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Abstract
This paper foregrounds the Native Hawai’ians’ environmental perspective of Aloha Aina in Oswald Andrew’s Ka’a’awa. By asserting that the land and all the entities are part of their family (ohana), this epistemology stresses the equality of human and non-human which run contrary to the Western anthropocentric view. This present study is conducted within indigenous ecocriticism perspective, in which alternative epistemology of human and non-human interaction should be considered in the light of global environmental crisis. In Ka’a’awa, Bushnell explores how reconciliation of indigenous perspective and White settler proves difficult to achieve under Orientalist discourse that derogatively perceive the native epistemologies as superstitious and irrational. Moreover, the enforcement of Western anthropocentric view towards the local natives through colonialism causes the islanders to forget their ancestral epistemology. This paper concludes that Bushnell’s elaboration of a novel culture which embraces both side of the spectrum, indigenous and white settler culture is an avenue to achieve sustainable ecological condition.
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Introduction
Issues related with environmental degradation has vastly emerged as one unsolved crisis in this modern era. The Nobel Laureate in 2002, Paul Crutzen coins the current age as the Anthropocene era, referring to a new geological epoch in which humankind has emerged as a globally transformative species with the intelligence to understand what it is doing and how it could stop it. (O’Riordan, 2007, p. 326). It is only in recent years that the science of ecology emerges, underlining the interrelation between organism and the environment that humanity is only a part of a greater whole. Previously a niche discipline familiar only to academicians, biologists, and botanists, the environmental crisis in the 1960's places ecology into popular public consciousness. (McIntosh, 1986, 1) With the publication of the influential book Silent Spring (1962) that vividly portrays the destructive impact of DDT pesticide toward the local ecosystem of an American town comes the realization that the present interaction between human and the non-human should be reconsidered. Worster aptly conceptualizes this phenomenon through his assertion that

we are facing a global crisis today, not because of how ecosystems function but because of how our ethical systems function. Getting through the crisis requires understanding our impact of nature as precisely as possible, but even more, it requires understanding those ethical systems and using that understanding to reform them (1993, p. 27)
Glotfelty’s statement underlines the necessity of environmental ethics to regulate the relationship between human and the non-human. Environmental ethics is a systematic account of the moral relations between human beings and their natural environment, ethical norms and considerations which previously only attached into human interaction should be expanded by incorporating the non-human entities. (DesJardis, 2013, p. 17) The daunting task facing such a reform is the underlying anthropocentric worldview within Western philosophical tradition. In his article, the Historical Root of Our Ecological Crisis (1967) Lynn White argues that Judeo-Christian view as the basis of Western thought encourages human’s domination over all lifeforms within the earth and ‘no item in the physical creation had any purpose save to serve men's purpose.” (1967, p. 1204). Although already proposing the call for reform the Western anthropocentric view, White remains skeptical towards incorporating other perspective such as Zen Buddhism. Hence, his outlook remains rooted within Western philosophical tradition. On the contrary Lawrence Buell openly expounds for a revision of Western ethical discourse.

If, as environmental philosophers contend, western metaphysics and ethics need revision before we can address today’s environmental problems, then environmental crisis involves a crisis of the imagination the amelioration of which depends on finding better ways of imagining nature and humanity’s relation to it. (Buell, 1995, p. 2)

As Buell has argued, the current environmental crisis is inseparable with crisis of the imagination and other possibilities of representing nature is needed. Although in his book, the Environmental Imagination (1995) he remains advocating Anglo-American nature writing in the tradition of Thoreau and Emerson to provide an environmentally-minded discourse, his subsequent writing, the Future of Environmental Criticism (2005) charts the development of environmental/eco-criticism by incorporating diverse voices. An expansion of canonical nature writing by accommodating non-Western literature to comprehend their native epistemologies concerning human and nature relationship is required to solve ‘the crisis of the imagination’. Their writings can expose us to new environmental imagination -conception and experiences of a place, based upon a subjective understanding of a particular environmental site-. (James, 2015, p. 7)

This study analyzes Ka’a’awa : A Novel about Hawai‘i in the 1850’s (1972) –shortened as Ka’a’awa- to explore how Oswald Andrew (O.A) Bushnell conceptualizes the Native Hawai‘ians’ indigenous epistemology of human-nature relationship, aloha aina. Bushnell portrays his protagonist, Hiram Nihoa as one of the last remnant of Hawai‘ians priestly class -the kahuna- through his journey across O‘ahu island to witness the vast changes of his ancestral land due to the arrival of the Western powers. Nihoa is forced to adapt to the societal shift, where the islanders no longer have respect to the nature due to the enforcement of Western anthropocentric view. Bushnell complicates this issue even further by the introduction of Saul Bristol, a haole (white man) as the second protagonist. This paper’s analysis on Ka’a’awa argues that a close collaboration between the indigenous people and the white settlers is essential for a sustainable environment through the creation of a novel culture.

Ecocriticism and Indigenous Ecocriticism

Ecocriticism originates from the premise that scholars of humanities can no longer ignore the environment, especially within the environmental crisis of the modern era. The seminal work of ecocriticism, the Ecocriticism Reader (1996) by Cheryl Glotfelty and Harold Fromm summarizes how to position literary criticism in responding toward ecological issues. Glotfelty articulates the
underlying premise that human culture is connected to the physical world, affecting it and affected by it. (1996, p. xii) The interconnection between nature and culture manifests through the cultural artifacts of language and literature. (p. xix) “Ecocriticism begins from the conviction that the arts of imagination and the story there of...can contribute significantly to the understanding of environmental problems.” (Buell, Heise and Thornber, 2011, p. 418) As this relationship is highly biased towards humans’ benefits (anthropocentric), ecocriticism mediates and negotiates through a different avenue of conceptualizing human and non-human relationship.

During the early period of its conception ecocriticism suffers from criticism due to the white-centric bias of nature writing, derived from Anglo-American romanticism. The early canonical works of environmental criticism is populated by non-fictional nature writing such as Emerson’s Nature (1836) and Thoreau’s Walden Pond (1854). The romantic spirit of celebratory of unspoiled nature, glorification of wilderness and calls to embrace agriculturalism and pastoralism causes ecocriticism to be accused for being apolitical. (Cilano and De Loughrey, 2007, p. 72-73). Furthermore, its strong association to the U.S modern environmentalism conservation and preservation leads ecocriticism to be accused as merely an extension of American environmental movement into third world developing countries. (Heise, 2008; Nixon, 2011; James, 2015) In her seminal work of ecocriticism, Glotfelty acknowledges that ecocriticism remains a predominantly white-movement and the necessity of embracing multi-ethnic perspective concerning environmental issues. (1996, p. xxv) Recent development of ecocriticism, what Buell coins as the second and third-wave ecocriticism expands the scope of environmental ecocriticism by incorporating voices from the marginalized ethnic groups and third world writers. (Marland, 2013) Moreover, non-Western indigenous epistemologies concerning the position of human in the wider ecology is seen as a possible solution on reorienting human and non-human relationship.

Indigenous ecocriticism rises from the realization that diverse voices concerning human and non-human interaction should be considered in the light of current environmental crisis. Western epistemological basis that asserts a clear demarcation between human and non-human, based on mental faculties causes the non-human to be designated merely as automata, in which no moral consideration should be attached to them. (Plumwood, 2003, p. 53) This anthropocentric paradigm as one of the ideological justifications of colonialism, legitimates the imperial domination over nature, as well as a useful tool to regulate the lives of colonized people. (Opperman, 2007, p. 184) Under the guise of providing a model of civilized living, the Western belief of the primacy of humankind among all the other species is enforced to the indigenous people by the introduction of animal domestication and agricultural/plantation based-economy.

The indigenous population was affected over the ensuring centuries through environmental -and hence cultural – derangement on a vast scale, such destructive changes were premised on ontological and epistemological differences between Western and (non-Western) ideas of human and animal being-in the world-. (Huggan and Tiffin, 2011, p. 11)

Run contrary to the anthropocentric worldview is indigenous epistemology of human and non-human relationship. A shared environmental outlook of the indigenous people is their “non-dualistic recognition within native people’s collective imagination of non-human entities as fellow beings, whether at a sensory or a spiritual level or both” (Buell, Heise, Thornber, 2011, p. 429). Instead of reinforcing Western demarcation of human and non-human, indigenous paradigm foregrounds mutual respects to the non-human as members of a biotic community. While in the past this perspective is denounced as ‘superstitious’ compared to the ‘objective’ and ‘rational’
Western scientific thought, recent shift in environmental humanities conceptualizes indigenous perspective of human-non human relationship in relation with the global environment crisis. (Monani and Adamson, 2016, p. 9) Alternative ways in conceptualizing human and non-human relationship is a necessity in this Anthropocene era.

Situating *Aloha Aina* in Bushnell's *Ka’a’awa*

This study analyses O.A Bushnell’s *Ka’a’awa: A Novel about Hawai’i in the 1850* through the framework of Native Hawai’ians’ environmental epistemology, *aloha Aina*. Within the commodified tourist industry of Hawai’i, *aloha* is more well-known compared to the more proper terminology of *aloha aina*. *Aloha*, which originally means reciprocal love and generosity has been commodified and misused for the benefit of the visiting tourists. Kay-Trask criticizes the ‘grotesque commercialization’ of labelling *aloha* in everything Hawai’ian, from the dancing *hula*, into cars, plumbing, to securities and air conditioning. (1993, p. 3) The aloha spirit and Hawai’ian hospitality are primarily catered for the visiting tourist’s fetishized image of Hawai’i which is not the exact representation of the more proper terminology of *aloha aina*. This terminology underlines the Hawai’ian people's attachment to the land around them, “care and love of the land” which is derived from Hawai’ian creation myth.

In the *mo’olelo* of Papa and Wakea, "earth mother" and "sky father," our islands were born: Hawai’i, Maui, O'ahu, Kaua'i, and Ni’ihau. From their human offspring came the taro plant and from the taro came the Hawaiian people. The lessons of our genealogy are that human beings have a familial relationship to land and to the taro, our elder siblings or *kua’ana*. (Kay-Trask, 1993, p. 141)

The prior assertion exemplifies the intertwined nature between the Hawai’ian natives (*Kanaka Maoli*) with their home islands. To the Hawai’ians, as the land and all the entities are part of their extended family (*ohana*), they have to treat it with care and respect in a reciprocal relationship. By loving and caring for the land and sea, the Hawai’ians does not only return the nature’s bounty but they function as steward of their culture, promoting a strong and healthy foundation for its growth and perpetuation. (El Dessouky, 2011, p. 255) Hence, this paradigm lies in stark contrast with the Western anthropocentric view that places human beings as agents of imperialism, and nature as mere commodity is subjected to exploitation, plunder, and pillage.

*Ka’a’awa* charts the journey of Hiram Nihoa - one of the last remnants of Hawai’ian’s *kahuna* (priestly) class – on his passage alongside the coastline of O’ahu island. Set three decades after the abolishment of the *kapu* system and the decline of the traditional ancestral worship by the introduction of Christianity brought by American missionaries, Bushnell foregrounds the resulting conflicts between embracing the new ways and forsaking the old Gods. Hiram Nihoa, although by necessity of his high status in Hawai’ian society as the advisor of King Kamehameha III and tutor of the heir apparent, Prince Alexander Liholiho (later Kamehameha IV) has to observe Christian rite, secretly he continues his worshipping of the Hawaiian deities. Although openly embraces Christianity in his household, Nihoa’s travel all over O’ahu underlines his adherence to the old traditions, offering ‘heathen sacrifices…. in form of *ki* leaf, a *hau* leaf, and a *kukui* leaf’ (Bushnell, 1972, p. 75) at the feet of Kaneholopali mountain. During his journey, he invokes the blessing from the amalgamation of deities, “first to Jehovah, then *Kane*, *Ku*, *Lono*, and *Kanaloa*, the four great gods, and the forty lesser gods.” (Bushnell, 1972, p. 17). Nihoa’s accommodation of both the former and the current ascendant deity of Hawai’i reflects belief of the possibility of a co-existence between the former Gods and the ascendant deity.
I grew soft with love for this island of my birth. “Praise God,” I said. “Praise God from Whom all blessings flow,” I sang, standing up in the stirrups to make my homage the more seemly. My, how I like that grand music! I sang it over again, in the Hawaiian translation Hiram Bingham made when he first came to Honolulu, and then, because the older gods were near—after all, did they not live in these blessed isles long before Bingham and Jehovah came?—I praised them too with a verse in our native tongue. (Bushnell, 1972, p. 67)

The conflict upon reconciling the ancestral Hawaiian deity veneration and Christian rite is viewed differently by the Kanaka Maoli and the Christian missionaries. Nihoa, a member of the Hawaiian priestly class which is exposed to the both sides of the spectrum posit that co-existence between the two religions is possible, as stressed in the subsequent passage.

Almost, it seems, these two gods are met in friendship at Ka’a’awa, as though each is a brother to the other. Or, indeed, as some of our Hawaiian priests have declared since the American missionaries came among us, as though the two were one and the same, differing only in the names our two peoples have given them and in the ceremonies of our worship. This is a good and comforting thought, because I respect both of these great deities and do not like to think of one trying to drive out the other. (Bushnell, 1972, p. 174)

As exemplified, Nihoa argues that both the Hawaiian deities -in this context Kane, the supreme God – and Jehovah actually embodies similar traits, differing only in naming and the ceremonies of worships. This line of reasoning is steadfastly rejected by the Christian missionaries, who scornfully denounce the Hawaiian religion as pagan and heathen and began a campaign of proselytizing. They believe in the justification of civilizing the natives as “Only the foolish, ungrateful man,’ he (Brother Dosion) said, ‘will reject the gifts of God.” (Bushnell, 1972, p.162) The missionaries’ distain towards the Hawaiian deity worship is further extended into their rejection of certain Hawaiian customs such as traditional medicine and recreation. Swimming and surfing, two popular Hawaiian recreational activities is strictly forbidden due to the belief that openly exposes one’s flesh is a temptation for sin.

Forbidden by the missionaries are these disporting in the sea because they are heathen pastimes, and because the nakedness of swimmers is an invitation to sins of the flesh, is an anathema. Alas, alas! Such narrow minds, such dirty thoughts, those Christians have. (Bushnell, 1972, p. 27)

The actions of the Christian missionaries in Ka’a’awa affirms with the Orientalist discourse of proclaiming the superiority of Western thoughts due to their rationality and scientism compared to the superstitious Hawaiian ancestral tradition. (Monani and Adamson, 2016, p. 9) Within their hubris of the superior Western method, they do not consider that the Hawaiian ways of living will be more suited in the tropical situation of this archipelago.

These foreigners have long ago decided that our Hawaiian medicines are useless, because they are heathen. These haole would rather die, I believe, than ask the help of a native physician. They will sick themselves with the horrible stuff they call castor oil, but they will not swallow a pinch of the flesh from a bitter gourd, or even of a single kukui nut, which we have found are better purgatives and far kinder to the taste as well as to the bowels. (Bushnell, 1972, p. 104)

The process of Western civilizing method through Christian proselyting and introduction of Western way of living causes the abandonment of ancestral Hawaiian tradition, especially aloha aina perspective. Love and respect towards nature as their family (ohana) is slowly forgotten
due to the enforcement of Western anthropocentric view. One notable case is the extinction of the Golden birds in *Ka Papakolea* Beach, this species which was previously conserved only for the ruling class’s attire by its feather now being hunted down into extinction. The temptation of Western traders by offering high prizes for the *lei* (garment) causes the Natives to treat the Golden birds as fair game.

Trappers and snarers, too, were there, seeking to catch the golden birds. Their meat is eaten by the very poor and by the rich, their feathers are used to make lei for commoners and foreigners, as is the fashion now that feathers are no longer reserved to the chiefs. (Bushnell, 1972, p. 52)

Similarly, the seduction of Western wealth proves to be tempting for the local woodcutters. The deforestation began to occur in the previously lush forests of Hawai‘i, either for freeing spaces for plantation or selling the excess lumber for the visiting traders. As Huggan and Tiffin has elaborated, colonialism causes ontological and epistemological shift in how the Natives interact with their environment. Bushnell laments this needlessness destruction, how the green landscapes of Hawai‘i will soon resemble the arid climate of California.

Almost as great as the hunger of men for food is their hunger for wood. Each year the edge of the forest moves farther away. Soon these hills, these mountainsides and ridges, will be robbed of their trees. Then the grass and the ferns will turn brown in the sun, as are the hills of California, and Honolulu will be no different to look upon than are San Pedro and San Diego. (Bushnell, 1972:45-46)

Moreover, lack of respect towards the older tradition is also associated into the distrust of the *kahuna*. Previously the privileged class whose authority is second only to the Chiefs (Bushnell, 1971, p. 115), the erosion of traditional *kapu* system leads into the downfall of the *kahuna*’s primacy in enforcing social norms towards the islanders. The younger generation, without guidance from the *kahuna* in their upbringing only knows what a *kahuna* is from their Christian education, a witch who practices heretical magic, shunned by the Christian Church. Nihoa himself is subjected into mockery and humiliation from King Kamehameha III’s royal guard.

And who is this kahuna coming here with you? Have you plucked him from out of the swamp, perhaps?

Old man, what sorcery do you make tonight?

When I was a youth, we had more respect for our elders. Never would we have mocked an old man or an old woman, never would we have dared to laugh at a *kahuna ’ana’ana*. But the young folk of today: alas for them. No wonder the nation is wasting away, no wonder we are beset with troubles from far and near. (Bushnell, 1973, p. 20)

Nihoa’s disparaged treatment articulates the successful enforcement of Western educational system, in which the Hawai‘ians’ traditional belief is stigmatized with superstition labelling, heretical and abomination to the civilized Western ways. The younger generation, already dogmatized by Western outlook denigrate Nihoa with scorn, and unwilling to listen to any of his preaching as it is contrary with what the Church taught them. Hence, the reintroduction of *aloha aina* epistemology proves difficult to achieve in such a hostile climate.

The situation depicted in *Ka’a’awa* runs parallel with the primacy of Western environmentalist movement that disregard the perspectives of non-West indigenous epistemology. Some criticism has arose concerning how environmentalist movement gives less concern with the marginalization of ethnic minorities by the White majority. One such attack by
Guha (1989) accuses that while Western environmentalism tries to reorient human and non-human relationship, they show “a lack of concern with inequalities within human society and how they are socially and historically produced. (p. 72-73) As exemplified by Nihoa’s example of his outcast status within his own community, the limited social agency of the indigenous people causes difficulty in articulating their ancestral epistemology concerning the position of human in a wider ecosystem. Moreover, the indigenous perspective of human and non-human relationship is often subjected into ecological Indian trope, which renders “indigenous cultures obsolescent by confining them to an antiquated past that has few corollaries to the present moment” (Mohs, 2018, p. 490-491). In other words, the indigenous custom of the natives is treated merely as past perspective, irrelevant in the modern era. In Ka’a’awa, Bushnell asserts the necessity of accommodation between the local islanders and the white settlers in articulating aloha aina perspective. This purpose is achieved by representing the character of Saul Bristol as the second protagonist to complete the saga of Ka’a’awa within a novel culture.

**Novel Culture for Sustainable Environment**

In his article, *the Cultural Work of Ecological Restoration* (2018), Mohs proposes the concept of novel culture to accommodate indigenous environmental discourse and Western philosophical outlook. He defines novel culture as “new associations of peoples that have no historical analog and thus hold the possibility for an improved relation both across cultural lines and with the other-than-human environment they inhabit.” (2018, p. 495) Mohs asserts the necessity of creating a dynamic and hybrid interaction among cultures, instead of enforcing one side’s belief and custom. Viewed with this perspective, indigenous perspective is not just constrained in the bygone era but instead an “essential, place-based component of the cultural element so imperative to their respective cultural projects.” (2018, p.495)

An important task in adopting the ecologically-minded discourse of the indigenous people is the immersion of the Western people within a native culture’s belief and tradition. The necessity of eliminating Orientalist bias of Western superiority concerning superstitious pagan tradition is the prime step before accommodation of cultures can be achieved. Bushnell underlines this issue through his depiction of Saul Bristol, a runaway from America who was shipwrecked in the coast of O’ahu. Bushnell narrates Bristol’s changes from being called as the Mad American and the Ogre of Ka’a’awa due to his open hostility towards the Natives into the Chief of Ka’a’awa. Owning a Western-style farm, the first in the Ka’a’awa coast, at first Bristol voices his dissatisfaction towards the ineptness of the local Kanaka.

Those dumb brutes were still huddled inside their stinking, sopping grass huts, surrounded by seas of mud.... A dirtier, lazier, more shiftless lot of savages I have never known. Their emotions lie too close to the surface. The slightest fright will make 'em scream, the merest pleasure will make 'em shout. But, because of that same shallowness of feeling, the slightest trouble is too much trouble: they will do nothing that requires exertion, they would rather die than work....When will I learn to give up my efforts to teach them the rudiments of civilization? (Bushnell, 1972, p. 197).

This passage highlights the colonial mindset as it is narrated by Saul Bristol. Believing that he himself is ‘teaching them the rudiment of civilization’, he grows uneasy with the seemingly incompetency of the islanders. His condescending stance changes during an outbreak of influenzas in Ka’a’awa, being the most isolated people in the world due to its geographical location, the Hawai’ians have no natural immunity towards diseases brought by the White
settlers. While it is common illness for the Western people, it vastly becomes epidemic to the Kanaka Maoli. Bristol “dosed them all with calomel & tea, just as I’ve done the past three days at Ka’a’awa” (Bushnell, 1972, p.202) bringing medicine all over the village. From this point onward, Bristol starts to immerse himself within the local culture and traditions. He learns how to speak Hawai’ians, affirming himself with “the arts and languages of indigenous people both support and are founded upon a specific relation to the natural world, the cultural is inextricable from the ecological.” (Mohs, 2018, p. 496). He comprehends the principle of Hawai’ian’s aloha aina epistemology that advocates respect towards their fellow inhabitant of Mother Earth as their ohana. “Where there is respect, there is order. Where there is order, there is harmony. And where there is harmony, there is contentment.” (Bushnell, 1972, p.347). Moreover, witnessing the majestic sight of the Three Peaks mountain (Puu o Ka’ai’o, Kanehoalani and Manamana) and ascend into highest peak, he witnesses devastating state of the surrounding ecologies brought by the Western people’s arrival and settlement.

From that vantage, where once chiefs and priests must have gazed out upon fertile fields and hundreds of happy people, today I saw only desolation. The people are gone, dead and vanished into the earth, and among the smothering weeds only the stone platforms upon which once their houses rose, only a few sagging, rotting grass huts, remain to show that this was a thriving community. (Bushnell, 1972, p.220)

Bushnell’s contextualization of a novel culture in Ka’a’awa is achieved through the joint effort of the two protagonists, Hiram Nihoa and Saul Bristol to enact an ecologically sustainable land tenure within Aloha Aina epistemology. Bushnell foregrounds that the Hawai’ian Kanaka Maoli had suffered from inferiority complex ever since the arrival of Captain Cook’s expedition in the 1778. Previously confined within a rigid kapu system, that breaking a taboo means natural disaster will likely to struct, foreigners break kapus repeatedly, and no volcanos erupted, the officers and traders who called at the island had no kapus, and they lived healthier and more abundantly than the Hawai’ian people. (Haley, 2016, p. 46). In line with Vourela’s statement that “through the powerful and authoritative Western civilizing process, the colonized are lured to take part in its process” (2009, p. i), the Hawai’ians forsake their indigenous knowledge in form of the supposedly superior system. Through Nihoa’s journey across O’ahu, he laments his outcry towards the plight of the Hawai’ians.

I think that we are a dying race because now we live in fear, not in harmony. Because we do not know what to do or what to believe. Because we have lost our respect for ourselves. This is the worst thing the foreigners have done to us: in so many ways they have made us to feel that we are ignorant and useless. In so many ways, they have taken away our respect for ourselves.” (Bushnell, 1972 p. 369)

A collaborative effort from both the native and the settlers, and symbolized by Nihoa and Bristol is a possible avenue to prevent environmental degradation. Bushnell asserts the necessity of embracing indigenous epistemology on the equality between human and non-human and Western prowess in technology. In other word, sustainability is important in cultivating the land, instead of exploitation and destruction for profit maximization.

Once we had claimed new pasture land for Ke Eahou, and Hiram had enlarged the vegetable garden, we progressed to even more novel tasks: we sawed wood from koa trees I had felled a year earlier; with the planks we built a house in the haole style, to replace the grass hut which had lodged the boys during the interval; and we made sturdy furniture to put into it. (Bushnell, p. 360)
The training school founded by Nihoa and Bristol, *Ke Eahou* focuses on self-sustain, in which the goods such as the furniture, farm implements, and grown vegetables are their own produce. Their reasoning of emphasizing self-sustained lifestyle lies in Nihoa’s assertion of “Why should they spend precious gold on shopworn pieces, I ask them, when they can get fresh goods free at home?” (Bushnell, p. 362) Realizing how the temptation of wealth and Western produce causes many Hawai’ians to discriminately exploit their surroundings, Nihoa and Bristol implores the necessity of sustainable living. New pasture land should consider the availability of untamed wilderness, trees should only be cut down whenever there is need in doing so. The training school which posits the possibility of harmonious living between human and the environmental, and also humans of different racial background highlights Bushnell’s intention of creating a novel culture, from indigenous and settler perspective as an avenue of sustainability living in Hawai’i.

**Conclusion**

To conclude, this study posits that Bushnell’s elaboration of a novel culture through interaction by the local natives and Western people is one possible solution in preventing ecological degradation. As indigenous people’s ecological relationship with the environment is still subjected within Orientalist’ discourse of denouncing the East as ‘superstitious’, ‘mystical’ and ‘irrational’, re-orientation of Western condescending view is required. Moreover, as the local Natives are already co-opted within a Western anthropocentric view, the Western people should reassess their demarcation of human and non-human by the adoption of indigenous perspective of human and nature’s relationship. Through Bristol’s immersion with the local natives of Ka’a’awa, Bushnell foregrounds the necessity of White’s collaboration in cultivating an ecologically sustainable environment. The creation of a novel culture, where *aloha aina*’s perspective is foregrounded within the advancement of Western technology embraces both side of the spectrum between indigenous and settler cultures.
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