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Abstract

Kūāhewa, Kona’s vast dry-land agricultural system, historically fed and sustained Kona’s community for centuries. This productive complex was the foundation of the social and cultural advancement in Kona, being only slowly abandoned in the decades following 1778. However much abandoned this immense system may be, it still retains a high potential for reestablishment. The goal of this Plan A thesis paper is to reintroduce and reengage the Kona community to Kūāhewa, a living agricultural system that has been covered for decades. This paper examines Kūāhewa’s historical importance and current relevance, where developing and implementing an ‘Āina-Based Program is an effective method to reconnect the community of Kona to Kūāhewa. This thesis seeks to provide a theoretical framework for the restoration efforts of Kūāhewa, fostering a social awareness and consciousness to Hawaiian dry-land agricultural crops and practices existent in pre-contact Hawai‘i.
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Chapter 1: Reconnecting Kūāhewa With Kuaʻāina

Ka Wehena: An Introduction

The primary objective of this thesis is to research a theoretical impetus for the restoration and development of a segment of the Kona Field System currently situated in the Kamehameha Schools’ (KS) owned ahupua‘a of Kahalu‘u, district of North Kona, island of Hawai‘i, in order to reconnect the community to the parcel by establishing an ʻĀina-Based program. The Kona Field System is a rich, rain fed, dry-land agricultural complex encompassing roughly 60 square miles between Kailua and Hoʻokena\(^1\), possibly the largest dry-land agricultural system in Hawai‘i. The subject parcel covers 355 acres of the mauka portion of Kahalu‘u, with nearly 3,500 recorded archaeological features.\(^2\) The underlying goal of this proposed project is to reengage the Kona community to the Kona Field System, creating a social awareness and appreciation to traditional dry-land agricultural crops and practices existent in pre-contact Hawai‘i.

Growing up in Kona in the 1990s, most of the community activities took place in the calm, inviting oceans. Fishing, surfing, paddling, and diving were weekend norms, in which the kai sustained my pride and admiration for Kona. Other than the advocates in the Kona coffee and macadamia nuts industries, not much was taught in grade school pertaining to the ʻāina of Kona. It wasn’t until I enrolled in HWST 107 where I realized how industrious the land in Kona once was. While I was in that class, I came across a drawing in one of the readings dealing with the intensification of production in pre-

---


contact Hawai‘i. The drawing, originally depicted by American missionary Lucy Goodale Thurston, conveyed the vast, productive uplands behind Kailua-Kona bay. The whole countryside behind Kailua-Kona bay was in cultivation, highly productive in its entirety. Hundreds of agricultural plots outlined by black walls were scattered across the uplands. Although this drawing is a simple rendition of what Thurston saw, as she was a missionary and not an artist, the land seemed rich, bountiful, and most of all, being cared for. This picture strikes no similarity between what I see today, now covered is the uplands of Kona with overgrown weeds and bushes.

It perplexes me that such drastic transformations have taken place on the Kona landscape, and it saddens me that not much is known of this system. Most people living in Hawai‘i today perceive Kona as a hot, dry, unproductive place, only having calm, blue waters and grandeur sunsets. The written histories of the Kona Field System have led me to understand that Kona’s potential agricultural productivity is immense. This simple sketch of Kona, coupled with the further readings of the journals of European explorers convey the productivity and complexity of agriculture in Kona.

A summer internship at the Kamehameha Schools’ Land Assets Division (LAD) office in Kona didn’t only introduce me to many professionals stewarding Pauahi’s legacy lands in Kona, it also revealed a potential research parcel for my thesis. Located on the mauka portion of the Kamehameha Schools owned ahupua‘a of Kahalu‘u sits a small segment of the Kona Field System. Within this parcel are the remnants of what was once seemed to be areas that were actively engaged in cultivation stretching in to the

---

Kahaluʻu forest reserve. However, mainly invasive non-native plants cover these stone remnants, only being frequented by a few hunters and vagabonds from time to time. The lack of human interaction with Kahaluʻu mauka speaks to the inherent disconnection the community has with this traditional system. Conversely, the potential for the reconnection of relatively unhindered remains are ever so present.

During my internship I have also learned that Kamehameha Schools developed initial visions to utilize Kahaluʻu mauka for many purposes. LAD seeks to revitalize the “Kahaluʻu field system as a traditional Hawaiian agricultural landscape,” enveloping guiding principles that promote “protection and stewardship of natural and cultural resources, restoration of knowledge; fostering education, community engagement, productivity, and sustainability.” KS also stresses the interrelatedness between these five principles, where they all work collaboratively to support LAD’s overall vision of “Thriving Lands and Thriving Communities.”

**Integrating Scholarship & Community**

The Kona Field System is such a profound agricultural complex, why would it not be in the consciousness of Kona’s community today? There has been a handful of scholars who has written about the Kona Field System, however none has seemed to successfully scale the walls of academia into the hands and minds of the community. When informally conversing about my research with my friends and family that grew up
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5 Ibid.

6 Cordy (2000); Newman (1970); Kelly (1983;1989); Desha (2005); Handy (1972); Maly (2012); Rechman (2012).
with me in Kona, the majority of them are not aware of Kona’s agricultural history. Placing community interests and visions of practical application as a driver for my research is a method to disseminate my scholarly work from academy into community. Also, aligning my research with Kamehameha Schools’ goals to reengage Kona’s community with Kahalu’u would be an effective avenue in the integration of scholarship and community.

There are many gaps between the historical data analysis, the contemporary knowledge and understanding, and the eventual implications of future ʻāina-based sites in the Kona Field System that need to be filled. Creating a multidisciplinary plan that incorporates history, planning, and education can successfully address and possibly fill these gaps. Last semester in my HWST 650 course, we tackled the concept of Mālama ʻĀina and how it applies today in various businesses and programs on Oʻahu. We came to realize that there are multitudes of ways to Mālama ʻĀina, and much of this expertise exists and are practiced in various disciplines (i.e. history, agriculture, law, planning, science, business, etc.). In order to build a successful program within the Kona Field System, all of these facets of Mālama ʻĀina must be understood.

Seeing and Knowing the Kuaiwi Walls

One of the most prominent features of the Kona Field System existent today are the stone walls borders running from mauka to makai. These walls, most commonly called kuaiwi, were formed as a result of kanaka maoli clearing stones to create planting

---

7 In contemporary Hawaiʻi, people refer to “Hawaiians” as a general term for a person residing in Hawaiʻi, similar to how a person residing in California are referred to as “Californians.” Therefore, in this paper I use the name “kanaka maoli” that refers to ancestral Hawaiians, in order to provide more clarity for the readers.
areas.\textsuperscript{8} These long kuaiwi walls stretch for miles up the slopes of Hualālai and Mauna Loa, and spanned an area of roughly 34,350 acres\textsuperscript{9}. Shorter, terraced walls running perpendicular to the slope intersected the kuaiwi walls, creating rectangular bounded agricultural plots. Puku‘i defines kuaiwi as a long, straight stone wall.

These kuaiwi walls were the center of the contemporary analysis of the Kona Field System, attracting the attention of archaeologists like Soehren, Newman, and later Recthman, beginning in the late 1960s.\textsuperscript{10} In their work, the kuaiwi walls were the characterization of the Kona Field System, where they predicted the immense size of the system by documenting the extent of the walls. By studying and analyzing the remnants of Kona’s dry-land agricultural system, they created a historical understanding towards the traditional agricultural practices in ancient Hawaiian civilization. The kuaiwi walls were the framework connecting their present scholarship to Kona’s historical past.

Based on the extensive archaeological body of work residing around the analysis of the Kona Field System, there is an overlying presumption that these kuaiwi walls are relics of the past; a historic tradition of agriculture disconnected from ‘Ōiwi culture and the kua‘āina of today. Generally speaking, when one hears the idea of a “traditional” entity, the immediate notion that arises is something that remains in the past, irrelevant in modernity. This poses a problem for kanaka maoli attempting to relive and reconnect “tradition” in today’s world.


\textsuperscript{9} Cordy. \textit{Exalted Sits the Chief}. 135.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid. 136.
Rechtman’s first proposed possible management strategies for sites in this area, is the option of “benign neglect,” further advocating, “…that is to preserve in its ‘as is condition,’ and to limit human interaction and allow for natural process to act uninhibited.”\(^{11}\) Although I technically agree that the over interaction of uninformed humans may detrimentally affect the integrity of the archaeological sites, I argue that “benign neglect” misrepresents the idea that “tradition” is dynamic, and is a strategy to promote further disconnection\(^{12}\) in the attempts to reestablish identity and meaning to the Kona Field System.

The protection of the “traditional” agricultural artifacts from human interaction (kanaka maoli included) skews the understanding of what tradition constitutes. If a kanaka maoli is denied access to the mauka archaeological sites in order to understand, interpret, and develop a meaningful connection to the place, the “traditions” of our past are left static. Trask conveys the constitution of the word “tradition” and culture, where she writes:

> But what constitutes ‘tradition’ to a people is ever changing. Culture is not static, nor is it frozen in objectified moments in time. Without doubt, Hawaiians were transformed drastically and irreparably after contact, but remnants of earlier lifeways, including values and symbols, have persisted.\(^{13}\)

These persisted values and symbols, physical, cognitive, and spiritual, are imbedded within archaeological remnants and should be open for interpretation. In *Pratt vs. State*, Mcgregor testifies and argues that kanaka maoli should be allowed to reopen


\(^{13}\) Ibid, 158.
and rededicate sites for use. Particularly on the island of Kahoʻolawe, they were attempting to rededicate a heiau where the archaeologists disagreed with them, fearing that they would disrupt the site. In response she stated:

…We were attempting to bring these sites back to life and not just have them sit there as idle artifacts of history, but that they will again become a living part of our culture and practice.\(^{14}\)

Mcgregor explicitly suggests that for the kanaka maoli, these archaeological sites are living entities, being as relevant and practical in modern times as it was traditionally. When analyzing an archaeological site through this lens, it is extremely difficult to distinctly decipher when “tradition” ends and when “modern” begins. Beamer suggests that, “the dichotomies of the ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ and their connotations are false.” Rather, they are tools that “…preserve European Hegemony and often re-inscribe links between the colonizer and the colonized.”\(^{15}\)

The theoretical framework for my project is an attempt to view these kuaiwi walls through a different lens. No longer should I vision these archaeological sites as “traditional” agricultural features, but rather sources of knowledge “mai nā kūpuna mai.”\(^{16}\) The existent kuaiwi walls shall be the developmental infrastructure for the plan to reopen agricultural plots, keeping in mind the various developmentally appropriate

---

\(^{14}\) State of Hawaii, *Pratt vs. State*, District Court of the Fifth Circuit, 118.


\(^{16}\) Meaning “from the ancestors.” Ibid. 27.
practices\textsuperscript{17} that apply. Although some of the walls within the parcel have been modified, damaged, or deconstructed, the integrity of the existing walls persisted from the ancestors into this time. While in my writing I will refer works, knowledge, and understandings “mai nā kūpuna mai” as “traditional”, I do not infer the disconnectedness that the word conjures as previously noted.

**Setting ʻĀina as a Premise of Research and Education**

ʻĀina, commonly understood as “land” to the general residents of Hawaiʻi today, is an integral part of Hawaiian epistemology. However, the oversimplification of the word ʻāina as just “land” would produce canopy of generalized interpretation, and potentially missing the significant understanding of ʻāina and the various physical, social, spiritual, and cognitive connections it has to kanaka maoli. There are many facets to the analysis of ʻāina that contribute to the holistic well being of kanaka maoli, each being equally important with one another. Each layer of the meaning of ʻāina supplements the pursuits of political, social, and educational self-determination, and catalyzes the perpetuation and propagation of cultural practices. In this section I will address how ʻāina can act as the medium for community engagement, which in return asserts identity, appreciation, and sense of place.

Native scholars have further expressed the essential meaning of ʻāina in their work. Although Pukui initially defines ʻāina as “land” and “earth,” she further refers that ʻāina stems off of the root word ‘ai, or to eat, signifying that ʻāina is an aspect that

feeds. ʻĀina pertains to all of the things that feed, including the land, sea, streams and ponds. The role and understanding of ʻāina does not cease at the fundamental physical feeding of kanaka maoli, however ʻāina also feeds and nourishes other mental and spiritual aspects. Andrade writes, “The ʻāina (the land and the sea) not only provides food, sustaining physical bodies, but also nurtures the social, cultural, and spiritual senses of the Hawaiian people.”

The progression and expansion of dry-land farming on the ʻāina of Kona was made possible by community involvement and developed leadership by various aliʻi. After his hard fought campaign to unify the Hawaiian Islands, Kamehameha, eventually returned to Kona to witness his people and ʻāina in famine. He encouraged farming to take place, where he gathered his men, both aliʻi and makaʻāinana of Kona, and created a large agricultural complex named Kūāhewa. Kūāhewa, meaning “huge, or vast,” extending in the uplands above Kahaluʻu, Keauhou, and Kailua, consisted of various dry-land agricultural crops such as kalo, mai’ā, and kō. The name of Kamehameha’s grand agricultural field was named so because upon gazing at the field, the borders could not be seen. The community of Kona were free to harvest the crops when ready, but
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21 Pukui, Hawaiian Dictionary, 169.

22 E.S. Craighill Handy, et. al. Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment. (Honolulu : Bishop Museum Press, 1972.)
under strict provisions. He advised his people when harvesting, they were to replant the
crops that they pulled out of the ground, not just leaving them on the ground to dry, so
that Kūāhewa would continue to feed the people in the future.²³

With effective leadership and advice, community and ʻāina engagement cultivates
more than just physical wellbeing. Even though Kamehameha’s first priority was to feed
his children²⁴ through production and industry, his actions instilled values of hard work,
responsibility, and caring for the land. By acknowledging and conveying that Kūāhewa
was created, managed, and benefited by his people, his advice also planted seeds of
appreciation, identity, and sense of place. In conclusion, Desha writes, “These were truly
good words of advice spoken by the most famous aliʻi of our beloved land. Words to be
taken and pondered by the new generation of the land which Kamehameha conquered,
the people whom he distinguished by calling them ‘my children’. “²⁵

Noelani Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, a professor and one of the founders of Hālau Kū
Māna, a Hawaiian culture-based charter school in Honolulu, writes about the
understandings and values derived from the experiences of her, as well as her students
and colleagues, during the reopening of loʻi at ʻAihualama in Mānoa. Teachers, students,
as well as community members all took part in the reestablishment of the pre-existing loʻi
terraces in order to feed and educate their students, community, and themselves. Their

²³ Desha, Kamehameha and His Warrior Kekūhaupiʻo. 347.

²⁴ When advising his people in Kona, Kamehameha referenced them as “my
children.” Ibid.

²⁵ Desha. 347.
efforts fostered a sense of place, identity, and kuleana. Danny Bishop, one of the caretakers of ‘Aihualama, states,

What I’ve come to understand as the whole idea of the lo’i and the importance to our youth and our future is [a] sense of place… particularly when you become nurtured by that sense of place, that is what really creates the identity, the connection, the spirituality…. All of that comes when you’re eating from it… what I owe that place, what I owe my people who came from that place and gave me this heritage, and then what I am going to give my children. Eating makes the circle complete. The food is important to us; it has a relationship to us.  

The establishment of identity, appreciation, and consciousness to an ‘āina also creates interests in obtaining deeper knowledge and understandings pertaining to place, found in the various repositories of Hawaiian knowledge. Research and writing about place forms a deeper connection and understanding not only to the ‘āina, but also other worldviews that comprise Hawaiian epistemology. Ho‘omanawanui states, “Within a specifically indigenous context, writing about place is also writing about our cultural, ancestral, and genealogical connections to the ‘āina.”

Recently educational programs have developed place-based learning in which students can learn through the ‘āina. Native scholars have deemed this pedagogy important, where many levels of learning can take place simultaneously. In teaching students at ‘Aihualama, Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua notes,

The work of rebuilding the ‘auwai and lo‘i that carry water to and shelter Hāloa aims not only to ground learning in math, science, social studies, and language but also to root students in an ethics of kuleana- a notion of responsibilities, authority, and

---


rights that are tied to one’s positionality in relation to place, genealogy, and effort put forth in knowledge acquisition/production.\textsuperscript{28}

Kanoelani Nāone is another scholar who has written on the intersections of ‘āina, education, and place. She notes that place-based education related to Hawaiian epistemology will play a significant role in reforming Hawaiian education. She also suggests that the historical traditions of that place should be the framework of teaching/learning.\textsuperscript{29} Meyer adopts the standard to “learn from the land and not simply about land.”\textsuperscript{30} Kaʻōpua further advocates that the process of restoring kuleana in an ‘āina in itself is also “… a powerful method of inquiry, teaching, and learning in contemporary Hawaiian education.”\textsuperscript{31}

The Kamehameha Schools’ ‘Āina-Based Education Department (ABED), incepted in 2012, was developed to educate their students and other KS beneficiaries by integrating, “…culture and place-based education to foster kinship and kuleana between people and the ‘āina.”\textsuperscript{32} Many community-based programs supported by ABED currently exist, or are in the planning process, within KS’ land base, offering a variety of diverse learning environments subject to the cultural and natural settings. Most importantly ‘Āina-Based learning, as defined by ABED, is “teaching and learning through the

\textsuperscript{28} Goodyear-Kaʻōpua, \textit{The Seeds We Planted.} 133.


\textsuperscript{31} Goodyear-Kaʻōpua. 133.

\textsuperscript{32} Kamehameha Schools, \textit{‘Āina Ulu Land Legacy Education}. Pamphlet.
ʻĀina,” further affirming that “Culture- and place-based education positively impacts social-emotional development, which drives academic achievement in Hawaiian learners.”

ABED is a relatively recent development in relation to the long history of the Kamehameha Schools, where further development is currently in process. ABED identifies the need for long-term commitment and investment, both internally and with community-based organization partners. In addition to long-term commitment, improvements to the physical sites and infrastructures are required to support the increase in learners and community engagement.

In her dissertation, Kaʻōpua claims that although KS’s 2000 Strategic Plan asserts that they are a Hawaiian institution, her conversations with several KS teachers and administrators indicates that “there is much to be done in the making of Kamehameha as a Hawaiian school’.” I believe that properly furthering the development of ABED would be a positive step in addressing the prolonged question, “is Kamehameha Schools a Hawaiian school or a school for Hawaiians?” KS, along with ABED, is in a position to progress their learners from superficial knowledge acquisition, towards deeper understandings and appreciation, developing relationships rooted in community and place. In addition, more collaboration between ABED and community-based

---


34 Ibid.

35 Ibid.

organizations and potential stewards of ʻāina-based programs needs to be constructed to advance program development. However, the overall benefits of having students, beneficiaries, and community members learn and apply themselves on the ʻāina will not only develop well rounded students, but it will also build and strengthen communities surrounding KS lands.

ʻO Ke Kahua Ma Mua, Ma Hope Ke Kūkulu: The Site First, and Then the Building\textsuperscript{37}

While in graduate school I began to work at Ka Papa Loʻi ʻo Kānewai, an ʻāina-based classroom within Hawaiʻinuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge that centered around the education of traditional loʻi cultivation. While there I learned the practices of uhau humu pōhaku, or dry stack masonry. The entire process of creating a dry stack wall can be a figurative analogy for my planning-inspired methodology. From deconstructing an existing structure, to laying the final capstones on the completed wall, each step in uhau humu pōhaku requires strategic foresight and planning to complete. Although at first it seemed painstaking work that tired my body and battered my hands, I came to value the arduous labor of our kūpuna and the lessons that stem from this practice.

The four main sections of the wall are the pōhaku niho, the pōhaku alo, the hakahaka, and the pōhaku pāpale. The pōhaku niho are the stones set on the base of the wall, acting as the foundation. The pōhaku alo are the stones that are stacked upon the pōhaku niho. The hakahaka are the pōhaku that fill the back of the wall, and are also the smaller pebbles that occupy the vacant spaces between the pōhaku. And finally, the pōhaku pāpale are the flat stones “capping off” the top of the wall. When stacking, lines

made of string are strung out acting as a guideline to successfully build a straight wall. Angled wood posts called banters hold up the lines.\(^{38}\)

The person building the wall must first gather all the pōhaku necessary. These pōhaku may be in various areas within his land, being many different shapes and sizes. The builder will decide what type of pōhaku (niho, alo, hakahaka, or pāpale) each one will be. The banters are then built and lines set, creating the required angle and parameters of the wall. The uhau humu pōhaku process begins with the laying of the pōhaku niho. The hakahaka and pōhaku alo are sequentially laid behind and upon the pōhaku niho as the work proceeds down the line. The pōhaku pāpale are placed at the end, creating a smooth, flat top. With skillful diligence laying the proper stone in the correct place, patience with stones not willing to sit right, and many hands contributing to a common goal, the successful completion of the project will create an aesthetic wall that will be utilized, studied, and admired for generations, similar to that of the kuaiwi walls of Kona.

My methodology will be in the form of uhau humu pōhaku. The pōhaku will metaphorically represent the researched information I seek to integrate in my analysis. Since my proposed project pertains to an area that has been in fallow for nearly a century, and no such plans have been published or applied, I will be concentrating on developing a plan with a strong foundation, only setting the pōhaku niho. By concentrating on the most important section of the wall, making sure that each pōhaku niho is strong and steady, the further building of my wall after graduation will be easier and more efficient.

\(^{38}\) *Uhau Humu Pōhaku*, DVD, directed by Halealoha Ayau (2012; Honolulu, HI: Hui Hoʻoniho).
Before any such work is to be done in terms of setting and laying the pōhaku niho, a framework structure of the length, angle, and height of the wall needs to be laid out. Wooden posts called banters are built to designate the proper angle of the wall, an aspect that is crucial for its strength and integrity. In addition, the banters hold up the lines that keep the wall even and straight. The banters in my methodology represent the ʻāina of my project. Understanding the importance of this parcel, the type and function of this type of ʻāina, and its purpose and meaning to the community is extremely important, for it delegates the method of reengagement, reapplication, and revitalization.

The pōhaku niho of my wall embodies the foundation of my research, where each niho will represent a respective focus in my analysis. In order to create an appropriate ʻĀina-Based program, it is imperative to first learn and understand the history of the parcel. Historical knowledge imbedded in the particular ʻāina will create a deep understanding of place, and provide direction as to how to reassert the preexisting identity into this ʻāina. Furthermore, building a strong foundation based on historical knowledge of the subject ʻāina will form a sound educational program where learners can connect past traditions with present conditions.

The first cornerstone niho is labeled “mai nā kūpuna mai.” The cornerstone is the most important pōhaku in the wall, where I believe moʻolelo pertaining to the ʻāina explained through the eyes of our kūpuna in the language of our kūpuna is of the upmost importance. Knowledge of our kūpuna takes form in ʻoli, mele, wahi pana, ʻōlelo noʻeau, kanikau, and moʻolelo. They can be found in the Hawaiian Language Newspapers, books published by kanaka maoli and foreigners alike, and oral traditions documented in Hawaiian language tape/video recordings. Also the native scholars emerging from the
Lahainaluna Seminary School in the mid to late 19th Century such as Malo, Kamakau, ‘Ī‘i, and Kepelino, among others, are included in this category.

The second niho is labeled “Historical Land Documents.” Somewhat similar to the first niho, kanaka maoli of Kahalu‘u provided historical information concerning place names, boundary markers, agriculture/cultivation, and physical descriptions of the ‘āina during the time of the Hawaiian Kingdom. Although the majority of the documents were recorded with Western-based hermeneutics of geography and cartography, the resulting maps and records of land divisions and boundary markers are that of a hybrid between kanaka maoli understandings and Western methods of mapping.39 These historical records take form in Māhele land documents, Land Commission/Royal Patent records, Boundary Commission reports and testimonies, and early Kingdom maps.

The third niho is labeled “Hoʻoulua Kaiāulu” which translates to “community growth and development”. As noted previously in this chapter, I stress the importance of integrating community interests within my research. This entails a direct attempt to include the perspectives and visions of various leaders within Kona’s community who make decisions that impact Kona every day. I interviewed five leaders of various existing community/ʻāina-based programs in order to analyze and learn their methods for the engagement of their lands and communities.

The fourth niho is labeled “European Explorers/American Missionaries.” In the arrival of European explorers and American missionaries to Kona in the late 18th

Century, much was documented in their journals. Visuals of everyday society were
described through their eyes, in which many of the written accounts pertain to the dry-
land agricultural system of Kona. Their stories can be found in numerous journals and
books written by Europeans and missionaries.

The fifth niho is labeled “Secondary Scholars.” These historical analyses come
from contemporary scholars in various academic fields. Within this category are the
ethnographers, anthropologists, archaeologists, and historians that have researched the
Kona Field System.

Outline of Chapters

The first chapter of my thesis introduces the concept of learning through ‘āina,
and examines the various roles of ‘Āina-Based programs as modes of physical, mental,
and social engagement to cultural knowledge and historical place-based understandings.
In this chapter, I will illustrate how kanaka maoli understand and view ‘āina, relaying a
deeper understanding as how ‘āina feeds more than physically. Chapter one will also
identify importance of creating a space that encourages cultural practices, and fosters the
physical reconnection of kanaka maoli to ‘āina of Kona today.

Chapter two will convey the various wahi pana, or storied places, embedded on
the ‘āina of Kahalu‘u. Through wahi pana, I will illustrate the ways in which kanaka
maoli mapped and identified with their ‘āina. In chapter three I’m arguing that the
epistemological understanding of the wahi pana of Kahalu‘u can be a pedagogy for the
mental reconnection of Kanaka Maoli to ‘āina.

Chapter three will first analyze the definition of Kūāhewa, or what contemporary
scholars title the “Kona Field System.” I will write about the history of Kūāhewa,
highlighting the important leadership qualities from various aliʻi that contributed to the establishment of this massive dry-land agricultural complex. I will analyze Kūāhewa’s rise and fall, focusing on the social and economic shift that occurred during the advent of Western explorers and missionaries. In this chapter, I will highlight the historical continuity of Kūāhewa, where today it is still a living system that is just as relevant now as it was historically.

Chapter four addresses the various methods of connecting to place and community by analyzing interviews of individuals representing various community/ʻāina-based programs in Oʻahu and Kona. Chapter four will argue the importance of sound leadership within communities to enforce and promote connectivity, relationship building and collaborative efforts in mālama ʻāina.

Chapter five will be a summary and analysis of the previous chapters and an argument for the importance of an ʻĀina-Based program in Kona. In this chapter I reiterate how understanding the historical significance of Kahaluʻu and Kona is essential in the reconnection and reestablishment of kuleana to this ʻāina. Furthermore, I will reinforce the values and morals that these programs possess, where they are the drivers of social change.
Chapter 2: He Aloha No Ka ʻĀina o Kahalu‘u: A Veneration for the ʻĀina of Kahalu‘u

Introduction: Wahi Pana as Connectors to Place

The ahupuaʻa of Kahaluʻu, Hawaiʻi is as important to the community of Kona today as it was in the time of our kūpuna. This ʻāina is rich in wahi pana, or storied places, which are found within the various repositories that make up the body of Hawaiian knowledge today. Pukuʻi broadly defines wahi pana as a “legendary place.” However, contemporary kanaka maoli scholars of various academic disciplines have further defined wahi pana, which have manifested multiple layers of interpretation and significance. Wahi pana are given names for geographical and geological features within an area with historical significance and genealogy bounded to its name. The names of wahi pana can also portray place-based knowledge systems, such as mapping place boundaries and weather patterns, that act as foundations for Hawaiian epistemologies. Lastly, the knowledge and understanding of wahi pana and their


attached moʻolelo establishes identity and a sense of well-being for kanaka maoli residing in the area. Crystal Kua, the Communications Director at the Office of Hawaiian Affairs states that wahi pana are:

Regarded with great reverence and respect in old Hawai‘i, these places were sources of mana or spiritual power. For Kanaka Maoli, wahi pana are places that remind us of who we are as a people- the past, present and at times, the future. The history of our people are carved out in these legendary locations. A sense of place gives us a feeling of well-being, stability and belonging especially to our ʻohana- those living and those long gone.43

I draw upon the theoretical framework pertaining to the importance of remembering, recovering, and writing about place, portrayed by Historian Kuʻualoha Hoʻomanawanui.44 Hoʻomanawanui argues that the “connection between kanaka maoli and ʻāina forms the basis of indigenous literacy,”45 where the recovery and retelling of moʻolelo “acknowledges and values kanaka intellectual history and contributes to the well-being of our lāhui.”46 The many sources of ʻŌiwi knowledge are very much available to the public, scattered throughout different repositories that can be researched and brought back to life. Hoʻomanawanui writes:

Writing place, or writing about place, is a new area of focus within the discipline of composition and rhetoric studies. Within a specifically indigenous context, writing about place is also writing about our cultural, ancestral, and genealogical connections to the ʻāina. It includes culturally specific genres of writing that demonstrate the relationship of our ancestors to place, their worldview developed


44 Hoʻomanawanui, 189.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid.
from living on that ʻāina, and the poetic, intellectual, and philosophical epistemologies that result.47

This chapter will reflect upon the many moʻolelo bounded to Kahaluʻu, to express how our kūpuna perceived ʻāina, as well as how they expressed their associations to their land. I cite kanaka maoli scholars that have written about wahi pana in order to map the understanding of its definition, and its various associations with place-based knowledge systems and epistemologies. I also analyze the role wahi pana partakes in the contemporary attempts to reconnect to a kanaka maoli understanding of place. I will incorporate specific wahi pana located within the Kahaluʻu ahupuaʻa and the broader Kona as examples in my analysis of the several interpretations that wahi pana represent.

**Wahi Pana as Place and History**

The most common and general understanding of wahi pana is the affiliation between the name of a place and its history. The names of places are sources of cultural knowledge that are instilled on the land, weather patterns, and oceans, connecting place to moʻolelo and moʻokūʻauhau. A place can be in the form of various physical geographical sites, and/or man-made structures. Some examples of physical geographical sites include kulapa (valley ridges), puʻu (hills, peaks, mounds, etc.), pōhaku (stone formations), ana (caves), koʻa (fishing grounds), and even forests and plant groves. Some man-made structures include heiau (worship temples), kiʻi pōhaku (petroglyphs), loko iʻa (fishponds), and māla (cultivated fields).

Moʻolelo of famous people and their journeys give great insight as to how wahi pana are named, and why they are important. They also describe the areas of their journeys, noting the geography, climate, natural environment, as well as the aliʻi and makaʻāinana

47 Ibid. 229.
residing there at the time. While maps created in the time of the Hawaiian Kingdom and archaeological reports convey the names of various wahi pana and their spatial differentiation, moʻolelo provides deeper context and meaning wahi pana. “Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki” (The Heart Stirred Story of Ka-Miki) is one such moʻolelo that delivers rich history and context to the places and names of various heiau within Kahaluʻu. Written primarily by J.W.H.I. Kihe and John Wise, Ka-Miki was published over a four-year span (1914-1917) in the Hawaiian language newspaper Ka Hoku o Hawaii. Doing research with this story, Kepa Maly states the origin of the information of this story, and the wealth of place-based knowledge entwined with this text:

While “Ka-Miki” is not an ancient account, the authors used a mixture of local traditions, tales, and family histories in association with place names to tie together fragments of site specific histories that had been handed down over the generations. The narratives… include documentation on approximately 800 named locations, and describe site and community histories, local and regional practices, ceremonial sites and practices, and mele (chant) texts.

Born of supernatural powers, Ka Miki and his brother, Makaʻiole, were the children of Pōhakuokāne and Kapaʻihilani, the aliʻi of Kohanaiki and Kaloko in Kona. In their upbringings, Kauluhenuihikoloiuka, the grandmother of Ka Miki and Makaʻiole, trains them to use their supernatural powers in various skills pertaining to both mental

---

48 Kaao Hooniu Puuwai no Ka-Miki. Ka Hoku o Hawaii, 1914-1917. I chose not to add Hawaiian diacritical marks to any direct quotation from all Hawaiian language newspaper articles. Hawaiian diacritical marks were first utilized in the late 20th century, none of which were inputted in the Hawaiian Language newspapers. I feel that inputting diacritics may jeopardize the intended meaning and translation of the story.

and physical competition. Kauluhe trains them well so that they can set out on their quest around Hawai‘i Island to challenge warriors and priests of ali‘i whose dishonorable conduct offends the gods of Hawai‘i.50 In their battles, they meet the ali‘i of Kahalu‘u, his many warriors and priests, much of which are the names of various heiau within Kahalu‘u. Using the mo‘olelo of Ka Miki and archaeological reports done in the early 20th Century by Thrum51 and Stokes52, I will express the various wahi pana of Kahalu‘u.

According to the Ka-Miki story, the ahupua‘a of Kahalu‘u was possibly named after its ruling chief, Kahalu‘u. In Kamiki’s trip to see the various political centers of Kona, his grandmother told him the name of the lands that he visited. When he explained what he saw at Kahalu‘u, his grandmother confirmed, “That land is Kahalu‘u, belonging to a chief of the same name…”53 There is a inherent connection between the naming of ‘āina of Kahalu‘u and the ali‘i that rule the ahupua‘a, however, it is uncertain whether the ‘āina was named after the ali‘i or the ali‘i was named after the ‘āina. It is as if this portrays one connective example of how ‘āina and kanaka are synonymous with each other.

50 Ibid. 34.
51 T. Thrum, Heiaus and Heiau Sites Throughout the Hawaiian Islands. (Honolulu: Hawaiian Almanac and Annual, 1909)
Kamiki’s grandmother also stated that the ali‘i Kahalu‘u had a daughter whose beauty was unmatched in all of the land. Kahalu‘u’s beautiful daughter’s name was Mākole‘ā,

O Makolea, ka maoli pua o ka wai kau mai i ka maka o ka opua. He wahine maikai loa ke nana aku, aohe puu aohe kee, pali ke kua, mahina ke alo.

*Makolea, the true flower of the water placed in the face of the opua. (She) is a very fine woman when looked at, no protrusion, no deformation, back like a cliff, face like the moon.*

Mākoleʻā married Kepaka‘ili‘ula, the son of Makaokū and Hina‘aikamalama from Hilo. A heiau is name after this attractive ali‘i, located on the southern end of Kahalu‘u bay. Thrum and Stokes report that the heiau was built in the time of Lonoikamakahiki, used for prayers in general.

Situated on the southern portion of Kahalu‘u bay is Haleokāne heiau. Stokes suggests that Haleokāne heiau is also named Halekumukalani. Halekumukalani was one of the several generals for Kahalu‘ukaiākea, the ali‘i of Kahalu‘u during the life of Ka Miki. Halekumukalani acted as the master of ceremonies for the fighting games Ka Miki partook in. The author further depicts that Halekumukalani, “shared a name with the

---

54 “Sole maka onaona, i ka pewa hiʻu o ka manini (Sweet-eyed kole, among the tails of manini).” This saying refers to attractive people, where the eye of the kole fish is highly revered as beautiful, in comparison to the unattractive tail portions of manini. *Ke Au Hou*, Honolulu: Hawaii. March 8, 1911. The word “sole” was printed in the newspaper, which may have been a typographical error or a Hawaiian accent not apparent today. Pukui expresses a similar saying in her definition of the kole fish writing, “*kole maka onaona, sweet-eyed kole* [said of an attractive people, as the eye of this fish is considered beautiful].” Pukui, *Hawaiian Dictionary*, 162.


56 Maly, 76.

57 Stokes, 80.
temple located in Kahaluʻu in those days… and the natives of the area knew that the name of the temple Halekumukalani was derived from this warrior.”

Located on the northern side of Kahaluʻu bay is Kuʻemanu heiau. Kuʻemanu was another warrior of Kahaluʻukaiākea mentioned in Ka Miki. Kuʻemanu was one of the many warriors that were defeated by Ka Miki in Hōlualoa. Although Thrum notes that this was a luakini, Stokes disagrees, stating, “I doubt if it should be regularly classed as such.” Kuʻemanu heiau faces the surf within Kahaluʻu bay, in which Henry Kekahuna suggests that was a “surfing temple.”

Keahiolo is a heiau that lies on the boundary between Kahaluʻu and Keauhou. In Ka Miki, Keahiolo was the kahuna of the Keauhou aliʻi. Keahiolo anticipated the arrival of Kamiki and Makaʻiole from Hōlualoa, where he plotted to kill them. Ka Miki noticed Keahiolo planning to attack, and he swiftly crippled Keahiolo by flinging a rock at his feet. Ka Miki nearly killed Keahiolo, however, Makaʻiole requested for Ka Miki to spare his life. Ka Miki agreed, and Keahiolo helped Ka Miki and Makaʻiole enter the competition at Keauhou. Stokes records that the Keahiolo heiau was for agricultural purposes.

---

59 Ibid. 62.
60 Stokes, 70.
62 Ke Au Hou, June 14, 1911.
63 Stokes, 70.
ʻŌhi‘amukumuku was another warrior of Kahalu‘ukaiākea that had a heiau named after him. He was a warrior that also was defeated by Ka Miki. According to Stokes:

The heiau stood on rising ground, in a position to command the village. Below its site, on the roadside, is a stone called Lapauila, described as a “straggling stone.” At one end of the stone is a perforation. The local tradition was that in certain cases a criminal was laid upon the stone and choked with a rope that passed around his neck and through the hole in the stone. Other local information was that ʻŌhi‘amukumuku was for offering human victims and was built by Lonoikamakahiki or Alapa‘i.64

The story of Ka Miki is the best mo‘olelo that I have found in my research that pertains to the place names and their histories of Kahalu‘u and Kona. It conveys detailed accounts of the landscape of Kona, and the people that defined them. It is certain that there are many other examples found within Ka Miki, as well as other mo‘olelo not mentioned in this section, of how mo‘olelo portray a connection of people and place. However, a dissertation would be required to express them all. My analysis merely seeks to introduce a framework to understand the connection of wahi pana and history, in which the purpose of this section was to explore the methods of researching what were the names of these places, who these places were named after, and why these people were important.

**Wahi Pana as Place and Mapping**

*Kona ʻākau, mai Keahualono a Pu‘uohau
North Kona, from Keahualono to Pu‘uohau*65

Kanaka maoli utilized wahi pana as palena (boundaries) on the land. Wahi pana acted as visible and distinguishable bodies that Kanaka Maoli were able to recognize.

64 Ibid.

The usage of wahi pana was one of the methods of portraying ‘Hawaiian cartographic traditions’ labeled by kanaka maoli Geographer Renee Pualani Louis. Wahi pana provided a spatial cognitive map for Kanaka Maoli prior to the advent of Western cartography, which utilized compasses and physical written maps in their methodology. These cognitive maps were eloquently conveyed in various modes of expression.

According to Louis:

Hawaiians incorporated their spatial understandings into various cultural practices such as mo‘o‘olelo (historical accounts), ‘ōlelo no‘eau (proverbs), mele (song), ‘oli (chant), mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy), and hula (dance).

The ‘ōlelo no‘eau noted in the beginning of this section is an example of how kanaka maoli incorporated wahi pana as palena. The Moku (district) of Kona ‘Ākau, or North Kona begins in the north at Keahualono heiau, which is situated on the boundary between North Kona and South Kohala in the ‘ili kūpono of Waikoloa, which is within the ahupua‘a of Waimea. Kona ‘Ākau ends at Puʻuohau, a cinder cone separating North Kona from South Kona. John Clark describes Puʻuohau:

---

66 See Louis, Hawaiian Place Names, 2.


68 Louis, 2.

69 Keahualono heiau was built by Lonoikamakahiki during the reconciliation between him and Kapaihiahilina. Abraham Fornander, Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore: The Hawaiian account of the formation of their islands and their race, with the traditions of their migrations, etc., as gathered from original sources. Vol. 4. (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1920) 362.
Cinder cone (230 feet), Kainaliu, Hawai‘i. The most conspicuous landmark on the low sea cliffs between Kealakekua and Keauhou bays, Pu‘u Ohau marks the boundary between North and South Kona. Also known as Red Hill.\(^{70}\)

There are many other examples of wahi pana that act as markers that delineate space and exist in these various forms of expression. This expression as a whole was the methodology that shaped the cultural landscape of an ‘āina, which contributed to a specific understanding of place. Wahi pana as a method of Hawaiian cartographic tradition is an integral portion of the overall Hawaiian epistemological worldview. Epistemology is “a branch of philosophy that studies the theory of knowledge and looks at the overall origin, nature and scope of knowledge.”\(^{71}\) Louis explains the relationship between the methodologies of cartography acting within a culture’s overall epistemology, stating,

> If cartography specifically focuses on the representation and communication of spatial knowledge, then epistemology (a culture’s overall origin, nature, and scope of knowledge) determines the way each culture develops cartographically (modes of representation and communication for spatial knowledge).\(^{72}\)

What Louis infers in her dissertation is that kanaka maoli developed their own form of cartography, influenced by their epistemological worldview. By understanding the way in which kanaka maoli expressed their methods of cognitive mapping, one can further recognize the role wahi pana plays in Hawaiian cartographic traditions. The next section will examine such roles as it pertains to mapping the environment of a place through a kanaka maoli world-view. I will examine examples found in mele, ‘ōli, and

---


\(^{71}\) Louis, 11.

\(^{72}\) Louis, 12.
ʻōlelo noʻeau to express how kanaka maoli referenced and utilized wahi pana to map their both their geographical and meteorological environment.

ʻO Ko Kona Mau Nō Ia a Ka La‘i: Calm is Typical of Kona

Mauna Kea, Mauna Loa, and Hualālai shelter the land and sea of Kona. Calm, pleasant weather is common year round, the tranquil ocean extends past the horizon providing ideal fishing, diving, and surfing conditions. The environment of Kona has been a desirable place today, as well as in the time of our kūpuna. Samuel Kamakau writes about ʻUmi’s desires to move from Waipiʻo to dwell in Kona, saying, “ʻUmi resided in Waipiʻo, Hāmākua, and when the island of Hawaiʻi was united by him, he desired to dwell in Kona where the climate was warm.” There are several ʻōlelo noʻeau that speaks to Kona’s peaceful climate and calm seas:

Kona, kai ʻōpua i ka laʻi
_Kona, where the horizon clouds rest in the calm_75

Kona i ke kai māʻokiʻoki
_Kona of the sea that is cut up_76

Kona, kai malino a Ehu
_Kona, land of the calm sea of Ehu_77

Volume six in Abraham Fornander’s, _Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore_, contains a unique mele that explains Kona’s convective weather

---

73 Pukui, ʻŌlelo Noʻeau. 269.
74 Pukui. 19.
75 Ibid. 199.
76 “From a distance one can see the smooth surface of the sea of Kona, Hawaiʻi, cut by innumerable streaks of color.” Ibid. 199.
77 “Ehunuikaimalino was a chief of Kona, Hawaiʻi, under the ruler Līloa.” Ibid. 199.
pattern, showcasing the names of the winds and famous ʻōpua clouds of Kona. The overlying message of this mele however, is meant to encompass love:

O kupu hawawae ke aka o ke ʻilio
*The shadow of the chief arose lobster like*

He auau i ka wai maka opua i ka lani
*Bathing in the water of the clouds in heaven*

Ke koiawe ae la he makua
*It has grown large and is trailing*

He makua ke ao ua no Kona
*The rain cloud is a benefactor to Kona*

O Kona kau aloha, ua eha, ua pepehiia e ka la
*I feel sorry for Kona, it is hurt, it is sweltered by the sun*

Ua napele ke kula o Kailua
*The plain of Kailua is sore*

Ua pa aoao i ka wela me he keiki mai hemo la
*It is struck on the side by heat as a child untied and left to himself*

Hemo haalele ke a o ke kai
*The rocks toward the sea lie by themselves*

Waiho malie wale iho no
*Nothing to disturb them*

Naenae ole ke alo o ka lai
*The breast of the calm is not panting*

Alokele pahee i ke kehau
*The face wet and slippery with dew*

Kehau wai hau no ka mauna
*The dew of the ice from the mountain*

He wai kino ole na ka makani
*A water without a body by the wind*

Ke hoomau wale no i ka ai
*Just simply wetting the food*
I ola ka ai o Wainae  
*To give life to the food of Wainae*

Auhea no la i na lea iho e  
*Let there be a resting so that*

Ka oopa a ke aloha  
*The pangs of love would be assuaged*

Ka malohilohi i ka makemake  
*And the weariness of desire*

O kau ia o ka makemake a komo he pua la  
*That is yours,- to desire until it is placed in your quiver*

Maloko i makamaka e hea mai ai owau e  
*When within there is a friend, a call issues forth, here I am*  

The composer integrated the convective weather pattern of Kona as a metaphor to express various emotions (i.e. loneliness, desire, shelter, fulfillment) pertaining to love/affection. Not only can we appreciate the aesthetically pleasing visuals conjured when reading this mele, but we also can extract valuable knowledge and epistemology pertaining to how the composer understands the natural phenomena that occur in Kona. In addition, this mele concurrently maps an ‘Ōiwi understanding to Kona’s daily weather pattern.

Orographic uplifting, the typical process of precipitation to the Hawaiian Islands, are due to the trade winds being forced up the Windward slopes. Since the three large mountains block the trade winds from reaching the leeward side of Hawai‘i island, Kona

---

78 Abraham Fornander, *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore: The Hawaiian account of the formation of their islands and their race, with the traditions of their migrations, etc., as gathered from original sources*. Vol. 6. (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1920) 543.

does not receive water from orographic uplifting; convectional precipitation however is
the driving force for daily rainfall in Kailua-Kona. Author Robert Louis Stevenson
accounts this weather pattern in his visit to Kona in 1889:

The land and sea breezes alternate on the Kona Coast with regularity, and the veil of
rain draws up and down the talus of the mountain now retiring to the zone of forests,
now descending to the margin of the sea.\(^\text{80}\)

In the early mornings, cool, dense, land breezes run down the gentle slope of
Hualālai towards the sea. This type of wind is called kēhau, which is also common
throughout the Hawaiian Islands. The kēhau breeze is referred in the mele above as,
“kēhau wai hau no ka mauna, he wai kino ‘ole na ka makani (the dew of the ice from the
mountain, a water without a body by the wind).”\(^\text{81}\) As the kēhau wind flows down the
mountain, it deposits dew and mist on the plants, being a source of water to the forest and
crops in Kona.\(^\text{82}\) Since the water created by the kēhau wind does not derive from cloud
formation, it is referred as a water source “without a body.”

\[\text{Hiolo na wainao‘a a ke kēhau.}\]
\[\text{The chilly waters of the kēhau tumble down.}\(^\text{83}\)\]

As the sun heats the land throughout the day, the density of the air decreases, and
begins to rise up the slopes of Hualālai. The wind then shifts to an afternoon sea breeze


\(^\text{81}\) Fornander, \textit{Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Aniquities and Folklore}, 543.


\(^\text{83}\) Maly, \textit{He Moʻolelo ʻĀina}. 76.
called ‘eka. The ‘eka wind is a light, hot, wind, in which the word ‘eka is defined as, “dirty, foul, fecal.”\(^{84}\) ‘Ōlelo no‘eau express that when the ‘eka winds blow in Kona, it is a time for fishing:\(^{85}\)

\[
\text{Ka makani kūkulu pe‘a nui, he ‘eka} \\
\text{The ‘eka, the wind that sets up the big snails}^{86}
\]

\[
\text{Ke ‘eka, ka makani ho‘olale wā‘a o na Kona} \\
\text{The ‘eka breeze of Kona that calls the canoe men to sally forth to fish}^{87}
\]

As the ‘eka wind climbs the slopes of Hualālai, eventually reaching the cool mauka portions, cloud formation occurs. In addition, the ‘eka wind carries the ‘ōpua clouds in the horizon inland, eventually precipitating in the uplands in the afternoon. The ‘ōpua clouds, carried in by the ‘eka wind, is an important source of water for the land and kanaka maoli. ‘Ōlelo no‘eau describes an ‘Ōiwi perspective to the importance the ‘ōpua cloud has in terms of water and life, specifically referring to Kona:

\[
\text{Aia ka wai i ka maka o ka ‘ōpua} \\
\text{Water is in the face of the ‘ōpua clouds}^{88}
\]

\[
\text{Ola i ka wai a ka ‘ōpua} \\
\text{There is life in the water from the clouds}^{89}
\]

\[
\text{Māmā kona i ka wai kau mai i ka maka o ka ‘ōpua}
\]


\(^{86}\) Pukui, ‘Ōlelo No‘eau, 159.

\(^{87}\) Ibid, 182.

\(^{88}\) Ibid. 57.

\(^{89}\) Ibid. 271.
Kona is lightened in having water in the face of the clouds

Lono, one of the main deities of Hawaiian religion, is prevalently found in the place names and histories of Kona. The many kinolau, or body forms, of Lono exist in Kona’s weather patterns, also within the suitable crops that grow well in Kona. In the story written by Mary Kawena Pukui titled, *Moolelo Kāhiko no Kumuhonua*, a fisherman named Lono was responsible for the bringing of crops to Kona. E. S. Craighill Handy, Elizabeth Green Handy, and Mary Kawena Pukui wrote about the presence of Lono in Kona:

The sweet potato and gourd were suitable for cultivation on the drier areas of the islands. The cult of Lono was important in those areas, especially in Kona on Hawaii… there were temples dedicated to Lono.

In the mele aloha mentioned above, the first four lines poetically expresses not only the formation of the clouds that will shelter the sun-beaten land of Kona, but also conveys the existence of Lono within the clouds:

O kupu hawawae ke aka o ke ‘lii
*The shadow of the chief arose lobster like*

He auau i ka wai maka opua i ka lani
*Bathing in the water of the clouds in heaven*

Ke koiawe ae la he makua
*It has grown large and is trailing*

He makua ke ao ua no Kona
*The rain cloud is a benefactor to Kona*

---

90 Ibid. 232.
93 Fornander, 543.
The translator interpreted the word “hawawae” as a small lobster, however, it also can be translated as “sprouts of a sweet potato.” In my analysis, the composer used the growth of an ‘uala vine as a metaphor that mimics the formation and growth of clouds. As the ‘uala vines grow, they sprout leaves and spread over the land, creating a blanket of leaves and vines that shade the land from the heat of the sun. This action similarly corresponds to how the ‘ōpuu clouds shelter and shade the land in Kona in the afternoon. Both the ‘uala plant and the ‘ōpuu cloud are kinolau of Lono.

Kona’s climate and geography is quite unique in comparison to the rest of the archipelago, which fostered a very place-specific understanding of land and resource management. This section examined the epistemology of Kona’s weather, primarily focusing on its names and meanings. These names and meanings to the weather patterns were imbedded in mele, ʻoli, and ʻōlelo noʻeau about Kona, composed and recorded in Hawaiian language newspapers and books written in the 17th and 18th century. This example is one of many ways in which they mapped their environment, and conveyed their connection to their place, as well as their deities.

**The Severance of Wahi Pana in the Late 17th Century**

ʻĀina without any connection to kanaka do not have wahi pana, and by extension, any moʻolelo or moʻokūʻauhau. Also in conjunction, kanaka without any land does not have identity or history. Carlos Andrade, a kanaka maoli Geographer, writes in his book, *Hāʻena: Through the Eyes of the Ancestors*, about the way in which moʻolelo and ʻāina

---

converge to form wahi pana. The conversion of story and place in return establishes identity within both the ‘āina and kanaka maoli. According to Andrade,

In the Polynesian past, what was important was not when something happened, but where, how and in what sequence events occurred. Hawaiian traditions pinpoint places as landing spots of ancestral navigators, as locations where the people emerged into the world, or as arenas in which they lived, fought battles, engaged in love affairs, and buried the dead. These name places were, and still are, considered sacred by the Hawaiian people. They preserve the memories of many generations, forming a repository, a foundation for their identity as a people.95

The ‘āina, along with the stories physically connected to it, does not only form the identity of the people, but also acts as the foundation to their sense of and connection to place. Kanoelani Nāone is another scholar that has written about the importance of wahi pana. In her dissertation in Political Science, she expresses the importance of knowing wahi pana, with the stories that are attached, for both perpetuating ‘Ōiwi knowledge and maintaining mana upon the ‘āina. She notes:

In hearing and passing down the stories of place the ‘ike of our kūpuna is perpetuated: this gives sustenance to the next generation and power to the land… Through place names and the names of winds and rains we can better know a place and ground ourselves in the value of dialogue between land and people.96

Wahi pana are geographical/geological references that educate, acting as a significant part of the pedagogy of Hawaiian epistemology. The dialogue between the ‘āina and the kanaka maoli dwelling upon it forms physical, mental, and spiritual stability. However, factors contributed to the disconnection between wahi pana as a mode of education, eventually affecting the wellbeing of kanaka maoli, and in return,

created social-political problems occurring today. Kū Kahakalau, scholar and one of the founders of Kanu O Ka ʻĀina, a Hawaiian charter school based on Hawaiʻi Island, expresses the detrimental effects of Western schooling on kanaka maoli, conveying,

Not only are Hawaiians not happy Natives, we are also not healthy or wealthy Natives. Over 150 years of Western schooling have left the vast majority of Hawaiians with little or no knowledge of our impressive traditional customs, or our poetic Native language, which traditionally validated our holistic worldview.97

One such factor is the reformation of education by Protestant missionaries that began in the 1820’s. They developed small school houses throughout communities in Hawaiʻi where children would enter to learn reading and writing, both in English and Hawaiian. In her dissertation, Nāone argues that the development of a Protestant missionary-based education separated land from the education for natives,98 stating that “this (Protestant missionary model of education) system worked as a part of the project of cultural colonialism to separate Kanaka Maoli from their language, ʻāina, and communities.”99

Although I agree that the inception of a Protestant missionary model of education in the 1820’s was the first attempt to replace ʻŌiwi knowledge with a more Western-based worldview, the knowledge and connection to wahi pana in kanaka maoli persisted during the Hawaiian Kingdom period, up until the illegal overthrow of Queen Liliʻuokalani in 1893 by American businessmen, where an Anglo-American political and


98 Nāone, The Pilina of Kanaka and ʻĀina. 142.

99 Ibid. 89.
An educational worldview was instilled. This is seen in the many moʻolelo, mele, ʻoli, moʻokūʻauhau, and ʻōlelo noʻeau written in the Hawaiian language newspapers throughout the 19th and early 20th Century. The kanaka maoli adapted and utilized the technology of writing to record their ancient stories previously passed down orally. They recognized Western mapping techniques as a technology, and utilized it to map the Hawaiian Kingdom in the mid 19th Century. When they mapped the land however, they incorporated the traditional names, including wahi pana, along with ancient land divisions such as moku, ahupuaʻa, ʻili.100

Many of the initial subjects taught by the Protestant missionaries, including literacy and mapping, were “tools of the other”101 that were used to preserve traditional knowledge. Rather than subjugating kanaka maoli in the classrooms with Western education, kanaka maoli used and adapted those resources while maintaining their identity.102 Kamana Beamer addresses the aliʻi’s ability to adapt to “modern” technologies while retaining their connection and identity to their lands and culture, stating, “Theirs was a strategy of selective adaptation, a strategy that had worked until January 17th, 1893.”103 The subsequent banning of Hawaiian as a medium of instruction


102 Ibid. 39.

103 Beamer, Na Wai Ka Mana? 9.
in 1896\textsuperscript{104} and the brutal punishment endured by our kūpuna for speaking Hawaiian at schools in the early 1900’s contributed to the eventual assimilation of kanaka maoli, instilling a Euro-American world view at the expense of a Hawaiian world view.\textsuperscript{105}

**Conclusion: Wahi Pana as a Medium for Reconnection**

In this chapter I examined the various layers that define the meaning of wahi pana. Similar to naming a building in the University after a person of importance, many of the wahi pana in Kahalu‘u, both man-made and naturally occurring, were named after famous kanaka maoli of that place. Wahi pana are also the infrastructure to a kanaka maoli understanding of mapping. I have expressed the relationship between ‘Āina and kanaka, and how it surpasses the realm of physical connection, also encompassing a mental and spiritual connection. What drives this notion is the various ways in which kanaka maoli convey their epistemological understanding, with their ‘āina being an essential part in their method of expression.

Wahi pana, an integral aspect of ‘Ōiwi understanding, was one of the many Hawaiian epistemologies that diminished following the ban of the Hawaiian language. With the medium between kanaka and ‘āina severed, the deep knowledge, appreciation, and connection to their ‘āina, mo’olelo, and mo’okū‘auhau were nearly lost. Fortunately, Hawaiian Kingdom maps expressing ancient place names, coupled with the many great mo’olelo captured in the Hawaiian language newspapers provides an avenue to reclaim place names with the mo’olelo attached, resurfacing and reconnecting wahi pana not only

\textsuperscript{104} “The English language shall be the medium and basis of instruction in all public and private schools.” Hawai‘i State Archives Session Laws 1896, Act 57. Section 30, pg 189.

\textsuperscript{105} Nāone, 143.
to the ‘āina, but to the consciousness of kanaka maoli today. Edward Kanahele portrays the importance for kanaka maoli to reestablish a sense of place of their home, which wahi pana facilitates the reconnection with ‘āina:

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

Where once the entire Native Hawaiian society paid homage to numerous wahi pana, now we may give wahi pana hardly a cursory glance. Only when a Native Hawaiian gains spiritual wisdom is the ancestral and spiritual sense of place reactivated.¹⁰⁶

Amidst the drastic environmental, societal, and political change that occurred within the past centuries, the ‘Āina and wahi pana persist. Knowing the names of wahi pana, understanding the meanings and histories behind them, and conveying them with the community of Kahalu‘u is a positive method of reconnection and appreciation of place. A kupuna¹⁰⁷ and community advocate of Kahalu‘u bay emphasizes this methodology of reconnection through education, stating:

Why do people keep come back and loving Kahalu‘u? It is because of the reef, that’s the consensus. We want to take care of place. ‘Āina is really important when you are educating on site. What you are observing today, would not be what I have observed in the 1950’s, because of the changes that occurred. But the reefs are still there, that’s your connection, that’s your piko. You have to make your community feel good about whatever they are doing, and then try to figure out how to make it better.¹⁰⁸


¹⁰⁷ As agreed with my interview subjects, I have opted to keep their identities and occupations anonymous.

¹⁰⁸ Personal interview conducted December 13, 2013.
I have only scratched the surface of attempting to examine, interpret, and understand the many layers of meaning found within wahi pana of Kahaluʻu and Kona. There are many different wahi pana of interest that need to be further studied and resurfaced in the personal, societal, and educational consciousness in Kahaluʻu and Kona’s community. Although, this chapter applied specific wahi pana as examples to express the theoretical frameworks of how wahi pana can be researched, interpreted, and conveyed. Understanding the place-based knowledge systems of Kahaluʻu and the overall areas of Kona will bring the histories and ʻŌiwi knowledge back to life, resurfacing a deep understanding of place that has been shrouded with cultural and historical suppression for nearly two centuries.
Chapter 3: Hoʻomau ‘Ia ‘O Kūāhewa e Nā Kuaiwi: A Historiography of Kūāhewa

Introduction:

The individual in old Hawaii viewed himself as a link between his long line of forebears and his descendants, even those yet unborn.109

In the summer of 2008 my father and I began the planting of various fruit trees within our five-acre parcel of land in Kealakehe, Hawai‘i. Dry-stacked stone walls already existent prior to moving there when I was a young boy borders our parcel, along with the neighboring parcels. I always wondered how old these ancient walls are and who were the ones that stacked them. Our land is rocky, with only a few pockets of soil suitable for planting large fruit trees. My father and I address the situation by digging large holes in the ground, filling them with rich soil, and planting the young trees in the soil.

In the fall of that same year as I returned to Honolulu for school, I came across a strikingly similar method of cultivation in ancient Hawai‘i. The description was found in chapter five, part eight in Kepelino’s book, Kepelino’s Traditions of Hawaii. The title of this part was “Dry Farming of Taro in Kona, Hawaii.”110 Within this part, Kepelino describes the various methods of planting kalo in Kona, one of which was named Pakukui. Kepelino states,

Pakukui, oia ka hana ana i na makalua a nunui; alaila, halai i ka lau kukui, hoopiha a uhi aku i ka lepo. A hala he mau pule, alaila, pulu ka lau kukui, alaila kanu na huli. He me e ka ikaika o ka ulu ana o ke kalo ma ia ano; e ulu no ia ehiku kapuai ke


The leaf-filling method consists in digging large holes and filling them with candlenut leaves and covering them with soil. After some weeks the leaves are decayed and the taro is planted. A plant thus handled may grow to seven feet and over and the taro may weigh twenty pounds and over. According to the depth of the fertilizer, so is the height and size of its growth.\(^{111}\)

I also learned the name and function of the dry-stacked rock walls that are so prominently found around my family’s land. These rock structures are called kuaiwi, which acted as borders of the areas where various crops were planted within. Archaeologist Ross Cordy defines them as,

…taro and sweet potatoes were grown on cleared terraced soil areas and on stone mounds in fields fringed with low mounded stone and earth walls (kuaiwi or iwi ‘āina). These long kuaiwi walls ran toward the sea (mauka-makai). This has been called the formal portion of the field system, or the formal-walled area.\(^{112}\)

The accumulation of the kuaiwi walls vastly scattered throughout Kona’s landscape is the remnants of a large dry-land agricultural complex called Kūāhewa. This name was dubbed during the reign of Kamehameha I. After his hard fought campaign to unify the Hawaiian Islands, Kamehameha, eventually returned to Kona to witness his people and ‘āina in famine. He encouraged farming to take place, where he gathered his men, both aliʻi and makaʻāinana of Kona, and created a large agricultural complex named Kūāhewa.\(^{113}\) Kūāhewa, meaning “huge, or vast,”\(^{114}\) extending in the uplands above

---

\(^{111}\) Kepelino. *Kepelino’s Traditions of Hawaii*. 152.


Kahalu‘u, Keauhou, and Kailua\textsuperscript{115}, consisted of various dry-land agricultural crops such as kalo, mai‘a, and kō. The name of Kamehameha’s grand agricultural field was named so because upon gazing at the field, the borders could not be seen.

Although my father and I were planting fruit trees instead of kalo and ‘uala within our parcel of land, our method of planting was strikingly similar to that of the kūpuna living in Kona centuries ago. Amidst the socio-political transformations that have occurred in Kona, the inherently simple actions to produce food for sustenance are fundamental and prevalent. Most importantly, these structures that fed our kūpuna are still existent in Kona, where the kuaiwi walls provide the infrastructure for reestablishment.

For this paper, I critique contemporary archaeological scholarship pertaining to the analysis that the kuaiwi of Kūāhewa (Kona Field System) is a “traditional” agricultural system, but rather a living system still being partially utilized and thriving today. I will research and analyze various accounts that mark the inception, development, and transformation of Kūāhewa. I argue that understanding the historical significance of Kūāhewa and the adaptive crop cultivation that transpired will portray this dry-land systems’ persistence and continual presence in Kona today. This I hope will raise further appreciation and awareness of Kūāhewa, as well as Kona’s overall dry-land agriculture, challenging the presumption pertaining to traditional vs. modern Hawaiian


\textsuperscript{115} E.S. Craighill Handy, et. al. \textit{Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment}. (Honolulu : Bishop Museum Press, 1972.)
dichotomies that disconnect, raising the social and cultural consciousness of this massive system.

The Historiography of Kūāhewa

In his article, Kuleana: Toward a Historiography of Hawaiian National Consciousness, 1780-2001, Hawaiian Historian Dr. Kanalu Young applies the roles kuleana has in a “context-based approach for the development of a body of publishable research that gives life and structure to a Hawaiian national consciousness and connects thereby to the theory of State continuity,” where he defines kuleana as, “a received sense of ancestrally-based responsibility.”

His article conveys the importance of creating a more robust, scholarly body of work that deeply analyzes the historiography of the Hawaiian nation. In doing so, a more continuous and fluid understanding of Hawaiian history will arise, further reconnecting the fragmentation of the socio-political events that unfolded during the Hawaiian Kingdom. Young expresses how kuleana acts as the piko of his analysis:

…the theme of kuleana will be used as the moʻo hoʻomanao (theme progression touchstone) for all ideas that advocate connectivity between various historical eras that gave the homeland a past life. Such connectivity is an eventual body of historiography offers the potential to comprehensively address and actively restore Hawaiian national consciousness to Ko Hawaiʻi Pae ʻĀina, its nationals who live in their country as an occupied State, and to the legacy that future generations can only experience if the present day kuleana is met.

---


117 Ibid.

118 Ibid, 14.
Young also expounds on the notion of utilizing ‘periodization’ as a methodology to further understand and invigorate the Hawaiian national consciousness.\textsuperscript{119} The periodization of Hawai‘i’s socio-political history into segmented eras provides directed opportunities for further research. Each of these segmented eras of research will deliver a ‘thick description’\textsuperscript{120} of events that can offer answers to the many questions regarding to how and why the Hawaiian national consciousness was lost, and how the current understanding of these events can right the wrong doings that were unjustly forced upon the Hawaiian Kingdom. The sequential alignment of these periodized bodies of research will sew a continuous historical thread, where “the relationship between our pre-national (before 1795), national (1795-1898), and occupation-era (1898-present) histories”\textsuperscript{121} can be understood. In conclusion, Young states:

The applied processes of responsible positivism that attend by the well-researched scholarly word to the restoration of properly sequenced and periodized indigenous and national histories of the Hawaiian experience can offer any more interested and correctly aligned Hawaiian national spine.\textsuperscript{122}

Although the intent of this article seeks to invigorate Hawaiian national consciousness and the eventual restoration of the currently occupied Hawaiian Kingdom


\textsuperscript{120} In his article, Young cites ethnographer Clifford Geertz’s analysis of “thick description,” termed during his observations of a Balinese cockfight. In his analysis, he determined the limitations of outsider interpretations of cultures, where “symbol, metaphor, and multiple representations of reality” contribute to a descriptive understanding of an event such as the Balinese cockfight. For more see Clifford Geertz, \textit{The Interpretation of Cultures}, (Princeton: Princeton Press, 1973).

\textsuperscript{121} Young, 14.

\textsuperscript{122} Ibid, 30.
by raising Hawaiian intellectualism through its historiography\textsuperscript{123}, a similar framework can be applied to express the historical continuity and relevance that Kūāhewa has with the people of Kona today, thereby fostering the social and cultural consciousness of Kūāhewa.

I will apply the methodology of periodization in my analysis. I will examine the history of the Kūāhewa system in three segments, Kūāhewa’s establishment & intensification (?-1400) Kūāhewa’s peak (1778), and Kūāhewa’s declination (1778-present). The ancient moʻolelo of a Kona fisherman named Lono suggests the establishment of dry land agriculture in Kona and the initial development of Kūāhewa. The following generations slowly furthered Kūāhewa’s development, however, ‘Umi-a-līloa’s reign in Kona lead to the intensification of Kūāhewa. The arrival of Cook in 1778, along with the subsequent American missionary and European voyages occurring after Cook’s demise in Kealakekua, was the beginning of Kona’s socio-political transformation that shifted Kūāhewa’s management from sustenance farming of ʻulu, ʻuala, kalo, and maiʻa, to commercial farming of cattle, coffee, and macadamia. Periodizing the history of Kūāhewa in such way will further convey the relationships and continuity between the ancient and modern understandings of Kūāhewa.

The kuaiwi walls will be the piko of my analysis. The kuaiwi walls are the physical structures that connect the past understanding of Kūāhewa with contemporary studies of Kūāhewa. The kuaiwi walls’ lasting persistence is a testament to the agricultural importance in Kona, currently reserving Kūāhewa’s continuity and historical relevance, acting as a vehicle for social reconnection. They also provide a foundational

\textsuperscript{123} Young, 1.
understanding and framework for reengagement, setting precedence for any future pursuits to reestablish kuleana with abandoned and/or underutilized sections of Kūāhewa.

**Redefining the Immensity of Kūāhewa**

Kūāhewa, Kamehameha’s vast garden plot in Kona, is one of his agricultural trademarks he and his followers left for the people of Kona. Before I can examine the inception, expansion, and decline of Kūāhewa, I must first seek to spatially define the extent of Kūāhewa and its limits within the larger Kona Field System. This may be challenging however due to the plethora of locations that various scholars have accounted Kūāhewa to be. Kelly, after drawing upon the accounts of ʻĪʻī, Kamakau, and Bingham, suggests that Kūāhewa is situated within multiple ʻili mauka of Kailua bay. She concludes that Kūāhewa may possibly be depicted in Thurston’s drawing, “View of the Country Back of Kailua,” where she states that the “large walled farm,” in the mauka slopes of Kailua is the extent of Kūāhewa.

Desha, in his moʻolelo *Kamehameha and His Warrior Kekūhaupiʻo*, places Kūāhewa in an area further south of Kailua. He also hints towards the derivation of the naming of Kūāhewa. He suggests that Kūāhewa “lies mauka of Kaināliu,” a land

---


126 Hiram Bingham, *A Residence of Twenty-One Years in the Sandwich Islands*, (Hartford: Huntington, 1847) 310.


division about six miles south of Kailua. Desha expresses in his story the huge extent of
the garden Kamehameha and his people planted, stating, “The eyes look until one can see
no more the farm of the aliʻi…”\textsuperscript{129}

While these analyses expressed above place Kūāhewa in Kailua or Kaināliu,
Handy theorizes that Kūāhewa lies within the Kahaluʻu, Keauhou, and Kailua mauka
divisions.\textsuperscript{130} Based on these various accounts, it is difficult to conclude the exact location
of Kūāhewa, as well as its actual size. This varying degrees of suggestions is similar to
the fabled poem entitled “The Blind Men and the Elephant,” written by John G. Saxe:

It was six men of Indostan to learning much inclined,
Who went to see the Elephant (though all of them were blind),
What each by observation might satisfy his mind.

The first approached the Elephant and happening to fall,
Against his broad and sturdy side, at once began to bawl:
“God bless me! But the Elephant is very like a wall!”

The second feeling of the tusk,
cried, “Ho! What do we have here? So very round and smooth and sharp?
To me it is mighty clear, this wonder of an Elephant is very like a spear!”

The third approached the animal and happening to take,
The squirming trunk within his hands, thus boldly up and spake:
“I see,” quoth he, “the Elephant is very like a snake!”

The fourth reached out his eager hand and felt about the knee,
“What a most this wondrous beast is like is mighty plain,” quoth he;
“It is clear enough the Elephant is very like a tree!”

The fifth who chanced to touch the ear,
Said: “E’en the blindest man can tell what this resembles most;
Deny the fact who can, this marvel of an Elephant is very like a fan!”

\textsuperscript{129} Desha, 346.

\textsuperscript{130} Handy, \textit{Native Planters of Hawaii}, 116.
The sixth no sooner had begun about the beast to grope,
Than, seizing on the swinging tail that fell within his scope,
“I see,” quoth he, “the Elephant is very like a rope!”

And so these men of Indostan disputed loud and long,
Each in his own opinion exceeding stiff and strong,
Though each was partly in the right, and all were in the wrong.131

One can liken the immense Kūāhewa with the large Elephant, where each
fragment is merely a section of the whole. Also the six blind men can parallel the various
suggestions as to the size and location of Kūāhewa. All their analyses hold merit,
however, could it be possible that the extent of Kūāhewa includes Kailua, Kahalu‘u,
Keauhou, Kaināliu, and all land divisions in between? And if so, then could Kūāhewa
also include the similar pockets of dry-land agriculture situated in south Kona? In
Desha’s story, he states that after Kamehameha and his attendants encouraged farming,
creating Kūāhewa in Kona, they then traveled down to Kealakekua and south Kona to do
the same.132 The title “Kona Field System” was dubbed by archaeologists studying the
kuaiwi walls beginning in the early 1970’s133, where the contemporary name and
understanding of Kona’s dry-land agriculture is of a more recent construct.

Evidence suggests that the enormous dry-land agricultural systems existent in
both north and south Kona, extending towards Kāʻū as well, was called Kūāhewa by the
kanaka living and tending to the land. A Boundary Commission testimony provided by


132 Desha, 348.

Ikipaananee, an informant and resident in Waiohinu, a land division situate in Kāʻū,

Hawaiʻi, testified the boundaries Waiohinu, including Kūāhewa in his statement:

…The boundary at shore between Kiolakaa and Waiohinu is at Kalaea a kauhale, at point near the goat pen at Hamauai, makai of the fish pond at Kaalualu landing, thence to Kuahewa, wahi mahiai (a cultivating ground) [emphasis added], thence mauka to Pohakuloa, a cave, and anawai; near the goat pen of Kanakanui…

This testimony suggests that the numerous dry-land agricultural field systems across Hawaiʻi were being called “Kuahewa” during the time when kanaka were still managing, maintaining, and utilizing the land for sustenance. More contemporary archaeologists and scholars may have overlooked the fact that the Kona, Kohala, and Kāʻū field systems may have had a general Hawaiian name, and this name could possibly be Kūāhewa. Also, this evidence questions the direct inception of Kūāhewa. Did Kamehameha and his followers “create” Kūāhewa, or did they “reestablish” Kūāhewa? Is it possible that Kūāhewa was the name of the agricultural complex created through the generations prior to Kamehameha?

Based on this evidence, I will further refer to the “Kona Field System” as Kūāhewa. I understand that the name “Kona Field System,” was constructed in more recent times, where the name does not necessarily reflect an ‘Ōiwi perspective. I will acknowledge Ikipaananee’s testimony and will call the wahi mahi ‘ai of Hawaiʻi island Kūāhewa. However, more research will need to be done to further suggest that the actual name of the “field systems” existent on Hawaiʻi island is in fact, Kūāhewa.

No Ke Kumu ‘Ana o Kūāhewa

This section pertains to the period of Kūāhewa’s history prior to Captain Cook’s arrival in 1778. I will examine the establishment and intensification of Kūāhewa, eventually ending at the peak of its production. I focus on three kanaka maoli rulers, Lono, ‘Umi, and Kamehameha I, and their historical accounts that contribute to the growth and extension of Kūāhewa, drawing upon their leadership roles that promoted the social stratification in Kona.

Lono and Kumuhonua

The moʻolelo titled Moolelo Kahiko no Kumuhonua, is located in the Bishop Museum’s Hawaiian Ethnographical Notes compiled by Mary Kawena Pukui. This moʻolelo pertains to the establishment of agriculture in Kona. The story tells about a fisherman named Lono who discovers and lives with a family living in the waters off Keauhou, Kona. Upon his stay he is given various crops that are associated with Kūāhewa, and plants them on the land throughout Kona:

Ma ka hanauna mua o Kumuhonua, oia ka mea mea maua of ka hanauna akua a kanaka paha, mamua o ka honua i ka wa kahiko, aole i ike na kanaka ma ka aina ia manawa kahiko. Nana mai ka ai a loa a kekahi kanaka ano akua i kapa ia o Lono ka inoa. Lono he kanaka lawai’a ia ma Kona, ua noho ia ma Keauhou Kona Akau. He hana pai kana. Mahope iho oia mau la ana i hana ai i ka lawai’a moana. Aia kekahi ko’a lawai’a ma Keauhou, o Mauna kona inoa, oia kahi e lawaia ai. Pau na makau i ka mokumoku. Minamina oia me kona kuhihewa he mau ma ke ko’a a lekei ke kanaka ma lalo e nana. Ua hoopaa ia e ka wahine o Hina-kaumo, ke kaikamahine o Kumuhonua. I aku la o Lono i kekahi kanaka, ‘E noho oe i ka waa o kaua.” Luu aku la ia a loa a wahine nei malalo. He aina ia a noho oia malaila. Ike oia i na mea hou, aole i ike mua, aka i ka ai ana a ike keia makemake i na mea ai, he uala, he kalo, he maia, he ko, he awa. Noho pu oia me laua malaila hookahi mahina a mahope malama oia ia mau mea a pau i mea kanu nana. Lawe mai la ia he kalo, he uala, he ko, he maia, he awa, a mahope inau oia ka wa a me ka po i na mea e ku ai ke kanu i ka uala. He uala maka, kalo maka, pohuli maia, puna ko maka, uhi, me ka awa ka mea e ulu ai. Oia ka mea i ha’i ia mai iai. E lawe i mea kanu nana a lawe
In the generation of Kumuhonua [Earth Foundation] before the time of the generations of gods and men, or before the time of the [population of the] earth in olden times, men were not numerous on the land then. It was through him [Kumuhonua] that a god-like man named Lono, obtained food. Lono was a fisherman of Kona and dwelt at Keauhou in North Kona. He made fish basket traps. A few days later he went to the ocean to fish. All of his fish hooks broke off. He regretted the loss of the hooks and thinking that they had caught on the corals he leaped into the sea to investigate. They were taken by Hina-kauo the daughter of Kumuhonua. Lono said to a man, “Stay on our canoe.” He dived and found the woman below. There was land there and there he remained. He saw new things that he had never seen before and when he tasted the foods he liked them, the sweet potatoes, taros, bananas, sugar canes and ‘awa. He lived with the two of them there for a month and then he saved some of the food plants for him to plant. He took taro, sweet potato, sugar cane, bananas, sugar canes and ‘awa and asked about the time and proper nights for sweet potato planting. It was the raw sweet potatoes, raw taros, banana shoots, sections of sugar cane, (raw) yam and ‘awa that would grow, so he was told. He was permitted to and so he took all kinds of plants from Kumuhonua. It was through him that Lono obtained all these food plants. He returned from the land of Kamupapa, the land where Kumuhonua dwelt at the foundation of the earth. Lono lived there and came forth from under the earth with all the plants gathered for him to plant. ‘Awa was first planted in Kona; sugar cane was planted at Kau-ha-ko at Ka’awaloa. Later, the sweet potatoes, taros and maia were planted. It was there in those places where they were cared for. These thoughts are sufficient, the remnants [of the plants] have remained in the histories of the people of old here in Hawaii.\(^{135}\)

This moʻolelo suggests that the god Lono, a fisherman, established the first planted crops prior to any one establishing residence in Kona. Archaeologists suggest that initial temporary settlements of the leeward sides of Hawaiʻi were in the coastal areas

where fishing was the main form of sustenance. However, fishing is limited in supporting a finite population, being less efficient and productive than plant cultivation. Lono, with the aid and support of Kumuhonua and Hina-kauo, planted the first ʻuala, kalo, maiʻa, kō, and ʻawa on the forested slopes of Hualalai. Lono’s introduction of the first plants in Kona was the foundation to supporting a greater populace, where the proliferation of these first crops exponentially grow through the generations, which provides opportunities for agricultural intensification in Kona. His new gifts to Kona brought forth a social shift from the hunting and gathering of fish to resourceful cultivation of crops, eventually turning Kona’s bays from temporary shelters to permanent residences.

ʻUmi-a-Līloa

Marion Kelly suggests that the agricultural intensification of Kūāhewa possibly developed around the time when ʻUmi-a-Līloa, the Mōʻī of Hawai‘i Island around the 15th Century, moved the capitol of his domain from Waipiʻo to Kona, where he desired a warm climate to dwell. ʻUmi was famous for his extensive leadership skills, poised character, and exceptional fishing and farming techniques. Samuel Kamakau writes about ʻUmi’s work:

ʻUmi-a-Līloa did two things with his own hands, farming and fishing. He built some large wet taro patches in Waipiʻo, and farming was done on all the lands. Much of this was done in Kona. He was noted for his skill in fishing and was called Puʻipuʻia a ka lawaiʻa (a stalwart fisherman). Aku fishing was his favorite occupation, and it

---


often took him to the beaches from Kalahuipua‘a to Makaula. He also fished for ‘ahi and for kala.\footnote{Samuel Kamakau, }\footnote{Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 1992) 19-20.}

It is obvious that ‘Umi did not see Kona as a land not suited for wealth; he saw that the land and oceans of Kona had much potential for agricultural growth. The vast upland landscape was conveniently unhindered by steep cliffs or valleys. The various sequentially stratified agricultural zones diversified growing conditions that were efficiently close to each other. The protection of the sometimes-unrelenting trade winds set up an ideal environment for dry-land cultivation. ‘Umi therefore governed accordingly, separating the work which Abraham Fornander describes:

\begin{quote}
During his reign Umi-a-Līloa set the laborers in order and separated those who held positions in the government. He separated the chiefs, the priesthood, the astrologers and the skillful in the land. He separated the cultivators, and the fishermen, and the canoe hewers. He set apart the warriors, the spear-warders, and every department with proficiency, and every laborer in their respective lines of work. So with the governors, district superintendents, division overseers and section wardens; they ere all set in order.\footnote{Fornander, Abraham. }\footnote{Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore: The Hawaiians’ Account of the Formation of their Islands and Origins of their Race, with the Translations of their Migrations, etc., as Gathered From Original Sources. Vol 4. (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1920,) 228.}
\end{quote}

‘Umi, after unifying Hawai‘i island under his rule, saw the development potential of the slowly growing Kūāhewa, in which he capitalizing on the opportunity by moving his political center to Kona. The leadership qualities that ‘Umi possessed acted as catalysts that significantly personified his supremacy and wealth\footnote{The Hawaiian word for wealth is waiwai, which can be referred to someone with an abundance of water.} as Mōiʻi of Hawai‘i. But his wealth was not solely reflected within himself, it was conveyed in the
productivity of the land and the respect and admiration of his people. The separation and
stratification of kanaka into classes fostered growth and efficiency at a social level.
ʻUmi’s leadership to set forth specific “occupations” and roles for persons and families
within the entire Kona society allowed for industrial refinement and production efficacy.
His visions to expand Kona’s societal potential lead to his command to stratify
government and social work in Kona. The effects of his instruction eventually placed
kuleana upon each individual, promoting advancements in agricultural production,
leading to the expansion of Kūāhewa.

**Kūāhewa’s Peak**

Early European Explorers arriving in Kona in the late 18th century, as well as
American missionaries in the early 19th century, documented the peak of Kūāhewa’s
productivity. Archibald Menzies was one of the several Europeans that recorded Kona’s
agriculture. Menzies was a surgeon and naturalist on board the ship *Discovery*, captained
by George Vancouver, which arrived in Kona in 1794. During his ascent to the summit
of Mauna Loa, Menzies wrote about the extensive production in Kona, taking note of the
ʻulu, ʻuala and wauke that were growing:

> On leaving this station, we soon lost sight of the vessels, and entered their bread-fruit
> plantations, the trees of which were a good distance apart, so as to give room to their
> boughs to spread out vigorously on all sides… But here the size of the trees, the
> luxuriancy of their crop and foliage, sufficiently show that they thrive well on and
elevated situation. The space between these trees did not lay idle. It was chiefly
> planted with sweet potatoes and rows of cloth plant.\(^1\)

As Menzies ascended above the ʻulu grove situated in the lower elevations, he
recorded the kuaiwi walls and the various crops that were planted on them:

\(^1\) Archibald Menzies, *Hawaii Nei: 128 Years Ago.* (1920) 75.
As we advanced beyond the bread-fruit plantations, the country became more and more fertile, being in a high state of cultivation. For several miles round us there was not a spot that would admit of it but what was with great labor and industry cleared of the loose stones and planted with esculent roots or some useful vegetable or other. In clearing the ground, the stones are heaped up in ridges between the little fields and planted on each side, either with a row of sugar cane or the sweet rood of these islands where they afterwards continue to grow in a wild state, so that even these stony, uncultivated banks are by this means made useful to the proprietors, as well as ornamental to the fields they intersect.¹⁴²

After Menzies and his tour guides reach the mauka extent of Kūāhewa, where he notes the fertile banana plantations, he concludes his observations of Kona’s agriculture:

Every step we advanced through these plantations became more and more interesting as we could not help admiring the manner in which the little fields on both sides of us were laid out to the greatest advantage and the perseverance and great attention of the natives in adapting to every vegetable they cultivate as far as lays in their power, its proper soil and natural situation by which their fields in general are productive of good crops that far exceed in point of perfection the produce of any civilized country within the tropics.¹⁴³

Menzies description of his travels through Kūāhewa provides a detailed illustration to the crop situations, cultivation methods, and garden imageries. He also remarked on the industry of the natives, where he commented on their industriousness. He observed the resourcefulness of the plantations, where no space was under utilized. Menzie’s positive remarks and his attraction to the well productive farms is the product of Kona’s gradual social development and political stratification, where the extent of Kūāhewa expanded along with the population growth.

**Kūāhewa’s Declination**

This section will describe the factors that contributed to the declination of the productivity of Kūāhewa occurring after the arrival of Captain James Cook in 1778. For

¹⁴² Menzies, *Hawaii Nei*, 76.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 81.
my analysis, I examine two main reasons for the declination of Kūāhewa. First, massive depopulation arising from waves of foreign introduced diseases by various merchant and voyaging vessels placed a heavy social burden on the up keeping of farming. Second, external pressures by visiting merchants for sandalwood caused a halt in agriculture and sustenance farming, massive deforestation, and famine occurring throughout Hawai‘i. Although there are many other such factors that contribute to the gradual abandonment of Kūāhewa, these two influences I believe had the most profound impacts, where it displaced kanaka from sustaining themselves through farming.

**Depopulation**

The gradual yet profound introduction of diseases to Hawai‘i accounted for the massive depopulation lasting throughout the 19th century. David Stannard’s estimates the Hawaiian population prior to the arrival of Cook was roughly 800,000 individuals.\(^{144}\) Although his estimate is indeed a projection, where other conservative estimates believe the population was only half that amount\(^ {145}\), the population decline during the end of the 19th century was over 90%.\(^ {146}\)

The depopulation of kanaka was apparent within all levels of society. Both ali‘i and maka‘āinana alike were stricken with disease. This detrimentally affected the reciprocal relationships between the various social classes, where the interdependent


\(^{146}\) Ibid.
synergy was severely disrupted. Kanalu Young comments on the effects loosing leadership in the passing of ali‘i:

Compared to the makaʻāinana (producer class) the Ali‘i Nui constituted a smaller population. Consequently, losses from their ranks would seem more severe, because the potential problems lack of leadership could bring and also because there were fewer of them.147

Introduced diseases made Kūāhewa less productive, rapidly diminishing the yield due to depopulation. Many working hands passed, and for those who persisted, much time was spent tending and caring for the dying. The aliʻi-makaʻāinana relationship were jeopardized, causing disorder and misdirection, causing disconnection between kanaka and ʻāina.

**Sandalwood**

Foreign interests in sandalwood arose in the early 19th century, sparking the initial attention of a possible product that European and American merchants can trade with China. This placed an early demand on sandalwood, where more and more ships would soon arrive to capitalize on this new economy. Kamakau writes on the rise of the sandalwood trade, stating,

During the sixth and seventh years of Kamehameha’s stay on Oahu several of the captains of the boats plying to and from Manila, Macao in China, and other places, informed the king and his chiefs that the fragrant sandalwood was a valuable article of trade with the people of China… The captains McCook, Ogden, Kawelipota [David Porter?], Winship, (Winihepa), Bartow, and David ʻOpeʻa-loa were among those who traded this wood in Macao and Canton for woolen, silk, and cotton cloth and other commodities.148
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Between the years 1810 and 1825, the sandalwood trade was at its height.\textsuperscript{149} The rising demand for sandalwood by foreign merchants shifted the main economy of Kona’s society from sustenance farming to commercial industrial harvesting. With the majority of ali‘i and maka‘āinana in the forests harvesting sandalwood for trade, much of the farming of Kūāhewa was unattended. The effects of the inattentiveness to Kūāhewa resulted in famine, where Kamakau notes famine in Kona observed by Kamehameha upon his return from Oahu:

This rush of labor to the mountains brought about a scarcity of cultivated food throughout the whole group. The people were forced to eat herbs and tree ferns, hence the famine called Hi-laulele, Haha-pilau, Laulele, Pualele, ‘Ama‘u, or Hapu‘u, from the wild plants resorted to.\textsuperscript{150}

Desha also accounts Kamehameha’s time in Kona during famine and his reaction to provide a strong, positive example by reestablishing Kūāhewa:

When Kamehameha arrived at Kona, he realized there was famine in the land because the people had been neglectful of his command to them to apply their hands (e hāwele nā lima) to the soil… When Kamehemeha saw this trouble in the land, he set himself as a good example for the people. He took up farming and perhaps this was when he farmed at Kuahewa…\textsuperscript{151}

Kamehameha witnessed the detrimental effects the sandalwood trade has done to his people, where he attempted to restore balance to society. He declared that all sandalwood harvested would be the property of the government, where he controlled the supply and amount harvested.\textsuperscript{152} He also advised his the sandalwood cutters to be


\textsuperscript{150} Kamakau, 204.

\textsuperscript{151} Desha, \textit{Kamehameha and His Warrior Kekūhaupi‘o}, 469.

\textsuperscript{152} Kamakau, 204.
mindful of the young sandalwood trees and not let the fallen trunks damage them, attentively making sure that future generations of sandalwood would continue to flourish.  

Kamehameha controlled the sandalwood trade not to capitalize on the market that was in high demand during his reign, but to reestablish his people on the land to feed themselves, and to salvage and save the rapidly depleting forests. Such visionary leadership and positive management of his people and domain personified a pono Mōʻī. In the first wave of diseases and foreign greed during his reign, Kamehameha acted diligently to protect his people and his rule. However upon his passing in 1819, his orders were not upheld and the sandalwood market was free again, causing aliʻi and makaʻāinana to abandon agriculture, focusing back on harvesting sandalwood.

**Agricultural Shift of Kūāhewa**

Prior to the advent of European explorers and missionaries to Kona, all acts of agriculture on Kūāhewa were for sustenance. A small barter economy between upland farmers and costal fishermen was apparent, which has developed internally in Kona over time, however all of the sustenance provided by the ‘āina remained with the people of Kona. Similar to the sandalwood economy, foreigners found these islands to be profitable, forecasting possible businesses in plantations, where the native inhabitants were perfect laborers. Menzies, while greatly complimenting the production of the
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154 Ibid, 204.
natives of Kona, forecasts the potential sugar industry in Hawaii, while exploiting the labors of its inhabitants, as well as immigrating foreigners to run the plantations:

…a party of natives from Kealakekua passed our hut, who were going up into the woods with calabashes and a small cask to fetch water for our vessels… One of these natives who met us the day before going down under a heavy load of calabashes full of water, showed us three small iron nails he got for his labour, with which he seemed very well satisfied… it proves that this metal still holds a high value among them, and that a settlement established at these islands would in this way procure indefatigable labourers at a very easy rate… In short it might be well worth the attention of the Government to make the experiment and settle these islands by planters from the West Indies, men of humanity, industry and experienced abilities in the exercise of their art would here in a short time be enabled to manufacture sugar and rum from luxuriant fields of cane…

Within a few decades of Menzies’ predictions, the first sugar industry was started in Hawai‘i, though Kona’s first sugar plantation never established until the 1870’s.

Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the development, peak, and decline of Kūāhewa and dry land agriculture in Kona. The method of segmenting the historical events that directly affected Kūāhewa was not to compartmentalize and detach its histories, but rather to address various avenues to examine possible relationships between the eras. This I hope establishes connections that build perceptions of continuity rather than disconnection. There are indeed extensive gaps within my analysis where further research is required to understand the usage of Kūāhewa in further detail. The early development of Kūāhewa fostered population growth and social stratification, building an efficient system founded
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155 Menzies, *Hawaii Nei*, 79.

on a sustenance economy. At the peak of its production, Kūāhewa’s vast walls extended beyond what the eyes can see. The arrival of foreign capital interests, supported by diseases that decimated the kanaka population, created an economic shift of production in Kona. Kūāhewa was used to grow plantations of sugar and coffee, among other crops, manufacturing produce that satisfied external demands rather than the local populace.

The remnants of Kūāhewa are scattered throughout Kona’s uplands, much of which have been abandoned for decades. In Kahaluʻu mauka, 3,500 archaeological feature, 203 being kuaiwi walls, have been recorded by Archaeologist Bob Rechtman in a 355 acre plot owned by Kamehameha Schools. In examination, Rechtman concluded:

In fact, whether by coincidence or providence, large portions of the study area have not been touched by human hands since the mid 19th century. As a result the people of Hawaiʻi are left with a pristine example of the Hawaiian gardens of old to study and appreciate.

Though I agree with Rechtman, and appreciate that we have an impressively intact remnant of Kūāhewa, he overlooked the perspective that I intended to address in this chapter. I view these kuaiwi walls and garden plots to be as alive and living as they were in the “old” days. They have been neglected and abandoned for over a century, however, I perceive this parcel to be in a fallow state, waiting to be reestablished and reconnected with the people of Kona today. Only to “study” the archaeological sites to gain knowledge of how kanaka maoli lived and survived in traditional times, and not practice how they lived and survived, is a strategy that will lead to the misrepresentation of the actual purpose and function that Kūāhewa has with kanaka maoli of Kona today.

Rechtman, Kahaluʻu Uka Management Strategies of a Cultural Landscape, 46.

The intent of this chapter is to express the continuance of Kūāhewa from its’ inception to its current state. The historical analysis of Kūāhewa brings forth the continuity, relevance, and social consciousness that connect the current residents of Kona living within its walls with the ones who created them in the past. It is certain that agriculture is still prominent in Kona, whether it be personal family gardens to industrial agriculture. The fruit trees we planted a few years ago are just beginning to provide produce that sustains our family and friends. Interestingly the property bordering our southern kuaiwi wall is an abandoned macadamia and coffee farm. However different these uses of the land may be, the Kūāhewa system still provides today.
Chapter 4: Ho‘oulu Kaiāulu: ‘Āina-Based Programs in Practice

Introduction

As academics we have the responsibility to our communities and our land to make a positive contribution. We cannot use our knowledge, our genealogy, or families, our resources (however small they may be), our community to achieve academic success and not reciprocate. It is unacceptable.¹⁵⁹

As Hawaiian scholars living and working within a Western academic structure at the university, our intellectual energy is submersed in the literary analysis and application of theories and scholarly concepts. We value the works and writings of early kanaka maoli historians such as Malo, Kamakau, Papa ʻĪʻī, Kepelino etc. as our foundation to our contemporary understanding of Hawaiian history. We appreciate the applied theories brought forth by more modern Hawaiian scholars like Trask, Osorio, Kameʻeleihiwa, Young etc. as they attempt to explain the political, societal, cultural, and historical situations that affect kanaka maoli in Hawai‘i today. All this reading and analysis is to say the least cerebrally challenging, as well as intellectually heavy.

One of my methods of release and replenishment when I feel mentally drained is to spend a few hours at Ka Papa Lo‘i ʻO Kānewai. Kānewai played an important role in my academic journey. Spending hours in the lo‘i as a volunteer focused my academic pursuits, where Kānewai was one of the main reasons why I switched majors from Pre-medicine to Hawaiian Studies. I took classes there and spent afternoons and weekends connecting to the place. I engaged not only in the physical work of lo‘i cultivation, but I also engaged with the various moʻolelo pertaining to Kānewai that spans from antiquity

to today. All of these experiences brought life to both the place, but as well as in my personal life, and my graduate research topic.

The aspect of Kānewai that I came to value most is its investment in the community it serves. Kānewai, along with other mentors and colleagues, has stressed the significance the community has in the area of my research. Analyzing and integrating aspects of knowledge found in both theory-based accounts and practical understanding through experience creates a body of work that is academically valid and applicable.

**Hoʻi Hou I Ka ʻIwi Kuamoʻo**:  

It is apparent that the utilization of the community and community members as a source of knowledge and understanding in academic research is underutilized. It is simple to merely call forth a book or passage in the library and extract the information that pertains to this research topic. It is much more difficult to seek knowledge from kūpuna, practitioners and community advocates practicing the ideas we research. However both repositories of knowledge are not only valuable for the work here at the university, but it also creates an opportunity to connect and form personal and professional relationships, bringing academy and community closer.

For a Hawaiian scholar, it is much deeper than just bringing harmony to theory and practice. Community consciousness in research is not only a responsibility, it is also an obligation. Hawaiian Political Scientist Kanoelani Nāone portrays the accountability Hawaiians have in research and community, writing:

We are responsible to our community, to our land and language because we are those things. It is impossible to separate one from the other. We are the land, the
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language and community collectively. All these things create a beautiful makaloha mat to be treasured for generations to come.\textsuperscript{161}

In pertaining to my research topic, ‘Āina-based learning and development in programs has been a relatively recent practice in Hawai‘i. Brandon Ledward, the Director of the Kamehameha Schools’ ‘Āina-Based Education Department, expresses that “‘Āina-Based learning is new old wisdom at work,” explaining that the oxymoron deals with the disconnection contemporary learners in the school systems today have with learning on the land, the way our grandparents or great-grandparents acquired knowledge.\textsuperscript{162} In her book, \textit{The Seeds we Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School}, Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua references the post World War II and post statehood era to the beginning of the disconnection of Hawaiian education, which included the ‘āina as an educational pedagogy. She then cites the late twentieth and early twenty-first century Hawaiian national movement and the U.S. Charter School movement as the events that helped put Hawaiian values and ways of learning back into the educational systems.\textsuperscript{163}

With ‘Āina-Based programs being a relatively new way to formally teach and learn an array of subjects and knowledge in Hawai‘i schools, the scholarship and analysis of the effectiveness as a program that serves its surrounding communities is limited. Therefore, it is reasonable and prudent to look to existing programs for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{161} Nāone, \textit{The Pilina of Kanaka and ‘Āina}, 36.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Noelani Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua, \textit{The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School}, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013,) 47-50.
\end{itemize}
inspiration and understanding in terms of programmatic development. This type of learning-by-experience is not only acquired in the learners and visitors to these programs, but these experiences are also learned and established in the educators, directors, coordinators and maintenance workers of these programs through the years. The well of knowledge retained in these individuals is valuable in my scope of research, and will be a priceless addition to my understanding of what ‘Āina-Based programs truly are, and the foundations that drive them.

**Aia Ka Wai I Ka Maka o Ka ʻŌpua**: Research Framework

*Water is in the face of the ʻōpua clouds.* This is a famous ʻōlelo noʻeau that speaks to where the people of Kona receive their water. An analogy can be drawn between this poetic saying and the framework of this chapter. The noted ʻōpua clouds billow up on the slopes of Hualālai not only sheltering Kona from the infamous heat of the sun, but also showers and gives life to the land. When a person from Kona seeks shelter and life, he has to do is look towards these puffy clouds. That can also be noted with the various ‘Āina-Based programs scattered throughout the land of Kona. It is as if these programs, being the ʻōpua clouds, bring wealth and life to the lands and communities that they care for. And when looking for inspiration and support from these programs, one can look to the many faces that work diligently to root and grow these programs. The wealth of knowledge (waiwai) is simply located in the individuals (maka) of these ‘Āina-Based programs (ʻōpua).

This chapter will be an analysis of the gathered research of ‘Āina-Based Educational programs that I have interviewed, five in total. Out of these five programs,
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164 Pukui, *ʻōlelo Noʻeau*, 55.
one of them currently exists on Oʻahu and the remaining four are located in Kona. These programs include: Ka Papa Loʻi ʻO Kānewai, Kohala Center, Kahaluʻu Bay Educational Center, Keauhou-Kahaluʻu Educational Group, and Amy Greenwell Ethnobotanical Garden.

**Ka Papa Loʻi ʻO Kānewai (Kānewai)**

Kānewai is an educational cultural garden centered around traditional Hawaiian loʻi cultivation practices. The centuries old ʻauwai and loʻi were rediscovered and reestablished in the 1980s during a resurgence of interest in Hawaiian culture and language by a group of University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa students. Today, Kānewai has grown into its own center within the Hawaiʻinuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge.

Kānewai is an integral part of the University of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa, the Hawaiʻinuiākea School of Hawaiian Knowledge, and the surrounding community. Each year, Kānewai hosts roughly 20,000 visitors with ages ranging from pre-kindergarten to kūpuna. Visitors from all around the globe engage and learn via an existing traditional Hawaiian agricultural system, where the values of laulima (cooperation), mālama ʻāina (caring for ʻāina), and puʻuhonua (safe haven) are applied and learned in action.

**The Kohala Center**

The Kohala Center, a community-based non-profit organization, is located in the small town of Waimea, Hawaiʻi island. On its website, The Kohala Center states its identity and vision as a resource capacity builder:

Founded in the year 2000, **The Kohala Center** is an independent, community-based center for research, conservation, and education… We turn research and traditional knowledge into action, so that communities in Hawaiʻi and around the world can
thrive- ecologically, economically, culturally, and socially. Our main areas of interest are energy self-reliance, food self-reliance, and ecosystem health.\textsuperscript{165}

Kahalu‘u Bay Educational Center

The Kahalu‘u Bay Educational Center is located in the heart of Kahalu‘u bay, West Hawai‘i’s most visited beach. Each year, more than 400,000 visitors, both residents of Kona and tourists, visit the bay. This human footprint indeed puts added stress not only the reefs, but also the marine resources and water quality. The Kahalu‘u Bay Educational Center’s website expresses their role as educators, and a resource for community engagement through volunteering, focusing their actions for the well-being of Kahalu‘u Bay, conveying:

Kahalu‘u Bay Educational Center is a partnership between the Kohala Center and the County of Hawai‘i to revive and revitalize Kahalu‘u Bay and Beach Park. Rich in historical, cultural, and environmental treasures, Kahalu‘u Bay welcomes more than 400,000 visitors annually, making it West Hawai‘i’s most popular tourist destination… Through volunteer-driven educational programs such as ReefTeach and Citizen Science, Kahalu‘u Bay Educational Center promotes and measures the positive impacts of environmental stewardship to ensure the bay remains a healthy and welcoming place for residents and visitors alike.\textsuperscript{166}

Keauhou-Kahalu‘u Educational Group (KKEG)

Founded in 2006\textsuperscript{167}, the Keauhou-Kahalu‘u Educational Group focuses on the revitalization and education of the natural, cultural, and historical resources within the Keauhou and Kahalu‘u ahupua‘a. KKEG is an entity within the Kamehameha Schools,\textsuperscript{168}


\textsuperscript{167} Since the conduction of this thesis, KKEG has changed their name to the Kahalu‘u Manowai Education Team. The group is still within the Kamehameha Schools’ corporation.\textsuperscript{168}
acting as positive stewards of their lands and drive educational program development in order for their lands and surrounding communities to thrive. KKEG has lead the transition to remove the two existing hotels surrounding Kahaluʻu Bay and restore various heiau that served as important sites in the time of various Kona aliʻi such as Lonoikamakahiki and Kamehameha I. The implementation and inception of KKEG is a direct action from Kamehameha Schools in their attempts to redefine wealth at Kahaluʻu and Keauhou from commercial tourism to cultural education, creating a framework to reconnect and reengage visitors and learners about the historical and cultural importance that Kahaluʻu and Keauhou has to Pauahi’s endowment.

**Amy Greenwell Ethnobotanical Garden**

The Amy Greenwell Ethnobotanical Garden was founded in 1974, when Amy Greenwell, a descendant and heir to part of the large Greenwell estate, gave roughly 15 acres of her land she slowly developed into a “Pre-Cookian” garden in Kaināliu, Kona, Hawaiʻi, to the Bishop Estate in order to preserve and educate visitors about Hawaiian Ethnobotany. The Amy Greenwell Ethnobotanical Garden is home to roughly 200 different native Hawaiian plant species, some of with are highly endangered. Its mission states, “Amy B.H. Greenwell Ethnobotanical Garden supports Hawaiian cultural traditions of land use and plants and conserves the plant resources of traditional Hawaiian cultural activities.” The garden is the only accessible part of Kūāhewa, where it
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hosts a number of events for the surrounding schools and communities to engage in a pre-contact Kona landscape.

Kūnihi Ka Mauna: Methodology

One of the most significant understandings I learned through experience at my years at Kānewai is the asking for permission and giving thanks. Whether it is from asking permission for entrance into a space, guidance from a kupuna, knowledge from a kumu, or to gather natural resources found throughout the ʻāina, it is essential that permission must first be requested, and granted. And in conjunction, once the requests are granted, a token of appreciation in various forms is vital. These two gestures can be simple, or grand, but nevertheless are required for the fostering of healthy and fruitful relationships grounded in humility and respect.

This foundational approach is what drove my requests for interview from individuals working within the diverse ʻĀina-Based programs mentioned above. I began with informal personal communication via email, phone calls, and/or personal interaction, in order to introduce myself and provide background information to my name and title at the university. If they were interested in my project, I requested for an interview. If they agreed, I set the interview date and provided them with the scope of my questions and the Human Subjects Consent forms. On the day of the interviews, I did not come empty handed. I brought a small gift, a small token that expresses my appreciation for their interests in my research. I handled their words and stories with respect, carefully transcribing the correct and exact words they uttered.
I maintained this humble and respectful demeanor throughout this process not just because these individuals were highly respected in their personal positions in their programs, but they were also influential members in the Kona community. To offer a few hours out of their busy day to sit down with me was greatly appreciated, and it conveyed that my research had merit. Some even had close, personal relationships with my family, therefore my reputation was not only being showcased, but also the character of my family was being carried throughout the interview process.

**Mai Kaulaʻi Wale I Nā Iwi o Nā Kūpuna**: Confidentiality of Subjects

For my analysis of this chapter, which is primarily focused on the information gathered from conducted interviews, I chose not to provide the names and titles of the interviewees in order to both protect their valued knowledge, and to foster a safe environment so they could be as candid as possible. Although I feel that the questions asked, the ideas that were shared, and my scope of analysis does not pose any threat to them or their respective programs, directly connecting their names with their voices may be an act of over exposure, where their quotes could possibly be taken far out of context by others in the academic research community.

**ʻĀina/Community Driven Research**

This chapter focuses on the analysis of the interviews of the five ʻĀina-Based programs mentioned above, occurring between December 9, 2013 and December 12, 2013. The questions I pose to the interviewees center around their roles and responsibilities to their ʻāina that they care for, the services to their communities they
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interact with, and the effectiveness ‘āina-based learning has on their learners. The
effects of the effectiveness of each program in comparison to each other, but rather
examples and answers I seek speak to the essential values that set the vision and drive not
only the individual, but the program as well. This analysis does not merely attempt to
evaluate the effectiveness of each program, but rather attempts to expound on the consensus; the ideas and values each program agrees to be
important for the well being of their program.

He Pilina Hemo ‘ole: Establishing Connection To Place, Fostering Community
Relationships, Setting Personal Kuleana

Whenever you go into a place and you start, you always got to do your homework. You got to talk story with anyone and everyone connected to the place, try to find
every single resource, newspaper clipping, video recording that you can find about
the place too. And on top of it just spending time there at the different seasons,
heights of seasons, highs and lows of seasons, summer time, winter time, drought,
rain, you know those kinds of things how the place gets affected. I think that’s
important too, and that comes with time too. I think that’s the advantage that we
have too is that over time the place has been there every one remembers, there is a
memory of the place as well too so I think that’s real important.  

The statement mentioned above speaks to the repositories where a connection can
be established. They can be found by conducting research in mo‘olelo, both ancient and
more modern, consulting with community members, and actually physically being
present on the ‘āina. Each method has merit in its own right, and is necessary to be able
to accurately express a more holistic representation of a place. It is a part of due-
diligence that allows a vision to have hindsight, which will influence foresight.

Noted Hawaiian scholar David Malo in his novel, Ka Mo‘olelo Hawai‘i,
expresses the apparent connection that Hawaiians have with their land in terms of
identifying and naming of their place. In his chapter entitled, “Ke Kapa Ana I Ko Lako

---

172 Interview by William Lee, Honolulu, HI, December 9, 2013.
Mau Inoa o Ka Moku,” he conveys how not all the land in Hawai‘i was identified as “ʻĀina”, stating,

> Ua kapa aku ka poe kahiko inoa no ko ka mokupuni mau mea ma ko lakou nana ana a kupono ko lakou manao ana, elua inoa i kapa ia ma ka mokupuni, he moku ka inoa, he aina kahi inoa, ma ka moku ana ia ke kai ua kapa ia he moku, a ma ka noho ana a kanaka, ua kappa ia he aina ka inoa. 

*The people of old gave the names for the island features according to what they saw and what they thought was appropriate to call them. There are two names used for calling the islands: moku and ʻāina. The term moku is used when you are at sea and the term ʻāina is used when a person is upon land.*

This description sets precedence for a kanaka to actually be positioned on the land in order for the land to be termed “ʻāina”. For the kanaka to be physically connected with the land, either dwelling on it and/or tending to it is fundamental for the land to properly function as ʻāina, a entity that provides food and nourishment as discussed in chapter 1.

A very common theme that was conveyed during each of the interviews was the importance of the connections the individual, and the program he/she represents with their place, their surrounding communities, and other programs. These connections take shape in various forms, and are the cornerstones that foster relationships. This segment will analyze the examples of how each program utilizes personal and professional connections that eventually establishes synergistic relationships that further programmatic development.

**Connection to Place: Primary Research**

---
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Place-based knowledge and understanding is a uniform concept in ‘ike Hawai‘i. The ‘ōlelo no‘eau, “‘A‘ohe pau ka ‘ike i ka hālau ho‘okahi,”\textsuperscript{175} speaks to a kanaka maoli understanding and acceptance of knowledge diversity. Dry-land kalo farming methods that derive from Kona would look starkly different from lo‘i kalo farming methods in Waipi‘o Valley. This is portrayed in an advice given during an interview,

If you want to start an ‘āina based educational program it has to be place based enough where it makes sense on that place. You can go to places that don’t have water and trying to have a lo‘i and making your own stuff up. It is really important that the place dictates what happens there if you want to do educational land based stuff.\textsuperscript{176}

Therefore, in order to deeply understand what to do, and how to do it on a piece of land in terms of developing an ‘Āina-Based program, one must first connect to the ‘āina. Two methods that were commonly being addressed were the connection to ‘āina through historical research, and connection to ‘āina through primary research.\textsuperscript{177}

The first and most organic way to connect to the ‘āina is to physically be there, conducting primary research through keen experiential observations. In the reestablishment of various heiau in Kahalu‘u, one of the main methods to understanding the purpose, meaning, and function of the sites were established through on-site observations:

…”Within an institutional timeline, plan, development, logic model, lesson plans, all of that, we also have to be sensitive and quiet and observant and available. So that’s why, as a cultural specialist… is the one of our team members who is on the site 24/7. So as much as your mom knows you, as one of her children, I think people

\textsuperscript{175} Pukui, 24.
\textsuperscript{176} Interview by William Lee, Honolulu, HI, December 9, 2013.
\textsuperscript{177} Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.
who are charged with ‘Āina-Based learning, have to know the ‘āina, as well a parent might know their child or a father who might know his son or daughter.\footnote{178}

In order to establish a connection with a place that is similar to how a parent understands and connects with a child, personal time and investment to the site must be clearly established. This relatively long-range observational study will provide answers to questions that cannot be found in a day on site. In terms of trying to completely understand the function of Hāpai Ali‘i and Ke‘ekū heiau in Kahalu‘u, the developers main focus was to observe the interaction the heiau had with the natural environment, connecting various observations to form a conclusion through logical deductive reasoning:

See the rooftop up there? Aunty remembers being up there one winter maybe 3-4 years ago and just watching how the water interacts with both Ke‘ekū Heiau and Hāpai Ali‘i. And it was like a mākahā, the water came up to the height of the walls. And it just wrapped itself around, as well as going through it. I observed how the water interacted with the cement wall that’s right up to the edge of the lawn. And I actually saw some stones fall off of it. It was more in conflict with it than it was with the heiau. And that’s a minuscule onsite observation that’s at a certain time of the year. If we were to be up there right now, the water would be totally interacting different. Different time of day, different season. So if you could imagine the kind of primary research that would occur and how different pieces of research were put together. No one knew that, basically that Hāpai Ali‘i was operating as a calendar for a time keeper until [she] was able to piece - wait a minute, something that [he] said, something that she recalled from another site, whipped out her compass, what she knows about the spherical shape of the earth, and realized - you know what? If this is - and finding the piko stone…\footnote{179}

\textbf{Connecting to Place: Historical Research}

Other than personally being on the ‘āina to conduct primary research, researching historical mo‘olelo is an integral aspect of reconnection. Heiau such as Hāpai Ali‘i and Ke‘ekū were developed and rededicated multiple times throughout Hawaiian history.

\footnote{178}Ibid.  
\footnote{179}Interview by William Lee, Honolulu, HI, December 12, 2013.
These rededication events were noted in moʻolelo and ʻoli, recording the significant events that demarcate its use and purpose. It also attaches persons to the place, providing a historical footprint that brings life not only to Kahaluʻu, but also to the kanaka maoli that was connected to Kahaluʻu. In speaking about the historical past of Kahaluʻu Bay, an interviewee described the purpose of Kahaluʻu in the reign of Lonoikimakahiki:

…But the one that we are referring to is Lonoikamakahiki’s residence, which is sitting over at the property right next to us, right South of us. So what we know about him that [she] has taught us is that really, he brought that he always gathered experts at that day and time. And not just tapped their expertise but in the gathering of all those experts; you could imagine the type of interaction that would occur. I think for us, it tells us that in our modern day that if we were to equate what Lonoikamakahiki did in this area, it would be like our university campus, that’s what we would equate with it. Or like, I’ve heard [him] refer to Hāpai Aliʻi and the general idea of heiau and the gathering the energies, a modern day equivalent would be a cell tower.  

Through research of the moʻolelo of Lonoikamakahiki, they have found that one of Kahaluʻu Bay’s main uses was a complex for learning and intellectual development. This find has established not only the understanding of Lonoikamakahiki’s purpose and intent to develop Kahaluʻu, but it also sets a foundation as to how this particular ʻĀina-Based program coordinators and educators proceed with reestablishment. Understanding the past set the vision and mission for their program, where they, “deliver a learning opportunity,” as how Lonoikamakahiki delivered educational opportunities for individuals and families skilled in their respective fields throughout Kona.

Establishing connections to their place was an integral step in the development of these various ʻĀina-Based programs, allowing the ʻāina to “speak for itself,” through its physical presence, as well as its historic tale. Understanding their place was just a due
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diligence in order to give respect and reverence to their site. The physical connection between the ‘Āina-Based program and its ‘āina is what forms a foundational relationship and a sense of place, which sets a precedent for the further connection with surrounding community members.

**Building Community Relationships**

The ‘Āina-Based program staff that were interviewed all stressed the significance and importance the surrounding communities that they serve have on the wellbeing of their programs. Within each of their respective visions and mission statements, they clearly stated the value their communities hold in the interests of their program. These communities constitute not only the physical residents within the vicinity of the program site, but also educational institutions ranging from nearby preschools to distant Universities, non-profit and for-profit programs, government agencies, as well as other ‘Āina/Community-Based programs.

For these relatively new programs trying to establish themselves and their land within communities, it is essential that they acknowledge the long lasting presence that their surrounding communities have on their land. Also one of the first things they do is to create a connection with interested community members in order to form a positive relationship:

When you are establishing partnerships with community, the community is there for perpetuity also, right. So the treatment of people or groups, or organizations has to be with that acknowledgment, that some community entities were there before you even came. And some of them might be here after any one of us might leave. So to approach the community with that kind of understanding and respect is really important, whether from an educator’s perspective or just a community member’s perspective.  

---

In terms of seeking guidance and understanding of a program’s site, connecting with kūpuna that have been on the land all their lives hold a unique and deep understanding that cannot be found anywhere else. Respecting and valuing their knowledge, sharing similar interests in their place, and requesting guidance from them was commonplace in the majority of the interviewed programs’ attempts to connect with community,

You still respect your elders. It’s very place specific. So you ask for permission with anything you do, and they respect that. And then you build a great relationship. You bring a makana, that’s the first thing you think of. When you do stuff for people you don’t go, “what are you going to do in return for me?” You just do it! That’s the right thing… It gives a focus and lets the community know we are doing this for you. You want the community invested.\(^{183}\)

From the inception of connecting with community stems potential for future projects and collaborations, where each entity has a resource that can be shared. Allowing such relationships to take shape fosters interdependence and reciprocation of various resources that will greatly advance the capacity for networks and relationships between the program and community. Also, understanding the resources you can provide, and the resource other entities can contribute, shapes a program’s kuleana and identity for the community. One interviewee conveys this concept, where being seen as a resource for education and sustenance helps guide the understanding of their kuleana in their community,

We have been expanded doing our kalo project and we’ve been funded doing the huli bank project. So that has helped to build that relationship in the community in knowing that we can be a resource for huli, for kalo and different things like that. And for me, my personal view I don’t see this as a museum, although its owned by a

\(^{183}\) Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.
museum and can be looked at as a museum. I see it as a huge resource to our community.\textsuperscript{184}

Another interviewee emphasizes their role as a resource of educating through feeding, as well as all the practices of feeding entails; highlight the need for this educational concept for 21\textsuperscript{st} Century learners in Hawai‘i:

You know I think that’s what is neat about not only about [us] but with any ‘āina education area or any farm is the fact that you are feeding, you are able to grow stuff, and then use it or eat it, and then go back and work again. I think people are attracted to that, I don’t know if it’s the in thing now but from when I have been around it has always been popular. And a lot of people have wanted to come, teachers see the value in it, parents see the value in it, and the university is starting to see the value in it. I think creating a rhythm or some kind of opportunity for the community and groups to come in and be a part of the whole thing that we are doing there is important.\textsuperscript{185}

The fact that these individuals convey the aspect of the programs that they represent are seen as a resource, both physically and educationally, to their community provides evidence of their program’s investment to their community. The relationships that they have established and continue to value today are not a contemporary moral in Hawai‘i. When discussing the role and importance of positive relationships between themselves, their program, and their communities, several interviewees referred to their upbringings in Kona and Hawai‘i where interdependence and relationships were necessary for survival:

Growing up in the 50s, Kona was very country. Hilo was the booming city, and we dressed up to go there, it took four hours to get there. But it made you understand that you lived in a community that needed to take care of each other. Without that bond, you would probably not survive. So the foundation that the kupuna shared is always looking at your family, but also you extended family, which are community,

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{185} Ibid.
respect, being humble, teaching the children not necessarily through schools, but through observation.\footnote{186}{Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.}

They also discussed how their programs are symbolic of this type of lifestyle, and how their past experiences drive how they build relationships with the communities existent today:

If you honor your past, it enriches your future. If you always keep that as your foundation, you’ll always see how you can manage to get people together… My investment in this place is because I have seen it from what it was to what it is today. And the reason that I create relationships that are very strong with the state, the federal, the county government, schools, community leaders, and developers is because we need to do something now that we know it’s the best that we can do because when we are pau, whoever comes later may change it all. You have to realize that you are going to have kids, there is going to always have to be places that can always keep that sense of place and sense of understanding.\footnote{187}{Ibid.}

The idea that community is the cornerstone of each subjects’ program was unanimous in the interview process, where the vast majority of their work is to engage their communities in their respective projects and programs. The visions of the interviewees and their programs were formed cohesively with the interests and visions of their communities, where long lasting relationships were formed well prior to their programs’ inception. And it is a ever lasting process of community engagement, relationship building, and collaboration, where the program’s interests and goals change as the interests and goals of the communities they serve change. However, as long as both the community and ‘Āina-Based program understand that they need each other in order to survive and thrive, much like in old Kona, there will be a kuleana for the existence of these types of programs in the community:
I think from my personal experiences at [our program], the community is the key part of what we do, how we do, when we do. At the same time, the community is also learning alongside us. So it’s not like any one entity knows all the answers, or is trying to influence the other more. It’s more of trying to move forward in the best way that we can. So communities have history, just like you and I have a history. To be aware of that helps you, how you work with one another. I think that you could imagine something that’s dynamic, like an ameba, sometimes this portion gets more tense, its highlighted more and something else gets smaller. Sometimes this small area gets larger and this large area gets smaller. There’s that kind of ebb and flow.¹⁸⁸

Conclusion: ‘Āina-Based Programs as the New-Age Konohiki

This chapter focused on the various kuleana that ‘Āina-Based programs have to their place and their community. The process and protocol of this chapter, from requesting and interview to analyzing data and writing, was a painstaking method of research. It took me quite a while in the analysis portion due to the distinctive power each passage has in my memory of sitting down and talking story with these influential community advocates. Each quote I noted possesses a lively presence in my mind, as if I could vividly recall the interviewee and myself in the moment. This resonating experience with each and every interviewee makes me only hope that I utilized their mana‘o in this chapter in the best way possible.

This chapter emphasized the importance of various connections ‘Āina-Based programs must have in order to thrive. Connecting to place, taking form of physically being present on site and conducting historical research about the place, is essential to understand where the site wants to be in the future. Connecting and building relationships with various communities around the program is also needed for the

community, as well as the ‘Āina-Based program, to understand that they are all in it together.

The often cliché Hawaiian idiom, “it’s a kākou thing,” where kākou in Hawaiian means “us all,” including the one being spoken to, speaks to the idea of relationships and connectivity, that provides an interest in us all. Possessing this concept as a foundation not only within an ‘Āina-Based program, but also within each individual moving the program forward, is similar to the role and responsibility of the konohiki in each ahupua’a. The konohiki was a head overseer or manager of an ahupua’a, being appointed by larger ali‘i. Konohiki carried many roles in Hawaiian society\textsuperscript{189}, which one of the main roles and responsibilities was to manage natural, cultural, and social resources.

Andrade expresses the wide range of skillsets a konohiki must possess, stating:

[Konohiki were] to coordinate planting and harvesting, to mediate water rights, and to organize the building and maintenance of irrigation ditches and the construction of new lo‘i. In consultation with maka‘āinana, konohiki also enforced seasonal kapu protecting various kinds of fish during spawning seasons… Konohiki therefore had to possess a wide arrange of skills. They had to know all of the waiwai (assets) contained within each ahupua’a- hydrologic, biologic, and geologic. They had to know the state of the soil, plants, and animals on land and sea, and guide decisions on their use. Most important, konohiki had to know how to deal with human beings.\textsuperscript{190}

Andrade also conveyed the essential kuleana of a Konohiki, by merely looking into what the word konohiki translates:

However, by breaking the word down into its component parts, one can expand the dictionary definition [of Konohiki], showing how wide-ranging and important the

\textsuperscript{189} For more information about the roles and responsibilities of a konohiki, see E.S. Craighill Handy, et. al. Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment. (Honolulu : Bishop Museum Press, 1972.) 321-322.

\textsuperscript{190} Carlos Andrade, Hā’ena: Through the Eyes of the Ancestors. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008,) 74-75.
role of konohiki was in traditional ahupua‘a society. Kono means to invite, entice, induce, or prompt. The term hiki commonly conveys the idea that something can be done, that it is within the realm of the possible.\(^{191}\)

In conclusion, Andrade reinforces that the konohiki needs to hold an “inclusive,” “can do” demeanor in order to create action and engagement between ali‘i and maka‘āinana:

…konohiki were bridges connecting the governing and the governed. Konohiki had to gather in the fruits, of ahupua‘a for ali‘i, mō‘ī, and maka‘āinana, and akua. However, they needed to ensure that the producers of these fruits, the maka‘āinana, were well cared for and fairly treated… konohiki had to be experts at ‘inviting’ both maka‘āinana and ali‘i to participate in tasks necessary to preserve order and prosperity within their ahupua‘a. In addition, konohiki also had to have respect from the people and enough charisma to draw in and make maka‘āinana feel confidence about investing their lives and energy in the long-term success of the ahupua‘a.\(^{192}\)

Current ‘Āina-Based programs placed in a similar position in today’s society.

Many of these programs are funded and supported to larger institutions such as universities, private land owners, museums, the government, etc. in order to engage communities, much like how konohiki are appointed by ali‘i to engage maka‘āinana.

Konohiki and ‘Āina-Based programs are the planners, coordinators, managers, directors, and consulters that create action within communities.

Like konohiki, ‘Āina-Based programs, and the individuals that manage them, are the connections between community and higher institutions. And in working with and managing a wide array of concerns from a plethora of individuals and interest groups, a “konohiki” type of attitude is essential for collaboration:

If you honor your past, it enriches your future. If you always keep that as your foundation, you’ll always see how you can manage to get people together. YOU are that catalyst to make people come together. Within groups you find that there is

\(^{191}\) Andrade, Hā‘ena, 74.
\(^{192}\) Ibid. 76.
always friction. Even within our group there is friction. But if you can find consensus, that is what we try to do\textsuperscript{193}… I think that with my experiences the test of collaboration comes from when things are not working well, when a problem arises or an issue arises. And the community as a whole is very mindful that when times get tough, it’s easy to bag-off and to end something. But would you do something like that with the community that you are a vital part of? No.\textsuperscript{194}

‘Āina-Based programs are a valuable part of the community in Kona. Their essence and spirit of being open, inclusive, and interdependent is a new, refreshing way of how we should conduct ourselves, professionally, academically, and personally. This chapter I hope exposed their programs in a positive way, including them in my research I felt was not an option, but a requirement. I believe the story each individual told is a direct justification of the importance to perpetuate similar programs across the State.

\textsuperscript{193} Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.

\textsuperscript{194} Ibid.
Chapter 5: Ua Hoʻi Ke Aloha I Kahaluʻu: Moving Forward

Ka Panina: Conclusion

_This work of farming is really a headache, yet it is the work by which is gained by the patient person._ \(^{195}\)

The quote above was uttered by Kamehameha I to himself, as if it was a self-reflective remark following his vision to reestablish Kūāhewa in Kona. It wasn’t meant to be heard; it was merely an internal comment to reinforce the importance of leading his people in the direction of farming. Fortunately it was heard by one of his attendants, in which it became a significant yet simple quote that conveyed Kamehameha I’s moral for being a gracious Mōʻī that cared deeply about the longevity of his people.

After Kamehameha I and his attendants returned to Kailua in 1812 \(^{196}\), the act of farming was invigorated in the community. Desha writes,

On the arrival at Kailua of this procession for the purpose of increasing food production, Kamehameha began the power of the got by encouraging farming for the very first time. He commanded the aliʻi and the makaʻāinana to go up to the Kona uplands to farm. The chiefs and men were aroused early. The men went up to farm… everyone began to farm. There were no favorites in Kamehameha’s presence. He personally entered into the farming with the makaʻāinana and prominent aliʻi of the land. \(^{197}\)

Kamehameha used his keen leadership abilities and planned a campaign not acquire power and self-gain, but to address a serious famine problem that was the result of temporary lack of leadership in Kona during his reign. By his actions to lead by example, including his hands in the work, coupled with having no favorites and treating

\(^{195}\) Desha, 346.

\(^{196}\) Handy and Handy, 524.

\(^{197}\) Desha 345.
everyone, ali‘i and maka‘āinana alike, as equals, was an indirect message conveying the presumption that Kūāhewa, and all the bounty it will provide, was meant to be for everyone. Desha continues this story with Kamehameha’s command to his people expressing how to go about collecting and maintaining the crops of Kūāhewa,

It is well that you have farmed and planted crops. When the time comes that our crop has matured and you begin to pull it up, or perhaps break off the sugar cane clumps, or take the bananas which we all have planted, here is my command to you: pull up the kalo and break off the top (huli) neatly, and then tuck it back into the soil rather than throw it out of the garden and let it just dry up. The same should be done when the sugar cane is pulled as to the sugar cane, the ali‘i desires you who break off the sugar cane, to thrust the cuttings back into the earth. Also when cutting the banana stalk to take the fruit, take care lest the shoots be trampled. If you do as I have directed you, then you will continue to consume the vegetable food, the sugar cane, and the bananas and will not die of starvation…

Kamehameha also commanded his attendants not to eat from Kūāhewa, this garden plot that they made was only for the community of Kona. Understanding the potential of greed and selfishness that might arouse during the maturity of these crops, he also banned the sale of any of the crops planted. In conclusion Kamehameha states,

…And do not forget this most important thing, take good care of our god to benefit our life upon the land. Also it is a good thing that you have spoken of the garden which we have just planted as Kuahewa. This is a good name, and it shall be so called hereafter. It will be know by our children, and it will become an instruction to them to join together in the good work to expel famine from the calabash [emphasis added].

His advice to the people of Kona as how to engage with Kūāhewa is the essence of mālama ‘āina, where the amount that the ‘āina will provide is parallel with the amount of mālama one gives. He also clearly stated the fact that this garden that they planted is

198 Desha, 346.
199 Kamakau, 204.
200 Desha, 346.
theirs, and it was planted to fix the social wrong that was developing in Kona at that time.

In essence, Kamehameha did not merely feed the community of Kona, he provided the
grounds to which Kona could feed *themselves*. This type of leadership promotes self-
efficacy, accountability, and responsibility; morals and values that have to potential to
uplift communities, harboring social change.

Kūāhewa, its concept, its history, and its function is the quintessential story of
leadership, cooperation, and engagement. All the theories and content I expressed in the
previous chapters contribute to the reestablishment of a small portion of Kūāhewa. The
physical remnants of Kūāhewa in Kona, currently overgrown with invasive plants, being
disconnected from Kona’s community for so long, are the center of instruction for
engagement and restoration. And developing an ‘Āina-Based program is an ideal
framework for the Kona’s community today to reconnect to this living system.

**Summary of Chapters**

The first chapter of my thesis was the “road map” of my thoughts and theories,
which drove my research. I discussed my personal experiences of how I perceived the
lands and environment of Kona prior to coming to the university, as well as how I
“discovered” a different perspective of the historical utilization of dry-land agriculture in
readings and depictions of historians, scientists, and ethnographers, both kanaka maoli
and haole alike. The basis that directed my research was the simple question, “why did I
have to travel away to learn about my own home, and why did I learn about this
magnificent segment of Kona’s history?” This made me realize and understand the
inherent disconnection not only with the people of Kona today with Kūāhewa and
Kahaluʻu, but also Kona’s community and knowledge I read and experienced at the
university. Also my experiences as an intern at Kamehameha Schools provided a potential site for the community’s reconnection with Kūāhewa.

Chapter 1 also discussed the role that the kuaiwi walls have as the theoretical framework for reconnection. This idea was a critique on previous management plans at Kahaluu‘u mauka, where the first and overlying suggestion was “benign neglect.” I utilized Beamer’s traditional/modern paradigm in his dissertation to convey my argument that if we as advocate and scholars of this site see these walls merely as “artifacts,” and relics of the past having no connection whatsoever with the community of Kona today, then we are directly promoting the further dismemberment and fragmentation of the understanding of our history and identity.

Chapter 1 was also a literature review of the roles that ʻāina contribute to a kanaka maoli understanding of research and education. This segment notes the various ways in which ʻāina feeds a person, physically, mentally, and spiritually. It also examines the doctrine expressed by contemporary kanaka scholars that ʻāina pedagogies are extremely place-based, where understanding the physical place, as well as the historical place, is fundamental. My review of literature also sets the methodology of my research, where I paralleled it with uhau humu pōhaku. To build a strong wall requires a strong foundation of pōhaku niho. These pōhaku are steadfast, and possess an established integrity. The pōhaku niho are the first pōhaku that are sought, often taking the most time to acquire. So too are the fundamental concepts that are needed to establish any ʻĀina-Based program.

Chapter 2 was an analysis of wahi pana of Kahaluu‘u, and broader Kona. I utilize moʻolelo, ʻoli, and ʻōlelo noʻeau that conveys background context and story to various
wahi pana scattered across the Kahaluʻu landscape. These wahi pana are not only physical markers designating spatial recognition and palena for the land of Kahaluʻu, they also encompass the weather patterns of Kona, which included various types of winds, clouds, rains, etc. By understanding the names of the many wahi pana and their associations with people, stories, and knowledge systems will attribute to an epistemology that was of a kanaka maoli construct.

Chapter 2 also discusses the severance of the understanding and utilization of wahi pana, where I attribute that kanaka maoli in the Hawaiian Kingdom period utilized and implemented wahi pana in Hawaiian Language newspapers and government-sanctioned enterprises. I argued that we codified the physical locations of wahi pana in Kingdom maps, and preserved their history and significance in many moʻolelo written in Hawaiian Language newspapers. The severance of wahi pana occurred following the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom and subsequent deliberate attempts to erase Hawaiian language and culture from territorial educational institutions in the early 20th Century.

I conclude however in chapter 2 the perseverance of wahi pana in Hawaiʻi, including Kahaluʻu and Kona, for nearly two centuries of cover-up and suppression from the community of Kona. This is due to the access to maps that convey the location of these wahi pana, coupled with the thousands of pages of moʻolelo that were preserved Hawaiian Language newspapers, still available today. The reemergence of these epistemologies and knowledge systems are a useful tool of reconnection, establishing a strong sense of place and identity for the community, and concurrently bring life and reverence back to Kahaluʻu and Kona.
Chapter 3 examined the historiography of Kūāhewa. I adopted the term historiography from Young’s work in his historical analysis of State continuity theory and its roles it provides in the emergence of a Hawaiian national consciousness. This approach in the analysis of history is a positive framework to understand the continuance of Kūāhewa and its practical implications of reestablishment today. I did not attempt to take a political stance pertaining to negative impacts that contributed to Kūāhewa’s decline in this chapter, rather the intent was to provide an historical “flow”, focusing more on its continuance and pertinence today.

Chapter 3 also “periodized” the history of Kūāhewa: its inception, its intensification, its peak, and its declination. This concept was also adopted from Young’s work, and I also addressed the themes that connected each era. This attempt seeks to provide a more robust and clear understanding of the functional history of Kūāhewa. While I also understand that my attempt was only a small example, where it would take a dissertation to fully encompass all the available information on Kūāhewa.

I also introduced a different way to examine the immensity of Kūāhewa in chapter 3. I argue that the obscurity of the exact location of Kamehameha’s famous garden plot is evidence of the possible misunderstanding of its historical identity. I deduce that Kūāhewa encompasses all of the “Kona Field System,” and possibly includes the “Kāʻū Field System” as well. My analysis also brings forth the labeling of Hawaiian dry-land agriculture as “field systems,” a name that has an obvious Western scientific construction. More research has to be done in order to empirically conclude that the “Field Systems” of Hawaiʻi island were called Kūāhewa.
I also suggest that if Kūāhewa was existent prior to the era of Kamehameha in Kona, then Kamehameha must have reestablished Kūāhewa. In the vision and mission of my research, this provides a priceless justification and precedence for the community of Kona to value the current remnants of Kūāhewa and reestablish its function. I conclude with the idea that Kūāhewa is an existing structure, where it has equal, if not more, value to Kona today. I emphasized Kūāhewa’s fundamental function that remained constant throughout all of its changes over the past centuries; it was meant to essentially feed the ones who maintained and managed it.

Chapter 4 was an exploration of the values administered by current ‘Āina-Based programs in O‘ahu and Kona. The connection to their place, both through primary and historical research, was a huge component in the knowing and understanding of how to utilize and conduct programs that aligned with the essential purpose, function, and meaning of the site. The importance of building relationships with diverse community individuals and organizations were essential for programmatic survival and growth. These traits were gained through personal and professional experience, where the foundational morals of inclusivity and openness are inherently required to catalyze and forward development.

This chapter also examined and expressed the importance of utilizing community perspectives in my research. I utilized various community-driven frameworks and theories established by contemporary kanaka maoli scholars, and implemented them in my research. This I believe is an underutilized research method in the university today, where I attribute the underutilization of community in research to the seemingly burdensome process of gathering information from human subjects. However
burdensome and time costly it may be, I feel that including community in research is highly valuable and creates positive relationships, contributing to a more holistic understanding that cannot be found and any document.

Chapter 4 concludes with my reflections on the interview process, where I feel that it positively raised my consciousness and value for ‘Āina-Based programs in Kona’s community, further justifying my stance for the need and expansion of these types of programs statewide. I also liken the roles of these programs to the roles of konohiki, stressing the large importance konohiki possessed to engage and uplift makaʻāinana to make their ahupua‘a productive and abundant. These ‘Āina-Based programs function the same today as konohiki did in ka wā kāhiko.

The argument and theme that remained constant in this thesis is the importance and inherent value of connection. It is important for one to connect to the ‘āina that will be served, which was discussed in chapter 2. It is important for one to connect to the history of the ‘āina, which is presented in chapter 3. And lastly, it is important for one to connect with the various forms of community individuals and organizations, which is expressed in chapter 4. This “connective” framework provides a foundation for effective programmatic development, where the ‘āina, its’ history, and its’ community all interwoven and incorporated into any future active management decisions and plans. If carried out properly, this planning framework fosters development that is engaging, holistic, and inclusive, a planning principal that is needed in all areas of development in Hawai‘i.

This idea of connection again was framed in response to one of Rechtman’s management plan for the kuaiwi and other archaeological structures scattered throughout
Kahaluʻu mauka, where “benign neglect” was offered as the overlying plan. This thesis was formed to attempt to convey that the further disconnection of Kūāhewa and kuaiwi from the community of Kona is not a productive and prudent plan. In contrast, creating an ‘Āina-Based program is a viable and prudent way to reconnect a priceless resource where the community should be a part of. In order for Kūāhewa to be a pertinent, living system today, the overlying morals of openness and inclusivity needs to be directly implemented in the management plans.

**Summary of Findings**

Throughout my research and writing process for this thesis, I put Thurston’s 1840 drawing of the mauka portions of Kailua as my wallpaper, as a piece of motivation and reflection during this academic marathon I endured. When I gazed upon the drawing in the beginning, I wanted and expected to depict a complete and deep moʻolelo of this large agricultural system. As I reflect upon this drawing today, I don’t feel as if I have done so. In my attempts to reconnect myself to Kūāhewa via research and writing, I have merely scratched the surface of what was, what is, and what will be Kūāhewa. I recognized Kūāhewa’s vastness locked in history, where multiple dissertations are needed to justly tell its story. This aspect conveys the inherent need for a more multidisciplinary approach to scholarship and analysis on Kūāhewa and Kona. I realized however the significance of my work was not in the amount of research and findings I acquired, but in the way I perceived and analyzed the information.

With over 3,500 documented archaeological features within a relatively small 355 acre parcel in Kahaluʻu mauka, the potential to reconnect and further our understanding of the Kūāhewa system seems limitless. However in this thesis I pose and question the
way in which researchers and scholars connect and view these structures. Shall we as researchers analyze the remnants of Kūāhewa as ancient artifacts and relics of the past? Are they structures that convey a way of life that is bounded and labeled “traditional”? Or is Kūāhewa a viable, living system where many parts are in the “fallow” state? Can they be seen as the infrastructure for reestablishment, acting as guidelines and physical models for Kona’s agriculture in the future? The latter vision I came to understand was, and should be, the essence of Kūāhewa, where its primary intent was to feed. And it will not feed unless many hands till and tend the soil. And as how we reference moʻolelo and scholarly works that provide guidelines as to how our kūpuna survived off the land, the kuaʻiwi walls should be a guideline for application.

ʻĀina-Based Programs as Vehicles for Social Change

Because to me this ['Āina-Based programs] is about social change. It’s about social change. Because if you really look at ʻĀina-Based programs it’s a whole set of communitarian values that once was Hawai‘i, was once was a part of Hawai‘i, and maybe a part of Hawai‘i’s future. It’s a choice; it should be presented as a choice. I would say ʻĀina-Based programs is about sustaining communities, it’s about resilience, it’s about self reliance.

The theme and content of these previous chapters portray a different vision of how the majority of Kona’s community conceptualizes how the ʻāina should be utilized to its fullest potential. As a product of Kona’s community, I see the careers that my generation is directed into. Other than tourism and construction development, there are not much other options to build a living off of. I am not an economist, nor is the scope of this thesis a contemporary analysis of Hawai‘i’s economy, it is clear however, that the business and political leaders of Hawai‘i have large interests in the utilization of our natural and social resources to fulfill external economic demands.
It would take multiple dissertations to accurately describe the economic situation Hawai‘i is faced with today, and to attempt to critically review capitalism in Hawai‘i’s history in this segment would be academic suicide. I will however focus this section around an eye-opening interview that was conducted in conjunction with the other interview I discussed in the previous chapter. This interview was focused around this individuals’ concern with current ‘Āina-Based programs today not fully recognizing it’s potential not only as advocates for their community and natural/cultural resources, but also as advocates for social change, stating:

…why are ‘Āina-Based education programs important? Let me tell you what I worry about current ‘Āina-based education programs, they tend to focus on the practice, and about natural resource management, who’s talking about values? Because it seems to me that to learn about it completely, would mean that you would understand that it wasn’t about consumer capitalism. You go to every single ‘Āina-Based education programs, and they talk about Hawaiian values in a way that its almost literary and cultural, and in terms of sort of every day kind’ve practical methods, but who talks about the politics? What is ‘Āina-Based living? 201

The main answer that this person was trying to address was that in a capitalistic perspective there is little to no economic value in ‘Āina-Based programs. However, as suggested in chapter 4, there is an intrinsic interest in the survival and expansion ‘Āina-Based programs statewide. This paradigm is in direct conflict with what is expected of us when we grow up; go to college, get a good degree and career, make money, etc. With ‘Āina-Based programs actually having a viable purpose and meaning in Hawai‘i with the community valuing its presence, “calls into question our entire current system of capitalism.” 202

201 Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.

202 Ibid.
The interviewee also breaks down the intent of agricultural capitalism in Hawai‘i and how it disguises itself as “farmers.” This person provides an example how big agribusiness companies often disregard the effectiveness of small-scale, diversified, community-driven agriculture. He states,

We work with small farmers, and these big shots from Honolulu come and they want to learn about what they are doing. And the farmers, the producers are saying, ‘I can’t tell you how good it feels to produce poi and deliver it to people I know, the businesses I know.’ And you know what the big shots say? ‘We knew it; you’re in it for the lifestyle. You’re not a serious businessman.’ You see it’s all about financial value, what about the non financial value… and they’re going, “What do you mean you don’t want to grow? Don’t you want to be a big business?” They go “No. As long as I can put my kids through school, pay my mortgage, feed myself, and stay here. Create a viable enough business so that if my kids want to come home from Honolulu they have something to come home to.” And it’s funny because so when they say, “so you are in it for the lifestyle?” They say, “Yah.” They don’t understand the criticism.203

I dub Hawai‘i’s big agribusiness and methods of management as “farmers” because when we look at how they conduct their work, it is more so a business, capital growth, and power than it is to feed and sustain communities. Their vision is to create a profit, where large-scale production is essential for sustaining such an enterprise. We have seen this in Hawai‘i as early as the mid 19th century in the sandalwood, sugar, and pineapple industries, and we are seeing this today in the biotech industries’ interests in Hawai‘i. This creates a strain on the wellbeing of Hawai‘i’s natural resources, and forms a misrepresentation on the community’s image of what agriculture looks like in Hawai‘i:

That’s [large-scale agriculture] the wrong foot to step with, and so here’s the other thing to right. Wherever you stand on the GMO debate, it’s clear that GMO provides for industrial scale agriculture. So the criticisms against small [farmers]… the UN studies, all these studies show that small scale diversified agriculture will feed communities the most effectively right? But the criticisms we get are, ‘you guys are just doing small-scale stuff, how are you going to feed the world? How you are...
going to feed the continent?’ And we are going, ‘why would we want to do that?’ Because you see, that scale, is about capitalism, it’s about huge corporate profits. And the other scale is about resilience, and it’s about supporting local communities… And for me it’s really about sort of self-respect and pride, and maybe even sovereignty. And it’s because of industrial capital that a sovereign government was overthrown.\\footnote{204}{Ibid.}

Large-scale agribusiness should not be the model that businesspeople, politicians, and communities imagine agriculture in Hawai‘i. The social, cultural, and natural resources cannot sustain such businesses. Alan Murakami, Litigation Director at the Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation, expressed in a panel discussion aired on PBS Hawaii’s \textit{Insights}, that “We can’t have continental values in island communities.”\\footnote{205}{“Insights on PBS Hawaii: Are We Preserving Access on Our Shorelines?” PBS Hawaii. December 13, 2013. Accessed December 13, 2013.} A new economic model must be addressed at all levels of Hawai‘i’s society to restore balance to a place where resources has been exploited for far too long:

‘Åina-Based programs really recognize not only the close relationship between humanity and nature, but recognizes the ability of island people especially Kanaka Maoli to think and plan, make decisions, operate through certain communitarian values that really worked. To me that’s all about ‘Åina-Based programs, recognizing intelligence, recognizing a whole other way of being. To me it’s an alternative, it’s a choice. People need to be presented with a choice and they make the decision.\\footnote{206}{Interview by William Lee, Kona, HI, December 12, 2013.}

‘Åina-Based programs offer this alternative. These programs have the potential to not only educate and ground learners both in “traditional” Hawaiian practices and 21st century skills, but it has the potential to shift the community’s perspective in how we view and treat, and utilize our ‘āina. Beamer expresses one way to view the idea of Aloha ‘Åina,
…the concept of Aloha ‘Āina was defined as a movement toward the union of culture and ecosystem. This was the true beauty and utter genius of the resource and economic system of Hawai‘i prior to the arrival of Cook. Language, culture, social structure, resource management, and land tenure were entirely embedded in and organized to be in harmony with ecosystems. Agricultural systems like lo‘i complemented systems of aquaculture, while culture and social systems recognized the uniqueness of place and environment.\footnote{Kamanamaikalani Beamer, “Tūtū’s Aloha ‘Āina Grace,” in The Value of Hawai‘i 2: Ancestral Roots, Oceanic Visions. (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2014,) 14.}

For years the majority of Kona, and by extension, Hawai‘i, has been physically, mentally, and spiritually disconnected from the many ways that ‘āina feeds. The physical representation of Kūāhewa, along with the social and cultural morals imbedded in its practice, has been abandoned for generations, with the structural remnants left quiet and unused. The lack of agricultural use for sustenance in Kona made way for dependency of foreign goods, allowing for a demand to be filled by foreign corporations to feed us. Subsequently this harbored the separation of Kūāhewa from Kona’s consciousness today, where interested scientists and academics reintroduce the ‘iwikuamo‘o of Kūāhewa to the community of Kona as “traditional” structures.

The inception of the Hawaiian language immersion movement and Pūnana Leo schools in 1983 was a direct response to avid concerns of the endurance of the Hawaiian language in Hawai‘i. Decades of suppression of the Hawaiian language and culture that was implemented in the public school systems during the Republic and Territory of Hawai‘i left the status of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i as a dying language. The Hawaiian language movement was based off of a developed sense of urgency, where the longevity of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i was in serious question. The resulting establishment of Pūnana Leo was the
result of the attempts to revive the Hawaiian language from a “dying” to a “living” state.\textsuperscript{208}

Today we should view the remnants of Kūāhewa in this fashion. Decades of disconnection and abandonment with Kūāhewa have left us not knowing how to sustain ourselves from the land. A new food system movement in Hawai‘i, much like the Hawaiian language movement mentioned above, needs to be planned to address current issues of foreign dependence on goods and food sovereignty. Socio-political awareness through education is the first step in this process. A large aspect of educating is the physical connection to ‘āina, and ‘Āina-Based programs connect people with ‘āina. ‘Āina-Based programs offer knowledge and understanding connected with utilizing ‘āina to feed communities, and based off of statistical data portraying Hawai‘i’s huge dependence on foreign goods\textsuperscript{209}, ‘Āina-Based programs are needed now more than ever.

Sustenance agriculture and farming to feed Kona’s community should be a priority in the leaders that determine the policy, land management, and planning in Kona. We have a road map to guide these implementations that our kūpuna left for us. Kona as a society has been disconnected from Kūāhewa for too long. No longer does Kūāhewa systematically feed the people of Kona. We need to educate ourselves about this system and how our ancestors managed it. But it must not stop at simply knowing about


\textsuperscript{209} Based on analysis from the Rocky Mountain Institute, about 85 percent of locally consumed foods are imported. For more information see, Christina Page, Lionel Bony, and Laura Schewel, “Island of Hawaii Whole Systems Project: Phase I Report,” Rocky Mountain Institute, (Hawaii), http://kohalacenter.org/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Research_RMI_WholeSystemsProject.pdf.
Kūāhewa. We must also further engage and reconnect with Kūāhewa, looking into various avenues for direct and active management.

We can look to the past to understand how our kūpuna created these systems to sustain communities and it can be a model of how we can live today. We need to value and reinforce the “place-based” approach to our culture, and stress a large importance to our community in any decision and action that we do. We should realize that our history and continuity of it should liberate us, not fragment us and pigeon-hold our identities to “traditional” or “modern” identities. The physical representation of this type of model is the remnant kuaiwi of Kūāhewa, all we need now is to reconnect the community to what was once a part of us.
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