

**Kānehūnāmoku: Indigenous Cultural Landscapes and
Biocultural Resources in Hawai'i and the Pacific**

Trisha Kehaulani Watson

Honua Consulting

4348 Waialae Ave. #254

Honolulu, HI 96816

E-mail: watson@honuaconsulting.com

William Ailā Jr.

Department of Land and Natural Resources

State of Hawai'i

E-mail: William.j.aila@hawaii.gov

Kepa Maly

Culture and Historic Preservation for Pūlama Lāna'i

E-mail: kepa@kumupono.com

AdiMeretui Ratunabuabua

Pacific Islands Museums Association

E-mail: pimachair@gmail.com

Abstract

Responding to the effort to protect both natural and cultural resources within the marine environment for the benefit of present and future generations, state and federal resource management agencies have been re-examining their cultural resource preservation mandates.

New understanding of cultural heritage, marine cultural resources, tribes, indigenous peoples, and cultural landscapes is beginning to emerge. It is clear that “all traces of human existence that lie under water and have a cultural or historical character” (UCH) includes much more than simply shipwrecks and aircrafts. The potential for these new definitions to engage local communities and associated disciplines and to address biocultural conservation needs is great, particularly for indigenous communities in Hawai’i and the Pacific who are currently undertaking extraordinary efforts to plan for and protect their resources from climate change and other environmental threats. By integrating indigenous cultural landscapes and their related biocultural resources into a dynamic paradigm on underwater cultural heritage, the field looks to gain allies across stakeholder groups and develop its relevancy for younger generations, thus helping to ensure long-range traction for the preservation of all underwater heritage resources. Participants in this session focus on policy and research issues in indigenous cultural landscapes, and the dynamic nature of cultural heritage management in Hawai’i and across the Pacific.

Keywords: Natural Resources, Cultural Resources, Cultural Heritage, Marine, Resource Management, Preservation, Indigenous Peoples, Cultural Landscapes,

Introduction

Underwater Cultural Heritage refers to all traces of human existence having a culture, historical or archaeological character, which have been partially or totally under water, periodically or continuously, for at least 100 years (UNESCO, 2001). For indigenous peoples in the Pacific, who have lived of and with the ocean as their cultural seascapes for millennia, a substantial amount of their cultural heritage is linked to the sea and submerged resources. These heritages, like other underwater resources, are in grave peril. As a result of the advocacy by groups worldwide, issues pertaining to the cultural resources of indigenous peoples have increased in import and visibility. Responding to this effort to protect both natural and cultural resources within the marine environment for the benefit of present and future generations, state and federal resource management agencies have been re-examining their cultural resource preservation mandates. New understanding of cultural heritage, marine cultural resources, tribes, indigenous peoples, and cultural landscapes is beginning to emerge. This new understanding reflects calls for enhancements of the Rights of Indigenous People. It is clear that “all traces of human existence that lie under water and have a cultural or historical character” (UCH) includes much more than simply shipwrecks and aircrafts, but a rich array of cultural resources valued by Indigenous Peoples.

The potential for these new definitions to engage local communities and associated disciplines and to address biocultural conservation needs is great, particularly for indigenous communities in Hawai'i and the Pacific who are currently undertaking extraordinary efforts to plan for and protect their resources from climate change and other environmental threats. By integrating indigenous cultural landscapes and their related biocultural resources into a dynamic paradigm on underwater cultural heritage, the field looks to gain allies across stakeholder groups and develop its relevancy for younger generations, thus helping to ensure long-range traction for the preservation of all underwater heritage resources. Participants in this session will focus on policy and research issues in indigenous cultural landscapes, and the dynamic nature of cultural heritage management in Hawai'i and across the Pacific. The goal of this paper is to articulate the status of cultural heritage activities in the U.S. and the Pacific and then provide a range of examples of how different local areas have used planning documents to guide community-based preservation activities. Through this comparison and the illustration of local examples, a promising intellectual landscape emerges. While there are certainly challenges in the field, it is nonetheless a time of great promise and potential. Cultural heritage in the Pacific is rich and dynamic, but there is still a great deal of work to be done if managers are to fully embrace the potential of this heritage. The reference to Kānehūnāmoku is intended to reflect that history and potential. Kānehūnāmoku is the secret land of Kāne. A mythical land of the gods, it is a valued resource associated with Hawai'i's cultural heritage.

In myth Kane and Kanaloa are represented as gods living in the bodies of men in an earthly paradise situated in a floating cloudland or other sacred and remote spot where they drink awa and are fed from a garden patch of never-failing growth. Often this land is located upon one of the twelve sacred islands under the control of Kane believed to lie off the Hawaiian group "within easy reach of and having frequent intercourse with it." These islands are frequently mentioned in ancient chants and stories before the last Paa migration from Tahiti. Today they are called the "lost islands" or "islands hidden by the gods." At sunrise or sunset they may still be seen on the distant horizon, sometimes touched with a reddish light. They may lie under the sea or upon its surface, approach close to land or be raised and float in the air according to the will of the gods. They are sacred and must not be pointed at.

The land of Kane-huna-moku (Hidden land of Kane) is one of these islands. Here live Kane and Kanaloa with other spirits who are Kane's direct descendants; such as, "Kane of the thunder," "Kane of the water of life," "Kane who shakes the earth," twenty of whom are listed by Rice. It is a middle land between heaven and earth where spirits enjoy all the delights of earth without labor and without death, and "in extreme old age return to earth, either in the bodies of men or as spirits," or "become gods and live in the clouds." Kepelino calls it the land where the first man was made. Here he lived until Kumuhonua transgressed the law of Kane and was driven from this good land. "There is no land to be compared to it in excellence." Hawaiians today say that this land had its birth from Niu-roa-hiki, a land belonging to Hawaii but which does not approach these islands, and that those who have kept thetapus may go there after death (Beckwith, 1976).

Sacred places, those that "may lie under the sea or upon its surface, approach close to land or be raised and float in the air according to the will of the gods" have long been part of the cultural narrative of the Pacific. They include tangible and intangible resources. They are landscapes that reach out across space and time. They include natural resources, as indigenous peoples believe resources to have both biological and cultural value. Increased understandings of the cultures of the Pacific only serve to strengthen the field of maritime history. There is a need to share learning and education within the field. The Hawaiian concept put engaged here is "a`o aku, a`o mai," the traditional Hawaiian process and value of reciprocal learning. This paper expresses both a need for shared learning as a means of building a stronger, more diverse discipline. "Makawalu" as a cultural value that can further inform and enrich an increasingly diversified range of inquiry. Makawalu literally means "eight eyes," yet conceptually reflects an approach that integrates numerous ways of seeing or knowing. A makawalu methodology would be one that considers the many different ways a community can approach or see a resource. This enables an individual to see a resource for its biological and cultural value. This is a concept not only applicable to a new understanding of cultural heritage, marine cultural resources, tribes, indigenous peoples, and cultural landscapes, but a concept that may frame emerging ethical issues related to underwater heritage and use of resources discovered at historical sites.

The approaches that come from a broadened understanding of heritage and resources offer not only opportunity to explore the world around us, but the world within us. As Epeli Hau'ofa wrote: "Oceania is vast, Oceania is expanding, Oceania is hospitable and generous, Oceania is humanity rising from the depths of brine and regions of fire deeper still, Oceania is us" (Hau'ofa, 2008). The lessons, approaches and case studies offered herein demonstrate the potential of this time we share now. It is a potential to not only explore the world below the ocean's surface, but opportunity to rediscover our own history and heritage, and through that rediscover our past commitment to conservation values that will sustain us into the future.

An Evolution of Underwater Cultural Heritage in Hawai'i: A Move towards an Integrated Cultural Seascape Approach

Hawai'i's marine protected areas (MPAs) offer interesting examples in the potential challenges of different approaches to addressing emerging cultural heritage needs. Both located within the Hawaiian archipelago, the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary (Sanctuary) and the Papahānaumokuākea National Marine Monument (Monument) both offer interesting and differing histories on the treatment of cultural heritage. Whereas the Sanctuary has focused on community-based deliverables that enrich current traditional practices and the ability of practitioners to enhance their own knowledge, the Monument has elected to pursue an approach to culture that keeps itself largely separated from other disciplines and stakeholder groups. The latter has also intentionally elected to keep cultural activities isolated within the Hawaiian community, referring to this approach as being "beyond integration" (Lewis and Bertelmann, 2013). These varying approaches offer communities across the Pacific valuable opportunities to assess the efficacy of differing approach to cultural heritage, providing occasion for Pacific Islanders to shape heritage activities in their own island communities. The hope is that through studying past activities; indigenous peoples can determine the most effective means by which to protect submerged resources within their regions.

The Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument was established by President George W. Bush through Presidential Proclamation No. 8031 on June 16, 2006 through authority delegated under the Antiquities Act, 16 U.S.C. 431-433. Unlike the Sanctuary, which aims to develop an integrated approach to cultural resources and scientific activities, the Monument elected to largely separate these activities. The first of the Monument's priorities under their Management Plan regarding culture and history was to "Identify and prioritize scientific and Native Hawaiian cultural research needs within 18 months". Five years later, a comprehensive plan on this issue

remains incomplete, compared to its natural resources science plan, which has exists for years. Conversely, the Monument caused considerable division in the Hawaiian community. In a letter drafted to President Bush in 2008, a group of Hawaiians wrote in opposition to the national marine monument in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI): “The Native Hawaiian communities have followed the progress of the Pew Foundation’s attempts to establish another national marine monument in CNMI with anger, trepidation, and despair. There strong and passionate emotions are universally felt by Hawaiians whenever the word ‘Papahānaumokuākea’ is mentioned. This is the name your administration picked for our islands. When you creased the national marine monument of Northwest Hawaiian Islands, it was done without the participation of the Native Hawaiian people” (‘Aha Kiole Advisory Committee, 2008). While there was a select group of Native Hawaiians involved in the establishment of the Monument, it would be impossible to deny that the process undertaken created considerable strain within the Hawaiian community, particularly among elders and fishermen. As a result, considerable hostility persists about marine protected areas, making it difficult for other programs to pursue conservation agendas.

The Monument was awarded World Heritage designation in 2010. The inscription reads:

Papahānaumokuākea is a vast and isolated linear cluster of small, low lying islands and atolls, with their surrounding ocean, roughly 250 km to the northwest of the main Hawaiian Archipelago and extending over some 1931 km. The area has deep cosmological and traditional significance for living Native Hawaiian culture, as an ancestral environment, as an embodiment of the Hawaiian concept of kinship between people and the natural world, and as the place where it is believed that life originates and to where the spirits return after death. On two of the islands, Nihoa and Makumanamana [sic], there are archaeological remains relating to pre-European settlement and use. Much of the monument is made up of pelagic and deep-water habitats, with notable features such as seamounts and submerged banks, extensive coral reefs and lagoons. It is one of the largest marine protected areas (MPAs) in the world(UNESCO).

Even this nomination was met with opposition and highlighted how the lack of an integrated and inclusive program fueled conflict between community groups and conservation programs (Akana, 2010). As a result of this conflict and despite the overwhelming and documented

benefits of protected areas and heritage designations (Heinemann et al., 2005), many Hawaiians remain resistant to embracing the opportunities available through marine protected areas. Comparatively, the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary was designated through an act of Congress by the Hawaiian Islands National Marine Sanctuary Act (“HINMSA” or “Act”) on November 4, 1992 (Subtitle C, P.L. 102-587, the Oceans Act of 1992) as a single-species sanctuary to protect humpback whales and their habitat, which lies within the shallow (less than 600 feet), warm waters surrounding the main Hawaiian Islands and constitutes one of the world’s most important humpback whale habitats. Section 2304 of the Act established the Sanctuary’s purposes as follows:

- (1) to protect humpback whales and their habitat within the Sanctuary;
- (2) to education and interpret for the public the relationship of humpback whales to the Hawaiian Islands marine environment;
- (3) to manage human uses of the Sanctuary consistent with the HINMSA and Title III of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA), as amended; and
- (4) to provide for the identification of marine resources and ecosystems of national significance for possible inclusion in the Sanctuary.

These purposes are consistent with the overall goals and objectives of the National Marine Sanctuary Program (NMSP), which are to: enhance resource protection through comprehensive and coordinated conservation and management; support, promote, and coordinate scientific research on, and monitoring of, site-specific marine resources; enhance public awareness, understanding, appreciation and wise use of the marine environment; and facilitate to the extent compatible with the primary objective of resource protection, public and private uses of national marine sanctuaries.

In 1997, the Sanctuary prepared and adopted a Management Plan in consultation with interested persons and appropriate Federal, State and local authorities, as required under Section 2306 of the HINMSA. Under 2306(a) of the HINMSA, the purposes of the Management Plan were to:

- (1) facilitate all public and private uses of the Sanctuary (including uses of Hawaiian natives customarily and traditionally exercised for subsistence,

- cultural and religious purposes) consistent with the primary objective of the protection of humpback whales and their habitat;
- (2) set forth the allocation of Federal and State enforcement responsibility, as jointly agreed by the Secretary and the State of Hawaii;
 - (3) identify research needs and establish a long-term ecological monitoring program with respect to humpback whales and their habitat;
 - (4) identify alternative sources of funding needed to fully implement the plan's provisions and supplement appropriations [under section 2307 of this subtitle] and section 313 of the NMSA (16 U.S.C. § 1444);
 - (5) ensure coordination and cooperation between Sanctuary managers and other Federal, State and County authorities with jurisdiction within or adjacent to the Sanctuary; and
 - (6) promote education among users of the Sanctuary and the general public about conservation of the humpback whales, their habitat, and other marine resources.

The 1997 Management Plan continues to further articulate coordination in the management of the Sanctuary through working relationships with appropriate Federal, State and county agencies to ensure the Sanctuary mandate through a cooperative management strategy. Acknowledgement of State jurisdiction over State resources was specifically illustrated through designation of the Sanctuary boundary. The Management Plan specifically states:

The establishment of the Sanctuary in no way conveys, or intends to convey, to NOAA any title or ownership of Hawaii's submerged lands. These lands, including those known as ceded lands, continue to be held in trust by the State of Hawaii. The Sanctuary will exist as a co-steward of the Sanctuary and its resources. Should the status of the submerged lands change at some time in the future (i.e., lands are conveyed to a sovereign Hawaiian nation), the Sanctuary will work with the appropriate entities to redefine its role if necessary.

In 1998, the Compact Agreement for the Coordinated Management of the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary ("Compact") was executed between the State of Hawai'i ("State") and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration ("NOAA") of the United States Department of Commerce for the purpose of clarifying the relative jurisdiction, authority, and conditions of the NOAA-State partnership for managing the Sanctuary. It clarified

the State's continuing authority and jurisdiction over its State waters, submerged lands, and other resources within the Sanctuary. The Compact further established provisions with respect to NOAA's collaboration with the State of Hawai'i on Sanctuary management issues.

The purposes and policies of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA, 16 U.S.C. 1434(e)) requires NOAA to periodically review and evaluate the implementation of management plans and goals for each national marine sanctuary. Accordingly, NOAA must revise management plans and regulations as necessary to ensure that national marine sanctuaries continue to best conserve, protect, and enhance nationally significant living and cultural resources. The current management plan review began in 2010, and this process will result in a new management plan for the sanctuary. The target for completing a draft revised management plan is 2013, and a final revised plan is targeted for completion in 2014. The management plan review process will help to evaluate gaps in existing marine conservation efforts in Hawai'i, and identify potential roles for the sanctuary in future management. Learning from the challenges with the Monument, Native Hawaiians engaged with the process early and successfully advocated for an increased commitment to cultural heritage within the sanctuary. Additionally, stakeholders from a range of disciplines worked together continuously to mutually educate each other and develop materials and guidance that acknowledged existing challenges which innovating solutions and ways forward. So although the sanctuary has considerably less resources than the Monument, it can be argued that the sanctuary has a more robust cultural heritage program as a result of its integrated and collaborative approach.

The success of these changes that have occurred in the sanctuary rest on three key points:

- 1) A sustained and codified commitment to cultural heritage and resources integrated across the sanctuary program and activities;
- 2) Sustained and significant engagement with the Native Hawaiian community enhanced by community capacity building opportunities that enable Hawaiians to remain effectively engaged in the management of the sanctuary;
- 3) A strong partnership with the state co-managing agency that retains jurisdiction of state waters, submerged resources and cultural resources.

As the Management Plan Review began, the Sanctuary focused on increasing representation of Native Hawaiians on the Sanctuary Advisory Council. Through a vigorous recruitment process, the number of Native Hawaiians on the Sanctuary Advisory Council increased from one (1) representative (of sixteen voting members) to seven (7) representatives (of eighteen voting

members). This increased the percentage of Native Hawaiians on the Sanctuary Advisory Council from 6% to 38%. The Sanctuary also worked to improve cultural content and programming. A Native Hawaiian working group was formed to develop recommendations for the Management Plan. In December 2010, the Sanctuary Advisory Council (council) approved the formation of the Native Hawaiian Working Group for the purpose of developing recommendations, which describe the role of traditional perspectives in the future identity of the sanctuary, and provide a framework for those perspectives to guide appropriate management actions.

In April 2011, a work plan for the working group was presented during a two-day meeting of the council. Accordingly, council members in attendance who were interested in participating in the working group had the opportunity to convene for the first time and discuss an appropriate way to conduct business. Members decided they preferred face-to-face interactions so initially working group discussions were limited to opportunistic conversations between individual members. In July 2011, the working group gathered for a full-day meeting on O'ahu to discuss relevant background information and perspectives to inform the development of their management recommendations. Working group members were provided with scoping comments associated with Native Hawaiian issues. This first face-to-face meeting provided the foundation for the working group to define the direction and scope of their recommendations.

A set of draft recommendations were developed from the initial meeting and in September 2011, the working group gathered for a second full-day meeting on O'ahu to review and provide input.

In November 2011, the working group met in a final face-to-face meeting to finalize their recommendations. The meeting was open to the public to allow comment and input before the management recommendations were finalized.

The group worked for thirteen (13) months on the recommendations, contributed over 500 hours of professional volunteer time and produced a document containing four (4) goals, four (4) objectives, and thirty (30) policy recommendations. The recommendations were adopted at the Sanctuary Advisory Council meeting in January 2012. A standing Native Hawaiian subcommittee was established at the January 2012 meeting, thus codifying in the advisory council's governing charter a permanent advisory role for Native Hawaiians into the

management process. Public meetings were deferred until such time as a technical expert workshop could be convened jointly with the Native Hawaiian and research subcommittees. In January 2012, the Sanctuary Advisory Council also recommended that the sanctuary convene a workshop for experts to discuss incorporating Native Hawaiian cultural management practices and Western scientific knowledge into the sanctuary management plan.

In July 2012, a group of technical experts gathered in Maunaloa, O'ahu, to reflect on the implementation of aloha 'āina (deep love for the land and sea) in an ecosystem-based management approach that has a strong basis in customary Native Hawaiian management practices and traditions. Workshop participants were invited based on their roles in their communities and relevant research or academic expertise in marine ecosystems or Native Hawaiian practices. Many of the participants represented experience in all of these areas.

The Aloha 'Āina workshop provided guidance that can be applied to a range of resource management entities and their respective kuleana (responsibility) to resources and communities, and this framework was presented to the Native Hawaiian and Research Subcommittees of the Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council. After review by both standing subcommittees, the framework was presented to the entire Sanctuary Advisory Council in September 2012. The council voted unanimously and enthusiastically to send the framework forward to sanctuary management for consideration in the management plan review. Additionally, the council advised that the document be used as a basis for both a handbook and trainings for conservation managers. While cultural heritage should be led and informed by indigenous peoples, the sanctuary's inter-disciplinary approach effectively illustrates the potential benefits from a process that integrate both western and indigenous perspectives. Reciprocal learning and shared implementation of initiatives enhances multiple program outputs. Similar evolutions have occurred across the U.S. and the Pacific, all to benefit of indigenous peoples and cultural heritage programs. They are compared below, as they offer extraordinary opportunity for maritime heritage programs to expand in a manner that builds community support and alliances that benefit preservation.

Discussion

Across geographies and scales, diverse groups of experts are coming together to advocate for enhancing approaches to understanding and preserving cultural resources. In addition to the work undertaken in Hawai'i, the National Marine Protected Areas Center engaged their Cultural Heritage Resources Working Group (CHWG) of the Marine Protected Area Federal Advisory

Council (MPA FAC) to make recommendations to improve the comprehensive conservation of cultural heritage resources within the national system. From their resulting white paper:

The evaluation revealed what tribal and indigenous peoples from many places have known for generations: the human family is an integral part of and has special responsibilities to many ecosystems. Cultural heritage resources offer records of these relationships and carry with them lessons for the future based on the wisdom and mistakes of the past. The group, which includes authors of this paper, recommended the Cultural Landscape Approach as a management framework because it offers the best available means to remember and learn from our past, and to understand human and natural influences on marine places and their ecosystems over time and into the future. This holistic approach integrates the complexities and power of contemporary science with historical, archaeological, and cultural knowledge and the human values of love of place. Adopting a Cultural Landscape Approach strengthens our will and enhances our capacities to steward wisely the world we inhabit (Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee, 2011).

Similarly, countries in the Pacific worked together towards the preservation of cultural heritage through strategic and coordinated actions. These collaborations developed the Pacific 2009 Program (2000-2009) through several regional consultations and the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee Meeting was held in Christchurch in 2007 under the chairmanship of Mr. TeHeuheu, Paramount Chief of the NgatiTuwharetoa Maori people of Aotearoa (New Zealand). This success directly resulted in an increase in the number of Pacific state parties of the World Heritage Convention as well as the World Heritage Sites in the region.

Following the Pacific 2009 Program, the Pacific state parties prepared and discussed the Pacific World Heritage Action Plan (2010-2015) at the 2009 Pacific World Heritage Workshop held in Maupiti. The Pacific World Heritage Workshop (Apia, 5-9 September 2011) reviewed progress in its implementation and updated the Action Plan by taking into account the outcome of the 2nd Periodic Reporting Exercise in Asia and the Pacific region. At the request of the Pacific member states, the Pacific Heritage Hub (PHH) was established at the University of the South Pacific in Suva in February 2013.

Key points from the two documents are provided below.

Comparative Analysis: Evolving Approaches in the U.S. and the Pacific

Recommendations for Integrated Management Using a Cultural Landscape Approach in the National MPA System, 2011 (NOAA, Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee)		Pacific World Heritage Action Plan 2010-2015 (UNESCO, World Heritage Convention in the Pacific)
Vision Statement	Achieving and maintaining healthy coastal and marine ecosystems requires a fundamental understanding of the relationships between people and the environment. Cultural heritage, which belongs to all people, emphasizes these connections, whether that heritage takes the material form of, for example, maritime resources (such as shipwrecks), natural resources (such as marine species and habitats), or sacred places. Through the national MPA system, cultural relationships among people and historic, natural, and place-based heritage resources are preserved and perpetuated in ways that recognize and share multiple cultural voices and knowledge systems for the benefit of all.	We share a dream that our Pacific Islands' heritage is protected and enriched for future generations.
Preamble	None	We the people of the Pacific Islands offer a unique contribution to the World Heritage community, through the enormous wealth of cultural diversity, as well as of the island and marine biodiversity of our region, much of which is endemic, and covers one third of the earth's

surface.

For us, indigeneity is inseparable from heritage. Our indigeneity has the following characteristics:

- Heritage in the Pacific defines our cultural identity and remains inseparable from our social, economic and environmental well-being, now and for future generations;
- Our heritage is holistic, embracing all life, both tangible and intangible, and is understood through our cultural traditions;
- There is an inseparable connection between the outstanding seascapes and landscapes in the Pacific Islands region, which are woven together by the rich cultural, historical and genealogical relationships of Pacific Island peoples;
- The region contains a series of spectacular and highly powerful spiritually-valued natural features and cultural places. These places are related to the origins of peoples, the land and sea, and other sacred stories;
- The Pacific is a region of distinct and diverse responses to oceanic environments;
- Protection of our heritage must be based on respect for and understanding and maintenance

of the traditional cultural practices, indigenous knowledge and systems of land and sea tenure in the Pacific.

Challenges

The guiding principles and the integrated management approach proposed here for cultural heritage resources will help address the two important cultural heritage challenges:

Attracting existing MPAs that have cultural heritage resources which meet national system eligibility criteria to join the national system; and Reducing uncertainties in recognizing cultural heritage resources within existing and potential MPAs.

As integrated and adaptive management is increasingly practiced, the Cultural Landscape Approach (CLA), as described below, will help MPA managers nationwide to identify and adopt policies and practices that manage cultural and natural resources at the ecosystem and landscape levels.

The protection of cultural heritage resources in marine areas is often separated from that of natural resources. In practice, this divide is often administrative in origin. The effective ecosystem-based management called for in the National Ocean Policy and advocated by countless scientists and natural resource management professionals recognizes that the connections between living things and the physical environment are

We recognise that the Pacific region continues to be the most under-represented region on the World Heritage List. In redressing this imbalance in representation and endeavoring to continue to build on the aforementioned achievements, the Pacific Island States face major challenges. These include:

- Limited awareness of Pacific cultural and natural heritage outside the region;
- Lack of adequate representation of the unique and special heritage of the Pacific on the World Heritage List;
- Large geographic area, isolation and resource limitations that restrict access to information and assistance and the ability of Pacific people to contribute to global forums;
- The character and scope of the UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention administration for the Pacific region, which masks some of the specific important national and regional heritage issues;
- Some people are represented by States Parties outside the region (UK, France, USA,

multifaceted and often inseparable. Managing places using an ecosystem-based approach requires the simultaneous understanding of cultural and natural factors and resources. Indeed, as many indigenous cultures have known for millennia, and as the scientific community is increasingly recognizing, humans are an important part of the ecosystem, and the human dimensions of the environment must be considered.

In contrast to previous cultural resource management paradigms, which approached resources individually for study and preservation, CLA uses cultural landscapes as an analytical framework to understand places and their associated resources. Analogous and complementary to ecosystem-based management, CLA examines the relationships among living and non-living resources, and their environment. An MPA may involve multiple ecosystems and resources, both cultural and natural, which span the land/sea boundary. A cultural landscape may extend far beyond the boundaries of an individual MPA, and may help identify ecological and cultural connections both within and between MPAs. The approach emphasizes cultural relationships to the environment, and highlights connections between human behavior and the condition of marine ecosystems over time.

Adoption of the CLA by the national system would

Chile) which can limit their ability to have sites inscribed on the World Heritage List;

- Limited financial and human resources, skills and capacities within communities and institutions to adequately manage the region's cultural and natural heritage;

- A need for increased awareness within communities of the great value that World Heritage Convention contributes to the protection and vitality of cultural and biological diversity;

- Political instability and a lack of good governance, which are significant barriers to heritage conservation in general, and World Heritage implementation in particular;

- Greater external challenges and threats in the Pacific than in most other regions of the world, with less capacity to respond to their impacts. Examples of these external influences include climate change, financial instability, globalisation of society and economy, technological development, commercialisation, energy supply and demand, natural disasters and tourism growth;

- Climate change is of particular concern because the Pacific region is especially vulnerable to its impacts and faces many difficulties in

represent an important step toward the meaningful integration of human culture and the natural environment in managing MPAs. As charged in Executive Order 13158, the national system, with its equal focus on natural heritage, cultural heritage, and living renewable resources has a unique potential to protect and conserve our natural and human environment in ways that simultaneously recognize the need to use, preserve, and respect our special marine places. The CHRWG recommends the following actions in order to move the national system toward fulfilling its charge.

adapting to and mitigating its effects;

□ The impacts on the environment and resources (both tangible and intangible) are widespread and sometimes difficult to monitor (e.g. spread of pests and diseases), which can limit our ability to protect heritage;

Goals,
and
Recommendations

[In relation to cultural heritage governance,] we recommend that the national system partners:

Advance and, where practical, adopt integrated cultural heritage governance practices that advance the National Ocean Policy and embrace ecosystem-based management principles that recognize and protect maritime cultural heritage;

Recognize that diverse cultural heritage management approaches exist at the local, state, tribal, and national levels, and accommodate flexible practices that best align local knowledge and circumstances with the principles embodied in the National Ocean Policy; and

Explicitly recognize the place-based authority and rights of tribal and indigenous peoples in

In the face of these challenges, our goals are to strengthen the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Pacific Island region and increase local, regional and global awareness, recognition and support for the conservation of the unique cultural and natural heritage of the Pacific in a way that takes into account the traditions, aspirations, opportunities and challenges of its people.

Main Actions

1. Encouraging dialogue between communities, agencies and organisations within and outside the Pacific region to identify, promote and protect the region's outstanding cultural and natural heritage to the global community;
2. Enhancing local communities' awareness of the benefits of preserving their cultural and natural heritage,

establishing and managing MPAs.

[In relation to the MPA Inventory and National Systems Recommendations,] we recommend that the National Marine Protected Areas Center (MPA Center), in concert with national system partners:

Reanalyze the MPA Inventory using the expanded cultural heritage definitions to identify cultural heritage resources both inside and adjacent to existing MPAs and develop a more comprehensive census of heritage resources associated with MPAs;

Expand analysis of existing national system MPAs to identify a greater diversity of cultural and natural resources that would benefit from additional protection and management;

Target outreach and assistance to MPA managers, particularly in tribes and indigenous groups, to encourage further inclusion of existing and potential cultural heritage MPAs in the national system;

Provide, improve, and coordinate MPA manager training programs and initiatives regarding cultural heritage resources, with additional attention given to tribal and indigenous knowledge and authorities; and

and encouraging community participation (particularly by youth and women) in all stages of the World Heritage process.

3. Supporting successful nominations for representation on the World Heritage list, by increasing in-country capacity to identify suitable potential sites and prepare nomination dossiers that fully meet the requirements of the World Heritage Convention.

4. Increasing in-country capacity at all levels, inclusive of indigenous people to develop best practices, management plans and arrangements to ensure effective protection of Pacific heritage sites, in a way that takes into account and recognises traditional knowledge and conservation practices for land, air and sea.

5. Assisting in the development of in-country heritage expertise in the Pacific by supporting technical assistance, where requested, including the development of a network of partner institutions within the region capable of providing technical services in the area of heritage conservation in a coordinated and integrated way.

6. Building partnerships between communities, heritage agencies, regional organisations, educational institutions and non-government organisations in the region, including the promotion of multilateral, bilateral cooperation and twinning programs between World

Expand educational and outreach ties to museums, schools, and cultural heritage programs.

In order to fulfill the intent of the EO, we further recommend that:

DOC and DOI increase capacity for the updated inventory and evaluation of coastal and marine cultural resources. Specifically, resources should be provided to the MPA Center for cultural heritage staffing and programs necessary to implement these recommendations.

[In addition to a cultural landscape approach,] we recommend that national system partners:

Adopt a cultural landscape approach as a means to protect cultural heritage resources and advance ecosystem-based management of MPAs;

Develop best practices to bring together all available knowledge of cultural heritage resources, including the incorporation of tribal and indigenous sources; and

Apply the expanded definition of cultural heritage resources embodied in CLA, which includes the National Register of Historic Places criteria, to manage MPAs.

Heritage sites and countries of the Pacific and beyond.

7. Assisting communities to develop and implement environmentally sustainable economic growth through heritage-related enterprises

8. Sharing information and data bases related to heritage (through properly informed consensus), through regional strategies and communication networks that link island communities.

9. Supporting the development and implementation of effective policies and legislation for heritage by Governments in the region, including access and benefits sharing within the larger development portfolio.

10. Establishing sustainable financing arrangements to support the effective conservation of Pacific heritage and building on other available funding sources and in-kind contributions.

11. Sustaining the ongoing consultative process by bringing together the representatives of the Pacific Islands States and Territories on a regular basis.

While the goals, challenges, and recommendations of the two regions are not identical, they are certainly complimentary. This illustrates the high potential for collaboration and exchange in helping to move these plans forward. Both regions have worked with their existing resources to implement their recommendations.

These complimentary developments are critical as climate events continue to occur in the Pacific. While the United States has been largely disconnected from activities in the South Pacific and Oceania when compared to other industrialized nations like China, Australia or member of the European Union, the United States still nonetheless maintains a considerable interest in the area through Hawai'i and the U.S. insular areas. The growing interest in cultural heritage by the U.S. MPA FAC thereby creates potential opportunity for more leadership from an alliance of industrialized nations to better support the protection of indigenous cultural heritage in the Pacific, particularly among small-island developing states (SIDS). Such support is already overdue, but as impacts of climate change continue to severely impact communities in Oceania, securing partnerships to effectively plan for and respond to these impacts is a necessity.

Below is a range of case studies that provide valuable examples of how the different regions are operationalizing their programs. By engaging a range of different ways with different partners in implementation, heritage activities are enhanced and thereby become an issue around which community is built rather than divided. They offer multiple examples of how a range of local and regional partnerships can be developed, which help to protect and secure cultural heritage as local levels.

Applying an Integrated Approach to Heritage Preservation: Emerging Case Studies from Hawai'i and the Pacific

Throughout Hawai'i and the Pacific, groups have found innovative ways to use their limited resources to effectively implement heritage goals. One of the primary needs across both regions has been to build awareness about cultural heritage and cultural resources. The Fiji example highlights a successful mapping toolkit, which helps to build capacity in local communities, specifically helping to educate government agencies on intangible cultural heritage needs. The permit streaming project for Hawaiian fishponds illustrates how government agencies can help to empower communities to protect and preserve their cultural heritage resources. Finally, Lāna'i's heritage activities show the great potential of private partners in community heritage programs.

Intangible Cultural Heritage in Fiji

Cultural heritage in the Pacific consists largely of Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH), which includes traditional stories, songs, knowledges, practices, customs, craftsmanship and natural resource management. Over the last decade, Pacific Island nations have worked successfully to protect these valuable resources. The cooperative brought together communities and stakeholders to develop mechanisms for identifying and protecting these resources. Critical to this effort was the implementation of capacity building programs that provided stakeholders, resource managers and decision-makers the ability to understand the resources from the community and cultural perspectives.

The Pacific Intangible Cultural Heritage Mapping Toolkit was developed by Sipiriano Nemani, Policy and Planning Analyst at the Department of National Heritage, Culture and Arts in Suva, Fiji, and commissioned by the Human Development Program of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community. The toolkit is based on Mr. Nemani's experience as part of a team that pioneered the development of a cultural mapping project whose goal was to determine and record the intangible cultural heritage or traditional knowledge of indigenous Fijians (or itaukei) and other peoples. In many cases, this cultural heritage is on the verge of disappearing, and requires urgent revitalization. Mr. Nemani was instrumental in formulating research strategies and a methodology for the mapping initiative, which has been widely appreciated and adopted as a best practice approach in some Pacific Island countries since its inception in 2004. As a result, many of the examples in the toolkit are derived from Fiji, although they can be applied to other Pacific Island nations. The project is part of the Government of Fiji's initiative to ensure that the intangible cultural heritage of Fiji's indigenous people is safeguarded. While many people may see this as a top-down approach in data collection and archiving, the government sees it otherwise. In this regard, communities and elders are seen as key holders of knowledge systems, and their wishes were always respected when undertaking mapping and subsequent dissemination of the information they imparted. These knowledge holders generally have limited access to recording tools, which is why the government - which has the required resources - became involved. It is important to establish a way that traditional knowledge can be stored and transmitted to the next generation before that knowledge becomes lost.

The toolkit is written from the perspective of a government cultural agency that is the initiator of a cultural mapping project. However, this does not stop communities from using the

mechanisms outlined in this toolkit, adapting them to their own situation, and initiating the project themselves should they have the available resources to facilitate data collection. Doing so would provide a sense of ownership of the initiative, boost the morale of local people in safeguarding their initiative and, in the Pacific way, revitalize and promote the transmission of cultural information (Ratunabuabua, 2012).

Traditional Hawaiian Fishponds: Living Heritages

Pre-contact Hawaii had the largest concentration and complexity of fishponds in all of Polynesia. Hawaiian aquaculture structures were found archipelago-wide, varying in type and scale, and included man-made and natural enclosures of water in which fish and other aquatic resources like crustaceans and edible seaweeds were raised and harvested. The evolution of socio-political complexity in Hawai'i to a primary state created a massive shift in power, ownership, and stewardship of natural resources, including aquaculture:

By the end of the 18th century, more than 300 fishponds were conspicuously owned by the high chiefs. Accessibility to these ponds and their products was limited to the elite minority of the native population – the chiefs and priests. Prehistoric ponds and pond products appear to have been taboo to the vast majority of Hawaiians and to have yielded them no direct benefit. However, indirect benefit came from ownership by the chiefs of exclusive food sources. Royal fishponds and their terrestrial equivalents, the royal gardens (Kō`ele), insured less demand on the commoners' food production resources. Every fish taken from a royal fishpond left its counterpart in natural habitat available to lesser chiefs and commoners. Ownership of one or more fishponds was one of the ultimate, high-status symbols in the status-conscious Hawaiian culture.

Prehistoric fishtraps, on the other hand, apparently were not as important economically since they were less reliable sources of protein. Fishtrap harvest was dependent on the tides, and fishtraps appear to have been of less religious and political significance than fishponds. This is evidenced by the accessibility of fishtraps to commoners as well as to women. ...fishtraps....are artifacts of the overall aquacultural practices ca. 1800. Molokai and Lanai Islands had massive fishtraps as well as fishponds (Apple and Kikuchi, 1975).

The history of Hawaiian fishpond systems, *lokoī`a*, is rich and extensive. According to oral histories, *Hinapukui`a*, whose name translates to “Hina gathering seafood,” is the goddess of

fisherman. She is the wahine (wife or mate) of Kūʻulakai, sister of Hinapukuʻai, Hina gathering vegetative foods, and mother to ʻAiʻai. Hinapukuiʻaʻs Kanaloa (husband or mate), Kūʻulakai, is the god and kupuna of fisherman and is said to have built the first fishpond at Lehoʻula on the island of Maui. Kūʻula, a name for which Kūʻulakai was also known, was said to be kino lua, many bodied -- empowered with mana kupua, supernatural powers, and able to control all the fish in the sea. Kūʻulakai and Hinapukuiʻa lived in Alea-mai on East Maui. They made their residence near Kaiwiopole. It was near Kaiwiopole that Kūʻulakai built the first traditional Hawaiian fishpond in Hāna. Kūʻulakai would share his knowledge of fishing and fishing practices with makaʻāinānā (common citizens) across Hawaiʻi through his son, ʻAiʻai, identified also as a god of fishermen. Written sources and oral traditions tell of ʻAiʻaiʻs extensive travels throughout Hawaiʻi during which he established fishing altars, called kūʻula after his father, and fishing areas, known as koʻa.

Lokoʻiʻa were an important part of Hawaiʻiʻs complex and sustainable natural resource management system. The full-scale development of lokoʻiʻa (fishponds) from mauka (the mountains) to makai (the ocean) dates back over 500 years. Cultivation and propagation centered on many different fresh and salt-water plants and animals, with the primary species being the prized ʻamaʻama (mullet) and ʻawa (milkfish). An inventory in the early 1900s found 360 lokoʻiʻa in the islands and identified 99 active ponds with an estimated annual production total of about 680,000 pounds, including 486,000 pounds of ʻamaʻama and 194,000 pounds of ʻawa. Lokoʻiʻa were extensive operating systems that produced an average of 400–600 pounds per acre per year, a significant amount considering the minimal amount of fishpond “input” and maintenance effort apparent by that time.

Increasing immigration and western influences during the 19th and 20th centuries, coupled with industrialization and urbanization had a devastating impact on the traditional Hawaiian resource management systems. Most fishponds fell into disrepair.

Hawaiian fishpond systems, lokoʻiʻa, are some of Hawaiʻiʻs most significant traditional cultural resources. They are biocultural articulations of Hawaiian innovation in the areas of engineering, education, hydrology, aquaculture and biology. They also illustrate how cultural sites were not isolated features but part of a larger cultural landscape that contributed to a historical narrative that spoke to the holistic living systems of indigenous peoples. They demonstrate traditional Hawaiʻiʻs excellence in sustainability, food sovereignty and natural resource management. In 2011, in response to recommendations from its Sanctuary Advisory Council and the public, the

Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary committed to support local communities in their efforts to increase the use of traditional knowledge in government activities. The initial focus of this commitment has been on restoring traditional Hawaiian fishponds.

In June 2011, an aquaculture workshop was co-hosted by the sanctuary and the University of Hawai'i Aquaculture Program, during which traditional fishpond practitioners advocated for an improved permitting process for the restoration of traditional Hawaiian fishpond systems. The sanctuary then hosted a meeting in March 2012 to facilitate discussions about the potential to streamline the permitting process for fishponds. The Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources' Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (DLNR/OCCL) and the Hawai'i Department of Health participated in this meeting, along with fishpond practitioners and other agency representatives. A de facto team was formed among the NOAA Fisheries Pacific Islands Regional Office, the sanctuary and DLNR/OCCL, to continue the agency coordination effort.

The team also supported a gathering of Hui Mālama Lokol'a, an informal statewide network of fishpond practitioners, by securing funding through University of Hawai'i Sea Grant. Recognizing the need for additional assistance to complete the necessary documentation and applications, Conservation International (Hawai'i Fish Trust) generously agreed to fund a consultant to assist in the process. This effort is critical to the preservation and practice of traditional ecological knowledge and cultural heritage throughout Hawai'i.

Many communities have a renewed interest in the repair and operation of traditional Hawaiian fishponds for their cultural, economic and ecological value. However, due to their shoreline locations, unique ecosystems, engineering and complex biological functioning, Hawaiian fishponds are subject to a myriad of regulations and oversight by a host of different agencies. As a result, community organizations and traditional fishpond practitioners have struggled for decades to maintain and restore fishpond systems. The difficulty of Hawaiian fishpond revitalization is compounded by the unique, fragile, and sometimes rugged environments in which they exist. The end result is that obtaining the necessary permits and approvals to restore, repair, maintain and reconstruction fishponds is both costly and time-consuming. Many restoration efforts have been stymied by this permitting process.

Currently, the State of Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR), through their Office of Conservation and Coastal Lands (OCCL) is pursuing a State Programmatic General Permit (SPGP) from the federal government that will allow the State to streamline the permitting process by using a single application process for the restoration, repair, maintenance and

reconstruction of loko i'a. Fishponds are identified as valuable cultural and ecological resources with benefits for coastal ecosystems and their adjacent communities. These activities will not only protect and preserve the cultural heritage associated with these historic features but stimulate traditional Hawaiian cultural activities and provide social and economic benefits. The project also highlights the benefits of an integrated strategy. By working across agencies and disciplines with an approach that embraces both ecological benefits and cultural heritage, the effort to restore traditional Hawaiian fishponds has reached new heights and unprecedented potential.

Lāna'i: Restoring Cultural Heritage, Uplifting Community

Lāna'i is a meaningful case to turn to in understanding cultural and community sustainability in regards to environmentalism. While all of Hawai'i maintains its livelihood (pre-contact) through sustainable practices and harvesting from only the archipelago and the surrounding oceans resources, Lāna'i's small size and dry environment elevates the significance of aquaculture sustainability. The island has gone through many transformations over the last 200 some years. First entirely inhabited by the indigenous population, later turned into a ranching island (late 1860s). From 1922-1992 James Dole's Hawaiian Pineapple company employed most of the island for pineapple production, earning the name, "The Pineapple Island".

Although these changes have significantly altered the landscape of the island itself the indigenous population's cultural identity and reverence towards this majestic island have remained relatively unscathed. This can be seen through the care in passing on and protecting hundreds of traditional names associated with particular sites on the island while also documenting the islands ahupua'a (districts) that are host to the main irrigation systems that fed the lo'i (gardens) and loko (ponds) and were responsible for the cultivation of all the resources needed for survival. The island itself is approximately 13 ¾ miles long and 13 miles wide, with a land area of 140 square miles (being a little over 90,000 acres). It is sixth (of 8) in size of the main Hawaiian Islands, with its highest point, Lāna'ihale, being 3,379 feet above sea level. The name of the island may be literally translated as Lā (day) [of] Na'i (conquest), being associated with the day the chief Kaululā'au vanquished the evil ghosts from the island. Hawaiians have

lived on the island of Lānaʻi for close to 800 years. Their culture, beliefs, and practices mirrored the natural environment around them. They learned to live within the wealth and limitations of their surroundings. Indeed, archaeological evidence indicates that more than 6,000 people lived sustainably by growing and catching all they needed from the island up until western contact.

A significant component to this sustainable practice was the implementation and use of Loko Iʻa. One of these significant loko iʻa being Waiaʻōpae. The loko iʻa at Waiaʻōpae consists of a low stone wall of approximately 1,500 feet as was traditionally integral to sustaining the life of the community in the immediate area.

Hawaiian Fishpond Study conducted in 1990, Waiaʻōpae was classified as a Type V fishpond. Described as a Loko Iʻa ʻUmeʻiki, the Type V is identified as a fishtrap with various combinations of inward and outward leading lanes. In his field notes, Bishop Museum archaeologist Kenneth Emory described his findings of Waiaʻōpae as follows:

Leaving the south side of the sandy point at Waiaopae, the ruins of an ancient fish trap run out onto the shallow mud flat, follow the shore two to three hundred feet out, and return at a point 1,472 feet from where they left. The wall is now so depleted by wave action that only now and then are parts visible even at low tide” (Emory, 1924).

With the support of the island's new owner, who purchased 98% of the island in 2012, a new preservation program has been instituted that looks to restore and revitalize the cultural heritage of the island. Resources from the new owner are allowing for archaeological work to take place at the fishpond, including educational programs for children and community members that introduce them to all forms of maritime children heritage, including fishponds and shipwrecks. It is a promising program poised to serve as a regional and global model of the role private partners can play in protecting cultural heritage in island communities.

Conclusion

Maritime Underwater Cultural Heritage offers a unique opportunity to integrate proven technology and research methods with a new commitment to biocultural resources and historic properties. Technological advancements make the world beneath the ocean's surface increasingly accessible. As heritage sites become more accessible, this access simultaneously creates opportunity for exploration as well as destruction. Valued resources can be more easily retrieved, posing a threat to *in situ* preservation. For those who seek to protect these resources for their inherent historic and cultural significance, conferences such as these present

opportunities to forge alliances. These alliances must be built across specializations and geographic regions. We all have a great deal we can learn from one another. Whether it is the history of a particular landscape or a new technology, coming together benefits us all and the heritage resources we collectively value. The strategic planning documents created in the Pacific and the U.S. illustrate that these groups know what needs to be done; it is a matter of implementing these plans. As our case studies show, that implementation is occurring in many places thanks to the support of local government and private partners. The potential for these new relationships to engage local communities and associated disciplines and to address biocultural conservation needs is great, particularly for indigenous communities in Hawai'i and the Pacific who are currently undertaking extraordinary efforts to plan for and protect their resources from climate change and other environmental threats. By integrating indigenous cultural landscapes and their related biocultural resources into a dynamic paradigm on underwater cultural heritage, the field looks make considerable gains across stakeholder groups and develop its relevancy for younger generations, thus helping to ensure long-range traction for the preservation of all underwater heritage resources. Our challenges can be defined. They are finite. They are surmountable. Conversely, our potential, as a community and as an evolving field of discovery, appears limitless.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the contributions of our four primary authors, Trisha Kehaulani Watson, William J. Ailā Jr., Kepa Maly, and AdiMeretuiRatunabuabua. In addition we are grateful to the organizations and agencies they represent: Honua Consulting, State of Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources, PūlamaLāna'I, and University of the South Pacific. In addition, the authors recognize the indigenous peoples of Oceania as the main stakeholders and partners in biocultural conservation in the Pacific.

References

'Aha Ki'ole., 2008. Letter to President George Bush opposing the establishment of a national marine monument in the three islands north of Saipan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI). Available online at: http://marianasconservation.org/pdf/hawaii_ahakiole_letter_to_bush.pdf.

Akana, R., 2010. Hawaiians Lost Control of a \$5 billion Trust Asset. *Ka Wai Ola*, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Anders, G.C. 1987. *Native Hawaiian Rights in a Regulated Fishery: An Exploratory Analysis*, Pacific Islands Development Program, East-West Centre, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Apple, R.A. & Kikuchi, W.K. 1975. *Ancient Hawaiian Shore Zone Fishponds: An Evaluation of Survivors for Historical Preservation*. National Park Service, Honolulu.

Alcorn, Janise., 2010. Indigenous Peoples and Conservation. *Macarthur Foundation Conservation White Paper Series*. n. pag.

Annual Report 2011/2012 United Nations Development Programme, The Sustainable Future We Want. Rep.N.p.:n.p., n.d.

Bath, UK and Burrows, C.K.P.M. 1989. Hawaiian conservation values and practices, in *Conservation Biology in Hawai'i*, C.P. Stone and D.B. Stone, Eds., pp. 203-213, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Batiste, Marie ed. 2000. *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Batiste, Marie. 1998. Enabling the Autumn Seed: Towards a Decolonized Approach to Aboriginal Knowledge, Language, and Education. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 22(1):16-27.

Beckwith, M. 1976. *Hawaiian Mythology*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Beltran, J., and A. Phillips. 2000. *Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas: Principles, Guidelines, and Case Studies*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN-TheWorld Conservation Union,

Berkes, F. 1999. *Sacred ecology: traditional ecological knowledge and management systems*. Taylor & Francis, Philadelphia and London, UK.

Berkes, F. and Folke, C. eds. 1998. *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK

Berkes, F., J. Colding, and C. Folke. 2000. Rediscovery of traditional ecological knowledge as adaptive management. *Ecological Applications* 10:1251–1262.

Berkes, Fikret. 1999. *Sacred Ecology: Traditional Ecological Knowledge and Resource Management*. Philadelphia: Taylor and Francis Press.

Blythe, J, and McKenna Brown, R. eds. 2004. Maintaining the Links. Language, identity and the Land. *Proceedings of the 7th Conference of the Foundation for Endangered Languages, Broome, Australia*.

Cajete, G. A. 1999. *Igniting the Sparkle: An indigenous science Education Model*. Skyand NC: Kivaki Press.

Capitini, C.A., B.N. Tissot, M.S. Carroll, W.J. Walsh and S. Peck, 2004. Competing perspectives in resource protection; the case of the marine protected areas in West Hawai'i, *Society and National Resources*, vol. 17, no. 9, pg 763-778.

Carroll, Matthew S., Keith A. Blatner, Patricia J. Cohn, and Todd Morgan. 2007.

Managing Fire Danger in the Forests of the US Inland Northwest: A Classic 'Wicked Problem' in Public Land policy. *Journal of Forestry* 105 (5): 239-44

Chapin, M. 1992. 'The Co-existence of Indigenous Peoples and Environments in Central America', map insert, *Research and Exploration*, vol 8, no 2, Revised and reprinted as 'Indigenous Peoples and Natural Ecosystems in Central America and Southern Mexico', map insert, *National Geographic Magazine*, February 2003.

Emory, K. P. 1924. *The Island of Lānaʻi, A Survey of Native Culture*. 1969 reprint of the 1924 Bulletin 12, B. P. Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, HI.

Friedlander, A.M., K. Poepoe, K. Helm, P. Bartram, J. Maragos, and I. Abbott, 2002. "Application of Hawaiian traditions to community-based fishery management," in *Proceedings of the 9th International Coral Reef Symposium*, pp. 813-815.

Hall, Budd L. 2000. Breaking the Educational Silence: *For Seven Generation*, an Information Legacy of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. In Indigenous

Harmon, D. 2002. *In light of Our Difference: How Diversity in Nature and Culture Makes us Human*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC

Hau'ofa, E. 2008. *We Are the Ocean*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Hawaiian Islands National Marine Sanctuary Act. Rep. N.p.: n.p.,n.d. Print.

Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary. 1997. Final Environmental Impact Statement / Management Plan. Hawaii. Office of National Marine Sanctuaries. Print.

Johannes, R.E.. "Traditional conversation methods and protected marine areas in Oceania, " *Ambio*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp.258-261, 1982.

Jones, S. "A long-term perspective on biodiversity and marine resource exploitation in Fiji's Lau Group," *Pacific Science*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 617-648, 2009.

Lewis, N and Bertelmann, P. 2013. 'Ike 'Āina: Native Hawaiian (Indigenous World Views) – Moving Beyond Integration. Forum. Hawai'i Conservation Conference, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Lizarradle, M. 2001. 'Biodiversity and Loss of Indigenous Languages and Knowledge in South America', in Maffi 2001, pp265-281

MacKenzie, M.K. 1991. *Native Hawaiian Rights Handbook*, Hawaiian Native Legal Corporation and Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Maffi, L. 1998. 'Language: a resource for nature', *Nature and Resources: The UNESCO Journal on the Environment and Natural Resources Research*, vol 34, no 4, pp12-21

Maffi, L. 2005. 'Linguistic, Cultural and Biological Diversity', *annual Review of Anthropology*. vol 29. Pp599-619

Maffi, L. 2007. 'Biocultural Diversity and Sustainability', in J. Pretty, A. Ball, t. Benton, J. Guivant, D. Lee, D. Orr, M. Pfeffer and H. Ward (eds), *Sage handbook on Environment and Society*, pp267-277, Sage Publications, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore.

Maffi, L. (ed.) 2001. *On Bicultural Diversity: linking Language, Knowledge and the Environment*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Maly, K. and O. Maly, *He Wahi Mo'olelo 'Ohana No Kaloko me Honokōhau ma Kekaha o Na Kona—A Collection of Family Traditions Describing Customs, Practice, and Beliefs of the Family and Lands of Kaloko and Honokōhau*, North Kona, Island of Hawai'i. Kumu Pono Associates, Hilo, Hawai'i, USA, 2002.

Maly K. and Maly O., 2004. *Ka Hana Lawai'a a me nā Ko'a o nā kai 'Ewalu, A History of Fishing Practices and Marine Fisheries of the Hawaiian Island*, Kumu Pono Associates, Hilo, Hawai'i.

Manne, L. L. 2003. 'Nothing Has Yet Lasted Forever: Current and threatened levels of Biological and Cultural Diversity', in B. Von Droste, H. Plachter and M. Rossler (eds), *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value: Components of a Global Strategy*, pp25-37, Fischer Verlag and UNESCO, Jena and New York, NY

Marine Protected Areas Federal Advisory Committee. 2011. Recommendations for Integrated Management Using a Cultural Landscape Approach in the National MPA System. Available online http://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/pdf/helpful-resources/mpafac_rec_cultural_landscape_12_11.pdf

McGoodwin, James R. 2001. Understanding the Cultures of Fishing Communities. A Key to Fisheries Management and Food Security.FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 401. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

McNeely, J. A. and Keeton, W.S. 1995. 'The Interaction between Biological and Cultural Diversity', in B. Von Droste, H. Plachter and M. Rossler (eds), *Cultural Landscapes of Universal Value: Components of a Global Strategy*, pp25-37, Fischer Verlag and UNESCO, Jena and New York, NY

Menzies, Charles R. 2001. Reflections on Research with, for, and among Indigenous Peoples. Canadian Journal of Native Education 25(1):19-36

Moore, J. L., Manne, L. Brooks, T., Burgess, N.D., Davies, R. et al. 2002. "the Distribution of Cultural and Biological Diversity in Africa', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, vol 269, pp1645-1653

Morrison, A.E. and T.L. Hunt, 2007. "Human impacts on the nearshore environment: an archaeological case study from Kaua'i, Hawaiian Islands," *Pacific Science*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 325-345.

Mosha, R. S. 1999. The Inseparable Link between Intellectual and Spiritual Formation in Indigenous Knowledge and Education: A case Study in Tanzania. In What is Indigenous

Knowledge? Voices from the Academy. L. Semali and J.L. Kincheloe, eds. Pp. 209-225. New York: Falmer Press.

Nemani, S. 2011. Pacific Intangible Cultural Heritage Mapping Toolkit, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC),

Nietschemann, B. Q. 1996. *The interdependence of Biological and Cultural Diversity*, Occasional Paper, No 21, Center for World Indigenous Studies, December.

Ostraff, Melinda. 2003. Contemporary Use of Limu (Marine Algae) in the Vava'u Island Group, Kingdom of Tonga: An Ethnobotanical Study. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC.

Oviedo, G., Maffi, L. and Larsen, P.B. 2000. *Indigenous and Traditional Peoples of the World and Ecoregion Conservation: An Integrated Approach to Conserving the World's Biological and Cultural Diversity*, WWF-International and Terralingua, Gland, Switzerland

Painemilla, Kristin Walker. 2010. *Indigenous Peoples and Conservation: From Rights to Resource Management*. Arlington, VA.: Conservation International.

Pannell, S. 2006. 'Reconciling Nature and Culture in a Global Context? Lessons from the World Heritage List', Report No. 48, available at www.rainforest.crc.jcu.edu.au/publications/nature_culture.htm

Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, *Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument Management Plan*, vol. 1-4, Honolulu, Hawai'i, USA, 2008.

Payoyo, P.B., Ed., *Ocean Governance: Sustainable Development of the Seas*, United Nations University, New York, NY, USA, 1994.

Poepoe, K.K., P.K. Bartram, and A.M. Friedlander, 2003. "The use of traditional Hawaiian knowledge in the contemporary management of marine resource," in *Putting Fishers' Knowledge to Work*, pp. 328-339, Fisheries Centre Research Report , University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, 2003.

Posey, D. A. (ed.) 1999.*Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity*, Intermediate Technology Publications and UNEP, London and Nairobi

Pukui, M.K. and S.H. Elbert, 1986. *Hawaiian Dictionary*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Pukui, M.K. 1893. *Ōlelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings*, Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Ralson, C. 1984. "Hawaii 1178-1854: some aspects of maka'aina response to rapid cultural change," *The Journal of Pacific History*, vol. 19, pp. 21-40.

Rapport, D. J. and Maffi, L. 2010. "The Dual Erosion of Biological and Cultural Diversity. Implications for the health and eco-cultural systems', to appear in J. Perry and S. Pilgrim (eds.), *Nature and Culture: Revitalizing the Connection*, Earthscan, London

Ratunabuabua, A. M. 2012.Introductory Note, in Pacific Intangible Cultural Heritage Mapping Toolkit, S. Nemani, Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC).

Shannon, M. A. 1992. "Foresters as Strategic Thinkers, Facilitators, and Citizens." *Journal of Forestry* 90 (10): 24-27.

Shindler, B., and K. A. Cheek. 1999. "Intergrating Citizens in Adaptive Management: A Propositional Analysis." *Conservation Ecology* 3 (1): 9.
<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol3/iss1/art9/>.

Sillitoe, Paul. 1998. The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New Applied Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 39(2):223-252.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T., Maffi, L. and Harmon, D. 2003. *Sharing a World of Difference: The Earth's Linguistic, Cultural, and Biological Diversity* and map *The World's Bicultural Diversity: People, Language, and Ecosystems*, UNESCO, Paris

Slovic, P. 2000. *The Perception of Risk*. Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Springer, Jenny, and Janis Alcorn. 2007. *Strengthening WWF Partnerships with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities: Key Findings and Recommendations*. Rep. N.p.: n.p.

Stevens, Stanley, 1997. *Conservation Through Cultural Survival: Indigenous Peoples and Protected Areas*, Island Press Washington, DC.

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage. Paris, November 2, 2001. 41 I.L.M. 40.

Usher, Peter. 2000. Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Environmental Assessment and Management. *Arctic* 53(2):183-193

Watson, T.K. et al., 2012. Aloha 'Āina: A Framework for Biocultural Resource Management in Hawai'i's Anthropogenic Ecosystems, Proceedings from a Technical Expert Workshop, Hawaiian Islands Humpback Whale National Marine Sanctuary, Available online at http://hawaiihumpbackwhale.noaa.gov/council/council_aloha_aina_guidance.html

Webler, Thomas, and Seth Tuler. 2006. "Four Perspectives on Public Participation Process in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making: Combined Results from 10 Case Studies." *Policy Studies Journal* 34 (4): 699-722.

Wilcox, B. A. and Duin, K. N. 1995. 'Indigenous Cultural and Biological Diversity:

Overlapping values of Latin American ecoregion', *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, vol 18, no 4, pp49-53

Wilkie, D., Morelli, G.A., Demmer, J. Starkey, M., Telfer, P. and Steil, M. 2006. Parks and People: Assessing the Human Welfare effects of establishing protected areas for biodiversity conservation, *Conservation Biology* 20(1): 247-49.

Williams, N., and Graham, Baines.,(Eds.),1993. *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Wisdom for Sustainable Development*. Canberra: Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University.

Wolf, Erica R. 1999. *Envisioning Power: Ideologies of Dominance and Crisis*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

World Heritage Convention. Pacific World Heritage Action Plan, 2010-2015. UNESCO.

Wyban, C.A. 1999. *Tide and Current Fishponds of Hawai'i*, University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu, Hawai'i.

Biographies

Trisha Kehaulani Watson, J.D, PhD is from Hawai'i. She was born and raised on the island of O'ahu to which she has long ancestral ties. She obtained her degrees from Washington State University and the University of Hawai'i, Mānoa. Her legal background is in environmental law. Her PhD studies focused on indigenous epistemologies and traditional natural resource management. She previously worked in administration at the University of Hawai'i on special projects related to culture and research issues. She currently runs her own consulting company, Honua Consulting (www.honuaconsulting.com) that focuses on biocultural resource planning and management in Hawai'i.

William Ailā Jr. is the Director and Chairman of the Hawai'i Department of Land and Natural Resources. Before Gov. Neil Abercrombie appointed him to the post, Ailā was the Wai'anae Boat Harbormaster and an active community organizer, focusing on environmental and

Hawaiian cultural issues. He is a widely recognized and respected traditional Hawaiian fisherman and cultural practitioner. Ailā was born in Waiʻanae and earned a BA in General tropical agriculture from the University of Hawaiʻi. He is a member of the MPA Federal Advisory Council and its Cultural Heritage Resources Working Group.

Kepa Maly was raised on the islands of Oʻahu and Lanaʻi, and as a youth, learned the Hawaiian language and cultural practices and values from native kūpuna (elders). In 1975, Kepa participated in an ʻuniki, as poʻo puaʻa, of Halau Hula o Maʻiki, and is a hoʻopaʻakumu hula (instructor of traditional chant and dance). Over the last thirty-five years, Kepa has continued to learn and document Hawaiian traditions and practices from kupuna from Hawaiʻi to Niʻihau- learning from native Hawaiians who have lived their culture as handed down by their elders before them. Kepa and his wife Onaona formed Kumu Pono Associates LLC in 1995, their on-going work has included researching and writing historical documentary studies; conducting detailed oral history studies; developing-site preservation plans, cultural resources management plans, and contributing to the development of integrated resource management plans; and writing interpretive plans for projects across the state of Hawaiʻi. They are presently residing on the island of Lānaʻi, working with the community in the development of a museum and heritage center, the Lānaʻi Culture and Heritage Center, and developing plans for long-term management of cultural and natural resources of Lānaʻi. He is the Senior Vice President Culture and Historic Preservation for Pūlama Lānaʻi.

Adi Meretui Ratunabuabua is an indigenous Fijian Chief. Her formative years were spent in Asia and Europe at British Army postings. She is currently the Pacific Heritage Hub Manager for UNESCO World Heritage activities in the Pacific, seconded from her post with the Fiji Government as Principal Cultural Development Officer in the Ministry of Culture. She serves on the Governing board for Intangible Cultural Heritage (ICH) Category 2 Centre for the Asia-Pacific region and in 2012 was a consultant examiner for the ICH intergovernmental Committee for UNESCO; is Chair of the intergovernmental Pacific Regional Culture Strategy; President of the Pacific Islands Museums Association and an executive founding member of ICOMOS Pasifika.