

LAND, FAMILY, AND HAWAIIAN RESISTANCE

Stephen T Boggs

Copyright 2003 by Stephen T Boggs

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter 1. Hawaiian resistance.	1
Chapter 2. Hawaiian adaptation to the environment.	7
Chapter 3. Attitudes toward land and sea.	15
Chapter 4. Struggles to remain on the 'aina.	31
Chapter 5. Hawaiian activism.	46
Chapter 6. The 'ohana of the past.	59
Chapter 7. The 'ohana today.	71
Chapter 8. Hawaiian sovereignty.	87

Bibliography

## Preface.

This book tells a story about a people--*ka po'e Hawai'i*--and their attachment to the land--the *'aina*. It is part of a larger story of the resistance of the people to their dispossession from their land.

I did not set out to write such a book. The information which it contains came through my involvement with Hawaiian people, beginning in 1966 when my wife, JoAn, and I joined a Bishop Museum team led by Dr. Alan Howard, in a study of households and child-rearing in Nanakuli, O'ahu. This study, which had the goal of improving the education of Hawaiian children, led ultimately to the Kamehameha Early Education Program (KEEP). A few years after the Nanakuli research some of the people living in urban areas of O'ahu began to protest their eviction from lands on which they lived. I participated in several of these protests, including two described herein. Subsequently, I also joined the actions on Moloka'i when Hui Alaloa successfully re-opened access to lands traditionally used by the people. These protests led directly to the initiation of the Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana and the occupation of that Island.

By this time I had learned of the central importance of the *'aina* as the rallying point of Hawaiian resistance. When asked in 1977 by attorney Clayton Ikei to testify as an expert witness in a court trial of Walter Ritte, Jr., and Richard Sawyer for going onto the Island of Kaho'olawe, I interviewed a number of *kupuna* (elders) on Moloka'i in order to provide evidence for my testimony about the meaning of *aloha 'aina*. What they told me confirmed what Kawena Pukui had described in her classic account, The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u about the family and its relationship with the land. These connections between the land and the family led me to further research on the physical basis of Hawaiians' adaptation to the land in the past. As a result I came to the conclusion that the key attitudes and values embodied in *aloha 'aina* could be traced to the requirements of living on the *'aina* as these were developed within the *'ohana*.

This information was included in an anthropology course on Peoples of Hawai'i which I taught beginning in 1971. When I retired in 1983 I thought to

write a book which would record this information for use in this course. At the time there were few written materials available on Hawaiians of the present day which were suitable for teaching purposes. By the time I had finished a draft of the book, however, my successor, Jocelyn Linnekin, along with many others, had become involved in a notorious controversy over the role of anthropologists in representing indigenous cultures.<sup>1</sup> I wanted no part in this controversy, particularly since it included the historical status of the concept *aloha 'aina*; and so put the draft of the book aside.

Since then indigenous scholars in Hawai'i and elsewhere have challenged the ability of anthropologists, unless themselves indigenous, to understand the meaning of indigenous culture; their usurpation of authority involved in representing it; and their contribution to the subjugation--intellectually as well as politically--of indigenous peoples. I have considered these issues for some time with regard to this book.

The limitation of an outsider can be illustrated in the meaning of *'aina*--a central concern of this book. Translated as "land" I think of it in the abstract, that is, regardless of a particular place, which to me is (simply) an instance of an abstract thing, like air and water. When I talked with Hawaiians I thought of it in this way, and I perceived them as responding almost without exception as if they thought of land in the same way. But I now believe that most of them probably thought first of a particular *wahi* (place) with its *mo'olelo* (stories, legends, myths) and the *'ike* (knowledge) derived from the former and from the physical characteristics of the place. Thus Hawaiian *kumu* (knowledgeable ones) speaking to a class on indigenous anthropology mentioned the knowledge which came to them from being at a particular place. But it wasn't until I listened to Frank Kawaikapuokalani Hewitt<sup>2</sup> speak of the *mo'olelo* of the *wahi*--Kealohi in He'eia--where his family had lived for many generations that I understood the way in which the *mo'olelo* and *ku'auhau* (genealogy of humans and gods) define the *mana* (power, efficacy) and *kuleana* (responsibility) inherent in residence in a particular place. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Linnekin, Jocelyn, 1983, Defining tradition: variations on the Hawaiian identity, *American Ethnologist*, v 10: 241-52, and Trask, Haunani-Kay, 1991, Natives and anthropologists: the colonial struggle, *The Contemporary Pacific*, 3: 159-67.

<sup>2</sup> June 21, 2003.

omission is important when it comes to understanding the long-term effects of removal from the *'aina* (Chapters 4, 5, and 8), which I now see it as even more devastating than when these chapters were written.

For me the key issue is responsibility. I have to admit that no one has extended to me the responsibility to write this book. But after thinking it all over, I decided that the responsible thing to do was to share what knowledge I had, limited and biased though it undoubtedly is, particularly because almost all of those who shared their knowledge with me are no longer living, and so much of what they knew is not being passed on to others today. If read with this in mind, I hope that it may be of some use.

The book takes the form of an extended essay, quoting facts and figures, the words of individuals, and observations of behavior recorded for the most part during the 1970's and '80's. It contains what individual Hawaiians at particular times and in particular circumstances have shared with me, as understood by me. I emphasize that many Hawaiians would have views and experiences which differ from those cited herein. The connections I see are, like all such, arguable. I may have gotten it wrong. If so, someone hopefully will correct me. But in any case, it is my essay. I do not claim that it represents the views of all Hawaiians; only those quoted herein and subject to the limitations mentioned.

## Chapter 1. Hawaiian resistance.

Over two hundred years after Capt Cook opened Hawai'i to the world in 1778; one hundred years after Americans took control of the Kingdom of Hawai'i's government in 1893; despite a decline in population within a century by 90 per cent or more, the transformation of land and labor into commodities, and the teaching by Christian missionaries that every aspect of the old religious world-view was evil the descendants of its first people maintain their identity. Many aspects of the culture remain alive, some more vibrant than they have been in a long time, the language is being taught to a new generation, and many seek to restore the rule of their nation. These are some of the facts of Hawaiian resistance. How and why did it happen?

*'Aina*--the land--and *'ohana*--the family--have played major roles in the resistance. Traditional practices and attitudes toward the *'aina* persisted. For generations down to the present people who lived in rural areas continued to live by means of traditional subsistence activities, shared food and labor, and retained detailed knowledge of the environment; while even those living in urban areas maintained their feeling for the land. The symbolic value of the *'aina* was never lost; while within the *'ohana* distinctive values, shaped by the requirements of living on the *'aina*, continued to be reinforced, even after most Hawaiians no longer lived on the land. Together these values gave rise to a resurgence of Hawaiian identity in the latter part of the 20th century.

The common people played the major role in maintaining these values and attitudes toward the *'aina* . In the past, as Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa (1992) explains, *'ali'i* and *maka'ainana* had distinctive roles in caring for the land:

It was the *Akua*, or Gods, who had made the *'Aina*. Moreover, having been born of the *Akua*, the *'Aina* is itself an *Akua*. (10)

Therefore, man serves the land as a chief, or god. (10, 341: note 4)

In traditional Hawaiian society, as in the rest of Polynesia, it is the duty of younger siblings and junior lineages to love, honor, and serve their elders. This is the pattern that defines the Hawaiian relationship to the *'Aina* and the *kalo* that together feed *Ka Lahui Hawai'i*. Thus, the 'modern' concepts of *aloha 'Aina*, or love of the Land, and *Malama 'Aina*, or serving and caring for the Land, stem from the traditional model established at the time of Wakea." (25)

Caring for the land involved both chief and commoner. "In practical terms, the *maka'ainana* fed and clothed the *Ali'i Nui*, who provided the organization required to produce enough food to sustain an ever-increasing population." (30) The *Ali'i Nui* mediated with the gods to ensure that famine and other tragedy would not occur. "Hence, to *Malama 'Aina* was by extension to care for the *maka'ainana* and the *Ali'i*, for in the Hawaiian metaphor, these three components are mystically one and the same." (31)

The major portion of Kame'eleihiwa's book is an analysis of the destruction of this relationship among chief, commoner, and land following the overthrow of the traditional religious system in 1819--which occurred before the arrival of the Missionaries. Briefly, and from my, non-Hawaiian, perspective it is clear that Europeans and Americans attempted to change the relationship

between people and land as soon as they settled in Hawai'i, striving unceasingly to change land tenure to a capitalist form, in which land is owned in fee simple.<sup>1</sup> They not only sought ownership of the lands generously allotted to them for their use, but returned this generosity by attempting to seize the lands of chiefs as payment for commercial debts. Indeed, backed by warships of their countries of origin, they threatened Hawaiian independence on numerous occasions in order to collect such debts. It was this incessant pressure upon the chiefs which ultimately brought about the downfall of native political power.<sup>2</sup>

What this means is that the traditional practices of caring for the land, and the attitudes and values which these practices embodied, were carried on for the past century mostly by the common people--the *maka'ainana* . Indeed, it was just such people who sparked the resistance to removal from the land in the 1970's.

The American missionaries' attempt to convert land tenure into fee simple ownership is known popularly as the Mahele, or Land Division (1848-54). After the Mahele the largest amount of land by far remained in the ownership of the King and the government. The next largest amount, originally awarded to the chiefs, rapidly ended up in the hands of foreigners, or citizens of foreign

---

<sup>1</sup> See Levy 1975. Thus the Reverend Richard Armstrong wrote: "This will compel them [the chiefs] to sell their waste lands of which they have an abundance."

<sup>2</sup> Compare Kame'eleihiwa: "It is not surprising that as foreigners gained economic control of the 'Aina they began to desire political control as well. In the sweep of history, it is but a short step from the 1848 adoption of private ownership of 'Aina to the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian government." (Kame'eleihiwa 1992: 15-16)



extraction. The commoners received next to nothing, and most lost ownership of even that by the end of the century.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the loss of land as a result of the Mahele, many Hawaiians continued to reside on the land and maintained the memory of the right to live on the land which they made productive and to take necessities from land and the sea. Indeed the right of access to land for traditional purposes was written into the Constitution when Hawai'i became a State in 1959. Less than two decades after Annexation traditional Hawaiian claims on the land were re-asserted in the movement which led to the passage of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1921.<sup>4</sup> Fifty years later, the memory of traditional rights to the land re-surfaced at Kalama Valley, O'ahu, when Hawaiians argued that they could not be legally convicted of trespassing on Hawaiian land.

The attitudes and values of the *maka'ainana* toward the land and the family were shaped by the adaptation of ancient Hawaiians to their environment. As described in Chapter Two, Hawaiian survival was based upon utilizing different ecological areas scattered from the shore to the mountains, each producing unique items. This led to a dispersed pattern of settlement and a system of sharing among households. Because people sustained life from working the land generation after generation, and laid the remains of beloved family members in that land, the land and people were attached to each other—interdependent.<sup>5</sup> The

---

<sup>3</sup> See Kelly 1956.

<sup>4</sup> Vause 1962 and McGregor 1989.

<sup>5</sup> I am indebted to Haunai Apoliona for this wording. Personal communication 9/29/90.

land became the source of identity. Chapter Three presents evidence for these statements.

The pattern of adaptation also affected the composition and organization of the family, which tended to be large and inclusive, incorporating strangers easily. The family was hierarchically arranged, in part to organize the work upon which it depended. The inclusiveness and sharing of work reinforced the values of *aloha* and *laulima*. These values then were identified with the *'aina* upon which the family depended. Thus was *aloha 'aina* nourished and sustained. Chapters Three and Six present the evidence for these statements.

As Hawaiians moved off of the land into urban areas, the values and attitudes associated with the *'aina* persisted. When in the 1970's and '80's some were forced off the lands upon which they had been living--or "squatting" in Western terms--these attitudes provided a rallying point. *Aloha 'aina* became the slogan for these protests. On Moloka'i resistance to exclusion from access to traditional lands led to the founding of Hui Alaloa, which in turn was instrumental in originating the Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana, or PKO--the most successful statewide Hawaiian movement of recent times. Chapters Four and Five describe these developments.

Meanwhile, as described in Chapter Seven, the family, even though drastically altered in scope and function, and for the most part no longer dependent upon the land, continued to form many of the feelings, relationships, and attitudes which characterized Hawaiians in the past, and thus helped maintain a distinct identity.

The protests of the 1970's and '80's helped reawaken memory of Hawaiians' loss of control over their national government in 1893. This memory in turn led some to seek the political restoration of the Hawaiian nation during the '90's. The final chapter discusses this development and the prospects for future resistance, both political and cultural, and some of the forms which it may take.

## Chapter 2. Hawaiian adaptation to the environment.

Something remarkable--and totally unexpected, except by a few-- happened in 1976 on the island of Kaho'olawe. On January 4 that year, a Sunday, nine persons, the oldest just past 30, landed on this island, which had long been used as a bombing target by the U.S. Navy.<sup>1</sup> The movement which began on that day turned this island into a symbol of protest against the loss and desecration of Hawaiian land and reasserted the concept of *aloha 'aina*. When the protesters were brought to court, they argued that it was this value which obliged them to act. The Navy replied by denying that *aloha 'aina* was a value in Hawaiian tradition. That argument has long since been abandoned, and with good reason. For *aloha 'aina* has been central to Hawaiian culture from the beginning, arising out of the adaptation of ancient Hawaiians to their environment. This chapter presents the evidence for this assertion. Subsequent chapters examine the way in which this adaptation and the concept of *aloha 'aina* became in the last quarter of the 20th century the symbol of Hawaiian protest.

The meaning of *aloha 'aina*.

*Aloha 'aina* has many meanings. One is love of nation. At the first trial of the Kaho'olawe protesters in 1976, the Navy argued that this was the meaning it had in the 1890's, at the time of the Overthrow of the Monarchy, rather than what the protesters claimed that it meant: love and care for the land. But they are the same. Love and care for the land means love of nation, as in the famous phrase about eating the stones of the land. This meaning of *aloha 'aina* long antedates the existence of Hawai'i as a nation in the Western sense. It is anchored, moreover, in

---

<sup>1</sup> Nine people, including one American Indian, were in the group. (Foster 1976: 3, cited in Tuggle 1982: 44).

the attitudes, actions, sentiments, and the very lives of the *maka'ainana*. It did not disappear with the Overthrow, but continued to the end of the 20th century.

There are several lines of evidence for this. Fundamental is the fact that people depended upon the land, as well as the sea, for the essentials of life. "People" meant, not individuals, but *'ohana*--family, spread out over the land and sharing with one another. The very distribution of resources necessitated in some instances, facilitated in other instances, this sharing. The produce of the land, along with that of the sea, thus nourished the *'ohana*--gave it life; and so the people felt for the *'aina* the love and gratitude that they felt for the *'ohana*. There was no greater love than this. In a later chapter statements to this effect made by elders on Moloka'i are inscribed. We shall see in other chapters how these attitudes persisted to the end of the 20th century, not only in rural and isolated pockets, but even in urban O'ahu; and gave rise to repeated protests when Hawaiians who continued to depend upon the land and sea were forcibly evicted from shoreline and valley. Finally, these protests led to a resurgent Hawaiian identity which called for the restoration of the Nation.

Traditional adaptation to the environment.

Two circumstances profoundly shaped ancient Hawaiian adaptation. First, each island contained a variety of micro-environments, each of which had specialized life forms which Hawaiians depended upon, along with the ocean and near-shore areas (see Handy and Handy 1972). Second, because the islands are large, relative to atolls, these small areas were typically some distance from one another and the ocean. Together these circumstances created a pattern of dispersed settlement within which exchange was carried out on a regular basis.

---

This exchange, conceived of as sharing, formed the basis of *aloha*, which became the key integrating value of Hawaiian culture.

The best evidence that Hawaiians utilized a great variety of micro-environments is provided by the detailed knowledge they utilized for growing things in them. The great variety of plant varieties named by Hawaiians reflected such knowledge. Although a single species, at least 300 named varieties of the principal food plant, *kalo--colocasia esculenta--* have been recorded. Handy and Handy (1972: 79, 83, 102-110, 124 ) report even in historic times detailed knowledge for growing taro in micro-environments ranging from swampy and brackish to barren and windswept. A further example: twenty-four named varieties of sweet potato were grown.

The kind of knowledge involved in the use of different vegetation areas is well depicted in Kelly's (1983:45-76) account of the Kona field system. There people utilized four vegetation and land use zones stretching from the shore to the fern forest at 2,000 to 3,000 feet elevation., every bit of which was planted. The naturalist Archibald Menzies' (1920: 80-81, cited by Kelly) wrote in 1793:

...we could not help admiring the manner in which the little fields on both sides of us were laid out to the greatest advantage and the perseverance and great attention of the native in adapting to every vegetable they cultivate as far as lays in their power, its proper soil and natural situation by which their fields in general are productive of good crops that far exceed in point of perfection the produce of any civilized country within the tropics.

Another major example of environmental knowledge can be seen in the development of a variety of fishponds (*loko i'a*) both on and off-shore. These

ponds took advantage of the fact that microbenthos, algae, and other nutrients thrive in brackish water (Hiatt 1947 cited in Summers 1964). Ponds were built along the shore at the mouth of streams or springs, where fresh water could mix with seawater, or in swamps just inland, sometimes connected with the sea. The ponds were then stocked with herbivorous species, such as mullet (*'ama'ama*, or *Mugil cephalis*) and milkfish (*awa*, or *Chanos chanos*). Often the streams drained taro pondfields, which added further nourishment (Cordover 1970, Handy and Handy 1972, Kelly 1987, 1989, pc). In addition to the fish ponds freshwater fish, such as *o'opu* (Hawaiian goby or guppy), shrimp (*'opae*), and even milkfish were grown in some taro pondfields (Kamakau 1976).

Hawaiians were exceptional in their utilization of the environment, even compared with other Polynesians. Thus walled fishponds appear to have been a Hawaiian invention. Elsewhere in Polynesia only fishtraps are found (Summers 1964: 19). Ponds differ from traps in having gates which are used to regulate the species and size of fish contained in them. The extent of the knowledge required to operate a fishpond successfully only came to be appreciated in recent years as difficulties were encountered in trying to restore production in rebuilt ponds.<sup>2</sup>

The efficacy of fishponds is demonstrated by the fact that it was able to support a larger population than could be sustained by agriculture in Hawai'i today.<sup>3</sup> Kelly (1989) has pointed out that while the Hawaiian pondfield system could produce 10 to 15 times as much taro as unirrigated fields; fish ponds increased

---

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed account of one effort and excellent information on fishponds in Hawai'i, past and present, see Wyban 1992.

<sup>3</sup> Estimates of 1778 population vary from 200,000 (Schmitt 1971) to a minimum of 800,000 (Stannard 1988). There is controversy over whether the capacity of the system to maintain the population had been reached or exceeded by that year (see Kirch 1982 and Stannard op cit).

the productivity of protein production by 100 times (citing Hiatt 1947) . Even after the drastic decline in population referred to below, Hawaiians were able for several decades to provision hundreds of ships which visited the islands every year, after meeting their own needs (Stannard 1988).

The tradition of sharing.

The dispersal of resources and residence over a wide area favored a system of exchange, which was, however, viewed as sharing. Pukui described it as follows:

Between households within the 'ohana there was constant sharing and exchange of foods and other utilitarian articles and also of services, not in barter but as voluntary (though decidedly obligatory) giving. 'Ohana living inland (ko kula uka), raising taro...and needing gourds...,would take a gift to some 'ohana living near the shore (ko kula kai) and in return would receive fish or whatever was needed. ...In other words, it was the 'ohana that constituted the community within which economic life moved. (Handy and Pukui 1972: 5-6).

Sharing in this form still was going on in the Ka'u district of the island of Hawaii at the end of the 19th century, according to George Kawaha, who told the following story to members of a Bishop Museum team in 1959 about a trip from Waiohinu to Waioahukini, near Ka Lae, Ka'u, Hawaii, around the year 1900:

...When I returned from school (in Hilo), my father asked me when I would like to go down to see the elder members of my family who resided at Waiahukini. ...we went up to the food gardens where we pulled up taro, enough to fill 10 bags. When we returned, two bags of taro were cooked and pounded for poi.



We took this along with the other bags of raw taro. Raw taro can be taken, dampened and buried in the sand so it won't dry too quickly and spoil.

We took along salt salmon that we got here (from the Waiohinu store). ...One could purchase a small keg...(for) just 40 cents. ...I go and buy one bag of daikon (turnips)...shoyu (soy sauce) and coffee (beans)... Four bags of flour...enough for several weeks.

The animals groan (under the weight).

...Weighted with fish coming back, with salt, dried fish (tuna, *ulua* and *kawelea*)...

The Japanese would be preparing the fire on which to broil the fish. ...With one drawing of the net, there would be 7 bags of fish. All kinds of fish.

We had a little luau. ...After eating poi, then we drank coffee with our fried pancakes. Sometimes sweet potatoes. The stomach is well filled. <sup>4</sup>

As Kelly (1969: 61) comments: "this is an example of the continuing function of the Hawaiian family system (*'ohana*), which even at that late date still recognized and kept active relationships between the upland dwellers (*ko a uka*) and the shore dwellers (*ko a kai*) of the family...." Such sharing survived the unimaginable disruptions that occurred in Ka'u between the time of contact and 1900. Kelly (ibid: 39) estimates that disease carried away three out of four persons by 1853. Added to this was the dislocation which resulted from the *Mahele* and movement of people off of the land.

It is worth noting the existence in the fishing village at Ka Lae of Japanese who lived in a grass house, grew local crops, and fished like the Hawaiians, and

---

<sup>4</sup> This has been excerpted from a longer account. Some missing parts are not indicated. (See Kelly 1969: 61-62)

their inclusion in the sharing. Apparently, Hawaiians and Japanese were included in the same system of sharing.

There is evidence of a more extensive sharing pattern earlier in the century. Henry Cheever, an itinerant minister, "observed the exchange between the people of Ka'u who 'drive a few hogs and goats eighty miles to Hilo, live there awhile, according to Hawaiian custom, upon their *maka-maka* (friends), get some of the cotton cloth in the way of presents, and then return to have the same friends come in due time to live on them, and take off some of their *kapas* [cloth] and hogs".<sup>5</sup> It is possible that the disruptions and depopulation in the first half of the century may have forced people to share over a greater distance--or this may have reflected a pattern of regional exchange of which little has been noted.

A legend of Mana'e (eastern Moloka'i) suggests that the sharing pattern is quite old. According to a Moloka'i *kupuna* the *Pohaku Hawanawana*--a huge boulder located on the road to Halawa Valley--was used in ancient times to send messages between the shore and upland. (*Hawanawana* means to whisper: Pukui and Elbert 1971) A similar stone located upland was used to return messages. In this way people would set the time to meet and exchange gifts. According to another Moloka'i *kupuna*, gifts of food or materials would be left at certain places without a visit.

The custom of sharing is indicated in other customs and sayings. Annie Kanahele (1976:17) reports that in Kona at the turn of the century it was "considered good manners not to go to a home empty handed but to offer a little

---

<sup>5</sup> (Johnson 1977: 45). The minister adds the gratuitous opinion that "this system of makana, as it is called, is very injurious to thrift and enterprise" (Cheever 1871: 270). Actually, it had the effect of reinforcing traditional enterprise based upon collectively organized labor. To this day Western observers fail to understand the motivation to work in Hawaiian culture.

something for the hostess." In return, departing guests were given a gift of fish, pork, etc. There is a pejorative saying (in English): "Only the eyes have come," meaning that someone came without bringing a gift.

Evidence presented in this chapter indicates that Hawaiian adaptation was based upon the existence of different, dispersed food producing areas, together with detailed knowledge of what could be produced to maximum advantage in each area. These factors combined with dispersed settlement to promote a system of voluntary, but obligatory sharing among households. Written accounts attest to such sharing at the end of the 19th century, and oral traditions indicate that it was a widespread practice earlier. Sharing was inherent in the attitudes which Hawaiians held with regard to the land and sea. As described in the chapter following, those attitudes have persisted down to the present.

### Chapter 3. Attitudes toward land and sea.

One afternoon in March, 1971, on the beach below Leahi on O'ahu I encountered an old friend with a group of Hawaiians who were fishing. The friend introduced me to an older man. He and I fell to talking story. When I mentioned having recently discovered a medical problem, he responded by telling a long story about a man whose faith had enabled him to survive a life-threatening injury. I asked him where one got that faith. Before he could reply, a man who was with the group abruptly entered the talk and began a lecture about where God was to be found. Nettled, the elder man pointed out to sea and said emphatically, "I know where God is. He is out there, on the ocean. I shake hands with him everytime I go out there." He paused: "It is like a blessing, that air coming off the ocean. Sometimes I feel like I am not worthy of all that." With that he launched into a bitter denunciation of those politicians who were talking of making Diamond Head into a conservation district. It was, said, just to keep the *kanakas* (Hawaiians) away, so that the rich could have it. He and his six brothers had been coming here all his life, every year in March. He would not mind if they asked him to pay a license and used the money to stock fish. But that was not what they wanted to do. Concluding, he stated fervently that he wished the legislators would ask him about their plan. He would tell them: "Just bury me. If you pass that law, don't think I am going to obey it. I am not! You can just put up a statue over me, and put on the bottom, 'This is what you have done to the *kanaka*.' So that the tourists will know, like that statue of Kamehameha." <sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The waters off Leahi were permanently closed to net fishing in May, 1988, as a conservation measure, exactly as the old man from Waianae had predicted.

The meaning which the sea had to this man is typical of attitudes toward the land and sea which have survived from earlier times. This chapter describes these attitudes and their persistence in practice.

Traditional attitudes toward the *'aina*.

From the language it is evident that *'aina*, the land, was regarded as the basis of life. *'Ai* means food, to eat. With its suffix *'aina* means the provider of food (Handy and Handy 1972: 45). Because it was the provider, the land was central to identity also. Native born people were *kama'aina*, children of the land--and they so regarded themselves. *Maka'ainana* (those who dwelled on the land) were literally the "eye" (*maka*--or as we might say, the "heart") of the land. *Ali'i* or *lani*, sacred chiefs, by contrast, were not of the land, but of the heavens. These meanings embedded in language make clear the importance of *'aina* for the majority of the Hawaiian people down through time.

In order to discover whether these meanings reflected the actual attitudes of ordinary people today, I interviewed nine *kupuna* (elders) on Moloka'i in the spring of 1977, seeking out those who were regarded by others there as particularly knowledgeable about the land. I explained that I was asking them in order to prepare testimony for the trial of Walter Ritte, Jr., and Richard Sawyer that spring, in which the existence of the idea of *aloha 'aina* had been challenged. The *kupuna*, it turned out, had differing opinions about what the young protesters had done, and several no opinion at all; but they were of one mind about the meaning of *aloha 'aina*.

The knowledge possessed by these *kupuna* went back a long time and represented a number of different islands. All had been born between 1890 and

1917 and raised in Waikapu, Ma'alaea, Kaupo, or Keanae on Maui; North Kohala or Kalapana on Hawai'i; Wailau or Ho'olehua on Moloka'i. Half were raised by grandparents; all had received special training from their *kupuna*. Their knowledge of details of taro cultivation was similar to that reported by Handy and Handy (1972) from even earlier informants. One had information about a ritual blessing of land which must have come from before 1800. All professed some variety of Christian religion. Several themselves performed ritual blessings of land which combined traditional Hawaiian and Christian elements.

Summarizing what they told me, people of old regarded the *'aina* as the provider of everything: "food, shelter over your head, a place to plant your feet and stand firm."<sup>2</sup> It gave one a sense of identity. Some spoke of it as a *piko* (umbilical cord) or link with the previous generations, since the spirits of the beloved dead returned to the *'aina* where they had dwelt. The meaning of *'aina* as inferred from the language--provider and basis of identity--corresponded to the actual attitudes expressed by these *kupuna*. And the same was true of *aloha 'aina*. "Respect for the land," one said, was the same as "the love I feel for what the land gave to my *kupuna* :food and life." Some said that they felt the same *aloha* for the *'aina* that they felt for the *'ohana*, because the *'ohana* worked, lived, and stayed on the *'aina* for eternity.

A number of other specific attitudes and values were included in their idea of *aloha 'aina*. These included the importance of work in order to be self-sufficient,

---

<sup>2</sup> Compare Kelly's (1983: 63) inference that the term *'apa'a*, referring to the zone where "the most productive gardens grew and where the native Hawaiian farmer concentrated his greatest efforts," may have connoted being "'firmly bound,' or *pa'a* to this zone."

land as a link to the *kupuna*, sharing within the *'ohana*, and land as a source of knowledge.

The importance of work.

The first thing that all of them mentioned in talking about *aloha 'aina* was the necessity of work: the land did not provide without hard work. The following traditional saying was quoted in various forms in English:

If you turn your hands up you get nothing/go hungry/"suck wind."

If you turn them down [ie, to work], you will have plenty.

(*Kau ka lima i luna, pololi ka 'opu. Kau ka lima i lalo, piha ka 'opu.*

(Mitchell 1982: 38) <sup>3</sup>

The *kupuna* recalled their grandparents working all the daylight hours, teaching them to work hard--that only when the work was done, could you rest.

One man recalled working in the *lo'i* (taro patch) early every morning and then had to run two miles to keep from being late to school.

Another said that the older children would talk with the adults in the evening after supper about the work to be done the next day. Next morning the older ones knew where the *huli* (stalks of taro) were that were ready to be planted and where to plant them. At other times father would put a pole in the

---

<sup>3</sup> Compare Pukui (1983: number 71): "Aia no ka pono--o ka ho'ohuli i ka lima i lalo, a'ole o ka ho'ohuli i luna. (That is what it should be--to turn the hands palms down, not palms up.) No one can work with the palms of his hands turned up. When a person is always busy, he is said to keep his palms down."

ground and the kids, starting from the oldest to the youngest, would line up and put the *huli* into the ground in straight lines down to the end of the patch, then move on to the next row.

In addition to foods grown there were many foods to be collected, and this was work, too: "up to the mountains for fruits and *ulu* (breadfruit), down to the beach for *limu* (seaweed), fish, crab, and squid." As one woman (a friend on O'ahu) always insisted, "Livin' gotta be hustle."

A lot of work was required to make a new *lo'i*. One man recalled that a horse was used to pack the earth, as it was easier and faster than tramping around in the mud. It is noteworthy that those who grew up in Kanae and Waikapu, Maui, had never seen a *lo'i* constructed, possibly because in their area *lo'i* were already long established.

Despite the hard work, several remembered having fun while working in the *lo'i*. One man told of tramping around in the mud "holding hands and talking story. We had a good time"--although it was serious work, he added. A woman remembered that when adults were not around the children would throw mud, "just like at the beach." These reminiscences echo Kamakau (1976: 34):

[The day of treading] was a great day for the men, women, and children, and no chief or chiefess held himself too tabu to tread in the patch. Every man, woman, and child bedecked himself with greenery, and worked with all his might--trampling here and there, stirring mud with his feet, dancing, rejoicing, shouting, panting, and making sport.



The importance of practical work was also reflected in the amount of detail that informants gave about it.<sup>4</sup> Among the things described were the tools used to clear and level the land, the construction of an *imu*, cooking, how to make and wrap *pa'i 'ai* (cooked and slightly pounded taro), how to catch white eels, *ulua*, crab, *o'opu*, mullet (turning them in the net and biting the heads to kill them); the rules for sharing fish caught from a canoe; and drying *opae* in mosquito nets after turning them in salt. (Some of this information came from other informants on O'ahu.)

It is important to note that the motivation for this work was subsistence, not monetary gain. Thus even when the food produced was sold, as in Wailau valley, Moloka'i, before 1919, much of the money was hidden and not spent. According to Rachel Naki, her large family and others there would make up to 2,000 bundles of *pa'i 'ai* (taro slightly pounded and wrapped in *ti* and *ape* leaves), each weighing about 25 pounds, once each year. These would be collected and taken by ship to Kalaupapa for the patients there. The people would be paid in gold on a return trip of the ship, which would also bring their store supplies for the year. Only limited purchases were made of coffee, salt, brown sugar, kerosene, and flour. Many of the coins were buried and not used.

Pioneers on the homestead lands at Ho'olehua, Moloka'i, recalled the grim efforts to survive in the early days there. Prince Kuhio had recruited some of them from Waikapu, Maui, because of their reputation as farmers. When they arrived on the raw lands at Ho'olehua, all available resources had to be put to use. A tank was built to store surplus water from the plantation nearby. Taro was

---

<sup>4</sup> This emphasis is also reflected in the title of Kamakau's (1976) assembled articles: Na Hana A Ka Po'e Kahiko. Foreigners ignore this emphasis on work as necessary to survival in Hawaiian culture. It is noteworthy that when Peter Buck, a Polynesian, described Hawaiian culture he chose to focus upon its arts and crafts (Buck 1957).

planted, but there wasn't much water, so people ate pumpkin: "pumpkin *poi*" it came to be called. One *kupuna* recalled planting corn by hand as a child, guiding the mules, piling dirt around the shoots on hands and knees in windswept fields, and tying down the watermelon vines to keep them from spinning around in the wind. There was hunger: parents would feed the children in the evening, drink a little water, and then go down to Moomomi Beach at night to catch crabs and a few fish. People recalled their former homes in Maui as idyllic by comparison.

This emphasis upon the necessity of work was linked to the deeply felt need to be self-sufficient. As one man put it, "We always prayed that we might grow our own food and not depend upon others." *Aloha 'aina*, several insisted, did not mean living off of welfare--an implicit criticism of some in the younger generation.

The relationship of the *'ohana* to the land.

The close identification of the *'ohana* with the land was indicated in various ways. One woman, an ordained minister, who had given the matter much thought, said that in pre-Christian Hawaii "the land was sacred." It was the *piko* (umbilical cord), because it was the source of food and life at the creation. Mentioning the *Kumulipo*--the creation legend--she said that the land was "like Mother Earth, the source, the Alpha and Omega." This was reflected, she thought, in the practice of bringing some earth when a woman was about to give birth so that the newborn would touch it first. Likewise the practice of rubbing some earth on the arch of the left foot and the right hand "in order to keep the child on the land," i.e., alive.

Another informant told of her family planting a fruit tree. (It is interesting that the word *pua* refers both to flower and child.) She, like the minister, noted that planting is like returning life to the land, continuing life.

This identification of the *'ohana* with the land was linked directly with sharing by all of the *kupuna*. Thus, they reported that their elders regarded everyone who lived "on the same land" as part of one *'ohana*.<sup>5</sup> Neighbors and those who shared with one another became "aunties" and "uncles," whatever their genealogy; their children became "cousins" and their grandchildren "nieces" and "nephews." Indeed, persons anywhere in Hawai'i will regard one another as related if they trace ancestry back to the same *'aina*.

This identification was based upon the fact that different households in the locality cooperated in many ways. For instance, families in Waikapu, Maui, and other places needing water for irrigation would go together to find the best source and dug the ditch together. The ditches were maintained by all who used them and there was no trouble about taking turns in the use of water. If one did not need it on a certain day, that household would trade with another.<sup>6</sup>

Other labor was shared also. Thus in Wailau, Moloka'i, "when the sound of pounding was heard all came with their boards to help make *pa'i 'ai*." Moreover, crops were grown in order to be shared with neighbors. One told of a grandfather

---

<sup>5</sup> Linnekin (1985: 60, 1983) regards this use of the term *'ohana* as modern, pointing to the fact that the term was rarely used in records of 19th century land transfers, and that when used it referred then not to a localized lineage segment but a "domestic group". "The local community was not composed of descent groups or lineage segments but of overlapping bilateral kindreds. This horizontal dimension of kinship corresponds to the modern Hawaiian use of the term *'ohana*...."(1985: 60). It may well be that Hawaiians are using the word *'ohana* for a traditional idea. But there is no disputing that traditionally those who shared and lived in the same district regarded one another as family in some sense. (See chapter 7 for further discussion.)

<sup>6</sup> This informal system accords with Nakuina's (1893) description, except for the fact that no *konohiki* existed to direct the work and allocation. According to Nakuina, water usage was proportional to the amount of work put in by the families who constructed the ditches and dam, under supervision of the *konohiki*.

who always planted lots of corn, "so he could give it away and everyone would have a good time."

Sharing was not even limited by Hawaiian ancestry. When immigrants appeared at Waikapu in the late 19th century, they were also included in the exchange system. All shared water from the irrigation ditch. Only the ranch tried to deny others the right to use the water. On that occasion the *'ohana*, which included both a lawyer and a judge, went to court and won the right to continue their traditional use of the water. One man from another place on Maui remembered sharing food with a camp of Russian plantation workers nearby, as a result of which he developed a liking for Russian food which he has to this day.

Land as a source of knowledge and power.

Several informants either stated or implied that knowledge came directly from the land. One stated that "you learned all you needed to know from the land," illustrating this by telling how her mother read the clouds at evening in order to predict what kind of fish her father would catch that day. Another, who still carried out rituals on the land, insisted that you could not restore anything, such as a *heiau*, on the land, without having the *mana'o* (knowledge) of that particular land.

*Aloha 'aina..*

The essence of *aloha* is giving and sharing out of love. *Aloha* for the *'aina* thus means giving or returning something to the land--"not just living off of it," as one person put it. To the *kupuna* love for the land was expressed by respecting it, beautifying it and using it properly, i.e., not greedily. Thus several stated that the

land should not be left "idle" or "*poho*." and for this reason devoted much labor to beautifying their land.

Strong feeling for the *'aina* was frequently expressed during the interviews. When she began to speak about what the land meant to her, one woman broke into tears, and it was some moments before she could say, simply, "It means a lot to me." Another expressed the great pleasure she felt remembering the land where she grew up, and wept as she told of her aged father being forced to sell that land to repay debt. Another woman--gruff and humorous up to that point--paused suddenly and said, seriously and simply, "I love my land." Every day she said she prayed for strength to work on it--so that she could take care of herself. A man remembered how "depressed" he had felt, fifty years ago, when the water ran out and he had to quit growing taro and leave his land. This man, in his 80's, was growing taro again on dry land with noone to help him. His fondest wish was that his sons, away in a city on the mainland, would return and take over for him. But, he added, when one son returned, he stayed only a week and had not been back since. A woman who had suffered from Hansen's Disease for most of her life, expressed the most feeling when she described how her aged grandfather had lost the land which she would have inherited, even though she could never have returned to it because of her condition.

The feeling of *aloha* for the land led the *kupuna* unanimously to condemn destruction of the land or using it greedily. As one woman expressed it, those who left it marred or desolate, would surely have bad luck, "no matter who they were."

The persistence of traditional attitudes in practice.

The *kupuna* on Moloka'i provided living examples of the work attitudes which they described as having come from their *kupuna*. One man, for instance, spent two hours every day tamping the earth with a 4 x 4 timber in order to plant one of the 17 varieties of taro which he grows. Smiling, he pointed to his only "machinery," the home-made tamper. Another 88 year old man was growing taro in an area several hundred feet square. It required almost constant weeding, most of which he and his wife did by hand. His only concession to machinery was to mix his poi by machine. Another couple were constantly at work clearing, planting, and weeding meticulously, growing a variety of food plants along with an abundance of flowers. All of these people grew food to use or share, not to sell. Several volunteered that they would not sell their taro, even though they had been asked by dealers to do so.

I asked most of the informants if Hawaiian people today could return to such a life on the land. One woman volunteered scornfully even before the question was raised that the young people today "believe in stealing and even killing before working for their food." She had helped several young *haole* by showing them how to clear land, plant taro, and make poi. But young Hawaiians, she said, would not work that hard anymore. Another man had gotten his grandson to work on his taro patch for two days; and ever since the young man "had found something else to do." A younger Hawaiian from O'ahu who had spent much time in the *lo'i* with his family as a child had the following to say:

Come around six o'clock...you so damned hungry, cold, your fingers ache from being wet all day, the feet--I hated it. Now I think back it's not as bad. ...From when I was a young kid I remember working in the taro patch. So, you

know, I don't think it was that great. ...I think I leave it for other guys who might want to do it (laughs).

Despite the hard work, there were young Hawaiians on Moloka'i in the '70's who were beginning to plant taro again. Part of the movement to assert Hawaiian rights to the land, which is described in Chapter 5, two families: Joyce Kainoa's and Richard Sawyer's, returned to the isolated North Coast of Moloka'i to live full-time on the land and grow their own food. Their actions symbolize the commitment which many younger Hawaiians who have no land feel toward the *'aina* today.

In 1976 Alu Like, Inc., a Hawaiian service organization, conducted a comprehensive survey of the social and economic conditions of Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian people. Interviews were conducted by local people with members of 2366 households on all islands, using a questionnaire designed by Hawaiians. Compared with the U.S.Census, the sample was broadly representative of the various islands; Maui alone was under-represented. The sample was somewhat skewed toward the better-educated, better off, urban households. This fact only makes the results discussed here more striking.

The survey found from 30 to 67 per cent of the households reported obtaining some or lots of food by hunting, gardening, fishing, or gathering. Specific figures are given in Table 1. As shown there, almost 90 per cent also reported sharing food. Rural households were not the main ones reporting these practices either: there was no significant correlation between these practices and island of residence. Nor was there a significant correlation with size of household, family income, or employment of husbands. The significant correlations were between the practices mentioned, the expressed desire to return to living off the

land, and the average percentage of Hawaiian ancestry reported by members of the household (Alu Like 1976). Thus the data support the inference that traditional meanings of the *'aina* continue to be expressed in practice throughout the State.

Table 2 shows that the great majority also expressed the desire to live off the land and sea if it were practical today. In order to test the reliability of this attitude, respondents were asked at another point in the interview what they would do if they had land of their own to use. 50 per cent of the men and 44 per cent of the women then spontaneously mentioned growing food, farming, or ranching. These responses indicate a consistency on this point in a sizeable part of the sample.

Several anecdotes provide illustrations of the behavior which underlies these statistics. For example, one man in Nanakuli would often put in up to 60 hours a week at work in a demanding job and then go fishing with a crew of family members and a friend for over 40 hours at a time, giving away all of his catch, getting little sleep. He and his wife organized a group to give a *luau* once each year, which was attended by a thousand or more people. Another man on the Windward side constructed a pond to grow shrimp. Friends and relatives contributed labor and most of the materials, which they obtained from various sources without spending money ("scrounging"). The plan was to share the shrimp with all who had helped.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> I am indebted to Kathie Richards for this example.



The value of sharing thus remains on urbanized Oahu. It even persists for a time when a large proportion of the food to be shared has to be purchased. One man in his 30's, raised in Honolulu, described his family buying rice in 100 pound bags, large bags of sugar; salmon, sardine, tuna, Spam and corned beef by the case; and soap in 20 gallon drums. In addition they grew taro in the country, harvested *ulu* and mango, and caught fish and shrimp in various locations all over the island. Most of this was shared with various boarders, child and adult, who lived with them for a time. Hospitality in town was exchanged with country people in return for sea salt, mullet, crab, *o'opu* (several kinds of fish), and vegetables. Urbanization did not prevent this family from living in a traditional style for a generation in the city. Incidentally, they were pure Hawaiian.<sup>8</sup>

There are changes in patterns of sharing within urbanized areas, however. Sharing in the city is not predictable, with the result that some may benefit at the expense of others. In order to continue sharing under these circumstances, new attitudes and practices have evolved. These are described in Chapter 7.

### Conclusions.

We have seen in this chapter the depth of feeling that many Hawaiians, old and young, had and still have for the land and the sea. These feelings resulted, I believe, from the fact that the land, and work upon it, provided the basis of sustenance for the *'ohana*, a connection with the ancestors, and the source of identity. The life of the *'ohana* on

---

<sup>8</sup> I am indebted to Elroy Makia Malo for this information.

the land involved sharing, so much so that sharing and *'ohana* became practically synonymous. Sharing thus had both personal and spiritual connotations.

The strong value that Hawaiians placed upon sharing persisted as circumstances changed in the 19th and 20th centuries. Immigrants were included. Goods purchased with cash were included. Urbanization has undercut the communal basis for this value. Nevertheless, the great majority of Hawaiians in urban areas still engage in sharing; and many rely to some extent upon resources of the land and sea for some of their food, and as a means of extending and fostering relationships. Moreover, many express the wish for returning to living off the land and sea if it were possible to do so.

The traditional attitudes and practices described in this chapter provided the impetus for the struggles of many Hawaiians to remain on the land during the 1970's and '80's. The following chapter describes a few typical examples of these struggles in urbanized O'ahu and the attitudes and practices of the people engaged in them.

Table 1. Reported ways of obtaining some or lots of food.

	Per cent of sample:
Gardening	44.1
Fishing	62.4
Hunting	31.4
Gathering	66.7
Sharing	89.2

Source: Alu Like (1976)

Table 2. Desired use of land and sea.

	Per cent of men:	Per cent of women:
Would like to live off land and sea	74.7	72.3
Would use land to grow food, farm, or ranch	49.8	44.1

Source: Alu Like (1976)

#### Chapter 4. Struggles to remain on the *'aina*.

In the small valley called Maunalaha on Oahu, back of Makiki, only a stone's throw from million-dollar homes, a score of Hawaiian families have lived for 70 years or more on land belonging to the State. The circumstances of their occupation of the land were typical of those affecting Hawaiians in urban areas in this century. In this case officials ignored their presence until the late '70's, when planning began for the Makiki-Tantalus Recreation Area. On most occasions in circumstances like this one, as described in this Chapter, the people have been removed, or allowed to remain only after protracted agitation. In this case the families succeeded in getting the State to allow them to remain. Their story is instructive, even though the outcome is not typical.

The people of Makiki forest.<sup>1</sup>

Most of the families in Maunalaha had been removed from land at Kewalo Basin, Kakaako, and Kalia when it was developed for urban uses. Hawaiians who lived in this area were lei makers and employed workers, who collected limu, shrimp, and other seafood in the nearby ocean. When the area in which they lived was developed, they were forced off the land. Seeing that they had no place to go, a sympathetic forest ranger suggested that they settle in Maunalaha. There they cleared land, which had been deforested, planted useful trees and shrubs, and

---

<sup>1</sup> References for this section include Altonn (1977a), Whitten (1982), The Native Hawaiian (1981), Auwae (n.d.), Burgess and Cameron (1987) and interview with Ronald Glushenko (1/26/1983).

built homes. In 1910 the Territory began reforestation and in 1913 the valley was declared a forest reserve. Forestry officials at the time were sympathetic to their remaining, but would not issue leases because the land had been obtained by condemnation, and leasing it for residential purposes would presumably have been illegal. With the passing of decades they were officially overlooked.

The practices and attitudes of the Maunalaha people echo those described in the previous chapter. They did not attempt to put the old taro patches located in the valley back into production. But as one resident, Minerva Kaawa, told reporter Helen Altonn:

Aloha has been given to the valley and a lifetime has been taken from it. The men, women, and children remaining in the valley have always worked hard for their land, and as far as can be determined, no one living in Maunalaha has ever been...on welfare.

It is interesting to note that the government treated the families sympathetically prior to 1970 because of "politics," as the acting Territorial forester said in 1945, "and the tendency of the press to defend the squatters" (Altonn 1977a). After newspaper coverage in the '70's negotiations resulted in the withdrawal of some 16 acres from the State Forest at Maunalaha in May, 1988, and the land was leased to the families (Tanji 1988). This attitude on the part of State officials changed by the late 1970's, as the following cases attest.

---

Mokauea Island.

Unlike the people of Makiki forest, the residents of Mokauea Island were forced to engaged in a bitter struggle with the State Department of Transportation for several years before the State finally agreed to grant the residents leases to live on the island for 65 years. Their struggle attracted the support of local Hawaiian activists, the press, and others in the community.

The "shacks" occupied by local Hawaiians and others were located on what appeared to be a nearly submerged sand bar off the Ewa shore of "Sand Island," known as Anuenue to Hawaiians. Mokauea, as the sand bar was properly called, was nestled between the seldom used back entrance to Honolulu harbor and the airport. It was once part of Moanalua, the most extensive fishery on Oahu, occupied by Hawaiians since the 13th century. The Mokauea residents themselves were not aware of this history at the start of their struggle. Nor was the State, which took control of the island in 1972 as part of the plan to build the present Reef Runway. Mistakenly, as it turned out, the State Department of Transportation claimed that the island was created by dredging a seaplane runway for World War I.

The first warning that something was about to happen at Mokauea appeared in the newspaper on a Sunday, June 1, 1975 (Tong 1975). Ground-breaking ceremonies had been scheduled for the last day of May for the new Sand Island State Park nearby across the channel. In order to prepare for this event, eviction notices had gone

out to those on the island about April 23, and bulldozers were brought to Sand Island about May 20. But some of the Mokauea residents had not left, despite prodding and threats by State police and officials. At the time, they were resigned to leaving, although they grumbled about the lack of State funds to help them relocate their houses from the island. Little did they imagine that the State planned to burn their "shacks" where they stood.

By June 4 , however, the mood had stiffened. A call went out for supporters to come and stop the bulldozers. Arriving about 7 am that day I talked with Bill Molale, one of the residents, who subsequently was elected President of the newly formed Mokauea Fisherman's Association. Smoke from a burning house on another island across the channel was blowing in the early morning trade winds.. It had been set afire by its owner we heard later, so that the State could not resell the lumber, as he assumed it would do. Bill was angry as he discussed the fact that only the houses were to be removed, while the recreational boaters were to be allowed to remain. He pointed out that everyone on Mokauea was supporting themselves by catching fish and taking them to the market, while "these guys in the water-ski club" had tried to run him off, "like they owned the whole ocean." "The time had come," he said, "for the people to "bark back."

People were tense as they waited for the bulldozers, which had to be transported across the narrow stretch of water from Sand Island. Some 150 people had come out to support the residents. They represented other struggles on Oahu: Save Our Surf, Heeia Kea,

Waiahole-Waikane, Census Tract 57, and the Stop H-3 Movement. Promises of support were voiced, and plans made. A prominent attorney volunteered his services. A lookout had been posted to give warning of any attempt to move the bulldozers. As often happens, he was employed by the company hired to do the work and also related to one of the resident families. Hawaiians often operate the bulldozers used to evict Hawaiians.

But the bulldozers did not come that day--nor the next. The State changed plans. On June 6 employees of a contractor, hired and directed by the Department of Transportation, burned down five of the houses, with officers of the Honolulu Police and Fire departments standing by. Fishing gear and personal possessions went up in flames.

News of the burning brought public outrage. The head of the Department of Transportation admitted later in a considerable understatement that "we should have taken a more sensitive approach" (Shrader 1975). Because of the resulting reaction in the press, the City decided not to provide further protection for the demolition. The State, meanwhile, decided to await the trial of those charged with trespassing before proceeding further.

Trial was set for mid-July (Shrader 1975, Donham 1975). By this time, however, research brought to light information which challenged the State's right to proceed and called into question the legality of what it had already done.<sup>2</sup> Up to this point officials had

---

<sup>2</sup> Taylor (1979) describes this research in detail. It makes fascinating reading.



made various and sometimes contradictory claims: that the State had acquired the property in question by court order in 1959 (or 1941); that the island had not been there before the seaplane channel was dredged prior to World War II; that the "squatters" had been there only for a brief time; that some had to be removed because of FAA regulations, or because the island was part of Sand Island Park, or because it was a bird sanctuary, etc. The last three claims proved to be false. Eventually the debate boiled down to who the occupants were and what right they had to be there. This joined the issue of land rights, which has been the issue ever since Westerners first began to take control of Hawaii in the 19th century.

Fortunately, on this occasion the residents, aided by the distinguished *kupunawahine* Muriel Lupenui and anthropologist Marion Kelly, did better research than the floundering bureaucrats, and the actual history of the island and its occupation emerged. The residents themselves at the time only knew that some of them had resided there for 25 years or more. Young people, for example, reported growing up there or on nearby Anuenue (Sand) Island. During the time they were growing up their families had engaged in traditional practices: collecting limu and catching lobsters, squid, and fish. They also hauled in boaters who foundered on the reefs nearby. They were self-sufficient, with wage work added to these traditional activities. Like the residents of Makiki Forest, none could remember anyone being on welfare--not even the aged and parents with young children. In fact the Territory and

---

State of Hawaii had undoubtedly saved significant sums over the years because of their self-reliance.<sup>3</sup>

The residents argued that under Hawaiian tradition they had a right to remain, because they had lived on the land and made it productive. This is all that ancient Hawaiian *maka'ainana* could claim as justification for their tenure: like the ancients the 1975 residents did not claim to "own" the land. However none could claim to have occupied the island for longer than 25 years, except for Joe Kuhiiki, who had been there since 1921. More was therefore needed to refute the State's claim that the island had not even existed before World War II. Then in early August, while sorting through the rubble left by the fires, a startling discovery was made: an overturned wooden canoe--its outer sides and insides bearing the clear marks of adzes. An expert from Bishop Museum estimated the date of manufacture as approximately 100 years ago. How had the canoe gotten there?

At about the same time Marion Kelly discovered a copy of a map made during the Otto von Kotzebue expedition (1816) and an artist's drawing of 1826, which clearly indicated that Mokauea island antedated the seaplane runway by over a century. Muriel Lupenui, a *kupuna* well-known as a *kumu hula*, added testimony that she had grown up on the island and lived there from 1912 until 1941. According to her, legend holds that a 13th century migration from Kahiki landed at Mokauea and the leader of that expedition was Kahuikilaulani. Ethel and Abby

---

<sup>3</sup> Interviews with Bill Molale and Ethel Kilaulani Dickens and Taylor (1979).

Kilaulani, residents of the island, believe that the name has come down to them from this ancestor.

Further research revealed that there were 7 islands in Moanalua Bay until the 1930's. At the time of contact there were an estimated 41 fishponds in the bay, making it the most productive on the south shore of Oahu. It was a home of the mullet (*'ama'ama*), which spawned there and then migrated to such places as Wai'anae, which means the "waters of *'anae*" (full-grown mullet). Even in recent days the fishery was capable of providing sustenance to more than a score of families on Mokauea and nearby Sand Island, despite dredging, industrial pollution, heavy recreational usage, a sewer outfall several hundred yards offshore, and jet exhaust from the airport nearby.<sup>4</sup>

With this new knowledge, the confidence of the residents was renewed, together with pride in their heritage, and they became firm (*pa'a*) in their demands on the State. They needed to be proud and confident, for the negotiations were prolonged. Eventually, their knowledge, added to their discovery of the State's past unsuccessful efforts to clear title, and the help of Hawaiian historian John Dominis Holt, led to an agreement which provided the residents with 65 year leases. In return the residents agreed to provide an example of a modern Hawaiian fishing village and educational tours of the island to visitors.

---

<sup>4</sup> This information is based upon class presentations by John Kelly and Taylor (1979).

The long delay in reaching an agreement with the State, however, had taken its toll on the resident families, who lived day by day. Thus, by 1979 only 4 of the 14 families entitled to live on Mokauea were still there. While a few others were awaiting the construction of houses, which now had to meet City building standards, many had gone to live with relatives, or to Sand Island nearby. The island had, however, a functioning fishpond, constructed with the volunteer labor and equipment of the 411th Army Reserve unit. Herman Puahi, a nephew of Muriel Lupenui, supervised the design of the fishpond, the first new pond to be built in Hawaii in several centuries.

In view of the traditional pattern of sharing it is noteworthy that the residents of Mokauea and nearby islets included a significant number of non-Hawaiians, who had adapted the Hawaiian lifestyle. As noted in Chapter 2, a similar phenomenon occurred at Waiaohukini around the turn of this century. One of the residents on an islet next to Mokauea was a retired civil servant of Japanese ancestry. For years before retirement he had spent all of his free time on the Bay, and when he retired, he moved there. His wife, who continued to work in Waikiki, told me that she joined him there because she could not get him to live "in town". Indeed, three of the four families still on Mokauea in 1979 were non-Hawaiian.

Summing up, the story of Mokauea offers several lessons. One is the arrogance of the State bureaucracy in ignoring the people, their knowledge, and the history of the island. Thus, without adequate investigation the State Department of Transportation posted "No

Trespass" signs on the island and proceeded to evict the occupants. An official on the island on June 4 informed me that Bill Molale had not even been there in 1972, since his name was not on a State report, when in fact Molale had been living there off and on for a quarter of a century.

Another noteworthy lesson is the connection between traditional practices and the identity felt by the people of Mokauea. As reporter Shrader (1975) noted:

They have chosen to live on Mokauea Island...to better pursue the activity that gives them their identity. ...fishing the waters around their home is an integral part of their lives and livelihood. They fish generally as a group and their catch is divided equally, to be eaten or to be sold as a source of income.

Supporting this account, Muriel Lupenui recalled:

When we came to Mokauea to fish, we would build a *kaheka*, a stone house, in shallow water. The fish go into the house, and you keep just enough to eat. Then you break up the house when you go home. (Taylor 1979)

Taking only as much as you need is a rule which no longer controls the waters of Moanalua, however. By 1979 the *limu* had all disappeared because outsiders had pulled it up by the roots in their greed or ignorance. It does not seem to occur to planners or

bureaucrats that a Hawaiian community which uses resources in a traditional manner is caretaking those resources. When officials remove such communities they argue that the public deserves equal access to them. But what is then happens to the resources?

This story, like many others, indicates that the expansion of public recreational facilities has been a major force in the removal of Hawaiians from the *'aina* in recent decades. Given the record of government depredations, it is clear that the people can only rely upon themselves to change this. The Mokauea story is of lasting significance because it demonstrates that they can succeed.

#### Makua Valley

From 1975 until 1998 State administrators have acted as if every confrontation with Hawaiian people on public land has been a test of power and will, rather than an opportunity to forge a new relationship with a dispossessed people. Without exception the State has proceeded to bulldoze homes and disregarded traditional rights of access, even though such rights are recognized in the State Constitution and are the law of the land (see Epilogue). Makua Valley is an example of this misguided policy. Particularly outrageous is the fact that the land was put to no use for decades after the people were removed from it. A humane policy would at least have allowed the people using the land to continue to do so until it was actually developed. The struggle to occupy the shore at Makua Valley has

continued to the present, despite repeated evictions. Here is that story.

The seaward part of Makua in Leeward Oahu has long been regarded as a refuge--a *puuhonua*--where Hawaiians came to draw spiritual strength, to get away from the rat race, or because they had no other place to go. The remainder of the valley has been used since WWII for artillery practice by the U.S. Army, and access to it is forbidden.

Makua, the last of dry Leeward Oahu's valleys as one goes toward Kaena Point, remains a majestic and beautiful place, despite widespread destruction of its floor and the scarring of its ridges. Many have viewed it in the film, The Hawaiians, for the village of Lahaina was built at the mouth of the valley and Abner Hale's church on one slope nearby. Even today one feels something remote and wild about it. In the valley or on its cliffs and forested ridges, often burned by explosives, some 17 rare or endangered native varieties of plants have been found. Erosion is evident on the slopes, in some places half-way up, some of it caused by feral goats and pigs. Although dry, the valley in the past had wells, streams, and sufficient rainfall to grow sweet potatoes, coffee, cotton, taro, and other vegetables (Scott 1977a, 1977b).

Hawaiians had lived in the valley for many centuries before World War II. There are historic *heiau*, house sites, and remains of other structures in the valley. In the early decades of this century the land

was ranched. After the railroad came, some of its workers settled in the lower valley and grew food. All of this stopped in 1943 when some 3400 acres of land originally belonging to the Hawaiian government and held in trust by the Territorial government, so-called Ceded Land, was transferred to the military by Presidential order. An additional 1500 acres at the mouth of the valley was also placed under military control at that time. A promise was made then to return the land after the war, but the promise was never kept, and the Territorial and State governments never pressed for its return. This land, which was supposed to benefit the Hawaiian people directly has instead seen Hawaiians forcibly removed from it.

For many decades before 1983 the beach at the foot of the valley was a place of residence for many people, mostly part-Hawaiians from Nanakuli and Waianae. Some people in their 20's grew up there. Many did not live there full time, but came just to be there, to recover from misfortune; even to live out their last days. Fishermen watched for schools of fish and worked on their nets. Groups of children running, laughing, and diving in the water flashed under an endless sun.

The beginning of the end for Makua residents came with the acquisition of the land at the seashore for a State park. This park was to include all of the Makua shore around Kaena Point to Mokuleia on the north shore of Oahu. The first announced plan was to build a highway from one end of the park to the other. But after a storm of protest the State shelved the plan. Some suspect that the road was intended



to provide a round-the-island junket for Oahu's massively increasing number of tourists.

The next move by the State came close on the heels of Hurricane Iwa in late November, 1982. The most devastating storm of a quarter century, Iwa wrecked most of the structures on the exposed Makua shore and drove the residents away. Before they had a chance to return, the State seized the opportunity to get rid of them by posting "No Trespass" signs and bulldozing all but one access road. Then, striking by surprise on January 4, 1983, when people had just returned to work from the holidays, and could not mobilize to protest the action, bulldozers knocked down the remaining debris and burned what was left.

Stung by this action, and only then getting leadership, some of the residents and a handful of their supporters reoccupied the land and prepared for organized nonviolent resistance. At dawn on January 20 over 50 security personnel with guard dogs and walkie-talkies descended on a score of men, women, and children. Those, six in number, who did not leave after 10 minutes were handcuffed and jailed for about two hours, charged with interfering with a government operation. The charges were later dropped. Subsequent attempts were made by a handful to reoccupy the land, but they were ignored by the authorities. In the early 90's after people returned, they were again

removed. Protests against use of the valley by the military continue to the present.<sup>5</sup>

## Conclusions

Hawaiians have been evicted from public lands on Oahu which they have occupied for decades, the State claiming that they had no right to be there. Hawaiian residents by contrast justify their presence by appealing to the traditional idea that they were making the land productive. There is a clash of ideas here over fundamental rights. In Hawaiian tradition use of the land was non-exclusive, and no one who used the land productively and met obligations to the chief could be evicted. In Euro-American culture the opposite holds: land is owned and enjoyed exclusively, and non-owners have to be evicted, lest they establish a claim to ownership by adverse possession. It is too bad that Hawai'i, which advertises itself endlessly before the world as a shining symbol of cultural tolerance, cannot compromise on this contradiction. Because a Hawaiian community which resides on the land and uses resources in a traditional manner is caretaking those resources for all.

---

<sup>5</sup> Sources include Guy (1982), Loo (1983), personal observation, and interviews on February 5, 1983, and other times.

## Chapter 5 - Hawaiian Activism.

We have been led astray since the discovery by foreigners,  
The trail has been strewn with your alienated  
'*opio* (youth), frustrated *makua* (parents), and  
despairing *kupuna* (elders).

Help us in this our last hope to *malama* (protect)  
you as you have always been a source and  
inspiration in our life.

--*Uwe Moloka'i*, *Malama Mana'e*

(*Moloka'i Lament*, *Protect Mana'e*)

The issue of access which was raised by the removal of Hawaiians from public lands on O'ahu led on Moloka'i to a response which had far reaching consequences. By 1975 public access to the beaches on the West and North sides of Moloka'i (one of which was Moomomi Beach, referred to in Chapter 3) had been blocked by the Moloka'i Ranch, which owned the adjoining lands. Hawaiians could not cross Ranch land to use beaches, as they had done for many centuries, without risking arrest. This was the issue which Hui Alaloa chose to dramatize the negative impact of development upon traditional patterns of life. The motive force behind this effort was *aloha 'aina*--whose meaning was discussed in earlier chapters. Hui Alaloa was the first enduring organization to publicly and self-consciously link *aloha 'aina* to ongoing struggles to gain access to lands for traditional uses. It led directly to the most successful statewide Hawaiian movement of recent times: the Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana, or PKO. But that was not all. Because *aloha 'aina* originated as a symbol of patriotism in the 19th century, its use by the PKO in a memorable series of court contests in the 1970's helped to reawaken

memory of Hawaiians' loss of control over their national government in 1893, when the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown. The ground was thus prepared for the development in the 1980's of the movement to restore the sovereignty of the Hawaiian nation (see Chapter 8).

### Hui Alaloa

One reason for the emergence of an enduring protest movement on Moloka'i was the rural character of the island. When Hui Alaloa began in 1975, Moloka'i was virtually undeveloped, outside of the Moloka'i Ranch and two sugar plantations, one recently closed. Because of its rural character, many Hawaiians and others were still able to depend upon local resources and sharing for a major portion of their livelihood. This built a strong sense of community, which was enhanced by the small size of the population-- 4900 in 1973 (URPP 1981: 7). People knew one another, and they stayed put, unlike those in the city of Honolulu.

Further development threatened the resources upon which so many depended for maintaining their rural life-style. The principal actor in development was Moloka'i Ranch, which owned some 75,000 acres, the largest share of the island's agricultural land. Land rich and capital poor, the Ranch began to trade its lands for assets outside of the state; and to plan large-scale development of tourist-related facilities, forming in 1968 the Kaluakoi Corporation as a joint venture with Louisiana Land and Exploration Company: a large transnational corporation. Subsequently Kaluakoi Corporation built the 292 room Sheraton Moloka'i, which opened in 1976, followed by 198 condominium units. Although the Ranch withdrew from Kaluakoi in 1977, it planned eventually to develop nearly 44,000 of its

remaining 66,000 acres as an affluent suburb whose residents would commute by hydrofoil to Honolulu.<sup>1</sup>

These plans stimulated opposition among a sizeable proportion of Moloka'i residents. To focus this opposition Hui Alaloa was formed in 1975 to open the trails which led to traditional gathering sites for public access. The name was chosen to recall the first law of Kamehameha the Great, that all should be free to walk safely on the highways (*alaloa*). (Stevens 1975, Ritte 1976). On July 4, 1975, to symbolize their demand that access to traditional gathering sites be continued, some 90 people walked a historic trail to Kawakiu beach on the west shore. Following this action the Ranch opened the road to Kawakiu Beach for public use, limiting it to weekends and holidays. Another march in October of the same year and one in August of the following year led to the partial opening of the Palaa Road, which runs from Kaunakakai along the southwest coast. This road had belonged to the government until 1955, when the Ranch claimed rights to it, the State government having failed to contest the claim (Maui News 1976). The Ranch also took over the road to Ilio Point after the State purchased it in 1968, again without protest from the State. These actions, like similar ones at Sand Island, on O'ahu, where land created by fill was turned over to private companies, typify the State's use of public lands for private benefit, while ignoring Hawaiian claims.

The feelings of the marchers were well expressed on April 17, 1976, when about 75 people of all ages, some of whom came from O'ahu, marched to 'Ilio Point, the island's northwestern limit, over the old road. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Smith (1982). It is well known that the Kaluakoi development has not been profitable.

marchers were deeply determined to right an ancient grievance, and joyful that they could express themselves at long last. Thus one *kupuna* told the crowd that it had been very hard to bring herself to break the law, especially in front of the *'opio* (youth). It was only love for a lifestyle that was passing away and love for the *mo'opuna* (grandchildren), who would never know such a lifestyle, that made her decide to stand up against the authorities and to face the possibility of arrest. Once made, however, the decision brought her joy. In fact the march became a celebration.

The opening of the roads in 1975-76 was important in giving the members of Hui Alaloha confidence to oppose the developments which lay ahead. The first of these occurred in 1979 when several developers from southern California sought permits to build an 84-unit luxury condominium at Puko'o on the East End (*Mana'e*, above). This was followed in rapid succession by at least 6 other proposed developments in the area: at Kawela, Kainalu, Aha'ino, Kupeke, Ohi'a, and Kamiloloa. To top it off, a condominium was proposed at Kawaikiu on the West End, which would surround the beach which had just been opened to limited public use (Hui Alaloha 1982).

The Puko'o development constituted a direct threat to resources which were important for traditional life-style. While Puko'o was zoned urban--because of a port there early in the century--it was the center of an area where people had been fishing; collecting limu; raising dairy cattle, and growing fruits, vegetables, and other crops for over half a century. To fight the Puko'o proposal, as well as others in the East End, the residents, led by Hui Alaloha, formed Malama (Protect) Mana'e (the group cited at the beginning of this chapter). With the help of Legal Aid, Inc., Malama Mana'e

obtained a contested case hearing on the application for a Shoreline Management Permit, which the developers were required to obtain.

In long days of testimony beginning July 2, 1980, people described, often in emotional terms, their use of the land and sea in the area, and how the proposed development would affect them. A few, however, spoke in favor of the development. They saw it as a source of jobs and income which were badly needed, and even as improving what they regarded as an unproductive rural slum: accusing those who talked about the lifestyle of old Hawaii of not in fact practicing it, depending instead upon government welfare (Bowman 1976). The community was deeply divided.

Opponents, however, outnumbered the proponents on this occasion, and the County planning commissioners denied the Puko'o permit, citing not only a variety of health and environmental reasons, but also the negative social impact upon the people of the area. It was the first time that a negative social impact had been cited under the State's shoreline management law.

But this was the last time that Hui Alaloa succeeded in stopping a development on Moloka'i. A shoreline permit to build a 150 unit condominium at Kawakiu--the site on the West End which had been opened to the public in 1975 as a result of Hui Alaloa's protests--was granted by the County; this despite statements by archeologists that significant historic remains existed at the site (Tanji 1981, Neller 1982). This decision created such anger that the County Mayor appeared in person on Moloka'i to announce the decision. Influential agencies also exerted pressure on three of the witnesses who had

testified against awarding the permit, warning them not to participate in any future protest.

The two decisions, while different, were in line with the wishes of a majority of Moloka'i residents, who had supported by vote in 1979-80 a development plan which would confine new tourist developments to the West End, where Kawakiu and Kaluakoi are located. Nevertheless, large-scale development on the West End--plans at the time called for 1,100 hotel units, as many as 1,300 condominium units, and up to 1,000 "agricultural" lots (Hui Alaloa 1982)--constituted a severe threat to existing water sources, even after the last remaining sugar plantation closed down.

#### The Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana

The Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana (PKO) formed in 1976 became the most effective statewide movement in modern times. Its actions over a number of years aroused wide support, eventual action from Hawai'i's Congressional delegation, and led ultimately to the return of Kaho'olawe to State control. Members of Hui Alaloa played a key role in the establishment of the PKO.

The discussions which initiated the formation of the PKO came from members of A.L.O.H.A. (Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry)--an organization founded by Louisa Rice in 1972 with statewide participation for the purpose of seeking reparations from the United States for the illegal taking of *ka pae Hawai'i* (the land of Hawai'i) as a consequence of the Overthrow of the Monarchy in 1893 and subsequent annexation of Hawai'i. A



second major purpose of the organization was to halt the perceived misuse of these lands by developers in Hawai'i.

Meetings were held on several islands from July 1975 onwards to decide how to effectively dramatize the misuse of *ka pae Hawai'i*. At a meeting on Maui in December Charles K. Maxwell, Sr., argued for a landing upon Kaho'olawe. The bombing of the Island was a dramatic example of misuse of land, and because it had no inhabitants whose *kuleana* (responsibility) it was, people from all the other islands could be called upon to join in protecting it. The argument carried. Plans were made for delegations from all Islands, to include *kupuna*, for a landing on Kaho'olawe soon after the first of the year. Members of Hui Alaloha were present, and were among the first to go onto the Island.<sup>2</sup>

On January 4, 1976, the several hundred persons who had planned to land on the Island were met at sea and turned back by the Coast Guard. Nine persons, however, succeeded in landing on the island. They were quickly escorted off, except for Dr. Emmett Aluli and Walter Ritte, Jr., members of Hui Alaloha. Aluli and Ritte, it turned out, were in fact left behind inadvertently and not found for two days, despite their efforts to attract the attention of searchers.

Hawaiians were not the only ones involved in this initial protest, nor in subsequent occupations. A number of local men, referred to as "the fishermen," had engaged for years in hunting and fishing on and around the island, despite the fact that it was legally "off-limits." The decision to occupy

---

<sup>2</sup> Information from speeches given on 6/19/99 at the Moloka'i Museum celebrating the Bishop Museum's Kaho'olawe exhibit.

Kaho'olawe meant giving up this opportunity. Despite this, they offered the use of their boats, and even subjected them to potential seizure by taking the occupiers to the island. Several of these men told me later that they had been willing to make the sacrifice because they believed in the Hawaiians' cause, and resented the military's use of the Island.

Occupations of Kaho'olawe occurred throughout 1976 and well into 1977. They produced a continuing confrontation with the U.S. Navy in the Courts and media, which forced the Navy at first to yield some of its control over access, and then, as a result of public opinion, to stop the bombing and return the entire island to the Hawaiian people. The struggle had the further consequence of widening protest from a series of local struggles to a cause which Hawaiians in many localities could identify with.

Another of the enduring consequences of the Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana movement has been a reconciliation of the generations about the need to take action to protect the *'aina*. When Hui Alaloa began what was regarded as "trespassing" in 1975 many *kupuna* on Moloka'i had been upset by the lack of respect for authority which the young protesters had shown--as illustrated above. But when these *kupuna* were approached for advice by the young protesters they gladly gave it. A similar attitude of reconciliation was expressed when Richard Lyman, Jr., a well-known leader, spoke out in favor of the young PKO protesters, saying:

I believe the young Hawaiians protesting the issue of Kaho'olawe and of A.L.O.H.A. (Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry) reparations should be given credit by other Hawaiians for what they've done.

Lyman went on to state that native claims growing out of the illegal overthrow of the Monarchy "have to be settled," despite having himself considered them "frivolous" up to a year ago. But, he added, he would like to see the claims of Hawaiians settled within the system (Altonn 1977b).

As mentioned earlier, carrying out the struggle to return Kaho'olawe in the name of *aloha 'aina* brought about a greater awareness of the meaning of this phrase. The Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana defined it as:

..our expression of the basic spiritual and life-sustaining relationship that the native Hawaiian has for the land. ...(It) was the day to day experience of the *maka'ainana* ...held together by a spirit of sharing and cooperation....

For ancient Hawaiians to survive, they took care of the land so that she would take care of them. It was a simple dependence. The land was their religion. --PKO (1981: 2)

The Navy sought in a suit brought by the PKO in 1977 to deny that *aloha 'aina* was a traditional Hawaiian value. Today no one doubts that it is a value to the great majority of *ka po'e Hawai'i*. Hawaiians, led by scholars who are Hawaiian, have succeeded overwhelmingly in demonstrating that fact. It could be seen in the continued relationship to the *'aina* maintained by many Hawaiians down to the present--even on urbanized O'ahu; and as far back as one can look into the past.

## Recovering memory of the Overthrow

The development of the economy following Statehood in 1959 brought a growing sense of dispossession to many Hawaiians. The decade which followed brought growing protest by *kanaka maoli*. Out of this context came a heightened awareness of Hawaiian identity, and with it memory of the loss represented by the overthrow of the Hawaiian government in 1893.

Removal of *kanaka maoli* from public and private lands increased after Statehood as the infrastructure for the tourist economy was constructed. The evictions at Mokauea and Makua, described in the previous chapter, are examples. Prior to 1970, however, there were no organized protests. Evictions from the Damon Tract to develop the industrial area around the airport, for example, proceeded with only a single complaint in the newspapers. In 1970, however, when local farmers, among them some Hawaiians, were evicted from land in Kalama Valley on Windward Oahu owned by Bishop Estate--a Hawaiian trust--in order to build upscale houses for newly arrived mainlanders, Kokua Kalama was organized to fight the eviction. Although the protest failed to halt the evictions, it provoked a lively debate among Hawaiians by its unprecedented, outspoken confrontation of authority, and its challenge to the use of lands held in trust for the benefit of Hawaiians.

At almost the same time an organization called The Hawaiians was organized statewide for the purpose of making the Hawaiian Homes program, a government trust, more accountable to the people who were its intended

beneficiaries. The major issue in both cases was the control or use of Hawaiian trust lands.

Several further circumstances following World War II had already heightened the feeling of *kanaka maoli* that they were becoming strangers in their own land. One was an increasing proportion of people of Japanese ancestry both in government and in jobs off of the plantations. The first resulted from the Democratic Revolution of 1954, when citizens of Japanese ancestry, led by returned veterans of World War II, overthrew the political domination of the Republican party in a sweep of Territorial offices. Decisions were made at the same time within the Big Five firms to hire Japanese. From that time on Hawaiians increasingly competed with local Japanese in construction jobs and even in such Hawaiian strongholds as the fire and police departments. Thus, by the time George Ariyoshi was elected in 196 , there was a widespread perception among *kanaka maoli* of "the Japanese taking over."

This perception was expressed when Matsuo Takabuki, a leading Democratic politician, was appointed as a Trustee of the Bishop Estate in June of 1971, for it seemed that Hawaiians were being ignored in determining the disposition of this key Hawaiian trust. More than 1,000 Hawaiians from a wide range of backgrounds, many of whom had never taken to the streets before, turned out overnight to protest the announcement of his appointment. Such a thing had never happened before.

A second circumstance contributing to the sense of dispossession was the rapid increase in net migration from the mainland and elsewhere following statehood in 1959. One effect of statehood was that newcomers could

obtain employment without being sponsored by a local employer, as had been the practice extending back to plantation times. The result was a rapid increase in net migration from the mainland and elsewhere.<sup>3</sup>

Added to the increase in resident population from outside was the explosive growth in the number of tourists and tourist facilities which came with statehood and the advent of large capacity jet aircraft. Ala Moana became the site of the world's largest shopping center in 1965. Within two decades of statehood the number of arriving visitors increased from a few hundred thousand to 4 million a year. In 1966 Waikiki had less than a dozen high-rise hotels. By 1984 it was a mile and half canyon of high-rise concrete. All of these developments directly promoted a flood of newcomers to the islands, many of whom became residents.

These were the circumstances then in 1972 when Louisa K. Rice initiated the organization known as A.L.O.H.A. (Aboriginal Lands of Hawaiian Ancestry), as the result of a dream. This organization shifted the focus of protest to the overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom: its purpose to obtain reparations for the the loss of lands resulting from the overthrow of Queen Liliuokalani in 1893. It elicited the veneration which *kanaka maoli* of all persuasions still felt for their Queen. Within a year A.L.O.H.A. had 9,000 members. Coming as it did in the midst of the other protests, A.L.O.H.A. created a direct symbolic link between the misuse of Hawaiian land and trusts in the present and the loss of land and nationhood in the past.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> I am indebted to sociologist H. V. Ball, Jr., of the University of Hawaiï for this analysis.

<sup>4</sup> Ethnic Studies Program (1974).

We have seen how A.L.O.H.A. led to the formation of the PKO. The joining of a reawakened feeling of *aloha 'aina* with memory of the Overthrow--where, indeed, *aloha 'aina* first became the symbol of national resistance--led to a revival of claims for the restoration of Hawaiian sovereignty in the 1980's and '90's.

#### Conclusions.

The link between the protests described in this and the previous chapter and the Overthrow is to be found in the concept of identity. To be Hawaiian means that one identifies with a particular historic experience. The major symbol of that experience is the Overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy in 1893, which resulted in the incorporation of Hawai'i into the U.S. Despite this, the *'aina* continues to stand as a symbol of Hawaiian identity and of the nation. Loss of one is reacted to as loss of the other. Thus the continued and accelerated loss of access to the *'aina* which so many Hawaiians have experienced, directly or symbolically, since the mid-'60's, combined with threats to Hawaiian identity resulting from development, continue to reverbrate with the memory of the Overthrow.

## Chapter 6. The *'ohana* of the past.

As described in previous chapters, the foundations of Hawaiian culture and identity were the *'aina* and *'ohana*. Because the *'ohana* resided and depended upon the land, the attitudes and values associated with the *'ohana* in the past became identified with the *'aina*. In this and the following chapter the values and attitudes formed within the *'ohana* in past times are compared with those today. Evidence will be presented to indicate that the Hawaiian family, even though drastically altered in scope and function, and for the most part no longer dependent upon the land, continues to form many of the feelings, relationships, and attitudes which characterized Hawaiians in the past.

### Membership in the *'ohana*

Theoretically the *'ohana* was conceived by *ka po'e kahiko* to include all of those persons who recognized one another as "relatives by blood, marriage, and adoption" (Handy and Pukui 1972: 2). Any persons who could trace relationship to the same forebearer or other relative could thus consider themselves members of the same "*ohana*" (ibid: 69-70). In practice, however, the *'ohana* was "concentrated geographically in and tied by ancestry, birth, and sentiment to a particular locality which was termed the *'aina*" (ibid: 2). It was residence on a common *'aina* which gave the *'ohana* its boundaries.

The close tie between the *'aina* and the *'ohana* is reflected in the various meanings of the word *kuleana*, which is commonly heard today. This word can mean a relative through whom a person lays a claim to a



relationship (ibid: 70), the land on which one lived, and one's role in a joint enterprise (Pukui and Elbert 1971).

Membership in the *'ohana* was broad for a practical reason: the *'ohana* supplied all of the labor for the production of food and other materials (see Chapter 2). Since there was sufficient land for the population, at least until late in the pre-contact period, broad incorporation of people into the *'ohana* was the way to promote prosperity for *ali'i* and *maka'ainana* alike.<sup>1</sup>

Archeological and historical data on Anahulu provide evidence that persons from outside were incorporated into the family already living on the *'aina*. This valley on the north shore of O'ahu appears to have been resettled late in the 18th century in order to produce goods and food for Kamehameha's army occupying O'ahu, and later to supply trading ships. Incorporation of people from outside the immediate area is reflected in the terms used to make claims to the use of land during the period before 1848, which were: *kupa*, meaning one held the land continually since the time of Kamehameha's conquest of the island of O'ahu; *'ohua*, meaning in-laws of those on the land before; and *hoa'aina*, meaning put there by the *konohiki* (a subsidiary chief managing the land). Kirch (1983) was able to determine from court testimony that the descendants of cultivators put there by the *konohiki* became over time *'ohua* (i.e., in-laws), while the latter became *kupa*. This process is supported by the meanings which Pukui and Elbert (1971) give to these terms: *kupa* as "native", as in *kupa*

---

<sup>1</sup> For a discussion of the controversy on the alleged overpopulation of Hawaii preceding contact see Stannard (1988) and Sponsel ( ).

'*ai au*, "native-born, long-attached to a place"; '*ohua* as dependent residents in a household (compare the meaning of *kuleana* above); and *hoa'aina* as "tenant, as on a *kuleana*." This evidence, as applied to Anahulu, reveals a system in which people who have been brought together on the land intermarry and come to view themselves over time as members of an '*ohana*. This is exactly the meaning given to the term by Pukui in the citation above.

The incorporating function of *aloha*

*Aloha* expresses the incorporation of people into the '*ohana*. It is difficult to emphasize sufficiently the cardinal importance and scope of this sentiment in traditional Hawai'i. According to 53 *kupuna* brought together in 1980 to consider ways of preserving the Hawaiian language the most important value taught to them by their *kupuna* was "to love one another" (Conference 1980). For them *aloha* and '*ohana* were synonymous. According to Handy and Pukui (1972) People were included in the '*ohana* in many ways--by hospitality (*ho'okipa*), adoption (*hana'i*) of both adults and children, meeting other's needs, mutual sharing, cooperation in work (*laulima*), feasting and entertaining. All of these practices incorporated outsiders and tied members of the '*ohana* together and to the land on which they lived.

The reputation of Hawaiians for *ho'okipa* began at first contact (Handy and Pukui 1972: 170). Newcomers were greeted and offered food and lodging at any time of the day or night, no matter how little there might be to share (ibid: 172-173, 186-187). To deny hospitality was a cause for scandal (ibid: 187, 191). These and similar practices of *ho'okipa*

are described in chant and legend by Chun (1985). He argues that hospitality was so important because it confirmed the identity of others. To deny *ho'okipa*, or refuse to accept it, constituted a refusal to recognize the identity of another. It is significant of this meaning that one of the principal causes of *kanaka maoli* resentment today is the refusal by *haole* to reciprocate the *aloha* accorded to the latter in the past. As one *kupuna*, whose attitudes were far from political, said in this connection: "*aloha* is a kick in the pants."

On Moloka'i in the recent past people still offered food to passers-by. One *kupuna* recalled that in the old days everyone would say, "*Hele mai, 'ai!*" ("Come in, eat"). "But no more," she lamented, "today people pass you by "*maka'ewa'ewa*--they look like they don't know you." However, hospitality on Moloka'i still carries the connotation of incorporation into the *'ohana*. As one *kupuna* told her granddaughter when I had just arrived for the first time : "This is your Uncle. Everyone who comes to your door is your *'ohana*. Now go fix your Uncle something to eat." As Handy and Pukui (ibid: 73-74) report, *ho'omakamaka* means "to make friends by extending hospitality." The *kupuna* in the 1980 Conference stated that an important value learned from the past was "to be generous to strangers." Such hospitality in the past might lead to adoption into the *'ohana*. There were many different ways of adopting adults (ibid: 73-74, Pukui et al. 1972: 167).

People marrying into the *'ohana* were encouraged to remain in the district, according to Handy and Pukui. Thus:

The people of Ka'u married mostly within their own district and discouraged marriages to those of the outside district or islands. If there was a marriage with one outside of the district that person was encouraged to remain as one of them. (Handy and Pukui 1972: 110)

This practice is consistent with the discussion of inheritance of land claims in Anahulu, O'ahu, discussed above.

Feasting was a major means of sharing and offering hospitality to all. Handy and Pukui (ibid: 115) describe it in this way:

While the merry-makers were eating there was much banter, joking, relating of anecdotes, matching wits.... The feasting and jollification roused some to rise here and there to dance a *hula*, as someone chanted a *mele*. The old people would be moved to chant *mele* and *oli* belonging to the family or the land, or relating some event, or perhaps honouring a beloved *ali'i*.

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, sharing was central to the production and exchange of food and goods in the past. It remains an important means for incorporating people into the *'ohana*, as discussed in the next chapter.

Hierarchical organization of the family and society.

Next to *aloha* the most important aspect of the *'ohana* of the past was hierarchy. There is no word for this comparable to *aloha*. But it was a

major principle by which people related to one another both within the family and, even more importantly, the society as a whole.

Within the family hierarchy was created by seniority. According to Handy and Pukui (ibid: 43):

Precedence or status was determined by genealogical seniority, not by generation or age, or by sex: persons from a genealogically elder branch outrank older generations of junior branches.

Seniority in the extended family was represented by the elder male of the senior branch--the *haku* (master), who directed the activities of the several households, acted as ritual head, and represented the *'ohana* before the *ali'i* (ibid: 6). The broader significance of the term *haku* is also reflected in the practice of playfully calling the youngest *haku* , "because the elders like to carry the little one around on their shoulders, which ceremonially was an honor accorded to the first-born" (ibid: 46).

Seniority likewise caused the first born of each sex to be accorded the position of *hiapo* or *hanau mua* (lit. born ahead). The *hiapo* would have precedence over the *poki'i* (younger siblings and cousins) and *hanau muli* (youngest)(ibid: 46). Theoretically, the male *hiapo* of the senior line would in the course of time become the *haku* of the entire *'ohana* (ibid: 47).

Within the household seniority was manifested by the expectation that younger siblings would obey the elder (Pukui et al. 1972: 170). Failing to heed the teachings of elders, being willful and headstrong, was seen as trying "to elevate oneself above others," *ho'oki'eki'e* (Handy and Pukui op

cit: 190). Striving for higher status by those of lower status was an aspect of hierarchy within the family.

The principle of hierarchy was imbedded in the society as a whole in the form of two classes: the *ali'i* (chiefs), who ruled, and the *maka'ainana*. The *maka'ainana* (lit. people who attend the land) produced the food and all other goods. Social strata developed to an extreme degree in Hawai'i. In all Polynesia only in Hawai'i and Tahiti could *maka'ainana* be put to death for violating *kapu* according to Goldman (1970) and Valeri (1985). This power, and the supernatural power (*mana*) on which it was based, gave rise to strong values of loyalty and obedience on the part of the *maka'ainana*. *Maka'ainana* rarely rebelled, and then only when severely oppressed (Kamakau 1961; Kelly 1956, 1969; Chun 2003).

It may be that the habit of obedience to the *ali'i* reinforced the emphasis upon obedience within the families of *maka'ainana*: Thus, children were enjoined to obey their elders, just as the latter had to obey the *ali'i*. One could argue that the lives of individuals in some circumstances depended upon this implicit habit of obedience to authority. Fear of breaking *kapu* was strong.

However, offsetting this emphasis obedience was the fact that the *ali'i* had reason to respect the people. As Trask (n.d.) points out:

...the independent *maka'ainana* and their *'ohana* were free to move and live under the *Mo'i* [ruling *ali'i*] of their choosing--while on the other hand, the individual *Mo'i* increased his status and material prosperity by having more people living within his *moku* or domain.

...together (this) created a powerful and permanent incentive for the society's leaders to provide for all their constituents' well-being and contentment.

Moreover, in addition to these considerations the *maka'ainana* had rights to use the land, sea, and irrigation water, which even the *konohiki* could not abridge (Nakuina 1893, Kelly 1956).

Presumably fear was felt primarily in the presence of the *Mo'i* (eg, I'i 1959). The *ali'i* who lived among the people, such as the *konohiki*, were not feared, but loved, according to Handy and Pukui (1972: 198). Distance from the *Mo'i* provided a measure of safety, and also allowed for the development of strong feelings of independence.

Among *maka'ainana* independence showed itself in the attitudes of the *kupuna* toward the *haku*: "the old folk, men and women of strong character were extremely independent in speech and action; consequently the *haku* was no dictator" (Handy and Pukui 1972: 7). Strict hierarchy was also offset in the relationship between grandparent and grandchild. The two shared a kind of reciprocity, the grandchild receiving indulgence and affection and returning affection and respect. While favoritism was generally resented, grandparents could show favoritism (ibid: 177). Thus *aloha* could take precedence over *staus*.

This was of great importance in the transmission of knowledge. "Intimate attachment" in the grandparent-grandchild relationship accompanied the special teaching which maintained continuity with the ancestors. Thus the stem *kupu* in the word *kupuna* (elder) means "to

grow", hence the growing point or source of growth; while *mo'o* in *mo'opuna* (grandchild) means "lineage" (ibid: 45, 75, 177). The re-emergence of this relationship during the Hawaiian resistance of the 1970's was therefore highly significant (see Chapter 5).

#### Learning values within the *'ohana*

All members of a household were expected to behave toward one another with *aloha* and *laulima*, which came to be linked as a child grew. Demonstrations of *aloha* began at birth and continued throughout life:

Perhaps the first expression of...*aloha* was between mother and child (ibid: 165). The child's arms around the mother's neck was likened to a *lei*. *A'a* was the sound of love expressed by a child for a home-coming parent (ibid: 164-165). It was a great thing to show love for...children (ibid: 166).

Throughout life *aloha* expressed family unity. Thus the saying:

The leaven of love makes the joy of gathering together and sharing.  
'Delicious are the *taro* greens when love is there.' (ibid: 168)

The principal goal of life was said to be "constancy of devotion." "*Ola na iwi*, 'the bones live'," elders say of themselves "when a child is good, thoughtful and loving" (ibid: 169).

*Aloha* was demonstrated by how well parents provided. Providing was the main role of the parents (*makua*), as that of the *kupuna* was to



teach and preserve knowledge. The role of provider was extremely important: "the main post." Good providers were admired and respected, while negligent ones were noted (ibid: 174-176).

*Laulima* becomes linked to *aloha* because everyone, including children, was expected to contribute to the work of the household. "Do chores first and play later" was the teaching reported by the *kupuna* (Conference 1980). The age of the child was categorized by the tasks which they could perform: old enough to carry a water gourd (about 2 years) or old enough to carry a little one on the back (about 10 years) (Handy and Pukui 1972: 178). As this indicates, children were expected to look after younger siblings--an experience which formed attitudes of obedience to elder siblings, as well as rivalry between them.

#### Procreation and gender.

Procreation was of fundamental importance to traditional Hawaiian culture. The concept pervaded the cosmology as expressed in song and chant (Charlot et al. 1983). Closely related were the concepts of male creativity and the segregation of men and women in the organization and daily life of the family.

Handy and Pukui (1972: 75) state: "as a means of perpetuating the *'ohana*, procreation was even more important than personal health." Chants were composed for the genitals of the children of *ali'i* and *kahuna* (experts), and the genitals were given special care. All males of whatever class were sub-incised around the age of 8 years to facilitate and enhance the pleasures of intercourse. "Sex knowledge was not kept from children"

(ibid: 93-95). On the contrary, when a boy "showed evidence of sexual awareness, he was allowed sex experiments and experience with girls and women" (Pukui et al. 1972: 114). As Charlot (1983: 52) makes clear, all of this served to continue the great cosmic act of creation. No distinction was made between spirituality and pleasure: "the sexual act was accepted without shame...as being both creative and one of the supreme pleasures" (Handy and Pukui 1972: 75).

In ancient times, ritual segregation of the sexes shaped the daily experience of men and boys.

The *Mua* or men's eating house was a sacred place from which women were excluded. It was the place where the men and older boys ate their meals and where the head of the family offered the daily offerings of 'awa to the family 'aumakua. Here men and family gods ate together, and that was why women, who were periodically unclean, were not allowed to enter here. (Handy and Pukui 1972: 9)

It seems from Charlot's account that the reason for the separation was the symbolic contrast between the godliness of male creativity and the humanity of females, rather than uncleanness per se. Mixing would be polluting, except in procreation. "Free eating," 'ai noa, thus became the symbolic act that overthrew the entire cosmology.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Emma De Fries reported as her tradition, received from her ancestor, the prophet Hewahewa, that ritual segregation was introduced into Hawai'i at the same time as more powerful *kapu*, the new temple worship and human sacrifice, i.e., at the time of Pa'ao. See Charlot's account of changes in Hawaiian religion at this time (Charlot et al. 1983: 146-47). Chun (n.d.) argues that 'ai noa also abolished the symbolic basis for the class system; which would be consistent with Charlot's argument.

In any case it was in the *Mua* that males, starting at about the age of five, learned by observation and participation, how to practice masculine skills and became men.

After a ceremony called "*ka i Mua*" or "expulsion to the *Mua*," which usually occurred in the sixth year of a boy's life, he was permitted to wear a *malo* [loin-cloth] and join the men in their eating house. He was then a man. (Handy and Pukui 1972: 9)

In the accompanying ritual the boy was dedicated to Lono, the Provider (ibid: 96). This was the most important event in a boy's life.

The removal of the *Mua* from Hawaiian life after the overthrow of the *kapu* --ie, '*ai noa*--in 1819 may have meant that boys remained in the company of women most of the time throughout childhood, with less opportunity to associate with men and learn masculine tasks. The possible consequence of this circumstance is discussed in the following chapter.

There is much more in Handy and Pukui's rich description of the traditional '*ohana* than what has been included here. In this chapter only those aspects of the family which show clear continuity or discontinuity to the present have been described. As described in the next chapter, continuities include the incorporation of persons into the family, *aloha* and *laulima*, and hierarchy. Discontinuities appear in the scope of the extended family, its leadership, the upbringing of boys, and relationships with authorities outside the family.

## Chapter 7. The *'ohana* today.

As we have seen, membership in the *'ohana* in the past was based upon the land which it occupied and depended upon for sustenance both material and spiritual. The great majority of Hawaiians today do not depend upon the land which they occupy for the major portion of their subsistence. In this chapter we examine what has happened to the *'ohana* as a result of this loss of its base. Evidence indicates that ties between related households have weakened. Relatives are scattered, and no longer look to a common head or leader. Instead, those who choose to regard themselves as *'ohana* exchange hospitality and *kokua* (help one another) in time of need. This, rather than common residence on the same *'aina*, appears to provide the basis of belonging in most cases, although in some instances related household do cluster together.

In spite of such a major change, it is remarkable that many of the traditional sentiments and patterns of behavior continue within the family today. Households still tend to be large. People want many children, and households typically contain more than a nuclear family--frequently incorporating children or adults through adoption--either traditional (*hanai*) or Western. Significantly, growing up in a Hawaiian household still provides experiences of *aloha*, *laulima*, and hierarchy like those in the family described in the previous Chapter. It is as though Hawaiians had retained within the household as much as possible of the extended *'ohana* of the past, despite loss of the *'aina*.

The extended family.

Few indeed are the extended families who still live on their own land. In land scarce Hawai'i, most do not even own their own homesites. Those few *'ohana* who still lay claim to land, and know where it is, may have one member who lives on it. Such a person may be referred to as *noho 'aina*.<sup>1</sup> The great majority of families, however, have lost ownership of their ancestral land, or no longer know its exact location. Elder informants on Moloka'i, for instance, all reported the loss or sale of their family lands, and still felt deeply about it. In very many cases land was lost by illegal means.<sup>2</sup>

The loss of the land base has seriously affected the commitment of members of the *'ohana* to one another, and weakened the existence of the *'ohana* as an extended, corporate group. This can be inferred from contradictory information about who is considered to belong to the *'ohana*. On the one hand some studies (e.g., Rosco 1977) report that genealogically related persons running into the hundreds regard themselves as one *'ohana*. Reunions of such large groups occur, sometimes on a regular basis. On the other hand Handy and Pukui (1972:91) state that relatives were not so readily recognized in 1953 as in the past.

To some degree, lack of recognition of relatives is due to lack of genealogical knowledge. Thus both Heighton (1971: 30) and Linnekin (1985: 60) report that informants did not trace genealogical

---

<sup>1</sup> Heighton 1971: 30, 31, 52; Rosco 1977.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, Stouffer 1990.

connections more than three generations. I have found many who even lacked knowledge of one or more grandparents, unless they had made a determined effort to discover who they were. In part this is due to extensive intermarriage among forebearers of differing ethnicity. On the other hand, people invariably try to relate to one another upon meeting by searching for a common possible relative (see the use of the term *kuleana* in Chapter 6).

Lack of genealogical knowledge is not the only reason for not recognizing relatives, however. Surprisingly, some say that they "have no relatives," explaining that they do not recognize a relationship with known relatives, because they have not received aid from them in time of need. This may be one reason why people on the average tend to mention only three persons among those outside the household that they "felt close to".<sup>3</sup> Heighton (1971: 29) states:

I doubt whether a traditional *'ohana* structure now operates...today the term is restricted more to the *hale*, the group living in the household plus a few close relatives outside the *hale*.

Interviews suggest that membership in the extended family today frequently depends upon voluntary exchange of services. Linnekin (1985: 6) reports that in the rural village of Keanae gift-giving, or "generalized reciprocity," phrased as *aloha*, defines who is included in the community. Even siblings, parents, and relatives will not be close if they do not exchange valued gifts and services.

The principle of hierarchy is apparent also. It appears that exchanges of valued gifts and services must be on an equal basis. For instance, on O'ahu a mechanic explained to me that he would be taken advantage of if he fixed everyone's car who asked him to, so he only did so with those who shared hospitality with him. This attitude is consistent with Heighton's (1971: 48) report that one-sidedness in exchange among equals is resented, because it suggests profiteering or inequality of status. Linnekin (1985: 139) similarly reports that people strive for equality in exchange with those outside the family, because of the feeling that indebtedness lowers the status of the debtor. "Overgenerosity" is interpreted as a pretension to superiority.

On the other hand reciprocity also works positively as a strategy for obligating those who exchange. Reciprocity in Keanae, for example, is greatest when people have to rely upon one another in order to meet production quotas and weekly deadlines for marketing *taro* (Linnekin 1985: Ch. 3). Because it insures against one sidedness, reciprocity avoids exploitation by outsiders, as Trask (1986) argues. This is exactly the point made by the mechanic quoted above.

Depending upon one another today would seem to be voluntary, rather than obligatory, as it was traditionally (see Chapter 2). This is expressed by the attitude that households should not burden one another--that each has responsibilities and troubles enough of its

---

<sup>3</sup> Howard 1971: 57, 59.

own. Such an attitude is based upon the fact that the extended family no longer has a common base of support.<sup>4</sup> Thus few relatives are typically regarded as close.

The lack of a recognized leader is another indication of the limited existence of the extended family. Thus Rosco (1977) found no *haku* (head of the family) in her large extended family. While Pukui et al. (1972: 128) report as of 1953 that most "continue to recognize one specific senior who outranks" others, in my experience none of these elders supervise, teach, and resolve conflicts, as *haku* did in the past.<sup>5</sup>

Household size and composition.

While extended families are less extensive than in the past, households today still tend to be large. This is especially true on Homestead land. In one such community the average was 6.5 persons per household (Gallimore et al. 1974: 51). Partly, this number was due to the fact that women past the age of 30 averaged 6.3 children each (ibid: 104). Households with young children tend to be larger than other households, averaging 9.7 persons (Howard 1971: 36). Larger households also contain on average persons who are not

---

<sup>4</sup> One might expect widespread interdependence in Keanae, where a land base has been retained. Linnekin (1985), however, reports efforts to limit interdependence. I have suggested (Boggs 1991) that this may be due to the fact that land tenure there is in effect individual. This leads to defensiveness about recognizing relatedness where inheritance of land is at issue (Linnekin 1985: 83-84). The result may be to limit the extent of interdependence.

<sup>5</sup> Pukui et al. 1979: 227-8. See Boggs and Chun 1990 for contemporary practice of *ho'oponopono*.



members of the core nuclear family (Howard 1974: 20). These include grandparents, collateral relatives, or in-laws of the head (Howard 1971: T-3). In many cases adults of the younger generation and their children live in one of the parental homes. Partly this is due to a severe shortage of affordable housing in urban areas. The small minority of families who are able to obtain Homestead leases also double up. For various reasons, therefore, households in many Hawaiian communities tend to be large, and to include several generations and/or relatives.

#### Adoption.

It is remarkable how readily Hawaiians continue to incorporate others into their households, permanently as well as temporarily. Traditional forms of adoption are still practiced by Hawaiians. The traditional term, *hanai*, means to care for and raise a child. Taking a child for this purpose is to *lawe hanai*. *Luhi*, on the other hand, means to care for a child temporarily (Pukui et al. 1972: 49-50). In either case, the child typically maintains the relationship with the biological parents, unlike the Western practice of legal adoption, in which the tie with the biological parent (typically the mother) is kept secret. Increasingly, however, Hawaiians are turning to legal adoption, while still maintaining the relationship between a child and its biological parents.

Levy (1973: 482ff) interprets traditional adoption in Polynesia as a statement that children belong to the extended family, and thus are to be shared. This attitude is consistent with the Hawaiian

tradition that grandparents have a right to raise a child, and parents are not supposed to protest. *Hanai* should also be permanent, for if parent and grandparent quarrel out of jealousy, it is believed that the child will suffer, and perhaps even die. Hence, one offers the child (*ha'awi hanai*) and the other accepts it totally (see Pukui et al., loc cit). Because it is not permanent *luhi* has to be clearly distinguished from *hanai*. Today, because of legal conflicts regarding inheritance and potential misunderstandings, some parents and grandparents resort to legal adoption in place of *hanai*.<sup>6</sup>

In any case the Western practice of adoption conflicts fundamentally with the traditional assumption that a child is to be shared with its biological parents. It also conflicts in the modern context with respect to inheritance. *Hanai* children traditionally inherited along with other children; but in Western courts they were often not recognized as heirs. Such confusions have often produced bitterness within families. As a consequence Hawaiians are often sensitive about the status of *hanai* children, and may deny that they are *hanai*.<sup>7</sup> Hawaiians, however, are still reluctant to follow the Western practice of adoption, because it may cut the child off from his or her genealogy (Pukui et al 1972: loc cit).

For many reasons, therefore, traditional adoption is still quite frequent in Hawaiian communities. According to two different surveys, as many as one-third of Hawaiian families living on Homstead

---

<sup>6</sup> See Modell 1994.

<sup>7</sup> My field notes; also Snakenberg 1979.

land have one or more *hanai* children (the average being 1.8: Howard et al. 1970). While statewide Alu Like (1976) reported a lower percentage of households containing *hanai* children (12.2 per cent of households, with 1.4 children per household), I believe that this difference may be due in part to variations in reporting due to the sensitivity mentioned above. The difference may also reflect the fact that families on homesteads adopt more children.

The great majority of adopted children are adopted as infants by family members, especially on the mother's side. So great is the value placed on sharing, however, that children are on occasion even given between friends as an expression of particular closeness. Here is one story:

B. said that one night when he was drinking with a friend, the latter offered to give B. the baby his wife was then carrying. The friend told his wife, "When the baby is out take it right up to B." The baby was a boy, and the wife took him to B. B. and his wife reared the boy. Many years later, when B. was widowed and living alone, this boy, grown to manhood, returned and lived with B.

Hawaiians give many reasons for giving and taking a child to raise. Most commonly a grandparent takes a first-born to raise and teach as a *hiapo* (see Chapter 6). Traditionally, a girl went to her mother's parents and a boy to the father's.<sup>8</sup> Grandparents, aunts or uncles might also adopt a child because of special *aloha* for that child.

Such a child was raised as a *punahele* (favorite), trained in traditional lore and elevated above its siblings.<sup>9</sup> In some instances infants are adopted by parents with older children because they furnish so much pleasure and entertainment (Gallimore et al. 1974: 103-116). Sometimes, indeed, the presence of an infant seems to re-establish ties among grown ups that have weakened over time (Collette Machado, personal communication).

On the other hand necessity can also lead to adoption. Parents who suffer financial hardship or divorce, or those with many children, may give one or more infants to others to raise (see, for example, Naliielua 1986). For somewhat similar reasons the first child or two of an adolescent who is not old enough or ready to marry may be raised as a sibling within the household. In the past children might also be taken for the sole purpose of serving the adoptive parent in old age, or to help care for a large family. In some of these latter cases the child when grown recalled receiving less *aloha* than other children in the family.

Occasionally today those in need, whether child, adolescent, or adult, may be taken into a household and remain there for a long period of time--a practice which resembles *ho'omakamaka* in the past (Handy and Pukui 1972: 74) and is sometimes called *hanai* today. Many are the stories of friends who are disabled or alcoholic being taken in this way. In one Homestead community five per cent of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Snakenberg 1979, Heighton 1971: 58.

<sup>9</sup> Handy and Pukui 1972: 46, Snakenberg 1979, and field notes.

households had a person who was unrelated living there (Howard 1971: T.3).

Growing up.

A child growing up in a Hawaiian family typically experiences a lot of *aloha*, while learning his or her place in a definite hierarchy. Following the first few years, children are led to contribute their share to the tasks of the household, and to care for younger siblings under parental supervision. From parents they learn to respect authority; whereas among siblings rivalry often develops.

Parents in one Homestead community described their goals in raising children as providing care and affection, teaching obedience, and training for practical tasks (Howard 1974: 172ff). In the first two years infants were typically observed being passed around, stimulated, and entertained; responding tirelessly with smiles and laughs (Gallimore et al. 1974: 108). The feelings of affection and intimacy which arise in this way form the basis of *aloha*. After the first several years, the child is inducted into doing things for others. Household tasks are typically arranged in such a way that each member of the household depends upon others. The ideal is to be generous, helpful, reliable, and sensitive to the needs of others (Gallimore et al. 1974: 65, 83). This is viewed as an expression of *aloha*. Gender differences begin at this point: girls are responsible for an increasing amount of housework as they grow older while boys typically work outside, if they work at all (op cit: 78). Everyone, however, is expected to help out when adults demand. Nothing

receives a greater expression of *aloha* from parents than carrying out one's appointed task.

Care of younger siblings begins spontaneously when children join in playing with an infant. Parents then may encourage this involvement by expecting the child care-taker to entertain, watch over, and provide for the needs of the younger, while being monitored by themselves or an older child. It is surprising how much 5 year-olds, especially girls, know about preparation of nursing bottles and changing baby's clothes (Boggs 1972: 308; 1985: ch. 3, Ex. I).

Taking care of younger siblings sets up a hierarchy. Younger children spontaneously seek to emulate older ones, thus setting the stage for rivalry when the older one rebuff their attempts. Boys experience this hierarchy differently from girls, for girls typically succeed in taking on the tasks which an older one has performed after a new baby is born, thus moving up in the hierarchy. Boys by contrast less often make this change of status. In any case, boys and girls treat younger ones as they have been treated, with the result that all learn not to act "above their age".

The relationship between obedience, care and affection is crucial for understanding the ideology and the dynamics of family relations. Parents clearly seek to maintain their authority over children. But they also attempt to limit the need to punish. As Gallimore et al. (1974: 93) state:

Parents hope to appear both powerful and generous, so as to stimulate helpfulness, obedience, and harmony.... authoritarian control is most successful when it is least in evidence--when children are willingly and spontaneously assuming and sharing responsibilities.

On the other hand parents do not allow children to initiate interaction on the child's terms: they are quick to threaten punishment if children importune, or delay in obeying. However, they do not punish nearly as often as they threaten to. When they do punish they do so dramatically. When carried out against a background of care and affection, punishment seems to make a profound impression. Children tell about it with a degree of awe, even into adolescence.

Parents view rewards for good behavior as "bribing." To make rewards contingent upon the child's behavior opens the door to manipulation of the parent as Howard (1974: 59-60) notes. When the parent is free to dispense rewards, however, they reward generously. In this way children are motivated to engage in household tasks without being told. They carry over this attitude to school, as revealed when they respond to a teacher's displeasure by performing a housekeeping task without being asked (see Boggs 1985: 131).

This is not to say that no Hawaiian children are willful and disobedient. A child who is seen to manipulate a parent is regarded by everyone as "spoiled"--and this is a severe judgment. A certain degree of misbehavior--being *kolohe*--is warmly approved, for it

demonstrates self-reliance and courage on the child's part. A performance which is mischievous but not disrespectful is called "acting," and is much enjoyed by all. But it cannot be carried to the point of seriously challenging adult prerogatives (D'Amato 1986: 247).

Rivalry is likely to appear wherever there is no clear hierarchy, such as that which exists between parents and children. Children learn first how to fit into a hierarchy, as described. But with others who are neither younger nor older, in school and neighborhood, they steadfastly resist one another's attempts to exert influence, make claims, or use things exclusively. What seems to underly these disputes is a sensitivity to assertiveness (Boggs 1985: ch. 4). D'Amato describes how children are taught by teasing at home to be assertive (1986: 265f, 275, 247). This may lead them to react assertively when confronted by other children behaving in a similar fashion, where age does not provide a clear hierarchy.

Adolescent boys.

In adolescence boys and girls face the task of detaching themselves from the interdependence which has heretofore enveloped them. This involves a bigger change for boys than for girls. Girls at all ages are more involved in household tasks and caring for younger children. Adolescent boys on the other hand seek escape from demands and criticism at home by hanging out with their friends (Gallimore et al. 1974: 171). Being out of the house with friends--who refer to themselves as "us guys" or "da bradda's"--is very important:



to be separated from friends when not in school is so dull ("dry") as to be unbearable.

Unlike home, to be accepted by peers all one has to do is "act natural," i.e., not like a big shot or in a self-centered way. Friends rigidly refrain from attempting to influence one another, for example, in deciding where to go. The dislike of dominating behavior can be seen in the fact that boys shun contact with those about two years older than themselves whenever possible, for at this age older ones frequently haze younger ones. Girls are more likely to participate in groups of varying ages.

Acceptance means equality, which is celebrated among friends by "talking story," ie, narrating collectively experiences which have been shared, joining in riddles ("jokes"), word play, and playful teasing. Favorite stories tell of fights, which highlight the ideal of being "cool"-ie, defending oneself when necessary, but keeping control.

Some adolescents experience more extreme pressures from home, and react by various kinds of self-destructive and publicly aggressive behavior, running away from home, and increasingly by substance abuse. These adolescents, girls as well as boys, typically describe conflicts with their parents, or outright psychological or physical abuse. All of them have low self-esteem and suffer from some degree of depression.<sup>10</sup>

In such circumstances young men, cut off from family life, and typically unemployed, can easily be recruited into criminal activity. Hanging out offers opportunities for petty theft and experimentation with drugs. The prestige associated with fighting and self-control (being "cool") may lead to employment as an "enforcer" in the local underworld. Substance abuse leads to repeated theft, and increasingly to uncontrolled violence when under the influence of crystal methamphetamine.

Adolescence typically ends when a young man becomes serious about a young woman and begins to spend less time with his friends. But this does not happen smoothly or quickly in many instances. And when it does not the stage is set for family conflicts. This is neither the time nor place to look further into these, except to note that households under present circumstances frequently lack the support of extended families or of an elder who has the authority to intervene.

The *'ohana* in Hawaiian culture today.

In Hawaiian tradition residence and dependence upon a common *'aina* enabled the extended family to exist. With the removal of the majority of Hawaiians from the land the extended family has all but disappeared. While sharing among households remains an important principle, and may help to bring people together in time of need, the greatest continuities with the *'ohana* of the past are evident within

---

<sup>10</sup> For information leading to these conclusions I am indebted to Billie Hauge, Joan Connor Boggs, Ernie Libarríos and Lucy Gay, of Project Rise at Leeward Community ~~and~~

the household. Composed of various relatives, often including adopted children, households still tend to be large and they continue to be organized according to roles based upon gender, age, and generation with stress being placed upon obedience and deference of younger to older--a continuity with seniority in the past. *Aloha* remains the key value. It is experienced with particular intensity in infancy, and reinforced through the importance attached to meeting the needs of all, including guests and visitors.

The greatest discontinuities in family life have occurred because of the absence of a *haku* or senior capable of intervening and resolving conflicts and the individualizing tendencies which separate many individuals, especially young men, from their families. No group exists now which can provide boys with daily opportunities to learn from elders how to work as part of a team, as the *mua* did in the past. It is significant of a change in this regard that some *kanaka maoli* men are now organizing themselves in ways which are based upon the *hale mua* of the past, emphasizing martial arts, re-enactment of ceremonies, language, oral performance, crafts, and other aspects of the culture which have long been missing from Hawaiian life.<sup>11</sup>

## Chapter 8. Hawaiian sovereignty.

On three days in January, 1993, the events which led to the overthrow of the Hawaiian Monarchy one hundred years earlier were re-enacted on the grounds of the Royal Palace in Honolulu, as part of a larger commemoration of that event. On the first day only a handful of people attended. On the second day there were at least several hundred. By the evening of the third day an estimated 8,000 people were present, solidly covering the Palace grounds. And when the Queen appeared at the door of the Palace and spoke to the people--her people--in the light of torches, praising them for their achievement as a nation, urging them to disperse peacefully and to stand firm in their right to continue to be a nation, you could hear not a sound in that vast crowd.

A feeling crystallized during those three days among those who attended. As one of the actors who portrayed the plotters who overthrew the Queen with the assistance of the US Consul, sailors, and marines, I well recall the shocked response of the smallish crowd as they heard the words demeaning them as a people and calling for the removal of the Queen, in order to benefit the Americans in the Kingdom and bring about annexation to the United States. The shock was as much due to astonishment as to anger. These people had never known up to that moment what had actually brought about the apparent loss of their nation. But from that time and place that memory was recovered.

For many centuries *kanaka maoli* looked to the past in order to foretell the future. Current events were interpreted as recurrences of history. This way of understanding persisted for a time after the arrival of Europeans and others in *ka pae Hawai'i*. But it also began to change, as

prophets foretold the replacement of *kanaka maoli* by foreigners. This prophecy appeared to be confirmed by many events, among them the decimation of the people by disease, the creation of a Monarchy based upon European models in place of the rule by *Mo'i*, the dissolution of the class system, and the nearly complete dispossession of the people from the land in the *Mahele*.

Capping all of this trauma the 1893 Overthrow, as it came to be called, left the great majority of *kanaka maoli* bereft of the guidance of the past--once their massive petitions to the United States to restore the Queen were summarily dismissed and Hawai'i was annexed to the U.S.<sup>1</sup> After that most no longer tried to teach the children the language. Nor were the events of the Overthrow and the subsequent resistance passed on orally. It was as if it was too painful to recall. Even today many older Hawaiians do not want to hear it mentioned. It was people born after the Overthrow, who had not heard of these events, who were galvanized by the Commemoration in 1993.

How and why, then, was memory recovered in the last decade of the 20th century? This is the sort of question which historians and philosophers wrestle with for centuries, and I am not about to suggest an answer here. To do so would require knowing what went on in the minds of thousands of people over a considerable period of time in reaction to an unknown variety of events both public and personal. The consequences of the recovery, however, are fairly clear to see. It added a political dimension to the cultural resistance which was already underway. It is the

---

<sup>1</sup> For a description of the extensive resistance prior to Annexation see Silva n.d. This resistance provides crucial evidence for the argument that Hawaiians never voluntarily relinquished their sovereign nation.

nature of the resistance, and its future, that this final chapter addresses.

The significance of the Overthrow.

Resistance to dispossession of the last *kanaka maoli* remaining on land which they did not own began among those in urban areas who literally had no place to go, and soon afterwards among those living in rural Moloka'i whose access to traditional places were cut off. Two of the organizations carrying on resistance soon seized upon the glaringly obvious misuse of the *'aina* of Kaho'olawe. The memory of Queen Lili'uokalani and her illegal overthrow motivated the foundation of one of these organizations: A.L.O.H.A., which played a significant part in the founding of the Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana, as discussed in Chapter 5.

The PKO first sought to stop the bombing of Kaho'olawe as a goal in itself and also to mobilize mass pressure for the return of the Island to *kanaka maoli* control. This latter goal was greatly reinforced by the idea that the Island properly belonged to the Hawaiian Nation, since it had been a part of the public lands transferred to the United States at the time of annexation. But the PKO limited itself to restoring the Island: it never attempted to become a means for restoring Hawaiian sovereignty over all of *ka pae Hawai'i*.

Late in the decade of the 1980's *kanaka maoli*--as they came increasingly to call themselves--began to talk about "sovereignty." Just what it meant was not clear, particularly in the circumstances they found themselves in--dominated as they were in every sphere by people whose homelands lay elsewhere. But it meant at least resuming more control

over what had belonged to them historically: *ka pae Hawai'i*. Just such a claim was made in September of 1993 before a panel of distinguished international jurists assembled in Hawai'i to hear the United States accused of violating international law in its treatment of Hawai'i in the past, continuing into the present.<sup>2</sup> This event was followed at the end of the year by a resolution passed by the U.S. Congress apologizing for the role which the U.S. government and its representatives played in the Overthrow of the Monarchy one hundred years earlier.<sup>3</sup> Key statements of the testimony presented to the international jurists were included in the Apology Bill, as it was called, as they also had appeared in President Cleveland's verdict on the illegality of the Overthrow delivered to Congress in 1893.

By the mid-'90's there had been enough discussion of sovereignty that three-fourths of Hawaiians reported themselves in favor of its restoration. But how to accomplish that was still not clear. Views were split with a minority in favor of independence from the U.S. and a majority in favor of some kind of status within the U.S. And so it has been up to the time of this writing.

Meanwhile, the circumstances within which the debate has been taking place have shifted dramatically. On one side a determined attack has been mounted in the courts challenging existing programs of the State and Federal governments intended to benefit *kanaka maoli* on the argument that they violate the U.S. Constitution. The first challenge was to the provision that only Hawaiians could vote for Trustees of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs: the agency set up by a revision of the State

---

<sup>2</sup> People's International Tribunal Hawai'i 1993.

<sup>3</sup> Public Law 103-150, 107 Stat. 1510 (1993).

Constitution in 1978 to receive income from various sources intended to benefit Native Hawaiians, including income from lands which once belonged to the Hawaiian Kingdom. The Federal court ruled that this restriction on voting was unconstitutional under the 14th Amendment, and all registered voters of whatever ethnicity were subsequently allowed to vote in OHA elections. Further suits were then filed challenging the constitutionality of OHA itself, its right to revenue from former Hawaiian Kingdom lands; and challenging the Hawaiian Homes Act of 1920, which provides for occupancy of certain public lands by Native Hawaiians. At the time of this writing only the challenge to the use of State funds from the land revenues is still being adjudicated. But there is little doubt that the organizations which have brought these suits intend to continue their challenge.<sup>4</sup>

As a direct result of this challenge, although also following upon earlier efforts to establish a special status for Hawaiians, a bill was introduced in Congress, the so-called Recognition Bill, which would accord *kanaka maoli* a status comparable to that of Native American Nations under the U.S. Constitution. This circumstance has deepened the split among *kanaka maoli* between those favoring independence and those seeking some accommodation less than this. The court challenges referred to have made the latter feel the desperate need to retain existing benefits; while the former fear that acceptance of the Federal status offered will foreclose the possibility of achieving independence.

On the other side, the independence cause in 2001 won stunning support in the Permanent International Court of Arbitration in The Hague, Netherlands. It came about in this way. Keanu Sai, a former Captain of

---

<sup>4</sup> Native American Rights Fund 2003.



artillery in the U.S. Army, began to study the documents recording the diplomatic and military history of Hawai'i in relation to international law. By the mid-'90's he had become convinced that under international law the Hawaiian Kingdom was a recognized nation, enjoying full sovereignty in the international system of the time; that it had been occupied without its consent by the United States since 1893; that the occupation was and remained illegal; and that the rightful (*de jure*) sovereignty of the Hawaiian Kingdom was not extinguished. He brought his argument to a group, the Hawaiian Kingdom, which regarded itself as the successor government of the same. A suit was instituted in the international tribunal to determine whether Hawaiian Kingdom sovereignty continued to exist under international law. To the surprise of many, the Court ruled that it did.<sup>5</sup>

Where this verdict will lead remains to be seen, since the U.S. is notoriously resistant to pressure from any international body. For the present, however, the verdict appears to have clarified considerably the grounds on which independence can be pursued.

The future of Hawaiian resistance.

Perhaps one tenth of all *kanaka maoli* know of or actively involve themselves in the political resistance discussed in the previous section. This is not an accurate indication, however, of the extent or depth of Hawaiian resistance to assimilation. That resistance has endured in cultural ways for over two centuries, and it will doubtless continue into the future. The forms which cultural resistance has taken in recent decades include the revival of the language, *hula kahiko*, ocean voyaging--

---

<sup>5</sup> For the text of relevant documents see: [www.hawaiiankingdom.org](http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org). In 1993 I examined many of these documents in the US National Archives, but lacking Keanu's

to name but a few. The breadth of this revival is astonishing to anyone who has observed it over the past third of a century. By way of example: today on the Manoa campus of the University one can hear *olelo Hawai'i* spoken by young *kanaka maoli* outside class. In the mid-'60's there were extremely few *kanaka maoli* on campus, even fewer knew Hawaiian; while a majority of those interviewed in a Homestead community did not know the meanings of common Hawaiian words--so complete had the suppression of the language become. Another example: graduates of Kamehameha Schools until the mid-'80's were exposed to no aspects of Hawaiian culture. Since then *hula kahiko*, has become one of the emotional high spots of the song contests which have long been the signature public exhibition of the Schools. The Merry Monarch Hula Festival in Hilo has become an international event, so popular that tickets to attend it have to be obtained long in advance.

Other forms of cultural resistance, however, are less widely known or recognized, even by *kanaka maoli*. This book has called attention to two of them: the persisting attachment to the land and characteristic features of the *'ohana*. Despite the removal of most *kanaka maoli* from the *'aina* the attitudes that were formed by that attachment over many centuries persist. They are expressed by restorations of *lo'i* on O'ahu and other islands. The Hawaiian Nation, mentioned above, has re-established itself on land leased from the State, restoring the *lo'i* along with the laws and protocol of the Kingdom. Resistance to the diversion of water from streams for residential developments continues in several places. There are strenuous objections to legislative attempts to regulate access to lands for gathering plants for traditional uses and to *malama* the *'aina*. If

anything, these actions are bound to be called for increasingly in the future.

In many ways the crux of Hawaiian resistance lies precisely in the difference in land use between American and Hawaiian cultures. The former insists that it be treated as a commodity to be exploited by individuals and corporations. Its meaning for *kanaka maoli* could hardly be more different. As the evidence of this book has shown, for *kanaka maoli* the *'aina* has a symbolic and spiritual significance which is even more important than its material significance. It is not to be exploited by anyone, but rather, cared for (*malama*) as a member of the family. And used for the *'ohana*, which means all of those with whom one shares. American culture has attempted unceasingly to change this use from the time Americans first appeared in Hawai'i. That was the motive behind the Mahele and the establishment of a constitutional monarchy from 1839 to 1854. Americans continue to obliterate Hawaiian land use today--in the conversion of lease-hold property to fee simple titles by condemnation, for example. The latest concerted effort is being made in the courts to combat land use regulation by creating rights to potential profit from speculation in land, which can be used to make claims upon governments which downzone land. This has already been attempted in Hawai'i, and will be attempted again.

Hawaiians have, fortunately, strong legal resources to defend their concept of land use in Hawai'i. One is the right of access to undeveloped land for traditional gathering, which is part of the basic law of Hawai'i (the PASH decision).<sup>6</sup> Another is the argument that the rights of tenants to one-third of the lands of the Kingdom remain unextinguished by any

---

<sup>6</sup> Forman and Knight 1997.

subsequent legal action of the Kingdom.<sup>7</sup> That is where the Larsen decision is so important, for it means that all present fee titles in Hawai'i are still subject to this right, which in turn means that such titles can be legally challenged. If Americans persist attacking "special treatment" for Hawaiians, they may in future find themselves trying to defend their own land titles in court.

But resistance to American land use depends upon continued use by *kanaka maoli* for traditional purposes. Without this even the restoration of full sovereignty will have little meaning. *Kanaka maoli* can continue to use the land in traditional ways without political sovereignty. There is much land even in urban areas which is currently unused (*poho*). Anyone who has seen European cities realizes this immediately. My friend Nohola Lorenzo created a *pohaku* shrine, beautifying it with plants and *ho'okupu*, on the barren hillside above Kalihi Valley Homes, the public housing project where she lived. Everyday she went there to recall her upbringing in Hana, to meditate, and to pray. One day someone came and bulldozed her shrine. But she built another. That is *onipa'a*.

As this illustrates, the land is used in traditional ways not only for its material products. Those who are restoring *lo'i* do not derive a major portion of their sustenance from it. They are doing it for spiritual sustenance, for connection, for a sense of belonging to a place, and in order to share. In all of these respects American culture increasingly offers no significant competition. That is, perhaps, one reason why *kanaka maoli* resist so strongly being completely assimilated in that culture.

---

<sup>7</sup> Lam 1985.

The greatest potential for maintaining Hawaiian culture lies within the *'ohana*. It is there that one learns what it means to be Hawaiian; and it is there that *kanaka maoli* have the greatest power to shape who they will be. The patterns of daily life which this entails are in constant danger of being lost because of the constraints imposed by work outside the home, television, and intermarriage, particularly when the mother is not *kanaka maoli*.

It is not appropriate for an outsider to make suggestions about family life, but I cannot refrain from noting that the revival of interest in protocol could be a help in maintaining and restoring older ways of relating, such as those described by Pukui. Protocol is associated with formal ceremony, but more broadly it can be thought of as the proper way to address and engage in dialogue according to the status of the parties involved. When I listen to certain *kupuna* address a *keiki li'i* in the old style I hear in the tone of voice such *aloha, malama*, and expectation of its being returned; and I see a response from the child which no other form of address is capable of producing. It also serves to remind one of what it means to request, to help, to share--in short to contribute to the *'ohana*. The idea of protocol can perhaps serve as a model for other relationships and aspects of daily life: for creating *ao*.

The Charter Schools conducted by *kanaka maoli* offer a wonderful opportunity for expanding and developing the protocols involved in teaching and learning in traditional ways, because they require everyone to consciously reflect upon those ways and put them into practice: sharing knowledge and example. Traditional teaching and learning was based upon establishing and nourishing a dynamic relationship, one-on-one; not the technological assumptions characterizing most modern schooling.

Thus the Native Hawaiian Charter Schools focus upon relationship as the basis for learning. And because of parental involvement, this means that they can also serve as a means for supporting relationships at home.

The Hale Mua O Mau'i provides another example of the way in which revival of protocol can help re-establish relationships that obtained in the past--in this case among men outside the family (Tengan 2003). Many men today are either not involved in family life or alienated from their families. In some cases, as discussed in the previous Chapter, this is the background for involvement in criminal activities. It was with this in mind that the late Peggy Ha'o Ross established the "Ohana O Hawai'i in the 1970's. The idea of the "Ohana was to reconnect men in prison through genealogy--both individual and as a Nation-- and thus create a family where one was lacking. In this context the revival of protocol in the Hale Mua would seem to offer a hopeful resource for addressing a grievous hurt in *ka po'e Hawai'i*--a hurt which no other existing program addresses.

In conclusion: these are some of the cultural ways in which *kanaka maoli* can be self-determining, whatever happens or fails to happen in the political realm. The late Georgianna Padeken said once that Hawaiians had to look to the future and not be trapped in the past. But the past need not be a trap: it can be a guide to the future. If *kanaka maoli* continue to look toward *aloha 'aina* in the future as they have in the past they may find better solutions for living in *ka pae 'aina* than any provided by the culture which surrounds them.

- Altonn, Helen. 1977a State lets squatters stay in Makiki Forest. HS-B, 3/25: A-1.
- Altonn, Helen. 1977b Lyman enlists in fight to rescue Kahoolawe. HS-B, 10/14: A-2.
- Alu Like, Inc. 1976 Social and Economic Patterns of Hawaiians. In Needs Assessment Survey. Honolulu: Alu Like, Inc. Unpublished manuscript.
- Auwae, Elizabeth Ieae. n.d. Oral history, prepared for her children. Recorded by JoAn Whitehorn Boggs.
- Boggs, Stephen T. 1972 The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian children. In C. B. Cazden, V. P. John, and D. Hymes, eds., *Functions of Language in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Boggs, Stephen T. 1985 *Speaking, Relating, and Learning: A Study of Hawaiian Children at Home and at School*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Boggs, Stephen T. 1991 Ethnic boundaries: rural Hawaiians and mainland migrants in Hawaii, *Reviews in Anthropology*, 17: 131-140.
- Boggs, Stephen T., and Malcolm Naea Chun. 1990. Ho'oponopono: An Hawaiian method of solving interpersonal problems. In Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and Geoffrey M. White, eds., *The Discourse of Disentangling: Conflict, Person, and Emotion in the Pacific Islands*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bowman, Pierre. 1976 A new hotel and big changes. HS-B&A, 9/12: C-1, C-3.
- Buck, Peter H. 1957 *Arts and Crafts of Hawaii*. Special Publication 45. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Burgess, Abigail, and Lillian Cameron. 1987 A family tradition. *Oral History Recorder*, University of Hawaii, Manoa, vol. 4, no. 1, Spring: 4-7.
- Charlot, John; Jean Charlot, Philip E. Spalding III, and Martin Charlot. 1983 *Chanting the Universe: Hawaiian Religious Culture*. Hong Kong and Honolulu: Emphasis International.

- Cheever, H. T., Rev. 1971 *Island World of the Pacific*. New York: Harper and brothers. (Orig 1850)
- Chun, Malcolm Nae'a. n.d. *Wakea and Papa: An Ancestral Tradition When "Religion" Began*. Unpublished mss.
- Chun, Malcolm Nae'e. (1985) *Ho'okipa:Hospitality*. Unpublished manuscript prepared for the opening of "Celebrating the Maori" exhibit and the B P Bishop Museum, 7/18/85.
- Chun, Malcolm Nae'e. 2003 *Alaka'ina*. Unpublished manuscript prepared for State DOE.
- Conference. 1980 *The Voice of the Kupuna: Report of a conference of native Hawaiian elders held May 29-31 at the Kamehameha Schools*. Reprinted in the *Native Hawaiian*, v 4, n 6.
- Cordover, Jill. 1970 *Molokai fishponds: man-made ecosystems*. In Henry T. Smith, ed, *Molokai Studies: Preliminary Research in Human Ecology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii, Manoa; Department of Anthropology.
- D'Amato, John J. 1986 *'We cool, tha's why', a study of personhood and place in a class of Hawaiian second graders*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- Donham, Buck. 1975 *Unlikely setting for confrontation*. HS-B, 6/28: A-2.
- Ethnic Studies Program. 1974 *Hawaiians: Organizing Our People*. University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- Forman, David, and Stephen M. Knight. 1997 *Native Hawaiian cultural practices under threat*, *Hawai'i Bar Journal*, 1: 1-20.
- Foster, Jeanette. 1976 *Kaho'olawe: what really happened*. *The Maui Sun*, Yr 6, Issue 11, 1/14-20: 3-6.
- Gallimore, R., J. W. Boggs, and C. Jordan. 1974 *Culture, Behavior and Education: A Study of Hawaiian-Americans*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.



- Goldman, Irving. 1970 *Ancient Polynesian Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Glushenko, Ronald. Interview, 1/26/1983.
- Guy, Pat. 1982 State is now seeking to bar newer Makua Beach shacks. HS-B, 12/24: A-6.
- Handy, E. S. C., and E. G. Handy. 1972 *The Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environments*. Bulletin No. 233. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Handy, E. S. C., and M. K. Pukui. 1972 *The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u, Hawaii*. Wellington, New Zealand: The Polynesian Society. (Orig. 1953.)
- Heighton, Robert H., Jr. 1971 *Hawaiian supernatural and natural strategies for goal attainment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Howard, Alan. 1971 *Households, families and friends in a Hawaiian-American community*. Working Paper No. 19. Honolulu: East-West Center Population Institute.
- Howard, Alan. 1974 *Aint No Big Thing: Coping Strategies in a Hawaiian-American Community*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Howard, A., R. Heighton, C. Jordan, and R. Gallimore. 1970 *Traditional and modern adoption patterns in Hawaii*. In V. Carroll, ed., *Adoption in Eastern Oceania*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Hiatt, Robert W. 1947 *Food-chains and the food cycle in Hawaiian fish ponds*. Pt 1: The food and feeding habits of mullett...milkfish...and the ten-pounder.... Pt 2: Biotic interaction. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 74: 250-280.
- Hui Alaloha. 1982 *Why destroy this...for this! We can stop developer's disease*. Kaunakakai, Moloka'i: Hui Alaloha.
- I'i, John Papa. 1959 *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, translated by Mary Kawena Pukui. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

- Johnson, William P. 1977 A study of the missionary effort to civilize the Hawaiian commoner. Paper prepared for Anthropology 486.
- Kamakau, Samuel M. 1961 Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.
- Kamakau, Samuel M. 1976 Na Hana A Ka Po'e Kahiko: The Works of the People of Old, trans by Mary Kawena Pukui. Special Publication 61. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Kame'eleihiwa, Lilikala. 1992 Native Land and Foreign Desires. Bishop Museum Press: 15-16.
- Kanahele, Annie. 1976 Annie, Life of a Hawaiian. Honolulu: Fisher Printing Co.
- Kelly, Marion, 1956, Changes in land tenure in Hawaii, 1778-1850, Master's thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Kelly, Marion. 1969 Historical Background of the South Point Area, Ka'u, Hawaii. Pacific Anthropological Records No. 6. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Kelly, Marion. 1983 Na Mala O Kona: Gardens of Kona. Report 83-2. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Kelly, Marion. 1987 History awareness builds new pride: students doing own research into the past. Year of the Hawaiian, HS-B: 80-81. Alto, N.M: C. F. Boone Publishing Co.
- Kelly, Marion. 1989 Dynamics of production intensification in pre-contact Hawaii. In S E Van Der Leew and R Torrance, eds., What's New? A Closer Look at the Process of Innovation. London: Unwin Hyman: 82-106.
- Kirch, Patrick V. 1982 The impact of the prehistoric Polynesians on the Hawaiian ecosystem. Pacific Science, vol. 36: 1-14.
- Kirch, Pat 1983 Political organization and agricultural intensification in Anahulu, O'ahu. University of Hawaii, symposium presentation, 2/24.
- Lam, Maivan Clech. 1985 The imposition of Anglo-American land tenure on Hawaiians, Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law, n 23: 103-128.

- Levy, Neil M. 1975 Native Hawaiian Land Rights, *California Law Review*, 63: 848-885.
- Levy, Robert I. 1973 *Tahitians: Mind and Experience in the Society Islands*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1983 Defining tradition: variations on the Hawaiian identity, *American Ethnologist*, v 10: 241-52.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1985 *Children of the Land: Exchange and Status in a Hawaiian Community*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Loo, Laurel. 1983 Defiant Makua squatters hit beach. *HS-B&A*, 1/16: A-4.
- Maui News, The. 1976 Palaau road opened up: another victory for Molokai's Hui Alaloa, 8/18: A-1.
- McGregor, Davianna Pomaika'i, 1989, *Kupa'a I Ka 'Aina: persistence on the land*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii.
- Menzies, Archibald. 1920 *Hawaii Nei 128 Years Ago*. Honolulu: W. F. Wilson.
- Mitchell, Donald D Kilolani. 1982 *Resource Units in Hawaiian Culture*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.
- Modell, Judith. *Kinship with Strangers*. U California 1994
- Nakuina, Emma Metcalf. 1893 Ancient Hawaiian water rights and some of the customs pertaining to them. *Thrumm's Hawaiian Annual for 1893*: 79-84.
- Naliielua, Gregory Kalahikiola. 1986 *Autobiography in Waianae Coast Culture and Arts Society, Ka Po'e Kahiko O Wai'anae*. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing Co.
- Native Hawaiian, The. 1981 *Aina Maunaloa, kuu home*. Vol. 5, n. 1: 1.
- Native American Rights Fund 2003 Cross-cutting themes in Hawai'i--Native Hawaiian Rights, perceived racial differences, and the desire to restore Hawaiian sovereignty. *NARF Legal Review*, vol 28, no. 1.
- Neller, Earl. 1982 Letter to Mayor Hannibal Tavares, Maui County, 3/16.

- D'Amato, John J. 1986 'We cool, tha's why', a study of personhood and place in a class of Hawaiian second graders. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- People's International Tribunal Hawai'i 1993. The People's International Tribunal Hawai'i Mana'o. Honolulu.
- PKO (Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana). 1979 What is the Ohana doing...? (Reproduced by University of Hawaii, Manoa; Ethnic Studies Program, E.S. 221 students, 11/14).
- PKO (Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana). 1981 Kalo'olawe Aloha 'Aina newsletter.
- PKO (Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana). 1988 Kaho'olawe Aloha 'Aina newsletter.
- PKO (Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana). n.d. Kahoolawe.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. 1971 Hawaiian Dictionary. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pukui, M. K., E. E. Haertig, and C. A. Lee. 1972 Nana I Ke Kumu (Look to the Source), Vol. I. Honolulu: Hui Hanai, Queen Liliuokalani Children's Center.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. 1983 'Olelo No'eau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings. Special Publication 71. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Ritte, Jr., Walter. 1976 Testimony at trial in Federal Court, April 14.
- Rosco, Rona Dale. 1977 The existence of the 'ohana in contemporary Hawaii. Unpublished master's paper, University of Hawaii, Manoa.
- Scott, Nadine W. 1977a A majestic valley. HS-B, 3/15: F-1, F-4.
- Scott, Nadine W. 1977b Fire a threat to Makua Valley. HS-B, 3/16, B-1.
- Silva, Noenoe K. n.d. Aloha 'Aina: Kanaka Nationalism and Resistance to American Empire in Hawai'i, 1903. Unpublished mss.
- Shrader, Steve. 1975 The fishermen of Mokauea. Hawaii Observer, 7/22: 1-2.
- Smith, Kit. 1982 Molokai Ranch--building a future on Friendly Isle. HA, March 21: F-1.

- Snakenberg, Robert Lokomaika'i. 1979 The Hawaiian hanai system as viewed by older keiki hanai. Paper prepared for Anthropology 486, spring semester.
- Sponsel, Leslie E. Is indigenous spiritual ecology just a new fad? Reflections on the historical and spiritual ecology of Hawai'i. In John Grim, ed. *Indigenous Traditions and Ecology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stannard, David E. 1988 "Fruitful and populous islands": a new look at the population of Hawai'i on the eve of Western contact. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Stauffer, Robert H. 1990 Land Tenure in Kahana, Hawai'i: 1846-1920. Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Stevens, Tom. 1975 West End access seen. *The Maui News*, 7/15: A-1, A-3.
- Summers, Catherine C. 1964 Hawaiian Fishponds. Special Publication 52. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Tanji, Edwin. 1981 Archaeologists split on Molokai survey. *HA*, 8/17: A-4.
- Tanji, Edwin 1988 [get citation]
- Taylor, Lois. 1979 Ancient ways. *HS-B&A*, 2/25: C-1, 19.
- Tengan, Ty Kawika. 2003 Hale Mua: (En)Gendering Hawaiian Men. Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Tong, David. 1975 Sad day at Sand Island. *HS-B&A*, 6/1: A-3.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. n.d. Cultures in collision: Hawai'i and England, 1778. University of Hawaii, Dept. of American Studies, mss.
- Trask, Haunanai-Kay. 1986 Review of Linnekin (1985). *The Hawaiian Journal of History*, vol. 20: 232-235.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay, 1991, Natives and anthropologists: the colonial struggle, *The Contemporary Pacific*, 3: 159-67.
- Tuggle, Myra Jean F. 1982 The Protect Kaho'olawe 'Ohana: cultural revitalization in a contemporary Hawaiian movement. Masters thesis, University of Hawaii, Manoa.

- URPP (Urban and Regional Planning Program). 1981 Moloka'i Data Book: Community Values and Energy Development. University of Hawaii, Manoa, Urban and Regional Planning Program.
- Valeri, Valerio. 1985 Kingship and Sacrifice: Ritual and Society in Ancient Hawaii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Vause, Marylyn M. 1962 The Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920: history and analysis, Master's thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Whitten, Harry. 1982 Taro patches are coming back to Makiki-Tantalus. HS-B, 7/29: A-3.
- Carol Araki Wyban, Tide and Current: Fishponds of Hawai'i, U of Hawai'i Press, 1992.