TONY SMITH IN HAWAI’I

JOHN CHARLOT

Tony Smith (1912–1980) is one of a few great artists who have visited the Hawaiian Islands, have learned quickly and intensely from them, and created works that teach us about them. Smith was invited in the summer of 1969 to design a sculpture for the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts, to be a visiting artist at a special program, the Festival of the Arts of this Century, and to teach a three-credit studio course at the summer session of the University of Hawai’i. Already recognized as one of the greatest American sculptors, Smith had worked as an architect and a painter, had been a member of the prestigious New York school, and was receiving increasingly important commissions. The State Foundation had been mandated in 1967 to use one percent of state construction costs for art commissions and purchases; the first director of the Foundation, the architect Alfred Preis, had devised and promoted the relevant law. Tony Smith was the recipient of the Foundation’s first official commission.

1 John Charlot 1978 is an earlier version of this essay. I want to thank Nancy Morris, John Wisnosky, and Margaret Foster for their comments on the draft of this new version; and Mamoru Sato for information. I also thank Ronald Yamakawa, Manager, Art in Public Places Program, and Malie Van Heuvelen of the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts (SFCA) for access to the Foundation’s files and for personal communications.
2 For instance, Max Ernst and his wife Dorothea Tanning were invited in the summer of 1952 to teach at the University of Hawai’i summer school. Contact had been established when our family visited them in 1951 at their home in Arizona; that summer, my father, Jean Charlot, painted his murals Hopi Snake Dance and Preparing Antivenom Serum at Arizona State College in Tempe. My mother, Dorothy Zohmah Charlot, had the idea that Ernst could be convinced to teach summer school if his wife, then much less known, were invited to do so as well. While in Hawai’i, Ernst painted an important series on the volcano then erupting on the island of Hawai’i. At the time, he told the Hawaiian community leader, John Dominis Holt, that he had always wanted to see a volcano and that the reality was even greater than he had imagined. Ernst also gave a lecture of about two hours on his own art; it was recorded for the university library, but the recording has not been located. Ernst gave his notes for the lecture to my father, and a photocopy has been placed in the Jean Charlot Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawai’i.
3 I have used two files from the SFCA: 74/UC-0121 Tony Smith, UHM-Art Department-Painted Steel Sculpture (referred to as SFCA I) and FY 74/UC 0121 Sato, Mamoru, UH-Manoa Campus-Art Department (referred to as SFCA II). A third file contains papers on the repair and restoration of The Fourth Sign, Woodruff 1976. "Academy opens exhibit of art by Tony Smith" 1969. The SFCA, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and the Summer Session of the University of Hawai’i collaborated to finance the project.
Smith impressed one immediately with all the intelligence and authority one could have expected. But he was also surprisingly interested in entering into Hawai’i, its land and people.6 “This is a magic place,” he once said. “Inspiring.” He often expressed delight at meeting my father, the artist and writer Jean Charlot; Smith emphasized to one and all that the monumentality and public character of the Mexican Mural Renaissance—in which Charlot had participated—had been a major influence on his own work and that of his friend Jackson Pollock. Smith’s For J. C. is a portrait head of my father; a marble version of the model was given to him, and a simplified monumental version was built later.5 The unusually complicated design of the original is an excellent portrait; “I did it for someone whom I think of as a Cubist and I thought it had a kind of humorous quality . . . .”7 Smith devoted himself to his students’ and friends, left small sculptures as gifts—including For D. C., for my then wife Dominique—and ultimately donated the design of a monumental art work for the Mānoa campus of the University of Hawai’i.

Smith’s combination of intelligence and feeling characterized his art as well. He used cardboard three-dimensional geometric forms—tetrahedrons and octahedrons—as modules to construct small-scale models of his sculptures. His rapid fingers moved like a card-sharp’s as he patted the little cardboard pieces into shapes I could not predict. Some resembled objects in ways that made me think about them all over again. Others aroused my feelings or laughter without my knowing why. Using the modules enabled Smith to think and compose in three dimensions. As we, the viewers, walk around one of his sculptures, we are continually surprised by how different the next side looks from what we were expecting; we realize how awkwardly and inhabitually we visualize in three dimensions. Smith himself could be surprised.8 As Smith worked, a part of him seemed to watch and decide when to fix a shape. Awkwardly applied scotch tape or bandages kept the cardboard pieces in place. This was the model that Smith the architect then described in blue-print form for the person or firm that would produce the final piece. The model could also be reproduced at its own scale in metal or marble and presented as a gift.

I was able to follow Smith’s creation of one sculpture from start to finish. Meeting him at an exhibition of my father’s paintings, I told him I had found a Tony Smith in one: a broom handle in Mexican Kitchen.9 Smith looked at it skeptically and then lit up. “You’ve given me an idea for a sculpture,” he said. A few days later, he arrived at my parents’ house with one of his small models. “I thought of doing a three-stage stick,” he said, “but I had to leave

---

6 Smith’s appreciation of Hawai’i cost him the support of a number of powerful people in the community, which he needed when his design for Hubris encountered opposition. A mark of provincialism is the depreciation of all things local, and Smith had been expected to scorn anything other than the latest New York trends. Smith also appreciated the architecture of Hawai’i. While driving, he remarked that he was surprised how much the local 1920s middle-class domestic architecture resembled that of New England. When I asked him what the resemblances were, he gave me a long answer full of technical architectural terms.

7 I find no mention of this still unfashionable attitude in the secondary literature on Smith, although other Mexican stimuli have been noted (Storr 1998: 31, 176 f., Mexican folk art; 130, a jade sculpture of a house; 132, two later murals of José Clemente Orozco). Through my father, I met Smith and had several opportunities to talk with him about his work.Jean Charlot 1969 reviews Smith.

8 Lippard 1972: 62, 81.


10 Mexican Kitchen, oil on canvas, 60” ×40”, Jean Charlot checklist number 1055, exhibited by the Jean Charlot Foundation, July 1967.
one off, because it looked too complicated.” The model was then executed in marble for my wife Dominique and entitled For D. C. (and nicknamed Broomstick). Later it was constructed as a monumental bronze.\textsuperscript{11}

In small pieces, one can see how Smith moved from an interest in geometric shapes to their pictorial and emotional possibilities. In his monumental projects in Hawai‘i, a new interest was added—fitting the sculpture into the land: making the sculpture appropriate to its place and also using it to express something about that place. Knowledge of the intended site is thus essential for a full understanding of such works, especially when Smith perceived Hawai‘i as special or “magic.” Moreover, the Hawaiian land is not only famously beautiful, but the basis of the indigenous world view with its extensive expression in literature and art.\textsuperscript{12} In fact, Smith’s three projects were portraits of the land: the first, of a volcano, and the last two of Mānoa Valley, where the main campus of the university is situated and where Smith was working. The portraits are as recognizable and illuminating as For J. C. Smith was working like a Hawaiian poet, who lives in a place, comes to know it, and composes Place Chants or Songs in its honor, chants that simultaneously describe the place itself and express the poet’s personal response to it.

In his first unrealized project for the campus, Haole Crater, Smith was interested in the formal problem of the relationship between the shape dug into the ground and the one built above it: “I have always been particularly interested in excavating and then piling the dirt up . . . .\textsuperscript{13} As an architect, Smith had built sunken gardens for houses he designed. The visitor walking up to Haole Crater would have met a sloping waist-high wall, the side of a square enclosure. Looking over the edge, he would have seen that the interior floor was sunk below the ground level he was standing on. Descending a metal ladder, he would have found himself in his head, able to “see only the sky.”\textsuperscript{14}

The project reveals itself to us in Hawai‘i immediately as a volcano. A common statement about the crater of Haleakalā, Maui, is that from its interior at night, one can see only the stars, but one sees them with a marvelous clarity. Smith’s title warns us, however, that this is specifically a haole, a non-Hawaiian, crater. Smith’s titles are unusually important for the understanding of his pieces, revealing especially his own thoughts about a sculpture. I sense in Haole Crater a note of culture conflict, of the artist defining himself over and against a special world he was just encountering. Smith later told Lucy Lippard: “Haole means Caucasian, any white person on the Islands. In the title of the piece, it probably means square.”\textsuperscript{15} Typically for Smith, geometry is connected to emotion and character. The squareness of the plan shows that the crater is man-made or, more particularly, made by the outsider, the Caucasian Tony Smith. But even as such, the crater retains the bigness and fearlessness of a volcano. I myself was reminded of the enormous, round World War II gun emplacements I saw as a child while hiking illegally on Diamond Head. Significantly, Smith did not continue with this project because he was convinced it was inappropriate for its setting: “I was talked out of it for the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Storr 1998: 170 f. When Smith told Dominique he wanted to create a piece for her, she asked, “Does it have to be black?” Smith assured her he could do it in white marble.
\item \textsuperscript{12} John Charlot 1983: especially 55–78.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Lippard 1971b: 68.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Lippard 1971a: 15.
\item \textsuperscript{15} Lippard 1971a: 10.
\end{itemize}
campus project by a Japanese-American student who contended that Hawaii already had too many craters, square or otherwise.”16

The second unrealized project for the university campus was *Hubris*, to be installed near the new biology or Physical Plant Building.17 A square pavement of nine rows of nine square slabs was set beside an equal square of nine rows of nine three-foot high pyramids.18 Smith was again interested in the relationship between shapes: pointed and flat, protruding and non-protruding. Smith showed me the object that gave him the idea for the piece: a long cheese board, one rectangular end flat for cutting, the other with pyramidal points on which to set the cubes of cheese. The rectangles were changed to squares, which he felt were more appropriate to the monumental scale of the project.19

The title reveals that Smith was following his practice of using geometry to express character. The Greek term *hubris* is used in classical ethics and tragedy to describe a person who tries to go beyond his limits in the plan of the universe. Smith was still using and re-examining his own attitudes and cultural heritage, rather than entering into a new thought world.

The sculpture also had an objective, pictorial aspect: “there are two squares: one representing the mountains, and the other, the plains.”20 The campus is situated in the broad mouth of Mānoa valley, and Smith was thinking of the mountains at the valley head, which resemble a row of enormous pyramids. From a general response to the volcanic Hawaiian islands in *Haole Crater*, Smith had now found his inspiration in a specific place. The sculpture would have been built low, so the viewer would have looked up at the mountains and then down at the sculpture and seen corresponding shapes. Those shapes would also have performed the service of framing the campus buildings, which are otherwise so sadly disconnected from their setting.

Although the sculpture was a portrait of the Hawaiian valley, Smith was still expressing very much an outsider’s response to it; and he was surprised that local people did not respond to his piece with the same emotions he felt himself:

> the mountains in Honolulu . . . have very sharp crests and sharp curves. I had thought of *Hubris* as very hostile and I found out the students didn’t think that way at all; they go barefoot and thought of running through it, racing, which seems to me quite a feat—to go from one of those things to another with no place to settle your feet.21

16 Lippard 1971a: 10. Not everyone would have discouraged Smith from the plan, and I had the impression he regretted its remaining unbuilt. He consoled himself with ancillary arguments; for instance, people might have thrown things into the pit.

17 Alfred Preis to KeNam Kim (State Comptroller), February 14, 1969, SFCA I. The building is also called the Plant Science building in some of the documents. Some documents state erroneously that the sculpture would have been in the courtyard of the building.

18 The dimensions reported at the time are forty feet by eighty feet (Kishi 1970); “Half of the concrete and asphalt work is flush with the ground and the other half, rising about four feet above the ground, is made up of 81 identical pyramids” (“Hubris’ finds a new home at EWC after one rejection” 1970). The following passage from John Charlot 1978 was used and partially quoted without acknowledgment by Joan Pachner in Storr 1998: 132. My letter to the editor was not favored with a response. Pachner misunderstood the passage in Lippard 1971a: 10; the seven schemes Smith mentions were developed *before*, not *of*, *Hubris*. Blueprints for *Hubris* can be found in SFCA I.

19 John Wisnosky pointed out that joined tetrahedrons produce a square base (personal communication, November 5, 1998).


21 Lippard 1971b: 68. Compare Alfred Preis to Douglas MacAgy (NEA), August 4, 1969, SFCA I: “a magnificent horizontal piece of sculpture . . . half of which can be walked on and the other half will consist of 81 four-sided equilateral pyramids on which many other things can be done.”
Similarly, having grown up under the protective shadow of the Manoa mountains, my response to their shapes differs from Smith’s. For me, as for Hawaiian tradition, they are awesome but benevolent guardians. In other words, the culture clash is between a Western or continental United States view of nature and a Hawaiian or local one. The Westerner sees the mountains as masculine, striving up towards skies they can never reach. The Hawaiian sees the mountains as feminine, opening themselves to the fertilizing rain. In many pieces, such as Stinger and The Snake is Out, Smith expressed his view of nature as dangerous and hostile to human beings, a view that was influencing his response to Hawai‘i. In one of his dark moods, he stated that in general, “I see my pieces as aggressors in hostile territory. I think of them as seeds or germs that could spread growth or disease.”

When the board members of the SFCA were presented with the maquette for Hubris, they responded with “ups swelling enthusiasm” to “the greatness of your idea.” Unfortunately, the project was selected as a target by “the then newly-spawned ecology movement on the campus.” The Campus Environment Advisory Committee and the Faculty of the College of Tropical Agriculture objected that they had not been consulted earlier and that the sculpture might generate heat that would interfere with experiments in the cooled glass houses near-by. More basically, the project was taken, especially by students, as a symbol and even as an example of the construction steadily destroying the local environment, a view they expressed in the hippy terminology of the time. A student argued, “What good is concrete when you can’t eat it and breathe it? A garden, which we want, can be eaten, breathed and even smoked.” Hubris was rejected for its original site, and the later attempts to place the sculpture at the neighboring East-west Center and at the State Capitol were unsuccessful. Smith returned to the mainland, and a small version of Hubris was cast in bronze.

---

22 The hula dancer Leinioni Apoliona made this point to me.
24 Alfred Preis to Tony Smith, July 30, 1969, SFCA I.
25 Alfred Preis to Brian O’Doherty (NEA), January 16, 1975, SFCA I.
26 E.g., Resolution of the Faculty of the College of Tropical Agriculture, April 30, 1970, SFCA I. The documents on the controversy reflect campus politics. “‘Hubris’ finds a new home at EWC after one rejection” 1970.
27 Kishi 1970. Neil Abercrombie—then a lecturer and now a member of the U.S. House of Representatives—stated: “We are not knocking the artist, who may be commenting on a problem of too much concrete, but it is that we just don’t want it . . .”, “All we want is an unesthetic tree.” A poll of the building’s users “indicated that ‘well over 90 per cent were in favor of plants’ rather than concrete sculpture” (“‘Hubris’ finds a new home at EWC after one rejection” 1970).
28 N. Denney, the distinguished author of The Astonished Muse, defended the project ably but unsuccessfully for the SFCA (Kishi 1970):

It (‘Hubris’) is a very completely realized expression of the artist and the time and the relationship of man and nature in the 20th century . . . .
It is possibly the best piece of monumental sculpture in the Islands.
I don’t think that ‘Hubris’ destroys the environment; it rather adds to it . . .

Curiously, the protesters referred pejoratively to the sculpture’s supposed resemblance to tank traps (Kishi 1970; “‘Hubris’ finds a new home at EWC after one rejection” 1970), whereas its contemporary admirers note the resemblance positively (Storr 1998: 32 and note 73). Smith’s own statements show that he had no such resemblance in mind.

29 “‘Hubris’ finds a new home at EWC after one rejection” 1970. The East-West Center land on which the statue was to have been placed reverted to the university in a land exchange, and the university administration did not want to reopen the controversy. The State government rejected the statue for the Capitol grounds because of its size. Many documents relating to these attempts are in SFCA I: e.g., Alfred Preis to Tony Smith, May 11, 1970; Harlan Cleveland to Alfred Preis, July 1, 1970; Alfred Preis to Tony Smith, July 27, 1970: “thank you for your warm and delightfully
The rejection of *Hubris* was painful for the artist. When Smith misunderstood a communication from Alfred Preis, he wrote, “I was hurt and crushed that you didn’t like my work.” When a solution seemed imminent, he wrote Preis, “how thrilled I am by the prospect of getting ‘Hubris’ on the ground.” Fortunately, Smith’s feelings for Hawai‘i remained strongly positive. When the chairman of the Art Department, Prithwish Neogy, later asked to buy one of Smith’s medium-sized pieces for the new Art Building, Smith—in a truly saintly act—offered to donate the design and construction drawings of “a piece specially designed to relate to the dominant visual characteristics of the art building.” In 1976, *The Fourth Sign* was constructed, one of the largest of Smith’s works actually realized in metal.

Both Smith and the Art Department emphasized that the piece was “unique—that is, one of a kind, with no duplicates elsewhere.” The reason for this was that it was site-specific in a new sense: it was not merely well-placed or even well designed for a place; it was in fact a portrait of the land in which it was built. The arms of the sculpture correspond to the arms of the valley it faces. As in *Hubris*, Smith has connected his sculpture and the neighboring buildings to the setting; the sculpture echoes the beams of the Art building behind it as it does the encircling mountains and arms of the valley in front.

*The Fourth Sign* is thus both similar to *Hubris* and significantly different; most obviously, the earlier sculpture is bristling and repelling, the later is open and receptive. Both are portraits of the same place: a land that drew from Smith responses that revealed his innermost views of the universe and his place in it. But in *Hubris*, the viewer stands above the land and looks down on it; in *The Fourth Sign*, he looks up at the sculpture and then around the valley in which it is.

---

friendly note, with which you responded to our crisis”; Alfred Preis to Tony Smith, December 17, 1970; Alfred Preis to James R. Thomas (NEA), May 23, 1973; Alfred Preis to KeNam Kim (State Comptroller), July 17, 1974; KeNam Kim to Alfred Preis, August 29, 1974; Alfred Preis to Brian O’Doherty (NEA), January 16, 1975: after the land exchange, the SFCA was told “that the University would not wish to be host to a Tony Smith Sculpture. Although the intensity of the student activism had then somewhat subsided, the administration felt it more prudent not to arouse the slumbering tiger.”

30 Tony Smith to Alfred Preis, May 18, 1970, SFCA I.
31 Tony Smith to Alfred Preis, January 25, 1971, SFCA I.
32 Prithwish Neogy and Harne McVay to Alfred Preis, July 22, 1974, SFCA I. Later, the contract for *Hubris* was rewritten to transfer the commission for that sculpture to the new design. Smith’s offer to donate the new design was made, however, while attempts were still in progress to place *Hubris*. Alfred Preis to Tony Smith, January 20, 1975, SFCA I, expresses “boundless gratitude” for Smith’s “extraordinary generosity” and “the magnanimous understanding with which you have accepted our continued failure to find an appropriately significant location for ‘Hubris’…”
33 Quarter inch steel, 15’ high, 15’ deep, 37’ wide (Wisnosky 1976). Mamoru Sato, Professor of Art and instructor in sculpture, was hired as a consultant “to supervise the fabrication, installation and completion” of the sculpture; Alfred Preis to Hideo Murakami (State Comptroller), August 2, 1976, SFCA II. The construction costs were shared between the SFCA and the NEA. A videotape was made of the construction of the sculpture (Anderson 1978). There were no protests; Enclosure 4, n.d. (it is not clear to which document this enclosure was connected). SFCA II: “The varied opinions of campus students and faculty is substantially more favorable than with previous works of art on the campus not because it is better but because the campus population is now more familiar with and knowledgeable of contemporary art.” *The Fourth Sign* is curiously neglected in the secondary literature; e.g., I do not find it in Storr 1998.
35 Minutes of Meeting, September 17, 1974, SFCA I: “Tony designed the sculpture for that space”; “Sculture expressed the same feeling as that side of the building and was in keeping with the X’s on that side of the building”; “Ishihara expressed how the sculpture represented the whole feeling of the building itself with its spaces and geometric quality.” The Art Building encloses a court. The sculpture also echoes the shape of the adjacent Varney Circle with its surrounding buildings. The siting of the sculpture and its precise angle were determined by Prithwish Neogy to fit the diagonal sidewalks entering the Art Building (Mamoru Sato, personal communication, November 6, 1998). I myself would have faced the statue directly towards the center of the back wall of the valley.
placed. The differences between the sculptures show that Smith’s views changed; the similarities show that he was dealing with the same concerns. In *The Fourth Sign*, geometry is again used to construct a fearsome shape: the arms and claws of the astrological crab, Cancer, with pointed ends as frightening as the tips of *Stinger*.36 *The Fourth Sign* clearly expresses Smith’s fear of the universe. Again in his title, he searches in Western culture for an idea. *Hubris* was a concept that emphasized for Smith the subjective pole of the piece: the human being who exaggerates his place in the universe. This time, Smith gives a new weight to the objective, representational pole of the sculpture. To interpret this “magic place,” he turns to the ancient cosmic teaching of astrology, a primitive expression of the often occult or “magic” interconnection of all things, including the person. The title invites the viewer to understand the sculpture on both a cosmic and a personal level.

In the context of Hawaiian thinking, Smith faces his sculpture, his crab, towards the mountains; his sea animal thus represents one side in the Hawaiian cosmic scheme of paired opposites: everything can be situated by the coordinates land and sea, *uka* and *kai*. This dualistic scheme is familiar to every visitor from the much-used directionals *mauka* and *makai*, landward and seaward. That is, just as the person cannot be understood outside the framework of the universe, so *The Fourth Sign* can be understood only as one element of its place. That is, the sculpture is essentially site-specific: its meaning cannot be defined without reference to its context.

As seen above, Smith had stated, “I see my pieces as aggressors in hostile territory. I think of them as seeds or germs that could spread growth or disease.” Mānoa Valley is clearly not hostile territory, but cancer is a disease. Smith had suffered from health problems since childhood, and the title of his sculpture focuses the source of its fearsomeness. As the viewer faces the sculpture, its arms reach aggressively towards him. But if the viewer looks at the sculpture as it faces the valley, the form reaches with both arms out to the valley like an *orans* in the ancient gesture of prayer with upraised arms. The valley in turn reaches around the sculpture to embrace it. The fearsomeness of the sculpture—and the fearfulness of the sculptor—are not denied, but they are put into a larger context. Cancer is indeed frightening, but it can be understood in the total framework of life, which is represented by the glorious valley. Pain is a part of life, but even greater is the beauty of the universe in which we live. The sculpture reaches out to the valley, not as an aggressor but as a supplicant, seeking some connection, some comfort, perhaps some hope of living on in the valley as a devotional work of art. Accordingly, the gesture and the message of the sculpture are an embrace We are all clasped in a universe as beautiful and as fearsome as God. We respond with a fear that is the beginning of wisdom and the end of *hubris* and with a wonder that fills us with comfort and hope.

This movement of Smith’s thinking and feeling may have been initiated by his surprise at how differently local people responded to the land from the way he had himself in *Hubris*. A greater influence, I argue, was the very experience of living in Hawai‘i, an experience that has inspired thinkers and artists since human beings first arrived in the islands. The land is the basis of religious feelings in Hawaiian culture and indeed inspires awe. But the land’s very immensity is part of its beauty, which draws us to the earth as our cosmic mother and to each

36 Cancer “governs” from June 22 to July 22, and may allude to Smith’s summer stay in the Islands. I do not know what other significance the sign might have had for him.
other as her children. The Hawaiian Christian minister, David Ka'upu, has stated that his native culture and religion can teach Westerners a greater sense of balance between human beings and the universe. Indeed, Hawaiian chants and songs about places alternate between a greater emphasis on the objective or on the subjective pole, but never lose sight of both. That is, Hawaiians understand themselves as part of the universe, and that universe is as beautiful as Hawai'i.

In a newspaper interview about The Fourth Sign, Smith emphasized its special character, its basis in his local experience, and its connection to learning:

Smith says the sculpture is one of his major pieces—it has the monumentality of some of his other works, but is more humane. In his words, "'The Fourth Sign' is an intimate expression of my experience as an instructor at the Manoa campus."... Conceived as an outdoor classroom, Smith hopes the work will supply a locus for teaching and learning. During the summer of 1969 the artist often held sculpture seminars in the little Thai pavilion on the grounds of the East-West Center.37

The sculpture would thus enclose a class just as the valley does the university. The sculpture is a monument to learning and a record of what Smith himself learned in the valley.

Indeed, had he returned to the islands, Smith could have seen students draping their young bodies over his sculpture and nestling within the enclosure of its arms, just as they bathe in the pool under Mānoa falls at the head of the valley. This is the local reaction to what, however awesome, is beautiful and a gift. The Fourth Sign is at home. Smith—the haole, the non-Hawaiian, the visitor—has felt the land and, by his actions, has shown that he is one of the few outsiders to be reborn in Hawai'i as a kama'āina, a true child of the land.
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