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ABSTRACT

The United States is comprised of landscapes that have been utilized by Indigenous cultures for many centuries. Non-Indigenous people now occupy and use landscape areas that were previously accessed and managed solely by Indigenous peoples. Social and intercultural relations between these two groups have been marked by conflict over land and resources. In this study I explore how relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples have been framed, informed, and conveyed by ideas and practices related to landscapes.

I argue that contemporary relations between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples of the continental United States and the islands of Hawaii continue to be informed by the ideas, traditions, and motivations of the past. Ethno-centric ideas and beliefs articulated by early immigrant settlers helped to firmly establish patterns of thought and practice that focused on severing traditional relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. Many of those practices included methods of reorganizing and controlling land and other resources in ways that either limited or prevented Indigenous peoples from using or accessing landscapes. This study finds that ethnocentric ideas and beliefs concerning Indigenous peoples, non-Indigenous peoples, and American landscapes continue to
persist in the form of established social and cultural traditions and practices as well as in non-fiction literature and other forms of contemporary discourse.

This dissertation provides a model of study that demonstrates how landscapes may be interpreted as an intercultural text that both reflects and conveys key elements of the social and cultural dialogue that occurs between Indigenous peoples and an immigrant settler nation. The methodology used interjects “landscape” as an intermediary element of analysis between Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups of people. Landscape related ideas, beliefs, traditions, and practices are then interrogated through the application of a culturally contextual framework of analysis before assessing social and intercultural motives and intent. While the examples considered herein are restricted to certain areas of the United States, this method of cross-cultural analysis may serve as a universal model for discerning how landscape related beliefs, motivations, and perspectives inform the nature of relations and interactions that occur between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

*The American landscape is what Americans have made of their surroundings.*
Stephen Mills

*The link that keeps us bound to our culture and to our ancestors is the ground. It is Mother Earth: the final place where we will all travel to one day... Home is not where the heart is but where our ancestors lie – for that is where we will go on our final journey.*
Larry Myers

*The basic principle is this: that all human landscape has cultural meaning, no matter how ordinary it may be... Our human landscape is our unwitting autobiography, reflecting our tastes, our values, our aspirations, and even our fears, in tangible, visible form.*
Peirce F. Lewis

Landscapes are important to us. They are comprised of the many living as well as inanimate objects and elements that surround, encompass, and sustain us. They are the places where we live out our lives and our relationships and experiences with landscapes help to shape our preferences, attitudes, and identities. To a considerable degree physical and environmental forces create and shape the essential forms and substances that comprise landscapes, however, we also endeavor to alter them to suit a variety of human needs and desires. As a consequence many of the physical qualities of the landscapes we inhabit reflect the synergistic effects of natural physical forces, environmental phenomena, and the actions we take based on and inspired in large part by our own ideas and values. Hence, while landscapes are shaped and formed by the relentless powers of physical and
environmental forces, they may also reflect and convey human ideas, values, and aspirations.

The geographer Peirce Lewis noted that when landscapes are altered through human activities they become imbued with cultural meaning. He asserted that such landscapes, otherwise known as cultural landscapes, represent an “unwitting autobiography” that reflects who we are as people and how we have lived. This study builds on Lewis’ assertion by exploring how we may interpret landscapes as an intercultural text as well as a form of a social dialogue that occurs between Indigenous peoples and an immigrant settler nation. Moreover, this dissertation explores how the study of our relationships to landscapes may facilitate a deeper understanding of the history and nature of intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

**Significance of this Study**

This dissertation investigates relationships between Indigenous peoples, non-Indigenous peoples, and American landscapes. This study examines ideas, practices, and perspectives that are drawn from the experiences and traditions of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler groups in both the continental United States and the islands of Hawaii. This cross-cultural analysis examines how beliefs and motivations with respect to landscapes have informed historical and contemporary relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.
What distinguishes this study from others is a methodology that focuses on understanding the unique relationships that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples have had with American landscapes, before analyzing how these groups ultimately relate to each other through the medium of landscape. At the core of this study is the premise that a culturally contextual interrogation of various patterns of thought and belief will illuminate some of the underlying motivations that have informed behavior.\textsuperscript{6}

While the examples considered herein are limited to the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii, the methodology used may also be applicable to the study of other people and places. To that extent, this study proffers a model of cross-cultural analysis that may be suitable in developing additional studies of culture and landscape that seek to investigate the underlying nature of social and intercultural relations that exist between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler societies.

\textbf{Relationships to Landscapes: Personal, Cultural, and Social}

In many ways our identities, cultures, and histories are closely intertwined both with and through the landscapes we occupy. As individuals we occupy landscapes in relatively brief and limited ways. However, because we are social creatures we almost always develop ideas and beliefs that are informed, at least to some extent, by the ideas and practices of others. Moreover, when two or more groups of people have occupied the same places, landscapes in those areas may evidence the intersection and
overlapping of ideas, thoughts, and practices. One way to understand how social and cultural histories may be reflected in and conveyed through landscapes is to begin by first considering how individual perspectives are informed by social and cultural ideas and practices. In the following example I explore how my personal experiences and relationships to landscapes are intertwined with social and cultural influences.

I grew up in a wide, open valley located several miles inland from the Northern California coastline. The valley floor was divided by a river and cultivated with pear orchards and vineyards. Today the area appears to be much the same as when I was a child, however the surrounding grass-covered hills are now more densely vegetated with clusters of oaks on one side and evergreens and conifers on the other. Back then the summers always seemed to be blazingly hot and the winters cold and brisk and yet the seasons were generally amenable enough to enable me to explore the surrounding countryside throughout most of the year. As kids my brother and I scampered about the terrain, “tracked” wild game, and occasionally heightened our playful adventures by thwarting the attack of a mountain lion or some other “unseen” predator that never quite materialized. Later, as a teenager I spent many hours hiking local mountain trails and following cool spring-fed streams that almost invariably led to the edge of the Russian River. The name of the river most likely references the early nineteenth-century foreign trappers and traders who settled briefly among the Native
peoples who had long inhabited the surrounding inland and coastal regions. The river generally flowed south and west toward the sea and the place where my mother’s people lived. It was there at the mouth of the river that as a young child my mother spent many carefree hours playing on a small island situated in the estuary. The island was where her grandfather lived and he owned and operated a small farm that supplied the inhabitants of the nearby town with milk and fresh vegetables.

The island, the river, and the surrounding environs are located at the center of many of our family stories that include tales of hunting, fishing, gathering, gambling, birthing, dancing, and dying. It is also the place where up until her death a few years ago, family members visited my Great Aunt Jo to talk, eat, fish, and share stories about seaweed, abalone, berries, shell collecting, and basket weaving. Interlaced with the conversations would be historical family snippets that included the sighting of Russian ships and the landing of foreigners on the coastal headlands; memories recounting why family members traveled inland to participate in “ghost dances” in a sad and desperate attempt to ward off death; the senseless loss of a relative who died on a forced march to a place of incarceration; and the bitter disappointment of survivors who returned home to find that their land and belongings had been irrevocably claimed and occupied by foreigners. There were also descriptions of how and where various family members lived and the places associated with significant events in their lives; stories about
“camping-out” and harvesting crops; practical advice about appropriate social and environmental protocols; and the story of an elderly grandmother who walked her grandson down the trail and along the creek to the train stop on his way to an Indian boarding school. All these family memories and more are intimately intertwined with the landscapes of Northern California.

The river, its tributaries, the coastal headlands, and the surrounding forest and mountain environs are located in what was once one of the most linguistically diverse and densely populated regions in North America prior to the arrival of European and Euro-American settlers. Today the landscapes of Northern California remain the homelands of many groups of Indigenous peoples including my own: the Pomo and Coast Miwok. Although our numbers are greatly diminished from earlier times, we count ourselves among those people whose families, cultures, and identities survived the onslaught of diseases brought by foreigners and all the horrors that followed in the wake of varies waves of immigrant settlers who purposefully murdered, starved, kidnapped, enslaved, drove the Native peoples from their homes, and then took their land and resources. The landscapes of Northern California are part of the physical and living entity that links Native family memories, histories, identities, and cultures to a time that predates, by at least several thousand years, the later use, occupancy, and possession of the very same lands by European, Euro-American, and other immigrant
settlers. These same landscapes now attest to an American autobiography of control, dispossession, and injustice.

For my family, that place where the river meets the sea reminds us who we are in relation to all that is important. It is where family members are buried and where we continue to fish and collect plants, shellfish, and seaweed. It is where we dream in solitude or alternately gather as a group to mourn and find strength and consolation in each other. The river and the surrounding coastal headlands, forests, streams, mountains, valleys, and trails embody the sights, sounds, smells, physical presence, and memory of personal, social, and cultural history. There amid things tangible and intangible we sense the presence and familiarity of the physical places and emotional and spiritual feelings that we associate with home. In the ebb and flow of the river’s tides, the sound of the sea crashing onto the beach, the pungent fragrance of coastal sage, the taste of berries and fish, and even the feel of the cool misty fog we are reminded of how our family history and the history of other surviving Indigenous families have long been intertwined with these specific landscapes. They are the landscapes that Indigenous peoples have valued and been nurtured by for many thousands of years. What has happened there has shaped and informed who I am and how I see the world and others. Those landscapes are the places I know as “home.”

I currently live on the island of Oahu, where my sense of orientation to the landscapes of Hawaii is completely different. While I may enjoy the
tropical climate, the surrounding seas, the refreshing rains, and the cooling trade winds, I have no family memories rooted in the ancient histories of the place where I now live. I do not possess any sort of culturally informed understanding of how I am related to the surrounding land, sea, climate, sky, and vegetation. Nor do I have that deep-seated sense of belonging and confident ease that comes from knowing how to negotiate and relate to the place that I inhabit. Although I have resided on Oahu for more than twenty years, it is still a foreign environment for me and I remain a visitor. In this place I am an immigrant settler and I consider myself a temporary and awkward transplant who lives in a landscape that has been shaped and formed by a different group of Native peoples.

The property where I reside reflects a varied and layered history of both Indigenous and immigrant settler provenance. The house is a small, one and one-half story structure built in the 1970s. Its builder, a Dutch-born engineering professor, assembled it from a do-it-yourself cedar home kit that was probably imported from North America. The design and architectural style of the house includes a simple A-frame that supports a broad and steeply pitched roofline, oversized architectural windows that are tucked beneath end gables, and tongue-and-groove cedar wood walls that support a high open beam ceiling. The fixed plate glass windows block what might otherwise be the flow of a cooling trade wind and instead help to coalesce warm air in the space above the second story level creating a seemingly
airless hothouse effect. The house might be better suited to a cool or snowy alpine environment and it seems oddly out of place in a Pacific island location.

The house sits atop a portion of a formal meditation garden that was once part of a much larger parcel of land that was at one time owned, developed, and occupied by the locally renowned physician, George Straub, and his wife, Gertrude Scott Ivers. Dr. Straub emigrated from Germany to the continental U.S. in the early part of the twentieth century, and then settled in the Hawaiian Islands. His wife, Gertrude Scott Ivers, was born in Japan and later lived in Hawaii with her parents who were of British and American heritage. In 1919, Dr. Straub reconstructed a large two-story, wood-frame mansion from the materials of a much beloved home that his wife had previously owned and occupied. The mansion and my house now sit adjacent to one another amid the remnants of what was once a large and elaborate garden estate.

The garden is thought to reflect the couple’s eclectic tastes, interests, and theosophical inclinations. It contains a dense array of palms, banyans, ti leaf plants, and exotic trees, vines and shrubs that are interspersed between lava rock terraces, walls, benches, footpaths, and even a few ten-foot high pyramid-shaped stone platforms. Along the back edge of the garden there is a wide, low-lying lava rock wall that appears to have been part of an older stone structure. The design of the wall suggests that its construction is rooted
in a much earlier landscape tradition in which Native Hawaiians used uncut lava rock to build structures and foundations without the need for modern-day mortar. Thus, the house and garden are part of a large and mostly vernacular landscape that evidences the use and design of landscapes by both immigrant settlers and the Indigenous peoples of Hawaii.

In many ways the property is an example of a microcosm of the history of landscapes found not just in Hawaii but throughout the continental United States and elsewhere: landscapes that were once occupied, shaped, and altered solely by Indigenous peoples are now primarily occupied and controlled by people from an immigrant settler culture that built atop many of the very same places that Indigenous peoples had long inhabited and successfully maintained. As such, landscapes located throughout the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii represent the physical manifestations of intersecting social and cultural ideas and practices.

Linking Landscapes, Culture, and History

The landscapes of Hawaii and the continental U.S. were occupied and managed solely by Indigenous peoples long before the arrival of foreigners from other lands. While the unrelenting forces of wind, sea, climate, and geology are clearly among the most powerful of forces that have shaped much of the physical form of these landscapes, humans managed to effectuate a cultural imprint. Indigenous peoples are known to have
occupied, altered, and managed landscapes in and around Hawaii and other areas of the Pacific region long before being “discovered” by others. In the continental U.S. the landscape practices of Indigenous peoples have been documented as dating back to at least tens of thousands of years. And in both locations Indigenous peoples are known to have developed social, cultural, and intellectual traditions in relation to specific land, water, and other environmental resources.

In the relatively recent past, various groups of settlers who arrived from elsewhere essentially sought to occupy, control, and possess the land and resources used and occupied by Indigenous peoples. Over the last two hundred and fifty years or so, immigrant settlers have altered landscapes in Hawaii in accordance with their own sets of social and cultural customs and beliefs, while in many areas of the continental U.S. similar processes have been occurring for more than five hundred years. As a result landscapes in both locations reflect the intersection of the cultural ideas, beliefs, and practices of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers.

In Hawaii some of the earliest nineteenth-century Euro-American settlers hoped to introduce the Christian religion to Native peoples and transform island landscapes into “fruitful fields, pleasant dwellings, schools, and churches.” Early explorers, other foreigners, and the waves of immigrant settlers that followed brought with them disease, pestilence, and
death\textsuperscript{11} as well as other customs and beliefs that seem to have unleashed unremitting harm on the Indigenous peoples of the islands of Hawaii.

Census data indicate that Native Hawaiians are now outnumbered by a ratio of at least five to one in terms of the total population of people permanently residing in Hawaii.\textsuperscript{12} Like many other groups of Indigenous peoples Native Hawaiians are often ranked statistically at or near the bottom of almost every quality of life indicator now measured by government entities.\textsuperscript{13} Notably, as an autonomous or officially recognized sovereign group of Indigenous people, Native Hawaiians currently do not possess any type of recognized authority over even the smallest fraction of a land base or other natural resources found throughout the islands. A seemingly endless tangle of U.S. actions and inactions, including participation in the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government and the subsequent annexation of Hawaii to the U.S., have essentially prevented Native Hawaiian people from exercising sovereign authority over lands in Hawaii. Even though in 1993 the U.S. issued an apology for participating in the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and the “deprivation of the rights of Native Hawaiians to self-determination,”\textsuperscript{14} official recognition of Native Hawaiian sovereign authority over land and resources has not been forthcoming. While the State Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is tasked with administering some programs associated with certain lands and resources, its representatives are elected by the general populace of Hawaii and not by an officially recognized group
of Indigenous peoples. Hence, in many ways the history of landscapes in Hawaii, like that of the continental U.S., attests to an American autobiography that has been rooted in colonialism, injustice, and Indigenous dispossession of landscapes.

Social and Cultural Influences and Intersections

Landscapes that evidence the influence of human activities are often described as “cultural landscapes” and may contain elements of a physical record of how different groups of people have historically interacted both with the environments they have inhabited and with each other. These types of landscapes may be relatively easy to locate if they have been recently altered by human intervention. Certainly the confluence of industrial technology and modern American cultural values can be seen in what we build and how we build it. The marriage of modern technology and American cultural values is reflected and conveyed in the landscapes of the U.S. in various ways such as in: the design and style of freeways and gas stations; consumer driven commercial developments like skyscrapers and shopping malls; efficiently plowed, planted, and irrigated agricultural fields; strategically located scientific, military, and utility installations; and in neatly planned residential suburbs. Efficiency and functionalism are often critical elements associated with recently constructed buildings and structures to the extent that many contemporary cultural influences are relatively easy to spot. But how do we perceive the older historical relationships between landscapes
and culture that predate modern industrial, commercial, and residential development?

In both Hawaii and the continental U.S., contemporary human constructed elements can be writ large across the landscapes we inhabit, while other elements may be more difficult to discern. Although the evidence of historical social and cultural associations may be present within the fabric of contemporary landscapes, they are sometimes more difficult to identify. In the continental U.S. evidence of some of the older associations that have existed between Indigenous cultures and landscapes can be found in constructed landforms, irrigation systems, rock art, the location and composition of flora and fauna communities, human settlement patterns, and even in transportation routes. In Hawaii similar types of associations can be seen between Indigenous peoples and the land and surrounding sea in a number of structures and forms that include: fishponds, agricultural terraces, roadways, heiau, house and funerary sites, vegetation and settlement patterns, and a plethora of other constructed landforms and features. Historical evidence of the presence or influence of immigrant settlers who arrived from foreign lands may also be found in various types of buildings, land development and settlement patterns, structures, and altered landforms.

When considering differences in physical geography as well as the multiplicity of social and cultural ideas and practices brought by immigrant settlers to the U.S. from many other lands, we might expect to find a fair
degree of cultural variability in the built environment. Often there are variations in the built environment in terms of style and design as well as other local customs and regional differences. However, many places also seem to exhibit forms, designs, or other similarities that attest to a sharing of ideas or the implementation certain common social and cultural traditions and practices.\textsuperscript{15}

Hawaii is an interesting case in point because its geographic location distinguishes it as one of the most isolated island archipelagoes in the world. Landscapes in Hawaii reflect the sublime effects of volcanic eruptions, warm humid climatic conditions, water and wind erosion, and the surrounding sea. Many tourism and other marketing schemes seem to successfully capitalize on these physiographic qualities. However, despite its isolation and other unique qualities, or maybe in part because of them, many contemporary human built elements of landscapes located throughout the Islands exhibit some of the same social and cultural influences found elsewhere in the continental U.S. These influences can readily be seen in the form and design of freeways, scientific, military, and utility installations, the style and design of certain houses and planned communities, types and styles of farming production, and even in the beaches and shorelines that have been artificially created for tourists.

To a large extent what we see in many of the everyday landscapes of Hawaii, including building designs, land use patterns, and even types of
vegetation, evidences the social and cultural influences of visitors and residents who arrived from other places within the last 200 years. Hawaii currently has a resident population of an estimated 1.3 million people\textsuperscript{16} and hosts over 4.5 million visitors annually from other areas of the U.S.\textsuperscript{17} Given the high ratio of visitors to residents, the extent to which numerous goods are imported from the continental U.S., and the pervading influence of major commercial and economic pressures, we should perhaps not be too surprised that many recently constructed buildings and land areas developed in Hawaii may be similar in appearance to those located in other places throughout the continental U.S. Thus, despite geographic isolation and physiographic differences, as well as differences in social, cultural, and historical development, many of the contemporary cultural influences found in landscapes in Hawaii clearly have emanated from the continental U.S.

While landscapes may contain various physical features and material culture artifacts, they should be considered as more than merely layered repositories of unrelated objects. Moreover, relying too heavily on the presence of certain visual clues in our surroundings may tend to focus only on the most recent cultural elements and thereby obfuscate some of the less tangible yet still important meanings and relationships people have with landscapes. This seems to be especially true when land use or land development has dramatically altered the appearance of an area. Author and social critic James Howard Kunstler suggests that as much as “eighty
percent of everything ever built in America has been built in the last fifty years.” As a consequence recently developed areas may have fewer older buildings and other types of material culture resources left visible so that many historical relationships to landscapes may go undetected and unappreciated even though they may be sites and locations that are imbued with rich social and cultural histories and meanings.

The foregoing examples illustrate an important point: nearly all landscapes found in the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii have been influenced and directly or indirectly occupied and used by Indigenous peoples. While we may currently inhabit a given landscape, the history of cultural interactions with that landscape is no doubt much older and more complex than we may realize. Hence any analysis of our relationships to landscape in the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii must include the ideas and experiences of Indigenous peoples if we are to understand anything deeper or more complex than the most recent layers of social and cultural history effectuated by the much later arrival of immigrant settlers.

Background: Issues and Concerns

Since time immemorial the histories, cultures, and identities of Indigenous peoples have long been intertwined with landscapes that now comprise nearly all areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. Moreover, the histories, cultures, and identities of a variety of immigrant settlers have also evolved, albeit much more recently, in response to many of
the same land areas and resources. Thus, individual as well as social and cultural histories are often linked in different ways to the landscapes that surround us. While landscapes may reflect elements of the social and cultural values and practices of the people who have occupied them, they also evidence how various groups of people have interacted with each other.

As noted previously, much of what we encounter in our everyday environment and physical surroundings is actually located amid or atop places that have much older and quite probably different histories of association, use, and meaning than many people may currently recognize. The identities and cultures of Indigenous peoples have been intertwined with landscapes of the U.S. for a period of time that spans many thousands of years. These same landscapes are also the places that non-Indigenous peoples have also sought to occupy and control through a variety of means. The ensuing conflicts have resulted in the massive dispossession of Indigenous peoples from their traditional lands and resources, and have repeatedly effectuated or threatened Indigenous peoples with physical and cultural annihilation.

Currently a myriad of government representatives and agencies, non-governmental organizations, private property owners, and a host of others are embroiled in disputes with Indigenous peoples over land and resources that were once within the sole domain of Indigenous peoples. Concerns often involve health and pollution, title and possession, access to, and the use of
land and resources. In the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. many of those conflicts and disputes tend to focus on interpretations of legislative intent, treaties, executive orders, and European doctrines. In Hawaii similar debates and conflicts are often rooted in issues concerning Native Hawaiian sovereignty and the role of the U.S. government and its representatives in the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii. Hence, despite major differences in geographic location and the different social and cultural histories associated with landscapes, the use of, control over, and access to land and resources in both the continental U.S and the islands of Hawaii have been the focal point of many prolonged and ongoing disputes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and cultures.

In a recent and well-publicized settlement, the federal government and members of the Blackfeet Tribe reached a multi-billion dollar agreement in response to Tribal members’ assertions of federal agency mismanagement of land and natural resource revenues dating back to at least the 1800s. The size of the settlement and the ability of the plaintiffs to prevail against formidable odds have arguably been impressive. However, the settlement reached concerning *Cobell v. Salazar* is just one of many cases currently pending or under judicial or administrative review in which Indigenous peoples are seeking clarification of management and accounting practices associated with land and resources that appear to have been mismanaged or otherwise lost by federal or state entities. Recently, another agreement
appears to have been reached between the U.S. government and 41 other Tribes that filed similar lawsuits. In Hawaii many people have been embroiled in negotiations and proposed settlements over certain lands and revenues that have not been properly managed by the State of Hawaii for the benefit of Native Hawaiians. Moreover, the ability of Indigenous peoples in Hawaii to exercise self-determination or authority with respect to a land base or other environmental resources has been limited, undermined, or essentially denied through the actions as well as inactions of federal and state entities.

Landscapes have long been the sites and subject of intercultural conflict. The history of efforts by settler cultures to reorganize, control, and take possession of Indigenous lands and resources started well before the U.S. was formed or recognized as a political entity. Arguably, such practices have continued throughout the country’s entire history. The U.S. government and its representatives have often played the roles of either the lead aggressor or the facilitator of actions or inactions that have failed to protect the interests of Indigenous peoples and especially with respect to land and resources.

In both Hawaii and the continental U.S. a plethora of culturally important sites that have long been an inherent part of Indigenous beliefs and practices, but that are not necessarily under the control or authority of Indigenous peoples, remain at the center of state and federal land
management issues and policies. Furthermore, many such sites are threatened with public or private encroachment or obliteration that in turn threatens the cultural practices of Indigenous peoples. Moreover, land use practices that result in pollution, toxic health hazards, and environmental degradation affect or threaten much of the land and many of the resources used by Indigenous peoples. Many of those dangers, including those that result from mining, gas extraction, poor forest management practices, water pollution, water diversion projects, global warming, and disposal of toxic wastewater, threaten the lives and welfare of Indigenous peoples. In some cases Indigenous peoples are particularly vulnerable to such hazards because they may live on or in close proximity to the lands affected and have an intimate dependency on the concomitant environments and resources associated with those lands in meeting a variety of physical, subsistence, and cultural purposes.

Conflicts over land and resources remain at the forefront of contemporary relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples of the United States. American Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians are estimated to comprise fewer than two percent (2%) of the total population of the United States. Moreover, federally recognized Native American Nations or Tribes exercise only partial authority over approximately 56 million acres of land or approximately two percent (2%) of the former land holdings of Indigenous peoples of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S.
Additionally, many Native peoples who are not members of a federally recognized group, including Native Hawaiians, also have little or no formal authority over landscapes that they use for a variety of subsistence and cultural purposes.

Disputes between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples over issues of use, control, and access to lands and resources remain a continuing source of conflict. This fact raises a number of disturbing questions, not the least of which is: Why after such a long and comprehensive history of killing, removing, and dispossessing Indigenous peoples from American landscapes do such conflicts continue? Is insatiable greed or an uncontrollable rabble of self-interest at the heart of every conflict? Moreover, is it really in the interests of the American people to continue to limit the ability of groups of Indigenous peoples to live upon, use, possess, protect, or have access to land and resources? Some of the answers to the aforementioned questions may be found in an examination of the history and underlying nature of ideas and associations that have occurred between people and landscapes.

This study explores how different groups of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers developed very different kinds of traditions and relationships with the landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. This study asserts that many of those differences continue to inform the nature of ongoing conflicts and disputes. Arguably many conflicts over
land and resources have been fueled by an American culture and society that has been dominated by the interests and values of Euro-American immigrant settlers in juxtaposition to Indigenous cultures that have refused to give up their long-standing associations with land and resources. In many ways American culture and society appear to remain entrenched in certain Euro-centric ideas and customs. As a consequence Indigenous cultures, who by definition developed their ideas and traditions through long association with the landscapes of North America and the islands of Hawaii, continue to struggle for survival against the ravages and traditions of an American culture and society that have both directly and indirectly facilitated the demise of Indigenous peoples, enabled their removal and displacement from landscapes, or otherwise divested them of land and resources.

**Study Purpose and Intent**

One of the key objectives of this study is to examine some of the underlying ideas and perspectives that inform the nature of intercultural relations between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. In this study I consider ideas and practices in juxtaposition with landscapes as a vehicle for understanding some of the underlying beliefs and motivations that have historically affected intercultural relations. Ultimately this study aims to illuminate how certain ideas and traditions that are firmly rooted in the past continue to influence and inform how we think, what we value, and perhaps most important of all:
how we interact with one another both in and through various mediums and practices associated with landscapes.

As discussed more fully in the ensuing chapters this study will examine how ideas, values and beliefs are closely linked to and conveyed through ways of thinking about and interacting with landscapes. In general the study follows a line of inquiry that first explores some of the cultural contextual ways that Indigenous and immigrant settler peoples thought about and related to landscapes. I then examine how ideas and practices regarding landscapes have been used to reinforce and reassert social and cultural values, beliefs, identities, and histories. This approach is predicated on the notion that the analysis and re-interpretation of ideas and practices relative to relationships with landscapes will provide useful insights into the underlying nature and motivations that have informed conflicts that occur between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

The fact that Indigenous and immigrant settler cultures have occupied many of the same land areas that now comprise the United States provides an opportunity to compare and analyze how different cultural groups have related to the same land areas. While landscapes have and are continually undergoing physical and biological changes, cultures also change and adapt over time. Given the changing nature of both culture and landscapes, what this study focuses on is not so much on the actual physical landscapes, but
rather on how ideas and practices relative to landscapes may be interpreted as personal and/or social and cultural motivations that inform behavior.

Since time immemorial Indigenous peoples have developed cultural ideas and practices in relation to the ever changing and evolving landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. For a much shorter period of time immigrant settler cultures have implemented a different set of ideas and traditions in response to both the landscapes and the people that they encountered. In the ensuing conflicts non-Indigenous peoples have succeeded in removing or displacing significant numbers of Indigenous peoples from their traditional homelands. This study analyzes and interrogates not only how people interacted with landscapes but also how they related to and treated one another through ideations and processes related to landscapes.

In order to facilitate an understanding of intercultural relations between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers, ideas and practices have been selected for consideration from among the various groups of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples who have inhabited the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. In this study social and cultural examples are analyzed primarily from the following groups of people: Native Americans of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S.; Native Hawaiians of the islands of Hawaii; and European and Euro-American immigrant settlers with cultural origins that are primarily rooted in the cultures of Europe. This
study is not intended to be an all inclusive or comprehensive survey of the many relationships Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers have had with landscapes. Instead selected examples are considered and discussed herein because they represent significant ideas or practices that contribute to an overall understanding of how patterns of thought and behavior may be linked to social and cultural processes and structures.

A key line of inquiry in this study explores how ways of thinking about and interacting with landscapes may reflect and convey social and cultural ideas and practices. In order to investigate this phenomenon, I explore the following themes: the interpretation of landscapes as social and cultural expressions; patterns of discourse about relationships between landscapes and people as expressed in non-fiction literature published during the latter-half of the twentieth century; selected landscape related traditions and practices; and ways in which the values and sensibilities of the past continue to inform the present. In this study I also consider how social or cultural ideas and beliefs related to each theme converge and may be asserted and reinforced in the some of the ways we think about and treat one another.

**Study Methods**

In his essay, “Paradigm Dramas in American Studies: A Cultural and Institutional History of the Movement,” Gene Wise provided an overview of some of the major methods and approaches that have been utilized in the field of American Studies from the late nineteenth century through the
He asserted that, from approximately the 1930s and into and throughout the 1950s, scholarship in American Studies focused on synthesizing broad historical aspects of the American experience. In general those approaches are considered and recognized as the “myth and symbol” school of thought and they focused on interrogating the underlying social and cultural meanings and associations that informed ideas and beliefs. Wise also suggested that a major turning point in the field occurred during the 1960s as social and cultural awareness generally broadened and became more inclusive. He described the effects of what he saw as an intellectual turning point that resulted in a “proliferation of sub-cultural studies focusing on one or another aspect of American life” including “a variety of different, often competing, perspectives” that eventually supported a pluralistic “rediscovery of the particular” and the rise of comparative cross-cultural approaches. This study is well situated in the latter tradition in that it undertakes a cross-cultural analysis of ways in which ideas and beliefs have influenced how we think about and interact with landscapes.

In many ways, American Studies as an intellectual discipline wrestles with the complexities of history and perspective. An American Studies approach provides some important intellectual guideposts and a variety of methodologies for analyzing the nature of intercultural relations. One important aspect considers the penchant for historiographies or even source observations to proffer an interpretation of or rationale for activities and
events. Consideration of this tendency to see others through the lens of a particular social or cultural perspective has been shown to be a particularly pertinent concern in the examination of Indigenous subjects. Robert F. Berkhofer explored the penchant for ethnocentrism in his analysis of how ideations about Native Americans may reflect and reveal more about the observers than about the reputed subjects of scrutiny. Discerning the perspectives and motivations that may inform historical observations and interpretations can be a critical step in the development and promotion of a robust and well-informed understanding of events and people. If fact, to do otherwise, seems to risk engendering the development of skewed results, erroneous conclusions, and the perpetuation of inaccurate or misleading information.

Another dilemma associated with the interpretation of people, culture, and history is articulated in that famous adage: “history is written by the victors.” This certainly has multiple meanings and interpretations, not the least of which includes the idea that members of an elite group tend to interpret historical events or subjects in ways that support perceived or established positions of privilege and power: “official” or written histories tend to reinforce a dominant social or cultural perspective. Edward W. Said explicates the pervasive and sometimes subtle nature of social and cultural bias in his treatise on culture and imperialism, in which he argues that certain forms of European and American literature interpret and convey ideas
through the lens of colonial imperialism. Ward Churchill also clarified a similar set of phenomena with regard to academic systems and processes in which he argued that Western educational paradigms and institutions support and effectuate forms of Euro-centric thinking and imperialism.

Bearing all of the above in mind, part of the challenge of comparing the expressions or representations of Indigenous and Euro-American perspectives, including ways of thinking about and interacting with landscapes, is to limit the possible effects or impact of the social and cultural biases of each source. One way this study accommodates this concern is by consciously choosing source materials or observations for analysis that will foreground perspectives and practices from within separate contexts rather than relying solely on the cross-cultural interpretations of others. For example, in this study the ideas, perspectives, and practices of Indigenous peoples are primarily accessed through the analysis and consideration of intellectual discourse and practices that are rooted in the experiences and explanations of Indigenous peoples. Works composed or explained by Indigenous peoples have generally been very helpful in developing an understanding of Indigenous perspectives. Explanations about the intent of early immigrant settlers have been helpful in accessing perspectives that are set forth in written observations such as diaries and letters. Social concerns and issues are also considered and accessed as set forth in newspapers, legislation, or statements of intent with regard to government policies and
programs. In each case the use of a culturally contextualized framework is particularly helpful in explicating some of the underlying meanings and associations that are expressed and conveyed by different groups of people through a variety of mediums associated with landscapes.

This study’s line of inquiry explores how interactions and practices with regard to landscapes may provide a contextually constructed framework for understanding the life experiences and perspectives of different groups of peoples and cultures. In essence the idea is to explore how different groups of people have thought about and interacted with landscapes as a means of discovering some of the underlying values and motivations that have informed behavior. Thus, in order to avoid the intellectual trap of relying too heavily on interpretations of the past through the self-limiting rationales of a single social or cultural perspective, this study’s methodology examines the ideas, traditions, and actions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous groups through separate lenses or cultural constructs. I then analyze patterns of thought and behavior that may have informed how these groups ultimately related to one another through various means and processes related to landscapes.

The overall framework for this study focuses on a triad of relationships between Indigenous peoples, non-Indigenous peoples, and landscapes. This approach enables me to first examine the relationships between each group of people and landscapes, and then assess the nature and motivations of
cross-cultural interactions. The research techniques used in this study vary somewhat based on the nature of materials available for examination. For example in some cases the issues and concerns unique to groups of people and regions may be clearly articulated in the work of scholars and other researchers. This study does not presuppose to challenge or proffer greater insights into certain issues that have already been well documented. Instead, in those instances where issues, actions, and concerns have been well documented or articulated, my focus will be on the synthesis of that scholarship and an analysis of patterns of thought and behavior within the larger context of considering and comparing cross-cultural perspectives and behaviors.

**Study Organization**

This study is organized into six chapters, each of which examines a different theme concerning ways of thinking about or interacting with landscapes. While each chapter explores a different set of ideas, practices, or perspectives, when considered together they converge on and contribute to a larger overall understanding of how thoughts and beliefs are manifested in association with landscapes. By analyzing associations, sets of ideas, and patterns of action through the alternate lenses of Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives, this study seeks to illuminate how an understanding of different cultural histories and practices may lead to a more robust and
holistic understanding of the nature of inter-cultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

The preceding sections of this chapter introduced the idea that physical landscapes may reflect or convey past and present social and cultural associations and meanings. I briefly considered how historical issues revolving around land and resources remain at the forefront of intercultural relations between Indigenous peoples and a nation that is deeply rooted in an immigrant settler society and culture. I also asserted that an understanding of the underlying beliefs and motivations that inform how people relate to and interact with one another could be explicated through an analysis of ideas, practices, and ways of thinking about landscapes. As set forth below, the remainder of this chapter concludes with a discussion of some of the methods used herein and an outline of the study’s organizational format.

Chapter 2 examines the theoretical foundations and frameworks that lend support to the idea that landscapes may function as both physical repositories of history and reflections of certain social and cultural systems and practices. This chapter examines key theories and methods that influenced the study of landscapes as social and cultural expressions. The first half of the chapter synthesizes and examines seminal concepts that emerged in the latter part of the twentieth century in the work of Carl Sauer, W. G. Hoskins, and J. B. Jackson. This section considers and analyzes some
of the early theories and methods proffered by these scholars that made
critical intellectual linkages between landscapes, history, and culture. The
next section explores a subsequent wave in scholarship in which a variety of
ideas and methods coalesced and intersected resulting in broad general
acceptance of the idea that landscapes may be interpreted as social and
cultural expressions. The final section of the chapter explores ideas about
how landscapes may be viewed as expressions and reflections of social
power and influence. The ideas and theories set forth by Henri Lefebvre and
others about the social production of space are explored within the construct
of understanding the dynamics of social power and control. The chapter
concludes with a discussion that considers how certain ideas that link
landscapes with social power and control may provide a conceptual
framework through which to view and assess the nature of intercultural
relations between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler societies.

Chapter 3 synthesizes and analyzes a broad pattern of intellectual
discourse about the relationship between people and landscapes. The period
of concern is the latter half of the twentieth and early part of the twenty-first
century. This era is particularly interesting in that it spans a time period when
both an awareness of environmental issues and an interest in Indigenous
peoples became subjects of increased public discourse and debate. The
central thread of analysis and discussion in this chapter focuses on ways in
which the perspectives of Indigenous peoples were considered within an
overall pattern of discourse concerning relationships between people and landscapes. Reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of this topic, examples are drawn from a variety of disciplines and areas of study that focus on relationships between landscapes and people, including geography, social and environmental history, and cultural landscape studies.

Changes in the pattern of discourse considered herein generally coincide with and reflect similar developments in the field of American Studies. Much of the early discourse in American Studies focused on the synthesis of history as a way of understanding and explaining generalized themes and broad patterns of American thought and belief. Later, methods of interpretation and subjects of discourse broadened to reflect a greater awareness of a variety of social and cultural perspectives. More recently, additions to the general confluence of this discourse reflect and articulate the perspectives of Indigenous peoples. This change in which the general pattern of discourse has evolved from being about Indigenous subjects, to actually articulating the concerns and perspectives of Indigenous peoples is analyzed, considered, and discussed.

Chapter 4 builds upon the notion introduced earlier that social and cultural ideas are expressed and conveyed through human interactions with landscapes. This chapter explores how different groups of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers have occupied, managed, and interacted with landscapes. I then examine some of the ways that social and cultural
practices effectuated the use, control and ownership of Indigenous lands and resources.

The chapter is organized into three parts concerning social and cultural landscape traditions and practices. The first two parts consider Indigenous and early immigrant settler practices separately in order to develop a contextual understanding of how each group related to and interacted with landscapes. Part I focuses specifically on landscape related traditions and practices implemented in the contiguous areas of the continental United States. Part II examines traditions and practices that were implemented throughout the islands of Hawaii. Part III explores the intersection of colliding ambitions between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers in both locations through an examination of how land and resources were reorganized and controlled by non-Indigenous peoples within the context of Indigenous dispossession.

Examples of how different groups of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples organized and managed landscapes are explored in the first section of each Part. Information garnered from fields and intellectual disciplines that include ethnography, anthropology, historiography, and environmental history are considered in developing a sense of the types and variety of traditions and practices implemented by different groups of people. This approach reflects the interdisciplinary nature of this study and also strives to provide a contextually appropriate understanding of the practices of Indigenous and
immigrant settler cultures. One of the benefits of considering ethnographic sources, Indigenous historiographies, and environmental histories is that Indigenous perspectives and memories are often placed in the foreground or otherwise explicated in ways that may not be as accessible or as well documented in other approaches used in the study of history. In the case of this study, information documented by anthropologists was used judiciously to demonstrate and supplement an understanding of the wide variety of ideas and practices implemented by Indigenous peoples.

More specifically, Part I considers Native American landscape traditions and practices. In light of the fact that there are some 565 federally recognized Tribes or groups of Indigenous peoples, and numerous other Indigenous groups without federal recognition, the examples explored herein are by no means comprehensive nor are they intended to be seen as representative of the entire array of Native American cultural practices. Instead they provide a basis for developing a broad understanding of the nature of traditions and practices implemented by Indigenous peoples. In general the traditions and practices examined appear to have been highly pragmatic and developed in response to and in concert with unique factors such as the type of resources available, the locational features of specific landscape environments, and the social and cultural needs of each particular group of people.
Also considered in Part I are some of the ways that immigrant settlers responded to Indigenous landscapes through the implementation of their own social and cultural ideas and traditions. As many European influenced forms of land use, settlement, and land division have been well documented, this section organizes and synthesizes scholarship concerning some of the early and more persistent forms and features associated with immigrant settler practices. I then consider the extent to which groups of immigrant settlers adapted to new landscape environments and then modified and developed their landscape practices and processes. These examples provide a basis for understanding not only the degree of variability among different groups of immigrant settlers, but also how ideas and practices were effectuated in response to each other and to the traditions and practices of Indigenous peoples.

Part II of Chapter 4 focuses on landscape practices and traditions implemented in Hawaii. This section briefly describes and synthesizes certain Native Hawaiian land use traditions and practices that have been well documented in a variety of sources. As discussed herein, those land-use practices and traditions appear to have been uniquely developed in relation to a Pacific island environment and were interwoven into the fabric of Native Hawaiian social and cultural structures and systems. Early Euro-American responses to the landscapes of Hawaii are also considered. Selected source materials include published letters, diaries, and illustrated sketches that are
examined within the context of how immigrant settlers and visitors viewed and interacted with the landscapes of Hawaii in the early part of the nineteenth century. While many of those source materials have been examined and considered for a variety of other studies and purposes, this study utilizes them to discern immigrant settler ideations, adaptations, and attitudes toward the Indigenous people and landscapes of Hawaii.

Part III considers the effects of the Dawes Allotment Act and the Māhele within the overall scope of understanding relations between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler societies. Both legislative actions are considered within a broad pattern of behavior that occurred at the intersection of Indigenous peoples’ and immigrant settlers’ interests. This section considers how the associated legislative and administrative actions were initiated and implemented in order to facilitate the control, reorganization, and acquisition of Indigenous lands and resources. Notably, these processes overwhelming benefited non-Indigenous peoples and occurred after Indigenous peoples had already adapted their own landscape traditions and practices to accommodate the needs and interests of immigrant settlers. The chapter ends with a discussion about how both of these legislative reforms and associated programs and processes have contributed to the nature and overall pattern of social and intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.
Chapter 5 examines historical as well as contemporary perspectives about landscapes and people. Essentially this chapter explores how certain ways of thinking about self, landscapes and other people may inform current day conflicts, frustrations, and misunderstandings between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. This chapter asserts that American ideas and policies regarding landscapes and Indigenous peoples have historically been informed by and, to a large extent, remain firmly rooted in the immigrant settler cultural conceptualizations of the past. It considers how such social and cultural ideas may be continually reasserted in ways that ignore or misconstrue the histories and ongoing presence of Indigenous peoples both generally and with respect to landscapes.

Chapter 6 summarizes some of the findings of this study and suggests that discarding or significantly modifying certain misconceptions and practices relative to the history of landscapes and Indigenous peoples would be beneficial to the nature of on-going relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the United States. The chapter concludes with a discussion about the general applicability of utilizing landscapes as an intermediary element in the study of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler societies.
Definitions

For the purposes of this study the meaning of certain words and expressions shall apply as set forth below.

*Culture* refers to the ways of living built up by a group of human beings and transmitted from one generation to another. This includes traditions, beliefs, practices, life ways, arts, crafts, and social institutions of any community.

*Cultural landscape* means the physical environment as it is shaped and influenced from the natural landscape by a cultural group.

*Euro-American culture* refers to cultural ideas and practices the origin of which is primarily rooted in one or more of the cultures of Europe.

*Euro-American settler(s)* refers to people who physically occupy or occupied North America or Hawaii and whose cultural traits and practices of origin are rooted in one or more of the cultures of Europe.

*Indigenous Person or Peoples* refers to people having origins in any of the original Indigenous peoples of North America and Hawaii.

*Landscape* means and includes all aspects of the physical environment including natural, biological, physical, as well as human-constructed elements.

*Native American(s)* refers to one or more people having origins in any of the original Indigenous peoples of North America who are otherwise known as American Indians.

*Native Hawaiian(s)* means one or more people having origins in the Indigenous peoples of Hawaii.

*Note:* A glossary of Hawaiian language words is provided on page 259.
CHAPTER 2
FOUNDATIONS AND FRAMEWORKS

… any landscape is composed not only of what lies before our eyes but what lies within our heads. D. W. Meinig

… the roots of the present lie deep in the past, and nothing in the past is dead to the man who would learn how the present comes to be what it is. William Stubbs

When we think about landscapes many of us might assume that what we mean are scenic locations or at least “natural” areas amply comprised of undeveloped lands such as parks or open space where flora and fauna are the most pronounced physical features of an area. The idea that landscape is primarily part of the natural environment is consistent with a long and varied history of study and research in the biological, physical, and natural sciences. It may not immediately dawn on us that other physical elements such as buildings, roads, patterns of development and other forms could also be considered parts of a landscape: a landscape that contains both human-constructed and naturally occurring elements and features. Hence ideas about landscapes are often interpreted and expressed in a variety of ways through the arts, social sciences, humanities, and material culture studies. While science-based and culture-based approaches to understanding and thinking about various ideas and disciplines can develop along separate lines of inquiry, interdisciplinary approaches may result in new ideas and still other ways of thinking. In the case of thinking about landscapes, ideas from
various disciplines often intersect or overlap at the point where we consider how humans interact with their physical surroundings and with one another. Therefore, whether we approach the study of landscapes through the lens and methodologies of the physical, natural or social sciences, the arts and humanities, or through some combination of fields and disciplines, ways of thinking about landscapes can challenge our ability to understand a complex web of human ideas and beliefs within the construct of a single discipline.

This chapter explores some of the ideas and ways of thinking about landscapes that have informed and shaped contemporary approaches to the study of landscapes as cultural and social expressions. It begins with an overview of influential ideas linking history, culture, and landscapes in the work of three seminal figures: Carl Ortwin Sauer (1889-1975), William G. Hoskins (1908-1997), and John Brinkerhoff Jackson (1909-1996). The next section explores some of the various ways landscapes were subsequently interpreted as social and cultural expressions indicative of a variety of intersecting and sometimes overlapping experiences, ideas, and meanings. The final section builds on the foundations and concepts explored earlier to establish a vantage point or framework for understanding how landscapes may be examined as elements of the kind of social and cultural dialogue that occurs between Indigenous peoples and an immigrant settler society.
Early Approaches to the Study of Landscapes and Culture

During the twentieth century an interest in the relationship between culture and landscapes developed into an area of study that explored and tested methodologies and expertise from multiple disciplines and fields including: history, geography, environmental and cultural studies, economics, anthropology, architecture, and planning. While it is correct to assume that various ideas and methodologies used in the study of landscapes and culture flowed from a wide variety of intellectual sources and disciplines, some of the most influential ideas and approaches can be found in the work of Carl Ortwin Sauer (1889-1975), William G. Hoskins (1908-1992), and John Brinkerhoff Jackson (1909-1996). Sauer, Hoskins, and Jackson each explored and articulated linkages between history, culture, and landscapes that have helped to lay the foundation for the study of landscapes as physical and historical manifestations of social and cultural ideas. This section examines certain ideas articulated by each of these men that ultimately influenced the study and consideration of landscapes in ways that reverberated well beyond the time period in which they lived and worked.

Carl Ortwin Sauer helped to establish an academic foothold on the study of landscapes and culture in the United States through his research and focus on both human geography and cultural ecology. Sauer was a historical geographer who taught at the University of Michigan from 1915 to 1923 and later taught at the University of California at Berkeley from 1923 to
1957. Throughout his academic career he wrote extensively, supervised thirty-seven doctoral dissertations, and helped to establish what generally became known as the “Berkeley School” of geography that focused on physical manifestations and intersections between culture, landscape, and history.⁴

Many of Sauer’s most influential ideas are thought to have emanated from a broad array of American and European intellectual traditions. These included the work of geographers such as Ratzel and Vidal, the anthropologists Kroeber and Lowie who also taught at Berkeley⁵, and Goethe (1749-1832). Sauer’s approach to the study of geography was particularly influenced by Goethe’s work.⁶ Goethe emphasized “culture” as the focal point of history and “form” as the manifestation of human, spiritual, and natural processes. This influenced Sauer to consider landscapes not merely as physical entities or artifacts resulting from natural processes; he focused extensively on ways in which the influences of people and cultures contributed to changes in both the physical and ecological aspects of landscapes.

In what is probably his most well known essay, “The Morphology of Landscape,” Sauer proffered a number of ideas about the study of landscapes from within a geography tradition that subsequently helped to lay the intellectual foundations for studies that focused on the relationship
between cultures and landscapes. He defined the term “landscape” in the following way:

Landscape is the English equivalent of the term German geographers are using largely, and strictly has the same meaning: a land shape, in which the process of shaping is by no means thought of as simply physical. It may be defined, therefore, as an area made up of a distinct association of forms, both physical and cultural.7

Sauer’s ideas helped to establish important theoretical linkages between the study of landscapes, history, and culture; an idea that he elaborated on in the following way:

The cultural landscape is fashioned from a natural landscape by a culture group. Culture is the agent, the natural area is the medium, the cultural landscape is the result. Under the influence of a given culture, itself changing through time, the landscape undergoes development, passing through phases, and probably reaching ultimately the end of its cycle of development. With the introduction of a different--that is, an alien--culture, a rejuvenation of the cultural landscape sets in, or a new landscape is superimposed on remnants of an older one. The natural landscape is of course of fundamental importance, for it supplies the materials out of which the cultural landscape is formed. The shaping force, however, lies in the culture itself.8

Essentially, Sauer was proffering the idea that landscapes reflected cultural as well as environmental processes. Moreover, this concept represented a significant change in the way many scholars had previously been thinking about and considering interactions between people and landscapes.

Prior to the publication of Sauer’s work, ideas that had influenced the study of relationships between people and landscapes had been premised
on the supposition that the natural environment was the primary influence that had resulted in the many and various forms of human settlement, land use patterns, and even the development of social and cultural values. Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier thesis is a case in point. Turner believed that the frontier experience had been largely responsible for the evolution of American cultural values and identity as exemplified in the development of democratic and egalitarian values. He espoused that belief in his essay, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” that he delivered to the American Historical Association in 1893. 

Because Sauer espoused an approach that focused on elements of human agency and choice in transforming the physical environment over time, his ideas about how human activities changed landscapes marked a significant departure from the doctrine of environmental determinism as expressed by Turner.

In his criticism of Turner’s frontier thesis Sauer clearly and directly stated his opposition to the theory of environmental determinism in the following way:

Turner made an unfortunate error when he accepted an ancient, deductive view that human progress advances through an identical series of stages, which he thought he could recognize as general stages of the American frontier. We know that there is no general cultural succession but that each culture must be traced separately through its history of acquisitions and losses... Since cultural change by no means follows a general or predictable course, it is necessary to trace back each culture through its historical steps.
What Sauer advocated was an approach to studying landscapes in which culture is considered a central element or a significant driving force that over time transformed natural or physical landscapes into “cultural landscapes.”

John Leighly, an early protégé of Sauer’s and later his contemporary at Berkeley, lauded the effects of Sauer’s influential essay and other methodological writings as effectuating “the death blow to the doctrine of environmental determinism that had dominated American geography since the turn of the century.”

Sauer’s work focused on an approach to studying landscapes that used cultural and historical forms of analyses. He advocated a general broadening of perspective in the study of history and culture, as set forth below.

Our several efforts may build consciously toward the understanding of the differentiation of the earth at the hands of man. We shall not get far if we limit ourselves in any way as to human time in our studies. Either we must admit the whole span of man’s existence or abandon the expectation of major results from human geography. Either we must produce or warm over what others have prepared. I see no alternative. From all the earth in all the time of existence, we build a retrospective science, which out of this experience acquires an ability to look ahead.

Sauer was interested in and advocating for an approach to the study of landscapes that considered how all humans changed landscapes. This idea is consistent with much of his work that included the study of Indigenous peoples and cultures. This interest in how people and cultures transformed
landscapes is clearly evident in much of his work that was focused on Indigenous and European cultural interactions with landscapes of the American Southwest and Central America.\textsuperscript{15}

Included within the construct of Sauer’s approach to understanding how landscapes change over time is the idea of “sequent occupance.” When using this method, geographical areas are analyzed in terms of changes made to landscapes by different cultures that have occupied the same physical territory over time. This approach is a logical one to the extent that often the most recent historical and material cultural resources appear to be the most tangible elements of a given landscape while others may appear, if they appear at all, as no longer connected to present-day uses. However, one of the inherent biases that may emanate from an assumption concerningsequent occupance is that it tends to reinforce the notion that Indigenous cultures are most appropriately viewed as part of the past and not the present. Some of Sauer’s ideas do not seem to have anticipated later scholarly developments that use one or more cultural or social perspectives as a lens for interpretation and study. It is significant, however, that much of his fieldwork focused on historical and ecological changes made to landscapes by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples prior to as well as after incursion by European immigrant settlers.\textsuperscript{16}

Sauer’s ideas clearly helped to shape and direct an interest in studying the interaction of cultures and landscapes over time. Much of his
work and that of his students focused on the physical environment and material culture resources and resulted in such diverse studies as the “origin and diffusion of house and barn types, vernacular production systems, and the study of the layers upon layers of material artifacts in particular places.”

What Sauer essentially did was to articulate clearly through research, writing, and teaching, his ideas about how cultures alter landscapes over time. Those ideas and insights helped to promulgate new ways of thinking about and studying the intersection of landscapes, history, and culture. His focus on and interest in Indigenous peoples and landscapes does not seem to have been fully integrated into many of the social and material culture based approaches to the study of landscapes. However, environmental history approaches have focused on relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes albeit more often than not in a historical rather than contemporary context.

While Sauer was formulating his ideas and methods for studying landscapes and culture as part of a geographical and ecological approach, William G. Hoskins and John Brinkerhoff (J.B.) Jackson were exploring their own ideas about the study of landscapes. Hoskins was a British academic and research historian who focused primarily on the study of physical landscapes in relation to local history. It was probably his methodology and ability to convey historical information to a wide audience that inspired, at least in part, American academic interest in landscape studies. Jackson, on
the other hand, was an American geographer, publisher, teacher, and essayist who concentrated on “reading” and interpreting the meanings associated with the ways people modified and used vernacular landscapes. As discussed more fully below, Hoskins and Jackson approached the study of landscapes in very different ways, but much like Sauer each was interested in examining what physical landscapes could reveal about the people who occupied and shaped them.

In 1931 Hoskins began his teaching career at University College, Leicester, where in 1948 he helped to establish England’s first university department of English Local History. He taught for a number of years at the University of Oxford and penned his most famous treatise in 1955. In 1965 he returned to Leicester as Chairman of English Local History and retired a few years later in 1968.18

In what is considered his most influential treatise, The Making of the English Landscape (1955), Hoskins explored the Celtic, Roman, Norman, Saxon, and Viking origins of a variety of landforms, structures, and settlement patterns still visible in the landscapes of modern day Britain. His major focus was on understanding how the past informed the character of present-day landscapes and his research examined the history of local and regional landscapes.

Hoskins’ approach to the study of landscapes emphasized a combination of fieldwork and the meticulous analysis of local historical
documents and resources. He explained the reasoning for this approach in the passage set forth below.

A commonplace ditch may be the thousand-year-old boundary of a royal manor; a certain hedgebank may be even more ancient, the boundary of a Celtic estate; a certain deep and winding lane may be the work of twelfth-century peasants, some of whose names may be made known to us if we search diligently enough. To discover these things we have to go to the documents that are the historian's raw material, and find out what happened to produce these results and when, and precisely how they came about. But it is not only the documents that are the historian’s guide. One cannot write books on this subject by reading someone else’s books, or even by studying records in a muniment room.¹⁹

The Making of the English Landscape is now considered a classic study in understanding the historical evolution of cultural or human-built landscapes. When first published it received favorable newspaper and magazine reviews but was not considered an immediate success in academic circles.²⁰ At the time Hoskins’ detailed focus on vernacular or “ordinary” landscapes and local history was considered an almost radical approach when compared to more conventional studies of English history that explored broad scale political and economic issues and problems.²¹

Hoskins continued his work after he retired from teaching in 1968. He went on to produce sixteen regional volumes on landscape history and also became a radio and television broadcaster. Based on his insights into researching the history of cultural landscapes, Hoskins authored and narrated a British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) film entitled “The Making
of the English Landscape” in 1972 as well as a series of shorter films produced throughout the late 1970s.\textsuperscript{22}

A sense of Hoskins’ unabashed enthusiasm for the study of landscapes is evident in the following pronouncement.

The English landscape itself, to those who know how to read it aright, is the richest historical record we possess. There are discoveries to be made in it for which no written documents exist, or have existed. To write its history requires a combination of documentary research and of field work, of laborious scrambling on foot wherever the trail may lead. The result is a new kind of history which it is hoped will appeal to all those who like to travel intelligently, to get away from the guide-book show-pieces now and then, and to unearth the reason behind what they are looking at.\textsuperscript{23}

His work sparked an interest among British television viewing audiences and his ability to communicate linkages between history and the nature of ordinary landscapes had broad public appeal. Hoskins’ approach and methodology in studying the history of landscapes influenced academic geographers in the United States at a time when the study of culture and landscapes was emerging as an area of interest in the 1970s.\textsuperscript{24}

While Hoskins was interested in researching the historical nature of physical landscapes, he found contemporary architecture and modern-day land use development less engaging, as he explained below:

… since the year 1914, every single change in the English landscape has either uglified it or destroyed its meaning, or both. Of all the changes in the last two generations, only the great reservoirs of water for the industrial cities of the
North and Midlands have added anything to the scene that one can contemplate without pain.\textsuperscript{26}

Hoskins’ main research interests were focused on the social and cultural histories of the past. His abhorrence of modern design and development resulted in his apparent lack of interest in the visual nature of contemporary landscape features. However, his methodology of combining fieldwork with historical archival research became a model for academic as well as professional research and documentation of historic landscapes.\textsuperscript{26}

While Sauer and Hoskins focused mainly on cultures of the past, J.B. Jackson was interested in the history and interpretation of contemporary landscapes. Jackson has been described as a private or maverick scholar\textsuperscript{27} who was more an insightful philosopher, writer, and teacher than a research historian. One of Jackson’s greatest strengths was his ability to link a wide range of cultural practices to architectural and land use features that could be found in American landscapes. He focused on a wide variety of vernacular features such as houses, towns, farms, roads, front yards, mobile home parks, and garages and linked them to the broad themes of history and culture.\textsuperscript{28} Jackson is generally recognized as the “the principal founder and inspiration of cultural landscape studies in America”\textsuperscript{29} because of the influence of his extensive body of work as conveyed through his writing, lectures, and teaching.

Jackson’s national notoriety began around 1951 when he launched \textit{Landscape}, a magazine established to “further the study of human
geography in the Southwest with an emphasis on rural places” but which eventually expanded to include a wide variety of landscape subjects and interests.\textsuperscript{30} In the magazine’s first issue Jackson articulated his interest in interpreting the meanings associated with vernacular, or informal landscapes, in the following passage:

\begin{quote}
... there is really no such thing as a dull landscape or farm or town. None is without character, no habitat of man is without the appeal of the existence which originally created it…. A rich and beautiful book is always open before us. We have but to learn to read it.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

By the second year of the magazine’s publication Jackson had expanded its focus to provide a venue for a broad range of ideas about human geography throughout America.\textsuperscript{32} The audience for \textit{Landscape} primarily included geographers, anthropologists, designers, historians, architectural historians, and writers.\textsuperscript{33} With Jackson as publisher, editor, and chief author, the magazine became a forum for the exchange of a wide variety of ideas about physical geography. Well-known academics and authors such as Lewis Mumford, Clarence Glacken, Carl Sauer, Jean Gottman, Herbert Gans, Kevin Lynch, and Ian McHarg contributed their work.\textsuperscript{34} Jackson privately published and edited \textit{Landscape} for seventeen years. During this time he was essentially at the center of much of the intellectual discourse on the subject of landscapes in America.

Much of Jackson’s work was premised on the notion that vernacular landscapes reflected adaptations made by common everyday people to the
established ideas and designs of an otherwise ordered society.\textsuperscript{35} A significant portion of his work focused on interpreting cultural and historical meanings associated with vernacular landscapes: places that were shaped by or “identified with local custom, pragmatic adaptation to circumstances, and unpredictable mobility.”\textsuperscript{36} From the late 1960s until 1978 Jackson taught courses on the history of European and American landscapes at both Harvard University and the University of California at Berkeley. His approach to interpreting the cultural meanings people attached to landscapes is summarized in the following way:

My theme has never really varied. I’ve wanted people to become familiar with the contemporary American landscape and recognize its extraordinary complexity and beauty. Over and over again, I have said that they should become familiar with the commonplace aspects of the contemporary landscape. The streets, and houses, and fields, and place of work, could teach us a great deal not only about American history and American society, but about ourselves and our place in the world. It is largely a question of learning how to see.\textsuperscript{37}

Jackson was interested in making connections between past influences and present day landscapes. However, he clearly did not romanticize the past nor apparently did he think there was anything particularly important about preserving it. He seemed to feel that it was important to understand how culture and history informed not only the present condition of landscapes but also potential future uses. He explained his line of reasoning in the following passage:
It is popular to say that we are in a period of transition – and it has been said, with some justification, for the past hundred years. But the phrase represents a kind of evasion, an unwillingness to recognize that in many areas of our culture the familiar form can be discerned. The notion of a line of perpetual transition has the effect of making us appraise many things in terms of a familiar past instead of in terms of present-day realities. The widespread belief that ours is a transitional landscape is a case in point: we tend to see it not as it is, with its own unique character, but as a degenerate version of the traditional landscape, and to see its history as a long, drawn-out backsliding, the abandonment of old values, old techniques, old institutions, with nothing developing to take their place.

But a more sensible approach, it seems to me, is to try to discover when some of its characteristics first made their appearance, rather than to dwell on the disappearance of the old. The gradual obsolescence of the traditional multi-purpose barn is not so important as the rise of a kind of farming where no barn is needed, and all produce is trucked to a local processing plant.38

After he retired from teaching and lecturing Jackson continued to write about and explore his interest in historical as well as contemporary landscapes. He expressed a certain focus on and keen awareness about the social implications associated with the use of landscapes. As explained below, Jackson’s interests expanded to include linkages between landscapes and the humanistic implications for how places would be used in the future:

The things that interest me in the landscape are not the amusement aspects of it, nor even the outrageous things, but the glimpse of a future that I see developing in America. I’m interested in seeing how certain spaces are being shared, or not being shared, or whatever is happening in the country. So this leads me to an abstract and probably ugly field. I’m not saying it’s beautiful. So, you’ll have to forgive me if I seem to have shifted from this pleasantly
Jackson showed a clear penchant for finding linkages not just between the past and contemporary landscapes, but also for questioning some of the social dynamics involved in how people used landscapes.

Jackson’s work influenced and inspired many others to study landscapes as linkages between the past and contemporary culture. Perhaps just as importantly he inspired a focus on vernacular landscapes and the many ways that everyday people changed and adapted landscapes to meet current as well future needs. This idea marks an important intellectual bridge between studying landscapes as reflections of the past to seeing them as expressions of social interactions.

**Interpreting Landscapes as Social and Cultural Expressions**

Part of the legacy of Sauer, Hoskins, and Jackson was their influence on their colleagues and protégés in the fields of geography and history as well as others in related fields such as architecture, planning, and various social and material cultural studies areas. While, Sauer, Hoskins, and Jackson explored and used different methods of analysis in studying landscapes, they each contributed in significant ways to the study of landscapes as historical and cultural expressions that represented the interface between human agency and the physical environment.
By the late 1970s a number of well-known American academics with an interest in geography, including Jackson, had been inspired by Hoskins’ work and were exploring a variety of ideas and methods about how to “read” or analyze landscapes.40 *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes* (1979) represents a compendium of many of the ideas, perspectives, theories, and methods for studying and investigating the social and cultural meanings associated with landscapes. In his essay, “Axioms for Reading the Landscapes: Some Guides to the American Scene,” Peirce Lewis asserted that landscapes were an almost unconscious form of social and cultural expression, an idea he explained in the following way:

> The basic principle is this: that all human landscape has cultural meaning, no matter how ordinary it may be. Our human landscape is our unwitting autobiography, reflecting our tastes, our aspirations, and even our fears, in tangible, visible form. 41

Lewis also set forth seven axioms or principles he felt were particularly applicable to interpreting or reading landscapes. An explanation of the principles he outlined comprised the greater part of his essay. These principles are briefly summarized and paraphrased, as follows:

1. Landscapes are a clue to culture and the culture of any nation is unintentionally reflected in its ordinary vernacular landscape.

2. Cultural unity as found in landscapes should be understood within the context of equality: landscapes reflect some aspect of culture that should be considered as no more or less important in terms of being a clue as to culture.
3. Common landscapes are by their nature hard to study by conventional means and may require researching a variety of nontraditional resources such as advertisements, travel literature, trade journals, etc.

4. In trying to unravel the meaning of landscapes it is necessary to understand historical and cultural context.

5. Geographic or ecological elements of a cultural landscape make little sense if they are studied outside of their geographic or locational context.

6. Most cultural landscapes are intimately related to the physical environment and should be understood in relation to geographic or locational opportunities and constraints.

7. Most objects in the landscape convey “messages” that may not be immediately obvious and may require additional historical and cultural research.

Lewis’s axioms outlined a methodology or set of guiding parameters that could be used in studying or understanding the social and cultural histories and meanings of landscapes. When considered together they also represent a snapshot in time of how geographers were wrestling with the complexities of interpreting physical landscapes as cultural expressions.

In the same book Meinig explored the idea that each of us sees and interprets landscapes through the lens of our own experiences, ideas, and beliefs. In the essay “The Beholding Eye: Ten Versions of the Same Scene” he described a wide variety of ways in which we view and ascribe meaning to landscapes. Examples included ways in which landscapes may be contextually considered as nature, habitat, artifact, system, problem, wealth, ideology, history, place, or in relation to a sense of aesthetic. Meinig concluded that the interpretation of the symbolic meanings associated with
landscapes might provide the basis for greater understanding between people, as he explained:

Ten landscapes do not exhaust the possibilities of such a scene, but they do suggest something of the complexities of the topic. Identification of these different bases for the variations in interpretations of what we see is a step toward more effective communication. For those of us who are convinced that landscapes mirror and landscapes matter, that they tell us much about the values we hold and at the same time affect the quality of the lives we lead, there is ever the need for wider conversations about ideas and impressions and concerns relating to the landscapes we share.43

It is clear in the work of Lewis and Meinig that landscapes had begun to be seen and studied as something more than a reflection of past actions and activities: they could be interpreted as expressions of cultural meanings and values. As noted earlier, Lewis felt that landscapes could be interpreted as a form of social and cultural biography. In support of that supposition he outlined what he felt were some key methods and approaches that could be used to “read” or discern the symbolic meanings of landscapes. However, the implications of how to interpret landscapes as more than one cultural biography, or through different or competing perspectives, had not yet been fully addressed. As Meinig stated, with so many possible approaches or lenses through which to study or understand landscapes, “there is ever the need for wider conversations.”44 A significant part of the work that followed in the study of cultural landscapes focused on ways of interpreting or “reading”
the many and various social histories and meanings associated with landscapes.

Stilgoe’s *Common Landscape of America, 1890 to 1845* (1982) is an example of a study that focused on rural landscapes of the United States. He argued that rural landscapes were “the product of traditional agriculture interrupted here and there by traditional artifice, a mix of natural and man-made forms.” Stilgoe traced the historical influence of many of the Spanish, English, Dutch, and German influences on American landscapes. He found those influences in a wide variety of built forms such as agricultural settlements, farmstead patterns, road and fence designs, lighthouses and bridges, and even the color of paint that was used on buildings. Stilgoe’s central thesis was that existing rural landscapes represented a historical as well as a cultural record of the many vernacular land use and design ideas and practices that had evolved in America through a rich and varied mixture of tradition and adaptation. However, his assessment of Indigenous influences on American landscapes was limited to little more than a brief acknowledgement that irrigation systems, agricultural fields, and certain types of crops that had been developed by Indigenous peoples were sometimes reused by others in the processes of control and resettlement of land. Although Stilgoe does mention some regional African influences, specifically with regard to architectural design, his primary focus was on the cultural landscape traditions and adaptations of European immigrant settlers.
An ever-widening circle of social, cultural, and ethnic perspectives that explored and implemented new views and ways of interpreting landscapes continued to develop throughout the 1980s. Cronon’s *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (1983), Kolodny’s *The Land Before Her: Fantasy and Experience of the American Frontier* (1984), and Limerick’s *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (1987) are examples of the type of historiographies that emerged during this time period. They each utilized innovative methods of analysis in combination with a focus on the intersection of social, cultural, and environmental histories. Cronon explored how the land use practices of Indigenous peoples and European colonists effectuated changes in the ecology of New England. Kolodny examined the intersection of class and women’s literary expressions as part of her interpretation of the American frontier experience. Limerick examined the history of the American West from a number of vantage points that included Anglo, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, and African American experiences. These studies demonstrated how methods and approaches to the study of history had began to consider landscapes as the sites of complex and interrelated social and cultural interactions along the lines of race, class, or gender.

*The Making of the American Landscape* (1990), titled in homage to Hoskins’ *The Making of the English Landscape* (1955), is a compendium of essays written by eighteen historical geographers. The book provides us
with a wide view of some of the ways in which cultural landscapes were being considered and studied at the time. These authors addressed a variety of major influences that they identified as having historically informed the development of certain cultural landscapes found in the continental U.S. Each author focused on a specific area of expertise, and when considered together the book covers an impressive and diverse array of how the intersection of culture and landscapes were being explored. Some authors examined Native American as well as various ethnic and Anglo-European influences. Others linked changes in landscapes to social and cultural ideas about utopia, religion, changes in technology and transportation, federal policies, and the influences of economic wealth and social power. Nearly all the major themes and topics covered were rooted primarily in traditional physical and cultural geographical forms of analysis and tended to emphasize the historic nature of contributions that affected different regions of the country. Some authors also included social, economic, and political forms of analysis that recognized the effects of social inequities. Others acknowledged specific contributions and activities implemented by various groups of people in more of a regional approach rather than within the context of a single or unified national "American" historiography.

Other approaches and analyses that examined the intersection of social history and landscapes soon followed. Many included perspectives that either had not previously received full consideration or that had generally
been ignored. Rose’s *Feminism and Geography: The Limits of Geographical Knowledge* (1993) explored feminist theories in an analysis of the intersection of geographic power and knowledge. While Dolores Hayden’s *The Power of Place: Urban Landscapes as Public History* (1995) focused on racial and social inequities. Hayden’s work, influenced in part by the social theorist Lefebvre, explicited the experiences and contributions made by women and minority groups to the history of urban landscapes that had until then received very little attention. Both of these studies demonstrated a generally widening in the circle of interests of how different groups of people interacted with each other through ideas and practices related to landscapes.

An interesting cross section of interdisciplinary approaches to the study and interpretation of cultural landscapes was presented in *Understanding Ordinary Landscapes* (1997). Seventeen authors from a variety of fields that included social history, architectural history, American studies, cultural geography, cultural landscapes, and landscape architecture developed the book. They were tasked with presenting essays that addressed how to use visual and spatial information to understand culture and/or how to approach the analysis of cultural landscapes within the “realities of social and cultural pluralism.” Among the diverse array of ideas and methods presented were a number of social, economic, and political perspectives that sometimes agreed--but almost as often seemed to disagree—as sort of a point and counter-point presentation of ideas,
approaches, and the various ways of interpreting histories, meanings, and experiences associated with landscape study.

When considered in comparison to all the other essays, Rina Swentzell’s “Conflicting Landscape Values: The Santa Clara Pueblo and Day School,” was particularly unique in that she examined the impact of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) use of space within the pueblo for a school compound. Swentzell contrasted the federal government’s use of land with the care and sensitivity that the Indigenous inhabitants of the pueblo typically expressed and experienced in relation to the pueblo’s plaza. She argued that the school’s design and associated use of space conveyed a sense of authority, efficiency, and indifference that promulgated feelings of isolation which had lasting and damaging psychological impacts on the children of the pueblo. This essay articulated the perspectives of Indigenous peoples in juxtaposition to the actions of a federal agency’s alteration of an Indigenous people’s landscape.

In his essay, “Seeing Beyond the Dominant Culture,” Wilbur Zelinsky argued that the Anglo-American cultural system had been so “supremely potent” that “obliteration was the fate of nearly all Native American landscapes.” He expressed a sense of hopelessness about his belief that nearly all Native American landscape influences were no longer extant. Zelinsky’s pessimism is seen in his response to Swentzell’s, which he expressed in the following passage:
... a conflict that began in the American Southwest more than four hundred years ago has not yet completely played itself out: that there is no solution mutually acceptable to the two contending ethnic groups. When it comes to the crunch, can there be any question as to which party will prevail?

We can only hope, as much for the sake of our enlightenment as for the general cause of ethnic integrity, that some pueblo landscape will remain intact and endure. Clearly, there is no comfortable answer to the dilemma of such embattled groups surrounded and constantly assaulted by the intrusions of an overbearing national society.\textsuperscript{48}

Zelinsky's perspective is perceptive in its assessment of the effects of intercultural conflicts over landscapes. However, he seems to overlook any consideration of how Indigenous peoples may think, feel, and potentially adapt to the impacts and conflicts over landscapes. Instead he focuses on the value of Indigenous landscapes for their ability to “enlighten” others and display a commendable level of “ethnic integrity.”

Zelinksy also opined about the general lack of a cultural imprint on American landscapes from more recent groups of immigrant settlers. A situation that he explained in the following:

No such advantage was available to those relative latecomers from Asia and Latin America (or the earlier ones from Africa) and from those sections of Europe beyond the zone nurturing the founders of our dominant culture. These immigrants confronted a preformed, predetermined set of rules, a settlement code already locked solidly in to the ground and one they could modify only in the more trivial details.\textsuperscript{49}
He further described landscapes of the continental U.S. as primarily a Euro-centric cultural adaptation in the following passage:

The Anglo-American ethnic landscape is more the product of the early transfer of various immigrant groups and their cultural baggage from northwest Europe, then a certain set of transformations under the impact of novel environmental and social conditions here, and, subsequently, the automatic acceptance of the resulting package by millions of later arrivals and their progeny.\textsuperscript{50}

Zelinsky, known for his “doctrine of first effective settlement”\textsuperscript{51} recognized the predominate influence of immigrant settlers in developing an American culture and society rooted in English cultural structures and systems. To some extent this helps to explain the skepticism he expressed when he wrote: "What I question is the effectiveness of examining pseudo-ethnic landscapes as a strategy for getting at cultural adjustment or survival."\textsuperscript{52} Arguably, he neglects to see the value and insights that might be gained by understanding the meanings and ideas that different ethnic groups attach to and express through their interactions with landscapes. In theorizing that later arriving immigrant groups have been less successful in influencing American cultural landscapes and that Indigenous landscapes were unlikely to remain viable he gives us some sense of how strangely rational and self-reflective the search for a unifying or overarching theme can be if only the most prevalent perspectives and experiences are considered.

The book’s interdisciplinary approach to the study of landscapes and diversity of authorial perspectives highlighted a myriad of complementary and
sometimes conflicting ideas and conclusions about how to study and interpret the social and cultural aspects of landscapes. Paul Groth, one of the editors, readily acknowledged the tension and disparity found throughout the book regarding perspectives and approaches to the study of landscapes. In his essay, “Frameworks for Cultural Landscape Study,” Groth explained: “… no single paradigm has controlled cultural landscape studies in its first half-century. Two generations of writers and scholars have added their own questions, types of sources, and traditions into cultural landscape study, and the parameters of the enterprise are still open.”

**Landscapes as Social Dialogue**

In discussing possible future directions for the study of landscapes and culture, Stephan Mills, British geographer and author, looked toward an assessment of the relationship between landscapes and social systems as being fertile ground for study. He described this position in the following:

… landscapes are products of social processes and power relationships; just as life and society have many divergent, even conflicting meanings, landscapes, too are capable of multiple meanings. Inhabited landscapes are cultural productions—that is, systems of meaning and arenas of competing discourses…

Mills clearly articulated his belief that cultural landscapes result from social processes that intersect and overlap. The suggestion that landscapes could be interpreted as “systems of meaning” and “arenas of competing
discourses” is particularly relevant and informs this study’s assessment of how different groups of people understand and relate to one another through their interactions with landscapes.

David Harvey, British geographer and social theorist, also explored how cultural landscapes may function as the sites of discourse or dialogue within the dynamics of social and political systems and structures. His work has focused on the ways that urban landscapes may be assessed and interpreted as expressions and sites of social power and control. He argues that “the command over space is a fundamental and all-pervasive source of social power in and over everyday life” and also that “the production of space is an important means to augment social power.” In much of his work Harvey has been critical of capitalism and its effect in creating social class inequities. In using a Marxist infused lens he argues that capitalism promotes and enables inequities in the quality of life experienced by socially and economically disadvantaged groups through the economic manipulation of space. Harvey’s work has been influenced by the ideas and work of Henri Lefebvre and a brief examination of Lefebvre’s reasoning is helpful in examining the underlying logic that informs how landscapes may be interpreted as a form of social dialog.

Lefebvre (1901-1991), a preeminent French social philosopher and considered a Marxist, focused on social and philosophical concerns about the relationship between social power and space. He asserted that “social
space” is a social product that every society produces and tends to reinforce.\textsuperscript{58} He offered the following description as an example of how certain ideas become actualized through the implementation of social processes and power:

These three levels of determination correspond, within an overall unity, to the perceived, the conceived, and the directly experienced (or lived). In and through a spatial practice, refined in the course of history, an \textit{intuitus} was transformed into a \textit{habitus} by means of a process first of consolidation, then of degeneration. During this process too, and after it, the \textit{intelluctus} made its appearance in the conceptualizing discourse of Vitruvius, as also of a variety of other authors (for instance, Cicero, Seneca). The triad perceived-conceived-lived, along with what is denoted and connoted by these three terms, contributes to the production of space through interactions which metamorphose the original \textit{intuitus} into a quasi-system: the vault and its magic, the arch, or the aqueduct. In the case of Rome, organization, thought and the production of space went together, as indeed almost hand in hand. And they did so not under the sign of the Logos but under the sign of Law.\textsuperscript{59}

In the example cited above, Lefebvre describes his view of how systems and processes of social power and control effectively act to create and recreate physical spaces that support and reinforce existing power structures. In discussing linkages between the generation of ideas and the modification of physical space, he elaborated on his belief that the construction and/or modification of physical spaces are not only the result of social processes but may also effectively become the medium through which social and cultural ideas are conveyed. Lefebvre’s ideas about the social production of space
are helpful in developing a perspective and way of viewing landscapes as not just historical texts of the past but also as physical representations that embody and convey social and cultural ideas and values.

J. B. Jackson may have been implying a similar set of associations between people, landscapes, and society when he observed that ordinary people tend to create and use space, or vernacular landscapes, in ways that defy more formal designs. Jackson interpreted the flexible and often informal use of space associated with vernacular landscapes as a form of “resistance to the well-planned intentions of an established social order.” In exploring ideas about the social production of space both Harvey and Lefebvre use a Marxist lens infused with ideations about politics and economics. Jackson’s ideas about the development of vernacular landscapes seem to have emanated from his observation that when people change more formally planned landscapes, those actions represent informal, if not unconscious, forms of resistance to social authority. What the approaches of Harvey, Lefebvre, and Jackson have in common is that they focus on how landscapes may be interpreted as symbolic representations of the dynamics and dialogue associated with social power and control.

Discussion

The work of Sauer, Hoskins, and Jackson each represent significant influences on the intellectual history of ideas concerning the study of landscapes as social and cultural expressions. The study of cultural
landscapes in the U.S. is firmly rooted in the work of Sauer who explored linkages between history, landscapes, and culture and essentially defined an understanding of landscapes as evidence human and environmental interaction. Hoskins’ work seems to have inspired methodologies and ways of identifying and documenting historic landscape practices as part of a layered pattern of use and occupation by different groups of people over time. Jackson’s work, on the other hand, suggested bold new ways of interpreting landscapes as cultural expressions that evidence not just historical but also contemporary social meanings, interactions, and aspirations.

Subsequent approaches to the study of landscapes through the perspectives of race, class, and gender followed. These studies were augmented by additional considerations about the nature of power relations between groups of peoples. Works by Rose, Hayden, Swentzell, and Zelinsky explored ideas about how the dynamics of social power and control can affect relations between disparate groups of people through landscapes. Of these, only Swentzell directly addressed contemporary Indigenous cultural perspectives within the context of how landscapes may be analyzed as social and cultural systems of power and control. This dearth in the study of contemporary landscapes and relations between Indigenous peoples and American culture suggests that further work in this area may prove revelatory.
The work of social theorists such Harvey and Lefebvre further suggests how we might use a lens of analysis that views interactions with landscapes within the context of social power and control. The use of a Marxist lens in trying to critique or interpret Indigenous peoples and cultures can be problematic. It has been argued that Marxism like other forms of western social and economic philosophies are poorly positioned to understand the context and meanings of Indigenous ideas and practices not rooted in western ideations. However, theories about the social production of space do seem to be helpful not in making social, economic, or philosophical judgments about Indigenous peoples and cultures, but in providing a framework of analysis or at least in developing a vantage point for examining the nature of intercultural relations with respect to landscapes. In this case, examining who controls landscapes and how, seems particularly relevant with respect to understanding the history of intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.

Another interesting approach that examines interactions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples within the construct of colonialism is set forth in the work of Andrew Sluyter in *Colonialism and Landscapes: Postcolonial Theory and Applications* (2002). Sluyter noted the limitations of geographical approaches of the past in developing a “comprehensive geographic theory of colonialism and landscapes” and proffered an alternative. His study of the Veracruz lowlands of Mexico examined the applicability of an approach that considered “native” and European
transformations of landscapes within the construct of a “colonial triangle” of analysis. He argued that the colonization process effectuated complex and sometimes subtle changes to landscapes resulting in a process of “native desettlement and non-native resettlement.” Sluyter focused primarily on changes in the physical morphology of landscapes and population demographics. His focus on interactions between Native and non-Native peoples in relation to landscapes demonstrates the complex nature of how colonialism can be effectuated through landscape transformation. Moreover, his work suggests that a similar framework of analysis might be particularly helpful in focusing on how different groups of people affect each other through the medium of landscapes.

**Conclusion**

This study builds on notions explored herein about the symbolic meanings of landscapes as a vehicle for interrogating the nature of intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Ideas about the cultural nature and social production of space provide a critical framework through which to view and interpret landscapes as physical entities that not only reflect but also convey social and cultural values and meaning. In assuming that over time landscapes come to reflect many of the ideas and values that we knowingly and perhaps unconsciously choose to implement, it is reasonable to anticipate that the examination of ideas as well as traditions and practices will afford an opportunity to investigate various
aspects of the social and cultural dialogue that occurs between disparate groups of people both in and through landscapes.

Approaches to the study of landscapes and culture have often employed theories about the meaning and use of landscapes within the construct and dynamics of social power and control. Many of these studies have been used as a way of critiquing and exploring the histories of various groups of people along the lines of race, class, and gender. Studies that employ a “colonial triangle” of analysis may assist in focusing on relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in relation to landscapes. However, generally missing from these forms of analysis are studies that examine not just the historical but also the contemporary and ongoing nature of intercultural relations between Indigenous and immigrant settler peoples.

If, as has been asserted by Lefebvre and others, landscapes are not only a material record of the past but also a medium through which ideas and values are continually conveyed, then we may well ask: What might the study of American landscapes reveal not only about the past but also about the continuing history and nature of contemporary social and intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples? This and other questions about how we may interpret the different social and cultural meanings and intentions associated with landscapes are explored in the chapters that follow.
CHAPTER 3
PATTERNS OF DISCOURSE

“It frequently happens that the historian, though he professes more humanity than the trapper, mountain man, or gold-digger, who shoots one as a wild beast (meaning Native American), really exhibits and practices a similar inhumanity to him, wielding a pen instead of a rifle.” Henry David Thoreau

(parentheses mine)

“… the history of indigenous people cannot be written from within Western culture. Such a story is merely the West’s story of itself... Our story remains unwritten. It rests with the culture, which is inseparable from the land. To know this is to know our history. To write this is to write of the land and the people who are born from her.” Haunani-Kay Trask

From time immemorial the ability to understand and negotiate a variety of relationships with the natural and physical forces that surround us has been a necessary and crucial element of human survival. It is little wonder, then, that we humans have also found a variety of ways to explain and express how we think and feel about landscapes. Ideas about the natural and physical forces that comprise the environments we inhabit can readily be found in a variety of forms, such as art, religion, architecture, music, dance, and in oral and written expressions. While the content of literature is not necessarily synchronous with contemporaneous social and cultural concerns, literature can when carefully considered within an overall pattern of historical context tell us something not just about the perspective of the author but also about the social and cultural milieu in which the author’s ideas emerged.
Many authors have explored ideas and perspectives about American landscapes through the medium of literature. Europeans and European immigrants were among the first to write about the landscapes of North America. In some instances written descriptions were rooted in specific motivations such as encouraging immigration or investment. While the written accounts by seventeenth-century Puritans were punctuated with religious idealisms and apprehensions. Much of this early literature about landscapes in North America reveals an intellectual history that was rooted in the expectations and experiences of European immigrant settlers before they arrived on the shores of North America. A literature that was sympathetic in identifying with landscapes and the Indigenous peoples found in what now comprises the continental U.S. does not appear to have been part of an immediate or automatic response from the vantage point of many early European immigrant settlers. It seems that it took a number of generations before immigrant settlers and their descendants developed a sense of identity or close affinity with the landscapes of North America. Emerson’s 1837 lecture entitled “The American Scholar” has been recognized as one of the first to articulate a need for a new form of literature that could break from its European antecedents and begin a literary tradition fundamentally rooted in and defined by American places and perspectives. Since then countless American authors have presented and explored a wide variety of perspectives about the relationship between people and American landscapes in forms of poetry, prose, and various genres of both fiction and
nonfiction literature. Some of those authors, including such renowned writers as Mark Twain, William Faulkner, and John Steinbeck, focused on capturing and celebrating the character of uniquely local and regional landscapes. Others such as George Perkins Marsh, Henry David Thoreau, Aldo Leopold, and John Muir laid the foundations for establishing an American nature writing tradition rooted in ideas and ethical concerns about the environment and conservation.

While many authors have explored the relationships between people and American landscapes, and some have examined Indigenous peoples and landscapes as subjects of study, far fewer have articulated Indigenous perspectives about landscapes. Arguably, this apparent lack of scholarship reflects a general lack of interest in or awareness about on-going relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. As explored more fully below, Indigenous issues and perspectives about landscapes and the history of Indigenous and immigrant settler relations over the occupancy and use of landscapes seem to have emerged as areas of interest that can be seen in the relatively recent publication of a number of literary works.

This chapter explores and analyzes patterns of intellectual discourse on relationships between people and American landscapes as expressed and revealed through the medium of nonfiction literature published during the latter half of the twentieth century and early part of the twenty-first century. The central focus is to examine how perspectives about Indigenous and immigrant settler cultures have been considered and presented in relation to
landscapes over the last fifty years or so. The publishing timeframe under consideration begins in the latter half of the twentieth century and ends in the early part of the twenty-first century. It is a compelling time period because it marks an era during which we see how the effects of a burgeoning sense of environmental consciousness and a greater awareness of multicultural issues sometimes influenced, paralleled, and/or intersected with an interest in relationships between landscapes and Indigenous and immigrant settler cultures. What is of particular interest throughout the course of this analysis is how patterns of discourse changed over time with regard to the ways that relationships between Indigenous peoples and Euro-American immigrant settlers were portrayed in relation to the landscapes of the continental United States and the islands of Hawaii.

This study analyzes a variety of nonfiction texts within the broad spectrum of American social and cultural discourse on landscapes. In some cases key pieces of legislation are noted to supplement an understanding of the general tenor of national concerns about landscapes and/or Indigenous peoples. While the analysis set forth below includes a small fraction of many possible texts that could have been evaluated, selected works are highlighted not so much for the veracity of the arguments contained therein but rather because they seem either to capture the spirit of the times in which they were published or represent important or interesting linkages in an
overall pattern of intellectual discourse on the relationship between landscapes and Indigenous and immigrant settler cultures.

**Mid-Twentieth Century Traditions**

In the latter half of the twentieth century a number of authors focused on examining the underlying cultural values that, they argued, had historically informed American experiences and interactions with landscapes. Two key intellectual works that emerged during this early period of introspection were *Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth* (Smith, 1950); and *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America* (Marx, 1964). In each case the author attempted to synthesize, trace, and explicate the history of certain ideas that had informed how Americans thought about and ultimately interacted with American landscapes.

In *Virgin Land* Henry Nash Smith took a retrospective look at the history of ideas about democracy and equality in relation to the myths and symbols associated with an era of westward expansion and settlement of the continental U.S. by Euro-American settlers. He argued that certain representations and mythological assumptions, especially those about Western heroes and heroines, the nobility of the yeoman farmer, the docile nature of American landscapes, and the democratic and equalizing nature of the westward settlement process, had been key factors that informed an American cultural mindset with respect to the relationship between Americans and landscapes. Perhaps most significant of all Smith critiqued
Frederick Jackson Turner’s 1893 frontier thesis set forth in “The Significance of the Frontier in American History” as a particularly influential work that portrayed the Western frontier as the literal and figurative intersection of savagery and civilization that uniquely resulted in the emergence of “new world” traditions and values associated with democracy and equality.

Leo Marx, a student of Smith’s, also attempted to examine the underpinnings of American cultural ideas with respect to landscapes in The Machine in the Garden. Marx explored literary and artistic genres that both reflected and informed what he identified as an emotional and psychological preference for the rural or “middle” landscape in which nature and civilization coexisted in an idealized, albeit somewhat uneasy, form of pastoral harmony. He argued that civilization and its representations in the form of technology had been a source of psychological angst and emotional conflict for most Americans, and that this conflict emanated from deep-seated social and cultural fears about both wilderness and industrialization.

What is interesting about both of these works is that while each author probed the relationship between an emerging American national identity and certain cultural perceptions and motivations with respect to the landscapes of North America, neither identified any tradition of meaningful discourse relative to Indigenous peoples and landscapes in America. When included in the discussion of landscapes, Indigenous peoples had generally been portrayed as either incidental players or temporary impediments in an
otherwise Euro-American narrative of Westward expansion and settlement. This lack of discussion fails to acknowledge any sense that Indigenous cultures had significant and long-lasting relationships with landscapes. The point also seems to indicate that for the most part an American literary tradition concerning the relationships between people and landscapes in the continental U.S. had not included Indigenous perspectives.

Two later works that emerged in 1967 and 1969, respectively, were *Wilderness and the American Mind* (Nash, 1967) and *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier 1629-1700* (Carroll, 1969). Both authors provided an analysis of how ideas about “wilderness” as both place and as a psychological metaphor were rooted in European conceptualizations. Carroll discusses the religious perspectives of Puritans who feared “the Devil lurking in the wilderness” and the Indigenous peoples they encountered as “men transformed into beasts” that were “the bond-slaves of Satan”.¹² Nash also notes the apprehensions of early European immigrant settlers, whose ideas were deeply rooted in Judeo-Christian beliefs and fears about wilderness. He further explores a history of ideas in which European ideations were eventually transformed by a later emerging sense of nationalism followed by the Romantic idealism of the eighteenth century and early nineteenth century. This idealism, he argues, subsequently informed the emergence of the preservation movement in the latter half of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. Both works
clearly focused on the perspective of immigrant settlers. However, Carroll provided more insight than did Nash into how certain ideations about Indigenous peoples might have been framed and informed by immigrant settler fears and apprehensions.

Interestingly enough over the span of some thirty-four years there were three subsequent editions to *Wilderness and the American Mind*. This gives us some subtle clues about how ideas changed over that time period not only regarding nature and the environment but also in how Indigenous peoples and their relationships to landscapes were characterized and portrayed. In the first two editions of the book, published in 1967 and 1973, respectively, Nash only marginally referred to the subject of Indigenous peoples and landscapes. He noted that the work of key figures such as Thoreau, the historian Francis Parkman, and the painter George Carlin had all included ideas about the presence of Native Americans in relation to nature and landscapes. Perhaps more importantly each also suspected that the demise of Native Americans, like the wilderness, was the likely outcome to result from the progression of American civilization. As seen in Chapter 12 of the second edition, Nash only incidentally mentions the subject of Native Americans in a brief notation about historic efforts by the Department of Interior to designate wilderness areas on Indian reservations. However, more importantly he reveals his own apparently emerging awareness of how Euro-
American ideas about wilderness were clearly rooted in European traditions, as he explains in the following:

… I found it necessary to probe back beyond 1607 and 1492 to get at the foundations of American attitudes toward wilderness. The first white “Americans,” I gradually came to understand, were Europeans. Their concept of wilderness was several thousand years old by the time of Jamestown or Columbus. Wilderness, after all, was not discovered in the New World.\textsuperscript{13}

It is not entirely clear if Nash had reached his “gradual understanding” prior to the publication of the first edition in 1967 or by the time of the later 1973 edition. What is clear is that he had begun to feel the need to explain that the American attitudes about wilderness that he had been examining were rooted in European cultural ideations.

By the time of the third edition of the book was published in 1982, Nash clearly identified Indigenous perspectives as being fundamentally different than the perspectives of Euro-Americans. In the preface he presented an Indigenous perspective about landscapes when he cited the following passage from Luther Standing Bear’s \textit{Land of the Spotted Eagle} (1933):

We did not think of the great open plains, the beautiful rolling hills and the winding streams with tangled growth as ‘wild’. Only to the white man was nature a ‘wilderness’ and … the land ‘infested’ with ‘wild’ animals and ‘savage’ people. There was no wilderness; since nature was not dangerous but hospitable; not forbidding but friendly.\textsuperscript{14}
In his analysis of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971, Nash cited a contemporary Eskimo’s belief that Euro-Americans:

… think there’s nothing out there, using land for hunting and fishing and trapping, as we have for 15,000 years …. They think the native people and our lifestyle are part of the nothingness of the frontier…\(^{15}\)

He also obliquely referred to the notion that ideas about nature and Native Americans had somehow been synonymously equated during the 1960s since people thought about “…wilderness and, parenthetically, of Indians, as victims of the same fixation on progress, growth, and competition which threatened countercultural values such as peace, freedom, and community.”\(^{16}\) By the time the fourth edition was published in 2001, Nash seems more confident in building upon his earlier references to Indigenous perspectives about wilderness and landscapes. He cites numerous international examples to support the idea that people from Indigenous and European cultures clearly saw and appreciated wilderness in different ways.

The pattern of discourse in Nash’s work demonstrates how the nature and level of interest in the natural environment, particularly regarding the idea of wilderness, transformed over time. His gradual inclusion and characterization of Indigenous perspectives about landscapes and immigrant settler culture also seem to reveal in an almost inadvertent way how Indigenous cultures were just beginning to be considered and then portrayed during the thirty-four year time period from 1967 to 2001. Interestingly enough Nash’s work seems to parallel to a limited extent a similar pattern of
change in the general level of interest in contemporary Indigenous issues concerning land and resources. As discussed more fully in the sections that follow, many other authors published during approximately the same time period as Nash also reflected a growing sense of awareness about Indigenous peoples and landscapes.

**Environmental Concerns and Indigenous Peoples**

Throughout the 1960s and early 1970s many subsequently well-known works signaled a burgeoning interest in both public policy in general and environmental activism in particular. Much of the discourse of this era included the ideas and interests that emanated from a number of diverse fields such as ecology, the natural and physical sciences, and economics which focused on and identified the negative effects of human-induced impacts on the natural environment and to some extent helped to support and establish the field of environmental studies. The decade of the 1960s was a period during which a number of legislative and regulatory reforms emerged aimed at protecting various aspects of quality of life through environmental regulation. Legislative actions including the Wilderness Act (1964)\(^{17}\), the National Historic Preservation Act (1966)\(^{18}\), and the National Environmental Policy Act (1969)\(^{19}\) focused on environmental issues and concerns and have had long-standing implications for governmental policies and actions that affect landscapes.
During this era of new regulatory reform a number of authors also focused on environmental issues. Memorable works produced during this time include discourse emanating from the biological sciences, such as Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring* (Carson, 1962), Paul Ehrlich’s social and agriculturally based predictions set forth in *The Population Bomb* (Ehrlich, 1968), Garrett Hardin’s Science magazine article, “The Tragedy of the Commons” (Hardin, 1968), and Ian McHarg’s land use planning methodology set forth in *Design With Nature* (McHarg, 1969). All of these works were highly critical of human choices with respect to ecological systems and environments and fueled the debate over negative impacts of human activities on the natural environment. Each author also contributed to and demonstrated a growing sense of consciousness about the ways humans interacted with their surrounding environments. However, they generally did not differentiate between Euro-American and Indigenous ideas and traditions.

*On Being Hawaiian* (Holt, 1964) proffered an Indigenous perspective about relationships between people and landscapes. In this monograph Holt contrasted the historical relationships of Native Hawaiians to the land and waters of Hawaii with the experiences of immigrants who arrived from other lands in the following way:

> We alone did not come here in the last century or so, fresh from other lands, aglow with hope for a better way of life, marvelously free to give any meaning we would to our new experience as the years unfolded. Those who did, came for
the express reason of ridding themselves of their historic and environmental chains. They could come here and enjoy the comfort of a new freedom, those elements of their ethnic heritage which they wished to cherish. They selected from their past life those ways that helped them to endure, to inherit in time the good life of their adopted homeland. The Hawaiians had no such freedom.20

Holt essentially identified how perspectives may differ and be informed by different social and cultural histories in association with the landscapes of Hawaii. He expressed a sense of injustice about how Native Hawaiians had been dispossessed of land. Moreover, he articulated and reasserted a long-standing Indigenous connection to the landscapes of Hawaii when he stated: “We assume the right to win back our lands, those belonging to us, as “reservations” belong to our Indian brothers and sisters.”21

Many contemporary issues informing relations between Native Americans and the structures and processes of American society were also being explicated in the continental U.S. In Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto (Deloria, 1969) Vine Deloria, Jr. examined a number of laws, treaties, and federal policies that affected Native American sovereignty, treaty rights, policies concerning self-determination, and other issues associated with land and natural resources. Deloria, like Holt, directly articulated contemporary Indigenous perspectives regarding land and resources as central points of discussion rather than as incidental areas of interest. This focus on the relationships between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples is markedly different than other works such as
Nash’s that placed the concerns of Indigenous peoples primarily within the context of more generalized environmental history approaches.

By 1969 a focus on Indigenous perspectives and issues regarding land and resources was poised on the forefront of a wave of national attention. The symbolic occupation of Alcatraz Island by Native Americans focused national media coverage on the history of Indigenous peoples and land. The occupation was promulgated in part by previous federal policies aimed at relocating Native Americans away from rural reservations and placing them in jobs located in urban environments.\textsuperscript{22} As it turned out the Alcatraz incident was one of the first of a number of more or less highly publicized protests and clashes that occurred throughout the 1970s revolving around Indigenous concerns about land and resources. As Deloria noted:

\begin{quote}
The summer of 1970 saw the movement overflow its channel and expand into almost every state where any significant number of Indians lived. In almost every case an immediate and identifiable injustice with respect to confiscation of Indian lands was the issue.\textsuperscript{23}
\end{quote}

Meanwhile in Hawaii struggles over the use and occupation of land relative to the rights and concerns of Native Hawaiians emerged as the basis for protest in the form of “Mass demonstrations, legal actions, and cultural assertions such as the construction of fishing villages….”\textsuperscript{24} One of the most highly publicized incidents involved the 1970 struggle over the suburbanization and development of Kalama Valley on the island of Oahu. In this instance environmentalists, farmers, and Native Hawaiian activists were
allied against land development interests. This incident was but the first of a number of “an ongoing series of land struggles throughout the decade of the seventies” and is recognized as having given rise to the modern Hawaiian Movement. That Movement has subsequently sought redress for Native Hawaiians over issues concerning the denial of nationhood, sovereignty, and losses associated with land and water resources resulting from U.S. policies and actions, including the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893 and the subsequent annexation of Hawaii to the U.S. in 1898.

A series of similar incidents focused national attention on contemporary Indigenous concerns throughout the 1970s. The more well-publicized clashes included: the occupation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) offices in Washington, D.C. in 1972; the occupation and subsequent violence at Wounded Knee in 1973; protests resulting in violence and homicides on the Pine Ridge Reservation in 1975; and a series of reoccupations of the island of Kaho'olawe by Native Hawaiian activists beginning in 1976. While these incidents were among the most highly publicized, there were in fact many other less well-known protests, physical clashes, and ideological disputes that occurred during this same time period involving various groups of Indigenous peoples and government entities over unresolved issues concerning land and natural resources.

Non-fiction discourse in the form of historical research and analysis seems to have reflected a similarly high degree of interest in conflicts
concerning Indigenous and Indigenous peoples. A report, *Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians* (1970) prepared for the American Friends Service detailed the significance of treaties and contemporary conflicts over fishing rights in western Washington State. This report presented the history of intercultural relations from a point of view that was sympathetic to the treaty rights of Indigenous peoples. In the same year *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee: An Indian History of the American West* (Brown, 1970) was published. Brown presented his research and analysis of a number of government documents and reports from the period 1860-1890 in developing a sympathetic account of how several Native American Tribes had historically suffered or otherwise been mistreated and swindled out of land and resources. He highlighted the unfair or nefarious policies and actions of the U.S. government and its representatives. In the preface to the book Brown characterized the period of his study in the following way:

> During that time the culture and civilization of the American Indian was destroyed, and out of that time came virtually all the great myths of the American West – tales of fur traders, mountain men, steamboat pilots, gold seekers, gunmen, cavalrymen, cowboys, harlots, missionaries, schoolmarmes, and homesteaders.27

Interestingly enough Brown’s stated assumption that Native American cultures had not survived beyond the nineteenth century is a theme that was in sharp contrast to the ways in which they were portrayed by Deloria and the American Friends Service report. While Brown’s work was a sympathetic
portrayal of Indigenous peoples, his historical analysis placed them primarily within the structures and confines of the past.

During the 1970s public attention and concern also reflected a growing sense of the need for environmental regulations. This awareness was amplified through the Earth Day public demonstration in Washington, D.C., on April 22, 1970\(^{28}\) and in legislative reforms that underscored the interdependent nature of relationships that existed between humans and other physical and biological systems. A number of regulatory reforms adopted during this era focused on restriction of human activities and land use practices as a way of protecting the capability of natural biological and ecological systems to sustain human health. Numerous pieces of federal legislation relating to environmental issues were enacted as a result of those concerns including the Clean Air Act (1970),\(^{29}\) the Clean Water Act (1972),\(^{30}\) and the Endangered Species Act (1973).\(^{31}\) These laws were aimed at protecting the viability of biological systems from the impacts of human land use and resource development activities and demonstrate a general sense of awareness of and interest in relationships between people and the natural environment.

In some cases legislation during this time period reflects a commingling of environmental interests and the concerns of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (1971)\(^{32}\) is a major piece of legislation that addressed a number of these types of
issues and concerns. Prompted by the desire to facilitate natural resource extraction in Alaska, the legislation addressed Alaska Native land claims and provided for some additional allocation and protection of public lands throughout the State. In a separate but somewhat related fashion, the Native American Religious Freedom Act (1978)\textsuperscript{33} attempted to negotiate the interstice between the practices of Indigenous peoples and the resources upon which they were dependant. This legislation was aimed at the protection and preservation of the rights of Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, Eskimos, and Aleuts to believe, express, and engage in traditional religious practices. Those practices included, among other things, access to sacred sites that had historically been denied by government entities. However, protection of the cultural integrity of those sites was not guaranteed. Both pieces of legislation infer that legislators were actively engaged in considering social and cultural connections between environmental and Indigenous related issues.

Much of the discourse published during the 1970s that focused on people and landscapes explored new ways of thinking about human relationships to either the natural or the built environment. In \textit{Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes, and Values} (Tuan, 1974) the author explored what he characterized as commonalities as well as differences in how humans have responded to and interacted with landscapes and the physical environments they inhabited. He saw
commonalities in the ways people interact with their environments as part of a universal human response. He also surmised that differences between groups of people often resulted from inherent differences in cultural values, attitudes, experiences and perceptions. A number of other works emphasized cultural landscape studies approaches, architectural design, rural landscapes, and social, political, and economic perspectives related to land use practices.\footnote{What many works published during this era have in common is that they were searching for new approaches to the study of people, culture, and landscapes, and this seems to have resulted in a proliferation of related studies.}

One work in particular seems to highlight how the histories and concerns of Indigenous peoples were portrayed in relation to a plethora of environmental concerns. In *National Parks: the American Experience* (Runte, 1979) the author lauded the achievement of environmentalists and others in creating and then preserving the nation’s system of national parks and wilderness areas. Runte noted that park preservation, as intended in 1872 in the establishment of Yellowstone National Park, was primarily aimed at the protection of landscapes but that those interests did not focus on the protection of the historical nature of relationships to landscapes. He noted that Native American landscape management practices had influenced the biological composition of the North American continent which included the past management of certain park land areas through the use of fire but
barely mentions Indigenous peoples in any other context. Runte portrayed the interests of Alaska's Indigenous peoples and the interests of the State of Alaska as having been summarily at odds with preservationists' objectives to protect wilderness from the hunting or harvesting flora and fauna. Runte doesn’t articulate the ways in which the establishment of National Parks resulted in the removal and or restriction of use of land by Indigenous peoples and his approach essentially overlooks historical relationships between Indigenous people and landscapes.

Social and Cultural Histories and Experiences

Throughout the 1980s the previous focus on relationships between humans and the natural environment seemed to broaden significantly to include the human-built one as well. The focus on human-built environments is reflected in a range of new topics and approaches explored in the fields of cultural, social, and environmental history. Much of this work focused on analyzing and tracing certain underlying social and cultural ideas, traditions, and practices that had historically informed interactions and experiences with landscapes. In some cases Indigenous relationships to landscapes were largely ignored while in others they were incorporated within the construct of environmental history or as part of a form of multi-ethnic social focus.

In *Common Landscape of America, 1580 to 1845* (Stilgoe, 1982) the author focused on rural landscapes in America located east of the Mississippi River. Stilgoe provided an understanding of how regional differences may be
reflected in existing landscape forms and historical architecture. He traced early modern European notions about landscape and settlement patterns in the Spanish southwest, Tidewater-South, New England, and Pennsylvania-New York areas. Stilgoe readily noted the “folk” or Old World influences on landscape development and design and focused on the adaptive processes implemented by mostly European and Euro-American settlers as they continued to move westward to occupy additional lands. Influential designs and land use patterns explored included: the Spanish extensions or pueblos, the New England villages developed by the English, and the market-driven and slave-based systems that influenced the plantation and commercial settlements of the South. The influence of women on farm and town design was also included. However, with the exception of an almost incidental reference to certain agricultural practices in New England and the Southwest, Stilgoe’s work lacked any form of discussion about the influences of Indigenous peoples on the landscape of North America. Given the fact that Stilgoe was a student of Sauer’s it is a somewhat curious oversight.

Two works published in the early 1980s that did examine the topics of landscapes, Indigenous peoples, and early immigrant settlers both focused on the New England region. In Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643 (Salisbury, 1982) the author takes a very detailed and nuanced look at social and economic relations between Native American and European settler cultures with regard to
control of land and exploitation of natural resources. In *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (Cronon, 1983) the author focuses on the vast and varied ecological changes that occurred in the New England landscape between approximately the mid-1600s and 1800. Cronon’s work was premised on the notion that European colonists and Native Americans viewed and used the natural environment based on different culturally informed values, perceptions, and belief systems. He also discussed differences in Native American and immigrant settler hunting, agricultural, and land management practices. In each of these works the authors portrayed Native Americans as having actively participated in changing the nature of the landscapes they inhabited and not as one-dimensional actors who had been impediments to Euro-American progress. These works demonstrated how environmental histories could successfully analyze and present Indigenous peoples’ practices on a somewhat even keel in relation to the experiences and practices of immigrant settlers. In both cases Indigenous peoples are not romanticized and they are portrayed as people with agency over their interactions with landscapes as well as with immigrant settlers.

In general works published in the 1980s demonstrated a wide range of interests in topics that explored many of the social and cultural dimensions of land use and development. Many focused on interpreting social, historical and cultural aspects of planning, architecture, and landscape design with
little if any focus on Indigenous peoples and landscapes. These may have
developed new interpretations and linkages between landscapes and social
histories but yielded little, if any, information about the nature of relations
between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. Others used a more specific
social or cultural lens of analysis that provided additional insights and new
ways of viewing social and cultural interactions with landscapes. Many of
these works examined previously unexplored or neglected perspectives
along the lines of race, class, and gender in interpreting the history of
immigrant settlement of the American West.

In some cases a widening in the geographical perspective of a study’s
focus seems to have facilitated new ways of thinking about relationships
between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. For example, *Ecological
Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900-1900* (Crosby, 1986)
explored biological explanations for the resulting profusion of people of
Western European descent who comprise the largest segments of the
population of North America, Australia, and New Zealand. This study
demonstrated how a focus on European immigrant settlers within the wider
context of global colonization could prove beneficial in understanding the
history of relationships between Euro-American and Indigenous peoples.
*Native American Estate: The Struggle Over Indian and Hawaiian Lands*
(Parker, 1989) addressed commonalties and differences in how Indigenous
peoples’ were dispossessed of land. The focus on interactions between
Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples in both the continental U.S. and Hawaii suggests that a comparative focus on disparate groups of Indigenous peoples could be beneficial in understanding broad patterns of behavior.

Many of the authors mentioned above, including Salisbury, Cronon, Limerick, and Parker, presented and articulated relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes in ways that had not previously received much attention. For example Salisbury used what was identified as an “ethno historical approach” to compare and contrast inter-Tribal and intercultural social systems and land use practices. Cronon explained how the ideas and actions of both European colonists and Native Americans were major influences and agents of ecological change involving the landscapes of New England. Limerick, on the other hand, examined the history of the settlement of Western regions of America through a multi-focal perspective that included experiences from Anglo, Hispanic, Native American, Asian, and Black histories. And, Parker’s work focused specifically on a variety of ways that Native Americans and Native Hawaiians had been dispossessed of land and other resources as well as the ways that each group of Indigenous peoples resisted the processes of dispossession. Each of these authors acknowledged the agency and influence of Indigenous peoples in relation to the landscapes of the U.S. and to the immigrant settlers who sought to gain control over those same lands. By the end of the 1980s the discourse on
landscapes and people had clearly begun to incorporate a keener sense of awareness of various cultural, social, and ethno-historical perspectives and histories. Many of these studies challenged, rather than relied on, the nature and limitations of previous forms of intellectual discourse that had focused primarily on the experiences of immigrant settler cultures within the context of a national or American sense of unity. Included within these studies were those that delved into the complex historical nature of relationships between Indigenous peoples and American landscapes.

**Landscapes and Intercultural Histories**

By the 1990s the idea of examining landscapes as the material evidence of cultural experience or “text” for understanding more about the variability of the American experience had become fairly well established. The idea had been buttressed by a plethora of new ways to explore landscapes as important elements of social or cultural historiography. As discussed more fully below, the ensuing witnessed a diverse range of historical perspectives about landscapes in relation to various facets of American culture. This era is further characterized by a new interest in some of the social and political implications associated with the discourse on Indigenous cultures and American landscapes.

As noted previously, in *The Making of the American Landscape* (Conzen, ed., 1990) some eighteen historical geographers with backgrounds and expertise in a range of subject matters explored a wide variety of
cultural, social, and historical influences that they believed had informed the physical development of various cultural and regional landscapes found in the continental United States. The book included the work of a number of preeminent authors, including geographers and historians such as Donald W. Meinig, Peirce F. Lewis, Michael P. Conzen, Wilbur Zelinsky, and J. B. Jackson. Areas of interest included topical chapters on: historical Native American, Spanish, and French geographical legacies; European and ethnic-specific influences, development patterns, and architectural traditions; political and economic influences; and even national design trends. The editor Conzen stated in the preface to the book: “Hawaii and Alaska in comparative landscape terms are worlds unto themselves and require individual treatment” and as such were not included among the many important regions and subjects examined. It appears that by 1990 both Hawaii and Alaska were regions for which intellectual connections between landscapes and culture had not been as widely explored or considered as other regions in the United States. Arguably these regions were being left out of the discourse on contemporary cultural landscapes and this area of study essentially remains an unexplored opportunity to examine the colonizing effects of American cultural influence.

Many works produced during this time period focused on particular themes or subjects associated with space and landscapes in the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. through the application of a range of
psychological, political, geographical, feminist, and other social and cultural perspectives.\textsuperscript{38} This diversity provided a variety of perspectives and new ways of thinking about our relationships with landscapes and become part of a growing discourse on people, places, and the landscapes we inhabit. While many works tended to focus rather narrowly on a specific theme or perspective, most made little of no attempt to present Indigenous histories, ideas, or perceptions in relation to landscapes. However, Meinig’s \textit{The Shaping of America: A Geographical Perspective on 500 Years of History} (Meinig, 1993) stands out as an epic or “big picture” perspective on geographical history in which he included the experiences of Indigenous peoples.

During this same time period, a number of other authors focused specifically on linkages between Indigenous peoples and landscapes as a central theme. In general they used a variety of ethnographic and anthropological approaches and methods to present ideas about cultural relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. \textit{Before The Wilderness: Environmental Management by Native Californians} (Blackburn & Anderson, ed., 1993) a compilation of the work of many authors, demonstrated in great detail that Native Americans actively managed landscapes in a variety of ways prior to the arrival of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers. Grinde and Johansen discussed a wide range of Indigenous adaptations to various environmental threats in \textit{Ecocide of
Native America: Environmental Destruction of Indian Lands and Peoples (Grinde & Johansen, 1995). This book examined the contemporary struggles of Indigenous peoples in relation to a variety of hazardous land use practices. Basso’s work in Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache (Basso, 1996) presented the perceptions and relationships of Indigenous people to landscapes from the cultural perspectives of his Apache informants. In each case, these works were documenting some of the land use practices and environmental concerns of Indigenous peoples.

In The Ecological Indian: Myth and History (Krech, 1999) the author also examined relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. His aim was to debunk popular ideas and imagery associating Native Americans with modern day conservation beliefs and practices. Krech cited selected sources that included anthropological interpretations of occupation and land use sites, historical accounts of European explorers and Euro-American immigrant settlers about Native Americans, and his own apparent speculations about how Native Americans might have historically thought about and interacted with landscapes and natural resources. Based on that information, he contended that Indigenous peoples, including people he labeled as “paleo-Indians,” had historically been as ignorant of and oblivious to modern-day ecological and conservation sensibilities as any of the later arriving groups of immigrant settlers. With its focus trained on the inadequacy
of Native Americans to meet a somewhat ill-defined modern day standard of environmental conservation, the approach borders on the edge of an anti-Indian sentiment and does little to present Indigenous perspectives and practices in a new way.

Some works explored cross-cultural relations between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers over land and resources as critical subjects of study. *New Worlds For All: Indians, Europeans, and the Remaking of Early America* (Calloway, 1997) focused primarily on colonial America prior to 1800 and portrayed the period as a time during which Indigenous peoples and European settlers made intercultural adaptations in response to each other. He noted that for immigrant settlers, adaptation to a new environment generally included an effort to replicate European customs and practices:

> Ultimately, the invaders of North America succeeded in their goal of building new societies that were more like their old ones in Europe than the Native societies they encountered in America.\(^{39}\)

*Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (Spence, 1999) focused on an historical examination of how Native Americans were removed and dispossessed of lands for the purpose of creating or expanding “uninhabited landscapes” for Yellowstone, Yosemite, and Glacier National Parks. This work contrasted sharply with Runte (Runte, 1979) in which Indigenous peoples were hardly mentioned in relation to the creation of national parks.
Other works published during this time period, articulated contemporary Indigenous perspectives about history, land and intercultural relations. Many of these authors, including a number of Indigenous authors, clearly linked their analysis of historical and intercultural relations to ongoing contemporary Indigenous issues and concerns affecting land and resources. *Native Land and Foreign Desires: How Shall We Live in Harmony?* (Kame'eleihiwa, 1992) and *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii* (Trask, 1993) articulated Indigenous perspectives in relation to land and resources in Hawaii. Both of these authors examined historical relations between Native Hawaiians and later arriving immigrant settlers. Trask’s analysis in particular helped to frame a contemporary political understanding of the people and islands of Hawaii in juxtaposition to ideas about American colonialism. Meanwhile works such as *Struggle for the Land: Indigenous Resistance to Genocide, Ecocide and Expropriation in Contemporary North America* (Churchill, 1993); *Red Earth, White Lies: Native Americans and the Myth of Scientific Fact* (Deloria, 1995); and *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Life and Land* (LaDuke, 1999) focused primarily on the impacts of cross-cultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples and cultures in the continental U.S. What is unique about this group of authors is that they were not just writing about Indigenous subjects; they were articulating and helping to define contemporary Indigenous perspectives about relationships to landscapes and the nature of social and intercultural relations.
Cultural Landscapes and the Perspectives of Indigenous Peoples

By the year 2000 numerous authors were exploring the history of ideas about American landscapes from multiple social and cultural vantage points. Many of these works offered multiple ways of thinking about and critiquing the history of ideas concerning nature and landscapes in ways that effectively helped to widen the relatively limited framework characteristic of earlier traditions in Western discourse. Some such as So Glorious a Landscape: Nature and the Environment in American History and Culture (Magoc, ed, 2002) and The Colors of Nature: Culture, Identity and the Natural World (Deming & Savoy, 2002) included Indigenous subjects or perspectives as part of a multi-focal approach to understanding relationships between people and landscapes. The National Parks (Duncan & Burns, 2009) included examples of how various social groups, including women and African Americans, participated in establishing national parks but generally glossed over or stopped short of examining how Indigenous people were dispossessed of the lands on which national parks were established.40 Others, such as Reinventing Eden: The Fate of Nature in Western Culture (Merchant, 2003) used the perspectives and experiences of other cultures, including Native Americans, as a foil to critique Western discourse and idealizations about nature.

A number of works published during this time period were aimed more directly at exploring Indigenous perspectives and practices in relation to
landscapes. *Sacred Lands of Indian America* (Little, 2001) presented a number of contemporary case studies that involved Indigenous issues and concerns regarding access to and protection of sacred landscapes in relation to the need to conduct traditional cultural practices on lands located in various parts of the continental United States. *Forgotten Fires: Native Americans and the Transient Wilderness* (Stewart, 2002) was a posthumous publication of the anthropologist Omer Stewart’s work on Indigenous use of fire as a landscape management practice. And, in *Tending the Wild: Native American Knowledge and the Management of California’s Natural Resources* (Anderson, 2005) the author focused on hunting, fishing, harvesting, and horticultural techniques that Native Americans have used in the management of California landscapes that to a large extent had gone unrecognized by scholars and other readers outside of the field of anthropology. Both of Banner's works: *How the Indians Lost Their Land* (Banner, 2005); and *Possessing the Pacific: Land, Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska* (Banner, 2007) presented historical and legalistic interpretations of land policies that enabled colonizing powers to replace Indigenous social and cultural systems and seize control over land in certain regions of the United States and Western Pacific.

Numerous authors were also not just writing about or incorporating Indigenous subjects or themes into their work; they were articulating a wide variety of Indigenous perspectives in their work. A number of authors
explored historical and cultural conflicts between Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers in relation to landscapes and then linked the implication of those interactions to the contemporary issues and perspectives of Indigenous peoples. A strong contingent of authors included in this movement originated out of Hawaii. In *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (Osorio, 2002) the author examined the political history of the Hawaiian Nation and clarified how legislative and political changes affected both land tenure and land use in Hawaii. Other works such as *Nā Kua’āina: Living Hawaiian Culture* (McGregor, 2007) and *Ha‘ena: Through the Eyes of the Ancestors* (Andrade, 2008) explored local histories and traditional cultural associations between Native Hawaiians and the landscapes and resources of Hawaii. *Recovering the Sacred: The Power of Naming and Claiming* (LaDuke, 2005) and *Where the Lightning Strikes: The Lives of American Indian Sacred Places* (Nabokov, 2006) also explored a number of contemporary examples that portray the ongoing nature of relationships between Indigenous peoples, landscapes, and land-based resources. All of these authors explained and portrayed contemporary and historical Indigenous cultural ideas, issues, perspectives, and traditions as the central thrust of their work. In doing so, each author proffered new insights and ways of evaluating Indigenous relationships to American landscapes. These approaches contrast sharply with older canons of Western discourse in which the histories of Indigenous peoples were essentially consigned to the margins of study and consideration.
Discussion

As seen in the latter part of the 1950s and early 1960s, numerous authors were searching for and examining the dominant social, cultural, and even psychological experiences and preferences that had informed how “Americans” thought about and interacted with the landscapes of North America. Writers such as Smith, Marx, and Nash explained some of the underlying values and motivations that they believed had historically existed between “Americans” and landscapes in the continental United States. While they noted that many American ideas and beliefs about landscapes were deeply rooted in European social and cultural preferences, much of their work focused primarily on examining the experiences, relationships, and perspectives of Euro-American immigrant settlers and essentially ignored or completely overlooked Indigenous relationships with landscapes.

A number of works published in the 1960s demonstrated a growing sense of social awareness about environmental issues, but many authors essentially continued to ignore any serious consideration of the relationship of Indigenous peoples with American landscapes or else portrayed Indigenous cultures as part of a somewhat hazy or obscure and distant past. The author Dee Brown focused specifically on historical relations between Indigenous peoples and certain federal actions and policies regarding the mistreatment of Native Americans. Brown premised his work on the idea that Native American cultures were part of a tragic and bygone era.
Holt and Deloria marked a significant departure from romantic notions about Indigenous peoples as fading or vanishing characters in an otherwise Euro-American drama. Both of these authors provided their own Indigenous perspectives and insights on the nature of historical as well as contemporary associations with land and resources.

During the 1970s discourse on the relationships between people and landscapes widened to include a multitude of disparate interests. While a strong sense of environmental consciousness was apparent throughout much of this era, there was also a growing sense of awareness about different ways of viewing and understanding connections between landscapes and social and cultural practices. Previously much of the discourse on people and American landscapes had articulated various attempts to synthesize major experiences as part of a master narrative. What had clearly begun to take hold was the idea that many of the predominate ways of thinking about and interacting with landscapes, especially within the context of American ideas about “nature” and “wilderness,” were clearly rooted in European traditions.

Conflicts between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples that occurred throughout the 1970s resulted in or at least paralleled a greater awareness of the contemporary nature of Indigenous peoples’ cultural and political concerns about land and natural resources. However, it seems that published accounts that highlighted Indigenous perspectives on land and
natural resources remained relatively few. Indigenous perspectives set forth in *Uncommon Controversy: Fishing Rights of the Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Nisqually Indians* (1970) were significant for the articulation of how contemporary impacts were related to Indigenous treaty rights and to a limited extent may have helped to alter perceptions about the concerns of Indigenous peoples and landscapes within the affected regional area.

From the late 1980s and forward a number of changes occurred in the overall pattern of American intellectual discourse on relationships between people and landscapes that seemed to widen the scope of concerns from a predominately Euro-American narrative to include a multitude of social and cultural perspectives. Many authors were exploring ideas about landscapes from a much more diverse range of perspectives and along the lines of race, class and gender. This is reflected in a general broadening of and change in the tenor of discourse on people and landscapes. While the relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes were sometimes considered, a significant portion of the discourse continued to focus on Indigenous subjects and experiences as part of the backdrop for an otherwise robust Euro-American immigrant settler cultural narrative.

An increased level of awareness about environmental as well as multifarious cultural and social concerns resulted in a number of critical studies and analyses that further expanded the subject and range of intellectual discourse on landscapes. Arguably, works focused primarily on
environmental or other social concerns tended to overshadow accurate presentations of Indigenous peoples and their concerns about landscapes. However, the environmental movement and a general increase in awareness about diverse peoples and cultures probably facilitated new approaches to the study of people and landscapes. This awareness coupled with a certain amount of Indigenous activism and scholarship opened up the possibility for a greater interest in works that explored the landscape traditions and practices of Indigenous peoples in juxtaposition with Euro-American immigrant settler practices.

While a number of authors have explored ideas about landscapes based on the historical nature of Indigenous models and perspectives, some, including many Indigenous authors, were not just looking retrospectively but were also articulating contemporary Indigenous perspectives in relation to landscapes. The publication of contemporary perspectives about Indigenous peoples and landscapes represents a significant change in how relationships between people and American landscapes are currently being studied and interpreted.

**Conclusion**

North America and the islands of Hawaii are places that were occupied and managed by Indigenous peoples long before the arrival of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers. The fact that much of the discourse on relationships between people and landscapes in America has
tended to focus on the perspectives and cultural historiographies of immigrant settlers conveys a sense of how the histories, experiences, and perspectives of Indigenous peoples have often been misrepresented, ignored or minimized. Arguably, this pattern of discourse is in itself a form of cultural hegemony in which historical as well as contemporary associations between Indigenous peoples and landscapes have received relatively little consideration throughout most of the twentieth century with regard to the discourse of people and landscapes.

Near the mid-twentieth century Indigenous peoples and landscapes were often portrayed as either impediments to Euro-American progress or as undifferentiated characters comprising part of a somewhat murky sense of the “uncivilized.” Such portrayals of Indigenous peoples and their relationships to landscapes appears to be inversely proportional to the extent to which intellectual discourse was more sharply focused on searching for unifying or nationalistic themes to explain certain aspects of an overall American history of experience with landscapes. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s authors had begun to explore a wider range of social, cultural, political, and economic influences on the relationships between people and the environment. To some extent the experiences of Indigenous peoples were included as elements of discussion in conjunction with environmental concerns and objectives. During this time period the historical and contemporary nature of Indigenous peoples’ perspectives also emerged as a
somewhat narrow and essentially parallel theme in the overall broadening of intellectual discourse on people and landscapes. When the experiences and perspectives of Indigenous peoples were included in discourse in the 1980s, it was often in conjunction with a multiplicity of social ideas about people and landscapes. By the 1990s various social and cultural perspectives were commonly implemented as a lens through which to view relationships between different groups of people in relation to landscapes. In some cases authors either wrote about Indigenous peoples or articulated Indigenous perspectives.

This chapter reviews and analyzes patterns in non-fiction literature about people and landscapes by interjecting the intermediary question of Indigenous perspectives. This approach offers a re-contextualized alternative to the ways in which ideas about people and landscapes are often presented as part of a dualistic critique and understanding of “nature” versus “civilization.” Through this analysis certain ideas and patterns in thinking about Indigenous peoples and landscapes are apparent. In general the pattern demonstrates how the experiences and perspectives of Indigenous peoples went from hardly being included at all, to being subjects that were written about. More recently a number of authors have presented and articulated the historical and the contemporaneous nature of the ideas and perspectives of Indigenous peoples. In general Indigenous experiences and perspectives with regard to American landscapes are now topics that many
authors explore within the larger overall discourse of the history of disparate groups of people.

The relatively recent placement of Indigenous histories and perspectives at the center of some of this discourse, or at least in the foreground of serious considerations regarding landscapes, has had three discernable effects: 1) the timeframe for study and consideration of landscapes and Indigenous peoples has generally been expanded to more readily include information and knowledge that predates the recorded onset of European or Euro-American contact; 2) discourse on the heritage of landscapes in the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii has been enriched and reframed to include some of the many Indigenous and immigrant settler social and cultural traditions, practices, and perspectives that have previously been overlooked or ignored; and 3) historical and contemporary perspectives of Indigenous peoples and issues regarding land use and related resources have received greater attention and become generally more accessible through the medium of nonfiction literature.
CHAPTER 4

LANDSCAPE TRADITIONS AND PRACTICES

The use of place and space to differentiate between “us” and “them” is a key ideological tool. The classification of things by place has important effects on the way we perceive and make sense of the world. More important though, these perceptions affect our practice – our actions. Tim Cresswell

“All these places have stories. We shoot each other with them like arrows.” Nick Thompson, Indigenous Informant, as quoted by Keith H. Basso in “Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache.”

When invasion is recognized as a structure rather than an event, its history does not stop. Patrick Wolfe

In addition to the many physical forces related to climate, geology, and biology, the landscapes of North America and the islands of the Pacific have been modified through the traditions and practices of Indigenous and immigrant settler peoples. It has been estimated that Indigenous peoples inhabited North America for at least 10,000 years or more prior to Western European contact. Certain sites that have been occupied by Indigenous peoples in the islands of Hawaii have been estimated to be at least 1,500 to 2,000 years old. The key point is that Indigenous peoples developed and managed landscapes and marine resources in both areas for many thousands of years before the arrival of European and Euro-American immigrants. Thus by the time the first European and Euro-American immigrant settlers arrived in either North America or the islands of Hawaii, they encountered landscapes that had long been occupied and in many cases managed by Indigenous peoples.
Prior to western contact Indigenous peoples had neither the need nor the inclination to hold “legal” title to land and resources in ways that were informed by and practiced in Western Europe. Linda Parker, academic historian and attorney, examined some of the historical and legal issues concerning traditional forms of land use and possession throughout the U.S. Parker asserted that an essential difference in the traditions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples was that “Indians and Hawaiians based their land tenure system upon use rather than on consumerism; the western practice of selling and buying land was alien to them.” As she further explains:

Among the many landscape traditions established by the Indigenous peoples of North America and the Hawaiian Islands were a variety of landscape ideas and practices that revolved around: usufruct rights, private property rights, and various forms of resource access and allocation.

This is not to say that all Western European peoples were familiar with or experienced in the selling and buying of land as a fair number of early immigrant settlers may not have previously held individual title to land. Historically, land tenure in Britain and parts of Europe had transformed from property rights systems based on use to individual land ownership systems between the fifteenth and nineteenth centuries. But certainly immigrant settlers were fairly quick to initiate methods of procuring individual ownership and title to land once they had settled on Indigenous landscapes. The significance of Parker’s assertion is that Indigenous peoples had shaped and
managed landscapes in ways that enabled them to effectively meet a variety of individual, extended family, and group needs -- long before the first waves of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers arrived. As explored more fully below, Indigenous peoples lived on and managed landscapes in a variety of ways that were unique, complex, and fundamentally different from the traditions of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers.

This chapter examines how social and cultural traditions and practices are reflected in and conveyed through the medium of landscapes. Each section considers information contained in the work of a number of authors, historians, ethnographers, and anthropologists to interrogate a variety of landscape traditions and practices that were developed and implemented by Indigenous peoples as well as some of the traditions and practices established later by European or Euro-American immigrant settlers. In many instances this information has not previously been considered from a cross-disciplinary approach or from within the scope of cultural landscape analyses particularly especially with regard to considerations about the dynamics of social power and control. In other cases, relatively recent works produced by authors and historians are cited as authoritative supplements in considering the nature of relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples with respect to landscapes. The examples considered herein are by no means comprehensive but rather convey a sense of the variability, complexity, and to some extent the nature of cultural practices and traditions that have
influenced the shape and form of landscapes found throughout the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. The central thrust of this chapter is to first examine how different groups of people related to landscapes and then consider how those differences may have informed the nature of relations between different groups of people in juxtaposition to landscapes.

Part I focuses on land areas that now comprise the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. This section explores examples of landscape traditions and practices developed by various Native American cultures and by groups of early European and Euro-American immigrant settlers. Part II explores some of the unique landscape traditions and practices developed by Native Hawaiians and some of the ways early European and Euro-American immigrant settlers responded to those landscapes. Each part also considers selected examples of how Indigenous lands and associated resources were subsequently reorganized and redistributed based on certain ideas and practices rooted in the cultural values of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers. The final section considers how patterns of land use and occupancy reflect some of the history as well as the nature of intercultural relations among Indigenous cultures and the European and Euro-American immigrant settler cultures that arrived later.
Part I: Landscape Traditions in the Continental U.S.

Interpreting Indigenous Traditions and Practices

Historians, ethnographers, and anthropologists have documented a wide variety of Native American landscape traditions and practices with regard to the landscapes, resources, and environments found throughout the continental U.S. Much of this work has detailed many types of agricultural, horticultural, fishing, hunting, and ceremonial traditions and practices. Furthermore, environments and traditions among Indigenous peoples varied widely with some Indigenous groups remaining relatively sedentary and traveling shorter distances to access a variety of resources while others traveled more frequently and/or over much greater distances.

Notably, the wide variety of differences among Native American groups resulted in the development and implementation of many different kinds of cultural practices and traditions. An example of this can be found in the variety of ways that Native American groups used fire as a landscape management technique. While many different groups used fire, their motivations and implementation techniques could be very different. In some cases fire was used to manage “wild” plant species for human use and consumption, in others it was used to improve forage and habitat for game, and in other instances it was used as a tool to assist in hunting game. Moreover, various groups no doubt changed and adapted techniques over time to meet changing needs and environmental conditions.
In many cases Indigenous people developed and implemented landscape traditions and practices to facilitate use, access, and allocation of resources in ways that were very different from those developed and practiced by early European and Euro-American immigrant settlers. William Cronon noted a number of land and resource management traditions that were implemented by both Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers in New England. In *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*, Cronon details Indigenous landscape practices that at the time were unfamiliar to immigrant settlers such as: management and use of fire to modify habitat and improve forage for desired animal species; agricultural techniques that involved planting multiple plant species in hillocks or mounds that minimized labor efforts and promoted replenishment of soil nutrients; seasonal relocation of land use and occupation sites as a lifestyle practice that facilitated the ability to utilize a variety of resources and limit the possibility of depletion through overuse; and highly complex systems of usufruct rights that were resource, location, and seasonally specific.

Vine Deloria, Jr. noted that among migratory tribes timing, location, the ability to access resources, and ceremonial needs were all critical factors in relocation and settlement patterns. These groups included, among others, Plains tribes such as the Lakota, the Cheyenne, and the Arapaho. In many cases “ceremonies needed to be conducted at certain sacred places at specific times of the year.” Hence, it was necessary to consider and plan
how specific resources might be obtained in conjunction with group needs and concerns about access and ceremonial practice. Thus, specific actions with regard to resources had to be considered in relation to how time and place might affect tribal life, land use, and landscape management practices.

California is a region that supported one of the highest densities of Native American populations in North America prior to western contact.\textsuperscript{11} It is also a region for which a wide variety of Indigenous peoples’ landscape practices have been well documented. Included in this documentation are certain horticultural techniques that have been used by Indigenous peoples to tend and harvest many different types of native plants.\textsuperscript{12} Additionally, ways of identifying or demarcating ownership, use, and access privileges to a particular area or resource have also been documented. For example, in some instances individual families might have ownership rights to “sources of food such as large manzanita trees, acorn trees, and good fishing sites” while in other cases “lands and sources of food were held communally.” \textsuperscript{13} Based on his interviews of Indigenous peoples at the turn of the twentieth century, S. A. Barrett, anthropologist, noted that use of and access to resources might depend on any number of very specific circumstances. As he explained:

According to my informants, property rights were everywhere quite clearly defined. Certain areas and places were, as a rule, communally controlled. These were the hunting grounds of a village, and the spots where good fishing was to be had. Some of these were what might even be termed international, for they were open to all
comers, regardless of tribal connections. Certain trees, however, were definitely individual, or at least family property. The same is true of certain openings where seeds were abundant or where “Indian potatoes” grew. The practice varied somewhat from village to village, but in general the reserved spots, etc., were known to all and rights were respected.  

There was, however, relative freedom of intercourse among village units, and if the people of one village desired to secure some food from the territory of another village, it was usually only necessary to ask permission of the owners.

In this case, a sense of ownership of resources among Native American groups appears to have been much more complex, resource specific, and fluid than contemporary notions about land ownership and designated land parcel boundaries.

As described below, other anthropologists and ethnologists also confirm that a sense of ownership of specific resources was not unusual:

Like many California Indian groups, the Pomo had clearly defined concepts about land-use rights, although tribelets varied in their application of these rights. ... for example certain trees and seed-producing localities, were owned by individuals, others by nuclear families. The exact degrees to which individuals owned and/or controlled basic subsistence resources is not clear and seems to have depended on the product exploited. ...In general, it would appear that there were at least three significant levels of economic ownership -- nuclear families, leader-alliance extended kin groups, and tribelets -- each maintaining at least use-rights of specific resources.

Among the Coast Miwok people of Northern California land “was not private property, but certain food-producing trees (oak, pepperwood, buckeye) were,
as were hunting, fishing, and clam-digging rights to some tracts.” 17 Thus, among Native American groups, use and access could be resource and conditionally specific; these ideas contrast significantly with those notions of land ownership in which a bundle of rights is affixed to a specific piece of property.

Among Native American groups, individuals or communities wanting to allocate or restrict access to resources also used a variety of methods to communicate a sense of territoriality. 18 In order to be effective, boundaries or territories had to be known, conveyed, or demarcated in ways that others could understand and recognize. In some cases traditional occupancy and use areas or territories included an entire drainage basin that could be understood as being bounded by mountain crests or watersheds that pragmatically included -- rather than being defined by -- a water or stream course. 19 A variety of landscape features such as mountain peaks, ridges, prominent rock outcroppings, or even unusual trees could be used to demarcate the boundaries of Indigenous territories. 20 While natural features might be used as boundary markers, other human-constructed boundary markers or other systems similar to those described below were also used.

As for territorial limitations, informants stated that the headmen met and agreed upon boundaries of their respective territories. At meetings in the dance houses these boundaries were announced and discussed. Usually this was sufficient. However, if a boundary had to be marked, they simply tied a girdle of leaves (pepperwood was frequently used) around the trees along the line, at intervals of about a mile. These girdles, which were
renewed from time to time, were tied just as high as a man could conveniently reach. It is said that the primary purpose of such markers was to prevent younger people from getting out of bounds.

An oak tree, manzanita bush, or any other privately owned food sources could be marked by tying a piece of brush or by setting up a stake. No one would then molest it. Others used a system of blazing to mark their trees.²¹

Hence, we see that territorial use and occupancy boundaries between different Native American groups could be based on human-constructed or naturally occurring physical features; but also generally required a certain level of social respect and mutual agreement both between and among different cultural groups.

Anthropologist Florence Shipek documented a variety of land and resource allocation systems utilized in Southern California. In Pushed Into the Rocks: Southern California Indian Land Tenure 1769-1986 (1987) Shipek identified and documented a wide variety of landscape traditions that she described and organized into the following categories:

To summarize, at the time of Spanish contact the native peoples of Southern California had land tenure concepts that included (1) the nonpolitical, or in some cases loosely political, ethnic or national territory; (2) rancherias, or bands, which were the primary political units, each defending a separate territory; (3) sacred lands, which belonged jointly to the ethnic or national group or to an individual band; (4) specific areas within the boundaries of each band that belonged to the band as a collective whole; (5) fields, including garden areas, that belonged to family units or individuals for their subsistence; (6) special individually owned areas; (7) individually owned articles and intangible properties such as songs, myths, and
What’s particularly interesting about the traditions and practices identified by Shipek is the level of complexity and variability of land tenure concepts practiced by Native American groups.

Other types of Native American landscape traditions have been described in *Canyon Gardens: The Ancient Pueblo Landscapes of the American Southwest* (2006). In this instance some thirteen different authors examined landscapes in the Southwest. V. B. Price, the book’s co-editor, describes the following traditions and practices used by Native American groups in the region:

Not only did Ancestral Puebloan builders and their Pueblo heirs construct great cities and urban precincts, they so engineered complex road systems, astronomical observation points, irrigation systems, shrines, and elaborate horticultural and agricultural microenvironments sufficient to feed and sustain virtually countless generations of their people.23

As further explored by many of the other contributing authors, Indigenous peoples in the Southwest demonstrated remarkably creative and diverse landscape traditions. Some included development of compact gardens and terraces, environmentally sensitive site planning, farming and landscape design, and courtyard complexes. Baker Morrow, landscape
Subtlety is the hallmark of the traditional Ancestral Puebloan landscape. Out in the hilly countryside around an old pueblo we will also find many edible and otherwise useful plants that were "encouraged" by the ancient Southwesterners and used regularly in their diets or handicrafts or trade. Among these are prickly pear, Gambel oak, currants, cotton, tobacco, chokecherries, sand plums, buffalo berries, and a number of other favorites. Yucca and agave, sand dropseed and Indian ricegrass, and juniper and piñon were much appreciated for their shade, fiber, flowers, seeds, and fruit, and for their cheerful ability to survive droughts and the endless ravages of the wind. ...It is perhaps best to think of them as growing in woodland gardens -- or in stretches of shrubby desert upland -- without walls or fences. As is true of many other elements of Ancestral Puebloan landscape architecture, they may not fit comfortably into modern concepts of how people should systematically develop the open spaces of their cities and towns. Contemporary people, using European languages and ideas to describe them, frequently don't know what they are. We moderns barely see them at all, and when we do they are out of focus.24

Based on the handful of examples described above, it is clear that the landscape traditions of Native American groups could be resource specific, seasonally adjustable, defined and demarcated in a variety of ways in order to effectuate ownership and access rights, and implemented to meet cultural needs in response to specific landscape environments. Many of those landscape traditions were developed and utilized in ways that were unique and highly pragmatic. In essence the land use practices of Native American groups who utilized the landscapes of North America were very different from
those that were brought by early European and Euro-American immigrant settler groups.

**Interpreting Settler Responses to Indigenous Landscapes**

As early European immigrant settlers encountered and then began to occupy Indigenous landscapes, they tended to establish settlement patterns that were in some ways familiar to them and which they probably believed would be advantageous to their ability to survive and thrive in a new environment. While nearly all early immigrant settler groups initially relied on Indigenous peoples to survive, the various patterns of occupancy and development that they implemented were influenced not just by the practicalities of location, function, and types of resources available but also by shared cultural values and preferences that they brought with them. Major patterns of immigrant settler occupancy have been well documented by geographical and historical analyses but have not generally been considered within the larger scope of meaning relative to Indigenous and immigrant settler relations. As discussed below, many early immigrant settlers and their descendants responded to the landscapes of North America by physically organizing and developing landscapes in ways rooted in traditions, experiences, and expectations that emanated from and in some cases had been developed by European traditions.
Some of the earliest European settlements in North America generally occurred pursuant to the issuance of a patent, charter, deed, grant, or other form of entitlement. Those entitlements were issued and sanctioned under the presumed authority of a European sovereign or religious patriarch. While methods of occupancy and patterns of land settlement and development may have varied, many also reflected the cultural practices and traditions of the colonizing country. Some of the earliest and most definitive forms and practices that characterized European influences are described briefly below.

Spanish settlers were among the earliest European colonizers to explore and occupy many parts of what now comprise the southeastern and southwestern areas of the continental U.S. Motivations for settlement included economic, military, political and religious rationales, and colonization practices included establishment of a system of missions and presidios. After an initial period focused on exploration and searches for mineral resources, missions were established that functioned as religious and commercial production centers. The mission system relied on the ability to persuade, capture, and confine Indigenous peoples for use as laborers in the production of goods and services for colonial use and consumption and the enjoyment and benefit of the mother country. Missions essentially functioned as coercive authoritarian institutions for the Spanish Crown, often resulting in the enslavement and brutalization of the surrounding Indigenous peoples.
Presidios were also established and functioned primarily as military installations charged with defending land areas claimed by the Spanish as well as controlling and capturing Native American “converts.” The presidios also served as sites of secular authority until civil government systems could be established. Once established, the civil communities or pueblos, missions, and presidios became part of a defensive strategy to actualize and protect Spanish land claims and Spanish occupied territories from competing European powers.

The Spanish sovereigns gave the early immigrant settlers a fair degree of latitude regarding the initial establishment of colonial settlements. However, a number of policies concerning settlement location and design were later developed. By 1573, King Philip II of Spain issued a formal proclamation known as the Law of the Indies (The Laws). The Laws included some 148 articles that decreed the standardization of certain forms and patterns for the development and operation of Spanish colonial towns. Many of the mandates concerned elements of settlement planning and design construction, such as the requirement that town plazas be located near the shoreline in coastal cities and in the center of towns in inland areas. Other directives included the location of important buildings, such as the church, town hall, customs houses, arsenal, hospital, shops, and merchants’ dwellings. Common use areas located around the perimeter of the original settlement were also to be designated to accommodate town
growth. The Laws directed the use of certain policies and practices whereby settlers were to draw lots for house sites and for farming tracts located outside the town.\textsuperscript{34} Construction practices also dictated that Indigenous peoples should not be allowed to observe the construction process nor enter the town until the fortifications and houses had been completed -- for the expressed intent of trying to instill a sense of “fear, respect, and desire for friendship with the Spaniards.”\textsuperscript{35}

The principles established by The Laws are thought to have emanated from a number of European sources including: the design of French bastide towns in northern Spain, ancient Roman military settlements, and classical treatises on urban form and design generated by Vitruvius, Alberti, and Machiavelli.\textsuperscript{36} To some extent The Laws were also informed by earlier experiences the Spanish gained in establishing settlements in Mesoamerica.\textsuperscript{37} In many cases the rapid westward development of land by other immigrant settler cultures and traditions have replaced or subsumed most of the Spanish colonial settlement patterns of land development and design.\textsuperscript{38} However, elements of early Spanish planning and design forms can still be detected in many present day American cities located in southern and western portions of the U.S.: San Antonio, Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Tucson, San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and San José.\textsuperscript{39}

French immigrant settlers also influenced landscapes in America. The French long-lot is a persistent form of land division that can still be seen
along riverine areas in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Louisiana. This method of creating individual parcels of land, sometimes described as an arpent system, divided riverfront lands into long narrow segments that run perpendicular to the river course. As originally developed, long-lot land parcels generally sloped back from the river’s edge toward a lower lying floodplain. This practice effectively enabled individual landholders to have “a proportional share of the lighter, better-drained soils near the river and the heavier, wetter lowland areas as well as access for fishing and stream transportation and to the roads that ran along levees.” French colonial towns also exhibited a simple rectangular grid pattern with a single open square fronting the riverfront, a parade ground established for military exercises, and a central town church. The open square, a central feature of the original town design, was repeated at intervals as the towns expanded. Mobile, Alabama, and New Orleans, Louisiana, are two of very few U.S. cities with surviving French colonial street patterns.

The survival of immigrant settlers often necessitated the assistance of Indigenous peoples and the adoption or adaptation of Indigenous practices. The difficulties of establishing an English colonial settlement at Jamestown in the early part of the seventeenth century resulted, at least initially, in exceedingly high mortality rates for the immigrant settlers. In analyzing this early period of settlement Blanton asserts that the misfortunes of these early immigrant settlers can be attributed to “a lethal combination of ethnocentrism,
ignorance and misplaced priorities in their interactions with the environment, but over the long run they developed a more viable though still imported mode of existence.\textsuperscript{46}

Another early settlement established by the English that was somewhat more successful occurred around 1620 with the arrival of the Pilgrims at Plymouth. Early communities often started out as frontier settlements with small fortress-like stockades and usually included fairly simple huts, dugouts scooped out from a bank, or bark-covered saplings-framed shelters.\textsuperscript{47} In one of its earliest forms the community of Plymouth was constructed and developed into a small compact village comprised of sawed timber houses with thatched roofs. The houses were sited facing a single pathway. Other features included a palisade and meetinghouse that was used for both civil and religious functions.\textsuperscript{48}

Indigenous agricultural practices were also often used until agrarian communities based on the English-style field system could be implemented.\textsuperscript{49} From the time period 1630 to 1640 many English colonial settlements established throughout the Massachusetts Bay region utilized settlement patterns that included compact villages as well as the traditional agricultural settlement patterns of the English open-field village system.\textsuperscript{50} Ownership of land within a New England township typically included land held individually as well as land held in common.\textsuperscript{51} The overall pattern of settlement development generally focused on community needs, with house
lots, agricultural fields, pasturelands, and even woodlands assigned to individuals. Land assignment practices accommodated varying levels of individual entitlement and nuances of local terrain, which resulted in settlements with irregularly shaped boundaries and geometrically configured land parcels.

At least initially early New England villages were developed as community ventures, and the physical forms “virtually duplicated the English model, except that the scale of the house lots and farm strips was likely to be larger.” Home lots were normally located near the center of town and each settler received a share of land from a common field. Farmers typically lived in the village and traveled daily to fields that stretched outward from a compact cluster of village buildings. Field systems divided land into long narrow strips in order to facilitate plowing. This also facilitated an equitable distribution of land among the settlers in terms of the size and quality of property received. Remaining lands not allocated to individuals were available for use by the town’s inhabitants as common pasture and woodlands.

New England villages were generally developed in a compact cluster or pattern that was either “squared” or linear in form, with a central village green known as a “common.” The common served a number of public functions: it could be used as a mustering and militia training ground, a common pasture area where cattle could be herded in case of enemy attack,
and also as the location for establishing a community meetinghouse.\textsuperscript{57}

Founded in 1638, the community of New Haven, Connecticut, is a classic example of a community that was initially planned and developed in the form of a square pattern that was comprised of nine blocks. The center square formed the common, and house lots were assigned in relation to the location of an owner’s outlying fields.\textsuperscript{58}

The methods and practices of establishing and developing towns in New England were very different from the land allocation practices typically implemented in the middle and southern colonies. In Dividing the Land: Early American Beginnings of Our Private Property Mosaic, Edward T. Price (1995) asserts that settlement of land under the provisions of the Virginia Company’s charter emphasized individual headrights but did not have a strong centralized form of land distribution. This practice enabled settlers and investors to choose their parcel locations and property boundaries, which generally occurred in concert with “squatting” or occupying the land prior to any formal demarcation of boundaries.\textsuperscript{59} The conveyance of large tracts of land rather than small individual land holdings tended to be more conducive and profitable to colony sponsors, particularly when combined and developed with slave labor. By 1700 even many of the smaller land holdings in the middle and southern colonies had been consolidated into large plantations.\textsuperscript{60}

By the late seventeenth century land sales had begun to replace grants with headrights. Thus later investors were able to obtain large land
grants that could be divided, with some parcels offered for free in order to encourage early settlement. The sale of other lots in remaining townships followed. Such entrepreneurial practices coupled with a general desire to obtain the best lands for agricultural development encouraged a pattern of settlement that favored a dispersed arrangement of individual family farms. Price (1987) theorized that this pattern of sparse development both reflected and engendered the notion that land was a resource to be possessed in order to advance private interests resulting in “a damaging view of the land as expendable and replaceable.” 61 He also surmised that by 1774 British attempts to regulate and control land division practices through the regulation of surveys and auctions were resisted by colonists and probably fanned the flames of rebellion.62

After the American Revolution, one of the major challenges the new government faced was how to sell and distribute lands for future settlement. Competing regional preferences emerged based on the New England tradition of surveying lands prior to occupancy versus the more laissez faire practices common in the other colonies where individual choice and squatting on land prior to surveying were more accepted.63 Eventually Congress adopted the Land Ordinance of 1785, which established a rectilinear or grid system of land division. Under the newly adopted system, property in the public domain needed to be surveyed into 6-mile square
townships that could then be divided and sold in thirty-six individual one-mile square lots of six hundred and forty acres each.

Hubbard (2009) asserts that at the time congressional representatives found the system attractive because: 1) it provided a relatively quick and easy means to divide land without first having to consider local site conditions or the preferences of potential land owners; and 2) it established an unbiased and uniform system based on lines of latitude and longitude that minimized the potentially corrupting influence of individual parties who might otherwise assert a vested interest in the particularities and eventual shape, size, and location of land parcels.\textsuperscript{64} The Land Ordinance set the precedent and effectively established the practice of dividing and distributing land in unsettled portions of the federal public domain, and it utilized a system of rectilinear land division with little or no regard to topography or resources. Many of the land divisions previously established by individual Spanish and French colonists were recognized and incorporated into American land title and division systems and to some extent are still evident today, however, Native American landscape traditions and practices were not.

**Colliding Ambitions and Landscape Practices**

After the War of 1812, British support of Indigenous resistance to American colonial expansion virtually ceased, and the removal of Indigenous peoples through treaties and land cessions in conjunction with military force became some of the primary means that the federal government used to
obtain land occupied by many Eastern Tribes. As immigrant settlers and their
descendants moved westward, military force as well as additional treaties
and successive land settlement and acquisition policies continued to push
Tribes further west and onto lands that at the time were considered too
remote to be needed by Euro-American immigrant settlers.

Thereafter, federal policies and programs enacted and supported the
removal and confinement of many Native Americans to the so-called “Indian
territories” or reservations. These efforts were focused on controlling and
limiting the possession and use of land by Indigenous peoples throughout
areas of the continental U.S. In total the federal government negotiated and
used an estimated three hundred and sixty-seven ratified treaties, at least
seventy-three non-ratified treaties, and numerous statutes and executive
orders in various agreements with Native Americans. Nearly all of those
agreements affected landscapes used by and associated with Indigenous
peoples.

Even after many Indigenous peoples had been removed to lands
reserved for their exclusive use, encroachment and control by non-
Indigenous peoples and government entities continued. In numerous cases
the direct or indirect actions of state, federal, and territorial governments
resulted in repeated losses of land and resources for surviving Native
American Tribes. Moreover, land was also taken by subterfuge or by federal
demands for repeated land sessions. In California, representatives of the
federal government negotiated some 18 treaties with a “random” number of tribes between 1851 and 1852 that promised “over 7 million acres of reservation lands in exchange for the entire state.” However, none of those treaties were ratified by Congress a fact that Banner, at least in part, attributes to pressure exerted on congressional representatives by immigrant settlers who already had or wanted to seize control of Indigenous lands. Instead the Indigenous peoples were killed, imprisoned, enslaved, or simply pushed aside until much later when a lesser area of land was ultimately set aside or otherwise purchased by individual Indigenous groups for Native occupancy or use.

Even after the policy of treaty making with Native Americans ceased in 1871, a number of federal commissions were appointed to implement additional land cessions from tribes controlling or using large tracts of land desired by immigrant settlers. Allotment of lands was a practice that essentially converted significant portions of communally held Tribal land to individual Native American ownership with remaining portions sold to the federal government and then made available for purchase and use by settlers. Many Tribes were subjected to the allotment of lands either individually or together with other groups. The effects of the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887 (Appendix A) are an example of how widespread official federal policies continued to be focused on control and ownership of Indigenous landscapes even after overt military action and treaty making had
been abandoned as forms of negotiation. One of the stated purposes of the Dawes legislation was to assimilate Native Americans into American society and culture by encouraging agricultural and grazing activities as a means of promoting the “adoption of a civilized life.” 70 In many cases non-Indigenous organizations concerned about the welfare of Native Americans advocated for allotment programs. 71

The implementation of allotment programs essentially failed to accomplish the stated goals of improving the lives of Native Americans by turning them into “civilized” farmers. 72 The policy of allotment also continued to expand Euro-American authority over Indigenous peoples and landscapes that had previously been designated and reserved for the exclusive use of Indigenous peoples. Furthermore, allotment programs weakened Tribal authority and often imposed a rectilinear system of land division, a checkerboard pattern of Indigenous and non-Indigenous land ownership, and fractionalized the titles of successive generations of heirs, all of which are land management issues that still affect many reservations today. By the time the allotment program ceased in 1934, an estimated 90 million acres out of a total of 138 million acres of land that had been reserved for Tribal use had either been sold as surplus or otherwise alienated from federal trust status or Native American possession. 73
Discussion

Given the fact that all landscapes in the continental U.S. were once the sole domain of Indigenous peoples, it should not be surprising that the history of U.S.-Native American relations has nearly always focused on land and resources. Parker (1989) describes the pattern and focus of those relations in the following way:

The U.S. government’s relation with the American Indian has largely concerned the status of tribal territory and has resulted in the progressive reduction of the Indians’ land base.  

In summing up some of the early strategies for obtaining land from Native Americans, Parker also noted the tendency to focus on “the concepts of right of conquest, doctrine of discovery, treaty making, and military force.”

As discussed above, the allotment of Tribal lands and the subsequent sale of remaining lands were developments that resulted in devastating losses in terms of use and cultural association for Native Americans. Other negative impacts for Indigenous peoples included a checkerboard pattern of land ownership, a fragmented land base, fractionalized interests divided among numerous heirs, and the weakening of tribal authority over landscapes. The allotment process imposed additional federal authority over Indigenous landscapes at a time when Indigenous peoples had already accommodated the needs of immigrant settlers. Upon implementation of
allotment programs essentially even more land and resources were made available for immigrant settler use.

The allotment system in the U.S. had certain similarities with “enclosure” programs in Great Britain that had also historically changed land tenure systems. In Britain, enclosure was a practice that was “highly visible throughout the nineteenth century, particularly during the 1880s, when Congress was debating whether and how to divide up the Indian reservations.” The consequences of the enclosure process in Britain had also resulted in devastating losses for those people who lost the right to use common fields on which they had previously relied.

Banner asserts that the various methods used by immigrant settlers in obtaining use and ownership title to Indigenous peoples’ land in North America fell within “the poles of conquest and contract” in which Indigenous peoples often had little power to resist the most egregious and abusive strategies. And, as history has shown this generally seems to have been the case as Native American lands were repeatedly targeted for use and ownership by non-Indigenous peoples.

**Part II: Landscape Traditions in the Islands of Hawaii**

**Interpreting Indigenous Traditions and Practices**

Over the course of approximately two thousand years before Captain James Cook first arrived in Hawaii, Indigenous peoples developed and implemented a plethora of unique landscape traditions and practices. Those
traditions included provisions for use, access, and allocation of island and marine-based resources. Patrick Vinton Kirch, archaeologist, noted that traditionally the “Hawaiian economy centered upon agricultural production and land-use was linked to a tiered system of land divisions.” At the time of Cook’s arrival in 1778, the islands of Hawaii are thought to have supported the “most densely settled population of any Polynesian island group.” Politically the islands were organized into four separate kingdoms, each with its own Mōī or sovereign. The Mōī was considered the ruler of an island or district who “held land under his jurisdiction, not as an individual, but by virtue of his office and as a trustee of the gods.” As explained below, the Mōī traditionally controlled and allotted portions of land for use by others through a complex structure of political and social systems:

The supreme chief, mōī, of an island “held” the land; but even for him the concept was not one of “owning” it, but of being trustee under Kane and Lono, the nature gods who caused the land to be fruitful. For the purposes of utilization and of taxes, the mōī partitioned the land into districts under the supervision of the high chiefs (ali‘i) of his entourage, retaining for his own use certain parcels and a revenue from those apportioned out. The high chiefs did likewise with their portions, dividing them in turn among their own lesser warrior chiefs, dependents, and supervising agents (konohiki); and the final subdivision was by these retainers to the commoners, or maka‘ainana, who cultivated the soil for themselves and for their overlords, to whom they rendered, in addition to a share of the products, certain other services of labor and homage.

Samuel Kamakau, the mid-nineteenth century Native Hawaiian historian, noted what might well have been an even earlier tradition in the following:
By 1810, Kamehameha I had effectively conquered and/or consolidated all of the major islands that now comprise the islands of Hawaii into a single political entity. He subsequently exercised traditional and discretionary authority in allocating islands or portions of islands to people of various social ranks. These people, in turn, apportioned smaller areas for use and supervision by a konohiki, who then, in turn, allocated lands for use by the maka‘ainana. In return for the use of certain lands and resources, each layer of the social hierarchy provided goods and services to support the needs of those designated by successively higher rank. Those with higher rank, in turn, had reciprocal responsibilities and obligations concerning the welfare of those below them in rank. The maka‘ainana were free to move from one area to another, and the control over allocation and use of lands and resources remained a revocable right of the sovereign.

The size, location, and type of resources allocated for use and control by each level of the social and political hierarchy varied. Access to resources might be apportioned in relation to various land areas identified as: moku‘aina, kalana, ‘okana, ahupua’a, or ‘ili‘aina. Malo, an early nineteenth century Native Hawaiian scholar, also described in detail a complex array of land and resource divisions that, while not necessarily inconsistent with the
general categories noted above, appear to have been even more functionally and geographically descriptive and specific. Traditional Native Hawaiian systems of resource allocation and other uses of land appear to have been layered with a complexity and specificity not found in the land ownership notions and practices that were familiar to many later arriving immigrant settlers.

As further described by anthropologist Marion Kelly, an overview of how intimately Native Hawaiian political and cultural structures were interwoven with social systems was expressed in the way use and access to various resources were allocated as part of a system of mutual sharing and support:

The land was controlled by the chiefs (*ali'i*), who expropriated food and labor from the cultivators of the soil, the commoner (*maka'ainana*). Everyone had rights of access and use to the resources of the land and the sea. Parcels of land (*ahupua'a*, *'ili*) were divided into small units (*kuleana*) cultivated by families and larger units used in common. The people were sustained by a tradition of sharing and common use.

Native Hawaiian landscape traditions included a unique, extensive, and fluid system of allocating and sharing land-based and ocean resources in ways inextricably linked to the prevailing political, economic, and religious authorities and structures. Thus the use and allocation of access to certain land and marine resources were interwoven into the fabric of Native Hawaiian social and cultural systems and traditions. Although sometimes
compared to the feudal land systems of Europe, Native Hawaiian landscape traditions did not require military service and maka’ainana were free to move between ahupua’a.  

Many of the land use practices used by Native Hawaiians in establishing territories and boundaries have been well documented. An ahupua’a was traditionally an economically self-sufficient, pie-shaped portion of land that could range in size from 100 to 100,000 acres. Anthropologists E. S. Craig Handy and Elizabeth Green Handy asserted that an ahupua’a might have been related to the need to establish tax divisions, while an ‘ili could have been a specific type of land division that was not always contiguous in terms of boundaries. In any case the ahupua’a system of apportioning the use of land and resources seems to have been uniquely suited to an island environment that was also capable of supporting a dense population of people through a combination of agriculture and other land and marine-based subsistence activities.

The boundaries of an ahupua’a could extend from the sea to the mountains, thereby enabling residents of an ahupua’a to obtain fish and other marine resources at the seashore; taro, bananas, and sweet potatoes from the agricultural lowlands; and forest products and other resources from the upper mountain areas. Boundaries of an ahupua’a were also sometimes marked by “an altar, ahu, dedicated to the rain god Lono, symbolized by a carved representation of the head of a hog, pua’a, which
was a form of Lono, the rain god and patron of agriculture.” 98 The well defined and fixed natural boundaries of an *ahupua’a* located on the windward side of the island of Oahu is described in the following way:

The boundaries in this case are readily definable, as each *ahupua’a* consists mainly of a broad stream valley running down from the Ko'olau ridge to bay or seashore, marked off each from each by transverse ridges.99

In various communities there were individuals who retained specialized knowledge about landscapes and were “versed in the local lore of land boundaries, rights, and history.”100 As Kamakau explains further, specific individuals were tasked with memorizing the names of the various land divisions101 and people who lived on the land were quite knowledgeable about land use boundaries:

In the old days the lands were divided up according to what was proper for the chiefs, the lesser chiefs, the prominent people, and the people in general to have. Each family clearly understood what was “their” land and “their” birthplace – their ‘*aina pa’a*, and their *one hanau* – and the chiefs knew what lands they had given to this and that person, and the obligations that went with each portion of the land. In the old days each division of land, large or small, had its own individual name, and it was a matter of “school-work” (*a’okula*) for the chiefs to learn and memorize the names of the *ahupua’a* and the ‘ili ‘*aina* on each island. Because of this memorizing, the ancient names of the lands have come down to this day. This is not so, however, in the case of localities named for some famous event.102

Hence, the *ahupua’a* system provided a highly practical and unique means of supporting groups of people who utilized a range of marine and island
resources. From the examples cited above, we get a sense of the rich social, cultural, and political complexity of Native Hawaiian landscapes practices and traditions. Those practices enabled a historically large population of Indigenous people to thrive over an extensive period of time in what still remains one of the most geographically isolated environments in the world.

**Interpreting Settler Responses to Indigenous Landscapes**

Sailors, traders, military personnel, and skilled craftsmen were among the first immigrant settlers to reside in Hawaii, and they generally did so at the discretion of the Mōʻī or sovereign. Among the early foreigners who gained permission to occupy lands in Hawaii were Euro-American missionaries from New England. The arrival of missionaries in 1820 was in part promulgated by a wave of religious zeal emanating from the evangelical revival movement of the late eighteenth century. Their arrival in Hawaii was further enabled by the coincident operation of New England traders who provided the knowledge and practical skill used in sailing ships and transporting goods between various ports located throughout the world. ¹⁰³

At the time that many of the first missionaries arrived in Hawaii, the disposition of land was still firmly under the control of the sovereign Kamehameha II. As explained below by the historian Ralph S. Kuykendall, restrictions on the use and dispossession of lands applied equally to all people whether native or foreign born.
Those who eventually “became permanent residents of the country, substantially naturalized citizens, did so with either the express or tacit permission of the king. They – and all other foreigners – if they received land, held it by the same precarious tenure as native subjects, simply at the leisure of the king.”

Missionaries sent by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) arrived in the Sandwich Isles (islands of Hawaii) armed with a sense of religious righteousness about the need to convert Indigenous peoples into Christians and some very clear ideas about how to occupy and transform landscapes. Lucy G. Thurston, one of the first women to arrive as part of the contingent, noted that in addition to bringing the Christian faith to the “Pagan Islands of the Pacific,” the missionaries also assumed they should change the physical and cultural landscapes of Hawaii. That responsibility, as directed by church leaders, is set forth in the following passage:

You are to aim at nothing short of covering those Islands with fruitful fields, pleasant dwellings, schools, and churches.

Evidently the missionaries believed that the landscapes of Hawaii should be transformed so as to resemble the landscapes of New England. They clearly considered the transformation of the physical and cultural landscapes of Hawaii to be an integral part of their overall Christian mission. Furthermore, as Christian missionaries they had preconceived notions about the superiority of their beliefs in relation to the beliefs and practices of the
people they expected to encounter. We get a sense of just how alien the cultural landscapes of Hawaii appeared to one missionary woman, who recorded a disparaging first impression of Honolulu in her shipboard diary:

I see the town of Honolulu, a mass of brown huts, looking like so many hay-stacks in the country; not one white cottage, no church spire, not a garden nor a tree to be seen save the grove of cocoanuts.\textsuperscript{106}

Upon arrival in Hawaii the first missionaries necessarily resided in the same type of locally constructed buildings as most of the local populace.\textsuperscript{107} However, within a year members of the group requested permission to erect a two-story wood frame dwelling imported from Boston.\textsuperscript{108} Although repeatedly denied permission by Kamehameha II to erect a western-style house, this first group of missionaries eventually garnered his pity and gained approval for construction.\textsuperscript{109} The building was a modest two-story wood frame structure and was described by Mrs. Thurston in the following way:

The wooden structure had been reared and finished, having board floors, glass windows, and two flights of stairs, leading the one up chamber, and the other down cellar. The front door opened into the hall, which extended through the house. At the right, on entering, was the large common receiving room. On the left, my own private apartment. The two back rooms on either side of the hall were for the accommodation of two other families. The table was spread in the basement, and the cook-house was separated a little distance from the house. Our families had entered and made it our home.\textsuperscript{110}

Although they were landless immigrants upon arrival, the first missionaries attempted to recreate a sense of the familiar in the design and
arrangement of their dwellings and other mission-related buildings. While the materials and techniques used in construction were often procured from or adapted to the local environment, they also utilized imported construction materials, architectural styles, building construction techniques, and methods of site planning that were consistent with their New England experiences.

During the 1830s, missionary efforts included the construction of churches, small mission residences, and school buildings that were located throughout the islands. Many of these buildings incorporated a combination of local materials, such as coral, lava rock, and adobe bricks as well as imported supplies, such as window glass, nails, and other supplies procured in New England and shipped to the islands by benefactors and sponsoring mission boards. Mission stations “typically consisted of one or several mission homes, an outhouse, and a cookhouse” with other “storage buildings, tack rooms, guest houses, carpenter shops, residences for workmen and their families and dormitories for boarders” added as needed, along with “enclosed land for goats and chickens, some space for a garden, and a well.”

The techniques used by early missionary families to construct buildings and organize their home environments demonstrate how these immigrant settlers recreated images of their homelands through the use of architecture and the transformation of the landscapes in Hawaii. Most missionary families also used a combination of local and imported materials
to build homes that reflected designs and architectural styles that were familiar to them. Like the Thurstons on Oahu, many early missionary families settled throughout the islands and constructed family homes and missionary settlements in architectural styles or with design elements based on their experiences outside of Hawaii.

The development of a cultural landscape in Hawaii that would eventually be dominated by western-style buildings, particularly in Honolulu, was facilitated by the importation of prefabricated wood frame houses. Members of the Native Hawaiian ali’i were among the first to utilize western-style houses in Hawaii. As early as 1809 the Hawaiian monarch had acquired a wood frame house that had been imported from Alaska.\textsuperscript{113} Within a few years’ time the construction of wood frame houses for foreign businessmen and other Native Hawaiian ali’i soon followed.\textsuperscript{114} The missionaries initially sought to construct their first imported wood frame house for the purposes of comfort and familiarity.\textsuperscript{115} However upon the completion of the house in 1821 they joined a rather elite group of influential ali’i and businessmen who were among the few who owned western-style frame built houses in Honolulu.

Over time imported prefabricated wood frame houses became an increasingly popular choice. By 1844 some twenty-six wood frame houses had been constructed in Honolulu, followed by a boom of four hundred that were built between 1850 and 1851.\textsuperscript{116} By the mid-1800s, the popularity and extent to which western-style architectural influences had been utilized in
Honolulu can be seen in the detailed sketches made by the artist, Paul Emmert. The sketches depict the extent to which western-style architectural forms and design elements were being used in Honolulu by the mid-nineteenth century. Many of the buildings shown in Emmert's sketches portray quite a number of commercial, religious, and residential buildings that were owned, occupied or otherwise used by prominent people in Honolulu and which also featured Greek and Colonial revival architectural design influences (Appendix B). Banner (2007) noted that by the late nineteenth century western-style building and design influences had become quite pervasive. In the following passage, he recounts one visitor's astonished observations about the extent of western architectural and design influences:

English lawyer Hugh Wilkinson was disappointed when he arrived in Honolulu in 1881, because his hoped-for exoticism had vanished. All he found were “churches, chapels, homes and meeting-houses, libraries, schools, and colleges galore! The town is laid in squares, after the American fashion.”

Throughout the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s, immigrant settlers gained significant social influence in Hawaii and that influence was reflected in concomitant architecture and other physical design changes to cultural landscapes in Hawaii. This resulted not just from an increase in the number of immigrant settlers who developed business, commercial, and other property interests in Hawaii but also, and perhaps even more significantly, through direct participation and involvement in political and governmental affairs.
Colliding Ambitions and Landscape Practices

As the population of immigrant settlers increased in Hawaii, an ever-increasing number of those settlers not only occupied land and built western-style buildings, but many also agitated for the right to own land. The following passage demonstrates how the interest of immigrant settlers during this critical time period focused on and revolved around a desire to own and control land in Hawaii:

Before 1830, the difficulties between foreigners and the government had to do mainly with moral laws and mercantile debts; after 1830 property rights of foreigners. Foreigners began to deny the right of the government to arbitrarily dispossess them of land or to prevent the transfer of property from one foreigner to another, and they appealed to their own governments for protection. ¹¹⁸

Osorio provides an in-depth analysis of many of the major actions, players, and intrigues that occurred in the political history of Hawaii from just before 1840 through approximately 1887 in Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887 (2002). In the following passage he conveys a sense of how the impact of one significant piece of legislation: The Rights and Laws of 1839, effectuated major changes in both land tenure and the structure of social and cultural relations in Hawaii:

With these paragraphs the ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of the land and the people in Hawai‘i passed from the ancient line of Ali‘i and the gods they represented to the newer and much less understood authority of law. ¹¹⁹
This piece of legislation was just one among a number of subsequent legislative and administrative actions that ultimately resulted in the transference of the use and control of major areas of land in Hawaii from Indigenous peoples to immigrant settlers.

In 1840 the Hawaiian Kingdom system of governance reorganized under a new form that replaced the traditional authority of the monarchy with a constitutional monarchy and established a bicameral legislature. In some ways the new political structure resembled the British model of government in that it also included a House of Nobles and an elected Chamber of Representatives. The newly reorganized government, with the assistance and advice of immigrant settlers who also included former missionaries, brought about major shifts in how Native Hawaiians and immigrant settlers subsequently occupied and interacted with the land and resources of Hawaii.

Under mounting political pressure and fears arising from the continued threats and posturing of foreign governments, businessmen, and immigrant settlers, the newly restructured government of the Kingdom of Hawaii effectuated a series of legislative and administrative acts in which the Native Hawaiian land tenure system was replaced with a western-style model of private land ownership. Those processes, collectively referred to and identified as events related to the Māhele, brought about changes in land tenure and the apportionment of land in ways that radically altered the social and cultural fabric of Native Hawaiian culture.
A significant step in the Māhele process included the adoption of legislation that created a Board of Commissioners tasked with investigating and making certain determinations with respect to claims for land title (Appendix C). The subsequent effect of creating the Land Commission resulted in a process whereby title to all lands in Hawaii was effectively apportioned among the newly reorganized Hawaiian government, the sovereign Kamehameha III, and certain Native Hawaiian ali‘i and konohiki, with subsequent consideration of the rights of the tenants. In many cases the ali‘i and konohiki submitted a claim based on the ancient or traditional name of lands and paid a government commutation fee in either cash or land before receiving actual land title.\(^{123}\) Moreover, because of the lack of skilled surveyors in the kingdom, it was decided that the actual legal boundaries of properties would later be established by individual land surveys.\(^{124}\)

In 1850 the legislature enacted the Act to Abolish the Disabilities of Aliens (Appendix D). This Act essentially enabled foreign nationals to own and sell land. Actions taken pursuant to this legislation were in stark contrast to previous traditions and practices that had limited land ownership by immigrant settlers to either naturalized citizens of Hawaii or those who had otherwise declared their allegiance to the sovereign or the government of Hawaii.\(^{125}\) This piece of legislation essentially removed the last major impediment that immigrant settlers faced regarding the possibility of ownership of land by individuals in Hawaii.
The subsequent adoption of the Kuleana Act of 1850 (Appendix E) effectuated a process enabling makaʻāinana to obtain land in fee simple. Under these new provisions the makaʻāinana were given a limited time period to file claims for ownership of land. In some cases the konohiki are thought to have discouraged the makaʻāinana from filing claims that might interfere with their own vested interests in lands they had traditionally shared. Kameʻeleihiwa suggests that Native Hawaiian social and cultural customs as well as a general lack of familiarity with the concept of land ownership may at least in part explain why relatively few kuleana land claims were filed. Moffat and Fitzpatrick noted that makaʻāinana who wished to assert ownership and authority over lands that they occupied were required to submit a survey delimiting property boundaries and that in some cases the survey costs were nearly equal to the value of the property itself.

Under the provisions of the legislation effectuating the Māhele process as well as the many subsequent administrative policies and legislative actions that followed, most Native Hawaiians were essentially and officially rendered landless. Kelly estimated that as much as ninety-nine percent of the makaʻāinana received ownership title to less than one percent of the land. Once ownership titles to land had been determined and established, land in Hawaii became eligible for purchase by individuals at prices that people who were actively engaged in a cash economy would have considered to have been relatively nominal in terms of cost.
Parker noted that after 1850 Native Hawaiians, unfamiliar with the concepts and implications of private property ownership, sometimes sold their land for small sums of money; defaulted on mortgages and lost their land; lost their land through tax liens; died intestate whereby their land reverted to owner of the ahupua'a in which it was located; or lost their ownership of land through the processes of adverse possession.\textsuperscript{132} Hence the processes of Indigenous dispossession of lands continued long after the initial and dramatic changes associated with the Māhele process.

By 1870 the Hawaiian government found it necessary to initiate the Hawaiian Government Survey in response to a morass of inaccurate and overlapping ownership boundaries.\textsuperscript{133} William DeWitt Alexander, the first surveyor general in Hawaii, was the son of missionaries who had been sent to Hawaii by the ABCFM. The purpose of the Hawaiian Government Survey was to survey “the landed property of the kingdom.”\textsuperscript{134} The survey system developed under Alexander’s leadership helped to clearly establish and define property boundaries for landowners and further facilitated the newly established practice of buying and selling land throughout Hawaii.

Moffat and Fitzpatrick (2004) noted that in determining some of the early survey boundaries, surveyors often relied on the remarkable level of knowledge possessed by Native Hawaiians, especially with regard to linkages between oral traditions and ancient land divisions. An impressive level of specificity and knowledge is reflected in maps made during this era.
that delineated traditional boundaries for ahupua’a, ‘ili, and kuleana as well as some recently effectuated land sales. In some cases maps produced during this time period were developed by Native Hawaiians who had local knowledge of landscapes and had been trained to make maps at the Lahainaluna missionary school. It has even been suggested that such a map was consulted during the Māhele to identify the location of various ahupua’a.

By 1898 when Hawaii was annexed to the U.S., the Hawaiian Government Survey Program had developed a uniform system of delineating property boundaries and had also produced about two thousand maps. These maps now provide an impressive record of traditional Indigenous place names and boundaries and demonstrate how a survey system of rectilinearly depicted geographical boundaries was imposed on the landscapes of Indigenous peoples to support and reflect the ideas and practices of an immigrant settler culture.

Discussion

Prior to the Māhele process the social and cultural systems of the Indigenous people of Hawaii had long evolved to meet the changing social and cultural needs of the Indigenous peoples of Hawaii. The ability to enforce those systems enabled Native Hawaiian leaders to limit the occupancy and settlement of foreign immigrant settlers. The subsequent ability of foreigners to “own” land came about only after immigrant settlers had infiltrated and
established social structures and systems that essentially supplanted existing practices with measures that effectuated the control and reorganization of Indigenous landscapes. Much like the ABCFM missionaries who a few decades earlier had pressed for the construction of an imported frame-built house, immigrant settlers were focused on changing traditions and practices to be consistent with their own ideas and expectations. When considered within the context of how foreign the idea of individual ownership of land was among most Native Hawaiians, the speed with which the events of the Māhele transpired, the near absolute finality with which all available land was apportioned, and the subsequent processes that effectuated further dispossession of land and resources it is little wonder that the majority of Native Hawaiians were dispossessed of land in ways that benefited immigrant settlers.

Part III: Comparisons and Conclusions

The Indigenous peoples of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii developed and honed a variety of highly effective landscape traditions and practices prior to the arrival of European and Euro-American settlers. They developed expertise in occupying, managing, and accessing resources over the course of thousands of years. They also developed social and cultural systems to meet changing and evolving needs in ways that were inextricably intertwined with the landscapes of North America and the islands of Hawaii. Those cultural and social systems enabled them to thrive and also
to limit the initial settlement and land acquisition ambitions of foreign immigrant settlers.

As we know, immigrant settlers, informed by their own ideologies, beliefs, and experiences, came to the landscapes of North America and the islands of Hawaii for a variety of reasons. However, one thing that they all had in common was that they did not come to share their own land or any other form of tangible resources with Indigenous peoples. Instead, they developed social practices, systems, and structures that were aimed at taking land and resources away from Indigenous peoples either by physical force or through a wide variety of other means.

Legislative and administrative actions also played a major role in the processes involved in the dispossession of the land and resources of Indigenous peoples by facilitating the buying, selling, transferring, and redistribution of landscapes to an immigrant settler population. In the contiguous areas of the continental U.S., after more than three hundred years of years of violence, murder, land cessions by Tribal peoples, military containment, and repeated forced physical removals, the Dawes Allotment Act of 1887 was enacted. This piece of legislation and all the attendant policies once again focused on the control and reorganization of Indigenous landscapes. The fact that allotment programs continued to be implemented by the U.S. until 1934 demonstrates the power and persistence of an immigrant settler culture that has been intent on replacing Indigenous
landscape traditions and use of landscapes with Euro-American forms of land ownership, occupation, and methods of spatial control. In Hawaii the dispossession of Indigenous peoples was effectuated largely through legislative actions. Events surrounding the Māhele process rapidly apportioned the use, control and ownership of land and resources with little regard for the use and needs of most Native Hawaiians.

Practices associated with changes in land tenure had long been effectuated in many parts of Europe. Changes from the common or open-field systems of agriculture that are often associated with the Middle Ages to modern systems of enclosure in which individual ownership rights prevailed occurred over a periods of many centuries.¹³⁸ The enclosure practices in Britain had historically tended to benefit landowners with the most substantial claims, helped to alienate lower class agricultural workers from their traditional use of land, and also lowered the standard of living for working class populations.¹³⁹ In England allotments, or small areas set aside for gardens, were seen as measures to assist the landless lower classes. The allotment process used in the continental U.S. and the Māhele process used in Hawaii attempted to effectuate similar kinds of programs to control and redistribute ownership and use of land. And while the technical mechanisms used in each region varied, the results were essentially the same: the majority of Indigenous peoples were dispossessed of land and to varying
degrees alienated from the landscapes on which they had relied on for survival.

As an integral part of the overall structure of supplanting the traditions and practices of Indigenous peoples, land surveying and mapping facilitated the implementation of a uniform system of geographic demarcation and individual ownership and use of land. In both Hawaii and the continental U.S., western forms of cartographic map and land survey systems were used to legitimize new patterns of land ownership and they remain the regulatory basis of land ownership and use today. While the cartographic mapping of lands has to some degree recorded Indigenous place names, such systems also facilitated the rapid sale and occupation of Indigenous landscapes mostly by immigrant settlers and the application of new forms of spatial limitation and land use control.

While the Māhele and the Dawes Allotment Act are two watershed events that precipitated the Indigenous dispossession of landscapes, they are also part of a much longer series of ideas and processes. The actions implemented by some of the most influential immigrant settler groups both before and upon their arrival to North America and the islands of Hawaii is perhaps most succinctly captured in the meaning of the word “colonialism.” “Colonialism” involves the processes whereby one group of people seeks to establish and maintain its authority over another. Alternatively, colonialism may be considered “the conquest and control of other people’s land and
Both meanings help us to understand the history of what followed after the arrival of European and Euro-American immigrant settlers.

In large measure many immigrant settlers and the subsequent social and cultural systems and structures that they developed in response to Indigenous landscapes have been aimed at use, control, reorganization, and possession of land and resources. In the process of occupying and achieving possession and individual ownership of Indigenous lands an immigrant settler culture has effectuated the physical demise, removal, and dispossession of Indigenous peoples from landscapes of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii.

Patrick Wolfe, author and academic, argued: “settler colonialism is a structure rather than an event.” Wolfe’s characterization of colonialism assists in explaining the persistence and effectiveness of immigrant settler practices aimed at gaining control over and possession of Indigenous landscapes throughout the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. The legislative reforms enacted during the effective periods of the Māhele process (1845-1850) and the Dawes Allotment Act (1887-1934) can be seen as steps in a larger overall process of colonialism, in which members of immigrant settler cultures acted individually and collectively to control, reorganize, and gain possession of Indigenous landscapes – often with little or no regard for the social and cultural traditions as well as future needs of Indigenous peoples.
Moreover, once the processes of colonialism become embedded in social and cultural structures and systems, they can be exceedingly difficult to abate. Arguably, American traditions and practices relative to Indigenous peoples and landscapes are firmly rooted in the earlier processes and practices associated with colonialism. Hence, ideas and practices that historically targeted Indigenous lands and resources for use, control, and ownership by non-Indigenous peoples may remain a part of America’s immigrant settler culture.

While the cultural, social, historical differences that have existed among and between groups of Indigenous peoples and immigrant settlers have been unique and varied, there are certain similarities in the overall pattern of how groups of people have interacted with and responded to landscapes. Indigenous peoples have often sought to protect and maintain essential relationships with landscapes by sometimes holding their ground and refusing to make concessions demanded by others and at other times ceding resources or absolute entitlements in the face of physical and cultural annihilation. Meanwhile an American immigrant settler culture has essentially sought to control, reorganize, and take resources away from Indigenous peoples through a wide variety of means. Many of those processes have fractured the practices, traditions, beliefs, and social and cultural systems of Indigenous peoples and attempted to replace them with social and cultural systems and structures that have benefited immigrant settlers.
As the general pattern of historical events shows us, early immigrant settlers developed social and cultural practices, structures, and systems of belief designed to effectuate and overcome perceived differences between themselves and the Indigenous peoples they encountered. Many of those efforts included ideas and actions that effectively attempted to sever and supplant the relationships that Indigenous peoples have had with landscapes. The implementation of those efforts resulted in the loss of association, use of, and access to landscapes and effectuated traumatic changes to the physical, social and cultural structures and systems of Indigenous peoples.

Arguably, attempts to eliminate or control the bond between Indigenous people and landscapes have been part of a continuing theme that has informed intercultural relations between American social, cultural and political systems and Indigenous peoples. The relentlessness as well as the wide and changing variety of both means and justifications that have been used to take Indigenous lands and resources demonstrate that a central focus—if not the central focus—of immigrant settlers’ relations with Indigenous peoples has been the possession and control of Indigenous lands and resources. Despite the intentions and actions of others, Indigenous peoples have fought to maintain their relationships to landscapes. Moreover, Indigenous peoples continue to struggle for future survival and cultural integrity in juxtaposition to an immigrant settler society with traditions that
have long been focused on the possession and control of land and resources.

Landscapes remain at the forefront of contemporary relations between Indigenous peoples and American culture. In many ways American culture remains rooted in its European cultural antecedents and has now had extensive experience in developing ways to take land and resources away from Indigenous peoples. Indigenous cultures have had the longest history of any group of people with landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii and continue in their struggles to defend their relationships with those landscapes. This history continues to be played out through the interactions we have with landscapes and the ways in which we treat each other. Landscapes located in the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii reflect a painful history between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. It is a history that is easily invoked by simply asking: Where are the Indigenous peoples now?
CHAPTER 5
CULTURAL PERSPECTIVES

Our indigenous origin enables us to define what and who is indigenous, and what and who is not indigenous. We know who the First Nations people are since we were, historically, the first people in the Hawaiian archipelago. Only Hawaiians are Native to Hawai‘i. Everyone else is a settler. Haunani-Kay Trask

The historian who remarked that America’s whole history could be read as one continuous real estate transaction was not too far off. Wallace Stegner

In the native belief system sacred places are not sacred because native people believe they are sacred. They have sacredness in and of themselves. Even if we all die off, they will continue to be sacred. Christopher H. Peters

This chapter focuses on contemporary perspectives about self as well as others in relation to landscapes of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. The intent is to explore ideas and explanations about how we think about and interact with landscapes, and then re-contextualize those ideas in relation to the experiences and perspectives of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. While the preceding chapters focused primarily on understanding the past, this chapter seeks to interrogate how certain ideas that are rooted in the past may be linked to contemporary perspectives.

The chapter begins by examining the nature of perspectives about self and others relative to landscapes. The section that follows explores how people may develop a sense of belonging or attachment to landscapes within the framework of the experiences and perceptions of being visitors or natives. The next section considers how social, cultural and historical
differences in experience may be considered and framed within the context of Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives that may intersect and conflict relative to the same landscapes or regional areas. The last two sections consider how certain historical patterns of thought may be linked to contemporary misperceptions about Indigenous peoples in relation to landscapes. The chapter concludes with a discussion about how the concerns and needs of Indigenous peoples may be perceived and informed by the ethnocentric perspectives of others.

**Relationships with Landscapes and with People**

The relationships Americans have with the landscapes of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii are continually reflected and conveyed in a variety of ways. An array of many ideas, beliefs and feelings can be found in oral and written cosmologies, social and cultural mythologies, the literary musings of religion and philosophy, political and economic policies, prose and poetry, art and architecture, and countless other forms of expression. Interestingly enough many of the values that inform these expressions appear to fall within a spectrum of ideas related to human values and needs. Ideas that value “nature” as an entity or commodity that is useful for the comfort or well-being of a person or people are on one end of the spectrum, while ideas that see “nature” as an entity that needs protection from human activities or intrusion are on the other end. Although the format and content may vary, what these
perspectives hold in common is the meaning or value that landscapes and other forms of “nature” have are informed by how and what we think about landscapes in relation to ourselves and others.

In thinking about the intellectual and psychological underpinnings of how we relate to landscapes, our ideas and expectations are rooted in one or more of the following: direct personal experience, an understanding of the experiences of others, or a belief about some combination of direct personal experience and understanding of others’ experiences. Knowledge or beliefs about how a particular place is linked to individual, familial, social, or cultural history also influence and inform how we think about or how we value a particular place or landscape region. An example of this can be seen in the ways in which we think about the concept of “home.” Many of us might think of “home” as the place where we reside or, perhaps, as the place where we or other family members have resided in the past. No doubt our idea of “home” or “homeland” is influenced by whether we are attached to a place or landscape through associations or experiences that contribute to a sense of whether we “feel” at home in a particular place. In any case, what we know or believe about history in association with place informs how we think about ourselves in relation to landscapes.

Yi-fu Tuan, geographer and philosopher, explored the relationships between history and environmental perceptions in *Topophilia: A Study of Environmental Perception, Attitudes and Values*. In the passage set forth
below, he describes differences in the ways visitors and natives relate to the
variety of environments they inhabit:

Generally speaking, we may say that only the visitor (and particularly the tourist) has a viewpoint; his perception is often a matter of using his eyes to compose pictures. The native, by contrast, has a complex attitude derived from his immersion in the totality of his environment. The visitor’s viewpoint, being simple, is easily stated. Confrontation with novelty may also prompt him to express himself. The complex attitude of the native, on the other hand, can be expressed by him only with difficulty and indirectly through behavior, local tradition, lore, and myth.4

While Tuan wasn’t necessarily writing about Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples when he refers to “visitors” and “natives,” he articulates the idea that people tend to perceive and relate to their environments in ways consistent with their own social and cultural ideas and practices. Because “natives” and “visitors” actually have different histories in relation to landscapes, their perceptions and relationships to landscapes are also different.

Simon Schama, British author and art historian, explored linkages between collective memory and meaning in relation to landscapes.5 In *Landscape and Memory* (1995) he ruminated about the emotional and psychological meanings associated with the “Western landscape imagination.” Schama asserted that certain ideas and meanings associated with landscape and landscape features -- such as trees, forests, rivers, and mountains -- are rooted in European folklore, memories, and even the mythologies of ancient western civilization. He contended that many forms of
European and American art, architecture, landscape interactions, and certain cultural ideas related to landscape (e.g., national identity and manifest destiny) were intellectually, emotionally, and psychologically rooted in much older or ancient European myths and memories. His work supported the notion that landscapes are perceived and experienced through the filter of social and cultural memories and meanings.

In a similar manner Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples’ social and cultural memories, experiences, and associations are rooted in the landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. Many of those landscape-related memories, ideas, and experiences have also been expressed and conveyed through mediums that include art, architecture and the transformation of landforms, oral histories, and various oral traditions. It seems clear that relationships with landscapes are influenced by experience and culture. In light of the foregoing discussion, it is likely that many Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples’ social and cultural memories may be inherently different because of differences in historical experiences and associations with particular landscapes.

What we perceive and how we react to the environment is informed and framed by certain experiences and expectations rooted in social and cultural customs and beliefs. If how we think and feel about landscapes is perceived and informed through the lens of personal as well as social and cultural memories and meanings, as Tuan and Schama have suggested,
then history and place -- or history in association with place -- is often interpreted and expressed through the filter of social and cultural experiences. In light of Schama’s assertions and Tuan’s argument that natives and visitors see and experience environments differently, this raises the question: How might these differences influence contemporary Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives about relationships with landscapes?

**Interpreting Landscape Perspectives**

Wallace Stegner (1909-1993), renowned author, educator, and conservationist, wrote extensively about the American West and his ideas and feelings in relation to the landscapes of North America. In *Wolf Willow: A History, A Story, and A Memory of the Last Plains Frontier* (1955) he wove together childhood memories, adult impressions and reflections, and historical analysis of the remote Montana and Saskatchewan border area. Stegner resided in Canada for several years and the northern plains region of the U.S., and in the following passage he summarizes his sense of personal attachment to and identification with the area:

> The successive stages of the Plains frontier flowed like a pageant through these Hills, and there are men still alive who remember almost the whole of it. My own recollections cover only a fragment; and yet it strikes me that this is *my history*. My disjunct, uprooted, cellular family was more typical than otherwise on the frontier. But more than we knew, we had our place in a human movement. What this town and its surrounding prairie grew from, and what they grew into, is the record of my tribe. If I am native to anything, I am native to this.
In his historical analysis of the region, Stegner portrays the locale as an uncivilized and dangerous frontier replete with heroic cowboys, Royal Canadian Mounties, and Indians wandering about the countryside. Stegner also describes in detail the movement, interactions, and struggles of various groups of Native Americans who fled across the Canadian Border during the late nineteenth century. He concluded the portion of his historical analysis concerning Native Americans with the return of the Lakota leader Sitting Bull and his band of followers to the U.S., and declared:

The day after that, the gates of Fort Buford closed behind them and their guns were stacked in the yard and the Plains Indians were done.\textsuperscript{10}

The sense that the Plains Indians were not just “down and out” but had reached the “end of the line” is implied throughout the course of Stegner’s work.

Stegner also summarized his assessment of the major historical changes of the area as part of a cycle of demise and replacement in which buffalo disappeared, cattle ranches failed, immigrant families farmed the land unsuccessfully, and Native nations all but disappeared, Stegner wrote:

But that block of country between the Milk River and the main line of the Canadian Pacific, and between approximately the Saskatchewan-Alberta line and Wood Mountain, is what this book is about. It is the place where I spent my childhood. It is also the place where the Plains, as an ecology, as a native Indian culture, and as a process of white settlement, came to their climax and their end.\textsuperscript{11}
Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, a Dakotah author and educator, contested Stegner’s identification as a “native” of the region and his assertion that Native American culture had “ended.” In *Why I Can’t Read Wallace Stegner and Other Essays: A Tribal Voice* (Cook-Lynn 1996) she argued against the notion that tribal nations “were done,” and challenged Stegner’s assertions with her own analysis of the history and conduct of Tribal peoples in the following: “representatives of Plains Indians nations signed peace treaties with the United States federal government, reserved land bases and rights for themselves and their future generations, and set up governments which continued to adapt to the inevitable changes of the modern world.”

Cook-Lynn recognizes Stegner’s work as “a valiant attempt at mythologizing one’s relationship to place,” and in the following passage, she presents her own point of view:

> Because I am an Indian, born and raised on a northern plains Indian reservation in this century, I argue with Stegner’s reality. The culture I have known imagines a different continuity and intimacy with the universe, which in large part still exists. It exists in communities all over the region, in language and myth, and in the memories of people who know who they are and where they came from.

What may have irritated Cook-Lynn was not just the way that Stegner claimed or legitimized his sense of identity and attachment to the northern plains, but also the impact his assertions could have on the perceptions and beliefs of both immigrant settlers and Indigenous peoples. In the passage set
forth below, she explains her objections to the ways Native peoples are portrayed and dismissed:

Clever prose style and substance in fiction as well as nonfiction interests the American reader as entertainment, but the purpose it ultimately serves is threatening. It serves to make the claim of the nativeness of all European immigrants to this land more valid because such indigenous populations as are described here will not last long, and if they do somehow survive their own ridiculousness they will do so as degenerates of history, defeated and outrageous.¹⁴

Cook-Lynn argues that social and cultural representations that fail to recognize the continuing history and ongoing presence of Indigenous peoples help to promulgate myth-making about American history and the American West that extended beyond the size of Stegner’s formidable readership. As Cook-Lynn asserts also below, she sees such works as a form of historical misrepresentation:

From the point of view of American Indian, the declaration of their demise (based on racial prejudice) had done much harm. Yet, the Stegner phenomenon of exclusivity in literature and history is powerful. It takes over, colonizes, invades the reality of human experience in North America to the extent the concepts of indigenousness and aboriginality are quite misdefined and ultimately misunderstood by the reading public. When that happens, the American Indian’s literary, historical, and cultural presence in America is repeatedly falsified and or denied.¹⁵

In reflecting on what Stegner believed was a pervasive lack of awareness among local townspeople about the history of the area where he grew up, he wrote:
In general the assumption of all of us, child or adult, was that this was a new country and that a new country had no history. History was something that applied to other places.\(^\text{16}\)

Stegner's later and more informed sense of historical awareness seems to have motivated his desire to effect an appreciation of the rich cultural heritage of the territory surrounding his childhood home. As set forth above, he seemed somewhat critical of the perspective that American history is something that began with immigrant settlers.

Throughout the body of his many works, it's clear that Stegner felt a very real and sentimental attachment to Western landscapes. After residing elsewhere he went on to become a strong advocate for the conservation of “wild lands,” particularly those located in the western regions of the country. By virtue of his experience and emotional bond to the area, Stegner seems to have confidently declared his sense of “nativeness” and “tribal” identity in relation to the surrounding landscapes. In light of his stated and implied assumptions about the demise of the Sioux and other Native nations, Stegner may have felt justified in identifying himself as a “native” based on his own experiences and personal sense of attachment to the landscapes of the northern plains.

However, Cook-Lynn assessed this approach to historiography as a form of cultural appropriation, as she clarified in the following passage:

Perhaps we can weep for all Americans who were and are \underline{merely} passing through. But that does not mean we can excuse them for imagining and believing that American Indians, too, are or were \underline{merely passing through}, a mere
phase of history to be disclaimed or forgotten or, worse yet, nostalgically lamented. To do so is to misunderstand indigenousness and to appropriate the American Indian imagination in the same way the colonists appropriate the land and resources of the New World.  

Cook-Lynn’s perspective as rooted in her ancestral history aptly demonstrates that certain assertions of attachment and identity that are made by people who “love” or in some way identify with certain landscapes might be considered rather presumptuous in light of the long and continuing history of cultural relationships and interactions that Indigenous peoples have with those same landscapes.

It is understandable when members of an immigrant settler society describe Indigenous peoples and their relationships to landscapes within the context of what they know or believe to be true. However, there is a point where the limitations of what is and what is not presented can and must be interpreted as more than indications of ignorance. When considered within the larger context of patterns of inter-cultural discourse and behavior, certain ideas not only reflect social and cultural values but also convey those values. As the work of both Stegner and Cook-Lynn demonstrate: literary mediums may reflect and convey various types of knowledge, levels of awareness about history, and conflicting social and cultural perspectives about landscapes, each other, and ourselves.
Ways of Thinking and the Treatment of Others

While it might be relatively easy to interpret the associations and relationships that we have with landscapes, it is much more difficult to understand the relationships that other people have with landscapes. Tuan (1990) offers a plausible explanation about why this is so. In the following passage he argues that people tend to understand and perceive the world through individual as well as collective social and cultural ideas, needs, and experiences:

Human beings, individually or in groups, tend to perceive the world with “self” as the center. Egocentrism and ethnocentrism appear to be universal human traits, though their strengths vary widely among individuals and social groups. … Egocentrism is the habit of ordering the world so that its components diminish rapidly in value away from self. Although egocentrism is a strong bias of human nature, it can be fully achieved only on rare occasions. … By contrast ethnocentrism (collective egocentrism) can be fully realized. Unlike the individual, a group can be self-sufficient; at least delusions of self-sufficiency are easier to sustain. Individuals are members of groups, and all have learned - though in varying degrees - to differentiate between “we” and “they,” between real people and people less real, between home ground and alien territory. “We” are at the center. Human beings lose human attributes in proportion as they are removed from the center.18

What Tuan’s analysis suggests is that humans have a tendency to assign significance and value to people and environments based on proximity and perceptions about individual and group self-interest. If this is true, then distance and a lack of familiarity are likely to engender certain biases about landscapes and people because they are perceived as being
further removed from one’s own self-interest. Therefore, how and what we think about other people as well landscapes is likely to be informed by—if not dependent on—the nature of our relationships and the extent of perceived self-interest. Differences in the types and levels of knowledge and experience that Indigenous and immigrant settler cultures have had with landscapes are likely to result in different types of affinities and affiliations with those landscapes. If the relationships between groups of people are competitive or adversarial in terms of land use or resources, as has been true for immigrant settler and Indigenous cultures, it is likely that reasons for certain conflicts are just as likely to abound in terms of patterns of behavior, thoughts, and beliefs.

As noted in the previous chapter, early European and Euro-American immigrant settlers brought and implemented many of their own ideas and landscape traditions. However, these settlers often ignored, failed to recognize, or simply chose to dispense with the pre-existing landscape traditions of Indigenous peoples. Robert F. Heizer (1915-1979), the preeminent archaeologist, noted the surprising lack of documentation of Indigenous traditions and practices by early Spanish soldiers, explorers, and missionaries. He theorized that:

While the Spaniards were always interested in the Indians they did not study them and record the details of their way of life, customs, and languages because these facts were considered unimportant as contributing to the knowledge of mankind. Indeed, with a very limited number of exceptions, there was no systematic investigation and recording of the culture of the California Indians in the Spanish period.
This notion of a presumed superiority coincides with the work of Todorov (1999). In *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* Todorov interrogated Spanish and Indigenous perspectives involved with the brutal colonization of Mexico and the Caribbean in sixteenth century. He argued that each cultural group related in completely different ways not only to each other but also to the environment. It was the early Spanish explorers who saw the Indigenous people of Mexico and the Caribbean as the inferior “others” by which they defined themselves.²⁰

Ethnocentric biases regarding their early observations and points of interaction with Indigenous peoples were also prevalent among other groups of immigrant settlers. The criticism that Indigenous inhabitants failed to use and occupy land in accordance with European or Euro-American standards and customs has been an enduring criticism that started fairly early on in the process of colonization. William Cronon, environmental historian, noted that when early immigrant settlers reflected on the landscape traditions of the Indigenous peoples of New England, they often found those traditions wanting and decidedly inferior to their own. He asserted that “[C]riticism of Indian ways of life was a near-constant element in early colonial writing…”²¹ Some of the earliest settlers necessarily depended on Indigenous assistance, knowledge, and supplies for their survival.²² Therefore, to the extent that Indigenous peoples were able to meet their own needs as well as the needs of others, perceived inadequacies of Indigenous land use
practices—as seen through the eyes of colonial settlers in New England—seem to have been both framed and filtered by colonial settlers’ own social and cultural perspectives of superiority.

The written records produced by the early missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), who arrived in Hawaii from New England, are replete with egocentric and ethnocentric ideations about and criticisms of Indigenous peoples. As previously noted, New England missionaries described Native Hawaiians and their social and cultural practices in comparison to what the viewer believed they should or could be. The landscapes of Hawaii did not include white cottages, church spires, or familiar settlement patterns and gardens, therefore, the New England missionaries saw those landscapes as a mass of brown huts that looked like haystacks compared with the more familiar New England towns and landscapes. And, since the missionaries’ perceptions about the landscapes of Hawaii did not reflect the familiar New England patterns of land development, the missionaries’ stated intentions to cover the islands with “fruitful fields, pleasant dwellings, schools, and churches” may have seemed even more justified when encountering the unfamiliar upon arrival in Hawaii.

Shortly after arriving in 1820, the Reverend Hiram Bingham viewed the landscapes of the island from the edge of Punchbowl Crater located on the island of Oahu. Presumably inspired by the view and full of evangelical
hope and enthusiasm, he wrote the following concerning his beliefs about the purpose and intent of the missionary enterprise:

> Who, among the true sons and daughters of Zion, looking upon such an open field, where Satan, by his varied malevolent agencies, had ruled and ruined generation after generation, would not exult in the opportunity of approaching the inhabitants with the varied Christian agency of the school, the pulpit, and the press, teaching, inviting, and persuading them to come under the protection, submit to the authority, and enlist in the service of the Prince of Peace? What evangelical local church in Christendom would not rejoice to employ an agent to rear there the altar and temple of the Lord, on the ruins of idolatry?

> We returned at evening, presenting to the rest of our company fresh productions of the soil, and our report of the land of which were to take possession.23

Bingham’s perspective was that the Indigenous peoples of Hawaii were not Christians; therefore, they were pagans in need of conversion and he intended to effectuate their conversion through manipulation of both the spoken and written word.24 The last sentence of his statement indicates his eagerness to take “fresh productions of the soil” for the missionaries’ use and foreshadowed an implied sense of entitlement to take possession—at least in a figurative sense--of both the hearts and minds of the people as well as the landscapes of Hawaii.

The early ABCFM missionaries’ perspectives about the inferiority of Native peoples and their own superiority informed both their actions and perceptions. The attendant criticism brought about by their perceptions also served to reinforce the justification for certain actions and beliefs. While most
people have preferences for and perspectives about what is familiar and unfamiliar, missionaries like Bingham clearly saw Indigenous “differences” as lacking or as a corruption of what they believed and practiced. Consequently, missionary efforts were aimed at convincing Native Hawaiians to overcome, correct, and transform what the missionaries perceived to be sinful deficiencies. The missionaries developed the remedy for such deficiencies--the adoption of religious and educational beliefs and practices that by their nature inculcated notions of Native inferiority along with the superiority of immigrant settler beliefs and practices. As funding for the ABCFM missionary efforts waned and missionaries were pressed to become self-supporting, some missionaries entered into business enterprises in Hawaii, some returned home to New England, some assumed positions of unprecedented influence in the government of Hawaii; and others continued to teach and supervise boarding schools in order to prepare and influence the next generation of Native Hawaiian and immigrant settler leaders.

As the number and influence of immigrant settlers continued to grow, agitation for land reforms mounted. In 1845 one of the most critical steps that brought about radical changes in land tenure in Hawaii occurred with the formation of the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles (Land Commission). The Land Commission was tasked with “the investigation and final ascertainment or rejection of all claims of private individuals, whether natives or foreigners, to any landed property acquired anterior to the passage of this Act…” The Commission subsequently adopted certain principles
that they intended to apply in executing their role in the quiet title process (Appendix C). In those principles they assert an interpretation and justification for changes in land tenure, as follows:

The Hawaiian rulers have learned by experience, that regard must be had to the immutable law of property, in things real, as lands, and in things personal, as chattels; that the well being of their country must essentially depend upon the proper development of their internal resources, of which land is the principal; and that in order to its proper cultivation and improvement, the holder must have some stake in it more solid than the bare permission to evolve his daily bread from an article, to which he and his children can lay no intrinsic claim. They perceive by contact with foreign nations, that such is their uniform practice, and that the rules of right under that practice are contended for, understood and likely to be applied, in regard to the lands otherwise held at their hands by a tenancy incomprehensible to the foreigner. They are desirous to conform themselves in the main to such a civilized state of things, now that they have come to be a nation in the understanding of older and more enlightened Governments.\textsuperscript{30}

The statement is infused with western cultural and political ideations that can be detected in reference to one’s “daily bread” and the assertion that “Hawaiian rulers” wished to have a more “civilized” form of land tenure. While the statement contends that the exiting land tenure system in Hawaii was “incomprehensible to the foreigner” it then explains that the remedy for this inability on the part of foreign people and nations was for the government of Hawaii to become more like the “older and more enlightened Governments” which, although not specified, probably referred to European and Euro-American government systems.
Significant measures were adopted and implemented by the King, the ali‘i, and the government of Hawaii to enable some forms of fee ownership of land. However, agitation continued for further reforms that would enable all people to hold fee title to land in the ways that were similar to those of the United States. At the time comparisons to land practices in Europe and the United States abounded. Arguments in favor of additional changes to the newly modified land use and tenure system proffered statements like the following:

> It is now generally admitted that the native race are unable to prosecute agricultural operations with the success which is necessary to ensure the permanent prosperity of the country. They lack the capital, the knowledge, and the enterprise necessary to ensure success in such undertakings.\(^{32}\)

Other justifications included rationales fraught with an underlying sense of ethnocentric superiority. The existing land tenure system was characterized as abusive and an obstacle to “the common people’s advancement.” Also cited was the lack of ease regarding land ownership which ostensibly prevented the investment in and permanent improvement of lands, which contributed in a negative way to “the migratory habits of the people.” It was also argued that the newly established fee simple processes that involved land survey costs and confirmation by the legislature or privy council resulted in “needless forms, ceremonies, and delays.” Additionally, it was argued that settlement of foreigners “exerts a good influence, by showing the people their rights.”\(^{33}\) As discussed previously, similar justifications were also often
expressed for the need to provide for individual land ownership for Native Americans through the allotment process. In these and countless other ways the cultural norms and practices of Indigenous societies were continually depicted as aberrant or deficient. The traditional relationships among Indigenous peoples—as well as the relationships between Indigenous people and landscapes—were effectively portrayed and supplanted by the immigrant settler society’s perceptions that its ideas and practices were superior.

Berkhofer (1978) explored some of the reasons why many immigrant settlers have historically perceived themselves as superior to Indigenous peoples. In the passage set forth below, he describes the tendency to view Indigenous peoples in negative ways:

Another persistent theme in White imagery is the tendency to describe Indian life in terms of its lack of White ways rather than being described positively from within the framework of the specific culture under consideration. Therefore, tribal Americans were usually described not as they were in their own eyes but from the viewpoint of outsiders, who often failed to understand their ideas or customs. Images of the Indian, accordingly, were (and are) usually what he was not or had not in White terms, rather than in terms of individual tribal cultures and social systems as modern anthropologists aim to do. This negative prototype of the deficient Indian began with Columbus but continues in the present as any history of the White education of Native Americans reveals.

Berkhofer also theorized that many ethnocentric or outright racist ideas that originated with European people and nations have continued to inform American policies and legalisms with regard to Native Americans. He
argued that government policies and actions—including military conquest, removal, the establishment of reservations, and allotment of reservation lands—were instituted in favor of two overriding concerns: 1) the extinction of Native title to land and resources; and 2) “the transformation of native lifestyles into copies of approved White models.” Berkhofer further asserted that justifications for those actions were based on self-serving notions about the superior nature of Europeans and the idea that conquest of others was a part of the natural and progressive disposition of European history.

Prior to their settlement in North America immigrant settler nations clearly had preconceived ideas about Indigenous peoples and their landscapes. The intentions of Europeans regarding the occupation, acquisition, and control of Indigenous lands were documented in the form of written agreements and assertions developed and based on European traditions and doctrines. Several European nations had ascribed to the “doctrine of discovery” before or shortly after embarking on quests to discover and claim Indigenous lands. This doctrine recognized that “a Christian sovereign acquired exclusive jurisdiction over new territories discovered by his representative or subject.” The underlying premise supporting the right to take and hold title to Indigenous lands was that Indigenous inhabitants were both non-Christians and uncivilized. These antiquated ideas not only informed past actions but are also still the basis of justifications for treatment, policies, and legal judgments regarding Native Americans.
In other ways ethnocentric perspectives continue to compare the relationships between Indigenous cultures and landscapes to those of immigrant settler cultures. Shepard Krech interrogated Indigenous landscape practices and traditions in *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (1999). His central argument was that Indigenous peoples from the time of the “paleo-Indians” to the present were no more conservation minded than anyone else with regard to landscapes and natural resources. Krech seems to suggest that Native Americans were and always have been just as lazy, ignorant, predatory, and wasteful with regard to landscapes and natural resources as any other group of people who have ever occupied the North American continent.

Krech challenges the popular imagery of Native Americans in juxtaposition with contemporary environmentalist philosophies. He proceeds to argue that Indigenous cultures were not the conservation-oriented people that others perceive them to be. Krech (1999) cites a wealth of non-Indigenous observations, archaeological excavations, historical accounts, theoretical imaginings, and a “lack of clear evidence to the contrary” to support his supposition that the actions and intentions of Indigenous peoples’ fail to meet certain contemporary resource conservation oriented expectations. When he did cite examples of how Indigenous people have tried to implement resource conservation practices, particularly within a contemporary context, he implied that in doing so Indigenous people were either influenced by Western mythology about themselves and conservation
or were simply implementing the modern-day wisdom of others concerning resource conservation. By casting a critical eye on Native Americans rather than staying focused on American cultural representations he demonstrates how the tradition of blaming Indigenous peoples for not being like Euro-Americans can still be found in recent discourse. His work extends criticisms of Indigenous peoples in relation to landscapes and the environment to include: sometimes not having been historically conservation minded enough to meet contemporary idealizations; sometimes being conservation minded in imitation of the ideas and practices of Euro-Americans; and most definitely for not living up to the ideas of who and what others imagine them to be.

Jean M. O'Brien, author, academic, and ethnohistorian, examined nineteenth century perspectives about Native Americans in Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England (2010). O'Brien examined written and oral historiographies of local and regional New England communities. She discovered a pattern of discourse that repeatedly ignored, overlooked, or dismissed the presence of Indigenous peoples. O'Brien also found that a belief about the inevitable extinction of Native Americans was pervasive. When confronted with information to the contrary rationalizations often characterized an Indigenous person as the “last” of a vanishing people or as some sort of degenerate form of a “legitimate” Native American. She notes that within the intellectual construct of immigrant settler perceptions, legitimacy sometimes depended upon the degree to which a
person appeared to be “pure-blooded” and the extent to which that person acted, lived, and presented him or herself in ways that were deemed to be sufficiently Indian-like. 41 O’Brien concluded that local events, speeches, and written materials that memorialized Native Americans as part of the past helped to legitimize the taking of Native lands and the promulgation of a myth about Native American extinction.

The idea that Indigenous peoples were soon to be extinct has also been a part of intellectual consciousness at the national level. In April 1910 the U.S. Commissioner of Indian Affairs hosted a private viewing of a lantern slide show, lecture, and “moving picture show” entitled “The Last Great Indian Council: the Farewell of the Chiefs.” In attendance were President and Mrs. Taft, members of the President’s cabinet, the diplomatic core, the U.S. Judiciary, U.S. Senators, members of Congress 42 and Colonel William F. Cody. 43 The show featured photographic images taken of Native Americans as part of Rodman Wanamaker’s “expedition to the North American Indian.” The central element of the film’s storyline included a gathering of Native Americans from several tribes who dressed in elaborate regalia, used traditional sign language to communicate, and then smoked a peace pipe together for one last time before riding off to their lonely fates as a vanquished and doomed people. Wanamaker, with the assistance and consent of the U.S. government, had wanted to capture images of Native American people, their customs, and ways of life before, as he believed, both the people and their traditions became extinct. Those who were filmed
included various Native Americans who were characterized as “chiefs,” some tribal leaders, and some Native American survivors of the Battle of Little Bighorn that had occurred some thirty-four years earlier. It was reported that J. K. Dixon, the leader of the expedition, gave the lecture, with twenty “full-blooded Indians” from the Carlisle Indian boarding school acting as ushers while music was played that had been “especially developed along Indian themes.”

Dixon, who the *National Tribune* identified as an “expert on aliens,” explained part of the process and reasoning that went into the production, as follows:

Last summer I succeeded in getting together about 150 pure-blood chiefs, representing practically all the tribes not yet extinct. I had photographs taken…When these chiefs die, their costumes will be buried with them, and the Indian as he was when this continent was discovered will no longer be found……The plow has replaced the bow and arrow, and the Indian is merging in American citizenship many fine qualities of body and mind.

The racist nature of the times can be inferred in the reported descriptions of both the event and the reasons for the expedition, including: references to the "full-blooded" students and the “pure-blood” chiefs, the Indian-themed music, and the belief that costumes make Native Americans like they were when the continent was discovered some 400 years earlier. Dixon’s last statement presupposes that once Native Americans became citizens they would merge into the general population and cease being Native peoples.
In total, Wanamaker financed three “exhibitions to the North American Indian” between 1908 and 1913. News of the expeditions and subsequent lectures, films, and photographic exhibits was widely reported in newspapers throughout the country. As explained in a printed program for one of the many lectures, the purpose of the 1908 expedition was to “preserve a faithful pictorial record of a “vanishing race.” After completion of the expeditions both Wanamaker and Dixon advocated for the extension of citizenship to Native Americans and various other related causes. The press coverage and related materials developed in relation to the “exhibitions to the North American Indian” provide a glimpse into the extent to which Americans either believed of were otherwise informed that Native America would in all likelihood be part of a romantic and soon-to-be nostalgic past--but not part of the future.

**Understanding the Roots of Contemporary Perspectives**

This study seeks to develop insights as to the underlying nature of historical and on-going conflicts that have occurred between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples over land and resources. The need for additional inquiry is manifested in the long-standing and continuing nature of these disputes. It is not uncommon for non-Indigenous people to assume that a viable Indigenous presence with respect to landscapes is no longer extant. Moreover, many Indigenous peoples articulate the belief that their relationships with landscapes remain a crucial element of their culture,
identity, and survival. Arguably, both patterns of thought and belief have fueled past and current-day conflicts and ideations.

In some cases the idea that Indigenous peoples are either not “real” because they don’t meet someone else’s expectation or that they belong to the past and should therefore be considered only within that context are still used as justifications for ignoring, mischaracterizing, and mistreating Indigenous peoples. Moreover, the social and cultural processes involved in forgetting, minimizing, or ignoring the histories of Indigenous peoples in relation to American landscapes seem to perpetuate further ignorance and indifference. Hence, an examination of the intercultural nature of the history of landscapes can facilitate perceptions about the ongoing history of intercultural relations.

Misinformed beliefs about Indigenous peoples and the past can affect contemporary perceptions about Indigenous peoples and American landscapes. In some cases ignorance about the history and culture of Indigenous peoples may be rooted in the belief that Indigenous peoples no longer exist. As set forth in the following example, such misconceptions can be evident in simple everyday interactions. Several years ago I was working as a city planner in San Diego, when a new officemate was introduced to me. She explained that she was a person of Jewish and Columbian descent and had been born and educated in the United States. Thinking that we might have some sort of “Indigenous peoples” connection, I responded that I was
Native American. She eyed me somewhat guardedly. So I explained, “You know, American Indian.” “Ohhhh!” she replied, “I didn’t know there were any Indians left. I thought they weren’t any more.” At the time her statement was incomprehensible and I might have dismissed her misinformed notions as a simple case of her not “expecting” to meet a Native American city planner. But I got the distinct feeling that she was actually surprised to meet a Native American person. Since then similar situations have occurred often enough for me to realize that what she was articulating is what many people really believe—Indigenous peoples are part of the past and not the present.

Indigenous communities have suffered the loss of many millions of lives, massive losses of land and resources, and devastating social and cultural impacts while enduring some 200-500 years or more of immigrant settler policies and practices. Despite that history, U.S. census figures indicate that Indigenous peoples clearly have survived. Additionally, federal and state governments officially recognize almost 600 different Native American Tribal nations, with more groups also seeking recognition. In 2011 the State of Hawaii recognized Native Hawaiians as the Indigenous people of the State of Hawaii. How state recognition of Native Hawaiians will be implemented is uncertain. Without official recognition status, Indigenous peoples in the U.S. may be limited in certain ways—including the ability to organize as Indigenous peoples, to participate in government-to-government
relations with state and federal agencies, and to effectuate actions of self-determination and continuance.

As an Indigenous people, Native Hawaiians are currently one of the largest groups of people being subjected to the injustices of federal indifference. In 1993, the U.S. issued an official apology to Native Hawaiians for its participation in the 1893 overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii. The apology acknowledged “the subsequent suppression of the inherent sovereignty of the Native Hawaiian people” and expressed a “commitment to acknowledge the ramifications of the overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawaii and to support reconciliation efforts between the United States and the Native Hawaiian people.” At present, U.S. reconciliation has not been forthcoming.

Issues concerning compensation for the loss of certain uses of land, revenues, and the continued suppression of sovereignty remain unresolved at both the state and federal levels. Meanwhile, further clarification and recognition of the official status of Native Hawaiians at the federal level has not been clarified.

This confusion and lack of clarity about the status of Native Hawaiians can contribute to the ways in which the Indigenous people of Hawaii and their concerns regarding land use and water issues are both articulated and perceived. The following is a simple case in point. Recently as a group of friends and I were chatting, we could hear in the background a television news report punctuated with the words and phrases “Native Hawaiian activists,” “protest,” “overthrow of the kingdom,” and “sovereignty.” When the
reporter had finished, one person in the group responded in all earnestness, "You can't go back and change history. Why don't they (meaning Native Hawaiians) just get over it?" The comment demonstrated how ignorance about the past may result in misperceptions about the extant nature of intercultural relations and can even foster an unwillingness to listen to--or even seriously consider--the concerns of Indigenous peoples. This type of indifference may well be exacerbated by the fact that the official status of Native Hawaiians as a sovereign group of Indigenous peoples remains unclear. Without official recognition it can be difficult for Indigenous peoples to organize and articulate their concerns in ways that will be socially and politically effective. Moreover, the failure to recognize and consider the needs and concerns of Indigenous peoples may undermine the ability to protect current and future social and cultural interests, relationships, and practices relative to landscapes.

**Discussion**

Landscapes reflect the disparate as well as conjoined social and cultural histories of the Indigenous peoples and immigrant settler cultures of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. As discussed herein, Indigenous cultures developed their histories and identities over extensive periods of time in ways that were intimately responsive to American landscapes. European and Euro-American immigrant settlers brought their own ideas, expectations, and traditions with them in their encounters with
Indigenous peoples and landscapes and they too developed systems of belief, tradition, and practice particularly with regard to settlement, ownership, and use of land and resources. Over time both groups of people developed social and cultural associations, meanings, and values that have been incorporated and ritualized into their social and cultural beliefs, traditions, and practices.

Despite all efforts to the contrary, Indigenous peoples continue in their struggles to protect, maintain, and adapt their beliefs, traditions, and practices in ways that will support future social and cultural survival in association with the landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii. In recent years land recovery has been a priority for many groups of Indigenous peoples. Since the 1960s Native American tribes have regained authority over several million acres of land.\textsuperscript{52} In Hawaii, the U.S. military ceased it’s bombing of the island of Kaho'olawe in 1990, and that island landscape which encompasses approximately 29,000 acres is currently being held in trust by the State of Hawaii unless or until jurisdiction is transferred to a sovereign Native Hawaiian entity. These notable developments were instigated through the concerted efforts of Indigenous peoples with the support and assistance of others and not because the policies and practices of an immigrant settler society volunteered to return land and resources to Indigenous peoples.
Many people have no awareness of how history is continuously being played out, or that it is written and rewritten from various vantage points. It is likely that an American culture and society that remains rooted in certain immigrant settler traditions, practices, and perspectives will continue to effectuate ways of divesting Indigenous peoples of their land, resources, identities, and cultures. Justifications for such actions have often been informed by presumptions of ethnocentric superiority and an American historiography in which Indigenous peoples and cultures have or will be swept into a mythical past. However, choices to act differently abound. One of those choices could be the commitment to stop attempts to sever the bonds between Indigenous peoples and landscapes—choosing instead to support and protect the needs and interests of Indigenous peoples who seek to continue their relationships with American landscapes. In order for that to happen, the structures of American culture and society must change or evolve to the point that its citizens respect and protect the ability of Indigenous peoples to continue their social and cultural relationships with landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii.

Conclusion

Many of the ideas and practices of the past continue to inform contemporary perspectives about relationships between people and landscapes. Early immigrant settlers in both the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii may have at first been limited in their ability to recognize,
understand, and negotiate the landscape environments and Indigenous peoples that they encountered. However, over relatively brief periods of time immigrant settlers in both locations developed and implemented various methods for securing possession and ownership of land and other resources based on and supported by ethnocentric beliefs, ideas, and practices. As a result of those actions Indigenous peoples have endured staggering physical, social, and cultural losses that have resulted from the processes of dispossession. Furthermore, the implementation of ethnocentric ideations has left a long-standing legacy of moral, legal, and intellectual precedents and justifications for the mistreatment of Indigenous peoples.

Many Americans tend to minimize, ignore, or otherwise be unaware of both the historical and contemporary nature of relationships between Indigenous peoples and landscapes. This lack of awareness has been informed and buttressed by interests and perspectives that have repeatedly repudiated, supplanted, or ignored the landscape traditions and practices of Indigenous peoples. Moreover, certain American social and cultural systems and practices remain rooted in immigrant settler traditions. Many of those traditions have focused on the use, control, and ownership of the land and resources used by or associated with Indigenous peoples. The fact that Indigenous nations continue to occupy or have control over land and resources renders them potential targets for future exploitation and mistreatment by others.
It is a matter of great consequence when Indigenous peoples and their relationships with landscapes—that were once the sole domain of their ancestors—are easily and readily ignored, overlooked, or dismissed. This raises serious concerns about the nature of relations that will exist between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples in the U.S. Will American social policies and practices continue to treat Indigenous peoples in ways that are rooted in historical conventions and ethnocentric practices and justifications? Or, will they choose to act as a group in ways that they have never chosen and acted before: to respect, support, and protect—in perpetuity—the relationships that Indigenous peoples have with the landscapes of the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii?

The answers to the questions set forth above will determine the difficulty of the path that lies ahead for Indigenous peoples. That path is not one that is fully formed as a result of their own choosing; it is one that they have negotiated and endured for hundreds of years. The social and cultural survival of Indigenous peoples necessarily dictates no other path but to continue in their efforts to maintain and revive their long-standing relationships to landscapes. On the other hand, American culture and society has more latitude in matters concerning landscapes and how Indigenous peoples are ultimately treated. Social and cultural systems and practices that are rooted in immigrant settler ideations and traditions and which have essentially facilitated the taking of land and resources away from Indigenous
peoples could be changed to now respect, support, and protect the relationships that Indigenous peoples have with landscapes.
CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

What we know of history differs from what actually happened not merely because evidence of past events has been lost or tampered with, or because the task of sifting through it is unending, but also because the changing present continually requires new interpretations of what has taken place. David Lowenthal

Landscapes in the United States are the sites of multiple social and cultural histories, meanings, and associations. Navigating the course of this study of culture and landscapes in America has been a bit like flying at high altitude over a wide expanse of land. The view may have at times appeared to be much like a patchwork quilt that has been pieced and stitched together from a variety of ideas, beliefs, and practices. That imagery, however, belies the nature of historical relations between different groups of people. Landscapes in the continental U.S. and the islands of Hawaii are in fact the sites of difficult, complex, and ongoing histories between many groups of peoples. Among those groups, no other has struggled longer nor endured greater losses as a result of social and intercultural conflict over land and resources than Indigenous peoples.

Perhaps we could believe that historical relations between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples may be rooted in something as simple as the perception that Indigenous peoples seemed to possess what immigrant settlers did not: land and resources. However, the “having” and the ability to “take” do not alone explain the character and ongoing nature of
conflicts over landscapes. In the United States many individuals, as well as
groups of people, have “more” or “less” than others. In fact, the laws and
regulations of the U.S. are routinely employed to protect the rights of people
from the hegemony of more powerful interests. So, unless we are willing to
believe that American society is not capable of protecting the interests of less
powerful groups, a deeper understanding of the complex history and nature
of intercultural relations is necessary. As discovered herein, the reasons for
continued conflict appear to be rooted in the complex history of ideas and
relationships that different groups of people have had with landscapes.

The United States exemplifies an immigrant settler culture that in
many ways remains deeply rooted in the immigrant settler ideations, beliefs,
and practices of the past. To be sure, many ideas and practices concerning
landscapes have been adapted and modified over time in response to
changes in environment, culture, technology and knowledge. Many have also
ignored the beliefs, needs, and interests of Indigenous peoples and have
helped to condone and justify continued acts of mistreatment. Indigenous
peoples have not exercised a similar position of indifference to either
landscapes or people. Historically, Indigenous peoples have chosen to
remain culturally attuned to both landscapes and people. Perhaps, social and
cultural survival dictates that they can ill afford to do otherwise.

This study has explored relationships between different groups of
people and landscapes by examining the perspectives and experiences of
Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. In focusing on some of the ways that Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples have historically thought about and interacted with landscapes, and with each other, this study proffers the following findings:

1. Theories and methods of cultural landscape interpretation in concert with ideas about the dynamics of social power and control support the development of a conceptual framework through which to view landscapes as a form of intercultural text and social dialogue that occurs between Indigenous peoples and an immigrant settler society.

2. The general pattern of published discourse about Indigenous peoples and their relationships to landscapes in the U.S. has changed over time. This pattern appears to have evolved from the placement of Indigenous peoples and their experiences with American landscapes as background subjects in Euro-American historiography. Later approached explored ideas about Indigenous peoples as historical agents of environmental change. More recently, the concerns and perspectives of Indigenous peoples have been articulated in juxtaposition to the ideas, actions, and values of an immigrant settler society. Hence the pattern has fluctuated between recognizing, minimizing, and ignoring the presence and agency of Indigenous peoples. Notably, however,
ethnocentric perspectives about Indigenous peoples and landscapes continue to be asserted and reflected in contemporary forms of literature.

3. The ideas, perspectives and practices of Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples remain rooted in the traditions of the past and may continue to inform the nature of intercultural relations. Many ideas and practices that effectuated dispossession, reorganization, and control over landscapes utilized by Indigenous peoples have persisted in American social and cultural systems of belief and practice. At the same time many of the beliefs, practices, and identities of the Indigenous peoples of the contiguous areas of the continental U.S and the islands of Hawaii remain rooted in ideas and traditions that are dependent upon maintaining their own social and cultural relationships to landscapes.

In order to improve future relations between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous peoples changes are needed in two key areas:

1. Public and private policies and practices should focus on ensuring respect, support, and protection of the needs and interests of Indigenous peoples and their long-standing and unique relationships to landscapes in the U.S.
2. Additional research and scholarship should focus on including and presenting accurately the experiences, histories, and perspectives of Indigenous peoples.

This study has examined relationships between people and landscapes from a variety of angles and perspectives. The approach has demonstrated how the placement of landscapes as a central or intermediary element of analysis is beneficial to understanding and interpreting what ideas, beliefs, and perspectives have informed intercultural relations between Indigenous peoples and an immigrant settler society. While the examples considered herein are restricted to certain areas of the United States, this method of cross-cultural analysis may serve as a model for other studies that seek to examine social and intercultural relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.
CHAP. 119.—An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severality to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in all cases where any tribe or band of Indians has been, or shall hereafter be, located upon any reservation created for their use, either by treaty stipulation or by virtue of an act of Congress or executive order setting apart the same for their use, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized, whenever in his opinion any reservation or any part thereof of such Indians is advantageous for agricultural and grazing purposes, to cause said reservation, or any part thereof, to be surveyed, or resurveyed if necessary, and to allot the lands in said reservation in severality to any Indian located thereon in quantities as follows:

To each head of a family, one-quarter of a section;
To each single person over eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section;
To each orphan child under eighteen years of age, one-eighth of a section; and
To each other single person under eighteen years now living, or who may be born prior to the date of the order of the President directing an allotment of the lands embraced in any reservation, one-sixteenth of a section; Provided, That in case there is not sufficient land in any of said reservations to allot lands to each individual of the classes above named in quantities as above provided, the lands embraced in such reservation or reservations shall be allotted to each individual of each of said classes pro rata, in accordance with the provisions of this act: And provided further, That where the treaty or act of Congress setting apart such reservation provides for the allotment of lands in severality in quantities in excess of those herein provided, the President, in making allotments upon such reservation, shall allot the lands to each individual Indian belonging thereon in quantity as specified in such treaty or act: And provided further, That when the lands allotted are only valuable for grazing purposes, an additional allotment of such grazing lands, in quantities as above provided, shall be made to each individual.

Sec. 2. That all allotments set apart under the provisions of this act shall be selected by the Indians, heads of families selecting for their minor children, and the agents shall select for each orphan child, and in such manner as to embrace the improvements of the Indians making the selection. Where the improvements of two or more Indians have been made on the same legal subdivision of land, unless they shall otherwise agree, a provisional line may be run dividing said lands between them, and the amount to which each is entitled shall be equalized in the assignment of the remainder of the land to which they are entitled under this act: Provided, That if any one entitled to an allotment shall fail to make a selection within four years after the President shall direct that allotments may be made on a particular reservation, the Secretary of the Interior may direct the agent of such tribe or band, if such there be, and if there be no agent, then a special agent appointed for that purpose, to make a selection for such Indian, which election shall be allotted as in cases where selections are made by the Indians, and patents shall issue in like manner.
SEC. 3. That the allotments provided for in this act shall be made by special agents appointed by the President for such purpose, and the agents in charge of the respective reservations on which the allotments are directed to be made, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may from time to time prescribe, and shall be certified by such agents to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in duplicate, one copy to be retained in the Indian Office and the other to be transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior for his action, and to be deposited in the General Land Office.

SEC. 4. That where any Indian not residing upon a reservation, or for whose tribe no reservation has been provided by treaty, act of Congress, or executive order, shall make settlement upon any surveyed or unsurveyed lands of the United States not otherwise appropriated, he or she shall be entitled, upon application to the local land office for the district in which the lands are located, to have the same allotted to him or her, and to his or her children, in quantities and manner as provided in this act for Indians residing upon reservations; and when such settlement is made upon unsurveyed lands, the grant to such Indians shall be adjusted upon the survey of the lands so as to conform thereto; and patents shall be issued to them for such lands in the manner and with the restrictions as herein provided. And the fees to which the officers of such local land office would have been entitled had such lands been entered under the general laws for the disposition of the public lands shall be paid to them, from any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, upon a statement of an account in their behalf for such fees by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and a certificate of such account to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. That upon the approval of the allotments provided for in this act by the Secretary of the Interior, he shall cause patents to issue therefor in the name of the allottees, which patents shall be of the legal effect, and declare that the United States does and will hold the land thus allotted, for the period of twenty-five years, in trust for the sole use and benefit of the Indian to whom such allotment shall have been made, or in case of his decease, of his heirs according to the laws of the State or Territory where such land is located, and that at the expiration of said period the United States will convey the same by patent to said Indian, or his heirs as aforesaid, in fee, discharged of said trust and free of all charge or incumbrance whatsoever: Provided, That the President of the United States may in any case in his discretion extend the period. And if any conveyance shall be made of the lands set apart and allotted as herein provided, or any contract made touching the same, before the expiration of the time above mentioned, such conveyance or contract shall be absolutely null and void: Provided, That the law of descent and partition in force in the State or Territory where such lands are situate shall apply thereto after patents therefor have been executed and delivered, except as herein otherwise provided; and the laws of the State of Kansas regulating the descent and partition of real estate shall, so far as practicable, apply to all lands in the Indian Territory which may be allotted in severalty under the provisions of this act: And provided further, That at any time after lands have been allotted to all the Indians of any tribe as herein provided, or sooner if in the opinion of the President it shall be for the best interests of said tribe, it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with such Indian tribe for the purchase and release by said tribe, in conformity with the treaty or statute under which such reservation is held, of such portions of its reservation not allotted as such tribe shall, from time to time, consent to sell, on such terms and conditions as shall be considered just and equitable between the United States and said tribe of Indians, which purchase shall not be complete until ratified by Congress, and the form and manner of executing such release shall also be

Allotments to be made by special agents and Indian agents.

Certificates.

Indians not on reservations, etc., may make selection of public lands.

Fees to be paid from the Treasury.

Patent to issue.

To be held in trust.

Conveyance in fee after 25 years.

Provision Period may be extended.

Laws of descent and partition.

Negotiations for purchase of lands not allotted.
Lands so bought to be held for actual settlers if allowable.

Patent to issue only to person taking as homestead.

Purchase money to be held in trust for Indians.

Religious organizations.

Indians selecting lands to be preferred for police, etc.

Citizenship to be accorded to allottees and Indians adopting civilized life.

Secretary of the Interior to prescribe rules for use of waters for irrigation.

prescribed by Congress: Provided however, That all lands adapted to agriculture, with or without irrigation so sold or released to the United States by any Indian tribe shall be held by the United States for the sole purpose of securing homes to actual settlers and shall be disposed of by the United States to actual and bona fide settlers only in tracts not exceeding one hundred and sixty acres to any one person, on such terms as Congress shall prescribe, subject to grants which Congress may make in aid of education: And provided further, That no patents shall issue therefor except to the person so taking the same as and for a homestead, or his heirs, and after the expiration of five years occupancy thereof as such homestead; and any conveyance of said lands so taken as a homestead, or any contract touching the same, or lien thereon, created prior to the date of such patent, shall be null and void.

And the sums agreed to be paid by the United States as purchase money for any portion of any such reservation shall be held in the Treasury of the United States for the sole use of the tribe or tribes of Indians; to whom such reservations belonged; and the same, with interest thereon at three percent per annum, shall be at all times subject to appropriation by Congress for the education and civilization of such tribe or tribes of Indians or the members thereof. The patents aforesaid shall be recorded in the General Land Office, and afterward delivered, free of charge, to the allottee entitled thereto. And if any religious society or other organization is now occupying any of the public lands to which this act is applicable, for religious or educational work among the Indians, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to confirm such occupation to such society or organization, in quantity not exceeding one hundred and sixty acres in any one tract, so long as the same shall be so occupied, on such terms as he shall deem just; but nothing herein contained shall change or alter any claim of such society for religious or educational purposes heretofore granted by law.

And hereafter, in the employment of Indian police, or any other employees in the public service among any of the Indian tribes or bands affected by this act, and where Indians can perform the duties required, those Indians who have availed themselves of the provisions of this act and become citizens of the United States shall be preferred.

SEC. 6. That upon the completion of said allotments and the patenting of the lands to said allottees, each and every member of the respective bands or tribes of Indians to whom allotments have been made shall have the benefit of and be subject to the laws, both civil and criminal, of the State or Territory in which they may reside; and no Territory shall pass or enforce any law denying any such Indian within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law. And every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States to whom allotments shall have been made under the provisions of this act, or under any law or treaty, and every Indian born within the territorial limits of the United States who has voluntarily taken up, within said limits, his residence separate and apart from any tribe of Indians therein, and has adopted the habits of civilized life, is hereby declared to be a citizen of the United States, and is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens, whether said Indian has been or not, by birth or otherwise, a member of any tribe of Indians within the territorial limits of the United States without in any manner impairing or otherwise affecting the right of any such Indian to tribal or other property.

SEC. 7. That in cases where the use of water for irrigation is necessary to render the lands within any Indian reservation available for agricultural purposes, the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to secure a just and equal distribution thereto among the Indians residing upon any such reservations; and no other appropriation or grant of water by any riparian proprietor shall be authorized or permitted to the damage of any other riparian proprietor.
SEC. 8. That the provision of this act shall not extend to the territory occupied by the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, Seminoles, and Osage, Minnies and Peorias, and Sacs and Foxes, in the Indian Territory, nor to any of the reservations of the Seneca Nation of New York Indians in the State of New York, nor to that strip of territory in the State of Nebraska adjoining the Sioux Nation on the south added by executive order.

SEC. 9. That for the purpose of making the surveys and resurveys mentioned in section two of this act, there be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, to be repaid proportionately out of the proceeds of the sales of such land as may be acquired from the Indians under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 10. That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to affect the right and power of Congress to grant the right of way through any lands granted to an Indian, or a tribe of Indians, for railroads or other highways, or telegraph lines, for the public use, or to condemn such lands to public uses, upon making just compensation.

SEC. 11. That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from their present reservation in Southwestern Colorado to a new reservation by and with the consent of a majority of the adult male members of said tribe.

Approved, February 8, 1887.
Appendix B: Honolulu in 1853

Central View Looking from the Harbor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Royal School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Old Custom House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interior of the Fort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Old Market House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Charity School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stone Church, Kawaihao Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Bethel Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Catholic Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Native Church, Kaumakapili Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Steamer Akamai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Honolulu House, Honolulu Hale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Palace of King Kamehameha III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Court House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Armory – Mauna Kilika</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central View Looking Southwestward
with Diamond Head in Distance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John Young Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alexander G. Angell, U.S. Consul, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>General Miller, HBM Consul General, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M. Perrin, French Consul, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Home of Prince Alexander &amp; Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reverend Richard Armstrong’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Louis Anthon, Danish Consul, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U.S. Consulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Stephen Reynolds, Consul of Bremen, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>E. O. Hall Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Robert G. Davis, Consul of Peru, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>R. C. Wyllie, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>David L. Gregg, U.S. Commissioner, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>John Montgomery Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H. Hackfeld, Consul of Sweden, Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The King’s Summer House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No.  Building Name

1.  Dr. John Mott-Smith, Dentist
2.  The Commercial Hotel
3.  The National Hotel
4.  The French Hotel
5.  Frank Spencer, Dry Goods/General Merchandise
6.  Lafrenz & Fisher, Cabinet Makers
7.  Charles Nicholson, Tailoring Shop
8.  Stuart & Rahe, Cabinet Makers & Turners
10. Ruggles & Co., Drug Store
11. French Store, P. Mitchell
12. Reynolds Store
13. Charles W. Vincent, Carpenters Shop
14. The Globe Hotel
15. Hudson’s Bay Co. Store
16. Dr. Lathrop’s Drug Store
Central View Showing the Shipping Port
Business Portion of Town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spencer, Ship Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rice &amp; Co., Commission &amp; Auction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Makee &amp; Anton’s Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>C. Brewer &amp; Co., Shipping &amp; Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D.N. Flitner, Jeweler, Watchmaker, Chronometer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J. C. Spalding, Ship Chandler &amp; Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Honolulu Iron Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Henry Sea, Auctioneer/ R. Coady &amp; Co., Ship Chandler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hawaiian Steam Navigation Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The Polynesian Office, Government Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Allen &amp; Co., Shipping &amp; General Merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Porter &amp; Ogden, Importing &amp; Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B. F. Snow, Ship Chandlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mitchell &amp; Fales, Ship Chandlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Melchers &amp; Co., Importing &amp; Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Von Holt &amp; Heuck, General Merchandise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Building Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John C. Bullions Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jules Dudoit Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Captain Snow’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alexander J. Cartwright Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Captain Tom Spencer’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>J.C. Spalding Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dr. Ford’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Captain Crabbe’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>James I. Dowsett Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Porter &amp; Ogden Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henry Macfarlane Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr. Sumner’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dr. Wood Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Bungalow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Dr. Newcomb’s Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Henry Sea Residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### No. | Building Name
---|---
1 | Dr. Lathrop’s Residence
2 | Honorable S. Paki’s Residence
3 | Washington Place
4 | John Ii Residence
5 | Judge Andrews’ Residence
6 | Reverend S. Bishop Residence
7 | Captain Luce’s Residence
8 | Reverend S. C. Damon’s Residence
9 | John Ladd Residence
10 | J.H. Wood Residence
11 | R. A. S. Wood Residence
12 | Waterfall, Nuuanu Valley
13 | A. B. Bates Residence
14 | Captain James Makee’s Residence
15 | Dr. Judd’s Residence
16 | Dr. William Hillebrand’s Residence
Appendix C:  
Law Creating Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles

Law Creating the Board of Commissioners

To Quiet Land Titles.

(PASSED DECEMBER 10, 1845).

(See Vol. I, Laws of Kamehameha III, p. 107.)

Section 1. His Majesty shall appoint, through the Minister of the Interior, and upon consultation with the Privy Council, five commissioners, one of whom shall be the Attorney-General of this Kingdom, to be a board for the investigation and final ascertainment or rejection of all claims of private individuals, whether natives or foreigners, to any landed property acquired anterior to the passage of this Act; the awards of which board, unless appealed from as hereinafter allowed, shall be binding upon the Minister of the Interior and upon the applicant.

Section 2. The said Commissioners shall, before acting, take and subscribe an oath to be administered to them by the Minister of the Interior, in the following form:

We and each of us do solemnly swear that we will carefully and impartially investigate all claims to lands submitted to us by private parties against the government of the Hawaiian Islands; and that we will equitably adjudge upon the title, tenure, duration and quantity thereof, according to the terms of article fourth of the seventh chapter of the first part of an act entitled "An act to organize the executive departments of the Hawaiian Islands," passed at Honolulu, —— day of ——, 18—.

Subscribed and sworn to, this —— day of ——, 18—.

Before me, ——, ——.

Minister of the Interior.

Which oath, having been sworn to, shall remain on file in the Interior Department.

Section 3. It shall be the duty of said Board of Commissioners to select one of their number as president. They shall have power to employ clerks and copyists for the purposes in this article defined; they shall appoint the time and place of their sessions; shall at pleasure adjourn their meetings, and when necessary, postpone the business pending before them.

Section 4. The president of said Board shall, at least once in 10—O. L.
each month, from the date of their first convention, report their proceedings to the Minister of the Interior—the number of claims then pending before them—the number to that date confirmed or rejected, and the reasons for confirmation and rejection of any particular claim to land, with all the evidences adduced to and reduced before them.

Section 5. It shall be the special duty of said Board to advertise in the Polynesian newspaper, during the continuance of their sessions, the following public notice, viz:

To all claimants of land in the Hawaiian Islands—The undersigned have been appointed by His Majesty the king, a board of commissioners to investigate and confirm or reject all claims to land arising previously to the —— day of ——, 18—. Patents in fee simple, or leases for terms of years, will be issued to those entitled to the same, upon the report which we are authorized to make, by the testimony to be presented to us.

The board holds its stated meetings weekly at ——, in Honolulu, island of Oahu, to hear the parties or their counsel, in defence of their claims; and is prepared, every day, to receive in writing, the claims and evidences of title which parties may have to offer, at the ——, in Honolulu, between the hours of 9 o'clock A. M. and 3 o'clock P. M.

All persons are required to file with the board specifications of their claims to land, and to adduce the evidence upon which they claim title to any land in the Hawaiian Islands, before the expiration of two years from this date, or in default of so doing, they will after that time be forever barred of all right to recover the same, in the courts of justice.

Dated —— day of ——, 18—.

Section 6. The said Board shall be in existence for the quieting of land titles during two years from the first publication of the notice above required, and shall have power to subpoeana and compel the attendance of witnesses by discretionary fine; in like manner when in session for the hearing of arguments, to punish for contempt; and they shall have power to administer oaths to witnesses, and to perpetuate testimony in any case depending before them, which, when so perpetuated, shall be valid evidence in any court of justice created by the Act to organize the judiciary.

Section 7. The decisions of said Board shall be in accordance with the principles established by the Civil Code of this Kingdom in regard to prescription, occupancy, fixtures, native usages in regard to landed tenures, water privileges and rights of piscary, the rights of women, the rights of absentees, tenancy and subtenancy—primogeniture and rights of adoption; which decisions being of a majority in number of said board, shall be only subject to appeal to the Supreme Court, as prescribed in
the Act to organize the judiciary, and when such appeal shall not have been taken, they shall be final.

Section 8. All claims to land, as against the Hawaiian Government, which are not presented to said Board within the time, at the place and in the manner prescribed in the notice required to be given in the fifth section of this article, shall be deemed to be invalid, and shall be forever barred in law, unless the claimant be absent from this Kingdom, and have no representative therein.

Section 9. The Minister of the Interior shall issue patents or leases to the claimants of land pursuant to the terms in which the said Board shall have confirmed their respective claims, upon being paid the fees of patenting or of leasing (as the case may be) prescribed in the third part of this Act, unless the party entitled to a lease shall prefer to compound with the said Minister as in the succeeding section allowed.

Section 10. The Minister of the Interior shall have power in concurrence with the Privy Council, and under the sanction of His Majesty, to issue to any lessee or tenant for life of lands so confirmed, being an Hawaiian subject, a patent in fee simple for the same, upon payment of a commutation to be agreed upon by His Majesty in Privy Council.

Section 11. The patents and leases issued in accordance with the award of said Commissioners, shall be recorded at the expense of the patentee or lessee, as prescribed in the third part of this Act, in a book to be kept for that purpose by the Minister of the Interior.

Section 12. The said Board shall not have power to entertain any claim to lands set up by any private person or persons until the claimant shall have deposited with the Minister of Finance a bond conditioned to defray the costs and expenses incident to the proposed investigation, according to the rates of charge prescribed in the third part of this Act; which costs and expenses shall, after award rendered, be taxed by the president of said Board, and a certificate thereof shall be given to the claimant, who shall exhibit the same to the Minister of Finance, whose certificate of full payment, together with the award of the Commissioners, shall authorize the delivery of the awarded patent or lease to such confirmed claimant, by the Minister of the Interior, and not without.

Section 13. The titles of all lands claimed of the Hawaiian Government anterior to the passage of this Act, upon being confirmed as aforesaid, in whole or in part, by the Board of Com-
missioners, shall be deemed to be forever settled, as awarded by
said Board, unless appeal be taken to the Supreme Court, as
already provided. And all claims rejected by said Board, unless
appeal be taken as aforesaid, shall be deemed to be forever
barred and foreclosed, from the expiration of the time allowed
for such appeal.

PRINCIPLES ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS TO QUIET LAND TITLES, IN THEIR ADJU-
DICATION OF CLAIMS PRESENTED TO THEM.

(See Vol. II, Laws of Kamehameha III, p. 81.)

When the Islands were conquered by Kamehameha I, he
followed the example of his predecessors, and divided out the
lands among his principal warrior chiefs, retaining, however, a
portion in his hands, to be cultivated or managed by his own
immediate servants or attendants. Each principal chief divided
his lands anew, and gave them out to an inferior order of chiefs,
or persons of rank, by whom they were subdivided again and
again; after passing through the hands of four, five or six persons,
from the King down to the lowest class of tenants. All these
persons were considered to have rights in the lands, or the pro-
ductions of them. The proportions of these rights were not very
clearly defined, but were nevertheless universally acknowledged.

The tenures were in one sense feudal, but they were not mil-
itary, for the claims of the superior on the inferior were mainly
either for produce of the land or for labor, military service being
rarely or never required of the lower orders. All persons pos-
sessing landed property, whether superior landlords, tenants or
sub-tenants, owed and paid to the King not only a land tax,
which he assessed at pleasure, but also, service which was called
for at discretion, on all the grades, from the highest down. They
also owed and paid some portion of the productions of the land,
in addition to the yearly taxes. They owed obedience at all
times. All these were rendered not only by natives, but also by
foreigners who received lands from Kamehameha I and Kame-
hameha II, and by multitudes still alive; of this there are multi-
tudes of living witnesses, and a failure to render any of these has
always been considered a just cause for which to forfeit the
lands.

It is therefore certain that the tenure was far from being
alodial, either in principle or practice; but even if living testi-
mony were wanting at the present time, the treaty established in 1836, between this Government and Lord Edward Russell on behalf of the British Government, would show the views then entertained on the subject by the contracting parties. It is there declared, "The land on which the houses are built is the property of the King." The same rights which the King possessed over the superior landlords and all under them, the several grades of landlords possessed over their inferiors, so that there was a joint ownership of the land; the King really owning the alodial, and the person in whose hands he placed the land, holding it in trust. But when he put it in the hands of a third person, that third person bore a similar relation to him that he did to the King. The superior always had the power at pleasure to dispossess his inferior, but it was not considered just and right to do it without cause, and dispossesision did not often take place, except on the decease of one of the landlords, when changes were often numerous, and the rights of heirs and tenants comparatively disregarded, for the purpose of favoring a new class of persons.

Such was the nature of the tenures, and such the titles by which the lands were held, when in 1839 protection was declared both for person and property, in the following words: "Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people; together with their lands, their building lots, and all their property." (See Declaration of Rights, p. 10 of translation.) In section 6 of the same Act, p. 33, the nature of the protection given to land is property is in some degree defined. It is there declared that the landlord cannot "causelessly dispossess his tenant," and it is also stated what shall be considered a sufficient cause. The same law confirms what has been already stated in relation to the rights of His Majesty the King in all lands. Section 3 requires that every tenant of land, by whomsoever owned, shall work 36 days in the year for the King or Government, showing clearly that there is no individual who has an alodial title to the soil, that title remaining with the King.

It seems natural then, and obviously just, that the King, in disposing of the alodial, should offer it first to the superior lord, that is, to the person who originally received the land in trust from the King; since by doing so, no injury is inflicted on any of the inferior lords or tenants, they being protected by law in their rights as before; and most obviously the King could not dispose of the alodialum to any other person without infringing on the rights of the superior lord. But even when such lord shall have
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received an alodial title from the King by purchase or otherwise, the rights of the tenants and sub-tenants must still remain unaffected, for no purchase, even from the Sovereign himself, can vitiate the rights of third parties. The lord, therefore, who purchases the alodium, can no more seize upon the rights of the tenants and dispossess them, than the King can now seize upon the rights of the lords, and dispossess them. This appears clear, not only from the first principles of justice, but also from the Act of 1839, declaring protection for tenants as well as for landlords. That Act particularly recognizes but three classes of persons as having rights in the land, viz: the King or Government, the landlords and the tenants. Indeed, section 9, chapter 3, of that statute positively forbids the lord who receives land in trust from the King to place another lord under himself, over the tenants. If, then, any landlord violate this law, he only divides his own rights; he cannot thereby diminish the rights of the King or Government, nor the rights of the tenants.

It being therefore fully established, that there are but three classes of persons having vested rights in the lands—1st, the Government, 2nd, the landlord, and 3rd, the tenant, it next becomes necessary to ascertain the proportional rights of each. Happily, evidence on this point is not wanting, though it may be the most difficult one to settle satisfactorily of any connected with land claims. The testimony elicited is of the best and highest kind. It has been given immediately by a large number of persons, of a great variety of character, many of them old men, perfectly acquainted with the ancient usages of the country; some were landlords, and some were tenants. There has been no contradictory testimony, but all have agreed on all essential points. Several foreign landholders under Kamehameha I, Kamehameha II and Kamehameha III, have been full in their testimony as to the rights of the King. Ancient practice, according to testimony, seems to have awarded to the tenant less than justice and equitably would demand, and to have given to the King more than the permanent good of his subjects would allow. If the King be disposed voluntarily to yield to the tenant a portion of what practice has given to himself, he most assuredly has a right to do it; and should the King allow to the landlord one third, to the tenant one third, and retain one third himself, he, according to the uniform opinion of the witnesses, would injure no one unless himself; and in giving this opinion, the witnesses uniformly gave it against their own interests. According to this principle, a tract of land now in the hands of a landlord and occupied by
tenants, if all parts of it were equally valuable, might be divided into the three equal parts, and an alodial title to one then be given to the lord, and the same title be given to the tenants of one third, and the other third would remain in the hands of the King, as his proportional right. It is altogether probable that since the Act of 1839, a few individuals may have acquired alodial ownership of landed property, either by purchase or by voluntary grant on the part of the King. Such ownership must be proved, or it cannot be acknowledged; for the King, representing the Government, having formerly been the sole owner of all the soil, he must be considered to be so still, unless proof be rendered to the contrary; and even possession of ever so long standing cannot be proof, any thing more than that which is specified above as belonging to the landlord, or to the landlord and tenant, as the case may be.

All the above principles and remarks apply most particularly and clearly to districts, plantations and farms, and to their owners. But between the ownership of lands for cultivation, and mere building lots, there are often broad lines of distinction. Mere building lots were never bestowed by the King or lords for the purpose of being given out to tenants, as was uniformly the case with lands suitable for cultivation. It follows, therefore, that (with some exceptions, which in all cases must be proved) in relation to building lots, there is no third class of persons having the rights of lords over tenants. The exceptions would be in those cases where individuals having received building lots from the King for their own particular use, those individuals have themselves for some considerations, expressed or implied, transferred such lots to third parties. Another exception exists in relation to building lots, especially if large, which were formerly within the defined boundaries of plantations and farms, and have since been occupied by persons owning no rights in the farms other than the building lots. Such lots must still be considered a part of the plantation or farm, in such a sense that the tenant must pay rent to the lord. This appears clear, not only from ancient usage, but also from the last clause of section 1, of chapter 3, old laws: "But possessions of house lots that are large like farm gardens, must aid the owners of the farms from which they are taken in payment of the yearly tax."

Although the above facts and principles are most perfectly clear and unquestionable, yet great evils have existed down to the present moment, owing mainly to the circumstance that several different classes of persons had undivided rights in the same
land, and each class was very liable to claim more than the due proportions. In such cases, lords, or persons of superior power or rank, have generally been the oppressors, and perhaps there are none of those classes, from the Throne down, who have not sometimes taken advantage of the powerless in this respect. Neither the laws of 1839 nor of 1840 were found adequate to protect the inferior lord and tenants, for although the violators of law, of every rank, were liable to its penalty, yet it was so contrary to ancient usage, to execute the law on the powerful for the protection of the weak, that the latter often suffered, and it was found necessary to adopt a new system for ascertaining rights, and new measures for protecting those rights when ascertained, and to accomplish this object the Land Commission was formed.

The decisions of an executive board would be so far surrenders of the Chief Executive Magistrate, who has approved the powers conferred upon that board, as to be an authorization from him to adjust all the past tenures in the manner most equitable, and if abstractly just, power to alienate for him any rights, which he as King could surrender in regard to these lands. The whole power of the King to confer and convey lands to which private equitable claim now attaches, is reposed in the Commission. What is the nature and extent of that power which the King has bestowed upon this board? It can be no other than his private or feudatory right as an individual participant in the ownership, not his sovereign prerogatives as head of the nation. Among these prerogatives which affect lands, are the following:

1st. To punish for high treason by forfeiture, if so the law decrees.
2nd. To levy taxes upon every tax yielding basis, and among others lands, if so the law decrees.
3rd. To encourage and even enforce the usufruct of lands for the common good.
4th. To provide public thoroughfares and easements, by means of roads, bridges, streets, &c., for the common good.
5th. To resume certain lands upon just compensation assessed, if for any cause the public good or the social safety requires it.

These prerogatives, powers and duties, His Majesty ought not, and ergo, he cannot, surrender. Hence the following confirmations of the board, and the titles consequent upon them, must be understood subject to these conditions.

But the King's private or feudatory rights, understood by the natives, differ greatly from the above enumerated corporate
rights, understood in civilized and refined nations, and in which the commonwealth is rather represented by the person of the monarch than the monarch himself. By the ancient usage, the taxes went not to the body corporate, in trust for political uses, but to the King, as his private income or revenue, and this gave him a private proprietorship in all lands. This autocracy was, however, diminished by the King’s liberal and voluntary surrender to his people in the Constitution, 8th October, 1840, in which the Government or body politic and the King are for the first time contradistinguished as follows: “He (the King) also shall have the direction of the Government property, the poll tax, the land tax, the three days monthly labor, though in conformity to the laws. He also shall retain his own private lands, and lands forfeited for the non-payment of taxes shall revert to him,” in which clause is perceivable the line of distinction above adverted to. All that is essential to the common good in regard to lands, taxes on lands, and revenue from lands, is reposed in the King, as the head of a corporation aggregate; or in himself as a corporation sole, and from these is contradistinguished his own private lands.

In the spirit of this constitutional distinction, on the 7th of June, 1839, the Nobles, with the sanction of the King, passed some ordinances or rules “respecting applications for farms, forsaking of farms, disposing of farms, and the management of farms,” having in view the encouragement of industry. In these the landlords are recognized as a distinct and independent class of local proprietors over such portions of their lands as are actually in cultivation, subject to the claims of their tenancy; and as to those lands not in actual use, it gives a community of ownership between the Government and landlords, by saying, “Those men who have no land, not even a garden, nor any place to cultivate, and yet wish to labor for the purpose of obtaining the object of their desires, may apply to the land agent, or the Governor, or the King, for any piece of land which is not already cultivated by another person, and such piece shall be given him.”

This appropriation was to be with co-operation of the King and the landlords. In like manner the corporate right is recognized in what the same law declares respecting the “residue in lands,” and “respecting landlords.”

Yet the principle of suzerainty seems to have followed the King in those lands which are otherwise declared to be the proper possession of the landlords: for the “advice to the Governors and landlords” commences with, “It shall be the duty of
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those to whom the King gives lands to see that they do not establish other landlords under themselves, over the people;" and in the 18th section, landlords are cautioned lest they "be dispossessed, according to the principles of the eleventh section," which makes the landlords' right of possession dependent upon industry and intelligence.

It would thus seem inferable, that as late as the 7th of June, 1839, and before the Constitution was given, the chiefs considered themselves tenants at special will of the King as the head of the nation, or in his corporate right. Also that that corporate right to dispossess them was only to be exercised for causes of a public nature, inconsistent with the public well being. To suppose that the landlords could be lawfully dispossessed by the King at will, for causes of private pique, or because of personal disfavor, would be to make the King the real or intrinsic owner of the land in his individual capacity, a doctrine neither sustained by the current of past legislation, nor the testimony which has already been elicited by the board. But to recognize his right of forfeiting the lands of the landlords for misuser or non-user, or for crime, is itself a recognition beneficial to the mass of the people, for whose happiness the corporation is instituted.

The Hawaiian rulers have learned by experience, that regard must be had to the immutable law of property, in things real, as lands, and in things personal, as chattels; that the well being of their country must essentially depend upon the proper development of their internal resources, of which land is the principal; and that in order to its proper cultivation and improvement, the holder must have some stake in it more solid than the bare permission to evolve his daily bread from an article, to which he and his children can lay no intrinsic claim. They perceive by contact with foreign nations, that such is their uniform practice, and that the rules of right under that practice are contended for, understood and likely to be applied, in regard to the lands otherwise held at their hands by a tenancy incomprehensible to the foreigner. They are desirous to conform themselves in the main to such a civilized state of things, now that they have come to be a nation in the understanding of older and more enlightened Governments.

Such we, the Commissioners, understand to have been the reason of the distinction in the Constitution of 1840, between Government lands and private lands of the King, and such we now understand to be the spirit of article 4th, chapter 7th, of the first part of the Act to organize the executive departments of the
Hawaiian Islands, founded upon the Law Report of May 21, 1845, in which it was recommended to prepare His Majesty’s Government to consort in some measure with the recognizing powers. In consequence, it was enacted that the King is to appoint five Commissioners for quieting land titles, and thus confer upon them all his private and public power over the corporate property in lands claimed by private parties, which in the nature of things he can delegate.

The requisition to appoint such a board is found in the fourth article of the 7th chapter of the first part of an Act of the Legislature, passed on the 10th of December, 1845, which took effect on the 7th of February following. The statute of which said article is a part, is as a whole denominated “An Act to Organize the Executive Departments,” indicating that the decisions of the board are not purely judicial, but executive adjudications. The Act as a whole in five parts, passed its final reading and received the approbation of His Majesty, on the 27th of April, 1846, and was promulgated on the 20th June following.

The Board of Commissioners, thus instituted, was organized in strict conformity with the law, which, having taken effect on Saturday, the 7th of February, the Minister of the Interior, on Monday, the 9th, in Privy Council, with the approbation of His Majesty, appointed and commissioned the undersigned, who at the same time, in the presence of the King and Council, took and subscribed the following oath of office:

“We, and each of us, do solemnly swear, that we will carefully and impartially investigate all claims to land submitted to us by private parties against the Government of the Hawaiian Islands; and that we will equitably adjudge upon the title, tenure, duration and quantity thereof, according to the terms of article 4th, of the 7th chapter of the first part of an Act entitled ‘An Act to Organize the Executive Departments of the Hawaiian Islands,’ passed at Honolulu, the 10th day of December, 1845.

(Signed)

WILLIAM RICHARDS,
JOHN RICORD,
J. Y. KANEHOA,
JOHN II,
Z. KAAWAI.

Subscribed and sworn to this 9th day of February, 1846, before me.

JOHN YOUNG,
Minister of the Interior.
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On the 11th of February, the day following their appointment, the Commissioners organized as follows:

"NOTICE.

"At a meeting of the Board of Commissioners appointed to quiet land titles, having in view the proper organization required and allowed by article 4th of chapter 7th of the first part of an Act entitled 'An Act to Organize the Executive Departments of the Hawaiian Islands.'

"The members of said board having convened, it was

"Resolved, 1st. That William Richards, Esq., be, and he is, hereby chosen President.

"2d. That Joseph Henry Smith, Esq., be employed as one of our stated secretaries, at a compensation to be hereafter determined, derivable solely from the fees and perquisites resulting to the Government from the labors of the Board.

"3d. That said secretary be duly sworn to fidelity in the discharge of his duties as such. That he be, and is, hereby authorized to receive claims and evidences for our after consideration, from and after the first publication hereof. That he be required to endorse upon each claim the day and hour of its receipt by him. That he keep an office in Hale Kauwila, in Honolulu, for the transaction of his duties, and for the facility of claimants. And that he be charged with keeping the minutes of this board, and of its proceedings upon claims.

"4th. That claims submitted for settlement be taken up and acted upon according to the order of their presentation, and be settled according to order taken in each case by a majority in number of the board.

"5th. That the stated meetings of this board be held on Wednesday of each week, commencing at 9 o'clock, A. M., at the said office at Hale Kauwila, in Honolulu, for the transaction of business. The first meeting to be held on the 4th day of March next.

"6th. That these resolutions be published in the Polynesian newspaper, concurrently with the notice to claimants required by law, to the end that they may be apprised of these by-laws established by the board.

"Done at Honolulu, this 11th day of February, A. D., 1846,

"(Signed) WILLIAM RICHARDS,

" JOHN RICORD,

" J. Y. KANEHOA,

" JOHN II,

" Z. KAAUWAI."
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Which resolutions were published in the Polynesian of the 14th February, 1846, together with the following notice, required by law:

"TO ALL CLAIMANTS OF LANDS IN THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS.

"The undersigned have been appointed by His Majesty the King, a Board of Commissioners to investigate and confirm or reject all claims to land arising previously to the 10th day of December, A. D. 1845.

"Patents in fee simple, or leases for terms of years, will be issued to those entitled to the same, upon the report which we are authorized to make by the testimony to be presented to us.

"The Board holds its stated meetings weekly, at the Hale Kauwila, in Honolulu, on the Island of Oahu, to hear the parties or their counsel in defense of their claims, and is prepared every day to receive in writing the claims and evidences of title which parties may have to offer, at the office of Joseph Henry Smith, Esq., Secretary of said board, at Hale Kauwila, in Honolulu, between the hours of 9 A. M. and 3 P. M.

"All persons are required to file with the Board by depositing with its Secretary specifications of their claims to land, and to adduce the evidence upon which they claim title to any land in the Hawaiian Islands, before the expiration of two years from this date; or in default of so doing, they will after that time be forever barred of all right to recover the same in the courts of justice.

"Dated 11th day of February, 1846.

"(Signed) WILLIAM RICHARDS,
" " JOHN RICORD,
" " J. Y. KANEHOA,
" " JOHN II,
" " Z. KAAUWAI."

1st. The field of the Commissioners is "the investigation and final ascertainmment or rejection of all claims of private individuals, whether natives or foreigners, to any landed property acquired anterior to the passage of the Act" of which Article 4th is an integral portion, to wit, 27th April, 1846.

2nd. The more minute powers of the Board for organization, and to carry out these objects, are specified and conferred; as the power to meet and adjourn, to appoint clerks, to summon parties and enforce mandates, to administer oaths, and to issue
commissions for taking testimony. These are auxiliary to the
powers and objects of the Board respecting land titles, which it
is created to confirm or reject definitely.

3d. The principles by which the Board are to be governed in
deciding certain questions, (i. e.) "Prescription, occupancy,
fixtures, native usages in regard to landed tenures, water privi-
ileges and rights of piscary, the rights of women, the rights of
absentees, tenancy and sub-tenancy, primogeniture, and rights
of adoption," are to be those "Established by the civil code of
the kingdom," which the general provisions of the Act to orga-
ize the Executive Departments, section 3d, defines as follows:—
"Until the passage of the civil code, the principles of the fore-
going Act, and the prescriptions of all the civil statutes now
existing, not at conflict therewith, shall serve and be binding as
a civil code for this kingdom, of which the courts of justice shall
take notice, in administering the rights to which they are appli-
cable."

A wide latitude is thus left to the Commissioners, who must,
in passing upon the merits of each claim, first elicit from credit-
able witnesses, the facts or history of each; and thus assort or
reconcile those facts to the provisions of the civil code, whenever
there is a principle in past legislation applicable to the point
under consideration; but when no such principle exists, they
may judicially declare one, in accordance with ancient usage and
not at conflict with any existing law, nor at variance with the
facts, and altogether equitable and liberal.

4th. From the fact that His Majesty, the intrinsic proprietor,
has reposed in this Board, such power of confirming or rejecting,
the Commissioners must infer that he intended the utmost liber-
sity to prevail towards the claimants, rather against the pecun-
inary interests of the body politic than against those of the claim-
ants. But,

5th. The Commissioners do not understand that in virtue of
such latitude, they are at liberty to disregard certain restrictions
contained in the same Act, by the 4th Article of the 7th chapter
of the first part of which they are created. For the same Legis-
lature by whose authority they exist, has elsewhere limited them
as follows:
1st. Aliens are not allowed to acquire any allodial or fee-
simple estate in lands.
2d. No leasehold estate shall be considered validly acquired
by any alien "until he shall have obtained a certificate of nation-
ality, as in this" the first article of chapter 5th required.
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6th. The Commissioners are only authorized by the Act to ascertain the claimant's kind and amount of title, and to award for or against that title, "wholly or in part." They are not authorized to grant leases or patents, or to receive the commutation allowed by section 10th. Yet since the government share in the land confirmed has intimate connexion with the amount of the claimant's title, the Commissioners must ascertain and report upon that share, for the guidance and information of the Minister of the Interior.

7th. Connected with each claim for land, is its configuration and superficial contents, without the ascertainment and demarkation of which, it were impossible to make an award, or to quiet the title as between neighboring proprietors. The Board is therefore under the necessity of causing each piece of land to be surveyed at the claimant's expense, before awarding upon it. This is clearly contemplated by the 12th section of the law, among the "expenses incidental to the proposed investigation."

The following benefits will result from these investigations and awards:

1st. They will separate the rights of the King and Government, hitherto blended, and leave the owner, whether in fee, or for life, or for years, to the free agency and independent proprietorship of his lands as confirmed. So long as the King or Government continue to have an undivided proprietary share in the domain, the King's and Premier's consent is necessary, by the old law, to real sales, or transfers from party to party, and, by parity of reasoning, to real mortgages also. This is because of the share which Government or the body politic has in the lands of the kingdom uniformly. To separate these rights, and disemembarrass the owner or temporary possessor from this clog upon his free agency, is beneficial to that proprietor in the highest degree, and also to the body politic; for it not only sets apart definitely what belongs to the claimant, but, untying his hands, enables him to use his property more freely, by mortgaging it for commercial objects, and by building upon it, with the definite prospect that it will descend to his heirs. This will tend more rapidly to an export, and to a permanency of commercial relations, without which there can never be such a revenue as to enable the Government to foster its internal improvements.

2nd. The patents or leases given to claimants, are for certain fixed and ascertained extents or dimensions of land. This must prevent after litigation in regard to boundaries. All parties having been cited before awarding, there can be no counter
claims to the same piece of land after award, except on appeal, and such appeal cannot be taken, except by a party who has presented his claims to the Board.

The patents and leases are recorded in duplicate, in the department of the Interior. This will enable the foundation of every one's right to be known to the Government, and inquiring parties. No pretended ownerships can exist without the means of undeceiving the public in regard to them. Subsequent purchasers and mortgagees need not be in ignorance of prior defects in the title, or of prior incumbrances.

The undersigned deem the foregoing prefatory remarks and explanations necessary to a clear understanding of the awards upon which they are about to enter, and indispensable to which awards, it is necessary to lay down the following general principles, to which they have arrived by critical study of the civil code, and careful examination of numerous witnesses; among whom are some of the oldest chiefs, possessing large tracts of land, which, equally with other lands, come under the adjudication of the Board, and under the principles here laid down.

The chiefs so situated, cannot have a personal interest in testifying to the facts leading to those principles, since they thereby clog their own rights, and become liable to pay the commutation to which the King and Government are entitled. Native proprietors and foreign residents are thus put upon the same footing in regard to their titles, in consistency with Article 30th of the treaties concluded with Great Britain and France, 26th March, 1846.

1st. For the purposes of this Board in all cases where the land has been obtained from the King or his authorized agent without a written voucher, anterior to the 7th of June, 1839, the Board will inquire simply into the history of the derivation; and if the land claimed has been continuously occupied, built upon, or otherwise improved since that time, without molestation, the Board will, in case no contests exist between private claimants, infer a freehold less than alodial.

2d. In all such cases as above specified, when there are counter claims to the same piece of land, the Board will confine their inquiry to which of the claimants has the freehold, less than alodial.

3d. In all cases where the land has been obtained from the King or his authorized agent, or from any governor, chief or pretended proprietor, subsequently to the 7th of June, 1839, the Board will strictly inquire into the right of the King, or
chief, or landlord, to make such disposition of the land; and will confirm or reject, according to the right of such donor, grantor, or lessor, regardless of consideration, occupancy or after improvements.

4th. In all cases where the land has been legally and validly obtained from the lawful proprietor, by written grant, deed, or lease, the Board will construe the claimant’s rights by the wording of the instrument.

5th. When rights were originally acquired either in writing or verbally, in a lawful manner, and from the bona fide owner, for a valid consideration or otherwise, and yet were never occupied, or have not been occupied by such claimant since the 7th of June, 1839, the Board will infer an absence of title. Especially in view of section 6, chapter 3, old law.

6th. The share of Government, or the body politic, to be commuted for with the Minister of the Interior, by any confirmed claimant wishing to obtain a fee simple title under chapter 7 of part first of the Act to Organize the Executive Departments, this Board understand, from the evidence adduced before them, to be one third part of the value of the land, without improvements, which third part of unimproved value, being paid by the confirmed claimant, should extinguish the private rights of the King in the land, and leave such claimant an allodion, subject only to the corporate rights of the body politic, to be exerted by the King under authorization of the laws, and through the agency of his officers created by the laws. The Board, in asserting this principle, do not mean, however, to restrict the power of His Majesty in Privy Council, to fix upon a less commutation, under section 10th of the article creating this Board, and subject to the private rights of tenants, if there be any on the land; for the King has no power to convey away the rights of individuals without their consent. They deem it their duty to state the maximum value of the interest retained in all lands of the kingdom at this date, which was never relinquished, and which the Government to this day has never received any valuable consideration for, even from the private chiefs from whom the claimants derive. Claimants cannot derive more than the original proprietor had, neither could the original proprietors grant more than they had to the present claimants. They had a possessory right under the crown, equal to two thirds undivided of the value of the land, provided there were no tenants; and in consideration of the undivided third of the King, they paid an annual rent, in produce of the soil, and in service. The foreign
claimants, deriving from these, have not, in all cases, paid the
rent which was due from their grantors, and have lost sight of
the corporate rights in their lands, pertaining originally to the
government. That rent can be sold by the Minister of the
Interior, for not exceeding one third of the unimproved value of
the land as aforesaid, which would divest the land so commuted
for of all interference, save that of the community, for the causes
and in the way aforesaid.

7th. The titles of all lands, whether rightfully or wrongfully
claimed, either by natives or foreigners, in the entire kingdom,
which shall not have been presented to this Board for adjudica-
tion, confirmation or rejection, on or before the 14th day of
February, 1848, are declared to belong to this government, by
section 8th of the article creating this Board. Parties who thus
neglect to present their claims, do so in defiance of the law, and
cannot complain of the effect of their own disobedience.

Upon these principles, the undersigned proceed to take up the
claims now before them in the order of their presentation.

(Signed)       WILLIAM RICHARDS,
“            JOHN RICORD,
“            J. Y. KANEHOA,
“            JOHN II,
“            Z. KAAUWAI.

Hale Kauwila, August 20, 1846.

——————

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The principles adopted by the Board of Commissioners to
quiet Land Titles, under date of August 20th, 1846, having
been read before the Nobles and Representatives of the people,
in Legislative Council assembled, and having been carefully con-
sidered, it was,

Resolved, That the same are hereby approved; and it is en-
acted, that from the date hereof, all claims for landed property
in this kingdom shall be tested by those principles, and according
to them be confirmed or rejected.                 KAMEHAMEHA.

KEONI ANA.
Appendix D:
Act to Abolish the Disabilities of Aliens

AN ACT

TO ABOLISH THE DISABILITIES OF ALIENS TO ACQUIRE AND CONVEY LANDS IN THE SIMPLE.

CONTENTS.

Section 1. Any resident alien may acquire land in fee simple, and convey the same by sale or otherwise.
2. When act takes effect—repeal of former laws.

Whereas, the development of the resources of the islands depends essentially upon their agriculture: And whereas, that agriculture requires the aid of foreign capital, skill and labor: And whereas, the King desires to encourage the introduction of foreign capital and labor to the utmost extent that His rights of sovereign jurisdiction and domain will allow, therefore:

BE IT ENACTED by the House of Nobles and Representatives of the Hawaiian Islands, in Legislative Council assembled:

1. That any alien, resident in the Hawaiian islands, may acquire and hold to himself, his heirs and assigns, a fee simple estate in any land of this kingdom, and may also convey the same by sale, gift, exchange, will or otherwise, to any Hawaiian subject, or to any alien, resident as aforesaid: Provided, always, that such alien, his heirs, executors, or administrators, shall in all cases of dispute in relation to his rights, title or interest in any land he may acquire in fee simple, or any part or parcel of said land, submit the same to the judicial tribunals of this kingdom, and abide by the final decision of those tribunals without seeking the intervention of any foreign nation or representative; and in case he shall refuse so to do, his estate and all his right, title or interest therein shall cease and determine, and the same shall be immediately forfeited and escheat to the Hawaiian government: And further provided, that no deed or other conveyance of land in fee simple to an alien shall be of any validity or effect, unless it contains a clause providing for such submission, forfeiture and escheat.

2. This act shall take effect and become a law from and after the day of its passage; and all acts, or parts of acts, resolves or parts of resolves, as contravene the provisions of this act shall be and the same are hereby repealed.

Done and passed at the council house in Honolulu, this 10th day of July, A. D. 1850.

Keoni Ana.

KAMEHAMEHA.
Appendix E: Kuleana Act

AN ACT

CONFIRMING CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS OF THE KING AND PRIVY COUNCIL, PASSED ON THE 21ST DAY OF DECEMBER, A.D. 1849, GRANTING TO THE COMMON PEOPLE ALLODIAL TITLES FOR THEIR OWN LANDS AND HOUSE LOTS, AND CERTAIN OTHER PRIVILEGES.

CONTENTS.

Section 1. 2. Fee-simple titles to be granted to natives occupying certain lands.
3. Land commission empowered to grant fee-simple titles.
4. Certain government lands on each island to be offered for sale.
5. House lots not to exceed one quarter of an acre.
6. Grants of kalo ground to be limited to actual cultivation by each claimant.
7. Certain rights reserved to natives.

Be it enacted by the House of Nobles and Representatives of the Hawaiian Islands, in Legislative council assembled:

That the following sections which were passed by the King, in privy council on the 21st of December, A.D. 1849, when the legislature was not in session, be and are hereby confirmed; and that certain other provisions be inserted, as follows:

1. That fee-simple titles, free of commutation, be and are hereby granted to all native tenants, who occupy and improve any portion of any government land, for the lands they so occupy and improve, and whose claims to said lands shall be recognized as genuine by the land commission: Provided, however, that this resolution shall not extend to konohiki or other persons having the care of government lands, or to the house lots and other lands in which the government have an interest in the districts of Honolulu, Lahaina and Hilo.

2. By and with the consent of the King and chiefs in privy council assembled, it is hereby resolved, that fee-simple titles, free of commutation, be and are hereby granted to all native tenants who occupy and improve any lands other than those mentioned in the preceding resolution, held by the King or any chief or konohiki for the land they so occupy and improve: Provided, however, that this resolution shall not extend to house lots or other lands situated in the districts of Honolulu, Lahaina and Hilo.

3. That the board of commissioners to quiet land titles be, and is hereby empowered to award fee-simple titles in accordance with the foregoing resolutions: to define and separate the portions of lands belonging to different individuals; and to provide for an equitable exchange of such different portions, where it can be done, so that each man’s land may be by itself.
4. That a certain portion of the government lands in each island shall be set apart, and placed in the hands of special agents, to be disposed of in lots of from one to fifty acres, in fee-simple, to such natives as may not be otherwise furnished with sufficient land, at a minimum price of fifty cents per acre.

5. In granting to the people, their house lots in fee-simple, such as are separate and distinct from their cultivated lands, the amount of land in each of said house lots shall not exceed one quarter of an acre.

6. In granting to the people their cultivated grounds, or kalo lands, they shall only be entitled to what they have really cultivated, and which lie in the form of cultivated lands; and not such as the people may have cultivated in different spots, with the seeming intention of enlarging their lots; nor shall they be entitled to the waste lands.

7. When the landlords have taken alodial titles to their lands, the people on each of their lands, shall not be deprived of the right to take firewood, house timber, aho cord, thatch, or ti leaf, from the land on which they live, for their own private use. should they need them, but they shall not have a right to take such articles to sell for profit. They shall also inform the landlord or his agent, and proceed with his consent. The people shall also have a right to drinking water, and running water, and the right of way. The springs of water, and running water, and roads shall be free to all, should they need them, on all lands granted in fee-simple; Provided, that this shall not be applicable to wells and water courses which individuals have made for their own use.

Done and passed at the council house in Honolulu, this 6th day of August, A. D. 1850.

Keoni Ana. Kamemeha.
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Chapter 6 – Findings and Implications

# Glossary of Hawaiian Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahupua’a</td>
<td>Land division usually extending from the uplands to the sea, so called because the boundary was marked by a heap (ahu) of stones surmounted by an image of a pig (pua’a) or because a pig or other tribute was laid on the altar as tax to chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ali‘i</td>
<td>Chief, chiefess, officer, ruler, monarch, peer, headman, noble, aristocrat, king, queen, commander.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiau</td>
<td>Pre-Christian place of worship, shrine; some heiau were elaborately constructed stone platforms, others simple earth terraces. Many are preserved today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ili</td>
<td>Land section, next in importance to ahupua’a and usually a subdivision of an ahupua’a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ili ‘aina</td>
<td>Land area. An ‘ili land division whose chief pays tribute to the chief of the ahupua’a of which it is a part, rather than directly to the king.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalana</td>
<td>Division of land smaller than a moku or district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konohiki</td>
<td>Headman of an ahupua’a land division under the chief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuleana</td>
<td>Small piece of property, as within an ahupua’a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maka‘ainana</td>
<td>Commoner, populace, people in general; citizen subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mō‘ī</td>
<td>King, sovereign, monarch, majesty, ruler, queen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Okana</td>
<td>A district or subdistrict, usually comprising several ahupua’a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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