Rain pelted the decks and the howling wind and twenty-foot ocean swells madly rocked our boat as we made our way in dawn’s first light from the port of Lahaina to the island of Kahoʻolawe. We struggled for a foothold, while grasping for trash bags to relieve ourselves of the queasy welling up of fluids deep in our guts. Uncle Harry Mitchell called out to us, “You had enough? And now, are you ready to turn back?” Everyone begged to turn around. Before the captain could steer the boat around to head back most of my students boldly jumped into the wild surf off of Olowalu and swam to shore rather than suffer the pangs of seasickness all the way back down the coast to Lahaina.

Uncle Harry sat me down. “You are a college professor, eh?” Yes. “And you saw the storm that has been gathering for the past few days?” No. “It was windy when you left Oʻahu?” Yes. “And you felt the storm?” No. “You know that we go across the channel to Kahoʻolawe on a small boat?” Yes. “Did you know that there were small-craft warnings before you left Oʻahu?” No. “What were you thinking about?”

I had been totally oblivious to the major elements of a huge storm swirling together for the past few days. I was the typical single-minded urban Hawaiian academic, bent on getting where I wanted to go, but completely out of balance with the natural forces around me. Uncle Harry explained, “If I had told you that you couldn’t make it over to Kahoʻolawe this morning you would have disagreed, argued, and insisted on going. So I took you out in the boat, not too far off the coast, not even in the channel, until you had had enough and were begging me to turn around.”

Through my bitter disappointment at not making it to Kahoʻolawe I learned one of the most important lessons of my life from kupuna Mitchell. Always be conscious and respectful of the natural elements around me. As
Uncle Harry would always say, “Watch . . . look at the moon, the stars, the clouds, they talk to you . . . listen . . . watch!”

“Aloha ‘āina, aloha ke akua, aloha kekāhi i kekāhi” (love and respect the land, love and honor God, love and look after one another, these are the three important things our kūpuna always ask us to remember); this was another mantra of Uncle Harry. From him I learned that one who understands and lives by these precepts embraces the world of Native Hawaiians. This Native Hawaiian worldview is called lōkahi, or unity, harmony, balance. It refers to the unity, harmony, and balance in the universe between humans, nature, and deities or spiritual life forces. For personal well-being, we need to be in balance with the people around us, and with the natural and spiritual forces of life.

So, there I was, spring break 1980, out of balance and stuck with twenty college students, coolers full of food for a week, grounded by a wild late-March storm that I never saw coming. Uncle Harry took pity on us. He loaded us into vans, a truck, and a car and took us home to Ke’anae-Wailuanui, Maui. The community of taro farmers and fishermen graciously allowed us to camp in their church hall. For the next few days Uncle Harry threw us into the taro patches to earn our lodging and he taught us the moʻolelo of Keʻanae-Wailuanui, and of the valleys, streams, and gulches from Keʻanae through Hāna and out to Oheʻo. We immersed ourselves in the way of life of the kuaʻāina of Keʻanae-Wailuanui. I awoke to a worldview and lifestyle that I would devote my academic endeavors to helping perpetuate. This is the life ways of the kuaʻāina.

I do not write of ruling chiefs, but of those who made the chiefs rulers. I write of those who first held the lands of Hawaiʻi in trust for the Gods of our nature and whose descendants have a vested responsibility and right to hold these lands in trust today. I write of the kuaʻāina, the keepers of Hawaiʻi’s sacred lands who are living Hawaiian culture. This is a moʻolelo, a history, or, in the Hawaiian sense, a succession of knowledge passed on orally from one generation to the next of kuaʻāina, who shared this knowledge with someone, such as Mary Kawena Pukui in the 1960s or me in the 1980s and 1990s, as oral history interviews. They are the source of the knowledge of which I write, and the shortcomings herein are my own.1

I can remember a time when it was demeaning to be called kuaʻāina, for it meant that one was an awkward and rough country person.2 In Hawaiian, kua means back and ‘āina means land, so kuaʻāina is translated literally in the Hawaiian Dictionary as “back land.” However, in the context of the Native
Figure 1  Uncle Harry Kûnihi Mitchell of Wailuanui, Maui, playing his guitar near Hakioawa, Kaho’olawe. Uncle, sparkle in his eye, knee-deep in his lo‘i, introduced me to the lives of the kua‘āina and their role in the cultural regeneration of Kaho‘olawe. 1979. Franco Salmoiraghi.
Hawaiian cultural renaissance of the late twentieth century, the word kua‘aina gained a new and fascinating significance. A kua‘aina came to be looked upon as someone who embodied the backbone of the land. Indeed, kua‘aina are the Native Hawaiians who remained in the rural communities of our islands, took care of the kūpuna or elders, continued to speak Hawaiian, bent their backs and worked and sweated in the taro patches and sweet potato fields, and held that which is precious and sacred in the culture in their care. The kua‘aina are those who withdrew from the mainstream of economic, political, and social change in the Islands. They did not enjoy modern amenities and lived a very simple life. This mo‘olelo recounts how the life ways of the kua‘aina enabled the Native Hawaiian people to endure as a unique, distinct, dignified people even after over a century of American control of the Islands.

Figure 2  The rural communities where kua‘aina have remained are cultural kipuka that have been bypassed by major historic forces of economic, political, and social change in Hawai‘i. Uncle Harry Mitchell’s Wailuanui is a cultural kipuka from which Native Hawaiian culture was regenerated and revitalized on Kaho’olawe and a new generation of taro farmers and traditional healers was trained. 1936. Bishop Museum.
NAʻAKAʻAINA AND CULTURAL KIʻPUKA

“Ke ha‘awi nei au ā oe. Mālama ‘oe i kēia mau mea. ‘A‘ohe Mālama, pau ka pono o ka Hawai‘i” (I pass on to you. Take care of these things. If you don’t take care, the well-being of the Hawaiian people will end):¹ these words were used by kūpuna to pass on knowledge and stewardship of their lands to a chosen successor of the next generation. Gifted with this stewardship responsibility, the successors held their ancestral lands and knowledge sacred in their memories and passed it on in custom and practice from generation to generation up through the twenty-first century.

Daniel Pahupu was a kuaʻāina and a kupuna whom Mary Kawena Pukui interviewed on the island of Moloka‘i in 1961 as part of a project to gather ancestral knowledge about the sacred and significant places in the Hawaiian Islands, referred to in Hawaiian as wahi pana. In 1961 Mary Kawena Pukui traveled from island to island interviewing kuaʻāina, as the keepers of the wahi pana, in order to document and thereby perpetuate their unique and profound knowledge for future generations. Conducting the interviews in Hawaiian, the kuaʻāina shared knowledge with Pukui that had been passed on from one generation to the next about the lands where their ancestors lived, worked, and sustained a spiritual connection to the life forces of the universe.⁶ The land and nature, like members of the ‘ohana or extended family, were loved. The place-names they were given reflected their particular character and nature and contain traditional knowledge accumulated by Hawaiian ancestors in utilizing the natural resources of these areas, providing kuaʻāina with information they need to understand and adapt to the qualities and character of the land in which they live, such as soil conditions, local flora or fauna, and seasonal fluctuations. Native Hawaiian ancestors also named the various types of rain and wind of particular districts. The names of places and natural elements not only provide a profound sense of identity with the ‘āina or land and natural resources, they also convey a sense of responsibility to provide stewardship of the area where they live.

In his introduction to Ancient Sites of Oʻahu, Edward Kanahele explained the significance of wahi pana in the perpetuation of Native Hawaiian cultural knowledge. He also explained how the understanding of a place, its names, and the reason for its designation as a wahi pana is essential to understanding the area’s function and significance in Native Hawaiian society:

As a Native Hawaiian, a place tells me who I am and who my extended family is. A place gives me my history, the history of my clan, and the history of my people. I am able to look at a place and tie in human events that
affect me and my loved ones. A place gives me a feeling of stability and of belonging to my family, those living and dead. A place gives me a sense of well-being and of acceptance of all who have experienced that place.

The concept of wahi pana merges the importance of place with that of the spiritual. My culture accepts the spiritual as a dominant factor in life; this value links me to my past and to my future, and is physically located at my wahi pana.

Where once the entire Native Hawaiian society paid homage to numerous wahi pana, now we may give wahi pana hardly a cursory glance. Only when a Native Hawaiian gains spiritual wisdom is the ancestral and spiritual sense of place reactivated. Spiritual knowledge and the wahi pana are ancestrally related, thus spiritual strength connects to the ancestral guardians, or 'aumakua. My 'aumakua knew that the great gods created the land and generated life. The gods infused the earth with their spiritual force or mana. The gravity of this concept was keenly grasped by my ancestors: they knew that the earth’s spiritual essence was focused through the wahi pana. (James, in E. Kanahele, 1991)

Kua'āina live in rural communities throughout the Hawaiian islands. In these areas, Native Hawaiians have maintained a close relationship to and knowledge of their wahi pana. These rural communities are special strongholds for the perpetuation of Hawaiian culture as a whole. An analogy which conveys a sense of the significance of these areas can be found in the natural phenomenon of the volcanic rainforest. From the island of Hawai‘i come the oli or chants of Pele and her creative force. The oli hulihia, in particular, meaning overturned, overthrown, and upheaval, speak of volcanic events, such as in the following chant.

**Kua Loloa Kea'au I Ka Nāhelelele / Kea'au Is a Long Ridge of Forest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kua loloa Kea'au i ka Nāhelelehe</td>
<td>Kea'au is a long ridge of forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hala kua hulu Pana'ewa i ka lá'au</td>
<td>The hala ridges of Pana'ewa are the trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ino ka maha o ka'ōhi'a</td>
<td>Numerous are the severed 'ōhi'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kū kepakepa kamaha o ka lehua,</td>
<td>Zigzag are the severed lehua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Po'ohina i ka wela a ke Akua</td>
<td>The grayish mist is the Goddess’s hot revenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uahi Puna i ka oloka'a pōhaku</td>
<td>Puna is smoky with hot rolling stones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nā pe'a 'ia e ka Wahine</td>
<td>Persecuted by the Goddess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nānahu ahi ka ka papa o Oluea  The plain of Oluea is bitten with fire
Momoku ahi Puna, hala i ‘āpua  Puna is cut off by fire, even to ‘Apua
A ihu e, a ihu la,  The flow is heading this way and that.
A hulihia la i kai,  Turning upside down toward the sea,
A ihu e, a ihu la  The flow is heading this way and that,
A hulihia la i uka,  An upheaval toward the uplands,
A ua wā'awa'a  It is so desolate, uninhabitable,
A ua noho ha'aha'a  Made low by the Goddess
A ua hele helele'ihelele'i  Falling, falling, nothing but ashes.

Even as Pele claims and reconstructs the forest landscape, she leaves intact whole sections of the forest, with tall old-growth ‘ōhi’a trees, tree ferns, creeping vines, and mosses. These oases are called kïpuka. The beauty of these natural kïpuka is not only their ability to resist and withstand destructive forces

Figure 3  The volcanic rainforest in Puna, Hawai'i, features numerous beautiful natural kïpuka of old-growth forest from which fresh fields of lava are eventually revegetated. Thus the Puna rainforest is a mosaic of old-growth forest and new-growth forest.
of change, but also their ability to regenerate life on the barren lava that surrounds them. For from these kïpuka come the seeds and spores carried by birds and blown by the wind to sprout upon and regenerate the forest on the new lava, sparking a dynamic new cycle of coming into and passing out of life.

The rural communities where kua‘äina have remained are cultural kïpuka that have been bypassed by major historic forces of economic, political, and social change in Hawai‘i. Like the dynamic life forces in a natural kïpuka, cultural kïpuka are communities from which Native Hawaiian culture can be regenerated and revitalized in the setting of contemporary Hawai‘i. Moreover, from the examination of the lives of kua‘äina in Hawaiian cultural kïpuka emerges a profile of the strongest and most resilient aspects of the Native Hawaiian culture and way of life. Such an examination provides insight into how the Native Hawaiian culture survived dynamic forces of political and economic change throughout the twentieth century.

Features of Cultural Kïpuka

Originally, cultural kïpuka were traditional centers of spiritual power. In traditional Hawaiian chants and mythology, major akua or Gods and Hawaiian deities were associated with these wahi pana. These districts were isolated and difficult to access over land and by sea. Owing to the lack of good anchorage and harbors, early traders often bypassed these districts in favor of more accessible areas. The missionaries entered these areas and established permanent stations during a later period than in other parts of Hawai‘i. Thus, traditional Native Hawaiian spiritual beliefs and practices persisted there, without competition, for a longer period of time. When Christian influences entered these areas, they had to coexist with traditional beliefs and practices.

The geography of these districts discouraged the widespread or long-term development of sugar plantations. In the arid areas, the lack of water resources made development of sugar plantations unfeasible. In the areas with sufficient rainfall, the terrain was too steep or rugged for plantation agriculture. Where plantation agriculture failed, such as in Moloka‘i and the Hāna district, ranches were able to succeed. The ranches employed Native Hawaiian men as cowboys and allowed them to live with their families in these isolated districts and pursue traditional fishing, gathering, and hunting activities to supplement their wages. In some areas small stores provided kua‘äina access to some basic Western commodities such as kerosene, lanterns, tools, flour, crackers, and sugar. However, for the most part kua‘äina were not consumer oriented.
Money to purchase these basic provisions came from selling taro or fish or an occasional day’s labor for a local entrepreneur or the government road crew.

Where neither plantations nor ranches were established, traditional subsistence activities continued to be pursued, undisturbed by modern economic development. In the wetland areas taro continued to be farmed, often in conjunction with rice. In the arid areas, sweet potatoes, dryland taro, and other traditional and introduced crops suited to the dry soil and climate were cultivated. Thus, the natural features and resources of these districts that rendered them unsuitable for plantation agriculture and ranching played a role in the survival, and eventual revitalization, of Native Hawaiian cultural, spiritual, and subsistence customs and practices. Concurrently, the quality and abundance of the natural resources of these rural communities can be attributed to the persistence of Native Hawaiian cultural and spiritual values and practices in the conduct of subsistence activities.

Very few haole or Caucasians settled in these districts, and kua’āina had very little interaction with the outside community. Chinese who completed their contracts on the plantation and did not return home or move to the mainland leased or rented lands from the kua’āina. Some served as middlemen, marketing whatever taro and fish kua’āina desired to sell in the towns and bringing back consumer goods for sale or barter in the rural communities. Where there was a small rural store in these districts, it was invariably owned by a Chinese, who in some cases was married to a Native Hawaiian woman.

By 1930 there were still seventeen rural districts where Native Hawaiians were predominant. Andrew Lind wrote of the significance of these areas for the continuity of Hawaiian culture:

These racial havens—small population islands still relatively secure from the strong currents which have swept the archipelago as a whole into the world-complex of trade—are strikingly similar to those which appear in the census of 1853. The dry and rocky portions of Kau, Puna and the Kona coast, the deep valley of Waipio, the wild sections of Hana, Maui, portions of lonely Lanai and Molokai where industrial methods of agriculture have not succeeded, the leper settlement, and Niihau, the island of mystery—these are the places of refuge for some 4,400 or nearly one-fifth, of the native Polynesians . . .

The old fish and poi company, with its accompaniment of tutelary deities, taboos, religion, and magic, still persists in modified form within many of these isolated communities. A small plot of taro and access to the
sea and the mountains are apparently all that is required for the satisfaction
of their material wants. The wage from an occasional day’s work on the
government road enables them to purchase the necessary supplies which
the old economy cannot now provide . . . The natives themselves have
found these rural havens where the economy of life to which they are
best adapted can survive.8

The seventeen districts where Native Hawaiians comprised a majority in
1930 were small isolated valleys and districts on the fringes of Hawai‘i’s eco-
nomic and social life. The overall population in these districts averaged 341,
and the number of Native Hawaiians in them averaged 248. The largest dis-
trict, Pala‘au-Ho‘olehua on Moloka‘i, had 1,031 inhabitants, of whom 826
were Hawaiian; and the smallest, Ke‘omuku on Lāna‘i, had 54 inhabitants, of
whom 33 were Hawaiian.

On Hawai‘i Island, these districts included Kalapana (88 percent Hawai-
ian); Waipi‘o and Waimanu (66 percent Hawaiian); Keaukaha, an area opened
for Hawaiian homesteading in 1925 (83 percent Hawaiian); the Pu‘unahulu,
Pu‘uwa‘awa‘a, and Kīholo district (79 percent Hawaiian); the Kohanaiki,
Kalaoa, Hu‘ehu‘e, and Honokōhau district (52 percent Hawaiian); ‘Ala‘ē,
Pāhoehoe, Honokaua, ‘Opiehale, and ‘Ōlelo-Moana district (82 percent
Hawaiian); and Ho‘ōpūloa, Papa, Alika, Kaunāmano, Kapua, and Miloli‘i dis-
trict (64 percent Hawaiian).

On Maui, the districts with a predominance of Hawaiians included Ke‘anae
to Nāhiku (78 percent Hawaiian); Nāhiku to Hāna (55 percent Hawaiian);
Kīpahulu (80 percent Hawaiian); and Kaupō to Kahinkini (86 percent Hawai-
ian). On Moloka‘i the districts with a majority of Hawaiians included Kawela
to Ualapue (62 percent Hawaiian); Kalawao (66 percent Hawaiian); and the
Hawaiian homestead lands at Pala‘au-Ho‘olehua (80 percent Hawaiian). The
small district of Ke‘omuku on the island of Lāna‘i was 61 percent Hawaiian.
The island of Ni‘ihau was 93 percent Hawaiian. On O‘ahu, only the district
that included the Kalihi Receiving Station and the hospital for Hansen’s dis-
ease patients had a majority of Hawaiians; 61 percent of the patients were of
Hawaiian ancestry. The statistics are summarized in table 1.

Except for the homestead districts of Pala‘au-Ho‘olehua, and Keaukaha,
the Hansen’s disease receiving station at Kalihi, and the settlement at Kala-
wao, the ethnic concentrations of Hawaiians were not induced or encouraged
by governmental policy. Among the remaining districts, certain qualities and
patterns of change and continuity can be observed as common to them.9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hawaiian</th>
<th>% Hawaiian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hawai‘i</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapana</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipi‘o, Waimanu</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keaukaha</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu‘uanahulu, Pu‘uwa‘wā‘a, Kīhōlo</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohanaiki, Kalaoa, Hu‘ehu‘e,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honokōhau</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ala‘ē, Pāhoehoe, Honokua,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Opiihihale, ‘ōlelo-Moana</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho‘ōpūloa, Papa, Aili‘a, Kaunāmano,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapua, Miloli‘i</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maui</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ke‘anae/Hāna</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nāhiku/Hāna</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kīpahulu</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupō</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moloka‘i</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawela, Ualapue</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalawao</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pala‘au-Ho‘olehua</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lāna‘i</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahue to Kamaiki (Keōmuku, Lāna‘i)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O‘ahu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalibhi Receiving Station/hospital</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni‘ihau</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>5,796</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics based on U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1931, pp. 70, 72, table 22. The district boundaries were found in Governors’ Proclamations, 1926–1930, pp. 6–21, 128–47; and Map no. 301, O‘ahu, State of Hawai‘i Archives.
In the 1930s two anthropologists from the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, E. S. Craighill Handy and Elizabeth Green Handy, in collaboration with Mary Kawena Pukui, traveled through all of the major districts of the Hawaiian Islands to assess the original native horticulture of the islands prior to the introduction of Euro-American plants. Their findings were published in The Hawaiian Planter, vol. 1, and in Native Planters in Old Hawai‘i: Their Life, Lore, and Environment. These volumes provide a snapshot of the lives of the kua‘āina in the rural districts during the 1930s. In the foreword to Native Planters in Old Hawai‘i Craighill Handy wrote:

It was shown that the older generation of country natives still had an extraordinarily intimate and thorough knowledge of the many varieties of taro, sweet potato, sugar cane, and banana still cultivated . . . The Hawaiians, more than any of the other Polynesians, were a people whose means of livelihood, whose work and interests, were centered in the cultivation of the soil. The planter and his life furnish us with the key to his culture.10

Only a handful of cultural kïpuka survived the onslaught of development after Hawai‘i became a state in 1959. These included the islands of Moloka‘i and Ni‘ihau; on Maui, the districts of Hāna (from Ke‘anae to Kahikinui) and Kahakuloa; on Hawai‘i, the districts of Ka‘ū, Puna, and Waipi‘o Valley, and the small fishing communities of Kohala and Kona, excluding Kailua. On O‘ahu, the Windward Valleys of Kahana, Waiʻahole, Waikäne, Hauʻula, and Lāʻie and sections of the Waiʻanae Coast, and on Kaua‘i, Waipā, Kekaha, and Anahola retained features of cultural kïpuka, although the population of Native Hawaiians has fluctuated.

Cultural Kïpuka and Lökähi

Rural Native Hawaiians today descend from kua‘āina who were content to remain in the isolated districts, though many others moved out during the twentieth century. For those who stayed behind, life was filled with interesting natural phenomena and forces that challenged them as they sought out their subsistence needs. The kua‘āina way of life is a model of the Hawaiian belief, custom, and practice of lökähi. Kua‘āina were intimately conscious of their ‘āina—the lands and natural resources where they live. They built their economic activities around the life cycles of the various fish, animals, and plants they depended upon for food. Thus, from month to month, as the seasons shifted from wet to dry, their food sources changed in accordance with
the type of fish, fruits, and plants that were in season. This knowledge of the environment and natural life forces was often passed on and remembered as Native Hawaiian traditions and beliefs. Native Hawaiians often chose to personify the forces of nature as spiritual entities or akua and ‘aumakua, Gods and ancestral spirits. They created legends and myths to describe and remember the dynamic patterns of change that they observed.

The Kumulipo, genealogy chant of the family of King Kalākaua and Queen Lili‘uokalani, exemplifies the Native Hawaiian belief in lōkāhi. It traces the origin of humans through a process of evolution in nature, beginning with day arising from the black primordial night. It continues with coral polyps as the first life form, which evolves into various forms of marine life and then into plants and animals on the land, through ancestral deities, and down to several generations of chiefly ancestors of the Native Hawaiian people. This chant, therefore, establishes that Native Hawaiians are descended from, and thus inextricably related to, natural life forms and the spiritual life forces personified as deities.\(^\text{11}\)

We also learn of lōkāhi in the Hāloa tradition. In this mo‘olelo the first-born offspring of Wākea, Sky Father, and his daughter Ho‘ohokukalani, maker of the stars in the heavens, Hāloa Naka, is stillborn. When buried, Hāloa Naka grows into the first kalo plant. Their second-born child, Hāloa, is a progenitor of the Native Hawaiian people. This tradition, again, establishes that Native Hawaiians are the young siblings of the kalo plant and that both descended from the deities Wākea and Ho‘ohokukalani. This relationship is eloquently described in Native Planters in Old Hawaii:

> When, therefore, the learned men in early times, all of them taro planters, compounded this myth as a part of their heritage of ancient lore, which describes the birth of nature and man as the consequence of the impregnation of Mother Earth by Father Sky, they sealed into their people’s unwritten literature this idea, that the taro plant, being the first-born, was genealogically superior to and more kapu (sacred) than man himself, for man was the descendant of the second-born son of Sky and Earth. The taro belonged, then, in the native parlance of family status, to the kai kua‘ana (elder or senior) branch of cosmic lineage, man himself to the kai kaina or junior.\(^\text{12}\)

In the “Oli Kūhohunu o Kaho‘olawe Mai Nā Kūpuna Mai” (Deep Chant of Kaho‘olawe from Our Ancestors), way-finding voyagers are elated at the sight of the island of Kaho‘olawe. They dedicate the island to Kanaloa, Hawai-
ian God of the ocean, out of gratitude for his guidance of their double-hulled canoe across the vast Pacific. In this example of lōkāhi, the Hawaiian way-finders who composed this chant bestow upon the island of Kahoʻolawe the distinction of being honored as a body form of the God Kanaloa. Subsequently, the voyagers develop Kahoʻolawe into a center to train navigators in celestial way-finding, which in its essence involves the acquisition of intimate knowledge of the natural forces of the ocean, winds, and stars collectively personified as Kanaloa.13

In tracing unbroken lineal descent from the original Native Hawaiians who had settled the districts, kuaʻāina also claim ancestry not only with the ‘aumakua, but also with the ‘uhane or spirits of the land and resources where they live. Kuaʻāina continue to acknowledge the presence of their spiritual ancestors in the surrounding land by maintaining respectful practices in the use of the land, streams, ponds, and ocean. These lands are treated with love and respect like a kūpuna of the ‘ohana. They regularly visit the various areas in the course of subsistence gathering. While traveling to the various ‘ili or sections of the traditional cultural practices region, through dirt roads and trails, along spring-fed streams, and the shoreline, practitioners continuously stay alert to the condition of the resources. If a resource is declining they will observe a kapu or restriction on its use until it recovers. They may even replant sparse areas. They are acutely aware of changes due to seasonal and life cycle transformations in the plants and animals. Plants and animals in their reproductive stage are not gathered. As kuaʻāina gather in their traditional area, they also renew their understanding of the landscape, the place-names, names of the winds and the rains, traditional legends, wahi pana, historical cultural sites, and the location of various native plants and animals. An inherent aspect of these practices is conservation to ensure availability of natural resources for present and future generations.

Many kuaʻāina have also continued to cultivate fish in ponds and the open ocean by regularly feeding the fish in conjunction with making offerings at the kūʻula shrines that mark their ocean fishing grounds. Taro and other domestic crops are planted according to the moon’s phases to assure excellent growth. Kuaʻāina take advantage of seasonal fruits and marine life for their regular diet. Native plants are utilized for healing of illness by traditional methods that involve both physical and spiritual cleansing and dedication. Cultural knowledge attached to the traditional names of places, winds, and rains of their districts inform kuaʻāina about the effect of the dynamic forces of nature upon the ocean and the land in their area, and activities are planned accordingly.
Legends and chants inform them about how their ancestors coped with such elements. Thus, in the cultural kïpuka, traditional Native Hawaiian custom, belief, and practice continue to be a practical part of everyday life, not only for the old people, but also for the middle-aged and the young.

The undeveloped natural resources in these areas still provide an abundance of foods for the kua‘äina who live in these districts. Forested lands provide fruits to eat. Vines, plants, and wood are used to make household implements and tools or as herbs of healing. The forest provides a natural habitat for animals that are hunted for meat. Aquatic life flourishes in the streams. The ocean provides an abundance of food. Subsistence activities continue to be the primary source of sustenance for the kua‘äina. Production in these districts is heavily oriented toward home consumption.

Kua‘äina also look after one another through maintaining relationships of ‘ohana or large extended-family networks. Hänai, or the adoptive raising of children of relatives, continues to be commonly practiced. Ties with family members who move to another island, especially O‘ahu, are maintained. If some of the children move away to the city, one or two remain behind to care for parents and the family kuleana or ancestral lands. Often those who move away send children home to be raised by the extended family during breaks from school and holidays. Families often visit each other between islands and exchange food gathered or raised through subsistence activities.

It should be noted that the methods and techniques of accessing, acquiring, or utilizing traditional natural resources may have changed over time. However, this does not detract from the fact that the purpose of the activities is to provide for Native Hawaiian ‘ohana and their community and that the activities are guided by traditional Native Hawaiian kapu or restrictions and guidelines associated with customary subsistence, cultural, and religious practices. For example, Hawaiian fishermen may use motorboats rather than canoes to get to their ancestral fishing grounds. They may use a nylon net rather than one woven from native plant materials to surround fish or to entangle them in the overnight fluctuating tides. In most cases they are still utilizing ancestral knowledge of ocean tides, currents, and reefs to locate and catch the fish. Their catch is used to honor family ‘aumakua and to feed their extended families and neighbors. Hawaiian hunters may drive a truck on a dirt road rather than walk along a trail to reach the area of forest where pigs roam. They may use a gun rather than a spear or knife. Since agriculture and residential development have destroyed the lowland forest areas where the pigs used to be plentiful and easily reached on foot trails, Hawaiians must go deeper into the
same forests or higher up the same mountain hunted by their ancestors. The meat is shared with their large extended families as well as with neighbors who no longer have the stamina to go out and hunt.

Hawaiian custom and practice are distinguished not only by the honor and respect for traditional ‘ohana cultural values and customs to guide subsistence harvesting of natural resources, but also by the uses made of the resources. Thus, when I speak of subsistence in this mo’olelo I do not mean that the kua‘āina acquire all that they need to live from cultivation, gathering, fishing, and hunting. As the market economy evolved in Hawai‘i, creating a demand for manufactured goods, and when taxes were imposed by the government, Native Hawaiians had to earn cash and interact with the market system. Instead, the definition of subsistence used in this mo’olelo is that developed by the Governor’s Task Force on Moloka‘i Fishpond Restoration in 1993: “Subsistence is the customary and traditional uses . . . of wild and cultivated renewable resources for direct personal or family consumption as food, shelter, fuel, clothing, tools, transportation, culture, religion, and medicine for barter, or sharing, for personal or family consumption and for customary trade.”

In addition, ‘ohana values and customs that guide subsistence activities are models of the practice of lōkāhi in modern Hawai‘i. The first rule with regard to the land, ocean, and natural resources is to only take what is needed. Wasting natural resources is strongly condemned. It is also important to protect the ability of living resources to reproduce. Thus, kua‘āina gather according to the life cycle of the resource and fish only during the particular species’ non-spawning seasons: different fish are caught during different seasons of the year to allow the animals to reproduce. In addition, kua‘āina alternate the areas where they gather, fish, and hunt in order to allow the resources to replenish themselves. If an area is observed to have stressed or declining resources due to drought, storm damage, or harvesting, a kapu on harvesting in the area is observed. Resources are replanted if appropriate.

Resources are always abundant and accessible to those who possess knowledge about their location and have the skill to obtain them. There is no need to overuse a more accessible area. More accessible resources are left for the kūpuna to harvest. Young men and women are expected to venture farther afield to acquire what they need. The knowledge and skill that has been passed down intergenerationally is respected and protected. It is kept within the family and not carelessly given away to outsiders. This knowledge includes an understanding of the areas which are kapu or reserved for various members of the community. Kua‘āina usually fish, hunt, and gather in the areas tradition-
ally used by their ancestors. If they go into an area outside of their own for
some specific purpose, they usually ask permission and go with people from
that area.

Kua‘aina never speak openly about plans for going out to subsistence hunt,
gather, or fish. When actually venturing out on an expedition, they keep
focused on the purpose and goal for which they set out to fish, hunt, or gather.
If they gather additional resources along the way, they do so when they are
coming out of the area, never when they are headed for their destination. They
are certain to stay aware of the natural elements and alert to natural signs.
They respect the resources and the spirits of the land, forest, and ocean and
do not act loud and boisterous. This enables them to better observe bo‘ailona
or natural signs important for their sense of direction, safety, and well-being.
For example, the sound of falling boulders signals flash flooding in a stream.
Sea birds flying inland before day’s end signal that a storm is moving in from
the ocean.

The resources acquired through subsistence enterprises are shared with
members of the broader ‘ohana, neighbors, and friends. In particular, the
young kua‘aina take care of the kūpuna who passed on their knowledge and
experience to them and are now too old to go out on their own. They also take
care of the widows and women who are single heads of households, who don’t
have men to provide for their subsistence needs. Finally, resources sacred to
‘aumakua of their ‘ohana are respected as sacred to them and never gathered.

Thus, kua‘aina living in cultural kīpuka are successful in acquiring the basic
necessities for their families through subsistence activities by employing tra-
ditional cultural and spiritual knowledge and practices passed down to them
from their kūpuna.

Benefits of Subsistence

Subsistence activities have added benefits related to family cohesion, health,
and community well-being. A subsistence economy emphasizes sharing and
redistribution of resources, which creates a social environment that cultivates
community and kinship ties, emotional interdependency and support, pre-
scribed roles for youth, and care for the elderly. Emphasis is placed on social
stability rather than on individual efforts aimed at income-generating
activities.14

Through subsistence, families attain essential resources to compensate for
low incomes. They can also obtain food items, especially seafood, that might
be prohibitively expensive in a strict cash economy. If families on fixed incomes were required to purchase these items, they would probably opt for cheaper, less healthy foods that would predispose them to health problems. In this respect, subsistence not only provides food, but also ensures a healthy diet.

Subsistence generally requires a great amount of physical exertion (e.g., fishing, diving, hunting), which is a valuable form of exercise and stress reduction and contributes to good physical and mental health. It is also a form of recreation that the whole family can share in. Family members of all ages contribute to different phases of subsistence, be it active hunting, fishing, gathering, or cleaning and preparing the food for eating. Older family members teach younger ones how to engage in subsistence and prepare the food, thus passing on ancestral knowledge, experience, and skill.

Another benefit of subsistence is sharing and gift giving within the community. Families and neighbors exchange resources when they are abundant and available, and the elderly are often the beneficiaries of resources shared by younger, more able-bodied practitioners. Most kuaʻainia believe that generosity is rewarded with better luck in the future.

Resources obtained through subsistence are also used for a variety of special life cycle occasions that bond families and communities. Resources such as fish, limu ʻopibi, wild venison, and so on are foods served at lūʻau for baby birthdays, graduations, weddings, and funerals. ʻOhana and community residents participate in these gatherings, which cultivate and reinforce a sense of family and community identity. If ʻohana members had to purchase such resources rather than acquire them through subsistence, the cost would be prohibitive, and the number of ʻohana gatherings would decrease. Subsistence activities therefore enable ʻohana to gather frequently and reinforce important relationships and support networks.

The time spent engaged in subsistence in the natural environment also cultivates a strong sense of environmental kinship that is the foundation of Hawaiian spirituality. Kuaʻainia reinforce their knowledge about the landscape, place-names and meanings, ancient sites, and areas where rare and endangered species of flora and fauna exist. This knowledge is critical to the preservation of natural and cultural landscapes because they provide a critical link between the past and the present. For example, wahi pana that are referred to in ancient chants and legends can be lost amidst changes due to modernization. However, visiting such places and sites while engaged in subsistence provides a continu-
ity that is critical to the survival and perpetuation of the knowledge of these cultural places.

Moʻolelo

I write this moʻolelo, or succession of oral traditions, to acknowledge the role of the kuaʻāina in the various cultural kïpuka of the Hawaiian Islands in perpetuating traditional and customary Native Hawaiian belief, custom, and practice. I hope to show that protection of natural resources and of the subsistence livelihoods of the kuaʻāina in the cultural kïpuka is essential to the perpetuation of Native Hawaiian culture, as a whole, for future generations. What is at stake in planning for the future of these cultural kïpuka is the perpetuation not just of a rural lifestyle, but of the Native Hawaiian way of life itself. In order for those of us who live in Hawaiʻi to attain lōkāhi and live in balance

Figure 4  Representative of two distinct generations and ‘ohana of Moloka‘i subsistence fishermen, “Mac” Kelsey Poepoe and Kanohowailuku Helm walk the old fishing trail to Mokio Point near the northwest corner of Moloka‘i, monitoring the subsistence fishing grounds for Native Hawaiian homesteaders. 2005. Richard A. Cooke III.
with our fragile island environment, we need to protect our cultural kïpuka. This may be a way to offset and perhaps begin to reverse the dramatic transformations of the natural and cultural landscapes of places such as Honolulu, O'ahu; Kailua-Kona; and Lahaina, Maui.

Intrigued by Andrew Lind’s account of cultural kïpuka in the 1930s, I decided to select an island, a moku or district, and an ahupua’a or basic geographic subdistrict usually coinciding with a valley from his list of remote areas to research as case studies. This would allow me to study the life ways of the kua‘āina within the distinct traditional land use regimes from the level of an ahupua’a through that of a district to that of an island. I selected Moloka‘i as the island; Hāna on Maui, from Ke‘anae to Kaupō, as the district; and Waipi‘o on Hawai‘i as the ahupua’a.

As for the island, Moloka‘i was the larger in size and population and had more diverse and abundant resources than Lāna‘i and Ni‘ihau, the other two islands mentioned by Lind. On Moloka‘i, Hawaiians comprised a majority of the population through 1930. Among the small islands, Moloka‘i had the largest number of kuleana holders in 1930, despite the large concentrations of land under Moloka‘i Ranch, Pu‘u o Hoku Ranch, the Bishop Estate, and the Territorial Government. Kaho‘olawe, as lands of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i that were ceded by the Republic of Hawai‘i to the U.S. government, was entirely under the control of the Territorial Government. It was leased out to Angus MacPhee for ranching in 1930. Ninety-eight percent of Lāna‘i was owned by the Dole Corporation in 1930. The entire island of Ni‘ihau was owned by the Ni‘ihau Ranch Company.

In modern Hawai‘i, the people of Moloka‘i continue to proudly proclaim their island as the “Last Hawaiian Island.” In addition, the kua‘āina of Moloka‘i led the movement to reclaim Kaho‘olawe as sacred Hawaiian land and to revitalize the Hawaiian cultural practices of aloha ‘āina or love and respect for the land on every island. This connection between the kua‘āina of Moloka‘i and the cultural renaissance that developed around the Kaho‘olawe movement clearly illustrated the regenerative quality of the cultural kïpuka.

I selected Hāna, on Maui, as the district because of its distinctive landscape and its pristine and diverse native natural resources, and because the ku‘a‘āina from that district had also played an important role in the Kaho‘olawe movement and the Hawaiian cultural renaissance. In addition, as discussed at the beginning of this chapter, I was first introduced into the world of the kua‘āina through Uncle Harry Mitchell in the Ke‘anae-Wailuanui community of the Hāna district.
I selected Waipi'o as an ahupua'a in order to develop a case study on the island of Hawai'i and because it played a critical role in the survival of taro cultivation in the islands as a whole. My research revealed that the island of Moloka'i, the Hāna Coast, and Waipi'o Valley were highly valued by Native Hawaiian chiefs as areas over which to maintain control. These areas comprised lands that were extremely well suited for the cultivation of taro and useful native plants, had streams abundant with edible aquatic resources, and were close to abundant ocean resources.

These case studies were initially developed for sections of my dissertation, which documented the life of Native Hawaiians during the first thirty-two years of direct American rule, 1898 through 1930. Subsequently, I had the opportunity to conduct additional oral history interviews and historical research and studies on the island of Moloka'i and the Keʻanae-Wailuanui ahupua'a of the Hāna district. In addition, I conducted ethnographic research in the district of Puna, on Hawai'i, and the ahupu'a of Waiahole, Waikāne, and Hakipu'u, on O'ahu, in separate studies.

In preparing this manuscript I decided to include the additional material gathered for Moloka'i and Keʻanae-Wailuanui and to include a chapter on the district of Puna. Puna enriches the case studies because it is the home of Pele and her family of deities. Its landscape and resources are constantly transformed by seismic episodes and volcanic flows. The Puna families sustain a dynamic relationship to Pele as 'aumakua.

These case studies are not exhaustive histories of the kua'āina and the cultural kīpuka selected. They are designed to provide an essential history of each area, to share the insights and perspectives of the kua'āina who live there, and to convey the importance of protecting the resources and cultural practices of these and other cultural kīpuka. They also provide insight into the importance of continuing to document both the oral and the written histories of Hawai'i's kua'āina and the cultural kīpuka.

The case studies emphasize the experiences of the kua'āina in the early twentieth century up through World War II. The war and the 1946 tidal wave, which struck right after the end of the war, served as the major turning point in the social and economic development of the islands, even in the cultural kīpuka. Moreover, the collections of oral histories of küpuna for Waipi'o, Hāna, Puna, and Moloka'i focus on their experiences growing up and living in these communities in the prewar period.

Through my research of these areas and interaction with the kua'āina who live there, I have come to the realization that the mainstream history of
Hawai‘i focuses too narrowly on the history of change and of cultural impact upon Hawaiian society, concentrating on O‘ahu and the ruling elite. A broader and more inclusive history of the Hawaiian islands would document not only the changes, but also continuity of Native Hawaiian culture. It would develop a history of the experiences of Native Hawaiian women as well as of men who raised their extended families by farming and fishing throughout the various islands of Hawai‘i, including the rural communities I call cultural kīpuka. This work contributes to a much broader history of the Native Hawaiian people and the Hawaiian Islands. Because time and space limited my ability to conduct ethnographic research on all the cultural kīpuka on all our islands, it is my hope that this work can inspire and inform new research to be conducted on the cultural kīpuka not selected and contribute to the development of a more comprehensive history, one that includes the rural districts on all the major Hawaiian Islands.

Each case study begins by examining the traditional cultural significance of the district. The ‘ōlelo no‘eau or descriptive proverbs and poetic sayings for which the area is famous are interpreted, and a descriptive chant for the area is translated and interpreted. These provide valuable insights into the cultural resources and features for which the area was known and thus the role of this area overall in the cultural practices and customs of Native Hawaiians. This is followed by a discussion of the history of the landscape and its settlement, the deities who dwelt there, and the ruling chiefs who controlled the area. Next the case studies review how developments in the nineteenth century affected the life of the kua‘āina in the area. Each case study then provides elaborate descriptions of the natural cultural resources available to the kua‘āina for their subsistence and livelihoods and of the beliefs, customs, and practices which guided their lives. Finally, an overview of the social and economic changes in each area through the end of the twentieth century as well as a discussion of the elements of continuity still evident in the lives of the kua‘āina in these communities is provided.

There is a final chapter on Kaho‘olawe, which is not a cultural kīpuka. Instead, it is included to demonstrate how the kua‘āina from the cultural kīpuka studied were instrumental in restoring the natural and cultural resources of Kaho‘olawe and reviving Native Hawaiian beliefs, customs, and practices on the island. Kaho‘olawe demonstrates the regenerative function of the kua‘āina from the cultural kīpuka examined in the earlier chapters of the book.
Establishment of the Indigenous Hawaiian Nation

Research by archaeologists, anthropologists, and ethnographers over the past thirty years suggests that the history of settlement, before continuous contact with Europeans in 1778, may be looked at in four distinct wā kéhikó or historic eras: the Colonization Period (1–600 CE), the Developmental Period (600–1100), the Expansion Period (1100–1650), and the Proto-Historic Period (1650–1795).

Ongoing subsurface archaeology continues to uncover evidence that suggests the date of first settlement is close to the time of Christ. Archaeological evidence suggests that the initial population was small, consisting of a few canoe loads of families and numbering at most around a hundred. They probably originated from the Marquesas or Tahiti and came fully prepared to permanently settle outside of their home islands, bringing with them food plants and domestic animals. Hawaiian legends, myths, and chants record, in story form, the experiences of the original Native Hawaiians. They describe the primal natural elements encountered by the original Native Hawaiians and how they adjusted to and coped with them. Often these original ancestors are personified as akua, kūpua, and ‘aumakua. To them is ascribed the bestowal upon the islands of special features and resources, including springs, streams, fishponds, mountain formations, caves, offshore islets, craters, cinder cones, and the varied rains and winds.

These deities or original ancestors made it possible for the Native Hawaiian people to adjust to the natural environment and resources of the islands and to live and flourish as a society. For example, in Tales and Traditions of the People of Old: Nā Moʻolelo a ka Poʻe Kabiko, Samuel Kamakau describes how Kāne and Kanaloa were honored as Gods who opened springs of fresh water for the people:

According to the moʻolelo of Kane and Kanaloa, they were perhaps the first who kept gods (‘o laua paha Na kahu akua mua) to come to Hawai‘i nei, and because of their mana they were called gods. Kahoʻolawe was first named Kanaloa for his having first come there by way of Ke-ala-i-kahiki. From Kahoʻolawe the two went to Kahikinui, Maui, where they opened up the fishpond of Kanaloa at Lua-laʻi-lua, and from them came the water of Kou at Kaupo . . . They broke open rocks so that water would gush forth—sweet, flowing water—at Wai-hee and at Kahakuloa on Maui, on Lānaʻi, at Waiakea in Punakou on Molokaʻi, and at Kawaihoa on Oʻahu.
The landscape was also made livable by the feats of Maui, who, according to tradition, fished the islands up from the ocean with the magic fishhook the constellation Manaiakalani. He is also said to have lifted the heavens high above the earth so that humans could walk upright. He ensnared the sun in order to lengthen the day. He also forced the 'alae or mud hen to share the secret of making fire so that humans could cook their food and have warmth at night: “There may be seen the things left by Maui-akalana and other famous things: the tapa-beating cave of Hina, the fishhook called Manai-a-ka-lani, the snare for catching the sun, and the places where Maui’s adzes were made and where he did his deeds.”

During the Developmental Period (600 to 1100) distinctively indigenous Hawaiian cultural patterns and implements emerge. Throughout this period, the inhabitants of Hawai‘i shared ancestry and heritage and developed an indigenous culture and language uniquely adapted to the islands of Hawai‘i and distinct from that of other Polynesian peoples. These indigenous Hawaiians developed a highly organized, self-sufficient subsistence social system and extended sovereign control over the Hawaiian archipelago.

The social system was communal and organized around subsistence production to sustain ‘ohana, the large extended multigenerational families. Hawaiian spiritual beliefs, customs, and practices focused on maintaining harmonious and nurturing relationships with the various life forces, elements, and beings of nature as ancestral spirits who were honored as deities. Land and natural resources were not privately owned. Instead, the Hawaiian people maintained a communal stewardship over the land, the ocean, and all the natural resources of the islands.

The kūpuna provided leadership and guidance to the mākua or adults who performed most of the daily productive work of fishing, cultivation, and gathering. Between the islands of Hawai‘i there was some variation of dialect and names for plants, animals, rains, and winds. There were also variations in physical structures and cultural and art forms. Origin myths varied according to the particular migration and genealogical line from which the families descended. The prominence of akua and kūpua also varied by island—for example, Pele and her family of deities for Hawai‘i, Maui on the island which bears his name, and various mo‘o or mythical dragonlike lizards on Moloka‘i. However, qualitatively, the language, culture, social system, and spiritual beliefs, customs, and practices were shared among the inhabitants of the islands, and the origin of the indigenous Hawaiian people’s sovereign nation can be traced to this era.

Dated to this period are basalt adzes and fishhooks that are distinctively
Hawaiian in form, as well as unique Hawaiian articles such as the 'ulu maika or stone bowling disc and the lei niho palaoa or tongue-shaped neck ornament. By the end of this period, leeward areas of the islands were settled, indicating an expanding population.

The Expansion period, between 1100 and 1650, includes a period of long voyages between Hawai‘i and Tahiti up through approximately 1400. These 550 years are distinguished by geometric growth of the population, technological innovation, intensification of production, and the emergence of a stratified social system. Remnant structures and artifacts dating to this time suggest that the leeward areas were extensively settled and cultivated during this period. The chants, myths, and legends record the transpacific voyages of great Polynesian chiefs and priests, such as the high priest Pa‘ao, the ali‘i nui or high chiefs Mo‘ikeha and Mo‘ikeha’s sons Kiha and La‘amaikahiki. The high priest Pa‘ao introduced a new religious system that used human sacrifice, feathered images, and walled-in heiau or temples. Traditional chants and myths describe how Pa‘ao introduced a system of ruling chiefs who appropriated rule over the land through intermarriage, battles, and ritual sacrifice.

The ruling chiefs organized great public works projects that are still evident today. For example, ‘Umialilao constructed taro terraces, irrigation networks, and heiau throughout Hawai‘i Island, including Ahu a ‘Umi on Hualalai. Kihaapi‘ilani oversaw the construction of the Ala Nui or trail around the entire island of Maui and the Ke Ala a ka Püpū, a whiteshell pathway, on Moloka‘i after he became ruler over all of the districts on these islands. The construction of major fishponds, irrigation networks, and field cultivation systems resulted in surpluses that sustained the stratification of Hawaiian society into three basic classes—ali‘i (chiefs), kahuna (priests), and maka‘āinana (commoners).

Despite these advances and the provision of food, barkcloth, and household implements by the common people for the households of the chiefs, Hawaiian society was predominantly a subsistence agricultural economy. There is no evidence of a monetary system or commodity production, although a system of barter in essential goods between fishermen, mountain dwellers, and taro cultivators existed within the framework of the ‘ohana. Such exchange within the ‘ohana functioned as a sharing of what had been produced upon the ‘ili that the ‘ohana held and worked upon in common:

Between households within the ohana there was constant sharing and exchange of foods and of utilitarian articles and also of services, not in
barter but as voluntary (though decidedly obligatory) giving. ‘Ohana living inland (ko kula uka), raising taro, bananas, wauke (for tapa, or barkcloth, making) and olona (for its fibre), and needing gourds, coconuts and marine foods, would take a gift to some ‘ohana living near the shore (ko kula kai) and in return would receive fish or whatever was needed. The fisherman needing poi or awa would take fish, squid or lobster upland to a household known to have taro, and would return with his kalo (taro) or paiai (hard poi, the steamed and pounded taro corm) . . . In other words, it was the ‘ohana that constituted the community within which the economic life moved.21

Under the ruling chiefs, land was not privately owned. The chiefly class provided stewardship over the land and divided and redivided control over the districts of the islands among themselves through war and succession. A single chief controlled a major section of an island or a whole island on the basis of his military power. Up until the time of Kamehameha I, however, no one chief was ever paramount over all of the islands.22

The high chief divided his landholdings among lower-ranked chiefs called konohiki. They functioned for the chief as supervisors over the people who lived on the lands and cultivated them. The konohiki’s tenure on the land was dependent upon their benefactor, the chief. Konohiki were often related to the chief and were allocated land in recognition of loyal or outstanding service to him. However, unlike elsewhere in Polynesia, the konohiki were rarely related to the maka‘ainana on the land under his supervision.23 Thus, the konohiki represented the collective interest of the ali‘i class over the maka‘ainana as well as the individual interest of his patron chief over the ahupua‘a.

The lands allocated to the konohiki were called ahupua‘a. Ahupua‘a boundaries coincided with the geographic features of a valley. They ran from the mountain to the ocean, were watered by a stream, and included landscape features such as mountain ridges or pu‘u and cinder hills.24

The ahupua‘a of the konohiki were further divided into strips of land called ‘ili, allocated by either the chief or the konohiki to the ‘ohana. These ‘ili either extended continuously from the mountain to the ocean or were made up of separate plots of land located in each of the distinct resource zones of the ahupua‘a. The ‘ohana was afforded access to all the resources within the ahupua‘a necessary for survival—vines, timber, thatch, and medicinal plants from forested mountain areas; sloping land for sweet potatoes and crops that require higher altitudes; low-lying lands irrigated by stream waters for taro and fresh
Ahupua’a boundaries reflected the pattern of land use that had evolved as the most efficient and beneficial to the ‘ohana throughout previous centuries. The boundaries were adopted and instituted by the ali‘i and konohiki to delineate units for the collection of tribute. These boundaries did not restrict access by the ‘ohana to those natural resources needed for survival that were unavailable within their own ahupua‘a. For example, the adze is an essential tool for the ‘ohana, yet the basalt used to hew adzes was not available within every ahupua‘a. ‘Ohana could access the adze quarries even if they were located outside the ‘ohana’s ahupua‘a. On the island of Moloka‘i, members of ‘ohana living in the ahupua‘a of the windward valleys would annually reside for part of the summer months in the ahupua‘a of Kaluako‘i to make adzes and to gather and salt fish. The salted fish would sustain them during the winter months when the ocean off their ahupua‘a was too rough for fishing. Evidence suggests that the island of Kaho‘olawe was also a place of temporary residence for Maui ‘ohana to gather fish and to acquire the basalt needed for making adzes.

The tenure of the ‘ohana on the land was stable, unlike that of the ali‘i and the konohiki. Two Hawaiian sayings illustrated this principle. The first was “Ko luna pōhaku no ke ka‘a i lalo, ‘a‘ole hiki i ko lalo pōhaku ke ka‘a” (A stone that is high up can roll down, but a stone that is down cannot roll). This means that the chief and his retainers, including the konohiki, who were over the people could be overthrown and lose their positions of influence. A chief could be defeated in war and lose his lands. When a chief died and a new chief succeeded him, the lands were redistributed, and the previous chief’s konohiki could be displaced. However, the common people who lived on the land from the days of their ancestors were stable on the land. They were not displaced when the chief or konohiki over them changed. They continued to live on and cultivate the land of their ‘ili from one chief’s rule to the next.

The second saying was “I ‘āina no ka ‘āina i ke ali‘i, ai waiwai no ka ‘āina i ke kanaka” (The land remains the land because of the chiefs, and prosperity comes to the land because of the common people). In other words, the chiefs held the land, but the common people worked the land and made it valuable.

Though the tenure of the maka‘āinana was stable, they were not tied to the land and did have the option to move away if they chose to. There is little evidence, however, that moving off of the land of one’s birth was ever a common practice.

The maka‘āinana produced all the necessities of life for their extended fam-
ilies from the ‘ili that was allotted to them. In addition to cultivating their own plots for the subsistence of their ‘ohana, the maka‘āinana were obligated to cultivate plots of land set aside for the konohiki and chiefs. These were called baku one and kō‘ele, respectively. The common people were also required to provide the chiefs and konohiki with an annual bo‘okupu or tribute that included food and all types of household needs, from tapa cloth and woven mats to stone and wooden containers and implements, as well as feathers to make the cloaks and helmets that were symbols of the ali‘i rank. In addition, the maka‘āinana were obligated to provide labor service and products from the land upon the request of the chief or konohiki. The ali‘i enjoyed full appropriation rights over all that was produced upon his land grants; however, it was the labor of the maka‘āinana that supported the entire society.

Maka‘āinana worked cooperatively and shared the fruits of the labor or laulima. Most of this labor was done within the context of the ‘ohana as the primary unit of production. The ‘ohana lived in dispersed clusters of households called kaubale on the ‘ili land granted to them. Within the ‘ohana there was also cooperative enterprise and reciprocal exchange of labor service called kōkua. This was practiced in the undertaking of major projects such as the chopping down, hewing out, and hauling of a log for a canoe or the construction and thatching of a house structure. These types of projects required the labor of more people than made up one single ‘ohana. In addition, all the ‘ohana within an ahupua‘a could be organized to do massive public works projects under the supervision of the konohiki. This included construction and maintenance of the irrigation systems and fishponds.

Although the chiefs and their konohiki had full appropriation rights over the land and the people, in the main this was a system of mutual obligation and benefit between the chiefs and the people. The chiefs controlled the land and distributed it among the maka‘āinana. The chief was required to manage and oversee the production on the land. He regulated the use of scarce resources and apportioned these resources among the people according to principles of fair use. Of these resources, water was the most valued, and the chief assured that the irrigation system was properly maintained. He conserved the resources of the land through restriction and replacement policies. Of great spiritual significance, the chief was responsible for conducting the proper rituals for the Gods who controlled nature. In return, the maka‘āinana were obliged to provide labor service and products of the land to the chiefs and konohiki.

Although Hawaiian tradition records cases of arbitrary, irresponsible, and
self-serving chiefs who abused the people, they were clearly exceptional cases and were quickly replaced with responsible chiefs who cared for the well-being of the people.28 The Hawaiian proverb “I ali‘i no ali‘i no Nā kanaka” (A chief is a chief because of the people) reflects the Hawaiian attitude that the greatness of a chief was judged according to the welfare of the people under him.29 According to the Hawaiian historian David Malo, “In former times, before Kamehameha, the chiefs took great care of their people. That was their appropriate business, to seek the comfort and welfare of the people, for a chief was called great in proportion to the number of his people.”30

From 1650 to 1795, the time of the Proto-Historic period, just prior to the arrival and settlement of Europeans, Hawaiian society was highly stratified under ruling chiefs who controlled whole islands and groups of islands and vied for control as a paramount chief. Individual high chiefs continuously competed to extend their control over more and more districts and islands through marriage alliances, religious ritual, and military conquest. The archaeologist Patrick V. Kirch provides an incisive description of this period:

> With the development of highly sophisticated and intensive agricultural and aquacultural production, an elaborate political hierarchy and land tenure system, a religious ideology and ritual practice that included war and fertility cults performed on massive stone temple platforms, and a highly stratified social structure, the Proto-Historic Hawaiian culture can be closely compared with other emergent forms of “state-level” societies elsewhere in the world (for example, the Olmec culture of Mesoamerica, the Pre-Dynastic Period of Egypt, or the Mississippian culture of North America).31

To the extent that Hawaiian society had evolved into a socially and economically stratified system by the eighteenth century, the responses of the Hawaiian people to contact and change after 1778 were divergent and largely influenced by the social and economic role the individual played in society. The acceptance or rejection of Western culture was largely the prerogative of the ruling class of ali‘i. The common people did not play a major role in determining the political and economic future of Hawai‘i. They let the ali‘i take the lead, while they struggled to survive the burden of contact—war, disease, famine, and the tragic widespread loss of beloved family, neighbors and friends.

As discussed above, the political, economic, and social development that came with contact, trade, and a plantation system were experienced unequally
in the various districts of each of the islands. The case studies presented relate the experience of the Native Hawaiians in the selected districts as these broader developments unfolded. Below is an overview of the key developments that affected the lives of the Native Hawaiian people from contact through the end of the twentieth century.

Contact and Monarchy

In 1778, the year the English explorer Captain James Cook arrived in Hawai‘i, the Native Hawaiian population was estimated at 400,000 to 800,000 inhabitants. Beginning in 1785 Hawai‘i became a regular stopover in the fur trade between America, Europe, and China. By 1810 Hawai‘i was an integral part of the China trade route as a source of sandalwood. Gradually Hawai‘i was pulled into the economic web of the worldwide market economy, causing far-reaching and irreversible changes that devastated the Native Hawaiian people. Periodically, the common people suffered famines that gripped the land as the chiefs gave priority to meeting the needs of the fur and sandalwood traders. According to Handy and Pukui, “As the desires of the chiefs and the pressure of the trading captains grew, more and more people were put to the task, fewer and fewer were left for the normal duties of everyday living; in many areas planting and fishing virtually ceased, and for a season thereafter there would be little harvested beyond the needs of the ali‘i and their konohiki (supervisors). It was the people who went hungry.”

Exposure to Western continental diseases such as gonorrhea, syphilis, colds, flu, dysentery, whooping cough, measles, and influenza killed thousands of Hawaiians. David Malo recorded that in 1804 alone half of the Islands’ population died of ma‘i oku‘u, a disease that was either cholera or bubonic plague.

Kamehameha began a series of military campaigns to conquer all of the Hawaiian Islands upon the death of his uncle, the chief Kalaniopu‘u, in 1782. In 1790 Kamehameha acquired the Western ship Fair American and the services of two Englishmen, John Young and Isaac Davis, to train his warriors in the use of Western military technology. In 1795, after a four-year period of peace during which Kamehameha trained his army, built his canoes, and planted acres of food to feed his army of warriors, he launched his military campaigns, which led to the conquest of Maui, Moloka‘i, Lāna‘i, Kahoʻolawe, and O‘ahu. In 1810 Kaua‘i also came under Kamehameha’s central authority when the chief Kaʻumualiʻi agreed to become a tribute chief of Kamehameha.
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rather than try to fight off an invading force of Kamehameha’s war canoes.\textsuperscript{35}
Thus, by 1810 King Kamehameha I, for the first time in the history of the Hawaiian Islands, established a central absolute monarchy with sovereign rule over all the islands.

Upon the death of King Kamehameha I in 1819, those chiefs who were closely allied to him feared a rebellion from rival traditional chiefs. As a means of undermining their rivals, the Council of Chiefs, under the leadership of Mō‘i Kamehameha II, Kuhina Nui Ka‘ahumanu, and High Chief Kalanimoku, instituted the ‘Ai Noa or abolition of the state religion.\textsuperscript{36} By abolishing the traditional chiefly religion under which rivals could claim rank, prestige, and position, the Kamehameha chiefs consolidated political power under the control of their monarchy.

Although Native Hawaiian religion ceased to have the official sanction of the royal government, Hawaiian spiritual beliefs and customs continued to be honored and practiced in most of the rural communities and settlements of the kingdom. Families continued to honor their ‘aumakua. Traditional 

\textit{kubuna lā‘au lapa‘au} or herbal healers continued their healing practices using native Hawaiian plants and spiritual healing arts. Family burial caves and lava tubes continued to be cared for. The hula and chants continued to be taught, in distinctly private ways. Among the deities who continued to be actively honored, worshipped, thought of, and respected, even to the present, were Pele and her family of deities. Every eruption reinforced and validated her existence to her descendants and new generations of followers.\textsuperscript{37}

In 1820, the year following the ‘Ai Noa, American missionaries began to settle Hawai‘i and convert Hawaiians to Christianity. In the same year commercial whaling began to attract increasing numbers of foreign settlers, who demanded rights of citizenship and private ownership of land.\textsuperscript{38} In 1839, nineteen years after King Kamehameha had established absolute rule over all of the islands, his son, Kauikeaouli, King Kamehameha III, initiated a serious of steps to set up a constitutional monarchy wherein the rights of the maka‘āinana, distinct from those of the chiefs and of the king, were recognized. The rights of foreigners who became naturalized citizens were also distinguished.

\textbf{Native Hawaiian Responsibilities and Rights Are Vested in the Land}

The first step in this process was the signing of the 1839 Bill of Rights. Up to this point, foreigners were unable to become naturalized citizens. Thus, when the law refers to “Na Kanaka a pau,” or all of the people, it refers only to the
native people of the Hawaiian Islands, the Native Hawaiians. It does not refer to foreigners residing in Hawai‘i. The Bill of Rights recognized a division of rights, the king being sovereign and distinct from the chiefs and the common people. It guaranteed the protection of the rights of the people, the Native Hawaiians, together with their lands, their building lots, and all their property. The 1839 Bill of Rights states in part:

5. Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people, together with their lands, their building lots and all their property, while they conform to the laws of the kingdom, and nothing whatever shall be taken from any individual except by express provision of the laws. Whatever chief shall act perseveringly in violation of this Constitution, shall no longer remain a chief of the Hawaiian archipelago, and the same shall be true of the governors, officers and all land agents.

The second step was the enactment of the 1840 constitution and the compilation of laws for the Hawaiian kingdom. Under the constitution, executive, legislative and judiciary branches of government were set up. The constitution included the same statement regarding protection of the people, their lands, their building lots, and all of their property. In addition, the constitution clearly stated that although the lands from Hawai‘i to Ni‘ihau belonged to the king, he did not own them as private property. Instead, the constitution states that the king held the lands of the islands of Hawai‘i in common with the chiefs and the people. Under this constitution, the responsibilities and rights of the king, the chiefs, and the people were vested together, in common, in the land, at a time when Native Hawaiians were the only citizens of the islands. Foreigners were not allowed to own land in Hawai‘i until a special law was passed in 1850. The 1840 constitution states in part:

Eia ke ano o ka noho ana o Na alii a me ka hooponopono ana i ka aina. O Kamehameha I, o ia ke poo o keia aupuni, a nona no Na aina a pau mai Hawai‘i a Ni‘ihau, aole Na e nona ponoi, no Na kanaka no, a ma Na alii, a o
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Kamehameha no ko lakou poo nana e olelo i ka aina. No laila, aohe mea pono ma mua, aohe hoi mea pono i keia manawa ke hoolilo aku i kekahi lihi iki o keia mau aina me ka ae ole o ka mea ia ia ka olelo o ke aupuni.

The origin of the present government, and system of polity, is as follows. Kamehameha I, was the founder of the kingdom, and to him belonged the land from Hawai‘i to Ni‘ihau, though it was not his own private property. It belonged to the people, and the chiefs in common, of whom Kamehameha I was the head, and had the management of the landed property. Wherefore, there was not formerly, and is not now any person who could or can convey away the smallest portion of land without the consent of the one who had, or has the direction of the kingdom.40

In 1846 Kamehameha III, the heir of Kamehameha I and ruling monarch of the Hawaiian Islands, initiated a process to establish private property in the Hawaiian Islands in response to the irrepressible demands of European and American settlers and their respective governments. The king and the legislature adopted “An Act to Organize the Executive Departments of the Hawaiian Islands,” which established a Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles. This act also included the “Principles Adopted by the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles in Their Adjudication of Claims Presented to Them.” These principles served to guide the establishment of a system of private property in Hawai‘i.

The introduction to the principles reaffirmed the joint responsibilities, rights, and interests of the king, the chiefs, and the ‘ohana in the lands of the Islands. From the time of High Chief Kamehameha Paiea and up until the creation of a system of private property, the king and the chiefs held all land as a sacred trust, and the indigenous ‘ohana continued their stewardship responsibility and tenure over the lands of their ancestors. Under the new law, members of the ‘ohana were now called hoa‘aina, or tenants of the land (literally translated, the term means “friend of the land”). The principles stated in part:

O Na pono a pau i pili i ke Alii maluna o Na konohiki nui, a me Na mea malalo o lakou, oia Na pono o Na konohiki nui maluna o Na hoaaina o lakou, a me Na lopa a pau i noho i ko lakou aina. Nolaila, me he poe hui la lakou, a ua pili ka aina ia lakou a pau . . .

Nolaila, he mea kupono maoli, a he mea pololei no hoi i ka haawi ana o ke Alii i ke kuleana alodio, ke haawi i ke konohiki maluna, oia hoi ka
mea i loaa mua ka aina Na ke Alii mai, no ka mea, i ka Hana Na pela, aole i Hana no ia Na konohiki, a me Na hoaaina malalo ona; ua hoomaluia lakou e ke kanawai, e like ma ka wa mamua. He mea akaka loa hoi ka hiki ole i ke Alii ka haawi aku i ke kuleana alodio ia hai, no ka mea, ina pela, ua nele ke konohiki mua. Aka, ina loaa i ke konohiki mua kona aina ma ke ano alodio, ma ke kuai, a ma ka haawi wale o ke Alii, ua mau no ke kuleana o Na hoaaina, a me Na lopa, no ka mea aole nele kekahi mea e ae no ka hoolilo ana o ka Moi i kona iho. Nolaila, o ke konohik i kuai me ke Alii a loaa kona aina ma ke ano alodio, ua hiki ole ia ia ke pai i ka poe malalo ona, e like ma ka hiki ole i ke Alii i keia manawa ke pai i ke konohiki.

The same rights which the King possessed over the superior landlords and all under them the several grades of landlords possessed over their inferiors, so that there was a joint ownership of the land; the King really owning the allodium, and the person in whose hands he placed the land, holding it in trust . . .

It seems natural then, and obviously just, that the King, in disposing of the allodium, should offer it first to the superior lord, that is to the person who originally received the land in trust from the King; since by doing so, no injury is inflicted on any of the inferior lords or tenants, they being protected by law in their rights as before; and most obviously the King could not dispose of the allodium to any other person without infringing on the rights of the superior lord. But even when such lord shall have received an allodial title from the King by purchase or otherwise, the rights of the tenants and sub-tenants must still remain unaffected, for no purchase, even from the sovereign himself, can vitiate the rights of third parties. The lord, therefore, who purchases the allodium, can no more seize upon the rights of the tenants and dispossess them.41

In a later section, the principles clearly state that there are three classes of persons who have vested rights in the lands of Hawai‘i—the government, the landlord, and the tenant:

Ua akaka loa hoi, ekolu wale no mea kuleana ma ka aina hookahi. 1. O ke Aupuni. 2. O Na konohiki. 3. O Na hoaaina, a nolaila he mea nui ka hoakaka i ka nui o ko kekahi kuleana, a me ko kekahi.

It being therefore fully established, that there are but three classes of person sharing vested rights in the land,—1st, the government, 2nd, the landlord, and 3rd, the tenant, it next becomes necessary to ascertain the proportional rights of each.42
These principles, looked at together with the declaration in the constitution of 1840, actually describe how any one section of land in the Hawaiian Islands is vested with multiple layers of responsibilities and rights. Native Hawaiian ‘ohana, referred to as hoa‘aina in the principles, who had cultivated their gardens and taro pond fields for generations and had gathered resources from mauka to makai, from the mountain to the ocean, in their resident ahupua‘a had one layer of vested interest, responsibilities, and rights in the lands of the ahupua‘a. Over them, the landlord chief or konohiki responsible for the overall management of the ahupua‘a and the well-being of the ‘ohana and hoa‘aina who resided there also had a layer of vested interest, responsibilities, and rights in each of gardens and taro pond fields that made up the ahupua‘a and in the ahupua‘a as a whole.

Finally, King Kamehameha III was descended from King Kamehameha I, who had conquered all of the chiefs and wrested control over each island. Therefore, King Kamehameha III, ultimately, had inherited a vested layer of interest, responsibilities, and rights over the individual gardens and taro pond

Figure 5  Kua‘aina have inherited the rights of the hoa‘aina. A Hawaiian taro farmer in Waipi‘o Valley embodies the image of the kua‘aina featured in this book, who, like the ho‘aina, bent their backs and worked and sweated in the taro patches and sweet potato fields and held that which is precious and sacred in the culture in their care. 1974. Franco Salmoiraghi.
fields in each of the ahupua‘a, as well as over each of the ahupua‘a in each of
the districts on each of the islands. The principles provided the following
example of how the multiple interests in any one tract of land might be
divided out:

Ina hookeia kela manaoho, e hiki no, ina he aina i ka lima o ke konohiki, a e
noho ana Na hoaaina, a ina like wale no ka aina a pau, hiki no ke mahele
maoli, i ekolu Apana like, a e haawi i ke konohiki i palapala alodio no kona
Apana, a pela no ko ka hoaaina, a koe hoi kekahi hapakolu i ke Alii i waiwai
no ke Aupuni.

According to this principle, a tract of land now in the hands of a
landlord and occupied by tenants, if all parts of it were equally valuable,
might be divided into three equal parts, and an allodial title to one then be
given to the lord, and the same title be given to the tenants of one-third,
and the other one-third would remain in the hands of the Kings, as his
proportional right.43

Therefore, the establishment of a private property system in Hawai‘i was
a process of dividing out the multiple layers of interest in each piece of land,
each ahupua‘a, and each island. The first step in this process of dividing out
multiple interests in the land was for the king and the landlords, or the chiefs
and konohiki, to distinguish their respective claims. The second step was for
the king and the chiefs to commute a portion of their respective claim to the
government of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i. The third step was for the common-
ers who lived on the lands to file for their portion of the lands claimed by the
king and the landlords or chiefs and konohiki.

Each of the māhele or divisions was in essence a series of quitclaim arrange-
ments between the king, on one hand, and a particular chief or konohiki, on
the other, relating to lands in which both had previously claimed an interest.
The summary is as follows:

1 That the King should retain all of his private lands as his personal and
individual property, subject only to the rights of tenants.
2 That one-third of the remaining lands be allocated to the Hawaiian
government; one-third to the chiefs or konohikis; and the remaining
one-third to the tenants or common people.
3 That the division between the chiefs or konohikis and the tenants might
be effected whenever either party required such a division, subject to
confirmation by the King and Privy Council.
4 That the tenants on the King’s private lands were entitled to one-third of the lands actually possessed and cultivated by them, and that such division should be made whenever either the King or the tenant required it.

5 That the divisions provided for in rules 2, 3, and 4 should be made without any prejudice to any fee simple grant theretofore made by any of the Hawaiian Kings.

6 That the chiefs or konohikis might satisfy the commutation due by them, by the payment to the government of a sum equal to one-third of the unimproved value of the lands awarded to them, or by conveying to the government a one-third part of such lands.

7 That the lands allocated to Kamehameha III were to be recorded in the same place and manner as all other allodial titles but that all lands allocated to the Hawaiian government were to be recorded in a separate book.  

The results of this Māhele were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crown lands reserved for the monarchy</td>
<td>984,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lands granted to 245 chiefs</td>
<td>1,619,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government lands, distinct from Crown</td>
<td>1,523,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,126,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these lands granted by the Board of Commissioners to the Crown, the government, and the chiefs continued to be subject to the rights of the hoa‘āina. The phrase “koe wale no ke kuleana o Na kanaka e noho ana ma ua mau aina la,” which the government translated as “subject or reserved only to the rights of the tenants,” is at the end of the declaration by the board establishing the Crown and government lands and appears on the grants of land issued by the board.

The establishment of a private property system in Hawai‘i transformed the relationships and mutual responsibilities between the ali‘i and the ‘ohana, who remained as hoa‘āina or tenants under the ali‘i. The rights and claims of the ali‘i were addressed through Ka Māhele, under which 245 ali‘i were granted a combined total of 1.6 million acres.

The rights of the hoa‘āina were twofold. First, through February 14, 1848, they had the right to file a claim against the lands apportioned to the chiefs and konohiki for those lands which they cultivated and upon which they lived. When the final land grants were made under the Kuleana Act of 1850, 8,205
hoʻāina received 28,600 acres, or 0.8 percent of all of the lands of Hawaiʻi. All of the land granted to the hoʻāina could have fit into the island of Kahoʻolawe, which has 28,800 acres. Although all of the 29,221 adult males in Hawaiʻi in 1850 were eligible to make land claims, only 29 percent received land; 71 percent remained landless.\(^48\)

Several factors may have contributed to the low number of applications and awards. Overall, the concept of private ownership of land was a totally foreign notion. The Hawaiian language does not even have a word for private property ownership of land. The word *kuleana*, which was used to translate the law, refers to personal possessions such as clothing. Thus, many Hawaiians did not appreciate or understand the importance of filing a land claim within the given two-year period in order to continue living upon their ʻili. And although the law was published and posted in key locations, it was vaguely worded, using foreign concepts that were not understood by the common people. Another reason may have been that those who lived in out-of-the-way places did not hear about the law or heard of it too late to file a claim. Furthermore, some of the makaʻāinana were intimidated by the chiefs not to make land claims against them. And finally, most of the makaʻāinana lived as farm tenants of the chiefs and functioned outside the nexus of a cash economy. Therefore, the fee for surveying the land, between $6 and $12, was beyond the reach of a majority of the makaʻāinana.

In the campaign to set aside the Crown lands for Native Hawaiians to homestead in 1921, Prince Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole focused on these lands as the principal trust held by the Hawaiian monarchy for the Native Hawaiian people. According to Kūhiō, King Kamehameha III and the Council of Chiefs had recognized that the common people had one-third interest in the lands of Hawaiʻi at the time of the Māhele. When the common people only received 0.8 percent of the land on an individual fee simple basis, the remaining portion of the one-third interest of the common people in the of the lands were held in trust by the monarchy as the Crown lands. Prince Kūhiō explained this point in an article he wrote for *Mid-Pacific Magazine* in February 1921:

> The act creating the executive department contained a statute establishing a board of royal commissioners to quiet land titles . . . This board decided that there were but three classes of vested or original rights in land, which were in the King or Government, the chiefs, and the common people, and these three classes of interest were about equal in extent . . . The common people, being left out in the division after being recognized as owners of a third interest in the kingdom, believing that new methods had to be
adopted to place them in possession, assumed that these lands were being held in trust by the crown for their benefit. However, the lands were not reconveyed to the common people, and it [sic] was so held by each monarch from the time of the division in 1848 to the time of the dethronement of Queen Liliʻuokalani in 1893.49

What remains clear is that the king and government of the Kingdom of Hawaiʻi recognized that the Native Hawaiian landlords and common people had vested interests, responsibilities, and rights in the land. The vested rights of 245 chiefs and konohiki or landlords were transformed into fee-simple ownership of a combined total of 1.6 million acres through the process of the Māhele. The vested rights of more than three-fourths of the common people were never transformed into fee-simple ownership. Kühiō, who was also Hawaiʻi’s delegate to the U.S. Congress, presented a compelling argument that the people believed the land in which they held a vested interest continued to be held in trust by the monarchy for their benefit.

The second right of the hoaʻāina was provided by the king and the legislature in section 7 of the Kuleana Act, which granted to them their traditional gathering rights, rights to drinking water and running water, and the right of way, provided that permission was obtained from the landlords. Thereafter, in 1851, the legislature amended section 7 of the Kuleana Act and deleted the requirement that the hoaʻāina obtain the permission of the landlords in order to exercise their traditional rights. Since 1851, the law has read as it now does in Chapter 7, section 1, of the Hawaiʻi Revised Statutes (HRS):

Where the landlords have obtained, or may hereafter obtain, allodial titles to their lands, the people on each of their lands shall not be deprived of the right to take firewood, house-timber, aho cord, thatch, or ki leaf, from the land on which they live, for their own private use, but they shall not have a right to take such articles to sell for profit. The people shall also have a right to drinking water, and running water, and the right of way. The springs of water, running water, and roads shall be free to all, on all lands granted in fee simple; provided that this shall not be applicable to wells and watercourses, which individuals have made for their own use.50

In 1850, over the protests of Native Hawaiians, foreigners were given the right to own land. From that point on foreigners, primarily Americans, continued to expand their interests, eventually controlling most of the land, sugar plantations, banks, shipping, and commerce of the islands.51
In the same year, new taxes were imposed upon the common Hawaiians: a kuleana land tax, a $2 school tax for males, a 50-cent horse tax, a 25-cent mule tax, and a $1 dog tax. Changes in the traditional land system and newly imposed taxes forced greater numbers of Hawaiians to enter the work force as wage laborers. They labored in the plantations as well as on ranches and in small enterprises such as the gathering of pulu (tree fern fiber used to stuff pillows and mattresses) and pepeiao akua (tree fungus), coffee growing, and production of salt for export.52

Though the foundation for wage labor to develop into the dominant form of labor was laid by the 1850s, it was the emergence of sugar as the primary commodity around which the Hawaiian economy would be organized that provided the impetus for the complete transformation of the Hawaiian social system. The ‘ohana began to gradually change from the primary unit of work and the context within which to make a livelihood to having no direct relationship to the organization of work and production. Instead, the ‘ohana began to serve as a source of refuge, comfort, and support to Hawaiian laborers who felt overworked and socially alienated from their ‘ohana and family homesteads when they labored on the plantations and in port towns. An 1873 article in the Ka Nühou newspaper described the ‘ohana in just these terms:

The kanaka [Native Hawaiian] has no need to be very constant, and does not suffer if he has neglected accumulation and aprovision [sic] for old age. The bounty of the whole race affords a sure refuge to any bankrupt, cripple, or pauper among their number. A kanaka can never become dead broke and dread the poor house, because he will always be welcome to fish and poi in any native hut that he enters. And so it is hard to get plantation hands out of such easy going, spending, mutually helping people.53

Though coffee, rice, tobacco, cotton, livestock, and silk were experimentally developed for large-scale commodity production and export, ultimately sugar proved to be the most viable and profitable to produce on a large-scale plantation basis.

Reciprocity, Overthrow, and Annexation

The critical turning point in the establishment of sugar as Hawai‘i’s principal trade commodity was the U.S. Civil War. However, when the Civil War ended and the United States imposed tariffs upon sugar imported from Hawai‘i, a Reciprocity Treaty between Hawai‘i and the United States was negotiated,
which became effective in 1876. The reciprocity treaty stimulated the unprecedented growth of the sugar industry and Hawai‘i’s economy. Immense amounts of capital were invested in land, labor, and technological developments. The profits derived from it were reinvested in further expansion of sugar production. The phenomenal expansion of the sugar industry was under the direction and for the benefit of the American and European factor-planter-missionary elite. Native Hawaiian elite lacked the capital to invest and benefit from the sugar industry, and common Native Hawaiians were displaced from their traditional lands as the cultivation of sugar expanded. In 1893 U.S. Commissioner James Blount described the treaty in his report on the conditions that led up to the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy: “From it there came to the islands an intoxicating increase of wealth, a new labor system, an Asiatic population, and alienation between the native and white race, and impoverishment of the former and enrichment of the latter, and the many so-called revolutions, which are the foundation for the opinion that stable government cannot be maintained.”

The Reciprocity Treaty effectively resulted in Hawai‘i’s becoming an economic colony of the United States. When it expired in 1886, King Kalākaua

Figure 6  In the 1890s Hawaiians still fished for subsistence off of Waikiki, but this changed at the turn of the century when tourism developed along its shores. 1890s. J. A. Gonsalves, Hawaiian Historical Society.
was reluctant to renew it. Not to be deprived of their economic wealth, American planter interests organized a coup d'état against King David Kalākaua, forcing him to sign the Bayonet Constitution, which took away his sovereign powers as king and restricted the civil rights of Native Hawaiians. The cabinet installed by the coup renewed the Reciprocity Treaty, and the king was compelled to approve it. In 1889 eight men were killed, twelve wounded, and seventy arrested in the Wilcox Rebellion, which attempted to restore the Hawaiian constitution. By 1890 non-Hawaiians controlled 96 percent of the sugar industry, and Hawaiians were reduced to only 45 percent of the population owing to the importation of Chinese, Japanese, and Portuguese immigrant laborers by the sugar planters.

In 1893 the United States Minister assigned to the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, John L. Stevens, conspired with a small group of non-Hawaiian residents of the kingdom, including citizens of the United States, to overthrow the indigenous and lawful government of Hawai‘i. On January 16, 1893, U.S. military forces invaded Hawai‘i, and the next day a provisional government was declared. It was immediately recognized by the U.S. minister plenipotentiary to Hawai‘i.

In 1898 the United States annexed Hawai‘i through the Newlands Joint Resolution of Annexation without the consent of or any compensation to the indigenous Hawaiian people or their sovereign government. Hawaiians were thereby denied the mechanism for expression of their inherent sovereignty through self-government and self-determination. They also lost control over their national lands and ocean resources.

Through the Newlands Joint Resolution of Annexation and the 1900 Organic Act, the Republic of Hawai‘i ceded to the United States government 1.8 million acres of land owned by the Crown and government of the original Kingdom of Hawai‘i. The U.S. Congress exempted these lands from the existing public land laws of the United States by mandating that the revenue and proceeds from these lands be “used solely for the benefit of the inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands for education and other public purposes.” This established a special trust relationship between the United States and the inhabitants of Hawai‘i.

Territorial Period

From 1900 through 1959 Hawai‘i was governed as a territory of the United States. The official U.S. policy was to Americanize the multiethnic society of
the Hawaiian Islands, beginning with educating Hawaiian children through the American public school system. Hawaiian and other non-English languages were banned as a medium of instruction; English was made the only official language. An elite group of Americans who were the owners and managers of what was called the Big Five factors had monopoly control over every facet of Hawai‘i’s economy. They controlled the sugar plantations, shipping, banking, and commerce.

In 1900 plantations harvested 289,544 tons of sugar from 66,773 acres of Hawaiian land. By 1920 the plantations harvested 556,871 tons of sugar from 114,100 acres of Hawaiian land. This increased in 1930 to 930,627 tons of sugar from 136,136 acres of land. The security of a stable American market for Hawaiian sugar after annexation led the sugar planters to expand the number of acres planted in sugar and to invest in an infrastructure to accomplish that. Of critical importance to the expansion of the industry was the development of vast irrigation systems that carried millions of gallons of fresh water from the wet windward sides of the islands to the dry leeward plains. On O‘ahu, the planters constructed the Waiāhole tunnel and ditch system from 1913 to 1916; ultimately, stream waters from Waihe‘e to Kahana on windward O‘ahu were diverted for the production of sugar on the dry ‘Ewa plains. On Maui, additional ditch systems were constructed from 1903 to 1920 to carry the waters of the Ko‘olau streams from Nāhiku through Ha‘ikū over into Pu‘unene. On Hawai‘i, the upper and lower Hāmākua ditch systems were constructed in 1906 and 1910, respectively, and the Kohala ditch from 1905 to 1906.

The impact of these irrigation systems upon rural Hawaiian taro farmers reverberated throughout the twentieth century. Cut off from the free flow of stream waters into their lo‘i kalo or taro pond fields, many kua‘āina gave up taro farming and moved into the city to find new livelihoods. Some of these families stopped paying taxes on their rural lands when they moved into the city and as a result eventually lost ownership of their ancestral lands through adverse possession by plantations and ranches. In other areas, the long-term impacts led to lowering of the water table, reduction of aquatic stream life and nearshore marine life dependent on the infusion of fresh water into nearby bays, and neglect of traditional irrigation networks.

The military was another force in the Americanization of the islands. In 1908 the United States began to develop Pu‘u‘uola into Pearl Harbor—dredging the channel and constructing a dry dock, barracks, warehouses, an ammunition depot, a submarine base, a radio center, and a hospital. By 1930 the
harbor was a major industrial base for the servicing of the U.S. Pacific Fleet. At the same time, the army established bases on Hawaiian national lands under its control at Lē‘āhi (Diamond Head) for Fort Ruger; at Waikiki for Fort DeRussy; at Kalihi for Fort Shafter; and in Wahiawa and the Wai‘anae mountains for Schofield Barracks. By 1941 the American naval presence at Pearl Harbor was so massive that the Japanese attacked Hawai‘i, convinced that this would cripple the American fleet in the Pacific. The military had become the largest single source of income and employment in the Islands, thereby guaranteeing the support of a major part of Hawai‘i’s local population.

By 1900 the pure Native Hawaiian population had declined to 29,800, with another 7,800 Hawaiians of mixed ancestry. Immigrant plantation workers and their descendants made up the majority of the population, but under U.S. law first-generation Asians were excluded from becoming naturalized citizens. Thus, in the realm of politics, Native Hawaiians held the plurality of votes and controlled the legislature and the delegate to U.S. Congress up through World War II. It was not until after World War II that second-generation Asian descendants matured to voting age and became a major political force in the islands. Hawaiian leaders allied with the Big Five under the banner of the Republican Party during the Territorial years. Thanks to political patronage, Hawaiians held a majority of the government jobs and dominated certain private-sector jobs such as cowboys on ranches, longshoremen on the docks, and in the electric and telephone companies. In 1927 Hawaiians held 46 percent of executive-appointed government positions, 55 percent of clerical and other government jobs, and over half of the judgeships and elective offices. Through 1935 Hawaiians held almost one-third of the public service jobs and dominated law enforcement, although they made up only 15 percent of the population of the islands. 59

Despite these obvious advantages, close to half the Hawaiian population failed or refused to assimilate and mainstream into the developing economy. Instead they remained in remote valleys and isolated rural pockets, providing for their large extended families through subsistence farming and fishing. During this period a major distinction internal to the Hawaiian community evolved between the urban Hawaiians who assimilated and accommodated to the socioeconomic system dominated by the American elite and the rural Hawaiians or kua‘aina who remained in the backcountry areas and maintained a traditional Hawaiian way of life.

During the Territorial period a “local” culture combining Native Hawai-
ian culture with the cultures of the various immigrant groups who settled in Hawai‘i began to evolve. Most of the immigrants who were imported to work on Hawai‘i’s plantations had been peasant farmers in their countries of origin. They shared with the majority of Hawaiians, who were planters and fishermen, a reliance upon the land and its resources and a strong respect for extended family relationships. Loyalty, respect, and caring for family elders and the overall well-being of all family members were important values that came to characterize “local” people. In rural plantation communities, the immigrant workers shared the common experience of oppressive working conditions, living in plantation camp housing, and being in constant debt to the plantation store. Children of immigrant workers and Native Hawaiians alike attended Hawai‘i’s public schools. There they were socialized by the American school system. The children learned together, ate and shared meals together, and communicated across cultural barriers in pidgin. They learned to hunt for pigs and gather fruits in the forest. They caught fish or gathered marine or aquatic life from common fishing grounds. The rate of intermarriage between Hawaiians and immigrant groups, particularly the second and third generations, was very high.

World War II ushered in major changes in the social, economic, and political life of the islands. Many Hawaiians left their rural enclaves to join the service or to work in high-paying military jobs in Honolulu. The military were also stationed in rural areas throughout the islands. The war experience broadened the social horizons and raised the expectations and aspirations of all Hawai‘i’s people for a higher standard of living. Raising the age for compulsory education to eighteen also forced rural families out of the most remote areas in order to comply with the law and send their children to intermediate and high school. There was also a large exodus of people in search of better job opportunities from Hawai‘i to the U.S. mainland.

The tidal wave of April 1, 1946, hit many rural coastal communities with a force they were never able to recover from. The tidal wave took lives, smashed houses, tore up roads, inundated taro fields and farms, destroyed fishpond walls and breakwater walls, and scared many families into permanently moving out of their isolated low-lying rural peninsulas and valleys to live on higher ground. Many coastal communities never rebuilt. A few coastal communities became sparsely repopulated over the long course of the twentieth century.

Labor unions successfully organized workers and gained collective bargaining contracts on the docks and plantations, at utility companies, and in trans-
portation, hotels, restaurants, and the public sector. Leaders of the Japanese community joined ranks with labor to reorganize the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party defeated the Republican Party in 1954. Gradually Hawaiians were replaced in government jobs by Japanese. The Democratic Party led the movement to gain statehood for Hawai‘i.

**Statehood**

Statehood stimulated unprecedented economic expansion in Hawai‘i. The number of hotel rooms more than tripled, and the number of tourists increased fivefold within the first ten years. Pineapple and sugar agribusiness operations were phased out and moved to cheaper labor markets in Southeast Asia. The prime agricultural lands that remained were developed into profitable subdivision, condominium, and resort developments. Left jobless, former plantation and cannery workers had few employment options. They obtained lower-paying and less stable jobs in the expanding tourist industry. An excerpt from a social impact statement concerning the effects of a proposed freeway

Figure 7  The tsunami of April 1, 1946, hit coastal cultural kīpuka with a force from which few recovered and contributed to the exodus of ‘ohana to urban centers. Downtown Hilo, April 2, 1946. U.S. Army Signal Corps, Bishop Museum.
connecting rural O‘ahu to urban Honolulu offered an insight into the frustrations and social pressures that Hawaiian and local people began to associate with development:

Some long-time residents have the feeling that they are being dispossessed of their traditional access to the beauties and bounties of nature around them. Anxieties arise as open space is filled up by newcomers and the taxes on land keep going up. Frustration is felt as the future character of their shrinking world is being decided by landowners and developers, government planners and elected officials in offices and meeting rooms far away. And there is a problem of the carry over of these insecurities to the younger generation. There are indications of social breakdown as reflected in the rate of unemployment, the growing incidence of family separations, the heavier welfare loads and the increase in juvenile delinquency and adult crimes.60

Changes to the rural and agricultural areas concerned all of Hawai‘i’s local people, but especially the Hawaiian community, because of its traditional con-

Figure 8  This photo poignantly shows the tides of change that swept through the islands when Hawai‘i became a territory of the United States and tourists began to visit the islands, a trend that exploded after statehood. 1930s. Hawaiian Historical Society.
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centration in the rural pockets. American progress seemed to be overdevelop-
ing the islands and replacing the Native Hawaiian and local way of life. How-
ever, beginning in the 1970s, through an extraordinary convergence of events,
the island of Kahoʻolawe became the focal point of a major political movement
challenging American control of Hawaiʻi. This movement became a catalyst
for a widespread Native Hawaiian cultural renaissance, which ultimately gal-
vanized into a movement for Native Hawaiian recognition and sovereignty.
Kahoʻolawe and the cultural renaissance that it spawned will be discussed in
a later chapter of this work, as an example of the role of the kuaʻāina from the
cultural kïpuka in the regeneration of Native Hawaiian culture in the late
twentieth century. Moreover, the cultural renaissance highlighted the impor-
tance of the cultural kïpuka and helped reinforce the efforts of the kuaʻāina to
protect their way of life from the assaults of proposed tourist and industrial-
ization projects in their communities.

Haʻina la Mai Ana Kapuana: Tell the Story

Here is my moʻolelo of the Native Hawaiian kuaʻāina. May their simple lives
in cultural kïpuka of the Hawaiian islands live on—not just in memory but in
determined efforts to protect and perpetuate their way of life and to have the
people of Hawaiʻi attain and live lōkāhi.