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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the implications of genealogical connections to blood and place (genealogy and land), as a prerequisite to self-determination and nation building. The identity of self becomes an undertaking grounded by ancestral land tenure and established genealogical connections to the ‘ili of ‘Ioleka’a, a kuleana land parcel located in He‘e‘ia on the island of O‘ahu. The kanaka ‘ōiwi voice is the signifier in this narrative and the discovery of self becomes a mapping project that locates not only a physical place, but the locus of the ancestors who have lived and still reside now on the land. The identity of self is fueled by both tangible and spiritual tenets which provide ancestral wisdom, blood connections, and relation to land as mortar for the kānaka ‘ōiwi foundation. These are necessary for kānaka ‘ōiwi well-being, self-determination and by extension, the building of an ‘Ōiwi Nation.
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“Knowing who you and where you come from is the genesis for self-determination”.
~Kameha`iku Camvel

Chapter I: Introduction

This thesis concerns `Ioleka`a, a family kuleana located on the island of O`ahu, in the district of Ko`olaupoko. Situated in He`e`ia between the towns of Kāne`ohe and Ahuimanu, `Ioleka`a is a section of land referred to as an `Ili on the windward side of the island. It is the land on which my ancestors have lived in for at least the last one hundred and seventy three years. Using `Ioleka`a as an example, I have compiled an authentic text which incorporates Hawaiian language newspapers, genealogical research, mahele awards, land claim awards, land testimonies, and probates to reimagine or remember a history within `ōiwi contexts through a kanaka `ōiwi voice.

In order to achieve this goal, I have organized this thesis into five chapters. Within each chapter are sections and sub-sections. The first chapter is concerned with research, political implications, theory, and methodology. Chapter two provides a framework for the historical significance of the mahele of 1848 and looks at the establishment of genealogy on the land from 1839 to the present. Chapter three provides the physical, spiritual, and familial mo`olelo of `Ioleka`a and is the crux of this research project. Chapter four takes a look at what the kuleana in the `Ili of `Ioleka`a might look like in the future.

The summary of this research project is articulated in chapter five, a concluding analysis of the chapters, nation building, collective national unity, and kānaka `ōiwi well-being. I have included the use of a glossary to define words in `ōlelo Hawai`i, as well as tables, maps, and illustrations. In order to emphasize the narrative, I have taken excerpts from personally written notes and conversations with late relatives. I include composed chants to elaborate the way in
which we honor the land, kūpuna and `aumakua today, but also as a recordation, stemming from the traditions of our ancestors, and functioning as an extension in the application of an oral and written chronicle.

Kānaka `Ōiwi

In this paper I use the term “kanaka `ōiwi” as one whose ancestors can be traced back to 1778 or before the arrival of Captain Cook to the Hawaiian islands. Today, there is ongoing discourse over the word “native” between kanaka `ōiwi and non-kānaka `ōiwi as to the word’s appropriateness and use.¹

Implications of Research

Research Questions. The questions posed in this research project had to do with identity and genealogy, or the relationship between blood and the land. For this endeavor, the land in question is `Ioleka`a. Of course the inquiries that had to be posed were obvious. How did the kuleana come to this family, and what were the connections between those who received the land and our `ohana? Where is this `āina and what is its mo`olelo? How has this genealogy shaped my identity and the identity of my family? One `ohana member lives there full-time and another maintains

¹ Native” is a Western term applied during the territorial years upon the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands in 1889. Hawai`i became a territory of the United States until statehood in 1959. In 1921, the Native Hawaiian Homes Commission Act was legislatively established. It is a federal government entity created to disburse lands to kānaka `ōiwi which requires a fifty percent blood quantum for those receiving land. I contend the word native is a divisive and problematic term that has evolved as categorical discourse between kanaka `ōiwi with forty nine percent or less blood quantum (relegated to the term “native” with a little), and those with fifty percent or more blood quantum (indicated as such with the term “Native” bearing a capital N) as a means of defining `ōiwi identity. It is this kind of discourse that must be disrupted in order to achieve an identity that is individual, collective, and national.
the property but does not reside on the kuleana. This begs the question of what will happen to this `āina in the future? What can this land be used for? These questions are exceedingly important as family members look to sustainability on the land in the forms of housing and food production. The continuity of mālama `āina is of critical consequence, especially as the connection between blood and place. These questions were the impetus to the research conducted in this thesis in order to find answers.

Articulating an Indigenous Identity. An indigenous charting of blood and place is a production of knowledge vital and necessary for an `ōiwi identity, coherence to land, and commitment to nation building. The mapping of an indigenous identity is a blueprint for the re-articulation and implementation of a larger `ōiwi political enterprise: the pursuit of self-determination through a national identity. Who we are, where we come from, and our connections to specific geographical locations (land) and blood (genealogy) are integral to kānaka `ōiwi self-determination. The examination of my own genealogical connection to `Ioleka`a informs my research and provides mechanisms for thematic query. Hence, what this project has produced is an authentic, indigenous narrative based on the connection between blood and place, that of `Ioleka`a and its ancestors.

The practical implications of this research is the benefit my family receives as verification of our family’s `ōiwi identity. I suspect that for many kānaka `ōiwi, the mapping of their own `ōiwi identities as a prerequisite toward the building of a self-determined nation is not something of great importance when weighed against the current state of affairs in the world. However, what makes kānaka `ōiwi special and unique is our indigenous identity. Before we can build a nation, the people of the nation must be healthy in mind, body, and spirit. For kānaka
'ōiwi, well-being hinges on an environment that recognizes, fosters, and sustains, an `ōiwi cultural inheritance and recognition. Genealogical research informs that environment. It becomes a practical application of an authentic `ōiwi identity.

*Blood and Place.* What I ascribe to in the `ōiwi term “blood and place,” differs significantly from the same terminology in which Momaday’s² signature troupe, “memory in the blood or blood memory” and Allen’s³ blood/land/memory complex is referenced. For Momaday, traditional Kiowa stories function as triggers for recalling memories stored in the cells of ancestors who have walked the path, or lived out historical events. “Blood memory, a memory forgotten yet never lost, re-defines Native American authenticity in terms of recollecting and remembering” (Huang 173). In other words, indigenous memories are imprinted in the body (DNA), serving as the genetic extension by which history is recorded and established, as a re-connection and identification to path or lives of the ancestors. These memories are passed down through the restoration or re-immersion in the customary and usual practices of contemporary Native Americans. A few examples of this are Native American Indian rituals such as naming ceremonies, story-telling, re-visiting and the commemoration of sacred and historical sites. The Native Americans’ heritage and cultural re-assimilation are aided by ancestral memories. Re-living the trauma experienced by their ancestors, i.e. the Trail of Tears, provides an example of the way in which the past is embodied in blood and fused into the memory or, as Momaday

__________________________


describes it, the “blood memory” inherited by the succeeding generations. For Momaday the remembering is the identity of the self and is in alignment with Meyer’s description of Hawaiian ontology when she says, “The politics of identity are tied to representation which is linked to the production of knowledge. Because Hawaiian epistemology is linked to a current ontological river that has never stopped flowing, there is still a strong sense of what we know as Hawaiian” (81-82). This paradigm sustains the flow of indigenous knowledge and is the proviso in the acquisition of an indigenous identity.

Another example in the use of blood memory is articulated by Chadwick Allen who explains,

Indigenous minority writers and activists in the early contemporary period developed a range of narrative tactics that enabled them to define an enduring indigenous identity “blood”) in terms of narratives of connection to specific lands (“memory”), and to use narratives of connection to specific lands (“memory”) to assert an enduring identity (“blood”), (220).

Allen’s blood/land/memory complex was especially constructed to disrupt the colonial inscribed identities assigned to indigenous Native Americans and the Maori within treaty discourses and activist texts. This blood/land/memory complex facilitates the way in which the Maori and Native Americans define their own indigeneity against definitions of legitimacy prescribed and imposed by colonizing non-indigenous settlers. Allen makes reference to George Manuel, the Shuswap4 architect of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples stating, “Manuel describes the global Aboriginal World as having in common four general characteristics. These engage the

4 George Manuel is a Shuswap Indian leader from Canada who, in 1974, organized the formation of the World Council of Indigenous Peoples. The Shuswap are indigenous peoples from the Columbia Valley region in British Columbia, Canada.
blood/land/memory complex in recognizable ways, defining indigenous racial identity ("blood") largely in terms of "land" and "memory." In this complex, blood memory serves as the underlying process for the recovery of Native American memories and the re-articulation of their indigenous identities.

Similar to Momaday’s use of memory configuration to an indigenous identity, kānaka ʻōiwi tradition also imparts memory recordation through oral traditions using chants, songs, and dance. Within the context of these devices are the accounts of such things as genealogies, historical events, chiefly exploits, births, deaths, transitions in life, love, and politics. Metaphoric values are conveyed in the text of those various chants, songs, and dances and one must be able to speak and understand ʻōlelo Hawai`i or Hawaiian language to essentially grasp the meaning and scope of the words as expressed. Herein, follows an example,

_Ua hānau ka moku_

_Born was the island_

_A kupu a lau, a loa, a `ao, a mu`o_

_It budded, it leafed, it grew, it was green_

_Ka moku i luna o Hawai`i_

_The island blossomed on tip, was Hawai`i._

_O Hawai`i nei nō ka moku_

_This Hawai`i was an island_

_He pūlewa ka `āina, he naka Hawai`i_

_Unstable was the land, tremulous was Hawai`i_

_E lewa wale ana nō i ka lani_

_Waving freely in the air_
Lewa hōnua

*Waved the earth*

Mai i Ākea ua pāhono `ia

*From Ākea it was fastened together*

Mālie i ke a`a o ka moku me ka honua

*Quiet by the roots was the island and the land*

Pa`a `ia ka lawa ealani i ka lima `ākau o Ākea

*It was fast in the air by the right hand of Ākea*

Pa`a Hawai`i lā a la`a,

*Fast was Hawai`i, by itself-*

Hawai`i lā `ikea he moku.

*Hawai`i appeared an island.*

In the description of the chant above, “Papahānaumoku plays the essential female role of “giving birth” to the Hawaiian Archipelago. Here, islands are conceived as living entities and afforded the same value and distinction as human life, capable of being siblings to people” (Kikiloi 82). Papahānaumoku (Earth Mother), and part of the Hāloa triad (see pages 13 & 14), is implicated and configured into the genealogy of Hawai`i island, who is also the elder sibling to kānaka `ōiwi. “Simply put, ontology is the science of the essence of things, Hawaiian ontology is the whole host of cultural beliefs, practices and values that make up Hawaiian form and essence” (Meyer Ho`olu 78).

In the analysis of the connection between blood (ancestors) and place (the land), there is a unique difference between both Momaday and Allen’s use of blood memory, and the

-----

blood/land/complex, from the kānaka `ōiwi blood and place phrase in which I am referring. Our ancestral knowledge comes from the land as ancestor. It is a direct connection to our ancestors. Those ancestors are Papahānaumoku, Hāloanakalaukapalili, and Hāloa.

This distinction is reinforced by the Hāloa triad. Kānaka `ōiwi genealogy, symbolized by the piko or the umbilical cord, is the connection of kānaka `ōiwi directly to the `āina. This relationship to the land is a familial one, born from the earth and blood of Papahānaumoku, who is also known as the goddess Haumea (Kameʻeleihiwa, Foreign Lands 36). `Ike kūpuna is passed on genetically and genealogically from the land to our kupuna and then to us. This places the Hāloa Triad and Haumea as significant and primary in the articulation of a kānaka `ōiwi identity.

Discovery of Self. The journey toward self-determination\(^6\) is personally, culturally, and politically configured. Self-determination is a basic human right to the ea of kānaka `ōiwi. The Kingdom of Hawaiʻi’s Motto, “Ua mau ke ea o ka `āina i ka pono” or “the life of the land is preserved in righteousness” makes clear the responsibility of kānaka `ōiwi to the `āina, to maintain the state of pono, or balance with the environment. It also attests to the ea or sovereignty of the land and the people. According to Pukui, ea also refers to the life, air, breath, respiration, vapor, gas; fumes, breeze, and spirit (36).

For most kānaka `ōiwi genealogical research provides for a discovery of self that can be both liberating and frustrating. The time and attention required in researching volumes of

\(^6\) The United Nations Charter states, by virtue of the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, all peoples have the right to freely determine, without external interference, their political status, and to pursue their economic, social and cultural development, and every State has the duty to respect this right in accordance with the provisions of the Charter.
resources can be intimidating, confusing, and exasperating but ultimately, rewarding. Gathering information about your ancestors and the land from which they were born, lived, and died on fortifies that piko or lifeline to them.

**Political Implications.** George Manuel expresses a Shuswap understanding, “Our culture is every inch of our land.” The well-being of indigenous peoples are inherently connected to the health of their lands. For kānaka ōiwi this is a truth reflected in the devastation, destruction, and desecration of the `āina, the waters, and the seas. However, the well-being of kānaka `ōiwi is reflective of the prosperity of the `āina.\(^7\) The health of neither fares well for the future if kānaka `ōiwi cannot access `āina, in particular for sustainability of food, family, and cultural or spiritual beliefs.

Indigenous peoples share an understanding of the relationship they have with the land. Again, Manuel’s keen insight is reflected in the following,

> The commonalities associated with an Indigenous viewpoint are a common understanding of the universe, a relationship with the land, a history of persistent resistance to colonial occupation and the survival of Indigenous Peoples into contemporary times (Allen 200).

This is an association that can be applied to the current tenets foregrounding the United Nations Declarations on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples or the UNDRIP. The use of lands, seas, waters, and air must be managed within a seriously sustainable framework that

\(^7\) Sustainable projects such as growing kalo, restoring fishponds, and other places that have produced food in the past and are doing so today, in particular, those managed by kānaka `ōiwi organizations and people, examples of the restoration of relationships (people to land) that nourish and bring forth well-being for the land and the people.
recognizes and implements free, prior, and informed consent. This is essential to the survival of both people and the land on which they live. The states must transition current corporate models of land development and resource management toward existing sustainable examples. Excess or additional lands should be identified for various sustainable uses, especially for the growing of food.

In looking at ways to transition the standard state or corporate prototype into a more sustainable model, the precedent setting rights embodied in the UNDRIP should be asserted into every application, development plan, zoning, variances, and other such requirements in the use of lands for but not limited to, sustainable housing, farming, education, and economic development.

**Nation Building.** The building of a nation means different things to different people. Having recently attended the 2012 United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, it is clear that the meaning of nation, self-determination, sovereignty, and a kānaka ʻōiwi identity are extremely diverse in the many non-government organizations, kingdoms, and various other political entities looking toward the establishment of a sovereign nation. The diversity of difference must be recognized and validated, but the larger vision for a collective and unified ʻōiwi nation must be the binding objective.

In this project, I argue that nation building cannot begin until the people of the nation know who they are, where they come from, and how they are connected to the life blood of a nation, its land. When kānaka ʻōiwi understand that the land is paramount to all else and must

---

8 The UNPFII is an annual forum held in New York City. Indigenous people from all over the world attend the forum to present. Regional indigenous issues regarding land, resources, health, economics, and basic human rights as articulated in the UNDRIP.
always come first, then will we know our collective and unified places, and from that context, determine our path to self-determination and sovereignty (both personal and cumulative).

In examining the egregious past of Hawai`i9 it is easy to understand the trauma associated with those accounts. Many kānaka `ōiwi still carry the trauma of those chronicled and personal events and have, since that time, moved into a colonial process of thinking, living, and being. The beginning of cultural recovery for kānaka `ōiwi began with the Hawaiian Renaissance. A rejuvenation of the `ōiwi self was activated during this period (1960’s to the 1980’s), with the re-assertion of the people’s collective kū’e or resistant activism. This included the revival of the Hawaiian language, `ōiwi culture, music, and dance. This ultimately led to the building of the Hōkūle’a, and its subsequent navigations over the Pacific ocean to Tahiti, Aotearoa, Rapa Nui, and the Marquesas. Kānaka `ōiwi spirits were revived, kāheas went out and the pānes have been resounding ever since.

_Pursuing Self-Determination through a National Identity._ Knowing who you and where you come from is a grounding exercise in nationalism. I am proud to be kānaka `ōiwi and that pride is reinforced by my connection to blood and place which establishes ea for me and my family. When there is confidence in the relationship to the ancestors and the land, a determination of self has been made that is incumbent toward the building of a collective10 national identity and by extension, a sovereign `ōiwi nation.

9

Missionary influence, the Mahele, death from foreign disease and the decimation of the population, the Bayonet Constitution , the overthrow of Queen Lili`uokalani, establishment of a provisional government, and finally statehood, all played a part in the dispossession of kānaka `ōiwi from their lands, marginalization, and loss of identity in the land of their ancestors.
An `Ōiwi Nation must identify the need for individual and collective ea, recognizing the diverse and cultural differences of its people yet acknowledging the need for territorial organization in the pursuit of its sovereignty. Important as well is a collective nationalism which addresses such issues as economics, health, education, social justice, political stability, cultural and spiritual values, quality of life, resource management, land development, as well as social and national unity. There must be a confidence and faith in the collective benefits of a sovereign `ōiwi nation by its nationals. Our kūpuna had no problem with their ea, for the most part they loved their Ali`i Nui, their chiefs and chiefesses, and their kings and queens. Their loyalty to their leaders were based on the supreme commitment to the land and resources.

We are already being guided by our ancestors toward a future of self-reliance and self-determination based on their kū`e. The link to our brilliance is anchored in the wisdom of our past and is available to us through our kūpuna. As Pualani Kanaka`ole Kanahele says, “All you have to do is ask.”11

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this project is structured around four key concepts whose variables are independent, yet dependent on the practical application of the methodological processes in this thesis. The first concept is the establishment of the Hāloa triad as the blood and place connection for kānaka `ōiwi. The second, is the transference and acquisition of ancestral

10 The term collective is used by the author to mean the majority of kānaka `ōiwi that would participate in the establishment of self-determination as the bedrock of a national identity.

11 Keynote speaker at the `Aha Wahine Ho`omālamalama o Nā Wahine Kapu, `Aha Wahine Conference held at Windward Community College, February 2, 2012.
knowledge by kānaka `ōiwi from their ancestors through the element of Haumea, the third, is the use of Papakū Makawalu as a foundational theoretical application in this project (in addition to its methodological function), and fourth, the determination of self as a pre-requisite to a political and national self-determination for kānaka `ōiwi as a political project.

_Hāloa Triad._ Ancestral genealogy locates all kānaka `ōiwi physically, spiritually, and geographically to `āina in Hawai‘i. Where kānaka `ōiwi come from in terms of geographical place was very important in the ancient times and still is today. This connection to `āina begins with the lineage of Papahānaumoku (Earth Mother), and Wākea (Sky Father), recorded in the cosmogonic chant called the Kumulipo. Together these antecessors produced a daughter, Ho`ohōkūkalani. It is the mating of this daughter and Wākea her father that conceives and prematurely births Hāloanakalaukapalili. This keiki `alu`alu dies and is buried in the ground from which then sprouts the first kalo plant, a staple and sacred food for kānaka `ōiwi. Later, a second child, Hāloa is born, and he becomes the first kanaka and Ali`i Nui of kānaka `ōiwi. It is this genealogical relationship that informs and dictates the fundamental and structural relationship between kalo, kānaka and ali‘i. Kanaka `ōiwi scholar and noted historian, Dr. Lilikalā Kame`eleihiwa tells us, “Thus, the kalo (taro) plant, which was the main staple of the people of old, is also the older brother of the Hawaiian race, and as such deserves great respect. It is the duty of the younger siblings and junior lineages to love, honor, and serve their elders” (25).

---

12 A cosmogonic chant of the universe of over two thousand lines. For further explanation, see The Kumulipo An Hawaiian Creation Myth foreword by Pualani Kanaka’ole Kanahele.
The mo`olelo of Papa and Wākea establishes what I refer to as the Hāloa triad, in which the genealogical connections between the `āina (Papa, Wākea, and Ho`ohōkūkalani), kalo (Hāloanakalaukapalili), and the first human ancestor and Ali`i Nui (Hāloa) are set forth. Accordingly it is this Hāloa triad that establishes the genesis for “blood and place” or the ancestral lineage of kānaka `ōiwi to the `āina.

*Haumea as the Process for the Transference of Ancestral Knowledge.* The relationship of kānaka `ōiwi to the `āina is one borne upon countless generating years of kānaka `ōiwi or ancestral DNA. It is this DNA that links the `ike of our ancestors to we, the living descendants today. We are the land, and the land is us. This is more than an analogy that references reciprocal relationships between humans and the land; it is a familial genealogy that plants kānaka `ōiwi in the `āina.

The configuration of an `ōiwi identity begins with one’s birth parents. Place is the historical context of that identity, but it is not only a spatial or geographical location, it is a biologically connected one. For example, there are kānaka `ōiwi genealogical narratives based on the lineages of Papahānaumoku, Wākea, and Haumea, the Hawaiian goddess of childbirth, politics and war. Kame`elehiwa (Nā Wāhine Kapu 7) states, “she (Haumea) is also reborn in each succeeding generation of her female descendants; she lives in every Hawaiian woman.” Following is an explanation of Haumea, her meaning, purpose, and function will seem quite controversial, however, it is a necessary “intervening” (Tuhiwai 147), a disruption, if you will, to

13 Deoxyribonucleic acid. The molecule that carries genetic information in all living systems.

14 This is a phrase applied by the author to denote an ancestral connection to the land. It promotes the Hāloa triad.
current scholarship, adding to contemporary indigenous discourse on ancestral memories (`ōiwi ways of knowing) and the way in which that takes place.

I have used ancestral memory, as a tool for guidance, wisdom, `ike, practice and protocol. In my own cultural practice, I depend not only on what I have learned from schools, institutions, and other such organizations, but also, the intangible forces in which the mana of the ancestors are also present. This is an indigenous way of knowing. Cajete states,

Western science is founded upon the premises of objectivity, abstraction, weighing, and measuring. “If it cannot be tested, it does not exist!” is an often voiced credo of the mainstream scientist. Yet the focus on objectivity can block deeper insight into the metaphysics of the reality and process of the natural world. Western science does not consider the affective, intuitive, and soulful nature of the world.

Here follows an explanation of such a wondrous journey from a kanaka `ōiwi perspective. I am conceived in the pū`ao or womb of my mother, as her mother before her, and hers before her and so on. It is this primordial journey that configures my genetic makeup, passed by mitochondrial DNA\textsuperscript{15} or female DNA. This DNA is Haumea in her most important sphere of activity (element), that of birthing, and the provision of the conduit by which ancestral knowledge is passed on to succeeding generations at conception and through the piko.

The piko is the umbilical cord. `Ōiwi epistemology identifies the piko as one of three major connective locations for the receipt of ancestral knowledge. The other locations are the po`o or head, and the ma`i or genitals. Hermeneutically, the piko is the life line, the connection,

\begin{footnote}
Mitochondrial DNA or mtDNA, found in mitochondria, which contains some structural genes and is generally inherited only through the female line.
\end{footnote}
the channel by which life and knowledge is passed. The kaona of the piko is figurative as blood relative (Pukui 328), and for that reason, is the paramount configuration for the ʻōiwi continuum of life for both blood and place, or ancestors and the land.

“As Native Hawaiians, each of us has the ability to tap into a preconscious reservoir of past experiences and to access all that exists in a storehouse of knowledge called ancestral memories” (Kekuewa 74). Here is the correlation of Haumea to the taxonomy\textsuperscript{16} of this transference process in which Sykes\textsuperscript{17} tells us:

What makes mitochondrial DNA (or mDNA for short) so special and so useful?
First is its unique inheritance pattern. Human eggs are full of mitochondria, while sperm have only a hundred or so, just enough to power it while it swims towards the egg. After fertilisation, when the sperm penetrates the egg, these few male mitochondria are immediately destroyed. This means that, while we all receive our nuclear DNA, with the exception of the X and Y sex chromosomes, from both parents, we get all of our mDNA from our mothers. She got it from her mother, who got it from hers – and so on back in time. Mitochondrial DNA is most useful in connecting the maternal lines of living people in different parts of the world.

I argue that in the ʻōiwi paradigm of conception and birth, the very core of our identity, Haumea (a.k.a. Papahānaumoku) functions\textsuperscript{18} as the conduit for mDNA thereby facilitating the

\textsuperscript{16} Taxonomy is a branch of biology concerned with the classification of organisms into group based on similarities of structure, origin, etc.

\textsuperscript{17} Bryan Sykes is a Professor of Human Genetics at the Weatherall Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Oxford.
transference of ancestral knowledge to kānaka `ōiwi. More simply, in this environment of pro-
creation Haumea officiates as mitochondria, “tiny organelles that live in the cytoplasm of cells-
There are thousands of mitochondria in each cell, and each one has its own circle of DNA, a
reminder of their distant bacterial ancestry.”

This is the mo`olelo or taxonomy of Haumea’s function in her element. It is the
process that figuratively anchors the ipu of my ancestor’s knowledge onto my own genetic
makeup at conception. It is the grafting or imprinting of those matriclinous or predominantly
maternal strands of DNA onto my own living genetic composition that pulsates with ancient
recognition (see fig. 1). At this moment, ancestral knowledge is transferred and I am, at that very
instant, who I was, who I am, and who I will be in the totality of my lineal configuration. I am, as
our `ōiwi mo`olelo tells us, Haumea re-born in this and all generations to follow; through my
children, my grandchildren, my great-grandchildren and so forth. The paramount relevance of
this discovery is that the cosmology of Haumea is fixed within the context of `ōiwi empiricism
rendering that experience as aggregated ancestral knowledge and one more essential point; it is
the variable that supports the concept of Haumea as the agent in the transfer of ancestral memory
at conception and birth. This then, is the reason I am able to access ancestral knowledge that is
uniquely related to me, because it comes from my ancestors. This is the reason then, that the only
person (s) who can tell the story of `Ioleka`a, are her ancestors.

Haumea is the goddess of childbirth, politics, and war. In the function of procreation (conception
through birth), I assert that Haumea, in the cycle of conception, reproduction, and birth, is the
element and transference mechanism of the genetic strands of DNA to the egg at the moment of
conception and through the growth of the fetus.
Papakū Makawalu as Foundational Theory. According to Dr. Pualani Kanakaʻole Kanahele,¹⁹ of the Edith Kanakaʻole Foundation, “Papakū Makawalu was the ability of our kūpuna to systematically organize knowledge: spiritually, mentally and physically. Papakū Makawalu was the laying of foundations which were stepping stones to understanding, knowing, acknowledging, becoming involved with, but most importantly, becoming the expert.”

¹⁹ Dr. Pualani Kanakaʻole Kanahele is a loea, a cultural expert. The Edith Kanakaʻole Foundation is the cultural component to the Ancestral Visions of `Āina Project, a program funded by an ANA grant that will teach 10 konohiki how to understand, know, and mālama the land in these contemporary times.
The foundation for this methodology comes from the Kumulipo, located in the 13th wā, line 1761 where Kanahele shares, “the emphasis of the lead names switches to the feminine followed by her male companion, then their offspring. This is notable as something different is happening; there is a shift in pedagogy, maybe even in the social structure for that time period” (Kanahele, Kūkulu Ke Ea A Kanaloa 31). It is quite a change from the way in which the genealogical recording had been transmitted until that time, which began with males first, then females in genealogical chants.

From lines 1761 to line 1764 of the Kumulipo, the women who are given status (usually granted to the male first born) are, Laumiha, Kaha`ula, Kahakauakoko, Haumea, Kauahulihonua, Hinamanoulua`e, Huhune, Haunu`u, Haulani, and Hikapuanaiaea. Here, as Kanahele (Kūkulu Ke Ea A Kanaloa 31) points out, there are three generations of females who are placed in the first-born status before the birth of Haumea. Lines 1766 to 1790 establishes a foundation of female leadership in which rituals were conducted to anoint experts recognized by the greater society for their intellect, genius, spiritual leadership, savant ability and expertise in areas of societal longevity. Essentially, lines 1792- Papahulihonua, 1793- Papahulilani, and 1794- Papanuihānaumoku, are the names of the Houses of Knowledge, whose names describe their system of organizing knowledge. These three Papa are what we have entitled Papakū Makawalu. Along with being houses of knowledge they are also classes of Kahuna practitioners. They are experts in their field of knowledge, gnosis and profundity.

Papakū Makawalu is the newest revelation that configures, as foundational, the incredibly intuitive ways in which kānaka `ōiwi acknowledged the total space around, above, below, and
under them, in which they lived. It is how they existed in their world and thanks to Dr. Pua Kanaka`ole Kanahele, we are able to receive from our ancestors, the `ike we need to begin to relate makawalu back into our lives today.

*Land As An Ancestor.* In order to tell the story of `Ioleka`a, the characters of the narrative needed to emerge and reveal themselves through inquiry and fact-finding. I invoked my kūpuna, that is those who have gone before me, for their kōkua, to come and meet me as I explored our genealogies, asking questions, contemplating, and pondering about the mo`olelo of `Ioleka`a. My invocations were in the form of pule and `oli. It is the way in which I made their acquaintance and was allowed to articulate, through my research, and their words, the telling of our stories. I define the telling of our stories as the narratives, bits of information, and answer to questions, collected from my kūpuna and given to me, via sensory, spiritual, visionary, and dream transmissions.

In my own research protocol, I invoke and acknowledge the `ike of my ancestors and their answers are the makana that I receive through the `ōiwi ontological frameworks stated above. This has provided connections between people and places leading to accounts of the past and present of `Ioleka`a that were fresh, exciting, and informative.

What has developed from this research effort is an informative, enriching, and compelling narrative by a kanaka `ōiwi wahine. In the telling of this story, I am the signifier, the kanaka `ōiwi voice that locates a story no one else can tell. It is me telling our ancestral story of blood and place, and which makes this research project an academic achievement.
Methodology

*Archival Research.* Archival research is a lesson in patience, listening, observing, and as our kumu always say, giving hoʻokupu or gifting those who work at these repositories of `ike. It is this kind of awareness that makes archival research a very personal journey, not only in the acquisition of important information, but of the way in which one goes about preparing for it, collecting it, correlating the facts, and then fitting them into variables with other sorted data as evidence. The information received from archival research substantiated the theoretical assumptions I made in comparing genealogies. This allowed me to thread those pieces, haku my lei, toward a comprehensive and informative narrative.

It is understood by most kānaka ʻōiwi that permission from akua, our kūpuna and/or aumākua is necessary to initiate the finding of one’s genealogy, or anything asked for that is important. People who know that you are doing this kind of research will always say, “Don’t forget to pray to your kupuna.” “Don’t forget to ask permission.” This is something most of us know, in the pit of our naʻau, that we must do for clearly, there is a difference when you do and when you forget to ask.

In asking for permission, the portal is opened and allows our ancestors to permeate the environment and our minds, thus we are successful when endowed with the gift of `ike in any form. I have benefitted from this protocol time and time again, and it is a part of my own research as well as life ritual. I note this because this method by which ʻōiwi research is conducted requires a preparation that is notably different from traditional western research methods.
Genealogical Research. Genealogy is the foundation for this research project. It provided the base from which the identity of self, of land, and of ancestral connections were configured. Records of land transactions supplied names and from those names the investigative journey began. Documentation of births, deaths, and marriages provided priceless information. Census records were very valuable in certifying and locating timelines and pedigree of main genealogical lineages. The pedigree of land in this case, is in alignment with the genealogy of the people who lived there. It is the bond by which the relationship between blood and land is forged and consummated.

In the case of `Ioleka`a, it was crucial to lay out a matrix or chronological chart of land acquisition by name, against a genealogy of land by ancestral or family occupation. In order to consummate the relationships between both the holders of the land and those who lived on the land, census records had to be accessed and comparative analysis in the births, marriages, number of children, their names, and their deaths had to be made for clarification. Genealogies placing relatives on the island of Hawai`i, Māui, and O`ahu were researched and some of those results are contained in this research.

Pieces of information that were recorded by past relatives, recorded accounts and interviews of meetings or events, and other such assorted and collected writings were used to try and piece together a comprehensive chronology. In this manner, the association of the `ohana to the land of `Ioleka`a was established but it is by no means exhaustive.

Maps. The maps used for this project were extremely helpful in charting the transitions of land tenure from 1839 to the present and in identifying land claimant names and L.C.A. numbers so as to make tracking manageable. The maps from which the most pertinent information was retrieved were,
As indicated in the maps, the transition of land, in particular, the Līhu`e kuleana can be tracked through land commission records as follows:

- 1839 Līhu`e gets `Ioleka`a from Kalauwalu.
- 1848 Mahele, Abner Paki receives the Ahupua`a of He`eia (Helu 10613).
- 1848 Mahele, Kapu relinquishes `Ioleka`a to Kamehameha III, it becomes government land.
- 1851 Līhu`e files a claim for the `Ioleka`a parcel (LCA 1917, Apanas 1, 2 & 3) and receives a Royal Patent (Helu 1014)
- 1878 Li`ikapeka (w) and Kauhi (K), her husband, sells to Keola R.P. 1014 (`Ioleka`a).
- 1906 Keola sells the `Ioleka`a parcel to daughters of Kahanupaoa, Helena Kea, Maria (Malia) Kea, and Kameha`iku Kea.
- 1913 Survey Map by Baldwin & Alexander indicates the identity of the `Ioleka`a parcel (Apana 2) as Līhu`e Keola.
• 1929 Treasury Department, Taxation Maps, 1929, show Malia McCabe and Kamehaʻiku Lono as owners.

• 1937 Land Court Territory Map states Mary McCabe and Kamehaʻiku Lono as owners.

• 1946 Hawaiʻi Territory Survey, or the Waiahole Forest Reserve Map lists E.L. Gouveia (a.k.a. Evelyn Domitilda Lono) as the owner (see Fig. 2).

What is revealed in the tracking above are the gaps indicated between the years 1878 and 1906. The change in land tenure, western and missionary influence, decimation of the population from foreign diseases and the influx of outsiders drastically changed the landscape of the islands, in particular for kānaka ʻōiwi. The overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani in 1898, placement of the Provisional Government and the territorialization of Hawaiʻi severely affected kānaka ʻōiwi lives, welfare, and ability to adapt.

A measure of that change is the land tenure of ʻIolekaʻa. During Keola’s residence the monarchy was still in place. This information was made possible in the use of maps which indicated the names of ʻohana members in the kuleana parcel in different years of transition.

Maps were also helpful in determining what the moʻolelo of the land might have been. Place names of old, not often included on the most recent maps, clearly establish what an area looked like and what is was called. In identifying the names of places, gulches, streams, and other various sites, the maps were most essential, and the older they were, the better. It is with great joy that I express my love for maps, for they too have a story to tell with much to say.
Fig. 2. Lester A. Marks; Surveyor; *Waiahole Forest Reserve; Island of O`ahu*; (Honolulu: Territory of Hawai`i, 1946) HTS Plat 2133. Print.

*Nā Nūpepa `Ōlelo Hawai`i.* Dr. Noenoe Silva is a professor of Indigenous Politics in the Political Science Department at the University of Hawai`i Mānoa. In her essay on Hawaiian newspapers she states, “For about a hundred years (1834-1948), Hawaiians produced knowledge, opinions, literature, political and religious discourses, and debates in print, leaving an extensive archive, including nearly 80 newspapers now preserved on microfilm and digitally, and an uncounted number of books” (108). The countless editions of nūpepa `ōlelo Hawai`i contributes to a vast wealth of knowledge from which researches have and are continuing to glean. These are
repositories reflecting kānaka `ōiwi lives, culture, and stories. They are the lifeline to the past and the heartline to the future.

Hawaiian language newspapers functioned as vehicles of resistance to religious oppression. They were also the carriers of events, publishers of valuable `ōiwi knowledge such as tales of gods and goddesses, genealogies, mo`olelo, the flora and fauna of the islands, as well as various methods of nā mea no`eau. These Hawaiian language newspapers provide a link for kānaka `ōiwi to a boundless wealth of information. Samuel M. Kamakau’s and John Papa Ii’s contributions to nā nūpepa `ōlelo Hawai`i were what became the material for the publications, *Fragments of Hawaiian History* (1959) and *The Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*.20

Clearly, understanding and optimally speaking Hawaiian language, is a mandatory prerequisite in order to use Hawaiian language newspapers as a resource. It is what makes this vast amount of information so significant. We are able, in our own language, to read and digest all the kaona, beauty, and metaphor of these stories. In effect, we live through and give life to the ancestors as we read from their lips, the words contained in these newspapers.

There is no overstating the importance or resource value of Hawaiian language newspapers. What makes this resource unique? It provides an erudite commentary on the existant knowledge of the ancestors. These are their words, their own `ōiwi voices, speaking `ōlelo Hawai`i to us, to a kānaka `ōiwi audience. Herein lies the essence of hermeneutics or the way kānaka `ōiwi interpret and configure ancestral `ike. As it was then, so it is again now, that with the availability and access to over tens of thousands of articles in the numbers of various `ōiwi
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language newspapers, our kānaka `ōiwi ancestors are speaking directly to us, articulating in the mother tongue, the ways of the people of old for which there can be no dispute.

Hawaiian language newspapers, now considered a primary resource, raises the academic bar on kānaka `ōiwi scholarship. These and other original Hawaiian language data used in research projects raises the didactic value of kānaka `ōiwi analysis, and in the process situates that synthesis within an intellectual or scholarly canon, of which it deserves.

_Papakū Makawalu._ In my thesis, the methodology of Papakū Makawalu was transformative and ontologically inspiring. It takes `ōlelo mākuahine to heights and depths of which I have never encountered. Here is how the methodology was applied in this project.

The three Papas or houses/foundations of knowledge are infused with the elemental qualities of atmospheric, geologic, and hydrologic functions (akua). These houses of knowledge, Papahulihonua (ocean and earth), Papahānaumoku (the birthing cycle from conception to death), and Papahulilani (from above the head to where the stars sit) are multi-faceted and non-static. For example, while the earth is a solid living worldscape, it’s functions (i.e. rotations, magnetics, tilts, electronic, atmospheric, geological and hydrological rhythms, etc.) operate autonomously yet, for the benefit of the whole, each spurring its own activity within the larger spectrum of the biosphere or life-scape.

It is this _knowing_ that connects kanaka `ōiwi to the land. The land includes everything above and below it, the inner and outer core, the fresh, salt and brackish waters, the heavens, the sky, clouds, wind, rains, all of the Kumulipo in its oratory of the genealogy of all life from the beginning or birthing of Pō to the genealogies of kānaka `ōiwi. These are the life blood of the people and the land. In other words, the entirety of the environment is the sustaining life force of the land and kānaka `ōiwi. This is the essence of Papa and the accretion for Papakū Makawalu.
The function of this methodology is to enable contemplative analysis and to establish essential meanings in the translations of words connected to `ōiwi mo`olelo. Envisioning the landscape becomes an esoteric exercise locating kānaka `ōiwi as principal. Papakū Makawalu brings those narratives to life.

Implementing Papakū Makawalu. As I began the work for this project, I realized that I needed to see the `āina. To hear the `āina. To acknowledge the akua of the `āina. Prior to the commencement of my research, it made absolute sense to ask the `āina in `Ioleka`a, “He aha ka mo`olelo o kēia `āina?” or “What is the story of this land?” I waited, and a moment later I heard a voice reply, “Ka wai. Ua pili `ia i ka wai i nā manawa apau loa” or “The water.” “It has always been about the water.” It was the voice of my kupuna.

The story of `Ioleka`a is about `āina where the gods operate as initiators of elemental configurations in the relationships between the `āina and its surroundings, ergo requiring a special way in which to contextualize such functions in this narrative. This is where Papakū Makawalu becomes essential and ground breaking.

Papakū Makawalu played a pivotal methodological role in the translation and articulation of the mo`olelo for `Ioleka`a, but more importantly, it allowed me, as a kanaka `ōiwi mo`o, to sharpen my own intuitive awareness, my own ability to tap into the ipu of my own ancestral knowledge contained within my kino, but anchored in the mana of my kūpuna.

Similar to brainstorming, this methodology or makawalu, is a process of the deconstruction and then, reconstruction of words as appropriate to the geography of the land, its spatial characteristics, and most important, elemental qualities (or akua) associated with the translations. For example the place name `Ioleka`a is often translated as “rolling rat” and while
some mo`olelo places the `iole as central in contemporary narratives of `Ioleka`a,\(^{21}\) it is, by no means, the only possibility.

In implementing makawalu, the potentiality of what might be indicative or associated with `Ioleka`a is brought forward and the real work of unweaving, and then, the haku, begins. Below is an example of the initial phase in the application of Papakū Makawalu for the term `Ioleka`a.

Io Hawaiian hawk (*Buteo solitarius*), a round, light colored bitter gourd (*Lagenaria siceraria*), bundle or food package, one who announces the presence of a chief, true or genuine, essence or substance.

Iole Hawaiian rat (*Rattus exulans*), name for a sinker of an octopus lure and the lure.

Leka Sticky, slimy, as mucus.

Ka hit, strike, throw, to make net meshes, to turn the soil, vine, as of sweet potato, to send out a vine, to grow into a vine, root cutting as breadfruit, to send forth shoots, incoming of a current

Kaa Roll, turn, twist, wallow, wind, revolve, to scud or move along as clouds, to wield as a club. To be in a state of, to be located at, to take effect. Tale or legend (now replaced by ka`ao). Thread, line, as of olonā, filament.

In this instance the tactile derivatives are; the hawk, the light colored ipu (used medicinally), bundle of food package, herald of the chiefs, the rat, tale or legend, vine growth (as in `ulu), and fine thread or filament. The remaining subsidiary words are conditional and active; genuine, sticky, slimy, to be in a state of or to take effect, essence, to locate, to hit or strike, to

\(^{21}\) Resources relating directly to `Ioleka`a are primarily limited to studies (cultural and historic), reports (archaeological, hydrological, and geological), state archival data (state and museum), Hawaiian language newspapers, and other such published materials (mo`olelo, legends, historiography (including bibliography) and other such narratives (personal family vignettes).
weave (netting), to set forth shoots (growth), incoming (as of the current), to roll, wallow, to
scud (as clouds), to wield (as club), and to take effect.

The constituents arising in the makawalu of `Ioleka`a are akua, both male and female, but
appear, in my analysis, to be particular to Kāne, Lono, Haumea, and Hina, who function as
divinities of the forest, fresh water, the moon, and the sun. The makawalu of `Ioleka`a reveals an
unmistakable connection to Kāne, the divine element of water, and Lono, initiator of growth,
and fertility. At a recent workshop, Dr. Pualani Kanaka`ole Kanahele provided a description of
Lono’s domain. “All the movement in sky and oxygen belongs to Lono, the horizontal layer, as
long as it is making water it is Lono.” In this environment, Lono is the phenomena that initiates
water or moisture in the forms of clouds and is the cloud himself.

The word scud or ka`a is of note here. The description of the action in the ka`a of
Lono “pertains to meteorology or the phenomena of the atmosphere or weather.” Low drifting
clouds called fractostratus, appear beneath a cloud from which rain is falling. These grey clouds
are formed by droplets of water and are described as, “low ragged layered clouds often appearing
below nimbostratus,” defined as a “dark, gray, mid-altitude cloud that often covers the entire sky
and precipitates rain” clouds during rain.” This is a specific atmospheric function of Lono,
initiator in his element of water (moisture, rain, condensation, clouds). In Lono’s environment,

Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies. Punalu`u. 28 April. 2007. Lecture.


Company. 3 June 2012.
ka`a (scud or scudding) is the name and movement of the long dark cloud, one of the body forms or kinolau of Lono. In the season of Ho`oilo, this element or Lono, functions as the initiator in the transition from the time of Kū to Lono. When the constellation, Makali`i rises on the horizon at the setting of the sun, it is the signal that heralds the time of Makahiki over which Lono presides. This seasonal transition was marked by ceremonial rituals in ancient times and have been revived and are celebrated today.

Lono represents other associative functions which are related to cultivation, fertility, and procreation. Vines, the growth and spreading of shoots, root cuttings, and of course, the ipu are all affiliated with Lono and resemble the growth, or swelling of the land due to the engorgement of water and/or proliferation. These are the tactile and gestational engendering elements of Lono in his role as the catalyst for fertility, growth, and reproduction. During Ho`oilo, the lush wetness, the walewale, and the misty rains which caress Papa are initiated by Lono. Growth is abundant, and Lono in the form of the pua`a and Kamapua`a, travel the forest and mountain terrain of `Ioleka`a.

Contingent to the idea of procreation is the kinolau of Lono in the form of Kamapua`a, or the pua`a. In this configuration the associations with fertility and procreation are portrayed in the actions of the pua`a and the stories of Kamapua`a. In nā mo`olelo, the physical manifestations of the demigod Kamapua`a, are prominent, in particular his sexual escapades. Pua`a is also a term used to describe “banks of fog or clouds, often as gathered over a mountain summit, a sign of rain and believed to be the form clouds of Kamapua`a.” (Pukui 344). The idea of wet, moist, mist, and other such liquid connotations are also associated to the `ōiwi kaona of sex and/or sexual activity.
The term ‘eku’eku means to root, as a pig, or to soften the earth, as in planting” (Pukui 40). To make the land swell. In this action, the pua’a is softening or digging the earth, making it soft for the planting of crops. The word ka`a means to wallow (Pukui 106) and the word leka is used to describe a substance that is sticky or slimy. Kame`elehiwa defines walewale as the “slime that established the earth” (Nā Wāhine Kapu, 2). In this frame of reference, the wallowing of the pua’a in the slimy lepo of Papahānaumoku is the symbolic metaphor for the creation and consummation of life, noting that pro-creation is not possible without walewale as preparation for intercourse.25 The sexual metaphors associated with Lono cannot be ignored. The metaphorical value is associated with the fertility and production of all life associated with the `āina, making perfect sense to our kūpuna, who with kaona made those associations clear in the mo`olelo, chants and prayers that they left for us. This is the mapping of our mo`olelo and the guide to our ‘ōiwi identity.

According to Pukui, Ipu `o Lono is a “variety of kalo used as an offering to the gods and is qualified by the terms kea and `ula`ula (white and red). Ipu `o Lono is also the name of an agricultural heiau; a heiau where ceremonies seeking to obtain rain were held” (Pukui 104). The term kea is also the name for male semen (Andrews 262) which certainly aligns with the sticky substance implied by the word leka. In the context of Lono, birth, renewal, generation, progeny, and death define the life cycle, the continuum of ea or the preservation of life.

25 Pukui defines ai as coition: to have sexual relations. She also defines it as wai or fresh water. She defines `ai as food, or the eating of food with the figurative meaning as, to rule, to enjoy the privileges and exercise the responsibilities of rule. It is interesting to note the associations of the term `āina, `ai, aina, and ai, as an expression of the fecund or fertile associations with the land (9).
Lono is the inspiration for kāhuna la’au lapa’au and is central to the mo`olelo of ‘Ioleka`a, in particular, Heiau La`au Lapa`au. This is a healing heiau, where Lono could be invoked with prayers and rituals for healing, birthing, love, longevity, life, and death.

In the analysis and application of Makawalu I have determined four functioning akua (elements) as associated to ‘Ioleka`a,

1. Lono is a focal element, functioning as weather initiator in the forms of clouds, air, winds, and the horizontal movement above the head and to the stars. This element also functions as the contributor of fertile growth upon the land and upon the people and is associated with Heiau La`au Lapa`au, a healing heiau.

2. Kāne is a primary element who functions as fresh water, the life giving waters that nourish the land, the kalo, and the people. He also functions as sunlight, a requirement, as water, in the sustaining of life.

3. Haumea (a.k.a. Papa and Kameha’ikana) is the mo`owahine, kia`i of the wai and the kai and associated with Wahine Wai`ū, responsible for the movement of liquid, and the initiator of conception, reproduction, and birth.

4. Hina, initiator of the lunar and rhythmic cycles for growth and reproduction and as Lonomuku, associated with Leleahina Heiau.

The preceding example is the reason why Papakū Makawalu is the preeminent methodology in this research and should be in future projects. It is `ōiwi appropriate and acceptably non-traditional. Further, it acknowledges `ōiwi epistemology and situates this particular emerging process of interpretation as transformative phenomenology, the science of phenomena as opposed to the science of being.
Chapter II: The Genealogy and Land of `Ioleka`a

Pre-Mahele, Mahele, Post-Mahele

In the search for the genealogy of `Ioleka`a, I drew heavily upon the lessons I had attained in the course of my academic work over the last eight years, in particular and most recent, that of the Ancestral Visions of `Āina project.²⁶

I am involved with this project as a Graduate Research Assistant at the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa. The vision of this endeavor is to establish a reconnection to the ancestral knowledge of land and resource management; something our ancestors knew and understood well. The goal of the project is to become as adept as our ancestors were in their keen observance of the land and everything in, on, above and below it, thereby increasing our capacity to manage the resources on those lands and to produce food to the levels of abundance as our ancestors did before us. The first two years of the project focused upon the transcriptions of land claim awards contained in ten volumes. These awards of land claims were made in the Mahele of 1848, an act which allowed for private ownership of land for the first time in Hawai`i. Within the scope of transcriptions, much information was gleaned from the many thousands of pages documenting number of award, description, location, payment, date, and some narrative data. In the transcriptions of these awards, I came upon my own family’s documentations as well as other connections that related to our `ohana. It was of no surprise to me that the assignment of pages I was responsible for contained records of `Ioleka`a and other relevant information.

²⁶ A project funded by the Administration for Native Americans (ANA) grant and is a working collaboration between the Edith Kanaka`ole Foundation (EKF) and Hawai`inuiakea School of Hawaiian Knowledge.
Pre-Mahele. Documenting the process of the Mahele between the years 1848 and 1855 was a most phenomenal task. It was not, however, without inconsistencies. Errors in transcriptions, translations, ambiguous and even missing documentation, as well as great variances in surveying results presented problems of accuracy. In his overview of the Mahele, Maly (Summary of Mahele ‘Āina Records, 2002) correctly states, “These problems present us with some questions that will never be answered, and require us to make educated assumptions (based on standard practices of residency and land use, and requirements of the Māhele application process at the time), to better understand what the records tell us.” While the records may be imperfect, they are extremely important and essential in the research of land. In the same overview, Maly writes, “The records of the Māhele ‘Āina (Land Division), describing native Hawaiian residency, land use, access, and traditional and customary practices—including responsibilities associated with such kuleana—are among the most significant historical documentary resources available to those interested in Hawaiian history and land tenure. What this implies is that the recorded data found was not, by virtue of its documentation, substantive in and of itself.

The land was here before us and the land will be here when we are gone. It is Hāloanakalaukapalili that provides the link to the land. Kānaka ʿōiwi are the ʻohā of the ʻāina, the offshoots or the younger siblings of Hāloa. We come from the land and as such our genealogies are inextricably tied to the ʻāina as ʻohana, hence it is pono to begin with the genealogy of the land.

The earliest date regarding land claims to Ioleka’a appears in the year 1846 and is found in the Native Register Volume.27 In the registering of his claim, Līhu’e affirms, “Na Kalauwalu

27 Volumes containing native and foreign testimonies and registrations to land claims in the Mahele.
mai loa’a i ka M.H. 1839. Aole mea keakea, or I received this land from Kalauwalu in the year 1839, no one objects.” Mahoe, a witness for Līhu’e, swears, “Ua ike au i kona aina ma ka ‘Ili [sic] o ‘Ioleka’a [sic], He’e’ia [sic], “I have seen his land in the ‘Ili of ‘Ioleka’a, He’e’ia.” Unihepa also swears, “Ua like no ka maua ike me Mahoe i hai ae nei,” “Our knowledge, myself and Mahoe, is the same as has been expressed.” These expressions were the common language in the instruments of recordation and are repeated throughout such testimonies and registers, as well as land claim awards in the Boundary of Land Commission Awards.28

Kalauwalu, also known as Kalualalu (Indices 287), “was the chief kahu or instructor of Alexander Liholiho, King Kamehameha IV. S. M. Kamakau tells us, “Here in Lahaina the prince’s personal attendant Ka-pololu died, and Ka-lau-`alu became his guardian.”

Kalauwalu’s wife, Kaunuohua, was a Chiefess of high rank and kahu to King Kamehameha IV” (McKinzie 60). Here is an additional note of importance by Barrere that, “King Kauikeaouli took this chief [Alexander Liholiho] to make him his heir. Kaunuohua [sic] was his attendant [kahu] and that she (Kaunuohua) was the wife of Kalauwalu who had been one of Nahienaena’s favorite attendants” (290). I believe that Kalauwalu and his wife, Kaunuohua, were very close to Kamehameha III and Kamehameha IV and as such received lands on which to live in numerous places as benefitting the king’s entourage. However, as Kame`elehiwa states, “Kaunuohua was a female descendant of Kalanunui`tamamao, a very high-ranking Hawai`i island (Hilo) ali`i and had extensive `āina in her own right (Native Land 264).

As for Kalauwalu, the king’s trust of him is further evidenced by the 1839 sugar agreement signed between Kalauwalu and Keoni, a native of China, for the planting of one

---

28 The Boundary of Land Commission Awards are ten volumes of recorded land claim awards made during the Mahele in 1848.
hundred acres of sugar in Wailuku, Māui. Kamehameha III plays a “substantial part in this sugar venture for he receives no shares of the sugar unless it is a portion for Kalauwalu and others” (Char 7). According to a notice issued in The Friend on December 1, 1905, Kalauwalu died on January 20, 1840. This date is erroneous as Kalauwalu filed a claim for land in Kauluwela, Honolulu (LCA 741) in 1848 and submitted testimony reflected in the Native Register (No. 741, Kalauwalu. N.R. 401v2. [Award 741; R.P. 2263; Kauluwela Honolulu Kona; 2 ap.; .83 Ac.]) in which he states,

Greetings to you, the Land Commissioners: I hereby tell you of my claim for my house lot at Kauluwela in Honolulu. The boundaries are: North, Naihe’s place; east, Keaweluahi’s place; south, an irrigation channel; west, the kula. This place of mine was from Kaule. I have held it peacefully and there is one house of mine there. I have two taro patches also.

For the same claim29 and in witness to, “Paele swears by the Bible and states, I have seen Kalauwalu’s place just as Palilo’s statements are which have been read here on everything about it. I have not known that anyone has ever objected to him.”

Clearly Kalauwalu was a man of station, means, political standing, and connection to Kamehameha III and Kamehameha IV. If the theory is correct and as according to Young that, “the kaukau ali`i were lesser-ranked members of the chiefly class” in the `ōiwi social hierarchy and “their rank was determined by their familial relationships to the Ali`i Nui or high chiefs in their capacity as chiefly servers” (iii), then in this capacity Kalauwalu had the ability and

29 No. 741, Kalauwalu. N.T. 546v2. [Award 741; R.P. 2263; Kauluwela Honolulu Kona; 2 ap.; .83 Ac.]
position to give land to loyal `ōhua members. I contend that Līhuʻe received his lands and
position because he was a part of that `ōhua.

Līhuʻe acquired other lands in addition to `Iolekaʻa, in the ahupuaʻa of Heʻeʻia. In
Kamahikilua, `Ili o Kapalai, ahupuaʻa of Kāneʻohe, (LCA 1889, R.P. 2408), he received a little
over 11 acres of land from Kekahimoku. S. M. Kamakau identifies Kekahimoku (a.k.a.
Kahimoku, Kekamoku) as the land agent for Boki in charge of Waikiki and husband of
Kaumealani (290). In the Native Register 3:288, Līhuʻe presents his land claim for Kapalai in
Kāneʻohe saying,

Commissioners who Quiet Land Titles, Greeting to you. I, the one who has a land
claim, tell you of my land at Kapalai, it is an `Ili [sic] land in Kāneʻohe [sic].
There are 13 loi kalo in my moʻo [sic] land; on the North of my moʻo [sic] land
are 17 loi kalo of mine; on the east is the land of Kekahimoku; on the west is the
land of Luluʻu [sic]; on the south is a cliff. There is also a kula with my moʻo [sic]
land; and a house claim, with 4 loi adjoining it and the loi of Kekamoku
[Kekahimoku]. All together there are 34 loi. Koʻolaupoko [sic] Apana 6. Dec. 19,
1847. By Līhuʻe [sic] (his mark).

Līhuʻe received the land in the `Ili of `Iolekaʻa from Kalauwalu. He received his land in
Kapalai from Kekahimoku. As explained by S. M. Kamakau regarding the giving of lands by
chiefs during the time of Kamehameha I, “They were all bent at this time upon securing honor
for themselves and would give away land only to relatives or favorites or to some high chief, in
which case it could not revert again to the government.” I believe Līhuʻe was related to the
retinue of konohiki or chiefs who were under the higher chiefs of Kamehameha I at the time of
the defeat of Oʻahu by Kamehameha. This explains Līhuʻeʻs land holdings, and while considered
meager against the example of Paki’s receipt of the entire ahupua’a of He’e’ia (with the exception of `Ioleka’a), it is none the less important in the blood and place connections of the land ten years prior to the actual mahele.

Mahele. In the Mahele of 1848, High Chief Abner Paki, husband to High Chiefess Laura Konia and father of Bernice Pauahi, received the ahupua’a of He’e’ia. Also recorded in the mahele book of 1848, the `Ili of `Ioleka’a is relinquished by Kapu, a High Konohiki (Kame’elehiwiwa, Native Lands 278) to Kamehameha III. The total amount of lands that Kapu relinquished as recorded in the Mahele book (99-100, 104-105) are as follows.

On the island of O‘ahu, district of Ko‘olaupoko, `Ioleka’a, an `Ili in the ahupua’a of He’e’ia and Halekou, an `Ili in the ahupua’a of Kāne‘ohe. On the island of Moloka‘i in the Kona district, the ahupua’a of Manawanui. On the island of Māui in the district of Hamakualoa, the ahupuaas of Uaoa [Ouaoa], Keaali‘i, and Keaaula were relinquished. In the Hilo district on the island of Hawai‘i, the ahupuaas of Ka‘alau, Pōhakukahi and Makea and in the district of Kohala, also on Hawai‘i island, the ahupuaa of Kāhie. These lands were given to Kamehameha III and in return Kapu received Pu‘unau, an ahupua’a in Lahaina on the island of Māui, Mahinui, an `Ili in the ahupua’a of Kāne‘ohe in the district of Ko‘olaupoko on the island of O‘ahu, and the `Ili of Kalaepōhaku in the ahupuaa of Waikīkī [sic], district of Kona on the island of O‘ahu.

---

The lands that Kapu received from Kamehameha III are recorded in the Land Commission Awards Volume 9, Helu 6400, apanas 1, 2, and 3, Waikīkī, Kāne‘ohe, and Pu‘unau Lahaina respectively. It appears that ‘Ioleka’a was either set aside prior to Paki’s receipt of the He‘e‘ia ahupua’a, as evidenced in the following correspondence, copied from the State Archives and dated January 24, 1849 from A. Paki to Keoni Ana, Minister of the Interior, as follows,

Honorable Minister of the Interior, Keoni Ana,

Greetings to you.

Grant me consideration for something which I want to ask the Government, that my division of Pohakupu, in Kailua, to belong to the Government, and the Government’s division of Heeia to belong to me, to wit: Iolekaa, should it meet your desire and love toward me.

Yours with thanks, your obedient servant.

Paki

From the foregoing evidence, ‘Ioleka’a was not a part of the land (He‘e‘ia ahupua’a) that was received by Paki. This is the explanation of why ‘Ioleka’a is relinquished by Kapu instead of Paki in the mahele. Another explanation may be that Kalauwalu, Mahoe, Kalua, and Kanakaōō were konohiki under Kapu who, as chiefly servers of Paki, would have still retained their lands in the `Ili, since all were loyal to the Kamehameha dynasty.

That Līhu’e received land from Kalauwalu in 1839, is evidence that he (Līhu’e) was a luna. Whether Līhu’e was a luna under Kalauwalu is in question, but his position as luna is corroborated in testimony given in a land award disputed for the king (Kamehameha III) on May 4, 1853, in which,
Līhue [sic], sworn, says he knows the part of this claim now in dispute, in the `Ili of “Palele” Kāne`ohe [sic]. There are 2 patches in dispute. They were Koele patches in the time of Kam 1 when he lived at Waikīkī [sic]. I am the Luna of the Konohiki on that land. I have been Luna about 4 years, and I have worked these patches as Koeles. They were Koeles also in the time of my predecessor, Panala`au. [sic]. Kapunai planted these 2 patches some time under the Konohiki and divided the food with him.

The `Ili of `Ioleka`a was the only parcel set aside as government land, as recorded in the Mahele book (219), making it unusual, though it does not negate Līhu`e’s tenure on the land since 1839. In the Mahele of 1848 six claimants were awarded lands in the `Ili of `Ioleka`a. They were Līhu`e, Na`ipu, Kāluhi, Unihepa, Kaniaupi`o, Kanakaōō, and Keakua. Kāluhi acquired his land from Mahoe and Kanakaōō in 1844 (LCA 7525) but this land was not awarded in the mahele. Keakua received his land from Kalua in 1845 (LCA 4221, Apanas 1, 2, & 3, R.P. 1020). Na`ipu got his land from both Kalauwalu and Mahoe, 1836 and 1839 respectively (LCA 10424, R.P. 2289). Receiving lands from Kalauwalu in 1839 were Līhu`e (LCA 1971, Apana 2, R.P. 1014), Unihepa (LCA 6097, Apanas 1 & 2, R.P. 4861), Kaniaupi`o (LCA 5821, Apana 1, R.P. 3628), and Kanakaōō, (LCA 4238, Apanas 1, 2, & 3, R.P. 1563). All six claims were filed and each received their property in fee as indicated by their royal patent numbers. The proximity of these parcels within the `Ili of `Ioleka`a suggest a strong relationship between Kalauwalu and these claimants.

I assert that these claimants functioned as favored luna and/or chiefly retainers and as such, received land in this `Ili as a reward for their loyalty and their mālama `āina.
Post-Mahele. Between the years of 1848 to 1898 the `Ili of `Ioleka’a remained intact, but the sovereignty of the Hawaiian islands did not. In 1854, Alexander Liholiho became King Kamehameha IV. In 1873, Lunalilo is elected king but does not live long and Kalākaua is elected king in 1874. By the time King Kalākaua’s coronation takes place, an influx of Chinese and Japanese have been brought to the islands as labor for the sugar plantations. In 1887 Kalākaua is forced to sign the Bayonet Constitution. He dies in 1891 and is succeeded by his sister, Queen Lili`uokalani in 1891. The Queen is overthrown in 1898 by a foreign oligarchy who then establishes a provisional government making Hawai`i a territory of the United States of America. From the Mahele to the overthrow, a short fifty years had changed the lives of kānaka `ōiwi forever. In another sixty one years, Hawai`i would become the 50th state under the United States of America. While these life changing events were taking place, the kuleana would remain intact.

Līhu`e held the kuleana at least up until his death, of which the year is unknown. In 1878 Li`ikapeka and her husband Kauhi sold her interest to Keola. As recorded in Document No. Liber 12342 PC99, Keola pays $50.00 for the kuleana. What is also established in this record is Li`ikapeka’s relationship to Līhu`e. In describing the kuleana she states, “Oia ke kuleana apau loa i ikeia ma ka inoa o Līhu`e [sic] i make. Oia ka makuakane ponoi o Li`ikapeka [sic] (w).” In my own translation. “This entire kuleana of Līhu`e. Li`ikapeka, the true [rightful heir] daughter of Līhu`e.”
Territorial Years: Keola, Kea, and Kahanu Paoa

Keola. The Twelfth Census of the Hawaiian Islands in 1900\textsuperscript{31} lists Keola’s birth year as 1845, his age as 55, and his status as single. In the same census, Hulupuni birth years is listed as 1880, her age 20, and her status as single. Also included in this household census, Ah Sing, his age 29, his status as single and his position as servant.

In 1900, according to the Census of the Hawaiian Islands, Kea was 59 and Keola was 55. Both men were born during the monarchy and both were probably raised in the old ways, in which the following excerpt from Gouveia evidences in her personal notes,

Keola and the Catholic Church of St Ann’s.

He had been a young boy when the Catholics decided to build the coral stone church in He’e’ia [sic]. (Scratched out from He...). The Catholic Church was situated on a heiau at Mōkapu [sic]. They had been steadily baptizing the maka`ainana[sic]. But they were not comfortable there. Many Hawaiians practiced the old ways there. Paki had run out of kerosene one day and had gone over to Kāne’ohe [sic] to ask the Rev. Parker for some and was refused. On his way back he met a priest of the Catholics and he gave Paki kerosene. Paki pointed to that place called He’e’ia [sic] Uli and gave them land there to build a church.

In the Thirteenth Census of the United States-Population Hawai`i of 1910, Keola Kanianiau is listed as 65 yrs. old and widowed in Heʻeʻia Village. The 1900 and 1910 census information is talking about the same man, Keola, who with Domitilla Kahanaaaauwai, hānai Anaita Kahanu Paoa (a.k.a. Anaita (Anaika) Kahanaupaoa in 1876.32 Hulupuni, whose paternity is unknown, is listed as his adopted daughter in the 1900 census. She was the eldest daughter of Kahanu Paoa. Gouveia further adds,

Keola and Kea very close- even lived together at times- one spot was the Koaena. Kea ma lived on the Kailua side of the stream, which when Haʻiku [sic] and ʻIolekaʻa [sic] streams meet at a fork, becomes Heʻeʻia [sic] Stream at Hoe. Keola had acquired along with 2 other kuleana properties, a small triangle of land on the Kahaluʻu [sic] side of the stream. The two men could be seen growing and caring for their kalo, always helping each other, always together. This Koaena was their spot. No women allowed. What was important that Kea took her33 to wife.

Given the context of the times and the great many changes that had already occurred, it is important to understand the social implications in the establishment of the Catholic church in Heʻeʻia. Many of St. Ann’s founding members were long time kupa of the area, families who, once given over to the church, gave willingly, frequently, and were committed, in particular, to the education the church provided for their children. Their love and dedication was exemplary in the building of the church which commenced in 1851 and was completed in 1852.

32 St. Ann’s Catholic Church baptismal records, contained in notes by Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia. Lists Ioane Keola and Domitilla (Kahanaaaauwai) as parents (hanai).

33 The her that was being referenced was Kahanu Paoa.
Gouveia\textsuperscript{34} provides the evidence showing the people’s love for St. Ann’s Catholic Church when she writes,

The coral for the church was cut at Mōkapu [sic] and, it is said, passed hand to hand, put on canoes which landed at He’e’ia [sic] Uli, and again passed hand to hand to the site. Keola had helped because he was Catholic baptized at birth at Mōkapu [sic]. He enjoyed being able to participate in such an undertaking. There were many who helped who were not Catholics but became one after the paina the Catholics laid out after the church was built. Growing up with the Catholics did not change Keola’s way of living. He respected the old ways although he did not show it. What he truly enjoyed of the church were the candles and the quiet, the beautiful singing of Latin. He liked the advice of the priest who told him about land and how to make the palapala. He was always ready to help the church. But, Keola planted kalo and loved to go fishing. He liked all the new clothes to dress up for church but wore canvas pants cut off at the knees as his every day. He liked all the new kinds of food but he ate poi with it, even hard tack and oil.

Keola was able to adapt to change while keeping intact his relationship to the thing he loved, the `āina, and his hana mahi`ai of kalo. There were things he liked about the church, and he helped out anytime the church needed kōkua. It speaks to the character, strength, and determination of kānaka `ōiwi in the face of change and adversity.

On the next page is the record (see fig.3) of Ioane Keola and Domitilla Kahanupaoa (Kahanaaauwai) signing up Anita Kahanupaoa for the first day of classes at St. Ann’s School in

\textsuperscript{34} Collection of notes belonging to Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia.
1876. The dates indicated here make it possible, that Anita Kahanupaoa is Kahanu Paoa, hanai of Keola and Kahanaaaauwai.

Fig. 3. Register for the first school day of St. Ann’s School in 1876, *St. Ann’s Church and School 150 Years: 1841-1991*, (Honolulu: Presentation Plus, 1991) 23. Print

*Kea.* Notes belonging to Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia revealed information which provided information on Keola, Kea, and Kahanu Paoa. In her notes Gouveia writes,

Kahanu Paoa was born in 1870. 1881 brought to Kalia at Waikīkī [sic] where she stayed for approximately three years. Hānai [sic] to Keola and Kahanaauwai ma.

Around eighteen years old when married off to John Kea who was thirty years her
senior. Kea-sterile-all children from two men, may three-one haole and two Hawaiian. She bore children which had no paternity\textsuperscript{35} until she married Kea.

My great-great-grandmother, Kahanu Paoa, became the wife of Kea (a.k.a. Joe Kea, Thomas Kea), at least thirty years her senior, most probably through the urgings of Keola, her hanai makuakane and best friend of Kea. This was approximately 1887. When she married Kea, she had already given birth to two children, Hulupuni, who was two years old, and Catherine Mele, who died in infancy. Kea would be the paternal father on record for the children born to her after their marriage.

\textit{Kahanu Paoa}. The children of Kahanupaoa, a.k.a. Anita Kahanupaoa born after her marriage to Kea were Ioane Keola in 1887, Helena Kea in 1889, Maria Keola in 1890, Ioane Keali`ikanaka`ole in 1994, and Domitilla Kamehai`ku in 1896. This information was found in baptismal records in a file of research notes belonging to the late Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia.

Helena, Malia, and Kameha`iku Kea, who while they were not the biological children of Kea, bought the Lihu`e kuleana from Keola. Gouveia notes that Kahanu Paoa (see fig. 4) came from Kalia. This establishes a Paoa connection not only to Kahanupaoa, but possibly to Keola and Kahanaaaauwai (a.k.a. Kahanaauwai) as well. That there is a connection to the Paoa’s of Kalia is no doubt, but exactly how has yet to be determined. This connection may prove helpful in providing an answer to that question.

\textsuperscript{35} The paternity of Hulupuni, born in 1880 and Catherine Mele, born in 1881 (died in infancy), was never known. She had not yet married Kea.
Perhaps it was Keola’s dedication to the church that may have influenced Kahanupaoa to become a member herself of St. Ann’s Catholic Church. By the time her daughters were ready for school, St. Ann’s Church would have been the school they attended. It was established and well known for the education provided to the children of He`e`ia and surrounding villages.
Fig. 5. From personal collection of Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia, Photo in a newspaper, *Keola* (top row, last person), and possibly *Hulupuni*, (center top in dark mu`u). (Newspaper article, publisher unknown. 1968) Print.

The picture above (fig. 5), is interesting. It is not clear who the woman between Louisa Adams and Mary McCabe is. What is clear is that her name is Anita. Since the man on the top right is identified as Kola Kahanu Paoa, a mis-spelling of Keola’s name, he is probably Keola,
and the possibilities are that the woman could be Hulupuni (a.k.a. Anita Hulupuni), hānai of Keola, Kahanu Paoa, wife of Kea, or Kameha`iku, youngest child of Kahanu Paoa. All of these women were called Anita, Anaita, or Anaika and the identity remains a mystery, at least until the original article can be traced.

In 1906, Keola sells the kuleana to Helena Kea etals. (Helena Kea, Kameha`iku Kea, and Mary (Malia) Kea) for $40.00. In the transfer of the land Keola states, “- [sic] ka inoa o Līhu`e [sic] (k) i make, kou makuakane ponoi ia nona ke kuleana Helu 1971 Palapala Sila Nui Helu 1014.” I translate this as, “The name of Līhu`e, dead, my real father, his kuleana claim number 1971, Royal Patent 1014.” In this way the genealogy of Līhu`e is fixed to the land by his progeny; from his daughter, Li`ikapeka, and then to her brother Keola.

Keola died sometime between 1912 and 1920, when the next census was taken. There is no account of his name in the records of He`e`ia in 1920, and by that time Kahanu Paoa is listed as head of household and widowed, which presumes the death of her husband, Kea.

In the census record of 1910, Helena Kea is listed as head of household, age 21, and single. Her children are listed as Daniel, foster child, age 2, and Elizabeth, a daughter, age 1 year and two months. No paternity is given but it is interesting to note that she is a single mother with a foster child in 1910. Dan Kea, the hānai son of Helena Kea, married Malia Moe, who is sometimes confused with Maria (Mary) Kea McCabe. Malia Moe married Dan Kea and were the parents of Pua Clothilda Kea who later married George Paoa, a well-known Hawaiian singer and cousin to Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia.

Maria Keola, was also known as Malia or Mary Kea. She was born in 1890 and according to the 1930 census record, Mary (Malia Kea) was married to John McCabe Jr., a policeman, and
had given birth to nine children, one of whom was Mary McCabe, later to become Mary Wong, noted kumu hula of He‘eia, and mother of Aloha Dalire, a contemporary kumu hula.

Domitilla was the name given to Kameha‘iku upon her baptism at St. Ann’s Catholic Church. It was common practice to change the names of kānaka `ōiwi upon their conversion, and converted kānaka were usually named after saints. Kameha‘iku married Sam Lono Jr. and bore him nine children, the last one was named Lorraine. Kameha‘iku died immediately after giving birth to Lorraine and saying she would come back for this baby. Perhaps she did because the infant died one month later.

It had been said that Kameha‘iku’s life was a difficult one, fraught with hard work, house making duties, the bearing of many children, and subject to the domestic difficulties between she and her kāne, Sam Ho`opi`i Lono Jr. These and perhaps other reasons unknown contributed to her early death and may explain why the two oldest siblings, Evelyn Domitilda and Samuel, took charge of their pōki`i, instead of their father.

Kameha‘iku gave birth to eleven children, two of them died at birth. My grandmother, Domitilla Evelyn Lono, was the eldest daughter of Sam Lono Jr. and Kameha‘iku Kea. My grandmother had one sister and seven brothers. After the death of Kameha‘iku (approximate date 1936-38), her two elder children took care of some of their siblings. Some of the brothers went with relatives. The remaining brothers went to an orphanage. Life was not easy for any of the Lono children, especially after the death of their mother.
What I remember of my grandmother (see Fig. 6), is that she was a business woman. By the time I was born, my grandmother had married Tai Ok Yang and they had purchased a house on Ko‘olau View Drive, across from Hawaiian Memorial Park, in Kāne‘ohe. My grandmother had started a taxi business, Kāne‘ohe Service Taxi. She had about six limousines which would carry a maximum of twelve people. She and her drivers would pick passengers up at their homes, and drop them off at the taxi stand on Fort Street in downtown Honolulu. These taxis would then make a return trip with passengers waiting to return home to Kāne‘ohe in town. Each driver did
about six runs a day, depending on business, starting early in the morning, and the last taxi
leaving town between 5:00 and 6:00 p.m.

When I was in seventh grade, I dispatched for my grandmother’s taxi service. Each
driver would pay me fifty cents. I would go right after school (King Intermediate) finished and
head for the taxi stand which was located where the current Kāne’ohe post office parking lot
stands. I would work until the last driver came in, and that driver would take me to my
grandmother’s house. I would turn over my earnings to my grandmother, she would give me
some for spending, and then put the rest in a savings account. It was great. I would watch my
Aunty Mary Wong, whose hula studio was right upstairs above the old post office building. I
would watch as they practiced, sometimes catching a glimpse of Aloha Wong, my cousin and her
boyfriend, John Dalire. Those were wonderful days. My grandmother had me attend sewing class
at the Singer Sewing Machine Store on Bishop Street every Saturday, taking some of my
earnings to pay for it. From this experience I learned how to sew, not expertly, but good enough.

My grandmother, through her taxi service, got to know a lot of people in He’e’ia and
Kāne’ohe and they, her. There were dozens of regular customers who made the trek to town for
work or holoholo, and back every day. Since there was no bus at that time, it was a very
successful business due to hard work of my grandmother.

One of the things that I remember was our marketing trips on the Saturdays. We would
start off at Foodland for regular groceries, then go to Dote Market for sliced luncheon meat,
bologna, and sometimes ham. My brother, sister and I used to make our lunches, luncheon meat
with a big rice ball wrapped up in wax paper, and bound with foil, so ono! After we returned
from marketing and were done with our chores, we’d go down to the old pali road and on to the
stream to catch swordtails. Oh those were the best times and most care-free times! We would
bring our fishes back and put them inside Tai Ok’s fish box in the back yard. But the one thing we always did before returning home from marketing was stop at Deluxe Bakery for a box of one dozen “Long Johns”, the best custard filled long doughnut in Kāne‘ohe. Those were the days!

By the time Kameha`iku had died, Evelyn was married to Raymond Gouveia, Sr. and had already had children of her own. Domitilla, Raymond, and family moved to downtown Honolulu. The children went to live with Dan and Malia Kea, close to Palama Settlement. Later, the children lived with their paternal aunt and her husband. Finally, my grandmother and grandfather, were able to afford a small apartment and moved the children into the apartment with them. For Anita, it was being finally being with her parents in their own place.
Chapter III: Where is `Ioleka`a?

Introduction: Who We Are and Where Do We Come From

For many kānaka `ōiwi, in the days of old as well as in contemporary times, introductions were paramount as they spoke not only to the identification of a person (s), but to place of origin. Today, it can be a casual exchange of who you are, your family connections, places of familiarity, and schools you attended. It might also be offered in a recitative form; perhaps a chant given as a kāhea or the calling out of a greeting as an initial introduction to a family and the land they live on. It can, on formal occasions, be a mele inoa or rendition of a mo`okūauhau, a formal genealogy of of for a person presented to the host. Whether as a kāhea, mele inoa or recitation of one’s genealogy, for most kanaka `ōiwi it was and remains a customary way in which to greet a visitor or request entry to call upon someone.

`A`ala i ka nāhelehele o `Ioleka`a

Fragrant is the forest of `Ioleka`a

Eia nei nā pua lehua nolu pē

Here are the graceful lehua blossoms,

Hiwahiwa no he makamae

So beloved, so precious

Hone i ka lono o ke ka`eke`eke,

Melodious is the sound of the ka`eke`eke,

Onaona i nā `awapuhi melemele

Fragrant is the yellow ginger

Ho`olahalaha o ke koa`ekea,

And the soaring koa`ekea
Me ke aloha pumehana,
With warm affection,
Aloha e, aloha e, aloha e
Welcome, welcome, welcome.36

The chant above, was composed at the request of my mother. Every year, our cousin Keola, (Aloha Dalire’s daughter) would bring the hālau onto the kuleana in ʻIoleka’a to gather ferns for hula. They would chant a kahea upon entering. Anita, who did not speak ʻōlelo Hawai‘i, would just say “Aloha, aloha kākou, mai, mai.” She felt so inadequate, and as the hālau made their way down the trail she whispered to me, “oh the shame us guys.” “Baby, promise me, when you pau with your Hawaiian language classes, you will write something for us so we can answer the hālau when they come in!” I promised.

This is the reason for the importance of introductions. The hālau would come down the path into the kuleana and chant, asking permission to enter and my mother felt that our pane was inadequate. She was right. My mother passed away before I was able to haku this ʻoli, but I know she is smiling every time we chant it.

This ʻoli is used as a kāhea or greeting chant, as well as a pāne, or response to a kāhea. It describes the notable characteristics of the land of ʻIoleka’a and informs through kaona, family associations and attributes threaded into the flora, fauna, and other distinct attributes of the land. Understanding the ʻāina as Papahānaumoku (earth mother) and as elder sibling requires a cognition which embraces the entire lay of the land, specifically the land of your own ancestors. From the mountain ridge to the valley floors, the streams, the gulches, the levels of forest and

36
Written by Kamehaʻiku Camvel at the request of her late mother, Anita, and was completed after her mother’s death in 1998.
canopies, the rain, the mist, the clouds, the wind; all of these things and many more, are the unique markers of the land and by extension, those who live there.

**Location and Description.** `Ioleka`a is an `ili or land section situated in the ahupua`a of He`e`ia and is located in the moku or district of Ko`olaupoko on the island of O`ahu in the state of Hawai`i. According to George Podmore’s 1934 survey of the ‘Ili, it is comprised of approximately 316.74 acres.

Nestled between Ha`ikū and Ahuimanu valleys on the windward side of the island, `Ioleka`a is an arc shaped forested valley containing numerous gulches and ravines. Within these gulches are trails, heiau, habitation sites, waterways, and streams. The forest is filled with Chinese bamboo, hau, `ulu, `ōhi`a `āi, kuawa, hapu`u, hō`io, `awapuhi, mango, various ferns and ti and a variety of other forest plants both native and introduced. There are an assortment of tropical flowers, yellow, white, red, pink and shell gingers, torch and kahili gingers as well as varieties of heleconia. Living in the valley are feral pigs, rats, and mongoose, as well as a number of bird species. The streams are filled with small fish and most recently discovered to our delight, `opae or freshwater shrimp endemic to Hawai`i. It is a fertile and lush forest valley. Waters flow into streams via two continuous sources; a cavity at the base of `Ioleka`a waterfall directly from the aquifer and a waterfall from a gulch that turns into a streamed named Kaiwike`e. Handy notes (1991, p. 455), “A small stream named Kaiwike’e flows into `Ioleka`a from southwestward in the Ko`olau range. Up all those valleys are old lo`i, now abandoned.”

Kaiwike’e and `Ioleka`a streams intertwine and become one (`Ioleka`a Stream) at the upper

---

agricultural terraces off the mountain trail to the source of the water. When rainfall is at its peak, the gulches and ravines are filled with a deluge of water creating cascades of magnificent waterfalls feeding the streams to full and sometimes over capacity.

At the top of the mountain or ridge of `Ioleka`a and to the east is Mauna Kapu overlooking Hālawa Valley. The `ili’s boundaries are the ridge lines of Ha`ikū, `Ioleka`a and Ahuimanu. From ma uka or mountain side to ma kai or seaward, the boundary that marks the end of the `ili is where `Ioleka`a stream meets Ha`iku stream and combines to become He`e`ia Stream. In the mid 1900’s this location was called Hoe and was described as being in the vicinity where Kahekili Highway and Ha`ikū Road meets today.

Family Relationships. My first memory of `Ioleka`a valley is as a child, perhaps 10 years of age or so, in 1962. I had gone there with my brother and sister, my mother, my grandmother, and my uncles and we were making our way beyond the old house and ma uka into the valley. My uncles wanted to plant watercress in the lo`i located in what is identified as the Nā‘ipu parcel. What I recall most vividly is the way in which we traversed the land, following the old trails, my uncles cutting away at bamboo and brush. I remember the sounds that I heard along the way, in particular the whacking and pinging of the cane knives my uncles used to cut and clear the path ahead of us. The Chinese bamboo was more than abundant, it seemed to crisscross everywhere, at every point, enveloping us in an endless landscape of muted greens, yellows, tans, and browns. These colors were indicative of the bamboo’s various stages of maturity, but what my eight year old eyes drunk in was the immensity of what seemed to be, the never ending bamboo forest.
As we traveled ma uka on the trail, we hung on to the bamboo to help steady and balance us, stepping on some that were on the ground, making a crackling and crunching noise beneath our booted feet as we walked. I remember seeing my mother and my grandmother clear away the dead bamboo, striking the dead ones away, out of their path, with their hands. Because they were dead, they fell promptly to the side, but to my eyes and mind, that was the magical power of my mother and my grandmother, a memory that is very vivid. When we arrived to our destination, a lo‘i that was approximately ten feet square and still intact, my uncles began the work of cleaning it, removing encroaching weeds, plants, pōhaku, and other such forest growth. I
imagine it made for quick day’s work by virtue of its size. I reflect on this now because when it was time for us to return home, the sounds and feel of the water flowing through the lo‘i and the mushiness of the thick mud under my boots could only be possible if the lo‘i was cleared, planted, and watered, and that it was! Hence it made for a wonderful end to a most delightful day, which seemed to me, had whizzed by so quickly.

These are memories which have now become the moʻolelo of ʻIolekaʻa. In the ensuing years of my childhood I spent time in many places with different family members, eventually being taken to the continent after my parents were divorced in 1963. The memory of ʻIolekaʻa became dreamlike. The kuleana became a mystery, and within the family dynamic of the 1960’s, acquired an almost fearful reputation. Life moved on, we moved out of Kaneʻohe and then to California. The mountain became a distant memory, and after a while, hardly a thought.

In the ensuing years of moving from one place to another, one family to another, my siblings and I, just as my mother and her siblings, lost connections with the ʻāina, and my siblings and I, with Heʻeʻia, with Kaneʻohe, and with much of our ʻōiwi ʻohana. I never lost sight of my homeland nor the strong desire to return, but ʻIolekaʻa was not a part of that sight in those days.

Moʻokūʻauhau: the Succession of Blood on the Land. With the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941, the impact of World War II was felt in the islands. Hawaiʻi would change and the kuleana land in ʻIolekaʻa would be directly impacted. Gouveia states,

38 Portion of testimony given on Senate Bill 3328, Senate Draft 1 at the Hawaiʻi State Legislature pertaining to kuleana lands.
We were forbidden to use our taro lands near the mountains because the military used our property and the surrounding lands for target practice and war maneuvers. When the war was over, we were discouraged from returning to the land because of the fear of live ordnances on and around the property. Still, our family managed to plant on the few terraces that had not been damaged by the military or overgrown with hao and bamboo that had taken over most of the property during the family’s absence.

During World War II, many lands possessed or lived on by kānaka `ōiwi were condemned or taken by executive order (i.e. Mōkapu, Waikāne, He`e`ia Kea, Pali,) for military use and/or training. After the end of war, housing and economic development fueled by tourism became a critical agenda of the newly established State of Hawai`i in 1959. It would be responsible for further alienating kānaka `ōiwi from lands they once held. Directly related to the family kuleana in `Ioleka`a, and in particular, access issues, Gouveia relates the following,

In the 1950’s and 60’s, we were forced to sell the two ma kai parcels to land developers, who created giant subdivisions to fill the need to house a burgeoning population on Oahu. In doing so, our access to our property in the mauka area given no consideration until an order39 was issued by the State Courts on our behalf.

In 1942, before she could return to the kuleana, Kahanupaoa died at Kapahulu where she had gone to live with her grandson and his wife. She was forced to leave `Ioleka`a when the

39 Haiku Plantations Associations, ET. AL., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. Samuel Lono, ET AL. No. 6449. This case settled the issues of egress, ingress, easements, and parking via private and state land for access to the kuleana.
military took over during the war and the `āina of `Ioleka`a was bereft of `ohana until the late 1950’s, early 1960’s when Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III, returned to the Līhu`e kuleana.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Age at Census</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lono (k)</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Married 19 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahele (w)</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Married² (26 yrs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imoehalau (k)</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lono, Jr. (k)</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ku (k)</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza (w)</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owaanui (k)</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahea</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana (k)</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Single/Lodger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in the census record of 1900 clearly states Lono as head of household (father), and Lono, Jr. as son. The record also notes this marriage as Kahele's second. What is also made clear is the relationship of Samuel Lono III to Lono Jr. (Samuel Lono, Jr.) which is corroborated by the data in the table above. This information was not accessible to the Lono family in He`e`ia because Samuel Lono Jr. did not speak about his family. As both my mother and aunt have confirmed, “Papa never spoke about his family in Kohala, nothing, not a word.” We may never know the reason why he left Kohala, or the cause for his refusal to speak of his
family, but one thing is certain. He was Samuel Lono Jr. and that made Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono a third. This indicates the longevity of the name, for in the naming, there is the continuance of ancestral genealogy and the mana attached to it.

Table 2. United States, Department of Commerce-Bureau of the Census, Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930 (Form 15-70), Population-Hawaii. Honolulu, Koolaupoko. Island of Oahu, City of Heeia, April 1930.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Age at Census</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lono, Samuel</td>
<td>Head of Household</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitilda</td>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domitilda</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Jr.</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustine</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecelia</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>3 7/12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>2 6/12</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paoa Kahanu</td>
<td>Mother-in-law</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above explains the connection of the Lono genealogy to the Kahanu and Paoa genealogies, a result of the marriage of Sam Lono Jr. to Kameha`iku Kea. At least two of their children, Evelyn and Samuel Lono III, would inherit the healing powers of their Lono lineage through their father and his Hawai`i island ancestors, but it would be Sam Lono III who would step into the role as kahuna la`au lapa`au, acquiring the `ike of his ancestors with and through the
teachings of his kupuna. When Sam Lono III returned to the ʻIli of ʻIolekaʻa, it had been many years since the moʻopuna had walked upon the land. The ʻāina, had been waiting, and the family had finally returned.

Samuel Hoʻopiʻi Lono III

The story about Samuel Hoʻopiʻi Lono III is one that is complicated, confusing, and legendary, but it is a narrative about the discovery or reinforcement of a kanaka ʻōiwi identity through the connection to blood and the land. As is the case with most families, the dynamics could be contentious. Certainly the early lives of Sam Lono Jr. and Kamehaʻiku’s children was difficult enough, a story grounded by the harsh and contentious impositions of colonialism and racism. However kānaka ʻōiwi are passionate, fierce, loving, and loyal and the love for the ʻāina is the love for their ancestor. In retrospect, the ʻāina would become the puʻuhonua for this family’s members, at least those who would choose to return to the ʻāina.

I have two vivid memories of Sam Lono III, or Uncle Sonny, as we called him. The first is in 1970. I was driving home from Waikīkī Beach, where all of us kids had gone to spend a lovely summer day. The Volkswagen van had a bed in the back, but the gate to close the bed was missing. There were about six kids in the back, one of them, my sister Tracy. As we came to the corner of Kahekili Highway and Haʻiku Road (not far from the entrance to ʻIolekaʻa) the light changed and I down shifted into third and second gears of the van. As I down shifted, my sister, who was at the end of bed, her back facing the street, and was adjusting her slipper, fell off the bed of the van and onto the street. The kids screamed and I stopped the car immediately. I was deathly afraid she would be run over by the car behind us and her head would be smashed. I ran to the back of the van in a panic, the rest of the kids, screaming her name, scrambling off the van
and strangers starting to form a crowd around my sister who was lying on the ground. I was in a frenzy, worried about my sister, not knowing what to do.

All of a sudden Uncle Sonny was there. He knelt down, touched my sister, making sure she was okay, telling us to get a blanket for her. He stood up and told me nothing was broken and that she would be alright. I was crying but happy as I knelt down to comfort her. When the ambulance arrived, I looked for uncle but he had dissapeared. In the end he was right, at the hospital later that evening, the family was told my sister had a hair-line fracture but would be perfectly fine.

According to the 1930 census, Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III was born in 1918 to Sam Lono Jr. and Kamehaiku Kea Lono. Uncle Sonny’s activity in the years between his birth and 1925 are not documented however, from 1925-26 until his death, he received knowledge from various kupuna, mentor, and ancestors and by the early 1960’s was beginning to establish himself as a cultural practitioner. The Temple of Lono’s biography on Kahuna Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono provides a timeline for his activities and states that, “from 1973 to 1979, Sam Lono taught classes on Hawaiian culture and religion at `Ioleka`a when he lost his sight and mobility. He has lectured at the University of Hawai`i, Community Colleges, and several high schools and intermediate schools throughout the state.” Much of what I know about uncle’s time in the valley from the years of about 1970 to 1985, is a reflection of the notes left by his haumana, chance encounters, and family information.

Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III was a kahuna la`au lapa`au, “a person able to heal and cure through the use of medicinal plants and herbs” (Andrews 321), as well as pule and `oli. There were four crucial events that took place at critical locations which would set the standard of what

40 Notes from the late J.J. Hall.
is referred to as the “Hawaiian Renaissance” period and move Sam Lono III into the public sphere. These occurrences would be the catalyst for the reclaiming and positioning of `ōiwi religion (based on the freedom of religious act) and the right to practice that religion on ancestral lands. It would also become the central model in the process for kānaka `ōiwi to acquire and maintain access onto ancestral lands, temples, and heiau in order to sustain kānaka `ōiwi spirituality or religious nourishment. These concerns would be the genesis for protest and the activation of kānaka `ōiwi “kū`ē i kō ha`i mana`o” or the opposing of others who would seek to marginalize kānaka `ōiwi to the fringes of what had become a militarily occupied, democratized, and capitalist society.

Kalama Valley. “As the first major struggle of the Movement, Kalama Valley was a precursor, a dress rehearsal for successful struggles a few years later. Many Kalama participants would reappear in these resistance efforts with improved organizing skills and a clearer sense of direction” (Trask 146). The Kalama Valley protests were motivated by the evictions of the last remnant of families living in the valley by Bishop Estate (now Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate). Located in this rural valley were a mix of subsistence farmers, construction workers, and others employed and making a meager living. As Trask describes, “They lived in old wooden houses with their animals nearby. Piggeries existed alongside food gardens and auto repair shops in a non-urban style variously described by residents as “Hawaiian” and “local” (129). Bishop

41 This Act became law on August 11, 1978 (Public Law 95-341, 42 U.S.C. 1996 and 1996a) and has been amended once. It provides for the inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and Native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites.
Estate wanted to develop a subdivision and were in the process of re-locating 150 families from the valley. Those who refused to go were served eviction notices. This was a symptomatic example of the struggle between classes, the elite against the poor, Bishop Estate against the poor lesees who had month-to-month leases on their Kalama Valley land. Sam Lono knew well the behavior of Bishop Estate. In the ensuing years after returning to the family kuleana in ‘Ioleka’a, the relationship between Bishop Estate, Ha`iku Plantations Association, and Samuel Lono III would not always be a cordial one. Issues associated with access, right of way, and the presence of a kanaka `ōiwi kahuna in the valley made everyone nervous. It didn’t really matter that the family had the right to access and/or live on the kuleana. It mattered that “those” people were down there in “their” valley. The following is a good description of the relationship between the gated community members of Ha`iku Plantations and the kuleana land owners of ‘Ioleka’a.

The plight of Sam Lono, a kuleana landowner and kahuna in Haiku Valley was reported by a newspaper out of the Ethnic Studies Department at the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa. In response to Lono’s repeated complaints of harassment by Haiku Plantations subdivision, the developer Ken Smith charged Lono with trespassing on subdivision roads in his effort to reach his kuleana deep in the valley. By law, Lono had the legal right of access through the subdivision. Residents also harassed Lono’s visitors, including school children, who came to learn about Hawaiian medicinal herbs. Lono, in turn, rightly argued that subdivision residents were trespassing on his land to reach trailheads deep in

42 The name of the newspaper was Huli.
the valley (*Huli* November 1972:10). But the cause for the harassment of Lono stemmed from the fact that the subdivision itself was built on Bishop Estate land (Najita 148).

Similar to Lono’s plight on the family’s kuleana, the Kalama Valley residents were subjected to the same kind of treatment. At the time of the forced eviction of the remaining families, Lono cursed the trustees of Bishop Estate. The Huli reported that,

> Trustee William van Allen refused to have Lono arrested along with his fellow protestors. Lono, being a kahuna, put a curse on the four remaining Bishop Estate trustees (one died recently). Lono said that they would be sick for a long time and not know why” (*Huli* May 1971:5). In 1971 police arrested Lono and some of his relatives for initiating a control burn on his property in order to plant medicinal herbs and taro. Lono viewed this action as harassment that prevented the practice and maintenance of culture; “Every time we try to do something to preserve our Hawaiian culture, these rich people make complaints against us. This kind of harassment from people like the Homeowner’s Association, the Bishop Estate, the State and the rich developers, has been going on for seven years. If they think we going to give in, they’re wrong! Cause we going fight!” (*Huli* October 1972: 6).

The problems associated with the development of land for subdivisions, in particular after statehood, created burgeoning laws which constricted access and use of kuleana and other lands that were being looked at as potential money makers. As more lands were expanded or acquired for economic development and housing, more and more kānaka `ōiwi were feeling the bite of economic, housing, health, and educational disparities. They were being pushed to the margins of society, many unable to afford to buy a home, let alone rent a house. Many kāa `ōiwi became
houseless. These issues were extremely difficult, as exemplified in the Kalama Valley case and the protest of the evictions of the people living there. It would also serve as lessons in the articulation of the kānaka `ōiwi voice, their representation, and organization. As the impetus for resistance, it would become the nucleus in the near future for the kū`ē of kānaka `ōiwi.

*Kanaloa Kahoʻolawe.* Kanaloa Kahoʻolawe\(^\text{43}\) became the catalyst for protest against the continuing use of the island as a military bombing target and the ongoing desecration of the `ōiwi landscape. The symbolism, measured in the desecration of both land and kānaka `ōiwi was obvious. In this resistance kūpuna, kāhuna, and kahu participated, providing `ōiwi ceremonial chants, prayers, and dances to serve as the rituals necessary for the re-opening, revival, restoration, and protection of Kanaloa Kahoʻolawe. This island became the metaphor for kānaka `ōiwi body, mind, and spirit, accentuating the last 200 years of continuing abuse. The bombing was stopped\(^\text{44}\) but it came with a cost, the lives of two young men,\(^\text{45}\) memorialized forever, in song, chant, and mo`olelo.

Samuel Lono III, along with Emma DeFries, and other noted kūpuna were brought in by the Protect Kahoʻolawe `Ohana (PKO) to provide Hawaiian expertise and knowledge about the cultural sites on Kahoʻolawe. According to Spriggs, “There was an insistence that Hawaiian

\(^{43}\) `Ōiwi name for Kahoʻolawe is Kanaloa.

\(^{44}\) In 1990 the bombing of Kahoʻolawe was stopped by Executive Order of President George Bush, Sr. through the efforts of Protect Kahoʻolawe `Ohana or PKO.

\(^{45}\) In 1977 George Helm, Billy Mitchell, and Kimo Mitchell set out to Kahoʻolawe. With one longboard, one short board and a set of fins between them, they departed into the rough seas between Māui and Kahoʻolawe. Billy returned to the Māui shore on the longboard and George Helm and Kimo Mitchell were never seen again, and presumed drowned.
Kupuna (elders) play a role in the study and interpretation and activists raised the specter of an alternative prehistory to be constructed from the memories of respected kupuna rather than the research of university-trained archaeologists” (124). In other words, the `ohana wanted kānaka `ōiwi kūpuna instead of the archaeologists from the University of Hawai`i, scholars from the Bishop Museum, or the state appointed experts.

This was the beginning of great change as the `ōiwi voice began to be heard and precedence was becoming established, but it would be a difficult task for Sam Lono as he began to express his mana`o on what he thought were appropriate `ōiwi rituals or ceremony associated with the cultural sites and heiau located on Kaho`olawe. He had concerns about PKO and leadership, and was at odds with the direction the organization was heading. In 1977, on behalf of PKO, environmental attorney, Cynthia Thielen, won the right of access for the group to the island. It would be Kahuna Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono that would open up the Temple of Kū and Hina at Hakioawa on Kaho`olawe. It would not be the first or the last time Lono would re-consecrate and rededicate heiau.

*The Right to Ingress and Egress: Samuel Lono versus Ha`ikū Plantations Association.* The 1970s in Hawai`i were tense years. These are the years when kānaka `ōiwi were finding their voices and using them in protest. Kānaka `ōiwi were pushing against the system, the state, and the courts. Ha`ikū Plantations is a subdivision that was built in the 1960’s. Located in `Ioleka`a valley, it was a high-end gated community, and the people who lived there were not exactly happy with a kahuna in their backyard valley. The family became “those” people and an adversarial relationship was unavoidable then and exists, to some extent, now.
In the building of this subdivision, the right of way to `Ioleka`a was paved over with an asphalt road. In 1966, Bishop Estate sought to re-align the easement over Haiku Plantations Drive. The Land Court decree of 1966 realigned the right of way over the newly established and privately maintained Haiku Plantations Drive. The court decided that the kuleana had ingress and egress rights but did not have the right to park vehicles.

The history of the court case is implicative of the bourgeois attitudes toward kānaka `ōiwi at that time, the idea being, to rid the valley of those Hawaiians, then the valley will be exclusively for the gated community. It was the epic battle brought about by the “sweeping” of the neighborhoods to make room for the incoming foreigners who were flocking to Hawai`i and for which, housing was needed. For Lono, it was a battle that needed to be fought. Since the asphalt road had paved over the right of way, there was a presumption that Lono no longer had access onto the family kuleana. Ha`ikū Plantations Association thought not. The following appeal filed by the association elucidates the kind of tension that permeated the environment of these times and in this case between Lono and the community of Ha`ikū Plantations. In Haiku Plantations Association versus Sam Lono case,46 it is stated that the, plaintiffs, Haiku Plantations Association, Samuel Eason, Marijane Golding, Jay Rockstead, Glenn Mowry, David Moncrief, Henry Walker, Marian Halberg and Herbert Halberg, filed in the circuit court on December 22, 1972, a complaint for injunctive relief to mandate defendant, Samuel Lono, Jr., to remove structures and tents that he caused to be erected and to fill and restore the open cooking pit that he caused to be excavated, and to restrain all defendants from (1) parking any vehicles within the Haiku Plantations subdivision, except as a guest of a resident

or owner of a home in such subdivision; (2) erecting any structures or tents or other shelters or otherwise trespassing upon the Haiku Plantations Subdivision; (3) trampling or otherwise damaging plantings or depositing trash or litter upon property of the Haiku Plantations Subdivision; and (4) assembling or conducting any public meetings or other gatherings or otherwise trespassing upon such property. As is customary the complaint further prayed that plaintiffs have such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper. Plaintiffs also filed, together with the complaint, a motion for an order to proceed against the unidentified defendants, an affidavit of counsel for plaintiffs, purporting to support the motion for an order to proceed against unidentified defendants, and the order of the court to proceed against unidentified defendants. They also filed, together with the complaint, a motion for temporary restraining order, a motion for preliminary injunction, seven affidavits to support and uphold the issuance of a temporary restraining order, and a certificate of efforts and reasons which was executed by counsel for the plaintiffs.

It appears that the Ha`iku Plantations Association wanted to make access difficult, if not impossible for Lono. Lono appealed the decision to include parking on the easement for himself and visitors. That appeal was not successful by the courts decision which agreed to access, but not to parking.

Today, the family parks at the top of the trailhead at the end of Ha`iku Plantations Drive. There is the common area where the asphalt road ends and where the easement begins. This area is where family members have been parking since the late 1970’s. Up until now, there has been
no major dispute between the kuleana land owners or Ha`iku Plantations Association, but the court’s decision is still in place and will need be rectified in the future.

*The Temple of Lono.* The Temple of Lono was formed in 1978 by Samuel Lono III and his haumana. The temple was dedicated to the traditional Hawaiian religion and traditional Hawaiian thinking. On March 6, 1980, Sam Lono, Robert Hudson, and Frank K. Nobriga filed a petition for a charter of incorporation with the State of Hawai`i under “The Temple of Lono” giving it a non-profit status. The president was Tahuna Nui Pari Tu-Samuel H. Lono. Vice President was Robert Hudson, a long-time companion and aide to Lono, and Frank Nobriga, a haumana, was the secretary. Three other haumana, J. J. Hall, Alden Herter, and Clive L. Cabral, served as directors. The corporation was organized for religious and cultural purposes; to practice the ancient Hawaiian religion including its cultural activities. It would be the Temple of Lono under the direction of Kahuna Sam Lono that would continue forge the path of persistence and resistance. This time the site was Mōkapu or as Lono called it, Mo`okapu.47

*Mō`okapu.* According to a newspaper resource,48 Samuel Lono III and his haumana “requested that the Marines reconstruct a “Temple of Ku” on the Kāne`ohe Air Station.” According to Lono, the Kū and Hina heiau had been destroyed when the construction of the base began in 1930. In challenging Lono’s assertion, the Marines used Dr. Kenneth Emory, a non-kanaka `ōiwi to

47 Lono considered the name Mo`okapu” to be the sacred name of Mōkapu . I believe this to be alignment with Haumea, the mo`o, of whose associations are particularly numerous within the ahupua`a that border the Bay of Kāne`ohe and are prominent in the mo`olelo of Ko`olaupoko.

refute the existence of a Kū temple. Based on Emory’s analysis, it was not a Kū heiau that was there, but a fishing shrine to Kāne and Kanaloa. Lono’s request was denied by the marine corps.

The following statement made by Kenneth Emory is an example of the racist environment by which the elite functioned. In the interest of protecting the institutional knowledge of the museum and scholars, Emory positions his prejudice, using carefully chosen words (this, these, we) when he stated,

We’ve experienced this springing up of kahunas before, he said. For a long time,

Daddy Bray was the one. Now there is a new crop. These individuals (Hawaiian religious leaders) have little in common. We as anthropologists are interested in the phenomenon of the evolution of Hawaiian culture. It’s changing. But it is departing widely from what has been passed down to us by earlier Hawaiians.

The context of his statement is by no means subtle in its provincialism. Sectarian in nature, it elucidates the social culture of the times and the treatment of kānaka `ōiwi, especially those who were “making trouble.” Lono’s response to Emory is a story that makes clear the reason for kānaka `ōiwi distrust of museums, scholars, and other such institutions as he relates the story,

One of the authoritative references says he was told that a man named George Moa took the sacred stones representing Kane and Kanaloa on the fishing shrine and threw them into Kaneohe Bay. Later, the man went insane, the source said.

His name was not Moa, said Lono. It was Moore. He was a black man and he lived with my auntie. He never did nothing and he was pupule already when he threw the stones in the water. My family went and got them back.

Lono’s request for the reconstruction of the Kū temple was denied by the Marine Corp Base.

Even as they stated their encouragement in requests for worship on the base as set forth in the
American Indian Religious Freedom Act, they still denied Lono the right to rebuild what had been destroyed, the temple in which to do precisely what the military said it encouraged; the right to practice or worship at ʻōiwi temple sites.

Lono also requested of Col. M. H. Sautter, permission to hold a Makahiki Festival to raise funds for the Temple of Lono. This request was also denied by the base as the Dept. of Defense regulations prohibit the solicitation of funds on board military installations. Lono’s response was to go ahead and make plans for a religious makahiki anyway to be held at Kūau, or what was renamed by the military and now known as Pyramid Rock.

In September of 1980, Lono was given tentative permission to hold the Makahiki festival, but there were conditions attached to his request. Lono had sent out announcements asking people to bring pōhaku with them to the makahiki. These pōhaku would contain the mana of those who had brought them, and in Lono’s words, “the more stones, the more mana will be added to the temple.” This he did in spite of being told he could not rebuild the temple of Kū.

The Kāneʻohe Marine Corps response was conditional stating, “all rocks brought as religious offerings would be removed after Makahiki. Any remaining on the base will be disposed of in any manner deemed appropriate by the Marine Corps.” The Temple of Lono did not respond to the letter stating thirteen additional conditions as part of the permission to hold the Makahiki at Moʻokapu.

Because Lono did not respond, the Marine Corps withdrew their tentative approval for the Makahiki festival. Lono acknowledged, “he had not answered the letter, however he would

---

49 This Act became law on August 11, 1978 (Public Law 95-341, 42 U.S.C. 1996 and 1996a) and has been amended once. It provides for the inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut, and Native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rites.
go on with the plans for the Makahiki. If they’re going to stop me, they’ll have to arrest me at the gate.” On October 12th 1980, Kahuna Sam Ho’opi’i Lono III, conducted ceremony at Mo’okapu, something that had not been done since 1819.

Bob Krauss describes the event. He says, “The sun was shining when Lono started chanting. By the time he finished, the sky had clouded over. He waited, watching the sky. Then a brief shower pelted down. Pretty soon, the sun came out again.” The rain was the hoʻailona that the gods were pleased and all was pono.

Lono held his ceremony and the Makahiki Festival went on. It was well attended, and many pōhaku were in fact brought to the event. True to their word, the base did remove any remaining pōhaku, casting them into the bushes that fringe the area. When the family returned to Kū`au in 2001, we found some of those pōhaku. Other pōhaku were taken to people’s homes for safekeeping so that they would not be so carelessly discarded. It is interesting to note that the `ohana, who began to celebrate the opening and closing of Makahiki at Mōkapu, built a kuʻahu for Kū around 2005 or 2006. I believe our kūpuna knew exactly what would happen. When opportunities arise at the right time, with the right people, the work of the kūpuna begins and `ike is given. Therefore, my draw to Moʻokapu is not one of coincidence, but of timing. Samuel Hoʻopiʻi Lono III fought for access to Moʻokapu. He maintained the right to practice ʻōiwi religion through adversity, harassment, and roadblocks, and in the end, he persevered and was successful.

---

Kualoa. In 1982 Sam Lono and his haumana went to Kualoa “to establish access, set up the
Temple of Lono, and rededicate the Pu’uhonua Lehua at Kualoa.” What Lono referred to as the
Pu’uhonua, is the seat of the Temple of Lono, the last surviving remnant of a line of priests who
dedicated themselves to the god Lono.

The Temple of Lono had set up a small compound consisting of tents for protection from
weather and to provide shelter for sleeping and cooking. The dedication of the Pu’uhonua Lehua
took place on the grounds and life for the members, their visitors and guests, extended in relative
peace with the exception of citations for illegal camping. What the temple members described as
worship, the city saw as illegal camping, and having cited them a year before, they again issued
fifty four citations over a ten day period in June of 1982.

Lono and his haumana went to court with the city. It would be an ongoing battle over the
right to access and practice `ōiwi religion at Kualoa. In this action, Samuel Lono III would
substantiate and set precedence in articulating his kānaka `ōiwi rights. Norgren and Nanda
clearly establish this when they describe the events that occurred at the Temple of Lono at
Kualoa in 1982. Here, they write to the crux of the matter in the situation that occurred. They
report,

In 1982, another case involving Native Hawaiian religious rights also attracted
wide media attention. Sam Lono, a Hawaiian religious leader, and his followers
were forcibly evicted from a several-months-long religious retreat in Kualoa Park,
an area in Oahu sacred to Native Hawaiians, because summer camping is
prohibited by state law. Most of the citations were dismissed and only small fines
were imposed, but Lono challenged the eviction and fines in court as a violation

51
of his religious freedom, citing state and federal constitutions and also the 1978 Federal American Indian Religious Freedom Act. This Act commits the federal government to protect and preserve the traditional religions of Native Americans and Native Hawaiians, “including, but not limited to access to sites, and the freedom to worship through ceremonials and traditional rights. They further explain,

The District Court rejected Lono’s claim, holding that “Defendant’s religious interest in participating in dreams at Kualoa Regional Park are not indispensable to the Hawaiian religious practice-[and]-[D]efendants’ practices in exercising their religious beliefs- [sic]are philosophical and personal and therefore not entitled to First Amendment protection.” The Hawaii Supreme Court, in its affirmation of the District Court’s Decision, further asserted that the state has a “compelling interest” in enforcing its camping regulations. These opinions highlighted the difficulty indigenous peoples, whose spiritual systems of belief and practices differ from America’s dominant Judeo-Christian tradition, face in gaining legal protection of their religious rights (30).

The establishment of the Temple of Lono became the organizational power behind the continued resistance and assertion of access rights to traditional lands, providing a precedence for the next and following generations in the insistence for those rights and access to those sites. These are the rights, which today, are embodied in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

Sam Lono was persistent in his resistance. He was passionate about his cultural practice and could be fiery and fierce, as anyone who knew him could attest to. He provided the direction
on the path of resistance, and little did he know, the ancestors would work their guidance into the succeeding generations based on what he had accomplished.

Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III passed away in 1985, on the very family `āina that had nurtured him, provided a pu`uhonua, a classroom, a sanctuary, and a home for him. He was a pioneer in the articulation of kānaka `ōiwi rights of access and the practice of our culture, our ho`omana or our religion and should be recognized as such. What he set in motion in the early 1970’s in Kalama Valley would lead the way to Mo`okapu, and then Kualoa.

Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia

*Tūnihinihi i nā pali wēkīu o `Ioleka`a*
Sheer are the peaking cliffs of `Ioleka`a

`ʻOlu`olu i ta aulia o te koa`ekea `ano alaheo
Graceful is the flight of the koa`ekea, now departed

*Ho`ani i ta wā iā ta nāhele `ohe tapa a Tāne*
The wā beckons to the bamboo forest

*Te tali nei i ta ua tea e pāne i ta noe*
White is the mist that lingers in answer

*Te mapu anuhea mai nei te `ala*
It is the fragrance of the maile hāpu`u

*o ta maile hāpu`u*
that wafts in the breeze

*Eia ku`u lei aloha*
My lei of aloha
Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia was born on June 12, 1934 on the day of a Muku Moon. Her mother, Domitilla Evelyn Lono, was the eldest child of Kamehaʻiku Kea Lono and Samuel Lono, Jr. Anita’s father was Raymond Gouveia, a man whose family had come to the Hawaiian islands from the Azores in Portugal. Anita was the eldest child of three children, her siblings, Priscilla Pamaialoha and her brother, Raymond Jr.

When the children were younger, the family lived in the back of Palama Settlement, in a Japanese camp on Sing Loy Lane. It was referred to as, Anita writes, “Sumida Camp.” She continues,

52 Mele inoa (name chant) written by the author for the `Aha Waimaka or gathering for the first years anniversary for the death of a loved one, in this case for Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia, the author’s mother.
They lived there with Aunty Malia, Uncle Dan and their family. In the summer of 1941, Anita and her siblings lived with Aunty Mary, their father’s sister, and Uncle Joe, her husband on Io Lane in Lanakila. As she recalls in her notes, “the only day that was largely awaited was Sunday when our parents would come to get us for the afternoon. It would begin at Roosevelt Cafe for lunch. After lunch, we were sent out to play at Aala Park. I loved the park.

Later, they moved, with their parents, Evelyn and Raymond, to 57 N. Kukui Street. For Anita is was a palace. She describes it as “a two story plastered concrete walk up with twenty rooms, three bathrooms, two showers, and one tub.” It was a busy time and the place where they lived was downtown Honolulu, smack in the middle of everything. It was 1941 and on December 7th of that year Japan attacked Pearl Harbor and Hawai`i was in a state of war.

Anita started Royal School in 1941, entering the second grade and attending up until the fifth grade finishing her sixth grade class at Likelike School. In 1946, the family moved back to He‘e`ia where she attended Benjamin Parker School. Anita attended Wallace Rider Farrington High school, was a song leader (see Fig. 9), and graduated in 1952. One of the stories my mother would tell my sister and I, is of how my grandmother would sew their dresses for both Anita and her sister, Pamaialoha. My mother told us, “Mama would sew these beautiful dresses for us, for me and Cilla. They were better than the store bought ones because mama could sew really well.” She went on to describe the style of a poodle skirt her mother had sewn for her, along with crinoline slips to make it poof. I was impressed. This story provided yet another talent that I was not aware my grandmother had. Maybe that’s why she sent me to sewing class on Bishop Street every other Saturday!
Anita was a very good writer and story teller. So was her sister, my Aunt Pamai. Pamai’s memories of the pāhale in Heʻeʻia were vivid. In a note to her daughter amongst the collection in my mother’s folder, she describes,

Fig. 9. Anita as a song leader at a Farrington High-school, around 1954. Personal photo collection.

The one-room house and porch was in the back of and a little to the left of this tree (mew lan tree). My grandmother had all of her children in this house. It had a long porch with wooden windows that dropped close to the porch when it rained. The kitchen-house was to the right and in back of the house. It had a kerosene stove, a wooden sink, a food safe, and a large table with benches. The outhouse
was about 50 yards or so further to the right and needless to say, we always had to look for it since locations were changed frequently. Where do you bathe? The spring was down the hill, ice cold, but as kids we used it as a pool; it was enclosed in concrete, square, about 5-6 feet by 2-3 feet. There was water at the house site, but not for bathing unless you wanted to squat under a pipe.

These were some of the memories of my mother and her sister as they moved about from the country to the city and back again. It was a different time, a hard time, but filled with many good times amidst the hard knocks of life in those years.

The story of how my father met my mother is another funny story. It would be at the pāhale in He`e`ia where they would first meet, around 1951. My mom used to recount this story about their first meeting,

One of my friends had come to the house (He`e`ia) to visit. She had brought this guy with her. When they arrived to the house, I was up in the mango tree picking common mango. Here she comes with this guy, me in the tree, hair all wild, clothes all raged and these two guys get out of the car. There they are, down on the ground, and she says, hey Nita, here’s someone I’d like you to meet! So, I had to climb down the tree in my junky shirt and shorts, all sticky from the mango sap, my hands and face dirty, to meet this guy named Donald.

Anita and Donald were married in the year that I was born in 1954. Two years later my brother Donald was born, and two years after that my sister Tracy was born. My father was in the Coast Guard, and then joined the Merchant Marines. He was often away at sea for months at a time. Then he would come home and we would have so much fun. We lived in Waikīkī and my mother eventually found work as a cocktail waitress to earn extra money.
I remember those days as happy and filled with fun. We lived where Discovery Bay is now, in a three story apartment complex called the Sun Apartments. The people were very close in those days and we could call Waikīkī our backyard the same way my mother would recall her time on Kukui Street. My parents separated and we moved to Kāne‘ohe with my mother’s mom, then to Kalihi with my father’s mother, and finally to Moanalua with my father’s sister. Anita and Donald divorced in 1985 but remained friends.

In 1988, my sister and I returned from Mountain View, California, having lived with my father after my parents divorced in 1985. At that time, my mother’s partner was Ernest Nalani Heen Jr. or “Juggie” as everyone knew him. When we returned from the continent, we went to live in Kāne‘ohe with my grandmother. In 1968 or 1969, my mother and Juggie were married and we moved to a house in Punalu‘u behind Kaya Store. It was a wonderful time and I have many happy memories of that place. We were a large family, with Juggie’s five children and my mother’s three children, we were like the Hawaiian “Brady Bunch.”

Later, we moved to Ka`a`awa, then did a stint we at Swanzy Park, camping when money was short. I loved that too, but of course my mother did not. Eventually, we moved into Kekoa Ka`apu’s house in Kualoa and finally, back to a cute little house in Ka`a`awa near Kauhi `īmakaokalani or Crouching Lion.

Those were formative years, and my mother and Juggie had many, many friends. Both of them loved the culture, the arts, books, food, music, and politics. My mother became an avid listener, a keen and astute observer. Anita and Juggie were very much in love, and it was a very passionate and tumultuous relationship.

In 1974, Anita Heen decided to move the island of Hawai`i. My sister had not yet graduated from high school and by the time I returned from the continent my mother had moved
to Hawai`i island. She just decided one day, made the arrangements, and went to look for a place to live. It would be this move that would change the direction and path of her life, her identity, and her awareness of herself as kanaka ʻōiwi woman. Juggie was working on O`ahu, and would come frequently on the weekends, sometimes longer. This arrangement worked out well for a while.

*Kukuihaele.* When initially looking for a place to live, she had bypassed the house in Kukuihaele, not knowing that she was destined to live there because, it was the ʻāina of her ancestors. The “Summer Palace” was a two story house, built most likely in 1930’s or 40’s (see Fig.10). It was located in Kukuihaele on the road to Waipi`o Valley, across the street from Fanny and Willyama Kanekoa’s house. It was a wonderful old wooden house with a tin roof, a huge lanai upstairs that was the width of the house, from which you had a bird’s eye perspective. On the bottom of the house was an old store, still intact, but in pretty bad shape. My mother’s plan was to open up that store, but for the time being, the summer palace way my mother’s sanctuary. She finally had a house of her own-even if it was rented.

The way to get in was to go to the side of the house and enter through a door that led into a large comfortable kitchen. There was a stairway that led to the upstairs and a doorway that opened up to the store in the front. When you took the stairs up, it led into an open air porch, and right at the head of the stairway was the bathroom. As you walked around the porch bannister, right there on the edge of the porch was a live beehive. We learned how to avoid that area when they were swarming, but many a night there would be a bee or two flying around the light bulb which hung down by a long cord from the ceiling, until they would fall, exhausted, to the floor. You had to be careful not to get stung. You would take a sharp right and come around to a door
that would open up into a large central room and four bedrooms in each corner. A screen door at
the other end of the central room opened up into the large lanai overlooking the road. It was
beautiful. It needed a lot of work and we could hear the rats crawling between the walls at night,
but we didn’t care, it was perfect for us.

Fig. 10. Anita Gouveia’s personal collection, *Anita’s Summer Palace*, the Kukuihaele house

Up to that point in her life, my mother had never really owned a house of her own. I
believe she saw potential, for love, life, happiness and an opportunity to make a little money.
Anita took it upon herself to fix up the place and fix it up she did! With her sewing machine she
created bedroom curtains, beddings, and pillows. She got downright funky. She painted the
central floor upstairs in what she called “Chinese red,” and the rooms in various shades of green, her favorite color. My sister was able to decide how her room would look and by the time I returned from the continent, it was the “coolest” place we had lived thus far.

Things were happening on the island of Hawai`i. In 1974, Sonny Kaniho, a retired Pearl Harbor shipyard worker and veteran, became an unlikely protestor. He had been on the Hawaiian Homes list, waiting for a home, for more than twenty years, and while he waited, big parcels of land were being leased to landowners such as Parker Ranch. Kaniho had had enough.

In 1974, Sonny Kaniho “illegally squatted on Hawaiian Homestead land on the Big Island’s Parker Ranch, occupying a piece of pasture land in Waimea. Kaniho and a group of supporters- Moanikeala Akaka, Mary-Mae Unea, Anita Heen, and well known photographer, Ian Lind, gathered in front of the pasture gate. My mother, Anita, joined the group of protesters and was arrested along with Kaniho and others for trespassing. Attorney Gil Johnston represented Kaniho and those who were arrested. Judge Olds dismissed the case because the ranch had no standing to their lease expiring. It was this incident that sparked and gave life to Anita’s activism.

Anita made many long-lasting friends. I remember, when I lived there, that our house always had visitors. People would come, share food, laughter, in an atmosphere of real good times. I believe this time to have been one of my mother’s happiest. There were phases when money was short and we were scraping by, but for the most part, it was heaven, and little did we know then, that we were, once again, on the land of our ancestors.

Anita rented the house from Aunty Ida Ma`a and had no idea, even up to the time that she left Kukuihaele, that Ma`a was a Lono, and that a good part of the land there was Lono land. She made it a point to learn everything she could about Hawai`i island. I remember the first time she
drove down Waipiʻo Road to go down into the valley. That drive required a four-wheel drive vehicle. My mother had a Toyota 4-wheel drive Land Cruiser and she put it to good use. As anyone who has driven down or even walked down knows, the road is extremely steep and when a car is coming up, they have the right of way. Well, on that day, we met two cars coming up and had to move to the side of this steep, narrow road, looking precariously over the steep edge which was about five or six hundred feet from the bottom. Let me tell you, we thought we were going to fall over and die. We were screaming and yelling until my mother told us to “Shut up!” I am positive my mother was just as afraid of driving down that road as we were afraid for her to pull on the side, but she was a trooper and we made it all the way down the road into Waipiʻo Valley. Wow what a woman!

My mother fell in love with Kukuihaele, impassioned by the entire island. She drove all over the Hawaiʻi island, getting to know the ʻāina and wanting to be maʻa. She didn’t only drive around the island, she also walked a portion of it.

In 1975, my mother might have heard or read of Bob Krauss and Twigg-Smith’s coordinating and retracing the tour of William Ellis. She had taken it upon herself to seek out places and decided to start in Pololu Valley at the end of Kohala...alone. It would be years later, when my kāne, Wali Camvel and I, would go down into the same valley and learn from my aunt that indeed, mommy had gone into Pololu and pitched a tent to stay overnight. As my aunt relates the story and I paraphrase,

53

Referred to as the “Ellis Expedition” accorded in the journal of William Ellis in 1823. This was an expedition taken by Rev. Artemus, Joseph Goodrich, Rev. Asa Thurston, Rev. Ellis, and Mr. Harwood.
Your mother had gone down into the valley, and you know this island, they get coconut wireless, news travels fast. Before you knew it, one of the Sproat `ohana went down into the valley and brought your mother some food. They remembered when Uncle Sonny had gone into the valley many years before, and wanted to `aloha your mother.

I thought to myself, what, Uncle Sonny had been here at Pololu? Wali and I had only gone because we saw a picture of Pololu Valley and had been using Pololu as a location for a story he was writing. Then we find out about mommy and Uncle Sonny having been here. I refer to this as the inherent ancestral compass or a direct leading to, by one’s kūpuna.

In any case, Anita spent the night there and made her way, slowly to Kawaihae via Kohala. By the time she got to Keauhou, she knew who she was looking for. Anita hooked up with the newly formed Ellis expedition in Keahou. As Honolulu Advertiser columnist Bob Krauss recalls,54

A pretty brown-skinned woman immediately pinned me against a stone wall. “Do you mind if I come along”? she asked with an eager smile. She was wearing pigtails, a lauhala hat, blouse, slacks, tatami sandals and a backpack half as big as she was. I recognized her at once. It was Anita Heen, wife of former State Representative from Oahu, Ernest Heen, Jr. and a member of a prominent, part-Hawaiian family.

54 Krauss published “The Island Way,” which described the re-tracing of the original trek over Hawai`i island by the original Ellis expedition.
She wanted to accompany them to the volcano, and while the group of men didn’t really want her to go, they could not dissuade her. By the time the group reached South Point they would part ways, but she and Bob Krauss would connect up again in the future.

By 1977 or 1978 Anita’s economic situation forced her to find work. Money was tight and Juggie was in between jobs. The closest place to work was Kona, forty miles away. She took a job at a boutique and managed to make ends meet however, by 1978 she had no choice but to leave her beloved Summer Palace in Kukuihaele and return to O‘ahu. I believe my mother was heartbroken and the prospect of returning was not a happy or an easy one. It would be the final event that would lead to Anita and Juggie’s divorce, though they would remain tentative partners until her death in 1998.

When Anita returned home, she stayed at her mother’s house in Kāne‘ohe at her mother’s home. It was here, through discussions and contemplation, that she would decide to go up to ‘Ioleka’a, to the kuleana. Anita got her mother’s permission to do so, though all the family members thought she was crazy to want to go up to the mountain. After all, she was a woman, all by herself, and up there with Uncle Sonny and all those people he had up there? I remember my mother recalling her mother’s words, questioning her, “Anita, why you like go up there?” “How you going live?” “No more toilet, no more electricity?” “What about water?” “You really like go up there?”

*Going Home: ‘Ioleka’a.* Anita was stubborn and strong-willed. She was determined, in part, out of need, but in part, because it was intriguing, isolated, and could perhaps finally become the home she had desired for such a long time. She was tired, she said, of having “No pot to piss in,
and no window to throw it out of.” And so, off she went into the valley and it was not easy. As a matter of fact, it was downright scary.

Arriving to ‘Ioleka’a, Anita took a small pup tent and pitched it right below Heiau La`au Lapa`au up on Kani`aupi`o (kuleana parcel). The first night she was there she tells a story of what occurred. It was late, about 8:30 p.m. as she recalls, when all of a sudden,

I head this big boom, loud, from behind, from the back of the tent. Sounded like one giant was walking, this boom...boom...boom, coming toward the tent. I was scared shitless, I started shaking! This thing came around the side of the tent, booming, loud, and all of a sudden, the thing stopped, right in the front of my tent. I was eating Vienna sausage and soda cracker, so I went crouch down, cup my hands together, put the sausage and cracker in my hands. My hands was shaking, I crawled to the opening of my small tent, and extending my cupped hands with the sausage and the cracker I said, I’m so sorry, this is all that I have, but I offer it to you, I mean no harm here. I put this offering of my dinner right outside the tent, on the ground, and as soon as I did that, the thing was gone. Just like that!

The ancestors had welcomed her home. It would not be the last of the way in which they would communicate with her. Anita struggled in those first few years, trying out ideas of building, actually building two hale made of Chinese bamboo that was abundant in the valley.

She knew she had to sustain herself financially so she did what Uncle Sonny had done. She picked hō`i`o, or edible fern shoot, which was plentiful in the valley. She would pick the tasty green vegetable and sell it at the swap meet two, sometimes three times a week. It was good enough to sustain her in what was now becoming a natural way of living. She planted lettuce and
tomatoes, experimented with corn, added herbs and continued to clear the land. Anita would spend the next twenty years living and relating to her blood ancestor, this ʻāina called ʻIolekaʻa.

Hālawa Valley and the H-3 Freeway. In 1963, the H-3 Freeway was proposed to connect the Pearl Harbor Naval Station and the Kāneʻohe Marine Corps Station. The North Hālawa Valley was chosen because it was unoccupied and there was little expectation of opposition. Once clearing began however, many sites were recorded, as many as sixty six archaeological sites in 1889. That fact would not have been known if Barry Nakamura, archaeologist for the Bishop Museum, had not come forward and announced it to the public. From that moment on, many kānaka ʻōiwi would come forth to challenge, occupy, resist, and protect Hālawa Valley.

Hālawa Valley and the protest of the building of the H-3 Freeway would bring together some of the most foremost kānaka ʻōiwi activists, scholars, historians, warriors, and future leaders. This valley would also bring together a hui of kānaka ʻōiwi wāhine that would bond and become spiritual sisters as the mana of the ancestors in Hālawa touched and imbued upon them all a new sense of direction and the heeding to the call of the ʻāina.

Anita by this time had changed her name back to Gouveia and had been living in ʻIolekaʻa for at least fifteen years. She wanted to know more about Hālawa Valley and so she went, and when she did, she was arrested as she took part in the obstruction of the road work to the H-3 freeway construction. From that moment on, she was committed to Hālawa Valley. The bonding she shared with women such as Mililani Trask, Sweet Matthews, Kuki and her sisters Olani and Kamakahukilani, Laulani Teale, Mahealani Cypher, Donna Bullard, Edwina Talkington (husband John), Diane Marshall, Toni Auld Yardley, Lilikalalā Kameʻeleihiwa,
Haunani Trask, and others, would evolve into another commitment of all of these fierce wāhine koa. And that would be Ka Lāhui Hawai`i.

Anita’s skill in writing, research, and articulation was brought forward in this journey. In 1991, five kānaka `ōiwi wāhine took up occupation at the Hale o Papa, a women’s heiau and over 500 people marched into the valley to support them. The Hālawa Coalition was founded and met with the federal highways administration in 1992, but to no success. In August, the women of the Hale o Papa erected a lele in the piko of the Hale o Papa and the luakini complex. Thirteen people were arrested for obstruction of work on the freeway and the Women of the Hale o Papa were evicted. By August 30th 1992, the State of Hawaii Department of Transportation issued a public notice that anyone entering Hālawa Valley who are not on official state business would be arrested. These events deeply affected Anita, who had by this time forged a deep spiritual connection with Hālawa Valley.

Ka Lāhui Hawai`i. Ka Lāhui Hawai`i was a grassroots initiative in the pursuit of `kānaka `ōiwi ea formed in 1987, sprung from a Native Constitutional Convention. The name means “the gathering of Hawai`i.” Within five years the `ōiwi nation had grown from 250 citizens to 12,500 `ōiwi citizens. As articulated in their press packet, “Ka Lahui has created a strong base of support by empowering native people through direct action and education.” (11).

Ka Lāhui Hawai`i directed phases of sovereignty education, that included a plethora of applicable processes in land management, sovereignty, and other information. Ka Lāhui Hawai`i built a governance structure that included an Ali`i and Kūpuna Councils. A strategy for sovereignty that, according to gouveia’s notes, included “five elements was created; faith in
akua, a people with a common culture, a land base, a government structure, and an economic base.”

Anita signed up not only herself, but her entire family as citizens of Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i. She began to attend meetings, participating in strategy planning sessions. She committed herself further when she was selected as O‘ahu Land Po‘o, or head of issues concerning the island of O‘ahu and land management. Dr. Lilikalā Kame‘elihia, stated in a conversation with me recently, “your mother knew everything there was to know about land on O‘ahu. If you had a question, all you had to do was ask her and she would know the answer.”

Personal photo collection.
Wherever you found Anita, you could be sure that Sweet and Kuki were not too far behind (see fig. 13). These women were strong of character, good fun, and committed to Ka Lāhui Hawai‘i.

Anita worked hard and at length on research in her capacity as Land Po`o. She was tireless in her recordations, all done by hand, and towards the end of her time, by typewriter. And, she was still picking hō`īō twice a week to support herself. When I think about this feat, it seems almost impossible with today’s use of computers and readily available information by the web, that she accomplished such work, but I have most of her original writings and it is a phenomenal hand-written collection.

Between the years of Hālawa Valley, 1991 to 1998, she would make a valuable contribution through her tireless efforts to establish land access, initial work on the ceded land inventory, an assessment of land occupied by the military, a hoaka at Mōkapu, and three Ka Lāhui Pūwalus that would inform, guide, and support the kānaka `ōiwi pursuit of political justice. She established herself as a leader, knowlegable, committed, with a purpose of strength that would take her well up into the time of her death, and the work was tremendous. She was committed, compassionante, graceful, funny as hell and very kōlohe. She had a vivacious personality but, watch out, no make her mad!

_Hoaka at Mōkapu._ In 1995 Anita and Toni Auld Yardley coordinated a spiritual gathering, to be held at Mōkapu (Marine Corps Base Hawai‘i). They called it a hoaka, a gathering ceremony of which purpose was to connect the people to their ancestors. The ceremony began on April 1, 1995 and ended, appropriately, on hoaka or the second day of April. A lele or ceremonial altar
was constructed at Kūʻau. It was a very significant in terms of ʻōiwi tradition. As Toni Auld Yardley says,

This spiritual gathering was very important for us. We are a small group, however, there was much mana (power) from the representation of three generations and family line of Paoa-Kea-Lono. These family lines are still connected throughout Polynesia. The ceremony helped to gather the family and was a chance for us to share knowledge, and for the younger generation to learn about and participate in a very important part of their heritage.

Here at Mōkapu, at this site of Kūʻau, was the same place Anita’s uncle, Kahuna Sam Lono III, had conducted makahiki ceremony in 1980, fifteen years prior. At this ceremony, three generations of Lono’s were present, marking the occasion as special for the family. It was the first time I had ever been to Mōkapu or participated in anything ceremonial. It would be life changing for me. In this effort, Anita firmly re-established her family’s connection, once more, to Moʻokapu, clearly articulating her own ʻōiwi identity and connection to the land.

Anita would make annual trips to Mōkapu until 1998. She would share moʻolelo with her family, her children and grandchildren, setting into motion a tradition that would continue after her death. The connection between her great-grandmother, Kahanu Paoa, would be fortified in the Mōkapu landscape and would be passed down to her children as they not only continued the tradition but extended what they did there. In fact, they would be the ones to re-discover Pōhaku o Hina.
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Anita’s family would continue the yearly hoaka at Mōkapu, especially after her death as a way in which to remember, and to infuse and receive the mana of their mother and the ancestors.
Taputapuātea. The Ka‘u Landing’s editorial section contained an article written by the late J.J. Hall in 1995, that explains why Anita’s trip to Taputapuātea was so vitally important. He states, “The *kapu*-lifting ceremony took place privately on the 17th with presiding priests only. The general public ceremony with over a thousand participants came the day after. The *kapu*-breaking day, March 17, is Sam Hoopi‘i Lono’s birthday. Anita’s comment to me about the incident was that Uncle Lono’s spirit was finally free. I had to agree.”

Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia, went to Taputapuātea with Toni Auld Yardley. They didn’t know how they were going to do it, but they just had to do it. Anita fretted over a lack of funds, but Toni told her, “don’t worry, the money will come” and somehow it did. What Anita discovered there would change our family’s mo`olelo and encourage us to take a closer look at our genealogy, to understand exactly what that meant in terms of kuleana and the bestowment of that knowledge to the succeeding generations.

Anita discovered that she was much closer to this great alliance of canoes (the Hōkūle`a, the Hawai`iloa, and other great canoes of Polynesia sail to Taputapuātea) sailing to Raiatea than she knew. What she discovered is the mo`olelo of her ancestors, Paoa and Tea (Kea). As Teiura Henry writes,

At last, during one of these conventions, after the religious observances were ended and the people were feasting, a quarrel arose between the primate names Paoa-tea and a responsible high chief of Te-ao-uri, named Te-po-rou-a-ra`i-ari`i (The-short–night-of-royal sky), who grew fierce and slew Paoa-tea unknown to anybody else. When he was missed, another high chief of Te-ao-tea, named Te-mauri-ari`i (Royal-trance), enquired of Te-po-rou-a-ra`i-ari`i what had become of Paoa-tea. *Ua pohe ia`u* (I have killed him), was the startling answer. Then Te-
mauri-ari`i became enraged, and before he could be prevented rushed forth and struck the primare, Paoa-Uri, who fell senseless to the ground. He was carried away as dead by his countrymen, wh, however, succeeded in resuscitating him and bore him away to his own land, somewhere in the southeast, while the people of Te-ao-tea believed him to be dead and felt themselves avenged. Great anger and confusion between the two sides followed, and there might have been more bloodshed had not the people of Te-ao-tea at once taken their canoes and fled. They rushed precipitately forward into the bay of Toa-hiva (Rock of clans), and not looking to th right towards the sacred harbor (Te-awa-moa) by which they had recently entered with much pagan dignity, they fled in a northerly direction. They passed through the double passage called Te-ava-rua (The two passages), in the middle of which is an islet covered with high trees. Against the reef on the northern side is another islet. Thus ended the friendly alliance which long had united many kindred islands. The people of the east also returned to their homes, and after that time only Raiatea and Tahiti continued to exchange Taputapu-atea rites.

Anita was astounded. As she visited around the island and learned more from the people she met, she realized the implications of this mo`olelo and how it connected directly to her own genealogy. She was suddenly made aware of the familys troubles, especially with her grandsons, who had been named Paoa and Kea. When she returned home from the trip of her life, she
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In 1995, the Hōkūle`a, Hawai`iloa, and the Makali`i voyaging canoes set sail for Taputapuatea in Raieatea from Hawai`i. They would be part of an alliance of canoes that would gather at that site since the deaths of Paoa and Kea. It was an incredible experience and journey for Anita.
called a family meeting and shared what she had seen, felt, heard, and learned on this wonderful journey. She was excited, eager to tell us of her experiences. It was, as she said that day of her trip, her crowning achievement.

Donna Ann Kameha`iku Camvel

The story of my own self-discovery and identity is one intricately woven in the fabric of my relationship with my mother and the kuleana. It was a time of change, drastic but necessary that led me back to the kuleana in 1996. When I made that move, my life was altered and so was I.57 I understood that my options were very limited after separating from my husband and I had little choice about where to go to live. The `āina was not my first choice of a place to live but it was the only option available. In retrospect, I realize that my path had already been determined by my kūpuna and I was destined to return to the land of my ancestors just as my mother, and my uncle had before me. I was able to ho`oma`ama`a, to become acquainted with the `āina. It was the beginning of my own identity mapping project.

It was rough. I had to pitch a tent on the `āina. My eldest and youngest sons had come with me, but my middle son decided to stay with his paternal grandparents in Hawai`i Kai. I was a single mom, living in a tent, with no hot water, no electricity, and no toilet. Was I crazy? My family thought so. I would be the third generation to return to the kuleana with everyone on the outside thinking I too, was crazy, just like my mom. I was working, cleaning offices at night, and attending Kapi`olani Community College during the day. My eldest son was getting ready to

57 I had decided to leave my husband and went to live in `Ioleka`a on the family kuleana.
graduate from Kaiser High school and my youngest son was at Star of the Sea School in Kahala. Talk about the span of driving that this move would make necessary.

We learned to live without hot water, bathing in the stream (we didn’t have a shower yet), bringing water up from the stream for cooking. We learned how to live out of a cooler, and to read by the light of a propane lantern. I learned how to get up at 5:00 a.m. not only to beat the traffic, something I still do now, but to get my children to where they needed to be, as well as myself, on time. I had my own janitorial maintenance company, and as the number of my accounts grew, so did the hours at which I reached home get later. My youngest son Aaron, and I spent a lot of time in my car, going home to the mountain and back to town, every day. Walking the trail at night with a dim flashlight was not happily anticipated. Many times, we simply slept in town, in my car, going to Ala Moana Park to brush teeth, clean up in the morning.

During the rainy season, we had to keep towels, umbrellas, extra boots, and flashlights for the trail. I had not learned how to drive the all-terrain vehicle, and refused to, so walking up and down the trail was how Aaron and I traversed. Yes, we carried many a load of groceries, supplies, tools, and other such things on that trail. Life in the mountain, as we called it, would become an adventure, making sure we had all the things necessary and not too much of things that were unnecessary. I would say, that it made for a strong composition of character, but for me, it was a renewed relationship with this `āina, my ancestor. The bond would become strong, so profound, and so deeply felt, second only to the love I had for my mother and my children.

When I think about it, I see my mother as the kinolau for Papa/Haumea, or my earth mother. In this manner, the configuration of my own identity was beginning to take shape. Who I was as a kānaka `ōiwi woman would become clearer and more defined as time went on.
I am taken back to the evening in 1997 or 1998, as I am hurrying into the `aina before it gets too dark because you don’t want to be walking down the trail in the dark. As I come to the `ahu I suddenly smell traces of tobacco that seem to come from behind. I stop and yell out in the darkening evening, “Who’s there?” No answer. I am sure someone is there hiding, and so I shout into the tree laden trail behind me, “whoever you are, you better get your ass outa here!” I continue to walk quickly following the `ala into the `āina. I get to the house, see my mom and tell her, “I think somebody is hiding on the trail.” “What do you mean?” she asks, looking concerned. I respond, “I could smell tobacco, like someone was smoking.” She laughs with relief. “That was Tutu Kahanu.” I look at her as she continues. “She loved to smoke her tobacco.” She laughs and smiles, her eyes reminiscing. “I remember her pipe in her hale. Yeah, garlic leaves and her paka. She loved to smoke her paka and eat garlic leaves. She used to put her tobacco in her pipe and smoke. Baby, that wasn’t somebody...that was your tutu Kahanu.58

My existence has always been predicated by one thing, the knowledge that I am kanaka ʻōiwi. From the time of my first remembering to my life today. This consciousness comforts me when I am away from my island home. It gives me an awareness of collective ethnic pride, as when marching in the 1993 Centennial Commemoration of the American Overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom at ʻIolani Palace with thousands of other kānaka ʻōiwi. I was incredibly amazed as I looked, for the first time, at a picture of Tutu Kahanu, my great-great

58 I wrote this after having this experience. It is one of the ways in which my ancestors have come to me. In the smells, sights, feelings, nuances of elements, and so much more, they make themselves known, and for a reason. In time you understand what they are intending for you to see, but it is in this way that we the moʻo are engaged by our ancestors.
grandmother. “My god, I thought as I looked at the image of this dark brown, strong and stern looking Hawaiian woman, sitting in front of St. Ann’s Church, with dark eyes and black hair looking so...so...Hawaiian.” Not only was I assured then that I was koko (Hawaiian by blood), but more importantly, in this particular experience, I was looking at my past and present all at once. From that moment on, I owned my identity, and it was my tutu nui who enabled that transformation, however, it was my mother who was the inspiring model from which I began to learn and truly appreciate who I was in the context of `Ioleka`a.

Thus, my identity was reinforced by returning to the place of my ancestors. This is where my kūpuna had lived, worked, sweated, cried, shed blood and tears. This is where the essence of my mother is alive and vibrant. I share the same space today with those who walked and worked this `āina for the last one hundred and eighty years and more. I am creating and adding to the continuum of this `āina just as my mother did, and her mother before her, and hers before as well. I am literally, figuratively, culturally, and spiritually, walking in the shadow and footsteps of my ancestors.

This is the framework that supports the construction of my family’s indigenous identity. Part of that ancestral connection encompasses migrations within the island chain and the Polynesian triangle as our genealogies connect us to Aotearoa, Rapa Nui and Hawai`i. Kana`iaupuni states (Kana`iapuni and Liebler 299),

The importance of place to Hawaiian identity is powered not only by ancestral genealogy, but also by the collective memory of a shared history. Hawai`i, the place, connects the Hawaiian diaspora through “social relations and a historical memory of cultural beginnings, meanings and practices, as well as crises,
upheavals and unjust subjections as a dispossessed and (mis)recognized people”:

(Halualani, 2002: xxvi; p.693).

I am a product of my identity. It informs and shapes who I am. It directs my decisions and choices, guides my life through a perspective that is uniquely `ōiwi and allows me full growth as a kanaka `ōiwi. I am this identity, a kanaka `ōiwi wahine. I have a kuleana or responsibility to share this legacy with my children and grand-children who are, like me, born of the generations of Haumea and connected to the `āina.

In 1997, I joined Pā Kui a Holo, a lua pā led by `Olohe Mitchell Eli. As part of the initiation workshop, consisting of three weekends in a row, haumana were taught a number of chants associated with movements or lua strokes used in battles of protocol and devastation by the ancient koa. On this particular day, I was having much trouble getting the movements of a chant associated with Lono. I could not get it right and I was frustrated and feeling quite inept. We had gone over and over the movements of the chants and I kept making mistakes. During a brief break, I went off to the side. I thought, this is a Lono chant, I am a Lono, why don’t I ask Uncle Sonny for help. I prayed for his assistance, asking for kōkua in clearing my head and providing what I needed to commit the movements of the ha’a to my brain. All of a sudden I felt a warmth that started from my head, coming into my po`o and going down the length of my body, getting a little bit warmer as this energy or mana infused my body. It went down the length of my body, departing at my feet. I had never experienced anything like that before, for I had never engaged my aumākua in that manner before. After the break I returned to the pā and was able to perform the ha’a with no further problem. From that time on, I began to rely more and more on my na`au as voice of my ancestors.
By 1997, my mother was terminally ill and we were privileged to care for her until her death. At this time, I met my kāne, Wali Camvel, who with my mother, became comrades in protest for Halawa Valley, dedicated members of Ka Lāhui Hawai`i, and very good friends. Wali would become Anita’s nakoa, and she loved referring to Wali as “Her personal nakoa.” They had much in common and both were kolohe and funny as hell. They became very close friends, to the point where my mother gave him his own place in `Ioleka`a. It would be during this time that I would meet Wali during a retreat my mother hosted on our kuleana in 1997.

It was a camp out event, and many of the Ka Lāhui gang was there. Sweets, Kuki, Toni Yardley, Kina`u Boyd Kamali`i and Linda Delaney. It was quite a collection of people. My mother, as well as Sweets and Kuki, were incredibly happy that Wali and I had found each other romantically, they thought he was a great guy and they loved him. As to his devotion to my mother, I will never forget it. He spent many, many weeks up at `Ioleka`a, leaving his own family, to help care for my mother, especially during the final three months of her life. He was there for me and my family, and I shall always remember, treasure, and love him for it was that.

After my mother’s death in June of 1998, we were stunned into immobility I was struck by how many people knew and loved my mother. It was a very difficult time for our family, and my grief due to her passing lasted a long time.

At the end of 1998, I established the He`e`ia Historical Society. It was something my mother had talked about and I, with the help of Toni Auld Yardley and Ninia Parks of the Maka`ainanā Foundation, set up the office for the society at the end of 1998. It would be this organization that would help establish my leadership qualities, but more importantly, establish an organization that would become involved in issues of access to lands for cultural practices, in particular, Mōkapu. I can look in retrospect and draw important analogies between our family’s
kuleana and the organizations that made those connections possible. For Sam Lono III, it was the Temple of Lono. For Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia, it was Ka Lāhui Hawai`i. For me, it was the establishment of He`eia Historical Society. Our family had returned to their practice, their kuleana perhaps, and for the first time since my grand uncle had done so, in the same location, twenty one years later, celebrated Makahiki at Mōkapu, and continue to do so.

Since my move to `Ioleka`a, I have and continue to attend the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa. I have earned two bachelor of arts degrees, one in Hawaiian Studies, the other in Women’s Studies, and will earn my master’s degree in Hawaiian Studies this summer. I have been accepted into the doctoral program in the Political Science Department at Mānoa and will specialize in Indigenous Politics.

It has been a very experiential and learning time for me and I have been blessed with many opportunities. I have participated, as representative of Kamakahōokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the United Nations Permanent Forum of Indigenous Peoples. This has greatly broadened my viewpoint about indigenous identity and collective indigenous power.

I have immersed myself in cultural practices, research, and continue to learn, every day, about my `ōiwi identity and what that means to me, especially in terms of `Ioleka`a. It has been a wonderful journey thus far with my only regret being that my mother is not physically here to enjoy it with me.

Mo`olelo `o `Ioleka`a

There is mo`olelo about all places in Hawai`i. The history of events that have occurred on the lands of our ancestors are infinite, and we will never know them all. The stories that are given to us must be recorded as part of the mo`olelo of the `āina and as part of ancestral
genealogy and kuleana. Below is an example of the sharing of such mo`olelo by Paul Kea Lono, younger brother of Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III. He shares,

One time, some Tahitians came to the mountain to see Uncle, and you know the big stone get at the beginning of the trail? Yeah, yeah- over there, that big one on the right-hand side-yeah, yeah that one. They went right over there to that rock and they started chanting-just like that-went over there and chanted. They said that pohaku [sic] was the guardian to this place and they chanted to that rock.” Yeah, yeah...they said there is a cave in here with one canoe and drums-you gotta chant for open up that buggah up. I believe that, I believe.

The mo`olelo of `Ioleka`a is wrapped in the mana of the `āina, which has housed kāhuna, priests and priestesses, male and female divinities, and ultimately, akua and a kua (of the back), as in the child that is carried. In other words, the `āina is Haumea or Papa and we, as ancestors, are carried on her back. Here lived those who served as facilitators and teachers in the ritual practices of kānaka `ōiwi religion. This is evidenced by the sites and archaeology that is still prominent on this `āina.

In 1990, Anita K.P. Gouveia found and recorded the sites listed in the table 3. While not an archaeologist, Anita was ma`a to the `āina and spent a lot of time hiking through the ma uka portions of the valley, following trails, many of them “old folks trails” as she described them. She would go, most of the time, alone, but sometimes had company, exploring the `āina, going far into the upper reaches of the small gulches, following streams or stream beds, coming upon sites that would become important in the identification of `Ioleka`a. The table on the following page, is a record of observations made by Anita Kahanu Paoa Gouveia of the ma uka portion of `Ioleka`a. While no map accompanied her documentation, she knew where every site was. The
family has begun to take steps to follow her notations and map out, through the use of GPS (Global Positioning System), the sites she identified.

My mother knew that valley well. She was gifted by the ancestors of long ago when one day, feeling like everything was falling apart, she hiked up ma uka, following a dry streambed deep into one of the many gulches, on the side of the Huna Mana. She traveled some distance, heading higher and higher. She “discovered” what she called “maile hapu’u,” because it was huge like the hapu’u fern and when the leaves were crushed, it smelled like maile. She continued on, making her way to a clearing and sat down on a pōhaku. She wept. She was feeling depressed and was thinking about leaving the valley. She poured her heart out, making up her mind that she would leave. As she brought her hand down, it fell on something solid. When she looked below where she was sitting, there, in perfect condition was a pōhaku ku`i poi. She smiled through her tears, knowing full well that it was a sign not only of encouragement, but of the affirmation of her belonging there on the land. When I look at that poi pounder today, I am looking at the ancestor who put itself in my mother’s hand as a way of affirmation and validation of her relationship to `Ioleka`a. It is the tangible connection between blood and land.

These is an example of the many experiences my mother had as she travailed the mountain terrain. Anita was interested in exploring beyond the boundaries of the kuleana, She became more and more ma`a to the land and began to record what she saw. As she walked and hiked trails, some identifiable, and many more not, she became adept at identifying formations, stone works, structures, house sites, unusually shaped pōhaku and other such indications of notable locations. She was already aware of Heiau La`au Lapa`au and the Huna Mana, and Leleahina, those three had been opened and made noa by Uncle Sam Lono III.
She learned on her treks, what was planted in certain locations, what features were located in different gulches, the streams and their locations. She could identify what she referred to as “the old folks trail.” I can remember hiking with my mother and we would stop and she would say to me, “Over there, baby, do you see it, the old folks trail?” I would look and nod in affirmation, but I didn’t see anything but the bamboo forest. She began to really know and become intimately acquainted with the `āina. Below is a table of her observations and descriptions of `ōiwi sites located in `Ioleka’a.

Table 3. Location of Archaeology Sites in `Ioleka’a. Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia.1990.59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Site (Name)</th>
<th>Location/Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leleahina Heiau McAllister, 1930.</td>
<td>Looking the same as McAllister’s description. Overgrown in shrub and trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ka Holua</td>
<td>Destroyed by pineapple growers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Trail into `Ioleka’a</td>
<td>Leads to all kauhale in ```Ili.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>`Ahu</td>
<td>Presently used as offering place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Petroglyph</td>
<td>Carvings depicting human forms, bird like forms, and a chain-like configuration of lines locates at the lowest level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kauhale</td>
<td>This area contains two, possibly three sites, a low stone wall, stone works, including a square stone-faced pit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kalo Lo`i</td>
<td>Known to writer as “Ka<code>ai</code>ele`ele. Includes auwai system, a mākahā diversion of stone, a circular stone lined basin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>House-site</td>
<td>Ala nui breaks off west. Located near gully.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>House-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>House-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information was found in Gouveia’s collection of notes in a folder on the kuleana. The site survey was conducted by Gouveia.
11 Kauhale
Two, possibly 3 house-sites, one terraced. Stone wall, partly destroyed. Path leading to pool.

12 Auwai

13 Stone works
Questionable as to how old. Path leading up to hilltop. Good view of ocean.

14 Large terraced area
Possible house-site

15 House-site
Topmost site in the 'Ili.

16 Beginning of `Toleka`a Stream and Lo`i.

17 Cave

18 Kalo Lo`i
Possible House-site

19 Stone works
Possible House-site located above Kukui grove.

20 Stone works
Possible house-site. Located near pool.

21 Kauhale
Heiau La`au Lapa`au
A large complex. House-sites, possibly three, terraces. Upper two house-sites contained by a moat-like depression and two stonewalls in a square on the sides of uppermost house-site. Upper complex contains a huge slab of rock with petroglyphs carved, showing a family with a newborn baby and other human-like forms. Lower house-site features a flat topped rock in which a bowl has been carved. Another large rock has a smoothed hole through it.

23 Possible house-site
Located further uphill. Stone walled terraces from this site leading to Site 21.

In March of 1972, Leleahina Heiau was re-dedicated by Kahuna Samuel Ho`opi`i Lono III. Offering chants and ho`okupu, the heiau was made noa for people who desired entrance there in order to practice their `ōiwi religion. In 1993, Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia took a cane knife and chopped her way through the Christmas berry to look at the same heiau. In 2001, I, under the auspices of He`e`ia Historical Society, signed a caretaker’s agreement for Leleahina Heiau with
Kamehameha Schools Bishop Estate. Wali Camvel has been the lead in the care of the heiau since 2010, and together we have brought in students for community service and family members for cleaning and mālama `āina of the heiau.

The significant location of the heiau and the mo`olelo associated with it comes from the goddess Hina. Hina is a multi-faceted deity, and her elements have to do with the ocean tides, the moon and its lunar rhythms, and the beating of kapa, another `ōiwi rhythmic movement of life. Her kinolau are the reefs or the papa, the laua`e fern, limu kala, and coral. She is Hinakuluiua, the element of dropping rain\(^60\) (155).

Hina is the initiator of movement. The coral, the moon, and the sea are the essential elements of life and Hina in the form of the coral polyp, is distinguished as the first born in the Kumulipo. Kame`eleihiwa describes Hinaōūholoko`amoana as “Hina whose womb is filled with everything from the ocean.” (Nā Wāhine Kapu 32). A makawalu of the term Leleahina provides some interesting correlations.

- lele to fly, jump, leap, burst forth. To move as a meteor in the sky, an altar.
- lelea the kapu which the priest imposed upon awa while the chief was drinking it.
- le`a joy, happiness, sexual gratification, the star Hōkūle`a (Arcturus).
- a of, to, in connection with motion.
- `āhina the silversword (*Argyroseriphium sandwicense macrocephalum*)
- hina the color gray, gray as the head of a mākule, applied to Moloka`i in the description of the fog around the top of the island, Moloka`i ahina.

---

\(^60\) Andrews dictionary describes, “Hinakuluiua as a goddess, kulu, to drop as rain; has two sisters, Hinakealii and Hookuipaele.”
Hina leaning, falling, topple, goddess, the color gray, to blow in a straight course, of wind. Ke hina maila ka makani mai uka mai, the wind is now blowing steadily from the uplands.

None of the descriptions are tactile, with the exception of Hina’s kinolau. In the deconstruction of the term, Leleahina, it is my analysis that the heiau is a place in which to invoke, placate, or honor the element (s) of Hina in her function as the moon. Movement is pivotal, the bursting forth of rain, the color grey, not only as the color of the moon but also the nuances created by it on specific nights, i.e. the silvery gray beams that shoot through the forest, lighting it up in a silvery glow. As the moon, Hina is the initiator of the ebbs of the ocean tides as it controls the rhythmic movement of the ocean, responsible for the growing of sustenance, medicines, and other such growth. Hina’s movements are life giving, hence, this bursting forth, this movement, of the tides, the rain, the wind, and the ocean, are the elemental signifiers of Hina In this element she is the cohort of Lono, as initiator of growth through the rhythmic or seasonal movements necessary for sustenance.

The coral polyp, the low lying reefs are the body of Hina in the element of the ocean. In this environment, she is the nesting place of life, in rhythm with Kanaloa, sparked by Kū, and mingling with Lono and Kāne.

The connection of Leleahina in the complex of sites located in the `Ili of `Ioleka`a have to do with the `ili’s function as a place of learning. The heiau that are located there, have much to do with the health and well-being of kānaka `ōiwi, and the training of those who would be kahuna and caretakers of kāhuna and would have to have a place to learn and live. I believe `Ioleka`a is such a place.
Chapter IV: Honoring the Land and Ancestors of `Ioleka`a

The land and resource management of the `Ioleka`a kuleana is subject to multi-jurisdictional agencies (City and County of Honolulu, State of Hawai`i, Department of Land and Natural Resources or DLNR) who serve as facilitators in the ongoing permitting process for any kind of activity on the land. Under the land use ordinance, the kuleana, located in an area zoned conservation, is designated as Preservation-1. While the parcel is eligible for a property tax exemption, it is ineligible for a ohana zoning designation which would allow for more than one house on the two and a half acres of kuleana land. In order to change the zoning, an application must be made to the DLNR with justification, public hearings and approval from the board of DLNR of the chair of DLNR.

In 1988, my late mother, Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia, testified before the Legislative House Committee on Planning, Energy, and Environmental Protection and the Committee on Water, Land Use, Development and Hawaiian Affairs on S.B. 3328 S.D.1 as a kuleana land owner (`Ioleka`a) stating,

> The creation of the now nationally famous "Green Belt Law" placed our last remaining parcel of land into the Conservation District. So far as I can find, no notice was sent to kuleana land owners when these lands were placed in that category.

She further stated,

---

61 Known officially as Act 187 of SLH 1961, this law established state zoning in Hawai`i and directly related property tax assessment to land use as zoned.
I wish to make clear that I have no argument with the need to regulate land use, but kuleanas like mine, under 10 acres, are treated as “non-conforming.

While the state allows for residential and agricultural uses, certain restrictions and the costly and time consuming process of Conservation District Use Applications has denied me the full use and enjoyment of the only land that I own.

It is now twenty five years later and the situation for the Līhu‘e kuleana is the same. Any and all improvements require a district use application and must comply with zoning which determines how that land may or may not be used. This is a burgeoning process. It is absolutely incredible that this kuleana land parcel of a little over two and a half acres is caught in the Greenbelt’s re-zoning of lands, responsible for placing the Waiahole Forest Reserve in conservation but capturing the kuleana in the process.

The zoning statues initiated by the Greenbelt Act rendered the heirs of the kuleana incapable of building more than one home on the property. Land zoning is problematic for kuleana land holders and because the issues concerned with zoning are systemic it is that much more difficult to address.

Kuleana lands which have been held by families since the mahele and are zoned conservation should not only be exempt from property taxes, but free from the constraints of regulatory land use, zoning, and restrictions, as appropriate. It makes no sense whatsoever to
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Gouveia was referring to issues of egress and ingress into the valley, especially after the new zoning laws placed the `Ili of `Ioleka`a into conservation with a P-1 (Preservation 1) zoning designating it as the highest priority in conservative land use. The results of that zoning allowed the development of Ha`iku Plantations on which the main road, originally the access into the `Ili, was built over. This created access issues which became very contentious between the family and the new land owners of the gated, high-end, and exclusive community of Ha`iku Plantations.
have kuleana land for over 100 years and continue to be restricted in the ability to build a home on it. This is not an example of sustainability.

`Ioleka`a presents an opportunity to address these concerns through the engagement of the state legislature, DLNR, the city and County of Honolulu, and various other agencies who control the way land is used. The implementation of the UNDRIP is particularly relevant to these islands and even more specifically for kānaka `ōiwi who want to manage kuleana lands still being held as well as other parcels that could be brought to production within various communities. In order to build a nation, we must be able to feed its people.

They way to honor our ancestors is to remain on the land. To never sell it. To go back and live on the land. `Ioleka`a is the blood and place for the present and succeeding generations to access the wisdom and practices of our ancestors. For even as we reclaim our identity and our practices, so do we, this generation, have a responsibility to make firm the tenure upon the land.
Anita Kahanu Paoa Gouveia (Fig. 12), passed away into the realm of our kūpuna and became our aumākua in 1998. While her body no longer remains, her essence is everywhere in the `āina, now forged with the ancestors of future and the past. The legacy she has left is enormous but we, the family, are proud to carry forward the work she started. Even as I contemplate my own identity, my children, my siblings, and my family, have already bonded with `Ioleka’a, with their ancestors. In varying degrees of understanding, I must now help my family to configure their own identities to the `āina. I realize that I have become my mother, through her essence, her blood, and this `āina. As my mother was Haumea, so am I, and as my
mother was the kahu of the `āina, so too are we, her children. The future for this `āina rests in the hands of the coming generations, but first, this generation must begin to understand their own connection to their ancestral land, that called `Ioleka`a.
Chapter V: Closing and Summary

Well-Being of the Āina, Healing of the `Ohana. `Ioleka`a has Stories to Tell.

In the telling of these stories or mo`olelo of our ancestors and the āina, so too do we honor, invigorate and empower the land. In the discovery of our culture and our identity we honor our kūpuna and all life, spiritual, and elemental forms of the living āina. Today, family members live, farm, gather, and practice their culture at `Ioleka`a. Another important factor is the healing aspect of the āina. For thousands of years ancestors, gods, goddesses, and the elements have meshed, interfaced, and separated. What is left behind are the nuances of life matter, pulses of vibrancy that illuminate and nourish the land and endow the āina with mana. It is here that the family must come in order to be healed (physically, mentally, and spiritually), and to discover what well-being really means. When the family returns to the land, the land is productive and the ancestors are happy. We are the land, and the land is us. When the land is healthy, so too are its people.

Mālama Āina.

Mālama of the āina, is the key to uncovering and establishing identity. In the hana of the āina, you become a part of the āina. You are interacting with the lepo, with the essence of Papahānaumoku, Wākea, and Hāloa. You are literally taking care of your ancestress and elder sibling. This is foundational for kānaka ʻōiwi. We honor our ancestors by being on the land, cultivating, caring, and working on the land, nourishing not only our families but our spirit (see
Fig. 13) as well. Our ancestors are happy when the `ohana is together. We strive to bring our ‘ohana back to the ‘āina, for in that relationship lies our true identity which enables us to achieve a determination of self.

Fig. 13. ‘Ohana work day at ‘Ioleka’a, Spring 2012.

Mo`okū`auhau

The importance of mo`okū`auhau is a vital and key aspect in the knowledge of self-identity and relationship to the ‘āina. This must be articulated and given to the `ohana because the
moʻokūʻauhau is the foundation for the moʻolelo of ʻIolekaʻa. It is an empowering and inspiring story.

As I struggled to access, analyze, and piece together the information for this endeavor, it became a mission of love that would provide a record of documentation, a legacy. Information that had been collected over many years by our ancestors, and research by my mother, has contributed to this legacy. From their voices comes the story of this land. While it may have seemed that information was not being shared or that it was hoarded, I now realize now that it really has to do with the importance timing, accuracy, and most critical, when we are mākaukau to receive information. Hence the waiting or holding on to, is really more about listening, looking, seeing, and hearing the kūpuna. The best practices of this kind of research is to follow the documentation and apply theoretical analysis that is guided by the naʻau and documentation. This is only the beginning of our family’s heritage project. This is what must be taught to our children and our grandchildren. This is the birthright that ʻIolekaʻa delivers; the ongoing connection of our children to the land that pulsates with the mana of their ancestors, that of blood and place.

Nā ʻIke a me Nā Hana, Knowledge (s) and Practices.

My family celebrates the time of Lono by practicing the ritual of the opening and closing of Makahiki (see Fig. 14), a seasonal transition from Kau (summer) to Hoʻoilo (rainy or wet season). This seasonal transition brings the acknowledgement and closing of the time for strenuous work, war, building and rebuilding. This is the time of Kū, another major god, prominent during months of February to October and governed by strict kapu and rituals. From
October to January these kapus are relaxed and the abundance of the `āina are harvested for tribute and enjoyed by the chiefs and their retinue. The abundant rains, which nourish the earth and herald the time of Lono, brings prosperity to the land, the people, and the chiefs. All were in a state of pono or balance with their surroundings, the land, the elements, and the Mō`ī. These were the traditional practices of our ancient ancestors, and have become the contemporary cultural practice of this `ohana.

Fig. 14. Makahiki Closing Ceremony at Mōkapu, (Honolulu: Honolulu Star Bulletin, 2006. Print.)
Today, our revival of Makahiki has made a cultural transition in both articulation and practice. We re-awaken the land as we take Lonomākua\textsuperscript{63} to Mōkapu in celebration of the seasonal transitions between Lono and Kū. We honor the season of Makahiki and in doing so, we also honor our kūpuna and the land. We carry the memories, and ceremonial practice of traditions from the past straight along into the present for the future. From the `ili to the ahupua`a, our cultural practice becomes our mo`olelo.


This is our kuleana, our practice, and our culture. In fact, the ahu for Kū (see fig. 15), has been rebuilt on this generation’s watch, just as Samuel Ho’opi‘i Lono III had intended.

Hale Noho and Hale Noa: Sustainable Housing on Kuleana Lands.

In looking toward the future for this ʻāina, it can serve as an example, of how we might develop land sustainably in the future. Because ʻIolekaʻa is off the grid, and there is no electricity or plumbing, it offers a unique location that can enable and integrate technologies which would be innovative, economical (indigenous enterprising), ecologically sound, and culturally appropriate.

I believe that general well-being, not only for kanaka ʻōiwi but for most indigenous peoples of the world are based on an equation of land, spirit (cultural ideology/religious beliefs), and kānaka. It is this premise that constituents and requires contemporary models of sustainability as corporate to the survival of the honua,64 and all living things. This well-being is the connection, physically, spiritually, genealogically. In these contemporary days, well-being includes shelter or housing.

The model for the hale noa was first discussed by my mother. An idea for how the kuleana could be used, under current zoning laws, was the conception of a modern day hale noa. A main house that would have walkways extending into separate, yet connected individual hales. For me, the idea creates a vision of the heʻe, with the head as central and the ʻawe as the walkways to both the head (hale noa) and the hale noho at the end of each ʻawe. This conceptual model would work very well in the ʻāina, a modern model of the hale noa. It might be a way in

64 Land, earth, world; basis, at the foundation, fundamental.
which to contend with the existing zoning laws and regulations for permitted land use or
variances and the building of houses on such lands.

Mahi’ai Hānai: Sustainable Food Production.

For `Ioleka’a that means continuing planting and maintenance of lo`i kalo. Extending the use of
the land in agriculture for the caring of the family. This is not a new concept, merely one that has
been lost in the society of today, although certainly making a comeback as resources and land
management practices of old erode. It can be an opportunity for food production, food security
and food sovereignty.

There is no doubt that `Ioleka’a has the potential for the production of more food then it
currently provides. The idea is, through education and practice, to get more of the family’s
investment in the effort of sustainable farming as a viable means to grow and eat the food they
themselves produce.

Application of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Kuleana
Land Rights.

Certainly this kuleana and its particulars are not the only one in existence in Hawai`i today. As
indicated in the zoning of the Līhu’e kuleana, changes must be made in order to allow kānaka
`ōiwi the opportunity to develop their kuleanas for cultivation and housing without the restriction
of laws that are not in the favor or kānaka `ōiwi owners.
Collaborative opportunities within the ahupua’a, both ongoing and proposed future projects, would lead the way to sustainable living and land management. These “little pieces of heaven” as my aunty calls `Ioleka’a, are the kipuka of the future. Some of these projects are already established and others coming to fruition as I write this paper. Still many more await the spark and ignition of motivation, commitment, and most important, belief. We must plant food, restore lo‘i, re-establish fishponds and rejuvenate our cultural practices. We must be on the land and in the land. This is the template for the future that `Ioleka’a has already begun to embrace.

Self-Determination

The articles contained in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples or, the UNDRIP, clearly affirms the rights of all indigenous peoples. Articles 3 of the UNDRIP states, “Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social, and cultural development.” In this arena, kānaka ʻōiwi can decide for themselves the direction in which to drive a national objective.

Again, this objective requires education, cooperation, realistic expectations, and the building of a foundation that allows for growth that weaves the old with the new, and insists on collective representation. Not an easy task for a nation under the duress of occupation in many forms, but, it is doable. As I have articulated, this must start with the `ohana. The relationship between blood and place, (ancestors and land) is the impetus or starting place for political awareness that is larger than an individual or self and part of kākou or collective.
Collective National Unity: A Nation Building Project.

It is clear that what is needed for kānaka ʻōiwi is a political or national identity in which we, ourselves, determine our own governance and most importantly, the management of our land and resources. The life of the land is held in the hands of we, the kānaka ʻōiwi of Hawai`i nei, however, this is contingent upon the collective well-being of the people. For too long now, we have been deprived of the basic human rights articulated in the UN DRIP. It is time to take our places, especially upon the land and in governance, to move our people forward and our lands to further production.

Fig. 16. Kameha`iku Camvel, Anita Kahanupaoa Gouveia with her grandchildren, the next generation. *Family Gathering up at ʻIolekaʻa* in (He`e`ia;1997) Photo.
Summary

The determination of self is grounded in knowing who you are and where you come from. The mapping of an indigenous identity begins with the genealogical connection to blood and place, or ancestors and land. This discovery becomes the catalyst for any future work because it is the foundation for kānaka ʻōiwi, a grounding that cannot be altered.

The narrative achieved in this thesis was produced through research using ʻIolekaʻa as an example. In the compilation of this authentic text, Hawaiian language newspapers, land claims awards, testimonies, and genealogical research was used to produce moʻolelo from a kanaka ʻōiwi perspective and through a kanaka ʻōiwi wahine’s voice.

The thrust of this project was motivated by the establishment of four key concepts; 1) the Hāloa triad as the connection to blood and place, 2) Haumea as the mechanism in the transference of ancestral DNA or memory, 3) Papakū Makawalu as foundational theory, and, 4) the application of Papakūmakawalu as the paramount methodological tool in deciphering or decoding the elemental configurations in the landscape or moʻolelo of ʻIolekaʻa.

In this project, the ʻaina of ʻIolekaʻa became the center, the foundation for experience and growth. The lesson learned is that the life and well-being of the Līhuʻe kuleana is inextricably connected to we, the descendants of ʻIolekaʻa. This is a lifeline that can never be severed and in the process of establishing our identities, informs our relationship by virtue of our kuleana to the ʻāina.

Self-determination is the genesis for understanding the larger context of a kānaka ʻōiwi national political project. The pursuit of such an enterprise must be a convergence of the kānaka ʻōiwi collective which values diversity in the pursuit of political change. There must be a
synthesizing of multiple disciplines and beliefs which addresses national priorities within the larger international arena. The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples plays an important role within that international paradigm as a precedent setting mechanism that may guide such a process.

I would like to mahalo ke akua, mahalo kini o ke akua, nā aumākua, nā kūpuna, nā `ōhana, a me nā `uhane `o ka `Ili `Ioleka`a. Indeed it has been a journey of discovery that has only just begun.
Aboriginal—original or earliest known; native; indigenous.

Ahuimanu—an ahupua’a located on the windward side of the island of O’ahu.

Ahupuaa—land division usually extending from the uplands to the sea, so called because the boundary was marked by a heap (ahu) of stones surmounted by an image of a pig (pua’a, or because a pig or other tribute was laid on the altar as tax to the chief. The landlord or owner of an ahupua’a might be a konohiki.

‘Āina—land, earth.

Ala—path, road, trail.

Alanui—street, roadway, highway, thoroughfare, waterway, course.

Ali‘i—chief, chiefess, officer, ruler, monarch, noble, king, queen.

Ali‘i Nui—high chief.

Akua—god, goddess, spirit. A kua, of the back, to carry on the back, as a child. I envision the term, a kua, as the land upon which the ancestors or kānaka ʻōiwi are carried.

Aotearoa—ʻōiwi and original name for New Zealand.

ʻĀpana—piece, slice, portion, land parcel.

ʻAumakua—family or personal gods, deified ancestors who might assume the shape of sharks, owls, hawks, mud hens, octopuses, eels, mice, rats, dogs, caterpillars, rocks, cowries, clouds, or plants. A symbiotic relationship existed between kānaka ʻōiwi and and their ʻaumākua.

Auwai—ditch, canal, waterway.

ʻAwe—tentacle.

Ea—sovereignty, rule, independence.

Ha’a—a dance with bent knees of bombastic style.

Haku one—a small piece of land under cultivation by the makaʻāinana for the chief.

Hāloa—second son born to Wākea and Hoʻohōkūkalani, first kanaka and chief.
Hāloanalaulaukapalili—first prematurely born son of Wākea and his daughter, Ho`ohōkūkalani. Known as keiki `alu`alu.

Hāloa Triad— a trilogy of land, blood, and ancestors (chiefs), as represented by Papahānaumoku (land or earth mother), Hāloanalaulaukapalili (blood relative and staple of life), and Hāloa (first man, first chief).

Hānai—foster child, adopted child. To raise, to feed.

Haole—white person, American, Englishman, Caucasian; American, English. Formerly any foreigner, introduced, of foreign origin.

Haumea—Hawaiian goddess of childbirth, politics, and war. Also known as Papa and Kamehā`ikana.

He`e`ia—an ahupua`a located on the windward side of the island of O`ahu. I believe that He`e`ia correlates with the kinolau of Kanaloa, marking the area as being of, or associated with hence the he`e or Kanaloa. Hence the justification for the `okina after the second e in the word.

Hō`ailona, `ailona—sign, symbol, representation, omen, portent.

Hōlua—sled, ancient sled used on grassy slopes; the sled course.

Honua—land, earth, world.

Ho`ohōkūkalani—daughter of Papahānaumoku and Wākea. Mother of Hāloanakaluakapalili and Hāloa, first ancestors of kānaka `ōiwi.

Ho`okupu—tribute, ceremonial gift-giving as sign of honor and respect.

`Ike—to see, know, feel, recognize, perceive, understand, receive revelations, knowledge.

`Ike kūpuna—wisdom of the ancestors, ancestral wisdom.

`Ili—The name of a small district of land, next smaller than an ahupua`a.

`Ioleka`a—an `ili located in the ahupua`a of He`e`ia on the windward side of the island of O`ahu.

Ipu—bottle gourd (Lagenaria siceraria).

Kahu—honored attendant, guardian, nurse, caretaker.

Kahuna—priest, priestess, expert loea in various skills.
Kai—sea, sea water; area near the sea, seaside, tide, current in the sea; insipid, brackish.

Kalia—a place located in Waikīkī.

Kalo—taro plant. (*Colocasia esculenta*). Staple food and ancestor to kānaka `ōiwi.

Kamapua`a—a pig demigod, associated with the god Lono.

Kanaka—human being, man, person, individual, mankind.

Kānaka `Ōiwi—native or ethnic Hawaiian people (plural).

Kāne—one of four major gods mainly associated with the sun, sunlight, and fresh water on the land.

Kāne`ohe—an ahupua`a on the windward side of the island of O`ahu.

Kaona—hidden meaning, as in Hawaiian poetry; concealed reference, as to a person, thing, or place; words with double meanings that might bring good or bad fortune.

Kapu—taboo, prohibition, sacredness, forbidden, consecrated.

Kauhale—group of houses comprising a Hawaiian home.

Kaukau ali`i—class of chiefs of lesser rank than the high chief.

Keiki `alu`alu—premature fetus.

Kiowa—a member of a Plains Indian people of the southwestern U.S.

Kīpuka—variation or change of form as a calm place in a high sea, deep place in a shoal, opening in a forest, openings in cloud formations, and especially a clear place of oasis within a lava bed where there may be vegetation.

Koa—brave, bold, fearless. Warrior.

Koele—patches on a parcel of land cultivated by the maka`āinana in which the best patch was exclusively worked for the ali`i. The konohiki or haku `āina’s patch was called haku one, and was also for the konohiki’s exclusive use.

Kōkua—help, aid, assistance, relief.

Kuleana—small piece of property, as within an ahupua`a. Also refers to responsibility or duty.

Kupa—citizen, native, well-acquainted.
Kupuna-grandparent, ancestor, relative or close friend of grandparent’s generation. Kūpuna is the plural form of kupuna.

Konohiki-headman of an ahupua’a land division under the chief.

Ko’olaupoko-district on the island of O’ahu in which the ahupua’as of Waimanalo, Kailua, Kāne‘ohe, He‘e‘ia, Ahiimanu, Kahala‘u, Waihe’e, Ka‘alaea, Waiahole, Waikāne, Hakipu‘u, and Palikū (Kūaloa) are located.

Kumulipo-origin, genesis, source of life, mystery; name of the Hawaiian creation chant.

Kupa-citizen, native, well-acquainted as to the land.

Lo‘i-irrigated terrace, especially for taro.

Lono-one of four major gods. Associated with clouds, rain, water, growth and fertility.

Lonomakua-legendary fire guardian and the name of the makahiki image.

Luna-land agent for the king, foreman, head man of a land or plantation who gives orders.

Mā-following the names of persons. And company, and others, i.e., you folks, Mary folks.

Ma`a-accustomed, used to, knowing thoroughly, habituated, familiar, experienced.

Mahele-land division of 1848.

Ma`i-genitals, genital, genital chant such as a mele ma`i.

Makahiki-ancient festival beginning about the middle of October and lasting about four months, with sports and religious festivities and kapu on war.

Makai- or ma kai, directional indicating a seaward location.

Makana-gift present reward.

Mākaukau-ready, prepared.

Makua-parent, any relative of the parent’s generation, as uncle, aunt, cousin, progenitor.

Mana-supernatural or divine power, miraculous power, authority to give mana, to have mana.
Maori-kānaka `ōiwi of Aotearoa.

Mauka- or ma uka, directional indicating an inland, upland, or towards the mountain.

Mo`okū`auhau-genealogical succession, pedigree.

Mo`olelo-a continuous or connected narrative of events; a history.

Na`au-intestines, bowls, guts; of the heart, of the mind. One of the three po`o or head by which ancestral knowledge is situated and from which ancestors are generated.

Nūpepa-newspaper.

`Ohana-family, relative, kin group, related.

`Ōhua-retainers, dependents, servants, members of a family.

`Ōiwi-native, native son.

`Ōlelo Hawai`i-Hawaiian language.

Palapala-document of any kind, bill, deed, warrant, certificate, policy, letter.

Papahānaumoku-wife of Wākea, mother of Ho`ohōkūkalani, earth mother and ancestor to kānaka `ōiwi. Also known as Haumea and Kameha`ikana.

Piko-navel, umbilical cord. Fig., blood relative, genitals.

Pō-realm of the gods, obscure, dark, time of, state of.

Po`e kahiko- the people of old, the ancient ones.

Po`o-head, summit.

Wā-period of time, epoch, era, time, occasion, season, age.

Wai-water, liquid, or liquor of kind except seawater.

Wākea-husband of Papa, who with his daughter, Ho`ohōkūkalani, produced Hāloana`iakapalili and Hāloa, first ancestors of kānaka `ōiwi.

Walewale-primordial ooze, the slime of creation.
Works Cited


Kanahele, Dr. Pualani Kanaka’ole. *Papakū Makawalu Methodology.* 2011. TS.

Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies, Honolulu.


Kana`iaupuni, Shawn Malia and Nolan Malone. “This Land is My Land: The Role of Place in


University of New Mexico, 2009. Print.


The United Nations. *The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2625 (XXV): Declaration of Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and*


University of Hawai‘i Mānoa. 2012. Hamilton Library.

