanikau* brings attention to the way that loss of land and loss of jobs is connected to neo-colonialism—and no where in the Islands is this situation more dire than on Molokai-a-Hina, the poetical name for the Island born from union between Wākea and the goddess Hina. The effects of neo-colonialism are staggering on Molokai. The residents of Molokai do not risk eviction, but extinction—extinction of their way of life and extinction of their island environment. An epigraph in *Noho Hewa* explains, “Molokai Ranch, which covers one-third of the island, encountered opposition to plans for an exclusive resort on 500 acres of Lā‘au Point” and because the owners were unable to win their battle with Molokai residents, they “closed all of their businesses on the island, blaming community resistance to the Lā‘au Point development. In a single day, 4.3% of the island’s work force lost their jobs.” Léo Azambuja, writing for the *Molokai Dispatch* quotes Governor Linda Lingle, “The loss of this many jobs in such a small community like Molokai is equivalent to 23,000 people on O‘ahu losing their jobs on the same day.” What we have here is a conglomerate resorting to strong-arm tactics to pressure the population of an entire island into submitting to their business interests.

What most people might not know is that an international corporation, GuocoLeisure Limited (“GL”), owns Molokai Ranch. The Guoco Group’s web page explains:

Molokai Properties Limited (“MPL”), a wholly owned subsidiary of GuocoLeisure Limited, owns approximately 60,000 plus acres or 40% of the Hawaiian island of Molokai which is located between the island of Oahu and Maui. MPL had since March 2008 ceased its tourism and other operations on

Molokai Island and is land-banking its remaining land assets on the island.
 (“Molokai Ranch”)

The Guoco Group is a member of the Hong Leong Group—a transnational conglomerate: “Hong Leong Group is a leading conglomerate based in Malaysia with diversified businesses in banking and financial services, manufacturing and distribution, property development and investments, hospitality and leisure, and principal investment with presence in North and Southeast Asia, Western Europe and the UK, North America and Oceania” (“Home”). GL’s bland statement about ceasing its touristic operations and its reference to “land-banking” belies its strong-arm tactics.

In *Noho Hewa*, Native Hawaiian activist and Molokai resident, Hanohano Naehu, shares details about what happened once Molokai Ranch owners made their decision: “They tried to shut off their water to all the people that bought land down on the West End side. They shut down the Kaluakoi hotel. They shut down the theatres. They shut down the golf course. And right now, after all of that, they leased all of this land to Monsanto.” *Noho Hewa* does not give the details of the accord, but according to *Honolulu Star Bulletin* reporter Nina Wu, Monsanto “entered a 99-year lease for 1,650 acres of land, of which about 1,200 are farmable.” However, as Naehu explains, Monsanto is growing an experimental corn crop that is not edible. For Naehu, it does not make sense to grow crops on precious land that cannot be eaten. It goes against everything he believes in as a Native Hawaiian. As Naehu speaks, an epigraph clarifies, “Monsanto (also the maker of Agent Orange), and other corporations, like Syngenta and Dow, created the largest concentration of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) on earth in Hawai‘i.”

Furthermore, Molokai does not have unlimited freshwater resources and thus, Monsanto's use of limited water sources to grow inedible crops is problematic. Naehu explains, "Because this company always get money and they get the resources for justify their needs, they get the water over the Hawaiians. They taking our water, which is our most precious, most valuable resource and we using 'em on stuff that we cannot eat." A 2008 *Molokai Dispatch* article by The Hemowai Brothers sheds light on the issue:

It appears Monsanto is ready to buy the surface water system from Molokai Ranch. This system includes water catchment dams, pipes, reservoirs, and water tanks. This system takes water from seven of our mountain streams, from Kalamaula to Kawela. The water goes from central Molokai to west Molokai using some twenty miles of pipes, on an island only thirty-seven miles long.

Molokai's residents are understandably concerned that their fate and the fate of their island lies in the hands of a company that owns one-third of the island and its surface water system—the same company who leased its property for 99 years to a global corporation notorious for producing GMOs. Naehu points to the corn and says, "This is hewa. This is hewa. There's many examples and many ways and many kinds of hewa, but this is hewa."

On their website, Monsanto reports, "Monsanto Hawaii is part of Hawaii's growing seed industry – valued at over \$222 million and the state's largest agricultural commodity . . . Each year, Hawaii's seed crop industry generates \$13.8 million in tax revenues for the State of Hawaii. Collectively, seed companies like Monsanto provide more than 1,800 jobs in Hawaii (*Monsanto*). These statistics suggest that a large amount of land in Hawai'i is currently being used for experiments with genetically modified seeds and crops that cannot feed Hawai'i residents. A 2011 economic report released by the First Hawaiian Bank reveals that five

companies, all major players in the GMO industry, are growing seed corn on the island of Kaua‘i: “Monsanto, Pioneer, BASF, Syngenta and Dow Agrosiences” (“Economic Forecast”). Although the acreage that these companies own is not revealed, the report does state, “Dow Agrosiences hopes eventually to use 3,500 acres there for seed corn and other crops.” Monsanto also has a farm on Maui, but its activity there is not as nearly as extensive as its operations on Molokai, Kaua‘i, and O‘ahu.

In 2007, *Pacific Business News* journalist Charlotte Woolard reported on GMO land use on the island of O‘ahu: “Seed industry heavyweight Pioneer Hi-Bred International Inc. bought about 250 acres in Kunia at the end of 2005. Monsanto Co. purchased another 2,300 acres in April 2006 . . . Syngenta Seeds Inc., in the market for new acreage, also is looking at Kunia, as well as the North Shore of Oahu.” The U.S. military also plays a part in this scenario, as I will show. In *Noho Hewa*, Cathy Mattoon explains, “Nearly a quarter of the island of O‘ahu is controlled by the military,” and furthermore, “Fifty-six percent of the military-controlled lands in Hawai‘i consists of occupied Hawaiian National Lands, or the Ceded Lands.” However, this is only a part of the story. The U.S. military is also a private landowner.

According to *Star Advertiser* reporter Andrew Gomes, “The U.S. Army and private development partner Lend Lease bought roughly 2,400 acres in Kunia from Campbell Estate in 2008” and “Monsanto in 2009 leased 1,675 acres for 40 years to grow seed corn.” It is extremely disturbing that the U.S. military has a business relationship with one of the most powerful and most despised global corporations in the world. Neo-colonialism and military expansion are literally consuming Hawai‘i, while Native Hawaiians and other island consumers pay the price. As an epigraph in *Noho Hewa* reveals, “90% of everything consumed in Hawai‘i, including food

is shipped in from the continental United States.” In the light of these statistics, everyone should be mourning the way land is being (ab)used in Hawai‘i.

Mourning the Desecration of *Iwi Kūpuna* (Ancestral Remains)

The importance of *‘āina* to Native Hawaiians extends to what lies within it. Mourning the land includes mourning the desecration of *iwi kūpuna*. Those who are no longer among the living are in need of someone who will speak on their behalf. Such is the case of Native Hawaiian activists and descendants who bear witness to the desecration of *iwi kūpuna*. There is a long history of the military, corporations, and individuals desecrating Native Hawaiian burial sites. Increasingly, ancestral remains are uncovered in construction site excavations. What many westerners do not understand is that these burial sites were purposely left unmarked. The bones of the dead were often secreted away at night so that their final resting place would remain unknown, and thus, “ancestral bones can be found almost anywhere in Hawai‘i today” (*State Historic Preservation Division*). Another crucial issue concerns Native Hawaiian beliefs about bones. Bones are imbued with the *mana*, or spiritual power, of the deceased, which returns to the earth as the bones disintegrate. Because the *‘uhane* (spirit) of the deceased resides in the bones, they “must be kept safe from molestation” (Handy and Pukui 151). The disinterment of *iwi kūpuna* is extremely distressing for many Native Hawaiians.

One of the most powerful scenes in *Noho Hewa* is a heated confrontation between activist Jimmy Medeiros and State-contracted archaeologist Alan Haun during a meeting with the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council. An epigraph explains the purpose of the meeting: “Archeologists for the state asked the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council to relocate burials blocking construction of one of the roads to the Hōkūli‘a Resort.” During this meeting, State-contracted archaeologist

Paul Rosendahl asserts that the human remains uncovered in the construction of the resort “should be treated as legitimate inadvertent discoveries and not as previously identified features.” Rosendahl’s words are immediately followed by an epigraph: “Defining a burial as “inadvertent provides investors and government officials with a legal framework that typically leads to removal of Hawaiian remains or construction on top of the graves.” In short, although measures are in place to safeguard burial sites, there are legal loopholes that work against Native Hawaiian efforts to protect *iwi kūpuna*. Haun gives an account of a sledgehammer being used to open a lava blister. It is clear that he considers this act acceptable. He then shares that this lava blister contained fragments of human bones.

When Medeiros takes his turn to offer testimony, he declares that these burials have been desecrated and inquires as to what charges or actions will be taken, or filed. At one point in his testimony, Medeiros directly addresses the archaeologists. He remarks that they are “lucky” to be living in “modern times” and that they “have the shield of the law” to protect them because what they are doing “is not work,” but “desecration.” The implication is that in ancient times, such a desecration would have been punished. Haun, who is seated off to one side behind Medeiros, interrupts his testimony and begins talking over him. The camera cuts to show a woman, Keola Hanoa, longtime activist and council member, who is observing their exchange. As she watches, a tear rolls down her cheek.

Obviously frustrated with Haun’s lack of regard for protocol, Medeiros reacts, “Shut up. You do not speak when I am giving testimony.” Medeiros leaves his chair and stands in front of Haun and says, “This is so damn serious—to sledgehammer any site—that’s not what we hired you for. You get one and a half million dollars.” Medeiros returns to his seat and apologizes to the council. He then remarks, “When we come here, I sit here, us people, Hawaiians, and testify

in public, we don't get paid a million dollars like him and Paul to sit here—we speaking real deal from our heart, from our soul, from our Hawaiian and who we are.” He adds, “We get more weight on this imaginary scale”—and here he turns to Haun—“than all your years of desecrating, okay?” Medeiros has identified another aspect of the issue—from the hegemonic western perspective, and especially in a western legal system, indigenous testimonies informed by cultural knowledge are often quite literally less valued than testimonies using western scientific methods. Haun's failure to fully grasp the nuances of what is morally permissible from a Native Hawaiian standpoint when dealing with a burial site is not an isolated case—such as the example of Walmart.

Walmart is the “most powerful, most influential company in the world” (Malone). Its slogan is “Save Money, Live Well” (*Walmart*). The company is an example of neocolonialism in action. While Walmart was constructing their Ke‘eaumoku store in Honolulu, a burial site was uncovered with the remains of 44 Hawaiians, but the archaeologists neglected to immediately inform the proper authorities (Apgar). Furthermore, archaeologists were accused of disrespecting excavated remains. *Honolulu Star Bulletin* journalist Sally Apgar reports, “Specifically, the commission report said conduct included ‘writing on a child's skull with indelible red ink, taping a child's (an infant's) teeth to an index card, using duct tape and modeling clay to hold remains together and writing the words 'Handbag Louis Vuitton' on a paper sack that contained a human hand.” On the day that Walmart opened its doors for the first time, these bones were placed in containers, which were stored beneath the access ramp to Walmart parking.

Noho Hewa documents the protest at the grand opening. Many of the protesters hold signs and walk back and forth from the access ramp to where customers are sitting at tables consuming food and drinks they purchased from external food franchises in the Walmart

complex. Demonstrators alternately shout out their protests and seek to engage passers-by in conversation. A shopper responds, “Oh come on. If it was your ancestors, you didn’t take very good care of them.” The shopper’s response reflects a typical ethnocentric settler perspective in which cultural practices alien to their worldview are dismissed and denigrated. One protestor tries to explain the concept of bones and mana to a shopper who listens. The shopper then responds, “It doesn’t make sense to me to keep this ground vacant just because someone’s buried down there, especially people that nobody now living ever knew.” The protester asks, “If Bush’s ancestors were buried here, you think there’d be a Walmart?” “Bush? No! Probably not.” The protester responds, “So, everybody is just people.” The shopper perceives the land as vacant and that vacancy is a waste. For him, the dead are not tenants. They have no rights—unless of course—you are white and you are powerful. For the shopper, there are people and then there are *indigenous people*. For the protester, “everybody is just people.”

Noho Hewa also reveals that not all Native Hawaiians respect traditional beliefs. Kelly does not hesitate to show that there are conflicts within the community about this issue and others. Kelly asks a passenger in a car leaving Walmart, “Are you Hawaiian?” The passenger nods. In that instance, Kelly and the passenger begin talking over one another. The passenger says that she is 50% Hawaiian, just as Kelly asks, “And you are driving over your kūpuna? What’s that feel like? Can I get an interview?” The scene cuts to where two youths are promoting Jamba Juice. One youth is dressed in a banana costume and the other as a strawberry. They are singing and dancing, their voices drowning out those of the protesters. The girl wearing the strawberry costume is the passenger who stated that she is 50% Hawaiian. Immediately following this scene is an epigraph of a well-known quote by Ngugi Wa Thiong’o from his book *Decolonising the Mind*: “The effect of the cultural bomb is to annihilate a people’s belief in their

names . . . in their heritage . . . ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland.” This sequence speaks to the colonial assimilation of a Native Hawaiian into American culture—the young Native Hawaiian woman becomes the poster child of that assimilation.

Two of the protesters, Kahili Kawainui Norman and Paulette Ka‘ano‘hi Kaleikini, are lineal descendants of the kūpuna who were disinterred from what is now Walmart. Norman explains that Walmart had reneged on its promise to reinter the bones before the opening. Kaleikini describes the desecration as “sickening.” Three years later, Walmart has still not kept its promise. Kelly interviews Kaleikini who explains, “At the end of 2008, and we still haven’t reinterred the iwi kūpuna that were placed in containers under the driveway.” She then reports the desecration perpetrated on the bones by an archaeologist (referenced earlier in the newspaper account). Kelly asks her, “So, how does that make you feel?” As Kaleikini struggles to find adequate words to express her pain, her facial expressions reflect her feelings. The camera continues to roll for several seconds, but no answer is forthcoming. This is one of the most powerful moments in *Noho Hewa*—the viewer becomes a witness to Kaleikini’s silent but eloquent testimony, to her inner struggle to find the words to express her grief and anger.

Noho Hewa draws our attention to a crucial aspect of this issue: unmarked burial sites are not accorded the same respect as, for example, western style graveyards. Dismantling a western style graveyard would be unthinkable, but disturbing the bones of Native Hawaiians to make way for hotels, houses, megastores, golf courses, and even sewage facilities is acceptable. Kelly interviews Ty Kāwika Tengan, a Native Hawaiian anthropologist who teaches at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Tengan explains, “We are at Mokapu Peninsula, Kāne‘ohe Marine Corps

station; this is the site of the single largest and longest running desecration of Native Hawaiian ancestral remains, or iwi kūpuna, starting from the period of 1915 up in through the present. Over three thousand sets of individual human remains were disinterred from this peninsula.” Tengan’s testimony also works to chronologically resituate indigenous human rights violations perpetrated by the U.S. military (and hence by the U.S.) from a violation that occurred in the remote past to one that is ongoing. Relegating indigenous human rights violations to the past is a tactic in neocolonial rhetoric—one that seeks to dismiss our claims for justice, to dismantle our resistance, to denigrate our indigenous epistemology. Everything is bundled up and buried beneath the claim that “this took place in the past.” Our ancestors buried beneath Walmart or at Mokapu belong to the past, our belief narratives belong to the past; indeed, our entire worldview belongs to the past. And then, the neocolonial powers construct their narratives—political, socio-economical, and cultural—upon the bones of our heritage. Genocide is not only the physical extermination of a people; genocide is also the destruction of a people’s spiritual and intellectual foundation.

Kelly also interviews Kaleikoa Ka‘eo, who is affiliated with Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai‘i Nei (Group Caring For the Ancestors of Hawai‘i). This nonprofit organization is “dedicated to the proper treatment of ancestral Native Hawaiians” (*Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai‘i Nei*). Ka‘eo gives testimony regarding the military’s threat to build a sewage facility over a Native Hawaiian burial site if the burial council did not move the remains. Ka‘eo explains that the “best of two evils was to remove our kūpuna; there’s no way we are going to allow them to build a sewer facility on top of our kūpuna.” He adds, “The military would not even consider building a sewer facility at Punchbowl, but the right of the military to discharge their waste was more important than the religious and spiritual rights of the Kānaka to remain in the ground in

their own homeland.” Cutting through Ka‘eo’s testimony is a brief glimpse of a military ceremony honoring U.S. veterans interred at Punchbowl. A master of ceremony exhorts the crowd to respect the memory of the veterans—today and always.

Ka‘eo continues his truth-telling, questioning the military’s rhetoric about the importance of Hawaiian land for training troops. He ponders how using Hawaiian land for golf courses and sewage facilities helps prepare soldiers for battle. He adds, “You can clearly see it’s beyond that—it’s really about them controlling everything, dominating everything, even at the expense of our kūpuna. So even you as a Hawaiian, you can get evicted as a Hawaiian, even when you pass on. We’re always—we’re always at the threat of being evicted from our homelands, even when we’re under the ground.” Eviction is a legal process that involves an owner expelling a tenant from her or his property, thus applying the concept of eviction to *iwi kūpuna* fully expresses the historical disenfranchisement of Native Hawaiians.

Summary and Conclusions

Native Hawaiians continue to cope with the aftermath of historic injustices to which they have been subjected—injustices that were carried out by missionaries and their descendants, by hostile settlers who overthrew the Hawaiian monarchy, and by the U.S. who supported their efforts, which resulted in Hawai‘i, an independent nation state, becoming (illegally and against the will of the Kānaka Maoli) the Fiftieth State. Native Hawaiians are fighting to recover from what Pukui laments as the “internalized acceptance of repeated, handed-down opinions first expressed some 150 years ago” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1: 85). She explains, “Told their gods were false, their rituals foolish, their dress, dances and manners unacceptable, their skills and talents unimportant, the Hawaiians as a people knew an ‘identity crisis’ long before the phrase

was coined” (85). These historical injustices are at the root of the unresolved grief and anger that Native Hawaiians transmit from one generation to another. In the colonial gaze, our *‘āina* is valuable—but we, Native Hawaiians, are dispensable. As J. Kehaulani Kauanui explains, “That is settler colonialism. It’s about replacing the indigenous people within their own landscapes” (*Noho Hewa*). Native Hawaiians do not only mourn the loss of our land, we also mourn the loss of our identity that is tied to the loss of land—the loss of our sovereignty.

We, Native Hawaiians, are constantly reminded that today we are Americans. We constantly navigate between two worlds and not all of us are able to come to terms with such cultural shuttling. For those of us who cannot and do not buy into being American, we have to find ways to cope. In *Noho Hewa*, Haunani Kay Trask shares her coping strategy:

The only thing that I think people can do is to fight it—for me any way. I can’t stand being depressed, which I am every day. I get up depressed—because it kills you. So, if you get out there and say, ‘Okay, we’re going to fight this.’ You feel a lot better because you’re taking control over something, as small as it might be, or turn out to be. It’s way better than doing nothing—you must fight it even if you lose.

Trask’s testimony exemplifies the feelings of many Native Hawaiians. This is clear by the many *kāhea* that go out, asking for and receiving support on various issues, whether to save a Native Hawaiian charter school, or assist a Hawaiian-language immersion school through fundraising, protest, by being present physically or signing a petition, against GMO, the desecration of *iwi kūpuna*, or the desecration of Mauna Kea—the list goes on. Native Hawaiians, because of the liminal political space we occupy, must take matters into our own hands. We do not have a powerful, international organization assisting us in any meaningful, practical way—no political

entity wants to take on the United States of America—yet, many Kanaka Maoli do so everyday. Resistance and insistence is the key to our physical, spiritual, intellectual survival.

In many aspects, Kelly's documentary is controversial. She addresses complex issues straightforward and does not hesitate to show how these issues divide Hawai'i residents and even the Hawaiian community. She does not romanticize what it means to be Native Hawaiian in the twenty-first century—a century that sees Native Hawaiians desperately fighting for their *'āina*, their culture, and their language. At the same time, the brutal honesty of *Noho Hewa* is the very thing that makes it beautiful—a tribute to Native Hawaiians who continue to resist the forces that threaten their existence.

Kelly's documentary not only testifies to violence perpetrated against Native Hawaiians, but in several very important ways, it also has the capacity to heal. *Noho Hewa* is a powerful reminder for Kanaka Maoli that we are not alone in our political struggles and our pain—other Kanaka Maoli whom we might not know and whom we might not ever meet share the same reality. *Noho Hewa* reminds us that we have supporters outside of our community. Kelly's documentary has been well received both in Hawai'i and internationally. To date, it has received the 2011 Grand Festival Award at the Berkeley Video and Film Festival, the 2010 special jury prize at the Festival International Du Film Documentaire De Oceanien (FIFO) in Tahiti and 2008 Best Documentary Award at the Hawai'i International Film Festival (*Noho Hewa*). Indeed, Kelly's work has enormous potential to elicit a compassionate understanding of Kānaka Maoli struggles. *Noho Hewa* serves an important need. It raises public awareness about the indigenous human rights violations that occur every day in Hawai'i. Arguably, Americans are unaware of the history of gross human rights violations that their country has carried out against Native Hawaiians. *Noho Hewa* also serves as a platform to invite discussion—where do we go from

here? From my own Native Hawaiian perspective, the strongest message of this film is embedded in its structure—it begins with a chant lamenting loss (the *kanikau* for Mākua Valley), but ends with a chant celebrating birth (Ka‘eo chanting the Kumulipo)—the message is hope and an invitation to continue resisting. We are still here, still fighting, still giving testimony on the historic and ongoing violations of our rights. We are still resisting *hewa*.

Notes

¹ The English portion of the title offers a translation of *noho hewa*: “wrongful occupation.” *Noho* is a word often used in connection with land, as in dwelling or residing, occupying or ruling. *Hewa* is a very strong word—it refers to a transgression of some sort—a violation. All translations are mine unless indicated otherwise.

² *Colonialism*, according to the definition offered by the *Oxford American Dictionary* (OAD) is the “policy or practice of acquiring full or partial political control over another country, occupying it with settlers and exploiting it economically. *Neocolonialism*, OAD explains, is “the use of economic, political, cultural, or other pressures to control or influence other countries, esp. former dependences.” In reality, colonialism and neocolonialism merged seamlessly—the nineteenth-century power plays that ultimately cost our people their independence as a sovereign nation gave way to new and more insidious power plays. The colonial and neocolonial reimagining of Hawai‘i has taken different forms in the last two hundred years—and whatever form it takes—it is always an act of violence. It serves to appropriate and erase Kānaka Maoli relationship to and understanding of place, and has ultimately worked to disempower us. For a discussion of the colonial re-imagining of Hawai‘i, see Cristina Bacchilega, *Legendary Hawai‘i and the Politics of Place: Tradition, Translation, and Tourism* (2007).

³ I do not italicize “Kanakanā Maoli” (singular), or “Kānakanā Maoli” (plural) for the same reasons that other nouns, such as “American” and “Americans,” are not italicized. I use Kānakanā Maoli and Native Hawaiian interchangeably. Other terms that Kānakanā Maoli use to reference ourselves include “‘Ōiwi,” the explanation of which is included in this paper.

⁴ This place-based approach to teaching college composition includes a critical examination of sensitive, complex issues connected in one way or another to a history of colonialism such as questions of identity, relationship to place, sovereignty, corporate tourism, exoticification of culture, racism, and competing ideologies on the value of land and water resources. The instructor, who developed this theme, Dr. ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, has kindly granted me permission to use the title for my own courses whenever she does not teach it. My syllabus is closely modeled after hers. For further discussion on her pedagogy, see ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui, “‘Ike ‘Āina: Native Hawaiian Culturally Based Indigenous Literacy.” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being, Vol. 5*. Honolulu: Kamehameha P, 2008. This journal can also be found at *Ulu kau.org*.

⁵ The interviewer’s voice in *Noho Hewa* belongs to Kelly.

⁶ Pukui, Mary Kawena, E. W. Haertig, and Catherine Lee. *Nānā I Ke Kumu: Look to the Source Vol 1* (Honolulu, HI: Hui Hānai, 2002),136.

⁷ *Mo‘olelo* is a Native Hawaiian genre that unites both history and beliefs in narratives.

⁸ Abraham Fornander published this chant, along with explanations, in Hawaiian and English (4: 12-20).

⁹ I will discuss Native Hawaiians beliefs regarding bones in detail later on.

¹⁰ An *‘ōlelo no ‘eau* is a poetical saying that can be didactic or commemorative.

Works Cited

Act of War: The Overthrow of the Hawaiian Nation. Kekuni Blaisdell, Lilikalā

Kame‘eleihiwa, Jon Osorio, and Haunani Kay Trask. Prod. Dir. Joan Lander and Puhipau. Honolulu: Center for Hawaiian Studies, 1993. DVD.

Apgar, Sally. “Wal-Mart archaeologist to fight claim he desecrated remains.” *Honolulu Star Bulletin* 19 Nov. 2005. *HonoluluStarBulletin.com*. Web. 21 Mar. 2011.
<http://archives.starbulletin.com/2005/11/19/news/story06.html>

Azambuja, Léo. “Molokai Ranch Terminating Operations and Employees.” *Molokai Dispatch* 24 Mar. 2008. *Molokai Dispatch*. Web. 10 May 2011.
<http://www.themolokaidispatch.com/molokai-ranch-terminating-operations-and-employees>

Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: on the discursive limits of “sex.”* New York: Routledge, 1993. Print.

First Hawaiian Bank. “Economic Forecast: Kauai Edition 2010-2011.” *First Hawaiian Bank*. Web. 10 May 2011. PDF. https://www.fhb.com/hm_news09222010.htm

Fornander, Abraham. *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folk-lore Vol. 4*.

Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 2004.

Gomes, Andrew. "Nonprofit plans agricultural park for local farmers." *Star Advertiser* 23 Mar.

2011. *StarAdvertiser.com*. Web. 10 May 2011.

http://www.staradvertiser.com/business/20110323_Nonprofit_plans_agricultural_park_for_local_farmers.html

Hall, Lisa Kahaleole. "Hawaiian at Heart and Other Fictions." *The Contemporary Pacific* 17.2

(Fall 2005): 404-413. *JSTOR*. Web. 21 Mar. 2011.

Handy, E.S. Craighill and Mary Kawena Pukui. *The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u*.

Honolulu: Mutual, 1999.

"He Mele no Lahainaluna." *Ka Nonanona* 8 Nov. 1842. *Ulukau.org*. Web 10 May

2011. <http://nupepa.org/gsd12.5/cgi-bin/nupepa?e=d-0nupepa--00-0-0--010---4---text---0-11--1haw-Zz-1---20-about-He+kanikau+ia+oe+e+Lahainaluna--00031-0000utfZz-8-00&a=d&cl=search&d=HASH01fd04151838123ff2504df4.2>

"Home." *HLG: Hong Leong Group*. *Google Search*. Web. 29 June 2012.

<http://www.hongleong.com/>

Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i Nei. "Background." *Hui Malama I Na Kupuna O Hawai'i*

Nei. Web. 5 May 2011. <http://huimalama.tripod.com/index.html#background>

Ka Nonanona. "Ka Make o ka Nonanona." *Ka Nonanona* 18 Mar. 1845. *Ulukau.org*. Web. 10

May 2011. <http://nupepa.org/gsd12.5/cgi-bin/nupepa?e=q-0nupepa--00-0-0--010---4---text---0-11--1haw-Zz-1---20-about-Ka+Make+o+ka+nonanona--0003301-0000utfZz-8-00&a=d&c=nupepa&cl=search&d=HASH01a63a210e84fa748c7b2b11.4>

Kanaka Hawaii. "He Mele Kanikau na ke Kanaka Hawaii i ka Makahiki 1856." *Ka Hae Hawaii*

-
- 14 Jan. 1857. *Ulukau.org*. Web. 10 May 2011. <http://nupepa.org/gsd12.5/cgi-bin/nupepa?e=d-0nupepa--00-0-0--010---4---text---0-11--1haw-Zz-1---20-about-Kanikau--00031-0010utfZz-8-00&a=d&cl=CL1.7.2&d=HASH0117fce2b2d2e2b2ce778eb6.2>
- Kame‘eleihiwa, Lilikalā. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea Lā E Pono Ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1992. Print.
- Kanahele, Pualani. “I Am This Land and This Land is Me.” *Hūlili: Multidisciplinary Research on Hawaiian Well-Being* 2.1 (2005): 21-30. *Ulukau.org*. Web. 22 Mar. 2011.
- Malo, Davida. “He Kanikau no Kaahumanu.” *Ka Lama Hawaii* 8 Aug. 1834. *Ulukau.org*. Web. 10 May 2011. <http://nupepa.org/gsd12.5/cgi-bin/nupepa?e=d-0nupepa--00-0-0--010---4---text---0-11--1haw-Zz-1---20-about-He+mele+no+Lahainaluna--00031-0000utfZz-8-00&a=d&cl=CL1.13.1&d=HASH018a6ce08b27b11a97ee373d.3>
- Malone, Robert. “Wal-Mart takes over the world: Giant changing the face of retailing one country at a time.” *Forbes on msnbc.com*. Web. 5 Mar. 9, 2011. <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/10838942/ns/business-forbescom/>
- “Molokai Ranch” under “Hospitality and Leisure Business.” *GuocoGroup: A Member of the Hong Leong Group*. *Google Search*. Web. 29 June 2012. <http://www.guoco.com/eng/business/hotel.htm>
- Monsanto. “Agricultural Biotech in the Islands.” *Monsanto Hawaii*. Web. 9 May 2011.
- Noho Hewa: The Wrongful Occupation of Hawai‘i*. Prod. Dir. Ed. Anne Keala Kelly. Honolulu: A Native Hawaiian News and Kuleana Works Production, 2009. DVD.
- . “Noho Hewa awarded Prix Special du Jury at FIFO!” *Noho Hewa*. Web. 5 May 2011. <http://www.nohohewa.com/>

-
- . “Winner Best Documentary Film: Hawaii International Film Festival 2008.” *Noho Hewa*.
Web. 5 May 2011. <http://www.nohohewa.com/>
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. *‘Ōlelo No ‘eau: Hawaiian Proverbs & Poetical Sayings*. Honolulu: U of
Hawai‘i P, 2001. Print.
- . Songs (Meles) of Old Ka‘u, Hawaii.” *The Journal of American Folklore* 6.245 (July-Sept.
1949): 247-258. *JSTOR*. Web. 10 May 2011.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. *Hawaiian Dictionary: Hawaiian-English, English-
Hawaiian*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum, 1986. Print.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, E. W. Haertig, and Catherine Lee. *Nānā I Ke Kumu: Look to the Source
Vol 1*. Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 2002. Print.
- Nānā I Ke Kumu: Look to the Source Vol 2*. Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 2002. Print.
- State Historic Preservation Division. “Protecting Native Hawaiian Burials.” *State Historic
Preservation Division*. Web. 5 May 2011. <http://hawaii.gov/dlnr/hpd/burflifer.htm>
- The Hemowai Brothers. “Molokai Water Wars part two.” *Molokai Dispatch* 14 June 2008. Web.
10 May 2011. <http://themolokaidispatch.com/molokai-water-wars-part-two>
- “Walmart. Save Money. Live Better.” *Walmart.com*. *Google Search*. Web. 7 July 2012.
<http://www.walmart.com>
- Woolard, Charlotte. “Hawaii seed crop business up sharply.” *Pacific Business News* 4 Nov.
2007. *The Business Journals Digital Network*. Web. 5 May 2011.
- Wu, Nina. “Biotech firm grows on Molokai.” *Honolulu Star Bulletin* 24 Mar. 2007.
HonoluluStarBulletin.com. Web. 10 May 2011.
<http://archives.starbulletin.com/2007/03/24/news/story03.html>