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Abstract

I have often wondered how Kānaka Maoli became minorities within our own homeland. I had no idea that the Haole Oligarchy had a structured process in place to build the American Anglo Saxon population base specifically. This thesis examines archival and other primary source documents of the Territorial Homesteading initiative that took place in the very early twentieth century. I demonstrate that more than two thousand acres in Haʻikū, Maui were settled exclusively by Americans, which was called an American colony by newspapers and publications at that time. This thesis argues that not only was this initiative discriminatory against Kānaka and other non-Haole living in Hawaiʻi at that time, but that the Territorial government run by the Haole Oligarchy was corrupt, nepotistic and racist, using the Haʻikū homesteads to benefit their friends and political allies financially.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Ha‘ikū in the district of Hamakualoa on Maui is the location of a Territorial time period oddity - an American colony. Perhaps the first of its kind in the Hawaiian Islands, this colony consisted of more than two thousand Hawaiian acres that were settled exclusively by American Anglo-Saxons. The colony came equipped with amenities: it had its own church, school and other infrastructure in order to allow white Americans to live their everyday lives exclusively around other white Americans.

This thesis examines the Ha‘ikū homesteads as an attempt to help the Republic of Hawai‘i government ensure their continued political success through settlement of Hawaiian lands. Haunani-Kay Trask defined the Republic of Hawai‘i as an "oligarchy with a franchise limited by property and language requirements and a loyalty oath that effectively excluded all Natives".1 Throughout this text, I utilize the term Haole Oligarchy to represent the leaders, employees and other officials of the Republic of Hawai‘i government. This Haole Oligarchy made attempts to balance the population demographics, which at the time of the illegal overthrow heavily favored Kānaka Maoli and the Asian plantation labor force.2 The effort to convince Anglo-Saxons to settle here from America began just after the overthrow. The Haole Oligarchy attempted to build up the Haole voter base to ensure their continued monopolization of the political, business and economic realms of Hawai‘i.3 These realms included, but weren't limited to, sugar plantations, shipping companies, and financial institutions. Segments of this monopoly

---

1 Haunani-Kay Trask, From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai‘i (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1999), 15.
3 Kamanamaikalani Beamer, No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2014), 197.
continue today, as do their negative impacts upon much of the current Kānaka Maoli population through persisting economic and social disenfranchisement.

This thesis will address three interrelated questions about the Territorial homesteading initiative in general as well as the Ha‘ikū homesteads in particular in an effort to begin to understand Hawai‘i's Territorial period.

Research Questions

(1) What was the purpose of the Territorial Homesteading initiative in Hawai‘i and what were the processes utilized?

This thesis examines how the Territorial government used homesteading to lure American Anglo-Saxons as settlers in Hawai‘i. My work details the function of the three lease types used in Ha‘ikū and how they were utilized to settle foreigners. As an example, the Right Of Purchase Lease ("RPL") was used in the vast majority of the Ha‘ikū homesteads to obtain fee-simple ownership. The RPL allowed for specific circumstances that the other methods didn't, including the settlement of homestead areas by exclusive groups of settlers through the use of Settlement Associations. These associations were central to the Territorial government's ability to settle these Hawaiian lands exclusively with white Americans. This thesis discusses how these associations were employed in the settling of the two Ha‘ikū Homestead tracts, Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela and Kuiaha-Kaupakulua.

I examine the Territorial government's actions that enabled the opening of the Ha‘ikū homestead tracts and how these tracts compared to other homesteads in Hawai‘i as a whole. I will compare the classification of these lands and the amount of government provided infrastructure, especially as related to the intended agricultural
function of these lands. It is clear that the American colony in Haʻikū was provided a greater level of infrastructure and government support than other homesteads. Because the Haole Oligarchy needed to offer more than Hawaiʻi's climate and beaches to attract American farmers from the continent to settle in Hawaiʻi, they also deeply discounted the land prices for these settlers. I also conduct a high-level comparison of the Haʻikū homestead prices, land quality, and what was offered as infrastructure to those of other homestead tracts that were more ethnically diverse.

(2) Who were the people involved in the Haʻikū homestead tracts?

This research question examines two groups of people: first, the individuals working within the Territorial government to create these tracts and second, the actual homesteaders. It was reported in the Maui News that both Haʻikū homestead tracts could not have come to fruition were it not for the help of the sugar industry leader Henry Perrine Baldwin. Negotiations between the Territorial government and Baldwin resulted in the exchange of the land that became Kuiaha-Paʻuwela Homestead Tract for land elsewhere on Maui. Baldwin played a starring role in the Kaupakulua tract as well, since the adjoining land was offered to the government by the Maui Agricultural Company, another enterprise belonging to Baldwin, for the purpose of these subsequent homesteads. My research analyzes the connection between the sugar plantation owners and the Haʻikū homesteads and hypothesizes what their motivation to help may have been to help.

The other biographical piece of my thesis examines the demographics of the homesteaders, including gender, marital status and occupation. This is an important segment of my research since my findings seem to contradict the Haole Oligarchy's stated definition of the desired homesteader.
(3) What was the result of the homesteading process in Haʻikū?

Most of the Haʻikū homesteaders lived in the Haʻikū homesteads long enough to fulfill the requirements and obtain fee-simple ownership of this Hawaiian land. However, while the Haʻikū homesteads were eventually deemed a failure by Maui newspapers and periodicals due to the eventual departure of the American settlers, my thesis analyzes the long-term effects on Kānaka of this initiative. My research will examine the changes in land use and tenure once the homesteaders depart and the eventual fate of these two thousand acres.

I also research the demographic and economic changes in Hamakualoa as a result of this homesteading initiative. There was a lot of economic profit realized by the homesteaders through the eventual subleasing and sales of their homestead lots and I provide a high-level analysis of some examples of this.

Theoretical Framework

I use settler colonialism theory to discuss the policies of the Haole Oligarchy as it relates to immigrating and settling more Caucasians from the continent into Hawaiʻi. While this theory may not fit perfectly with my analysis, it does help me explain the actions of the Haole Oligarchy and Territorial government specific to immigration and desired population demographics and how they connect to the homestead initiative in Haʻikū. As an example, the lease type created by the Haole Oligarchy that was intended for Kānaka Maoli was strategically different than the two intended for Haole. Of the three lease types, the type intended for Kānaka was the only type that did not allow for fee simple ownership. In Patrick Wolfe's book, Settler Colonialism and the

---

4 In this paper, the term Kānaka refers to Aboriginal Native Hawaiians.
Transformation of Anthropology, he speaks of the process of elimination then changes into a strategy of exclusion of the Indigenous person through the inability to obtain land,

It can be seen how the logic of elimination, most crudely manifest in the initial massacres, has persisted into the present by way of a number of strategic transformations...So far as the present is concerned, over the key question of land, Australian policy continues to be exclusive rather than inclusive in that...the bulk of the Indigenous population is eliminated from the reckoning.5

I contend that the Haole oligarchy did the same to the Kānaka Maoli population in an effort to produce the same settler-colonialist outcome of elimination of the indigenous.

In addition, I utilize Vanishing Indian Discourse to analyze this period in Hawai‘i's history. There are pointed similarities between this theory and the way in which the Haole Oligarchy spoke about Kānaka Maoli dying out. In Philip Deloria's book Playing Indian, he writes about "the full-blown ideology of the vanishing Indian, which proclaimed it foreordained that less advanced societies should disappear in the presence of those more advanced."6 This racist theory of the natural elimination of lesser peoples due to the presence of people that are more intelligent and civilized impacted Kānaka and was written about by members of the Haole Oligarchy.

Literature Review

In some ways, Hawai‘i's territorial government period is a mystery. The Ha‘ikū homesteads began in 1908, shortly after Hawaiian nationals had defeated a treaty of annexation with the United States and America unlawfully claimed Hawai‘i through the Newlands Resolution. There is little written about Hawai‘i Territorial homesteading to date. In spite of this, the texts that have contributed to this thesis provide valuable context into the historical events that led up to the creation of these homesteads. These

5 Patrick Wolfe, Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology the Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event (London: Cassell, 1999), 204.
6 Philip J. Deloria, Playing Indian (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 64.
sources discuss why the Haole oligarchy that was illegally leading Hawaiʻi desired to settle Anglo Saxons from America in Hawaiʻi. They also detail the different methods through which settlers obtained land. I use these texts as a jumping-off point for my research. It is important to reveal and analyze the policies surrounding homesteading and how this affected Kānaka. This is especially true because Kānaka continue to be impacted by the political, legal and social changes that were put into place during this period. The 1895 Land Act and the process of quiet title in Hawaiʻi have disenfranchised Kānaka and our ability to purchase land and homes.

The literature review for this text consists of three interrelated areas that give valuable context to understanding Hawaiʻi’s homesteading initiative.

(1) Land Laws As A Disenfranchisement Tool

Hawaiʻi's land tenure system is unique. In order to understand the Haʻikū homesteads, my audience must possess a basic understanding of historical land tenure. They need to understand what Sanford Dole and his colleagues saw as challenges immediately after the overthrow. Once those challenges are understood, their solutions to those challenges can be analyzed. This allows my reader to understand the land-grabbing vehicles they put into place to settle Hawaiʻi with Anglo-Saxons from America. I rely heavily on texts such as No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation, Who Owns The Crown Lands Of Hawaiʻi?,7 and "Kuleana: A Genealogy of Native Tenant Rights"8 to assist with those explanations and the related historical background information.

---

7 Kamanamaikalani Beamer, No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2014).
One such historical event was the Māhele. The transition from the traditional ahupuaʻa structure to the Māhele has been written about in many different ways. Some have represented the Māhele as something that the Mōʻī were convinced to do by Haole to provide increased economic stability and viability, including W.D. Alexander in his book *A Brief History of Land Titles in the Hawaiian Kingdom*\(^9\) and Jon Van Dyke in his book *Who Owns The Crown Lands Of Hawaiʻi.*\(^{10}\) Among the first Kānaka Maoli scholars to analyze the Māhele through a Kānaka lens was Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, Ph.D. in her book *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea lā e Pono ai?*.\(^{11}\) More recent texts written by Kānaka Maoli scholars examine the idea of the Māhele as a way to protect Kānaka rather than disenfranchise them. In Dr. Kamanamaikalani Beamer's dissertation, "Na Wai Ka Mana?", there is a more in-depth discussion of the Māhele as a system to begin to divide out the rights of Kānaka with respect to land and actually protect the Kānaka, rather than a Haole created system that was forced upon the Aliʻi. He writes:

These (rights) needed to be settled because it had been codified in law through the Declaration of Rights and laws of 1839 and the Constitution of 1840, that the lands of the Kingdom were owned by these three groups...The Mahele was an instrument to begin settling these undivided interests, and it was the division of nearly all the land in the Hawaiian islands between the Mōʻī, government and chiefs which ultimately allowed for large-scale private ownership in the Hawaiian Kingdom, subject to the rights of native tenants (native Hawaiian 'commoners') to make their claims for land. Following the Mahele, the only group with an undefined interest in all the lands of the Kingdom were the native tenants, and this would be later addressed in the Kuleana Act of 1850. Those individuals of the native tenant class who did not divide out their interests continued to possess, in

---


perpetuity, and undivided right in the entire dominium, until they divided their interest and acquired a freehold title whenever they desired a division.  

Beamer's views begin to shed a light on the Māhele which is less fatalistic than the viewpoints that were previously published by both Kānaka and Haole scholars. In turn, other scholars begin to write about Kingdom land tenure differently. In Mark 'Umi Perkin's PhD dissertation, "Kuleana: A Genealogy of Native Tenant Rights", he states:

It is most likely the process [of the Māhele and Kuleana Act], while ostensibly well-conceived, took on a life of its own, leaving some Hawaiians in control of their economic fate, at least for a generation, and some disenfranchised. And despite aspects of the process that opposed Hawaiian and Indigenous understandings of land, it was the economics of their situation and the process of erasure and forgetting that led to alienation, rather than the design of the Māhele process itself.  

Shortly after the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1893, a Constitutional Convention May 30 - July 5, 1894 was held by the PGs in order for the "Republic of Hawaii" to adopt a constitution. Van Dyke's book Who Owns The Crown Lands Of Hawai'i? explains the land laws that were put into place during the Republic of Hawai‘i years, 1894 - 1898, as well as the Territorial period that followed. These were critical times in Hawai‘i’s land tenure history since this is when the Haole Oligarchy set up the terms of the Land Act and Article 15 of the 1894 Constitution. According to Van Dyke, the Constitution of 1894 was "prepared primarily by Sanford Ballard Dole and Lorrin A. Thurston and was declared to be the law of the land effective July 4, 1894, by

---


14 In this text, PGs refers to the leadership of the illegal Provisional Government.
proclamation." The fate of the crown lands was addressed in article 95 of this constitution:

That portion of the public domain heretofore known as Crown Land is hereby declared to have been heretofore, and now to be, the property of the Hawaiian Government, and to be now free and clear from any trust of or concerning the same, and from all claim of any nature whatsoever, upon the rents, issues and profits thereof. It shall be subject to alienation and other uses as may be provided by law. All valid leases thereof now in existence are hereby confirmed.

Article 95 combined the crown lands (lands stolen from Liliʻuokalani during the overthrow) with the government lands (lands stolen from the Hawaiian Kingdom during the overthrow) and renamed the resulting land base 'Public Lands.' Through this hoʻohui, the Haole Oligarchy set up the possible sales of crown lands through the reversal of their inalienability, an attempt to free them from any trust obligation. The Haole Oligarchy also claimed the income for their government that was being provided through the leasing of the crown lands, essentially robbing Queen Liliʻuokalani of this money.

The Oligarchy began to research settlement of Hawaiʻi by Americans as a way to safeguard their interests against the Kānaka and Royalists, who still greatly outnumbered them. From the illegal overthrow up until this time, many Hawaiians did not participate in voting events due to a requirement that they first take an oath of allegiance to the organization that illegally overthrew their Queen. There were also a number of Royalists who were not Kānaka Maoli who supported the Queen and were threats to the Haole Oligarchy. The growing Asian population, brought in by sugar plantations as labor, compounded the need to drastically increase Hawaiʻi's Haole population segment. These Asians did not have voting rights at this time, but the children of this large alien population would be. This next generation that was born in Hawaiʻi were citizens and

---

would eventually be in a position to threaten the political structure due to their large numbers. The risk to the Haole Oligarchy staying in power remained as long as Kānaka, the Royalists and the next generation of Asians outnumbered the American Haole population. The research of methods to settle Hawai‘i with Americans included correspondence with the New Zealand Surveyor General and a trip to New Zealand by Haole Oligarchy member W.O. Smith. According to Dr. Beamer, Smith conducted a "formal investigation of the system of land title and registration there."

They looked to the Haole in New Zealand for advice because they had been "fairly effective in promoting the foreign settlement on their lands," according to Beamer. Thus began the campaign to settle Anglo-Saxons of the American variety in Hawai‘i.

The Ha‘ikū homesteads utilized land lease systems that were created through the 1895 Land Act and disenfranchised Kānaka. Scholar J. Kēhaulani Kauanui writes about the Hawaiian Homelands Commission Act and the resulting Hawaiian Homesteads. These homestead leases are available exclusively to Kānaka that meet a fifty percent blood quantum, as defined by the U.S. Federal government. In her book, Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity, Kauanui states, "Because the HHCA (Hawaiian Homelands Commission Act) does not allow for ownership of the homestead lands, it also created a form of dependency in the leasing scheme. Stress on preventing land alienation amounted to another form of paternalism." This dependency and resulting disenfranchisement was also present in the Territorial homesteading initiatives due to the fact that the primary vehicle for

---


17 Ibid.

Kānaka to obtain land (as provided for in the Land Act) was a 999-year homestead lease. Much like HHCA, it did not allow for land ownership. This brings up the question of why the Land Act would allow for such a long lease period without ever granting ownership. Of course, the primary vehicles for Haole to obtain land (as provided by the same Land Act) allowed for fee simple title, supporting the theory that the Land Act was a paternalistic system that disenfranchised Kānaka.

(2) Homesteading - A Colonial Tool For Population Transformation

Homesteading in Hawai‘i had an early history, although the term meant different things and impacted different people and organizations in contrasting ways over time. According to the Legislative Reference Bureau's Public Land Policy in Hawaii: An Historical Analysis, this started as early as 1845 when the editor of The Polynesian, a Hawaiian newspaper, advocated for it in his article of October, 1845:

> Every Hawaiian subject should have the right to acquire certain tenures in the soil;...This done and the country holds a safe pledge of the poor man, however small his patch and few his resources. He has his home, his house, his cattle, the products of his own industry to love, to defend...Every improvement of farm, stock, and house would be his. The means of subsistence would increase and as a corollary, population...Industry and economy being necessary to accumulation would tend to purer morals, religion would have a cleanly home, and an abundant table. Wealth would gradually arise and produce refinement.  

The above-referenced article names Hawaiian subjects as the beneficiaries of these proposed homesteads. Less than thirty years later, as early as 1872, Sanford Dole began arguing that "Hawaii's future depended upon attracting immigrants to resettle Hawaii's lands in the familiar, American pattern of family farming, rather than through...

---

development of enormous plantations worked by alien field gangs." The Legislative Reference Bureau report refers to both instances as homesteading, but they differ significantly since one is referring to helping the Kānaka population and the other of replacing them. Furthermore, Dole's quote and the eventual Territorial government's homesteading initiative specifically named Americans as the intended beneficiaries, with small-scale farms as the basis for the desired communities. This report also explains the 1895 Land Act and the 1900 Organic Act, which exhibited Congress' intent to change Hawai‘i's public land laws to "encourage family farming in the pattern established on the American mainland." This intention is reiterated through the newspaper articles that appear in U.S. newspapers advertising public lands for sale. The report further breaks down Hawai‘i land policy chronologically and by president and governor, which facilitates comparing and contrasting the individual policies and initiatives they supported. The governors during the time period of the Ha‘ikū homesteads were Carter, Frear and Pinkham, and each of these executives were reported to have been steadfast in their support of the settlement of Americans through homesteading in Hawai‘i.

Dole's long-time interest in opening Hawai‘i's crown lands to American settlers is discussed in detail in *Who Owns The Crown Lands Of Hawai‘i?* and "Na Wai Ka Mana? ‘Ōiwi Agency and European Imperialism in the Hawaiian Kingdom." In fact, the 1895 Land Act's renaming of the crown and government lands to 'Public Lands' shows an effort to mask the origin of these lands. Documents at the Hawai‘i State Archives tell the

---


21 Ibid., 23.

22 Ibid., 26-35.

same story. Among these is an undated report titled "Land Settlement." It states "As of yet but little had been done in the way of introducing Americans from the mainland to these islands. Although the preparation of the [Land] Act of 1895 was distinctly made with that object in view."²⁴

Although they initially appear similar in function, Dole's homesteading plan differed from the vision that Kauikeaouli had in creating the Kuleana Act. First, the beneficiaries of the two were completely different. Secondly, the motivations behind these initiatives were clearly disparate. Thirdly, Kauikeaouli's effort was an attempt to preserve indigenous Hawaiian land tenure and sustain traditional food systems. He hybridized land tenure relationships and codified ancestral relationships to lands and resources. This effort was different than Dole's ideal of family farming.

In D.C. Preza's "The Empirical Writes Back: Re-examining Hawaiian Dispossession Resulting From the Māhele of 1848," he points out that kuleana rights, sometimes referred to as native tenant rights, were limited to aboriginal Hawaiians only, "foreigners, even those naturalized as Hawaiian Nationals, were not considered Native Tenants and therefore, they were not eligible for a Land Commission award from the Kuleana Act."²⁵ Hawaiian Nationals that were foreigners, though they were subjects of the Hawaiian Kingdom, were not considered to be part of the native tenant class that possessed ownership rights that needed to be divided out. In contrast, Dole and the Haole Oligarchy put homesteading into place to target American Anglo Saxons exclusively as homesteaders. As an example, the Territorial homesteads in Haʻikū were set aside and

---
²⁴ S.B. Dole, Land Settlement (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu) as cited in Kamanamaikalani Beamer's text, No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation, 277.
ultimately given to Americans almost exclusively, in spite of Kānaka expressing interest in obtaining homestead lands in the area of Hamakuapoko. The perception that the government was reserving this valuable land was not unfounded. In a letter from Governor Frear to a prospective homesteader, he states:

We are very anxious to get American farmers in this territory and we are now trying to settle such farmers in one of the best districts which we are keeping for that purpose, instead of opening it generally for people of all nationalities. It is in a very desirable place in the matter of climate...It is land that is particularly good for raising pineapples. I refer to the land of Haiku on the Island of Maui.26

This quote shows the intent of the Territorial Government, whose governor had the ability to approve or disapprove the opening of homesteads on particular tracts of land. The policy of targeting American Anglo Saxons as settlers in Hawaiʻi is made clear through the myriad of correspondence and publications during the early Territorial period. Doing so would build a particular segment of the population that was likely to support the Haole Oligarchy while excluding Kānaka, Asians and other non-Americans already living in Hawaiʻi.

Because of the vast numbers of immigrants residing in Hawaiʻi, the population demographics during the period right after the illegal overthrow were a risk for the Haole Oligarchy. The Haole were outnumbered and Sanford Dole and the other Oligarchy members decided that more Haole were needed in Hawaiʻi to safeguard against being outvoted by Kānaka and children of the numerous Asian immigrant laborers brought to Hawaiʻi by the sugar plantations.27 I contend that the Haʻikū homesteads are a direct result of this threat, part of the 'legal' initiatives that 'justified' the creation and subsequent disposal of the 'Public Lands' land base. Another way the Haole Oligarchy justified

---

26 Governor Frear, Letter to William Grant Leonard, November 20, 1911.
changing the land laws in this time period was they believed that Kānaka would eventually die out completely. Linda Parker writes about this type of discourse in her text *Native American Estate:*

> Adding to the haoles' desire for land for commercial and agricultural pursuits was the prevailing belief that the Hawaiians were quickly becoming extinct. The native population had decreased dramatically since the first contact with whites because of the introduction of venereal disease, measles, and other diseases, and the acceleration of warfare. Exploitation in the sandalwood industry and other economic enterprises also contributed to the high death rate. The haoles sought to ensure that the land would be theirs when the indigenous population expired.  

> There will be a considerable amount of biographical information on the homesteaders included in this thesis. The vast majority of this information comes from archival documents, a variety of English and Hawaiian language newspapers, and Thomas G. Thrum's *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual.*

> My thesis helps re-write and the history of Haʻikū. It is a step to re-righting the historiography that has happened all over Hawaiʻi nei.

**Methodology**

The primary source of research for this thesis was archival documents located at various archives on Oʻahu and Maui. The Hawaiʻi State Archives house the documents that relate to putting the homesteading initiative into place. Public Land Commission folders and related correspondence received from prospective American settlers were reviewed to learn how the homesteading scheme worked in Hawaiʻi. I also utilized reports that were provided to the Governor's office from various government departments from the time of the illegal overthrow through 1930.

---

In addition, I obtained additional documents from the State Bureau of Conveyances and the State Land Department. These documents included the Right Of Purchase Leases and associated grants that were issued to each Haʻikū homesteader as well as the sublease and purchase history of each homestead lot after fee simple ownership was attained.

Ke Alaloa

The correct history and related historiography of an area or topic must be realized before the process of rewriting and re-righting it can begin. This thesis is a first step in learning what happened to land in Haʻikū after the illegal overthrow and through Hawaiʻi's Territorial period. Chapter two discusses the genealogy of homesteading in Hawaiʻi and historical changes to land tenure from traditional times through the Māhele and the overthrow of the Monarchy in 1893, up until the Territorial period. There were significant changes in land law made post-overthrow that tell the story of what was desired by the Haole Oligarchy. Chapter two also discusses the changes that were made to the Land Laws during these periods and examine the Territorial homesteading initiative that these laws allowed for. It exposes how Hawaiʻi's lands were promoted and some of the resulting correspondence between the governor and prospective homesteaders. Early Hawaiʻi homesteading results are also examined. Chapter three explores the Haʻikū homesteads in particular, looking at the biographical demographics of the homesteaders, how the Haʻikū homestead land was obtained, and the infrastructure that was provided to the people that settled there. Henry P. Baldwin's integral role in this initiative is discussed with many of his businesses standing to profit from its success. It exposes nepotism within the Republic of Hawaiʻi and analyzes discrepancies between the
Republic's goals and the way in which settlers were chosen for the Haʻikū acreage.

Chapter four discusses the results of the Haʻikū homesteads including changes to the area demographically, economically, and socially. This chapter details the process of converting Right Of Purchase Leases to fee-simple ownership and criticism of this process by a Haʻikū homesteader. Chapter four also exposes the opinions of Kānaka and others, including Congressional Delegate Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole, who filed a complaint against Governor Frear that alleged mismanagement the administration of Hawaiʻi's public lands. The Haʻikū homesteads were discussed in detail in this complaint. This chapter also reviews the exodus of many of the homesteaders and looks at what happened to this acreage subsequently. Chapter five argues that the Territorial homesteads were intended to be a vehicle to build up the Haole population. However, the Haʻikū homesteads were utilized by the Haole Oligarchy to reward their friends, associates and supporters. Some of these individuals were land speculators disguised as homesteaders who made a lot of money through this scheme. It also examines the significance of uncovering and understanding the history of the Haʻikū homesteads.

Exposing the Haole Oligarchy's actions during Hawaiʻi's Territorial period will empower Kānaka and take us a few steps closer to justice through Aloha Ōʻāina.
Chapter 2. The Genealogy of Homesteading In Hawai‘i

Many experts contend that homesteading in Hawai‘i began with the Kuleana Act of 1850, put into place by King Kamehameha III, Kauikeaouli. This act allowed for the codifying of ownership rights for the maka‘āinana as defined by the Māhele of 1848, enabling them to file claims for the land they occupied and cultivated. Applicants obtained testimony to substantiate details such as the location, boundaries, items cultivated, and origins of the land in question and submitted the information to the Hawaiian Kingdom’s Land Commission. Once the claim was reviewed and reconciled, a land commission award was granted signifying fee-simple ownership to the claimant free of commutation as was consistent with the Kuleana Act.

Sanford Ballard Dole, (eventual Committee of Safety member and leader of the Haole Oligarchy,) began advocating for immigrating settlers in Hawai‘i as early as 1872. Dole was twenty-eight and working in the Kingdom of Hawai‘i legislature when he wrote a series of essays about Hawai‘i’s population problems that were published in the Pacific Commercial Advertiser. The following is an excerpt from the first of those essays:

And there is no less doubt but that, with our lands brought to a state of careful cultivation, and through the economics of a higher civilization than our dusky predecessors could boast, a nation of at least a million might in comfort and plenty occupy our islands, and make them rich and prosperous...The Hawaiian is not to be displaced, but must be supplemented.

In this essay, Dole insisted that his proposed initiative was not trying to replace the Kānaka population, but supplement the Kānaka who had been going through a

30 The term maka‘āinana refers to Kanaka Maoli land tenants.
31 Kānaka Maoli scholar Dr. Kamanamaikalani Beamer writes of the Māhele and the Kuleana Act in his book, No Mākou Ka Mana, Liberating The Nation.
tremendous depopulation. However, settler colonization historian Patrick Wolfe argues that "Settler colonialism destroys to replace...[and is] inherently eliminatory."\textsuperscript{33} Thus, even though Dole stated his goal as supplementing the native population, according to Wolfe's definition, Dole was attempting to replace Kānaka in his proposed settlerism effort. For the purpose of this thesis, I do not utilize the term settler colonialism and will instead use the term settlerism, which I believe more accurately describes Hawaiʻi's unique situation of being inundated by American settlers without legal conquest according to international law. According to international law, annexation of a sovereign nation state requires a treaty of annexation. Because Hawaiʻi was a sovereign nation state and there was no such treaty, Hawaiʻi could not have been annexed to the United States. Instead, Hawaiʻi was (and is) belligerently occupied by the United States.\textsuperscript{34} Dr. Kamanamaikalani Beamer refers to "the quasicolonial structures and events put into place to disguise America's belligerent occupation of Hawaiʻi, another sovereign state as faux-colonialism."\textsuperscript{35} Because Hawaiʻi was never colonized by the United States in accordance with international laws that deal with sovereign nations, I use the term settlerism in this thesis. While the term I choose to use is different than the label used by Patrick Wolfe and other historians, the effects are identical - the eventual elimination of the indigenous.

The second of Dole's essays was published one week after the first. In it Dole further details his plan and draws comparisons to American homesteading:

\textsuperscript{34} Belligerent occupation is discussed at length in Kamanamaikalani Beamer's book \textit{No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation}, pages 196-197.
\textsuperscript{35} Kamanamaikalani Beamer, \textit{No Mākou Ka Mana: Liberating the Nation} (Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2014), 197.
No one will deny that with our fast decreasing population, the only method of repeopling our domains is through immigration... The United States hold out the tempting prizes of citizenship and fee simple homesteads, and her gain in population through these means has never been paralleled [sic]... As inducements, we have first, wages; second, homesteads; and third, citizenship. Wages are first, not because they are most important, but because as an inducement they act first upon the class of people with whom we have to do as immigrants. In like manner, the attainment of homesteads would be prized far more at first than the privileges of citizenship... the problem of population is only to be worked out through far more comprehensive efforts, which shall aim to bring us settlers and citizens rather than convicts and coolies.  

In the above essay, Dole introduced his homesteading objective and the fact that he believed land would be the ultimate lure for settlers from America.  

In January of 1893, Sanford B. Dole was part of the small group of Haole businessmen that engineered the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i and was named the President of the resulting Provisional Government and of the eventual Republic of Hawai‘i. Immediately after the overthrow, Dole began the process of putting his long-time obsession with settlerism into place within the framework of the Republic's Government, keeping his eyes fixed on the eventual goal of building up the American Anglo-Saxon population. It was important to Dole to settle not just any American, but American Anglo-Saxon farmers in particular. He writes,

In order to develop a citizenship here that will be always improving in those characteristics which are recognized as the highest attributes of American citizenship, it is essential that the class referred to as Anglo-Saxon should be largely increased and particularly that it should be increased by the introduction of persons from the mainland who have acquired long residence and particularly by inheritance and position, the qualities of citizenship above referred to.  

According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, the term Anglo-Saxon is someone whose ancestors are English. Dole did not name all Caucasians as desirable settlers of

---

Hawai‘i, but a particular type of Caucasian - only people with a background identical to his, of English racial origin, but with American nationalistic ideals. This language singling out American Anglo-Saxons as the target of Dole's immigration scheme appeared in correspondence and government documents for decades.

Why Settle American Anglo-Saxons?

At the time of the illegal overthrow, Hawai‘i's demographics were heavily weighted in favor of non-Haole. According to the population census that was administered every six years, Hawaiians and Part-Hawaiians comprised forty percent of the populace, with Chinese and Japanese at thirty eight percent and Haole at just seven percent. These population numbers reflect the extreme minority that Haole were in Hawai‘i and help to explain the Oligarchy's urgent desire to build up this segment of the population with American Anglo-Saxons. Doing so would benefit the republic in a number of ways. It would help to suppress Hawaiian nationalism, which was still evident through the actions of the Hawaiian Homerule Party as well as the formation of the Hui Aloha ‘Āina for Women and for Men just after the overthrow, whose mission it was to support Queen Lili‘uokalani and oppose annexation efforts. There was much organizing going on among Kānaka as well as the numerous non-Kānaka Royalists that proclaimed their loyalty to Queen Lili‘uokalani and disagreed with the Haole Oligarchy's quest for annexation by America. By building up the American Anglo-Saxon population base, it was believed that American nationalistic attitudes would replace Hawaiian nationalistic sentiments.

---

Building up this segment of the populace would also help allay the Haole Oligarchy's extreme fear of the burgeoning Asian population that immigrated to Hawai‘i as sugar plantation labor. There were many racist sentiments being printed in newspapers in Hawai‘i and the continental U.S., some of which were written by members of the Haole Oligarchy. Lorrin A. Thurston, Committee of Safety member and the Provisional Government's envoy to the United States, authored an article that appeared in the Sacramento Record Union newspaper in 1897. An excerpt appears below:

The Japanese are not eligible to citizenship; but an energetic, ambitious, warlike and progressive people cannot be prevented from participating in the Government when they become dominant in numbers, and the ownership of property. Already they are restless, and it will be impossible for any local independent Government to much longer withhold from them the privileges which they demand…All that is now holding Hawaii from retrograding into an Asiatic outpost is a handful of resolute and determined men. But there is a limit to their strength, and if help is to come in time it must come soon. Annexation will settle the issue and maintain American control in Hawaii and nothing else will.40

As another example, University of Hawai‘i agriculture professor and eventual Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela homesteader F.G. Krauss, wrote an article that was published in Thrums Hawaiian Annual. In this article, Krauss makes a distinctly anti-Asian comment as seen below:

Whether we do our part or not, the future agriculture of Hawaii will largely be made up of small farms and diversified agriculture. These farms will be owned by the man who tills the soil - the man who makes his home on the land. Unless we permit him to be the Oriental, he will be an intelligent, educated and prosperous, substantial and desirable American citizen.41

Krauss’ contrasting of the Oriental and the superior American as settlers communicates the anti-Asian sentiments that were prevalent throughout Hawai‘i and American at the time.

The 1895 Land Act Brings Changes

The Land Act of 1895 addressed these concerns in a number of ways. This act was put into effect with the specific goal of settling Hawaiian land for the purpose of small-scale agricultural cultivation. A letter authored by J. F. Brown, the Republic's Commissioner and Agent of Public Lands stated "We mail a copy of our Land Act, 1895, as finally amended and passed, which has for its especial [sic] object the settlement and cultivation of agricultural land." This statement shows the Haole Oligarchy's core reasoning for the 1895 Land Act and each set of amendments as the vehicle for bringing American Anglo-Saxons to Hawai‘i as settlers. This act replaced Hawaiian Kingdom land tenure laws and combined the Kingdom's government land base with the formerly inalienable Crown lands and renamed the resulting acreage Hawai‘i's Public Lands.

Using the word 'public' as a label for this resulting land bank, of which some was inalienable, was an intentional act that helped erase the historical origins of this ‘āina as private property that was passed to the Queen by previous monarchs of Hawai‘i.

The Land Act provided the infrastructure needed to implement Dole's long-planned homesteading initiative. It allowed for three homesteading processes, open to all races except Japanese aliens. While Kānaka were legally able to participate in this program, each process required Republic of Hawai‘i citizenship, effectively disqualifying the ninety percent of Kānaka that had signed the Anti-Annexation petitions.

(1) Homestead Leases

The homestead lease was strictly a long-term lease, which was issued after the prospective lessee met all of the terms and conditions of a certificate of occupation.

---

42 J.F. Brown, Letter to S. Percy Smith, October 25, 1895.
covering the probationary period of six years. Once these requirements were met, a nine hundred ninety-nine year lease was issued. This lease could never result in fee-simple ownership and came with lease transfer limitations. While this homesteading type was earmarked for Kānaka, because of the oath of allegiance to the Haole Oligarchy that was required, this was not an opportunity that the majority of the Kānaka population had available to them. With the nine hundred ninety-nine year lease, there was no rent to be paid, but the lessee was required to pay the real property taxes assessed. Assignment was prohibited, whether in part or in whole and upon the death of the initial lessee, the remaining years of the lease were passed down to the statutory next of kin. Homestead leases were not issued for more than one acre of wetland, sixteen acres of agricultural land, and forty-five acres of pastoral-agricultural land. These acreage limitations were strictly enforced.43

(2) Right Of Purchase Leases

The right of purchase lease was a twenty-one year lease that could be converted into fee-simple ownership, with annual rent based on the appraised value of the parcel. Lessees were required to construct a residence, live on the property for a minimum of two years, and cultivate a percentage of the leased acreage. Once these requirements were met, the lessee was able to purchase the parcel at the appraised value.44

44 Hawaii Land Laws Revision Committee, Final Report, 10; Department of Land and Natural Resources, Report on Homesteading, 4; Legislative Reference Bureau, Public Land Policy in Hawaii: An Historical Analysis, 8.
(3) Cash Freeholds

The cash freehold was a variation of the standard agreement of sale that could result in fee-simple ownership. The purchaser paid 25% of the purchase price as a down payment, 25% after the first year, 25% after the second year, and 25% after the third year. There was a probationary period requiring residence and cultivation. This was the only form of homestead that was made available by public auction, but land commissioners had the authority to make "special homestead agreements." These special agreements featured terms of sale, mode of payment, and conditions of residence and land improvement that were determined solely by the land commissioners. This gave powerful latitude to those that worked in this capacity within the Haole Oligarchical government.\(^4^5\)

One such special agreement scheme that was put into place was the Settlement Association Plan, which was described as a "special method of homesteading under two of the other forms [of homesteading provided for in the Land and Organic Acts]."\(^4^6\) Governor Frear described this plan in a letter written to a prospective homesteader from Portland, Oregon:

> It is the desire of the Territorial administration to encourage the settlement of Americans from the mainland on the public lands as much as possible...Lands, in general, are of high value here, but lands are disposed of for homesteads usually at only a fraction of their real value, say, only a fourth or a third of the amount that they would bring at auction for cash. There is a fifth form of homesteading...It is called the settlement association plan by which six or more persons may form an association and then they alone select neighboring lots in a particular tract. The object of this is to enable Americans to come from the mainland and form little congenial communities by themselves, and not run the risk of being scattered among all sorts of other peoples. This method practically gives a monopoly to the persons in the association, no others being permitted to come in. Under this method the members of the association

\(^4^6\) Governor Frear, Letter to Joseph Mann, January 26, 1911.
may take up land under either the right of purchase lease method or the cash freehold method...if a number of Americans from the mainland desire to take up land under that method, I shall be very glad to let them do so, and, indeed, give them the pick of the public lands in the whole Territory. There are two or three places--particularly one at Haiku on the island of Maui and another at Kapaa on the island of Kauai--which seem especially suited for an American colony.  

There were parts of the Land Act that were eventually put into place to prevent abuses of homesteading opportunities by land speculators.  

No person is entitled to receive any certificate of occupation, right of purchase lease, cash freehold agreement or special homestead agreement who, or whose husband or wife has previously taken or held more than 10 acres of land under any such certificate, or agreement made or issued after May 27, 1910, or under any homestead lease or patent based thereon; or who, or whose husband or wife, or both or them, owns other land in the Territory, the combined area of which and the land in question exceeds eighty acres; or who is an alien, unless he has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States as prohibited by law, and no person who has so declared his intention and taken or held under any such certificate, lease or agreement is permitted to continue so to hold or become entitled to a homestead lease or patent of the land unless he becomes a citizen within five years after so taking.

In addition, homesteaders that achieved fee-simple ownership of their land were not allowed to lease or sell their parcels to corporations or aliens. However, these limitations did not apply if the homestead lands were transferred or assigned at any point after the lot assignment was made. Since the assignee was free to lease or sell their acreage to whomever they desired, this loophole helped to facilitate the land speculation that the Land and Organic Acts tried to discourage.

All homesteading after 1895 required applicants to be over eighteen years old and to be either citizens of the Republic by birth, naturalization, denization, or to hold special

47 Governor Frear, Letter to Joseph Mann, January 26, 1911.
48 Land speculators referred to people who purchased large acreages of public lands in America and held on to them until land values increased. The eventual sale of these lands made large profits for these purchasers.
50 Organic Act, Section 73.
rights of citizenship. Applicants were disqualified if they were delinquent in tax payments, had misrepresented themselves in prior land applications, or had civil disability imposed for any offense.\textsuperscript{51} A consequence of these strict applicant conditions was disqualification of most Kānaka for homesteads of any kind because the majority of them refused to join the Republic and remained loyal to the Hawaiian Kingdom. While the basis of this homesteading initiative was small-scale farming, there were no agricultural or horticultural qualifications required. Because each of the homestead applicant requirements was strictly political, the Hawaii Land Laws Revision Committee concluded that this initiative was "more about demographics than agriculture".\textsuperscript{52}

*The Promotion of Hawaiʻi's Land Begins*

The faux annexation of Hawaiʻi by America and the subsequent Organic Act continued to foster the homesteading initiative in Hawaiʻi. Shortly after the Organic Act was put into place, members of the Haole Oligarchy and other employees of the Territorial government began writing numerous articles promoting homesteading in Hawaiʻi. These articles appeared in newspapers and periodicals in Hawaiʻi and all over America. One such article, authored by Frederick J. Haskin, a Haole writer living in Hawaiʻi, appeared in the *LA Herald*:

> The United States has decided to spend some millions of dollars in fortifying Hawaii. It is equally as necessary that the American nation do something practical to fortify Hawaii with a good, sturdy, honest American citizenship. The task of "Americanizing" Hawaii is one of the greatest problems which the people of this mid-Pacific territory have to solve...So far as politics is concerned, Hawaii is already Americanized. The task now is to bring the industrial and social life to the American standard and to keep it there. The overwhelming majority of Japanese and Chinese population makes this task a difficult one...The oncoming of the vast numbers of Orientals of Hawaiian birth

\textsuperscript{52} Hawaii Land Laws Revision Committee, *Final Report*, 11.
who will be entitled to vote is a danger which must be faced...The policy of the American party (in Hawaii) is to encourage the immigration to Hawaii of American farmers who will take up small homesteads and become citizens, to form a nucleus for a middle class to stand between great King Sugar and the semi-servile laborers of the cane fields...Hawaii has good homestead lands, and it offers opportunity for making money to the hard working farmer.53

There was tremendous interest in obtaining Hawai‘i's cheap land among Americans. These interested parties began writing letters of inquiry to the territorial government and came from all over the continent, including California, Oregon, Minnesota, and Texas. An image of a page of one such letter appears below54:

Figure 1. Letter From Prospective Homesteader

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives

54 H. E. Boothby, Letter to Governor Frear, February 18, 1905.
This five-page letter was typical of the letters found at the Hawai‘i State Archives in a few ways. It was a direct result of referenced newspaper articles that promoted the opening of public lands in Hawai‘i for homesteading and speaks of the desirable class of American that was being targeted for this purpose. The letter states, "The Asiatics have many good qualities, and have undoubtedly played their part in the development of Hawaii, but Caucasians (of the better class) would permanently contribute to the growth and development of the Islands." This anti-Asian sentiment was also commonplace among the letters reviewed. This correspondence also mentions the fact that the author is not a practicing farmer, "I visited the Islands as a correspondent for the San Jose Mercury. I have written extensively and lectured occasionally...I am a newspaper man." The governor responded by saying that the Land Commissioner, J.W. Pratt would be coming to California to speak with Boothby about this opportunity, further supporting the fact that there was no requirement for such skills in this recruitment process.

Once these letters were received, the Governor or the Commissioner of Public Lands would respond, including a pamphlet featuring the latest iteration of homestead laws and general information about Hawai‘i's climate and environment with the correspondence. Normally, the letter spoke of the discounted cost of the homestead lots as incentive to lure settlers here. Many times, there would be mention of Anglo-Saxons as the desired class of Americans that were so sought after by the Haole Oligarchy. The following quote is an excerpt of a letter written by Josh Tucker, Commissioner of Public Lands to a prospective homesteader in Colorado:

55 H. E. Boothby, Letter to Governor Frear, February 18, 1905.
56 Governor Frear, Letter to H. E. Boothby, April 8, 1908.
The Government seldom places large tracts of first class agricultural land upon
the market, it being their desire to reserve such land for settlement in small areas,
say, not to exceed one hundred acres, for the purpose of building up the white
population of the Islands...The average prices of these lands to the settler are from
two to thirty dollars per acre, according to location and productiveness. The
above prices are about one-fifth the amount asked by private parties for the same
class of land...We do not want the land speculator, but the American Home
Builder...The Administration is desirous of settling its public lands, with the
American farmer and his family, and to that end, will make the terms of purchase,
residence and improvements as easy as possible, so that the complying with all
conditions will not be a hardship.  

These examples are typical of the dozens of correspondence items found at the
Hawai‘i State Archives and demonstrate some of the enticements that were offered to
settlers. In fact, these enticements were developed after a lengthy fact-finding inquiry
was completed, ultimately resulting in the Report of the Commission on Advances To
Homesteaders, presented to Governor Frear in June 1910. The purpose of this
commission was the "consideration of the ways and means of aiding homesteaders by
advances of money...and other ways and means of securing the same results to the
homesteaders." This report detailed the land laws and related enticements that Canada,
Denmark, Argentina, Australia, America and New Zealand provided their settlers. An
excerpt of the report and related correspondence stated:

We also append hereto a resume of legislative and executive action...by leading
countries of the world who are seeking desirable immigration, emphasizing, as it
does, the wholly inadequate and half-way measures thus far inaugurated in this
territory to promote like objects, although Hawaii has, in many respects, far less
to offer than countries like Canada and Australian colonies, and is handicapped by
the presence of a large alien population, which we have no right to assume can be
thoroughly assimilated and become a part of the citizen population of Hawaii.
These things considered, Hawaii, if she is to develop a citizen population, has got
to do more, and offer more, not less than countries like Canada, which have vast
areas of rich and arable lands available for the would-be settler. We believe that
this country has to face the fact that it cannot retain within its borders desirable

57 Office of the Commissioner of Public Lands, Letter to Prospective Homesteader William Sipple, July 10,
1908.
immigrants, even after such immigrants have been brought here, if it cannot offer as attractive inducements to stay as can be found upon the Pacific Coast. In other words, more wages and more attractive inducements available on the Pacific Coast to any person now or hereafter in Hawaii, by the payment of twenty-five dollars passage money, is sooner or later going to take that person there, unless we have as much to offer here, and it is a sheer waste of money to keep on bringing immigrants of the better class to Hawaii only to see them sooner or later drift to the coast. The problem confronting Hawaii is not so much to get settlers here as it is to keep them here.  

The report made homestead infrastructure recommendations, including the transportation of agricultural goods produced by homesteaders, the improvement of public lands prior to the opening of such for homesteading, and the lowering of interest rates on deferred land payments. They provided three bills for Governor Frear to consider, none of which were put into place.  

*Early Homesteading Results*  

The land law changes and homesteading promotion yielded results, with a number of homesteads being opened during the first twenty-five years after the inception of the Land Act. The following table details government lands that were taken utilizing the homesteading initiative during the two-year period of 1896 and 1897. The figures come from the Report of the Commissioners of Public Lands.  

---

Table 1. Homestead Lands Taken Up 1896-1897

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Land District</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>6,007</td>
<td>$44,167</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>$3,493</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>$13,143</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hilo and Puna, Hawaii)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Land District</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>24,426</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>10,691</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hawai‘i and Kohala)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Land District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kona and Kau)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Land District</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3,907</td>
<td>10,504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>6,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Maui, Molokai, Lanai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Land District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Oahu)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>13,361</td>
<td>$80,921</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>$3,948</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5,223</td>
<td>$33,984</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Public Land Policy In Hawaii: An Historical Analysis.*

According to this report, a total of 20,234 acres was taken during those first two years, over ninety percent of which was located in the First Land District of Hilo and Puna.

The same report for the following two years shows an additional 21,943 disposed of, with most of the acreage again coming out of the First Land District. A synopsis appears below:\footnote{Legislative Reference Bureau, *Public Land Policy in Hawaii: An Historical Analysis*, 13.}
At the helm of the Haole Oligarchy as Governor between the years of 1893 - 1903, Sanford Dole promoted Hawaiʻi's homesteading initiative along with the Commissioner of Public Land, Edward S. Boyd. During this ten-year period, several hundred Republic of Hawaiʻi citizens secured acreage under the movement, but the rate of homesteading settlement showed no appreciable increase due to some of the awardees abandoning or subleasing the land. When Dole resigned as Governor in 1903, Commissioner Boyd reiterated his commitment to the Republic's objective of settling Hawaiʻi's public land base with Americans, stating in his department's report that "this office will use its best endeavors in every way possible to settle our public lands with..."
desirable settlers, and will encourage by literature and otherwise the migration of American farmers."  

George R. Carter replaced Dole as governor and served in that role for four years, from 1903 - 1907. Carter publicly made statements supporting homesteading, including this excerpt taken from his report to the Secretary of Interior:

> It is my intention with the proper approval, to cut up and offer for settlement every piece of arable land fit to put a settler on as fast as the leases expire. That in the following this plan there will be opposition is a certainty, but in the firm belief that this is the only way to increase the citizen population and the wealth, prosperity, and productiveness of the Territory, this policy will be maintained.  

Despite his statements of support, Carter made it clear over the course of his term that he had serious issues with the efficiency of family farming. In fact, he made several recommendations for changes to the Organic Act that would have made it more difficult for homesteaders and instead favored plantation agriculture. Furthermore, he had reservations about the authenticity of Hawai‘i’s homesteaders, stating:

> A radical change has been made in the administration of the land laws, with a view to preventing the disposition by sale or exchange of large tracts of government land to corporations or individuals and of small tracts to persons professing to be bona fide settlers, but who in reality seek land for purposes merely of speculation or investment.  

Governor Walter F. Frear succeeded Carter in 1907 and served until 1913. Frear was a staunch supporter of homesteading and secured amendments to public land laws during his term that attempted to eliminate the previous abuses by land speculators. He came under strong criticism by a number of public figures over the course of his tenure.

---

63 Commissioner of Public Lands, Report Year Ending June 30, 1903, by Public Lands Department (Honolulu: Territory of Hawai‘i, 1903).

64 Territory of Hawai‘i, Report of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the Secretary of Interior, by Governor's Office, (Honolulu: Territory of Hawai‘i, 1904), 42

65 Legislative Reference Bureau, Public Land Policy in Hawaii: An Historical Analysis, 27.

66 Territory of Hawai‘i, Report of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to the Secretary of Interior, by Governor's Office, (Honolulu: Territory of Hawai‘i, 1907), 4-5
A 1911 letter from A.W. Carter, a member of the newly formed land board, detailed dissatisfaction with the slow development of homesteading in Hawai‘i:

I think that many felt that you would accomplish much in homesteading government lands. To be candid, I do not think that much has been accomplished in homesteading of a permanent nature that is where men get more than a mere living. The difficulties in consequence of the opposition of the plantation interests which dominate all business within the Territory may be insurmountable but I believe that an aggressive policy and a demand on the part of the Executive that government lands within a plantation should be homesteaded successfully, which would include reports to Washington, and if necessary an attach upon the industry as it is conducted, would bring results.67

Criticism of Homesteading

Criticism of the homesteading initiative in Hawai‘i was common. One source of this was based on the lack of government loans for the settlers. After moving on to the homestead land, there was no way for homesteaders to secure financial support from banks because they did not yet own their land. This resulted in a curious relationship between homesteaders and sugar plantations. Many settlers ran low on money because of the initial cash outlay for clearing, planting and building of a residence. The time period between these expenses and realizing their first income from harvest was a struggle for many. The lead-time needed for cultivation posed a financial challenge. This concern was included in the 1905 Territory's Report of the Governor:

A new feature of the work of those responsible for the administration of public lands in Hawaii is the cutting up of sugar lands that have been planted for years under leases by various corporations, some of which are now expiring. The opening of these lands must necessarily be proceeded with in a cautious manner. They have a market value of from $40 to $150 per acre, and there is therefore a great demand for them. The applicants in a large majority of cases have no means with which to keep the land under cultivation. This is no inconsiderable item, for sugar culture as conducted in this Territory requires from $150 to $200 outlay per acre before the crop can be matured.

67 A. W. Carter, Letter to Governor Frear, 1911.
Thus with many of the applicants there is a prospect of seeing good cane fields lapse into jungles again, unless the capitalist meets the demand of the so-called settlers and buys them out, or takes a mortgage for the funds necessary to plant, cultivate, and harvest the crop.68

The sugar companies capitalized on this by offering homesteaders mortgages based on the homesteader's lease. These plantations were the only source of loans until 1917, when a farm loan process was put into place. For these corporations, issuing these mortgages was a win-win situation. If the settler defaulted on their loan, the lease would then be transferred to the plantation and they would be able to realize a likely profit for the remaining term of the lease. Unlike the homesteaders, these companies had the capital to sustain themselves while waiting for the first harvest, almost ensuring their profit if the homesteader defaulted on their mortgage. If the homesteader was able to meet the terms of the mortgage, the plantation still made a profit through the loan interest, usually set at 8%.69

Another area of criticism was the alleged abuse of the land laws by the Commissioners of Public Lands and their agents. A homesteader, formerly an employee of the Territorial Agricultural Experiment Station, wrote to the a number of newspapers about these issues:

The present land laws are not enforced. It is well known throughout the Territory that one can fulfill the homesteading requirements in a perfunctory way, and it will be passed. There is no efficient inspection of what is going on on the homesteads. The knowledge that this is so encourages large land owners and corporations to ignore the third paragraph of the Organic Act, Section 73 prohibiting the transfer of title to leases or to lease public lands to any corporation or alien.70

---

69 Marilyn Vause, "Twenty Years Of Contest Over The Public Lands" (Hamilton Library), 141.
70 Edwin C. Moore, "Homestead Plan to Solve Problem Laid Before Lane," *Hawaiian Gazette*, June 18, 1918.
The correspondence above referred to the inspection process that ensured compliance with the requirements of residency, percentage of cultivation and dwelling construction. The responsibility of the prove-up process\textsuperscript{71} belonged to the public land commission agents. The allegations also mentioned the fact that leases could not be transferred to corporations or aliens, with the author contending that this was being allowed regularly.

Certainly, some considered the odds stacked against the success of the homesteader. The fact that they were able to obtain large pieces of proven agricultural land at a fraction of the appraised value was intended to offset these challenges. In many cases, however, it seems that this wasn't enough to allow for success. Many settlers were not able to sustain themselves and their families over the long term. Marilyn Vause details some of the results of the Territory's homesteading initiative over time:

Not unusually it was only the persevering homesteader who lasted more than several harvests, for most ended their ventures by either leasing their rights to other cultivators who had fewer economic alternatives, such as Japanese aliens, or else by leasing to the plantation. After 1910 it became illegal to transfer homesteads either by lease or sale, except to other homesteaders, but as is the case of the 1,000 acre limitation on corporations, the law was circumvented.\textsuperscript{72}

Summary

Chapter two provides a genealogy of the homesteading initiatives in Hawai‘i, starting with the Kuleana Act of 1850 that Kauikeouli put into place. This act began the task of dividing out ownership rights of the makaʻāinana as defined by the Māhele of 1848. Kānaka filed claims for the lands they occupied and cultivated, ultimately receiving land commission awards signifying fee-simple ownership free of commutation.

\textsuperscript{71} The term 'prove-up process' is used by the Territorial government to define the process of converting Right to Purchase leases into land grants, signifying fee-simple ownership.

\textsuperscript{72} Marilyn Vause, "Twenty Years Of Contest Over The Public Lands" (Hamilton Library), 142.
In complete contrast, Hawai‘i’s Territorial homesteading initiative was designed to immigate and settle American Anglo Saxons in Hawai‘i by offering them inexpensive land on each of the major Hawaiian islands. This effort began just after the illegal overthrow of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i.

Dole's desired immigration of white Americans would help the Haole Oligarchy in a number of ways, including building up the white voter base, which was identified as a priority due to the extreme minority that Haole were in Hawai‘i just after the overthrow. The Haole Oligarchy had extreme fear of Kānaka, Royalists supporters of the Queen, and Asians as population segments that might eventually have the population numbers to usurp their power. In addition, settling American Anglo-Saxons in Hawai‘i would create a particular kind of white, utopian community that was desired by Dole and others working within the Republic of Hawai‘i.

The Land Act of 1895 was put into place in order to facilitate Dole's desired immigration scheme, with two of its three types of homesteading specifically designed to facilitate bringing the white Americans here. Both of these homesteading plans offered land at twenty to thirty percent of appraised value, providing the bait to lure them from the continent to Hawai‘i nei.

Just after the Organic Act in 1900, promotion of Hawai‘i's land began, utilizing articles appearing in newspapers across the United States to advertise the availability of cheap land in Hawai‘i. These articles also pointed out Hawai‘i’s beauty and tropical climate as enticements to make the offer more appealing. These articles resulted in hundreds of letters from interested Americans sent to the Public Land Commissioner and the Governor. Replies were usually handled by the Governor and detailed the Land Act
initiatives specifically designed to bring these settlers here. The Governor's responses made clear the racist attitudes of the Haole Oligarchy.

The early years of homesteading had mixed results for many reasons, including the financial challenges of the settlers, the indolent attitude of the Territorial Public Land Commissioner and his agents, and the abuse of the land laws by land speculators. Chapter three examines two homestead tracts that were created on the island of Maui and were referred to as an American colony.
Chapter 3. The Haʻikū Homesteads

Chapter two reviewed the genealogy of homesteading in Hawaiʻi, beginning with the Kuleana Act and moving through to the Haole Oligarchy's Territorial homesteading scheme. This chapter focuses on two homestead tracts located on the island of Maui. I cover the origin of these lands, the government leaders and sugar interests that made these homesteads possible, as well as who the actual Haʻikū homesteaders were.

There were two territorial homestead tracts opened in the district of Hamakualoa on Maui. The Hamakualoa district is located on the windward side of Maui. The tracts within this moku were categorized by the territorial government as First Class agricultural land and had access to viable water sources. The Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead was comprised of just over 1,200 acres that were part of the Hawaiian Kingdom Government lands at the close of the Māhele. By 1900, this acreage was owned by Haiku Sugar Co., Ltd., with Henry Perrine Baldwin as proprietor. These 1,200 acres were divided into thirty lots averaging forty acres each and was opened for settlement in 1911.

The second territorial homestead tract opened was 1,000 acres in size and located adjacent to the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract. The Kuiaha-Kaupakulua tract contained twenty-seven lots that averaged thirty-five acres in size. This acreage was opened for settlement in 1913. These lands were also former Hawaiian Kingdom Government lands. By the year 1900, six hundred acres of this parcel was owned by Maui Agricultural Company, with the remaining four hundred acres owned by Hawaii Commercial & Sugar Company.

---

73 While the homestead name contains the place name ‘Kaupakalua,’ most Hawaiian place name resources spell it as ‘Kaupakula.’ I do not know if this spelling change was intentional. In this thesis, I use the accurate place name unless it is part of a quote. In quotes, I reluctantly use the name given to the homestead by the Government.
Kuiaha-Paʻuwela Tract Land Acquisition

The Territorial government's acquisition of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead tract began in 1908. Negotiations for a land exchange between the Haole Oligarchy and Henry P. Baldwin, president of Haiku Sugar Company began in September 1908, when three appraisers, Willard E. Brown, George R. Ewart and Byron O. Clark arrived on Maui aboard the Mauna Kea and completed the surveying and land valuations of Haiku Sugar's Hamakualoa acreage and the area of public land located in Ōmaʻopio that Baldwin was interested in obtaining as part of this proposed land exchange. Henry P. Baldwin, his son Henry A. Baldwin, and Public Land Sub-Agent Worth O. Aiken accompanied the three appraisers on their trip. This visit resulted in a report dated September 8, 1908 in which they make a recommendation to Governor Frear:

In connection with the Omaopio lands, we have taken into consideration the facts that the lands are without water rights...In the valuation of the Haiku lands we have considered the sales of nearby lands, the uses of the cultivated portions, the rainfall, cannery facilities, the prospects of a continuation of the Kahului Railroad to the Haiku cannery, and the fact that it has not been demonstrated that a single crop can be grown continuously; this being the opinion of the planters of that district and they are preparing to go into diversified farming. After a careful consideration of all conditions, we are of the opinion that Twelve Hundred, (1200), acres, gulch land inclusive, of the Haiku lands would be a fair exchange for the Eight Hundred and Eighty-eight, (888), acres of Omaopio."

This report was sent to Henry P. Baldwin and results in a response from him, an excerpt of which states:

Your committee have asked for more Haiku land, in exchange for the Omaopio land, than in our opinion they should have asked for. Taking all things into consideration, in comparing the Omaopio land and Haiku land they have selected, it has been our opinion that the exchange should be acre for acre.

---

74 W.E. Brown, G.R. Ewart and B.O. Clark, Letter to Governor Frear, September 8, 1908.
However, we have concluded to approve of their proposition, and we will recommend to the Directors to accept.\footnote{H.P. Baldwin, Letter to Governor Frear, September 15, 1908.}

An image of the two-page letter appears below:

Figure 2. Letter From H.P. Baldwin re: Land Exchange
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\caption{Letter From H.P. Baldwin re: Land Exchange}
\end{figure}
Despite Baldwin's objections to the unequal valuations of the two parcels, the Directors of the Haiku Sugar Company adopted a resolution agreeing to the land exchange of the 1,200 acres in Hamakualoa for 873 acres in ʻŌmaʻopio in the Kula district of Maui. The resolution stated, "The Directors of the Haiku Sugar Company would like to have the Omaopio lands deeded by the Government to whatever person or corporation they may select" and was also approved by the Maui Agricultural Company's Board of Managers.76

Once the surveys were completed, the land exchange was finalized on May 13, 1909. The Hamakualoa land was first transferred from Haiku Sugar Company to Henry P. Baldwin and his wife Emily for the price of $35,00077 then transferred again to the Territory of Hawaiʻi, in exchange for land patent grant #5167 issued to Henry P. and Emily A. Baldwin for the acreage in ʻŌmaʻopio.78

Source: Hawaiʻi State Archives.

76 J.P. Cooke, Letter to Governor Frear, September 24, 1908.
77 State of Hawaiʻi Bureau of Conveyances, Liber 316, 321.
A Territorial map of the Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela homestead tract appears below and is dated 1909.

Figure 3. Map of the Kuiaha-Pauwela Homestead Tract


78 State of Hawai‘i Bureau of Conveyances, Liber 318, 1.
**Kuiaha-Kaupakulua Tract Land Acquisition**

The acquisition of the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua homestead tract acreage also took place in 1908. In a November 1908 letter from Henry P. Baldwin to Governor Frear, reference was made to a resolution passed by the Maui Agricultural Company, which was also owned by Baldwin.\(^79\) This resolution called for the offering up of six hundred acres in the vicinity of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract. Furthermore, Baldwin offers even more land from another of his companies, Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar:\(^80\)

I would say that I have no doubt the Maui Agricultural Company will put up more land in the vicinity [sic] of the six hundred acres above mentioned and that the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company will also put up land in that vacinity [sic] if the Government is successful in homesteading that region with desirable American citizens.\(^81\)

These six hundred acres were adjacent to the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead lands and according to the resolution, were "available for such division, sale and settlement...to provide small farms and agricultural plots for the promotion of agriculture and the encouragement of immigration to the Territory of a responsible and desirable class of people."\(^82\) The resolution clearly draws attention to the alignment of the continuing mission of the Haole Oligarchy to bring settlers from America as a common goal of their company. An image of this resolution appears below:

---

\(^79\) Maui Agricultural Company was formed when a number of small plantations owned by H.P. Baldwin and S.T. Alexander were combined.

\(^80\) Controlling interest in Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company (HC&S), established by Claus Spreckels, was obtained by Alexander & Baldwin in 1898.

\(^81\) H.P. Baldwin, Letter to Governor Frear, September 15, 1908.

\(^82\) Maui Agricultural Company, Board of Managers Resolution, November 7, 1908.
Governor Frear responded enthusiastically to the resolution, as evidenced by the following excerpt from his resulting correspondence:

The setting aside of lands by the Maui Agricultural Company for homesteading and the prospect for similar action by the Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company is most gratifying and I am sure will have a splendid effect in Washington, and I hope will prove to be a beginning of a movement which will be joined in by other holders of large tracts of lands in these islands, I hope that a
success will be made of homesteading both these lands and the adjoining lands which the Government hopes to obtain, with desirable American citizens.\textsuperscript{83}

In 1911, a unique suggestion came from the Sub-Agent of the Fourth Land District (Maui) W. O. Aiken. In a December 1911 letter to Governor Frear Aiken introduced his idea of Maui Agricultural Company's lands being homesteaded by the company directly:

I can assure you that it will be a pleasant duty to select 600 acres more of the Haiku lands upon which to settle more homesteaders of the class that we have in view for the present tract...I presume that this new tract will not be formally deeded to the Government but will be homesteaded in the name of the Maui Agricultural Co, and we can thus choose whom we please as applicants.\textsuperscript{84}

I believe that Aiken's unusual suggestion could be a reaction to a complaint against Governor Frear filed by Congressional Delegate Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole. This complaint was filed in October of 1911, and Aiken's suggestion is made in December 1911. Kūhiō's complaint alleged mismanagement of Hawaiʻi's public lands due to Frear's close relationships with sugar interests. It also accused Frear of racism against the kupaʻāina of Hawaiʻi with regard to Territorial homesteads all over Hawaiʻi. In light of a possible investigation, it would be to Governor Frear's political advantage to have Maui Agricultural Company be the entity to settle the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua tract's one thousand acres exclusively with American Anglo Saxons rather than doing it himself and possibly opening himself up to more criticism.

Aiken continued this push in another letter that suggests a particular area of land as a possible addition to the six hundred acres from Maui Agricultural Company. The

\textsuperscript{83} Governor Frear, Letter to HP Baldwin, November 10, 1908.
\textsuperscript{84} Sub-Agent W.O. Aiken, Letter to Governor Frear, December 12, 1911.
land that he refers to is just over four hundred acres located in East Kaupakulua and was retained by Hikiau in the Māhele:\footnote{Hikiau's land in Kaupakulua was issued under grant 771.}

While this matter is warm it might be a good time to suggest a plan that I have several times mentioned, publicly and otherwise. That is that the plantations themselves form a homesteading bureau and proceed to homestead their suitable lands upon the same terms as the Governments. If the above two plantations could be interested in this and agree to open up all of their lands east of Maliko to desirable settlers, it would be the biggest thing of the [sic] kind in the history of the country, and a mighty good object lesson to the planters in other localities. I should like to be at the head of such a bureau.\footnote{Sub-Agent W.O. Aiken, Letter to Governor Frear, December 22, 1911.}

Aiken's idea of incorporating the sugar companies as partners in the Haole Oligarchy's homesteading scheme was promoted in at least one widely read periodical, the *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual*:

A number of tracts of favorably located government lands have been thrown open for settlement on each of the several islands. Indeed, in at least one instance has the plantation adjacent to one of these tracts offered settlers a like area on precisely the same terms as the government, and the offer has been accepted.\footnote{F.G. Krauss, "Hawaiian Homesteading," *Thrums Hawaiian Annual*, 160.}

More research needs to be completed on this unusual partnership idea between sugar plantations and the Territory, deemed a "Planters Homesteading Bureau" by Governor Frear to better understand the nuances of this relationship.\footnote{Governor Frear, Letter to Sub-Agent W.O. Aiken December 27, 1911.} My current research leads me to believe that the sugar interests, represented by H.A. Baldwin (Henry P. Baldwin's son,) made these lands available to the Haole Oligarchy as homesteads for a number of reasons. First, these six hundred acres were deemed "remnants that will be of little use after the Government lots are fenced and settled."\footnote{Sub-Agent W.O. Aiken, Letter to Governor Frear, December 22, 1911.} This acreage was called a remnant because it was cut off entirely by the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead tract. Once
that tract was settled these six hundred acres would be unusable by the plantation.

Secondly, there was no way for homesteaders to secure financial support from banks because they did not yet own their land, prompting the plantations to offer mortgages based on the homestead leases. The plantations stood to realize a profit whether or not the homesteader was able to make their mortgage payments.\textsuperscript{90} Lastly, the Haole Oligarchy was anxious to improve the relationship between homesteaders and sugar plantations. In fact, in Governor Frear's inaugural address, he stated:

\begin{quote}
Indeed, far from being in opposition, the campaigns for small landed proprietorships and the sugar interests should be, for best results to each, in closest conjunction...They (the sugar interests) need the small settler as much as he needs them. The land laws must, of course, be applied liberally for the promotion of settlement and strictly for the prevention of speculation or of absorption into large estates...It may yet, in the natural course of events, prove to be to the advantage of the sugar planters to have their operations confined to central factories, and their lands, whether now held under lease or in fee, subdivided and sold to settlers.\textsuperscript{91}
\end{quote}

Henry P. Baldwin's integral role in securing this extension of the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua homestead tract did not go unnoticed by the press. In February 1912, The Maui News reported that making this American-only homestead larger was a long-time personal, albeit racist goal of Baldwin, stating:

\begin{quote}
Alexander & Baldwin have practically turned over to the land department of the government about a thousand acres of land adjoining the homestead lands at Haiku, leaving it to the public lands department to manage the opening of the lands. This unusual step is a result of plans considered long ago by the late H. P. Baldwin, and there are sentimental as well as other reasons why the present members of the firm are watching the scheme with unusual interest. "As long ago as 1908 Mr. Baldwin had in mind the plan now being carried out by the settlement of homesteaders on this land," said J. P. Cooke. "There could hardly be a more favorable homesteading proposition...Carrying out plans cherished by Mr. Baldwin for many years, we stand ready to offer the lands."\textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{90} See chapter two for further details about these plantation-issued mortgages.
\textsuperscript{91} Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole, "Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole Against the Administration of Hon. Walter F. Frear" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1911), 10-11.
\textsuperscript{92} "Opening More Land," \textit{Maui News}, February 17, 1912.
An image of the article appears below:

Figure 5. Newspaper Article "Opening More Land"

Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.
A July 1912 Territorial map of the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua homestead tract appears below:

Figure 6. Map of the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua Homestead Tract

Homesteads Thrown Open

Kuiaha-Paʻuwela Tract:

The Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homesteads were opened during the latter part of 1911 utilizing settlement associations. Announcements appeared in the Maui News indicating that thirty-six members of either the Lindsay or California Settlement Associations were exclusively securing lots within the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract. Along with these announcements was a front-page article explaining why Americans alone were accepted as settlers. The article states:

The settling of homesteads by thirty-six American homesteaders, in one locality, is an event of more than passing interest in Hawaii. It might easily mark the opening up of a new homesteading era, the commencement of the migration to Hawaii of the American farmer, so much desired. The lands in question are among the most valuable for homestead purposes in the Territory, being especially adapted [sic] pineapple cultivation, with a cannery within reach and with the prospect of being brought into touch with the market through the proposed extension of the Kahului railroad. As the opening of this land has been petitioned for under the homestead settlement clause of the land law, only those who are members of one or the other of the associations are eligible to make entry. The land office has received several inquiries as to this lands since it became known that the settlement associations were formed, the inquirers in each case being referred to the heads of the associations. This accounts, probably, for the reports that the government is reserving this land for white settlers only, as it happens that only Americans are members as yet of the two associations. 93

This article made it sound as though it was a coincidence that only Americans were members of those associations when in fact, settlement associations were created and promoted in America for this very reason. The homesteading process, settlement association provision, and the greater portion of the Land Act totally disenfranchised most Kānaka, since all three types of Territorial homesteads were available exclusively to citizens of the United States. If they were not already citizens, they needed to have

declared their intention to do so. This disqualified the over ninety percent of Kānaka that had signed the Kūʻe petitions approximately a decade earlier unless they were willing to take an oath of allegiance to the Republic of Hawaiʻi. By this time, the Fourteenth U. S. Constitutional Amendment was in place, declaring it illegal to deny life, liberty or property to anyone. America's claim of being colorblind to race certainly did not apply here, as the majority of Hawaiʻi's non-Haole population was automatically disqualified from these Haʻikū homesteads. Both the article⁹⁴ and notices appear below:

Figures 7. Newspaper Article "Settlement Associations"

Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.
Figures 8 & 9. Newspaper Articles "Notice of Opening of Public Lands"

BY AUTHORITY.
Notice of Opening of Public Lands in the District of Hamakualoa, Island of Maui.

Notice is hereby given to Will J. W Som, Carlton C. James, S. T. Starrett, Florence Wood, Lucia Shephardson, J. S. Walker, J. Latimer, F. G. Krauss, Edward Ri Blanchard, Mrs. Frank Hamilton, H. L. Sayers, C. B. Estle, S. A. Pawley, Walter Hamilton, D. R. Newell, R. R. Bray, and Paul Parent, and others, if any, members of the California Settlement Association, that Lots Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 27a and 28, in the Kuihia-Pauwela Tract, Hamakualoa; County of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, will be opened for homesteading in the following manner, in accordance with the laws relating to public lands in the Territory of Hawaii, subject to withdrawal of any of such lots prior to their selection. Such opening shall be in the manner set forth in the advertisement of public lands dated May 12, 1911, in respect to the method of application, drawing, selection, and other methods, except as follows:
The lots may be taken only by the Right of Purchase Lease or Cash Freehold Agreement method. Application for participating in the drawing may be made only by members of said California Association, and shall be presented to the Commissioner of Public Lands by ordinary mail, or on or before Thursday, February 1, 1912: the drawing and assignment of the order of the selection of lots shall take place at the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands, Honolulu, at 9 o’clock A.M., on Friday, February 2, 1912; the selection will take place at Circuit Court House, Wailuku, Maui, at 9 o’clock A.M. Monday, February 5, 1912.
The right is reserved to grant to the Kahului Railroad a right-of-way across any of said lots, the purchase price thereof to be reduced in proportion to the area so taken or the Railroad Company to compensate the homesteader for the right-of-way so taken.

For further information, forms, maps, etc., apply at the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands, Honolulu, or at the office of the Sub-Agent of the Fourth Land District, W. O. Aiken, Makawao, Maui.

CHARLES S. JUDD,
Commissioner of Public Lands.
Dated at Honolulu, November 21, 1911.

Approved: (Sgd.) W. F. FEAR.
Governor of Hawaii.
Dec. 2, 9, 16, 23, 30, Jan. 6, 13, 30.

Notice of Opening of Public Lands in the District of Hamakualoa, Island of Maui.

Notice is hereby given to E. C. McCall, Elizabeth J. Lindsay, T. K. Hinckley, James Lindsay, Isabella C. A. Lindsay, Margarette Naughton, Matilda K. Simiti, W. I. Wells, and H. M. Wells, and others, if any, members of the Lindsay Settlement Association, that Lots Nos. 7, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21, in the Kuihia-Pauwela Tract, Hamakualoa, County of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, will be opened for homesteading in the following manner, in accordance with the laws relating to public lands in the Territory of Hawaii, subject to withdrawal of any such lots prior to their selection; such opening shall be in the manner set forth in the advertisement of public lands dated May 12, 1911, in respect to the method of application, drawing, selection, and other methods, except as follows:
The lots may be taken only by the Right of Purchase Lease or Cash Freehold Agreement method. Application for participating in the drawing may be made only by members of said Lindsay Settlement Association, and shall be presented to the Commissioner of Public Lands by ordinary mail, or on or before Thursday, February 1, 1912; the drawing and assignment of the order of the selection of lots shall take place at the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands, Honolulu, at 9 o’clock A.M., on Friday, February 2, 1912; the selection will take place at Circuit Court House, Wailuku, Maui, at 9 o’clock A.M. Monday, February 5, 1912.
The right is reserved to grant to the Kahului Railroad a right-of-way across any of said lots, the purchase price thereof to be reduced in proportion to the area so taken or the Railroad Company to compensate the homesteader for the right-of-way so taken.

For further information, forms, maps, etc., apply at the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands.
Right to purchase leases were issued to this initial group of Americans from July, 1911 through October, 1912. As reported, the use of settlement associations facilitated the exclusively American nationality of these settlers. Just over 1,200 acres were opened in this tract, valued at a total of approximately $16,500.00. The average appraised value of this first-class agricultural land was $14.50 per acre.

Kuiaha-Kaupakulua:

The Kuiaha-Kaupakulua homesteads were opened in March 1913, with a drawing for particular lots being held at the Wailuku Courthouse. According to a Maui News article, just twelve of the twenty-six lots were taken up that day. The article, quoted below and pictured on the next page, made it clear that the public would not be allowed to apply for the remaining fourteen plots unless the members of the settlement association were not able to find others to take them in the three months following the drawing:

There were twenty-six lots in all to be balloted for, but only twelve were disposed of. The settlers are formed into an association and they have the right, for three months, to say who shall take up land on the tract, and who shall not. After the three months are pau, the lots may be applied for by anyone.95

---

Figure 10: Newspaper Article "Homesteads Are Secured"

Homesteads Are Secured
Kaupakalua Lots Are Balloted For
—Twelve New Pineapple Ranches.

At the Wailuku Courthouse last Wednesday morning, the drawing for lots of the Kaupakalua homestead tract was brought off by Deputy Land Commissioner W. O. Aiken. There was a good attendance and twelve lots were taken up, under the right of purchase lease. Some of the people who took up the lots hail from the mainland. All of the applicants are of the kind that will be a credit to their new home.

There were twenty-six lots in all to be balloted for, but only twelve were disposed of. The settlers are formed into an association and they have the right, for three months, to say who shall take up land on the tract, and who shall not. After the three months are past, the lots may be applied for by anyone.

The land taken up on Wednesday is located just beyond and adjoining the present Haiku homesteads. The lots are divided into areas of from 33 to 45 acres. Under the right of purchase lease, the homesteaders have to take up their residence on the land within one year from the date they secure the land. Then, for two years more, they have to live on the selection and fulfill the requirements of the law, before they can get their patents to the land.

The drawing in Honolulu took place some time ago. That drawing settled the names of the lucky ones, and the order in which they should take part in the second drawing that took place on Wednesday morning last.


Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.
Once again, the use of settlement associations facilitated the granting of American-exclusive access to this homestead tract. The majority of the Right Of Purchase leases for the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua homestead lots were issued between March and June of 1913, with some not being issued until 1915. A total of 1,008.17 acres was opened in this tract, valued at a total of $16,725.00. The average appraised value of this first-class agricultural land was $16.59 per acre. Just for context, land in this area currently sells for up to $200,00 per acre.

Promised/Implied Infrastructure

There were many promises of infrastructure that was to be provided to those taking their chances on the Haʻikū homestead tracts. The Haole Oligarchy was ardent to get American Anglo Saxons as settlers and that was conveyed in the correspondence responses to prospective homesteaders as well as in newspapers and other publications. A letter to a prospective settler residing in Newberg, Oregon stated:

We are very anxious to get American farmers in this territory and we are now trying to settle such farmers in one of the best districts which we are keeping for that purpose, instead of opening it generally for people of all nationalities. It is in a very desirable place in the matter of climate. Others are now taking up land there. It is land that is particularly good for raising pineapples. I refer to the land of Haiku on the Island of Maui. A railroad now running within about seven miles of it is expected to be extended to it soon, connecting with the harbor of Kahului on that Island, which is now being improved by the federal government by dredging and the construction of a breakwater.

The implied infrastructure in this letter is clear, especially when one considers that the Kahului Railroad Company provided the only mode of transportation, for goods or people, between Kahului and windward Maui, where Haʻikū is located. The ability for

96 Governor Frear, Letter to William Grant Leonard, November 20, 1911.
the homesteaders to transport their crops directly to the Kahului harbor could have meant
the difference between probable failure and almost certain success. Conveniently,
Kahului Railroad Company was yet another business owned by Alexander & Baldwin,
with H.P. Baldwin as a proprietor. An image of the referenced letter appears below:
Figure 11. Letter From Governor Frear re: Infrastructure

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
Articles appearing in the *Maui News* also spoke of the improvements and arrangements that were being put into place to ensure the success of the homesteaders. One such article that appeared just twelve days after the first Right To Purchase leases had been issued for the Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela tract stated:

The Kahului Railway Company has surveyors at work on an extension of its road from Paia in the direction of the new farms. It is planned to have the road extended within a year to the Haiku cannery site, which is only three miles from the land. Surveys will also be made beyond there, with a view to possible further extension...The banks here on Maui are willing to aid the new homesteaders in every way possible, that is consistent with conservative banking. As everyone with common sense knows, however, they have no intention on advancing money to homesteaders to the full valuation of the property, as one paper had it last week.97

Another article that was printed two months later reported that homesteaders would have a large pineapple cannery on Maui to handle their crops:

Homesteaders who have taken up lands recently in and around Haiku have entered into negotiations with California canning interests to build a big pineapple cannery on Maui, where it will be available for the plantations that are going in...That California canning interests will be glad to erect a cannery in return for a guarantee of a steady market was assured when two substantial Coast concerns, hearing of the opportunity, at once entered into negotiations with the representatives of the homesteaders of the Lindsay and California settlement associations.98

This announcement appeared one month prior to the homesteaders even beginning to clear their land, and proved premature, since the California interests never built the cannery. The fact that this cannery was not built meant that Haiku Fruit & Packing was the exclusive outlet for the Haʻiikū homesteaders' cultivated goods. Conveniently, Haiku Fruit & Packing was yet another business owned by Baldwin, meaning that the California cannery not being built profited his company. The Haʻiikū homesteads benefitted more

---

than one of Baldwin's business ventures including the Kahului Railroad Company (as the exclusive transporter of goods and people to Kahului,) and Haiku Fruit & Packing (as the exclusive canning/packing facility and provider of mortgages,) reflecting the business monopoly that certain missionary descendants had at the time. Hawaiʻi's land policies during this time period were strongly in favor of Haole. The disenfranchisement of Kanaka was blatant, along with other non-Haole segments of the population including Asians. The 1895 Land Act that combined the Kingdom Government land base with the inalienable lands of the Queen (commonly referred to as the Crown land base) was the start of a malicious process of land disposal, further facilitated by the renaming of these lands as 'Public lands' when there was absolutely nothing that was public about them. This renaming helped to erase evidence of the origin of these lands and implied collective ownership by the 'public' of Hawaiʻi. The Haʻikū homesteads were just another chapter in this genealogy of land disposal to Haole and the replacement/disenfranchisement of Kanaka.

**Who Were The Homesteaders?**

When one considers the stated goals of the Haole Oligarchy, the people that end up as the Haʻikū homesteaders seem an unlikely match. The objective of settling American farmers was publicized widely as the reason for opening homesteads in Hawaiʻi. While the Haʻikū homesteaders met the goal of being American, the vast majority of them were not farmers by trade. There were bankers, lawyers, holders of doctorate degrees, engineers and chemists that settled in Hamakualoa, with only a few being experienced farmers. Some of these homesteaders already owned land in Hawaiʻi, both on Maui and Oʻahu. The majority of them were already established and living in
Hawai‘i, with just two or three moving from the continent to take up residence in Ha‘ikū.

Some general biographical information on a few of the more socially prominent homesteaders appears below. I would like to conduct more in-depth research on the rest of the homesteaders in order to take a closer look at who they were.

**Frederick G. Krauss:** Educated at Stanford University and University of California; Superintendent of Seed Growing, Sunset Seed and Plant Co., Menlo Park, California, 1899; Instructor, University of California, 1901; Agricultural Instructor, Kamehameha Schools, 1906; Agronomist Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station, 1912; Professor Agronomy, College of Hawaii, 1915; Superintendent Agricultural Extension, U.S. Dept. Agriculture, Haiku, Maui; Acting County Agricultural Agent for Maui, 1917; Commissioned by U.S. Dept. Agriculture to investigate rice and cotton industries of Japan and China, 1909; Member Territorial Milk Commission; Chairman Tax Appeal Court for Second Judicial Circuit.99

**William J. Cooper:** Educated at University of West Virginia; Associated with father in lumber business; Went to Beaumont, Texas, 1904, with oil well supply concern; Reporter San Francisco Chronicle, 1906; Reporter Honolulu Star, 1907; Assistant to H.P. Wood, Hawaii Promotion Committee, 1908; Represented committee at A.Y.P. Exposition, Seattle, 1909; Reporter Honolulu Star, 1910-1912; Manager and Editor, Maui Publishing Company, Ltd. (The Maui News), 1914; Appointed Member of Industrial Accident Board for Maui County through 1912; Member Honolulu Lodge No. 616, B.P.O.E.; Aloha Lodge No. 3, K.P.; Wailuku Sigma Chi Fraternity.100

**Hugh Howell:** Engineer, Department of Interior and County of Maui; Fence Commissioner, District of Makawao; Homes Commission Engineer; Designed East Maui Irrigation Ditch System, Maui. Howell's business, Hugh Howell Engineering, is also responsible for the filling in of Loko Mokuuhinia with its sacred island of Mokuʻula in Lahaina, the former location of the Hawaiian capital and royal compound.101

There were also a number of women homesteaders, most of which were married at the time of receiving their Right To Purchase leases. In spite of the fact that they lived on the homestead with their husbands, these leases were issued in the wives' names. It

---

100 Ibid., 77.
will require more research to learn why these couples chose not to appropriate ownership to the husbands in these cases. Some of the spouses of these women homesteaders were prominent figures in the business and social landscape at that time, as detailed below:

**Edward B. Blanchard - Husband of leaseholder Roby Blanchard:** Territory Food Commissioner; Territory Food Analyst; Private Sector Analytical Chemist.

**William F. Crockett - Husband of leaseholder Annie V. Crockett:** Educated at University of Michigan Law School, 1888: Law Practice, Montgomery, Alabama, 1888-1900; Lecturer on Commercial Law for B. T. Washington, 1889; State Agent for Southern Cotton States Exposition, Atlanta, Georgia, 1895; Assistant, Passenger Department, South Pac. Company, Alabama, 1900; Attorney for Hawaiian Commercial and Sugar Co., 1901-1903; Law Practice, Maui, 1903; Member Board of Registration, Maui; District Magistrate of Wailuku; Deputy County Attorney, Maui; Member of House of Representatives, 1915 session.¹⁰²

The fact that the homesteaders detailed above were all employed by the Territorial government was not unusual within the Haʻikū homesteads. In fact, over thirty percent of the homesteaders were government employees, working in various white-collar positions. This percentage is significant, especially when contrasted with the less than ten percent that were experienced farmers.¹⁰³

---

¹⁰³ All of these statistics are based on the initial forty-two homesteaders. There was difficulty filling the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua tract, as evidenced by the fact that more than two years transpired between the first and last Right To Purchase lease dates. Homesteaders that obtained leases after June 12, 1913 were excluded from these statistics.
As the homesteaders took possession of their land and began the work of building a residence and cultivating their land, there were many articles published in the Maui News chronicling their experiences. This fact wasn't surprising, since the Editor and Manager of that newspaper, Will J. Cooper, was himself a homesteader in the Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela tract. These articles detailed the progress of the work being done by the settlers as well as prospective business outlets for the agricultural products being cultivated there. Some examples of these types of articles appear below.104

Figure 12. Newspaper Article "Homesteaders at Work"

Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.

Small Farming

Many Expert Farmers Ready to Come To Hawaii.

Five hundred people from in and around San Jose, Cal., are ready to come to Hawaii and take up homesteads if they can be assured of enough land to make a living on and a market for the products, says W. C. Hamilton, of San Jose, who arrived on the Wilhelmina last week to take a chance on a homestead at Haiku.

Hamilton is a farmer, and knows a lot about truck-farming and fruit-raising, and declares that from this one section of the mainland along Hawaii can get plenty of men who know farming from the ground up. He says that Hawaii today offers a better chance for the small farmer than California does, that it offers a wider diversity of products and gives promise of a market that will return the farmer more of a profit.

"A lot of people from around my home are waiting to see how I size up the situation down here," said Hamilton. "They are anxious to make a move. They are successful farmers, too, but California does not offer the opportunities now that Hawaii does.

"The climate and country here just about suit me, and I've made up mind to stay."

About thirty homesteaders arrived this week on Maui, and they are mostly from the mainland. They came here, and are going to stay here and prove that small farming can be made profitable when carried along on a scientific basis.

Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.
Along with the numerous *Maui News* articles, Professor Frederick G. Krauss provided a good overall description of life as a homesteader in his articles that appeared in Hawaiʻi periodicals that were produced for the American market. In his article that appeared in *Thrum's Hawaiian Almanac* in 1910, Krauss details the history of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homesteads as the settlers gained access to the plots and began planting. This article stated:

During the latter part of 1908 surveys were begun on the Kuiaha-Pauwela homestead tract in Hamakualoa, Maui, and completed in February 1909. About a year later they were thrown open for settlement. The tract consists of 1,200 acres, and was divided into thirty lots, averaging 40 acres each. As has so often happened in the past, but little interest was provoked in placing these lands on the market. Local people did not recognize their opportunity, and the few who did take up claims soon relinquished them, so that finally only two out of the eight or ten who made original entry remained. During the latter part of 1911, a small group of Honolulans became interested in the lands, and upon inspection found them so satisfactory that they added to their number other friends, both locally and in California until all the available lots, some twenty-five in number, had been spoken for and the California Settlement Association was born the vanguard of the new Hawaiian homestead of the future. Frequent meetings were held in Honolulu for the discussion of matters vital to the enterprise in hand. The earnestness that characterized the debates spoke well for the future of the undertaking. In the meantime, the Lindsay Settlement Association formed, and these latter have joined forces with the California Association. Our leases were forthcoming in April 1912. Most of the settlers took immediate possession of their lands. Contracts were let for clearing and plowing, so that as early as June some had begun to plant their first pineapple plants. By October a dozen cottages were either completed or well under way. A hundred or more acres had been planted to pineapples. Many had constructed fencing and some had developed a permanent water supply. No other crops were planted that year, but the active preparation of the land was continued, so that another hundred acres of land was plowed and planted by the middle of the present year. At this writing a half dozen settlers have each 20 acres, another half dozen ten acres each, and a third half dozen five acres each planted to pineapples. Nearly every homesteader has some live stock: work horses, milch cows, swine and poultry being included under this head. A grass patch adjoins nearly every barnyard, and a flower and vegetable garden adorns every cottage doorway. A modern little schoolhouse crowns the most prominent eminence, and a large attendance is enrolled. The first Hawaii Boys and Girls' Corn Club held its competitive exhibit last July. A farmers' club was formed in September, and regular meetings are held. Church services are held every second Sunday. A piano has been secured for the schoolhouse through
the aid of Honolulu friends, and a rousing farmers' meeting and entertainment was held in October. The nucleus of an agricultural library has bee supplied by the Federal Experiment Station, and this is constantly being added to. Also has there been established a branch of the Honolulu Public Library. The construction of new roads is well under way, and the first gulch road will be ready for use before the main crop comes off in the spring of 1914. Already, two of the three original settlers have each harvested their first crop of pineapples and have done well in the transaction. It has been estimated that altogether some 500 tons will be harvested by the homesteaders during the coming year, representing a value of approximately $10,000. So much for the present status of these New Era Homesteaders.105

The Haʻikū homesteads were created as part of the larger homesteading scheme put into place by the Haole Oligarchy across Hawaiʻi Pae ʻĀina. Unlike other homestead tracts, the Haʻikū acreage was filled with Americans exclusively through the use of settlement associations. Once a settlement association was formed and assigned a particular homestead tract, only the members of that association were allowed to apply for land. Once the specific plots were assigned to member applicants, if there were any lots left, the association had three months in which to select additional applicants. Only after this process was exhausted would land become available to people that were not association members.

These homesteads were comprised of first class agricultural lands that had been proven arable by their previous sugar company owners. Both homestead tracts could never have been opened without the help of Henry P. Baldwin, owner of Haiku Sugar Company. Baldwin negotiated a 1908 land exchange with the territorial government for the first 1,200 acres resulting in the first tract to be opened, Kuiaha-Paʻuwela. Later that same year, Baldwin offered additional land from Maui Agricultural Company and Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Company, both companies that he led. This agreement

resulted in an additional one thousand acres being opened as the Kuiaha-Kaupakulua tract in March 1913. Without Baldwin, both Haʻikū homestead tracts and the resulting American colony would not have been possible, confirming what the Maui News identified as a "cherished plan" of his - the importance of settling Americans in an exclusive community on Maui.\textsuperscript{106}

The first Right Of Purchase leases were issued in February of 1912. All of the lessees were American, which was aligned with the Haole Oligarchy's overall goal of populating these homesteads with what they termed a desirable class of people. However, in addition to being American, more than a third of these homesteaders (or their spouses) were employed by the government and had already been living here in Hawaiʻi. Strangely, the vast majority of homesteaders were not experienced farmers, and some of them were already landowners in other areas of Hawaiʻi. This appears to contradict the utopian community made up of small farmers described in Krauss' article.\textsuperscript{107}

There was a lot written about the infrastructure that was supposed to be supplied to these homesteaders, including roads, a cooperative cannery and a railway extension that would facilitate transportation of the agricultural goods they cultivated to the harbor. These implications appeared in government correspondence and publications alike, but were not necessarily provided to the Haʻikū homesteaders, complicating their attaining economic success.

\textsuperscript{106} "Opening More Land," \textit{Maui News}, February 17, 1912.
Summary

The Ha‘ikū homestead tracts were unique within Hawaiʻi's homesteading initiative. Henry P. Baldwin was responsible for the land acquisition of both tracts, first through a land exchange and the subsequent offering of remnant lands by two sugar companies that he owned. Baldwin also played a part in the promised and implied infrastructure for these homesteads, as letters sent to prospective American Anglo-Saxon settlers from Hawaiʻi Governor Frear promised a railroad extension that would provide transportation of the homesteads' cultivated goods to the Kahului harbor. Baldwin was an owner of this railroad and stood to benefit from increased profits this railway extension would provide. There were also reports of a California investor opening a cannery for the homesteaders to utilize, but that never materialized, which left Haiku Fruit & Packing as the exclusive outlet for the homesteaders' crop yields. Once again, Baldwin was an owner of Haiku Fruit & Packing and stood to benefit from realized profits.

This chapter also provided biographical information about the Ha‘ikū homesteaders, revealing that some of them already owned land in Hawaiʻi, and roughly thirty percent of these settlers were Republic of Hawaiʻi employees. This meant that the Haole Oligarchy that was approving them as homesteaders had also either appointed or hired them. Furthermore, the vast majority of these settlers were not experienced farmers.

The conclusions that one can draw from the documents and evidence presented in this section are numerous. First, the Haole Oligarchy ran a government filled with nepotism and racism. Their disenfranchising of Kānaka and other non-Haole parts of the
population, who were the majority at the time, was blatant. Secondly, there were a handful of Haole businessmen during this time period that monopolized many different areas of enterprise in Hawai‘i. The plantation owners were the shipping company owners, newspaper owners and road owners. Likewise, appointed commissioners, engineers, attorneys and other officials of the Territorial government become homesteaders, able to purchase large, first class agricultural lots at a fraction of the appraisal amount that was undervalued to begin with. The Haole Oligarchy used the label of 'homesteading' to facilitate the building of their friends' and political supporters' wealth and to build what they defined as an ideal, utopian American community on Maui. Homesteading was a familiar term to the American politicians that had to approve their public land policy, therefore it was more palatable than calling it what it really was - inequity and discrimination based on race while also being a mechanism to reward supporters of the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom.
Chapter 4. The Results of the Haʻikū Homesteads

This chapter discusses the diverse results of the Haʻikū homestead initiative. It exposes some of the opinions of Kānaka through letters, petitions and testimonies as well as a complaint that was filed in the US Congress about many of the same concerns. The prove-up process\(^{108}\) is explained, along with information about allegations of related complacency on the part of the Territorial government. The failure of these homesteads, as evidenced by the leaving of the settlers and resulting uses of these parcels are presented, with an analysis of financial ramifications to the homesteaders. This chapter will support my argument that these homesteads were run by a government and officials that relied on nepotism and discrimination to reward American Anglo Saxons that were already involved with various Territorial government departments and initiatives.

Opinions of Kānaka and Others

Lots within the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract of the Haʻikū homesteads were turned over to the homesteaders between July 1911 and October 1912, with the majority of the leases issued in February of 1912. There were many articles that appeared in *The Maui News* that described their cultivation progress and personal society-page type events such as marriages, vacations, dinner parties and charity work being undertaken by the settlers. Amidst these glowing reports of the homesteaders, there was one letter published January 27, 1912 that was written on behalf of a "large number of interested voters and citizens" by M. S. DePonte. DePonte was a notary public at the time that notarized some of the Right To Purchase Leases and related documentation that gave these settlers their land.

---

\(^{108}\) The prove-up process is the process through which the Public Lands Commission Sub Agent certified that all requirements were met and the lease should be converted to ownership in fee.
The letter detailed the alleged discrimination that Hawaiians and Portuguese that lived in the area of Ha'ikū experienced when inquiring about the Ha'ikū homesteads. An excerpt of DePonte's letter and an image of the newspaper post appear below:

How is it that there appears to be no Hawaiians or Portuguese applicants as members of the various settlement associations, as advertised in your recent issues, when it is a well known fact that both Hawaiians as well as Portuguese, long residents in the same District, have made inquiries of the different land agents for information concerning the conditions to be fulfilled before making application for lots in the above Homesteads, but as of yet have been unable to get any satisfactory information that would place them among the various Malihini names that appear from time to time in the list of proposed homesteaders, much to the dissatisfaction of these poor and humble Kamaainas...The indifference of the Land agents and that department generally, has caused considerable consternation among the humble citizens of Maui, who have for years been waiting for information and opportunity to take advantage of our liberal land laws, and thus procure for themselves a home... What can be done under such conditions that would place a citizen of less pull and perhaps intelligence on a basis with the list of Malihinis (who no doubt will secure their homesteads,) and thus disable him from securing equal rights to a homestead which certainly is much more preferable than a list of "carpet baggers: who for sure are looking for a wild cat investment and not for a home.\(^{109}\)

---

Figure 14. Newspaper Correspondence From M.S. DePonte

CORRESPONDENCE.

Wailuku, Maui.

Dear Sir:—Please allow me the space in your paper to propound the following questions in reference to the Kula and Paauilo Homesteads:

First—How is it that there appears to be no Hawaiians or Portuguese applicants as members of the various settlement associations, as advertised in your recent issue, when it is a well known fact that both Hawaiians as well as Portuguese, long residents in the same District, have made inquiries of the different land agents for information concerning the conditions to be fulfilled before making application for Lots in the above Homesteads, but as yet have been unable to get any satisfactory information that would place them among the various Matai names that appear from time to time in the list of proposed homesteaders, much to the dissatisfaction of these poor and humble Kamasinas.

Secondly—The indifference of the land agents and that department generally, has caused considerable consternation among the humble citizens of Maui, who have for years been waiting for information and opportunity to take advantage of our liberal land laws, and thus procure for themselves a home that every free American citizen has a right to, by act of Congress.

Thirdly—What can be done under such conditions that would place a citizen of less pull and perhaps less intelligence on a basis with the list of Matai names (who no doubt will secure their homesteads,) and thus disable him from securing equal rights to a homestead which certainly is much more preferable than a list of "carpet baggers" who for sure are looking for a wild cat investment and not for a home.

You will please pardon me for taking up your valuable space, but this is done by me at the request of a large number of interested voters and citizens, who have but few to champion their just cause, and appeal for equal rights.

Humbly yours,

M. S. DEPONTE.
DePonte's letter was the only negative reactions to the Haʻikū homesteads I found printed in *The Maui News* over the course of my research. At the time the letter was published, Henry P. Baldwin was a co-owner of *The Maui News* and Will J. Cooper, the editor and manager, was a homesteader in the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract.¹¹⁰

DePonte and the people that he/she represented in that letter were not the only ones in opposition to the goings-on in Haʻikū. In October 1911, Hawaiʻi Congressional Delegate Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole filed a complaint against the administration of W. F. Frear, then Governor of Hawaiʻi. Kūhiō's alleged that Frear was mismanaging the administration of Hawaiʻi's public lands. In his forty-eight page complaint and sixty page rejoinder, Kūhiō alleges that the Haʻikū homesteads were the result of a secret agreement with the former owner of the lands, H. P. Baldwin, to exclude Hawaiians as homesteaders "upon no other basis, apparently, than that of their blood and color".¹¹¹ He also charged that the local land agent, W. O. Aiken, who was "closely allied with the interests of the Baldwin family," met with Nelson K. Kaloa, Jr., a Hawaiian who inquired about the Haʻikū homesteads. Kaloa was informed by Aiken that "none of said lands would be assigned to Hawaiians, because before the exchange referred to, it had been agreed between the Government and Mr. Baldwin, that the lands in question would not be assigned to Hawaiians or to then present residents of the Islands, but that they would be assigned to strangers from abroad (Na Malihini)."¹¹² The fact that Aiken's response did not only exclude Hawaiians, but also "present residents of the Islands" is significant since

¹¹¹ Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole, "Rejoinder to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole Against the Administration of Hon. Walter F. Frear" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1912), 47.
¹¹² Ibid., 46.
the vast majority of the settlement associations and consequent homesteaders were, in fact, already living in Hawai‘i, although none were Hawaiian.

The conversation between Aiken and Kaloa also contradict Frear's published intentions taken from his inaugural address, which stated,

Doubtless, also, no unprejudiced person would deny that the highest interests of these islands require them to be peopled as far as may be by small landed proprietors. Hawaiians and Portuguese form the bulk of our present citizen population; it can not be questioned that they may become successful landed proprietors in far larger numbers than at present. To what extent Anglo-Saxons may become such, whether tilling their lands exclusively themselves or employing others to assist, is not so clear.\(^\text{113}\)

In addition, the above quote from Frear's inaugural address is in conflict with many of the letters sent to prospective Haʻikū homesteaders detailed in chapter three, lending credibility to Kūhiō's allegations.

Delegate Kūhiō also alleged that some of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homesteaders were close personal friends and/or political allies of Frear. He contended that:

... The exceedingly prompt opening, platting and assignment of homesteads at Haiku, Maui, to members of two separate settlement associations, the "Lindsay" and the "California", some of whom are now in possession of their assignments. Among the "farmers" to whom such assignments have been made are the following, all close personal or political friends of the Governor, viz.:

1. Edward B. Blanchard, residing in Honolulu, about 130 miles from the land in question, and on a different island; appointed by, or at the instance, of Governor Frear, to the position of Food Inspector, which he now holds.
2. Sylvanus T. Starrett, resident in Honolulu, appointed by, or at the instance of Governor Frear, to the office of Superintendent of Marketing, in the Department of Immigration, etc., which office he now holds.
3. Wm. J. Cooper, resident in Honolulu, and reporter upon a newspaper which has supported, and now supports, Governor Frear, in this controversy, more persistently and violently than any other newspaper in the Territory.
4. Carlton C. James, a chemist, resident at Honolulu, employed at the Honolulu Fertilizer Factory, and member of the Republican Territorial...

Executive Committee, and one of the members of that body who assisted in the recent passage of a resolution which was telegraphed to Washington, since the controversy between myself and the Governor became acute, and recommending the reappointment of Governor Frear.\textsuperscript{114}

As mentioned in the previous chapter, approximately one-third of the Haʻikū homesteaders were employed by the Haole Oligarchic Territorial government. Because Kūhiō's statements above were made in March 1912, only the very first of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela had been assigned, and his list only includes the homesteaders that had been named up until that point. My numbers include the second tract that wasn't opened until March 1913. In this way, it appears that Frear, Aiken and the Public Land Commissioner continued the nepotism that Kūhiō's complaint alleged while settling the subsequent Kuiaha-Kaupakulua tract.

Kūhiō was also critical of the large lot sizes in Haʻikū that averaged forty acres, as compared to the average lot sizes of other homesteads. He stated:

Further than this, we find that the Governor's antipathy to assignments of liberal size was probably "not working" when the Haiku lands were surveyed, platted and divided among his favorites, for the average area of the Haiku lots so assigned exceeds forty acres. This becomes especially interesting when compared with the average size of other homestead lots "opened" under the preset administration. Thus, on the canelands, so "opened", we find that on the Hakialana Tract in North Hilo, the 32 lots opened range in area from 6 to 14 acres;
On the land of Kaieie, South Hilo, 32 lots, the areas run from 9 acres to 18 1/2 acres;
On the land of Kulaimano, South Hilo, 22 lots, areas range from 9 acres to less than 24 acres. (No homesteaders have taken possession of any of the lots on the three lands last mentioned, as my attorney is informed by the Commissioner of Public Lands;)
On the Omao Tract at Koloa, Kauai, 51 lots range in area from approximately 5 acres to approximately 8 acres;
The Pahoa Tract, at Waianae, as shown upon a former page, has been resurveyed and platted into lots of approximately 5 acres each;

\textsuperscript{114} Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole, "Rejoinder to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole Against the Administration of Hon. Walter F. Frear" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1911), 28.
A tract at Kalauao, near Honolulu, Oahu, being dry land, above the cane belt, has lately been platted and is about to be advertised, where the areas (exclusive of gulch land) range from about 4 acres to approximately 7 acres, - with the average probably less than 5 acres;
On page 59 of the Governor's Reply, he shows that the average area of the Kulaimano and Kaieie lots, above referred to, is 13.19 acres.\footnote{Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole, "Rejoinder to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole Against the Administration of Hon. Walter F. Frear" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1912), 47.}

Kūhiō was not alone in his comparison of the Haʻikū homesteads with other tracts. Twenty-one native born residents of the Kīhei district of Maui hired an attorney and filed a petition in June 1911, complaining about the high valuation of land for the Waiohuli-Keokea beach lots, which they applied for as homestead land. Attorney James L. Coke's letter accompanying the petition that was sent to Governor Frear in June of 1911 stated:

Some time ago a number of residents in the vicinity of Kihei, Island of Maui, made application to the land department for certain homesteads in what is known as the Waiohuli-Keokea beach lots...These lots were surveyed and appraised, and the same now are being advertised. But for some reason or another, the appraisement of this property is so high as to be prohibitory. You will note that by referring to the appraisements, that this property is appraised at about $40.00 an acre. I am personally well acquainted with the property in question, and am free to confess that it is surprising to me that any such appraisement should be placed upon property of this nature...I am writing this letter under the belief that you are not aware of the unreasonable appraisement, and that you and your administration desire to encourage homesteaders in this territory to secure small tracts of the government lands throughout the territory. This being the case, I would respectfully ask you to investigate the matters referred to in this letter, and correct, if possible, the injustice being done to the people applying for the lots in question by reducing the appraisement to a reasonable figure. I would call your attention to the fact that practically all of the applicants are native born residents of the Kīhei District, on the Island of Maui, and have a right to expect and do expect just treatment at the hands of your administration.\footnote{Attorney James L. Coke, Letter to Governor Frear, June13, 1911.}

This petition contended that the valuation should have been appraised at approximately $10.00 per acre, and listed several comparatives as evidence including the
appraised value of the Haʻikū homestead land at approximately $20.00 per acre. In actuality, the average per-acre costs of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela and Kuiaha-Kaupakulua lots were $15.94 and $16.59 respectively, even less than was alleged by the petitioners and their attorney. The petition's implication that the beach lots were grossly over-valuated is supported by the fact that the Haʻikū lands were classified as first-class agricultural land, while the beach lots were not. Pages one and two of this petition appear below:¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ Attorney James L. Coke, "Petition Waiohuli Keokea Beach Lots" (Hawai‘i State Archives: Honolulu, 1911), 1-20.
Figure 15. Petition Waiohuli Keokea Beach Lots

HIS EXCELLENCY W.F. FRENCH, 
GOVERNOR OF HAWAII.

SIR:

We, the undersigned petitioners, respectfully beg to call your attention to the high valuation of the homestead lots in the public notice of the opening of public lands to homesteaders, more particularly in the 8th Land District, in the section designated as the "Waiohuli Keokea beach lots, Kula", and hereby petition you to have said valuations reconsidered and reduced to enable your petitioners who are people with small means to take up a homestead lot at a reasonable valuation.

We represent that the values put on said lots are speculative values only, and in our opinion a valuation of said lots at $10.00 an acre would be fair and reasonable, and in support of our contention beg to present the following facts for your consideration together with other matters which will throw a light on the real value of said lots, to wit:

1st, That only a year ago the Commissioner of Public Lands offered to sell the lease of Waiohuli and Keokea including this tract at the upset rental value of ten cents an acre per year, which fixes his estimate of the value of said land at that time at eighty cents (80c) per acre, a very moderate figure compared to his valuation of $40.00 an acre to-day;

2nd, That hundreds of acres of land covered with kiawe were mauka of these homestead lots, included as part of the pasture lands recently leased by the Commissioner of Public Lands to ranchers, at a yearly rental of a fraction over fifteen cents an acre, which would fix the real value of said kiawe lands at One dollar 25/100 per acre;

3rd, That only three years ago the Commissioner of Public Lands sold five homestead lots on kiawe land alongside of this

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
Figure 16. Petition Waiohuli Keokea Beach Lots

tract to homesteaders at a valuation of about $6.00 an acre and the lands were taken at the upset price;

4th. That the Commissioner of Public Lands has opened to a settlement association a tract of first class agricultural lands at Kuaiha near Haiku, located alongside of successful pineapple plantations and the vineyards of Kaupakulua, giving these favored settlers lands acquired by the government from private parties at an exchange value of about $200.00 an acre, at a low valuation of about $20.00 per acre.

Whereas at Kuaiha it is possible for an industrious homestead to improve his property by raising crops of pineapples or grapes, in a district where there is a ready market for his produce, so that he may become well to do and so increase the value of his holdings to $100.00, $200.00 or more per acre, as has been the case at Wahiawa on Oahu, but on the “Waiohuli and Keokea beach lots, Maui”, the profitable cultivation of agricultural crops is impossible as proved by the result of the sugar plantation experiment at Kihei which is nearby, where a corporation with millions of money and large resources were unable to make good;

5th. That outside of getting a homestead and the raising of a few pigs and chickens, and going to work for wages on the neighboring plantations and ranches during the busy season, all that a homesteader can do on these lands would be to cut and sell a few cords of kiawe wood, or to sell kiawe beans during the season, and the market for both articles is limited to from 50 to 60 cords a month for the wood and to less than 1000 bags of beans during the season. Of the kiawe wood demand the lessees of Waiohuli and Keokea has been supplying 40 cords a month, a trade they will continue to hold since over a hundred or two hundred acres of kiawe woods were included in the pasture land.

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
Governor Frear responded, justifying the government's appraisal due to the "cutting privilege of the kiawe wood growing on the homestead acreage, ultimately refusing to lower the valuation of the beach lots.\textsuperscript{118}

\textit{Infrastructure Problems}

Chapter three listed some of the promised or implied infrastructure at the Haʻiʻikū homestead tracts. These included roads, a cannery to process their pineapple, the extension of a railway to transport their goods and more. One month after the Right Of Purchase leases were awarded to the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela settlers, the local land agent, W. O. Aiken sent Governor Frear a letter asking for roads to be built. Aiken is the land agent that Kūhiō named as being "closely allied with the interests of the Baldwin family".\textsuperscript{119} Aiken's letter was written on a Haiku Fruit & Packing Co. letterhead, listing W.A. Baldwin as the Manager. I am not aware of why Aiken wrote this letter using this company's letterhead - perhaps he held a position with them. In any case, it does substantiate Kūhiō's claim of Aiken's close relationship with the Baldwin-owned business. This is an area of my research needing further examination that is a bit outside of the scope of my MA project, but that I will continue in my PhD work. An image of this letter appears below.\textsuperscript{120}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Governor Frear, Letter to Attorney James L. Coke, June 15, 1911.
\item Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole, "Rejoinder to the Complaint of Hon. Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaole Against the Administration of Hon. Walter F. Frear" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1912), 46.
\item Sub Agent W.O. Aiken, Letter to Governor Frear, March 25, 1912.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Figure 17. Letter W.O. Aiken To Governor Frear

Hon. W. F. Frear, Governor, Honolulu.

Dear Sir:—

I beg to call your attention to the fact that the one thing first necessary to make the Haiku homesteading a success is roads, and the need for them is immediate and imperative. One homesteader is now building a home on an upper lot and has undergone much trouble and expense in getting his material to the spot. Several of the lots are inaccessible and unless roads are built, the homesteaders will require air-ships to get themselves and material onto the same.

This summer most of the homesteaders expect to get busy on their lots, and unless road work is started very soon, they will be unable to do so.

I do not know in whose jurisdiction this matter lies, but believe that you can do the most towards stirring it up. Several of the homesteaders have appealed to me and I promise them I would write you.

Trusting that something may be done in the matter soon, I am, very Respectfully,

W.O. Aiken

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
Governor Frear's response to this letter suggested that the homesteaders pay for their lots as soon as possible so that the payments could be utilized for road construction.\textsuperscript{121} Aiken responded to Frear by pointing out that the rules of the Land department did not allow for Frear's early payment solution.\textsuperscript{122} At this point, the Governor responded with a final letter that stated:

\begin{quote}
I see no reason why the Haiku homesteaders could not pay for their lands at any time without waiting three years even though they hold under right of purchase leases. It is true they would have to continue to pay rent and so would practically lose the interest on the purchase price if they should pay it now but the gain in roads would be far more to them than the loss of interest and they could very well afford to stand that loss in view of the fact that they obtained the lots at only a fraction of their real value, otherwise I cannot see how we can build the roads, for there is no money on hand from other homesteads on the Island of Maui and there is not likely to be more for sometime to come.\textsuperscript{123}
\end{quote}

The sharp tone of Frear's correspondence is hard to miss, and his statement about the land being obtained at a fraction of their real value supports my contention that the Haʻikū tracts were grossly under-valued. In any event, the roads in question weren't built until much later. While the Haʻikū homesteaders were provided better infrastructure than that provided to other homesteads comparatively, the inability to provide roads in early 1912 caused problems for several early settlers and those problems would contribute to an eventual exodus.

\textit{The Prove-Up Process Results In Fee-Simple Ownership}

Transferring the Right Of Purchase leases into a land grant and fee-simple ownership involved the fulfillment of several requirements. These requirements, according to the Land Act of 1895, were:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{121} Governor Frear, Letter to Sub Agent W.O. Aiken, April 1, 1912.
\item \textsuperscript{122} Sub Agent W.O. Aiken, Letter to Governor Frear, April 5, 1912.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Governor Frear, Letter to Sub Agent W.O. Aiken, April 8, 1912.
\end{itemize}
1. To pay to the Government, in equal parts, half yearly in advance, on the first day of April and the first day of October of each year, a rental of eight per centum on the appraised value of the land;

2. To continuously maintain his home on the demised premises from the end of the first year of the said term to the end of the fifth year thereof;

3. To, before the end of the third year of said term, reduce to cultivation and have under cultivation, not less then five per centum of the premises, if the same is classes as Agricultural land;

4. To, at the end of the fifth year of the said term have reduced to cultivation and have under cultivation at one time not less than ten per centum of the premises, and have planted and maintained in good growing condition on the said premises an average of not less than ten timber, shade or fruit trees per acre of the whole area, if the same is classed as Agricultural land;

5. To fence in the land if same is classed as Pastoral land.

6. To comply with the foregoing alternative requirements respectively regarding the two kinds of land if the same is classed as Pastoral-Agricultural land;

7. To obtain the written consent of the Commissioner before assigning his interest or any part thereof under the said Lease.

To provide some context to these cultivation percentages, the average lot size in the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead tract was approximately forty acres. In order to obtain ownership in fee, the homesteader had to have at least ten acres under cultivation, which needed to be certified by the Public Land Commission Sub Agent.

The first homesteaders begin the prove-up process in early 1915, with Land Patents being issued consistently for both tracts over the next six years. To complete this process, the Sub-Agent of the Land District sent a packet of prove-up documents to the Public Land Commissioner consisting of the following:

- Sub Agent's Report as to the fulfillment of all conditions;
- Testimony of occupant;

---

124 Territory of Hawaiʻi, "1895 Land Act, Part VII Pamphlet" (Hawaii State Archives: Honolulu, 1908), 6-8.
• Testimony of one witness;
• Certificate of Deputy Tax Assessor as to payment of taxes.

The Sub-Agent's report certified the attainment of several requirements:

• Improvements made to the parcel;
• Maintenance of a home;
• Cultivation;
• Number of Timer, Fruit or Shade Trees per acre.

Once these documents were sent to the Public Land Commissioner, a Land Patent was issued to the homesteader, providing fee-simple title to their homestead lot. This process seemed to be a relatively quick one, since all the Land Patents examined in the course of my research were issued an average of one week after the date of the prove-up packet.

An example of the cover letter and Sub-Agent's Report associated with the prove-up certification of Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homesteader Mrs. Elizabeth J. Lindsay follows. Lindsay's Land Patent was issued ten days after the packet date, May 31, 1919.125

---

125 Territory of Hawaiʻi, "Survey Notes Grant 7280" (Hawaiʻi State Archives: Honolulu, 1919).
Figure 18. Letter Lindsay Prove-Up Packet

TERRITORY OF HAWAII
COMMISSION OF PUBLIC LANDS

PAIA, MAUL. May 21st, 1919.

Prove Up, R. P. L. #100,
Lot 26, Kuiaha-Pauwela.

C. F. Bailey, Esq.
Commissioner of Public Lands,
Honolulu, Gahu.

Dear Sir:—
Enclosed herewith you will find papers in connection
with the application of Mrs. Elizabeth J. Lindsay to secure Patent
for her homestead at Haiku held under Right of Purchase Lease
No. 100, same being Lot No. 26, as follows:—
Sub-Agent's Report as to Fulfillment of Conditions.
Testimony of Occupant.
Testimony of Witness, W. I. Wells.
Certificate of Deputy Tax Assessor as to payment of taxes.

Trusting that all of the above may be found in order,
and that Patent will issue at an early date, I am,

Very respectfully yours,

Sub-Agent 4th. Land District.

WOA.
Encl.

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
Figure 19. Sub-Agent's Report of Conditions Fulfilled

Sub-Agent’s Report as to Fulfillment of Conditions.


To the Commissioner of Public Lands:
I hereby certify that I have inspected Lot No. 20, of the Kulahea-Pauwela Homestead Tract, at Pauwela, Maui, T. H.,
occupied by Mrs. Elizabeth J. Lindsay,
under Right of Purchase Lease, No. 100
and certify as follows:
Class of Land First class agricultural.
Improvements Substantial frame dwelling house of eight rooms, with stable and lot fenced.

Maintenance of a Home Occupant with her family of four children resided continuously upon this lot from March 1913 to about September 1918.

Cultivation About fifteen acres of said lot cleared and planted to pineapples.

Number of Timber, Fruit or Shade Trees per acre about 25.

I further certify that all charges on account of rent, interest or purchase price due at this date have been paid, and submit herewith the testimony of Elizabeth J. Lindsay, occupant, and of W. I. Wells witness, and recommend that Patent be issued for said lot.

Respectfully submitted.

Dated: May 21st, 1919. Sub-Agent Fourth Land District.

Source: Hawai‘i State Archives.
The language used in Sub-Agent Aiken's prove-up reports is very general, with the word 'about' being used numerous times in every report that I reviewed. These reports appeared to be a matter of formality rather than an accurate assessment of requirements met. Some excerpts from other reports authored by Sub-Agent Aiken appear below:

Occupant resided continuously upon this lot from about July 1913 for over four years and altho [sic] absent in Honolulu at present, still has her home upon the lot...About 30 acres cultivated to pineapples...Number of Timber, Fruit or Shade trees per acre: about 15 trees.  

Occupant has resided continuously upon this lot for about five years...The larger portion of the land is planted to pineapples and about two acres to bananas...Number of Timber, Fruit, or Shade trees per acre: more than required.  

Since July 1913, occupant has resided upon this lot fairly continuously. Since getting married in January 1915, he has made it his home entirely and does so yet...Has over five acres in pines, and about 15 acres being planted this year.  

Occupant with his wife has resided upon his lot most of the time since moving thereon in 1912. Lately he has been employed a great deal of the time in Wailuku, but his wife has maintained a home on the lot...About 12-1/2 acres planted to pineapples and vegetables.

The lackadaisical impression of the prove-up procedure is supported by a letter that was printed in several Hawai‘i newspapers written by a homesteader in the Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela tract, Edward C. Moore. Moore, formerly employed by the Territorial Agricultural Experiment Station, a government department created to help ensure the success of cultivation in Ha‘ikū, stated in his letter:

126 Territory of Hawai‘i, "Survey Notes Grant 7179" (Hawai‘i State Archives: Honolulu, 1919).  
127 Territory of Hawai‘i, "Survey Notes Grant 6884" (Hawai‘i State Archives: Honolulu, 1917).  
128 Territory of Hawai‘i, "Survey Notes Grant 6827" (Hawai‘i State Archives: Honolulu, 1917).  
129 Territory of Hawai‘i, "Survey Notes Grant 6691" (Hawai‘i State Archives: Honolulu, 1916).
The present land laws are not enforced. It is well known throughout the Territory that one can fulfill the homesteading requirements in a perfunctory way, and it will be passed. There is no efficient inspection of what is going on on the homesteads. The knowledge that this is so encourages large land owners and corporations to ignore the third paragraph of the Organic Act, Section 73 prohibiting the transfer of title to leases or to lease public lands to any corporation or alien.130

A partial image of Moore's letter as it was printed appears below:

130 "Homestead Plan to Solve Problem Laid Before Lane," Hawaiian Gazette, June 18, 1918.
Figure 20. Newspaper Article "Homestead Plan To Solve Problem Laid Before Lane"

Source: Maui News Accessed at Hamilton Library.
If Edward Moore's allegations were accurate, it would explain the government's ability to issue Land Patents just seven to ten days after the date of the Sub-Agent's report and prove-up packets, which seemed impractical. However, if this process was just "perfunctory" as Moore states, this consistently expedient time frame seems more practicable.

The Homesteaders' Exodus

While the first prove-up packets were completed and land patents issued for lots in the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela tract in early 1915, the reports of American homesteaders leaving Haʻikū altogether begin appearing in newspapers by September that same year. Just less than half of the Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homesteaders received their fee-simple ownership by that time and the articles reported that while the homesteaders were leaving their newly acquired land in Haʻikū, most of them were retaining ownership. The first of the articles that appeared in The Maui News stated:

The reason for the decrease of population in the district, is that many of the homesteaders have now obtained titles to their lands, and not having been able to make a living on their places have moved away. As yet, however, comparatively few lots have changed hands, the original owners still holding then [sic] in hope that with better prices for pineapples or the development of some other staple crop that they may yet be able to realize on their investments. 131

That article appears in its entirety below:

---

An article that appeared five days later further details the exodus of Haʻikū homesteaders. Interestingly enough, it suggests that the real reason for the failures of the initiative may have been the homesteaders' lack of farming experience. The author spoke of the quality of the soil and the good infrastructure that was provided to the settlers, leaving him to surmise that the problem was most likely that there were so few "real" farmers. The article states:

At the present time perhaps a third of the original settlers have proved up and have left their lots, and others are preparing to do likewise. Already this most promising and attractive of rural communities in the territory is badly broken up. The regular semi-monthly church services have been discontinued because there are no longer people enough to justify holding them. The school attendance has dropped by one half.

It is true that the homesteaders who have left have not sold their lands; but this is probably due to the fact that they could probably not sell for sufficient
to break even. However, it is also doubtless true that sentiment and the hope that the future may hold something better than the past has held, has a part in this loathness to cut entirely loose and start all over. The fact that most of the homesteaders in the Kuiaha tract, pinning their faith to pineapples, have lost heavily, has certainly warranted discouragement, and with pineapples still a very uncertain quantity for the future, and nothing definite to take the place, it is not to be wondered at if many have been force [sic] to leave and hunt more remunerative work.

But there are still some who have not given up...The soil is undeniably good, the location could scarcely be improved upon, with good shipping facilities, and now with a system of very fair roads. A good many things have been grown on a small scale successfully, though so far no staple crop, for which a reasonably certain market may be had, has been found. These problems are being vigorously attacked by the federal experiment station and the Territorial marketing division, and there is certainly reason to believe that ultimately they will be able to demonstrate the feasibility of small farming in Hawaii...In fact there are many things that a real farmer should see most encouraging in Haiku as it is at present. And perhaps this is the key to the situation - there have not been enough real farmers in the community, and too many amateurs.\textsuperscript{132}

The irony of the author's opinion is hard to miss, since farming experience was never a skill that was required or even called desirable by the Haole Oligarchy during the years of homestead and public land disposal promotion.

Hawai‘i newspapers continue printing articles reporting the homesteading failure at Ha‘ikū and suggesting possible reasons for this failure. An article in \textit{The Maui News} on October 5, 1917 that was authored by a successful Floridian homesteader stated:

A man need not go far to find evidences of the failure of homesteading in Haiku. The derelict farms, the vacant homes, the wasted energy, the blighted hopes, not to speak of the earnings sunk in the projects, all are evidences of failure, which should stir those that remain to sit up and take notice, to analize [sic] the causes, and if possible discover the antidote, lest they themselves share a similar fate. To my mind the causes of failure are due to a variety of circumstances, but to some in particular. Amongst the latter we might mention the misfits, the book farmers, those who thought they would like farm life, who calculated they could make a living, if not a fortune, on raw land from the day they set their foot upon their homesteads, but who never did calculate the brawn as well as the brain necessary to turn a luxuriant crop of guava bushes into a paying crop of corn or pineapples. Amongst them we might include those without the experience of

\textsuperscript{132} "Another Homestead Failure?," \textit{Maui News}, September 10, 1915.
farming, who, while not exactly "misfits," failed to realize the hardships, sacrifices, and determination necessary to bring success.\textsuperscript{133}

An editorial piece in the same newspaper issue further spelled out other possible reasons for the Ha‘ikū homestead failure. An image of this text appear below:\textsuperscript{134}

Figure 22. Newspaper Article "Small Farming In The Territory"

\textbf{SMALL FARMING IN THE TERRITORY}

The paper of Mr. J. F. O’Brien, read before the Haiku Farmers’ Association and published elsewhere in this issue, is interesting in that it comes from a man who has made a success of small farming and knows what he is talking about. As we understand it, however, that success was attained in Florida where the important essentials of water and markets formed no problems whatever; and, moreover, the labor question is never a serious one. In Hawaii the small farmer has, as a rule, those factors to contend with from the very start, and inasmuch as he is left to solve them alone, much time and study and patience are called for.

Every question has its beginning; every failure as well as every success starts somewhere. In Hawaii conditions are such that, in a majority of cases, unless certain work can precede homesteading, small farming must, and does, prove an uphill business. That a success can be made of it we all know; examples of this are not few. But in all such cases the road has been a tedious one, attended by great risks and calling for extreme effort.

When a man, or corporation, lays out a block of land to be sold as residence lots, water is laid on the property, streets are established, and such other necessities as circumstances may call for supplied. Homesteading areas should be prepared with much the same care before settlers are invited upon the land. The United States has come to recognize this fact, as witness the large irrigation projects in the west; and it is to be hoped that this Territory has seen the last of people being sent out into fields of rocks, or barren, waterless wastes and given “Get busy; good-bye” as their principal, official encouragement to success.

The Haiku lands are rich; they were always promising; but the settlers there are still handicapped by conditions which should have been remedied before they were invited upon the land. They have overcome many handicaps, but at the expense of much toil and money; and will eventually “get there”. It has, however, been a hazardous and difficult effort.

The appeal of Mr. O’Brien for diversified farming is passed without comment, for the reason that its soundness is perfectly clear and is understood. Much instruction and effort is already being put forward in this direction.

Source: \textit{Maui News} Accessed At Hamilton Library.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{133} J. F. O’Brien, "Failures-Successes In Haiku," \textit{Maui News}, October 5, 1917.
\textsuperscript{134} "Small Farming in the Territory," \textit{Maui News}, October 5, 1917.
This piece points to the lack of infrastructure as the probable cause for the failure of the Haʻikū homesteading initiative, stating "When a man, or corporation, lays out a block of land to be sold as residence lots, water is laid on the property, streets are established and such other necessities as circumstances may call for supplied. Homesteading areas should be prepared with much the same care before settlers are invited upon the land."

This reasoning is supported by a conclusion drawn by the Legislative Reference Bureau when evaluating Hawaiʻi's homesteading initiative. They state "it was certainly unlikely that Hawaii's territorial government was prepared to make the enormous investment of public funds required for development of roads, water supplies, and other improvements without which a successful homesteading policy could not have been pursued in Hawaii at that time."\(^{135}\)

Regardless of the reason(s) for the reported failure of the Haʻikū homesteads, the exodus of the settlers began to change the landscape of this area. While most of the homesteaders retained ownership of their land, many of them chose to lease their land to Japanese aliens, in spite of the fact that doing so was forbidden by Section 73 of the Organic Act. Because so many of the homesteaders left within a relatively short time span, this sub-leasing activity appears in clusters within the grantor and grantee books at the Hawaii Bureau of Conveyances. The image of one such page appears below and reflects forty agreements between various Japanese aliens and Haiku Fruit & Packing Co., Ltd., the cannery that handled the products cultivated in the Haʻikū homesteads.\(^{136}\)

Intrestingly, this company was owned by the Baldwins, whose patriarch made the homesteads possible in the first place.


Source: Hawai‘i Bureau of Conveyances.

There are at least one dozen pages in these books that document the agreements that were made between Japanese aliens and Haiku Fruit & Packing Co., Ltd. I found relatively few agreements documented with the government between the Japanese and the
individual homesteaders. The Organic Act made it illegal for homesteaders to lease or sell their land to Alien Japanese residents, so it makes sense that the homesteaders may not have wanted to expose any evidence of those kinds of transactions. However, as a business, Haiku Fruit & Packing needed to document their contracts with these lessees and was legally free to do business with anyone, including Japanese Aliens. For these reasons, I believe that these agreements are a better indicator of how many Japanese took over farming the land within the Haʻikū homestead tracts.

While the newspapers call the exodus of homesteaders a failure, the fact remained that the vast majority of them were able to obtain fee-simple ownership of their large plots of land. Whether these homesteaders decided to sell their parcels or sub-lease their land, they did derive some income from their land. As an example, I located six agreements between Japanese aliens and homesteader Carlton C. James, owner of Kuiaha-Paʻuwela homestead lot twenty-five. James went through the prove-up process and obtained his Land Patent signifying ownership of his original lot on October 1, 1915. By the end of 1920, James owned at least four homestead lots, as indicated by agreements that he put into place with Japanese aliens between July 1919 and November 1920. An image of the Bureau of Conveyance grantor book reflecting these transactions appears below:

---

137 Carlton C. James was one of the homesteaders that Kūhiō named as a personal friend/political ally of Governor Frear.
The details of these transactions show that Carlton C. James had control of Kuiaha-Pa‘uwela lots twenty-three, twenty-five and twenty-six in addition to Kuiaha-Kaupakulua lot fifty-three. In each of these agreements, James received between 20 to 25 percent of all proceeds obtained by the growing and selling of cultivated goods from his property to Haiku Fruit & Packing Co., Ltd. At this point, it is difficult to determine how much income James derived from these agreements. More research needs to be done in order to determine the scale of profits made through subleasing to the Japanese.

Another homesteader that leased his lot to others within the Haʻikū tracts was Frederick G. Krauss. Krauss received his fee-simple ownership in 1920 and leased his entire lot in September of 1921 to N. Omsted, who paid a total of $10,000 to lease Krauss' forty-nine-acre parcel for a period of five years. Omsted had control over all

139 State of Hawaiʻi Bureau of Conveyances, Liber 588, 41-51.
cultivation and buildings on the land with the exception of one house.140 This transaction afforded Krauss a handsome profit on this lot, since he paid just $845.00 for the entire forty-nine acres just one year prior.141 Once the lease with Omsted expired, Krauss again leased his land for at least another five years starting in 1926.142 Only ten years prior, Krauss published an article in the Hawaiian Almanac and Annual that completely contradicts his eventual actions. In this article he stated, "We do not pretend that the homestead of the future will offer a rich field for speculation. The very term "homestead" is opposed to this idea...Let it be said that small farming in Hawaii, the farm of 40 to 160 acres is not a get-rich-quick scheme, but it is a legitimate business, and will in time become the Territory's greatest asset."143 Krauss' words seem hypocritical after examining his actions just ten years after he penned them.

In examining current-day tax maps, I discovered that most of the Haʻikū homestead parcels were subdivided and sold off. A few of the owners have last names identical to those of their homesteader ancestors, but the vast majority were carved up and sold. Title searches on these parcels need to be done in order to determine just how much money was made over the course of the last century. There was potential for huge profits based on the high property values in Hawaiʻi as compared to the 20% of appraised value they paid, which may very well have been severely under-valuated to begin with.

In 1945, the Land Law Revision Commission furnished a report to then Governor Stainback, drawing the following conclusions after an in-depth investigation of the homesteading initiative in the Territory of Hawaiʻi. It states,

141 State of Hawaiʻi Bureau of Conveyances, Land Grant 7497.
142 State of Hawaiʻi Bureau of Conveyances, Liber 836, 393.
The homestead laws have been utilized as an additional conduit for siphoning off of government lands into private ownership...the majority of homesteaders have proved themselves to be mere speculators or investors with no intention of establishing or maintaining a homestead...judged by the definition of the word "homestead," homesteading in Hawaii has not proved a success.\(^{144}\)

In 1961, George W. Luter provided a report on the homesteading initiative in Hawai‘i to the State Department of Land and Natural Resources. His conclusion spoke of the profits made by homesteaders in Hawai‘i, stating:

Some homesteaders have made profitable use of their lands by assuming the role of landlords, leasing or contracting the homestead lands to adjacent plantations for cultivation. Others, by their own initiative or with occasional legislative assistance, have managed to hold their lands; by taking advantage of subsequent real estate "boom" periods. Very few have made successful application of the basic principles of homesteading - residence on and personal cultivation of the land.\(^{145}\)

The Ha‘ikū homesteads did not contribute to the Haole Oligarchy's goal of settling more Anglo Saxon Americans in Hawai‘i. While it is true that the vast majority of the homesteaders in Ha‘ikū were American, they were already living in Hawai‘i, with most of them working for the government. This fact supports Kūhiō's assessment of these homesteads - they were meant to benefit and perhaps reward the people that were associated with the Haole that were in power at the time, including Governor Frear, the Public Lands Commission, and others. In fact, Governor Frear's term marked a difference in the stated goals of his predecessors (Governors Dole and Carter) by using the Ha‘ikū homesteads to reward his friends, supporters and associates. In spite of the Ha‘ikū homesteads not contributing to immigrating Americans to Hawai‘i, other initiatives did, as evidenced by the population demographics reported through the 1900,


1910 and 1920 censuses. The segment of the population that classified themselves as being born on the U.S. continent grew 34% between 1900-1910, 90% between 1910-1920, and 175% between 1920-1930.146

Summary

This chapter has detailed the results of the Haʻikū homesteads, including the controversial prove-up process used to obtain the Land Grants that granted ownership in fee of over two thousand acres in Hamakakualoa. It has also discussed various opinions expressed by Kānaka ʻŌiwi (including Congressional Delegate Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole) and others. I have disclosed details about the failure of the homesteads due to the homesteaders abandoning their land. While the government called this a failure, I contend that this depends on the lens one uses to evaluate this situation. Because I am looking through the lens of a landless Kānaka Maoli, I do not consider this initiative to have failed since the settlers obtained ownership of the land, which then benefitted many of them financially over the next century. Furthermore, calling the Haʻikū homesteads a failure helped to mask the underlying issues of nepotism, racism and corruption through the theft of lands from Kānaka as well as the huge profits realized by the friends and political allies of the Haole Oligarchy resulting from this theft. This Territorial initiative continued the process of disenfranchising Kānaka in our own homeland. The examples of subleases to Japanese and others are just a glimpse into the money made by these homesteaders, some of which were already landowners in Hawaiʻi. The nepotism and discrimination described are good examples of the pro-Haole

---

corruption that was present during the territorial years in Hawai‘i. Sadly, the behavior of the Haole Oligarchy wasn't just pro-Haole, it was anti-Kānaka.
Chapter 5. Conclusion

History classes that I have attended, even classes specific to Hawaiian history, have not taught me about Hawai‘i’s Territorial period. It seemed to me a mysterious time during which many of the laws and policies were put into place that clearly gave Haole an advantage over Kānaka. The corruption and racism that I have uncovered during the research of this thesis caught me off guard and continue to shock me. After reading a brief three sentences about the American colony in Haʻikū, I could not believe that such a thing happened on Maui, where I was born and raised. Once I was able to verify that it was not only true, but had been conceptualized and executed by the Haole Oligarchy that illegally took the Hawaiian Kingdom, I knew that I had to research and tell this story - the story of racism, nepotism and the continued disenfranchisement of Kānaka Maoli. My husband and I are landless Kānaka, just like many of our Kānaka friends and family. This is but one attempt to understand why.

Summary of Previous Chapters

Chapter one was an overview of my thesis research. It contrasted the features that Haʻikū was known for in moʻolelo of Hina, Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Kahekili with what this famed area had become by 1912. Chapter two outlined the history of homesteading in Hawaiʻi, beginning first with the Kuleana Act of 1850 and moving through the very different vision of homesteading belonging to the Haole Oligarchy, which was put into place via the 1895 Land Act. It also detailed the different methods of homesteading and the tremendous efforts that the territorial government went through to try to lure American Anglo-Saxons to Hawaiʻi as settlers. Chapter three introduced the two Territorial homesteads located in Haʻikū, Maui that settled only Americans on over two
thousand acres. It also examined where this land came from as well as who facilitated the creation and realization of this American colony. Chapter four indicated the results of these homesteads, including the prove-up process, changes in demographics, as well as the opinions of the Kānaka of Hawai‘i and others. These homesteads have changed the Ha‘ikū landscape through the large lots that were eventually subdivided and sold off, making some of these Haole settlers huge profits.

Each of these chapters detail a part of a larger initiative to maintain Haole dominance in Hawai‘i through the settling of more Haole, intended to help offset the demographic imbalance between Haole and other races, including Hawaiians and Asians. The Haole Oligarchy specifically chose American Anglo-Saxons as their targeted settlers, further exhibiting their racism through their desire to settle Haole just like themselves. This overarching goal was achieved through the use of different initiatives, including the Ha‘ikū Homesteads.

*Key Findings*

My initial intent was to tell the mo‘olelo of American Anglo-Saxons being brought here to settle these lands in Ha‘ikū, thereby fulfilling the copious amounts of settlerism rhetoric that were published by the Haole Oligarchy in newspapers, correspondence and periodicals. About halfway through my research, I realized that my mo‘olelo was instead about the corruption and nepotism that was prevalent within the territorial government. Although the lessons that we can take away from my research are many, I offer a few key findings utilizing ‘Ōlelo No‘eau to connect my conclusions to traditional Hawaiian knowledge.
E kolo ana no ke ēwe i ke ēwe.
The rootlet will creep toward the rootlets.
Of the same origin, kinfolks will seek and love each other.\textsuperscript{147}

While homesteading in Hawai‘i was the intended vehicle for settling American Anglo-Saxons and increasing a voter base that would support the Haole Oligarchy, the Ha‘ikū homesteads could not have happened if it were not for the help of like-minded Haole sugar barons. The pro-American Anglo-Saxon, anti-Kānaka and Asian attitude that they shared facilitated their partnership. While many historians have written about the antagonistic relationships between plantation owners and the territorial government, my research shows the extreme cooperation that H.P. Baldwin and others exhibited while working with the government in the creation and support of these Maui homesteads. The Ha‘ikū homesteads could never have been actualized if it wasn't for the help of Maui sugar interests.

Lilo aku la ka nui a koe ka unahi.
Most [of the fish] are taken and only the scales are left.
Said after someone has taken the lion's share for himself.\textsuperscript{148}

There were many things that set the Ha‘ikū homesteads apart from other Hawai‘i territorial homesteads. First and foremost was the fact that the homesteaders were exclusively American, with other races being excluded through the use of Settlement Associations. Both tracts were categorized as first class agricultural lands, which most other homesteads were not, and the Ha‘ikū lots were much larger in comparison. The per-acre average valuation of these lands was considerably lower than the valuations of other homestead lands of lesser quality. There was also more infrastructure provided to

\textsuperscript{147} Mary Kawena Pukui, ‘Ōlelo No‘eau (Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1983), 39.
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid., 216.
the Ha‘ikū homesteaders, including the transportation of their cultivated goods. In spite of these advantages, the Ha‘ikū homesteads were eventually deemed a failure.

**I ka waha no a ulu ka ‘ai; i ka waha no a maloʻo.**  
*Food crops are made to grow by the mouth; while still in the mouth they wither.*  
Said of one who talks about farming and plans to plant but does nothing about it.\(^{149}\)

One of the hallmarks of homesteading is small-scale subsistence farming. Biographical research of the Ha‘ikū homesteaders is in complete conflict with this hallmark, since the vast majority of them had no farming experience at all. In addition, roughly one-third of these settlers were territorial government employees, having their appointment or hiring approval rendered by then Governor Frear. Congressional Delegate Jonah Kūhiō Kalanianaʻole filed a complaint against Frear that exposed details of his nepotistic connections to a few of the Ha‘ikū homesteaders. While it is hard to ascertain the degree of successful cultivation that took place in these tracts, the eventual exodus of these settlers was partly blamed on the lack of "real farmers" that settled there.\(^{150}\)

**ʻAi no ke kōlea a momona hoʻi i Kahiki.**  
*The plover eats until fat, then returns to the land from which it came.*  
Said of a foreigner who comes to Hawaiʻi, makes money, and departs to his homeland to enjoy his wealth.\(^{151}\)

Just after the first of the Ha‘ikū homesteaders went through the prove-up process and obtained ownership of their lots, there was a mass exodus of these new landowners, who left Ha‘ikū for other endeavors. While this emigration was dubbed a failure in newspapers and periodicals, most of the settlers retained their ownership of the land.

Some of them entered into lease agreements with Japanese aliens, which was forbidden by the Organic Act, and collected a percentage of the cultivation profits as rent. Others leased to Haole that wanted to try their hand at farming, charging annual rent amounts that were sometimes double the homesteaders' total land purchase price. Eventually, the majority of this acreage was subdivided and sold off for huge profits.

_E uhi wale no ʻaʻole e nalo, he imu puhi._
_No matter how much one covers a steaming imu, the smoke will rise._
The secret will get out.\(^{152}\)

The mystery of Hawaiʻi's territorial period needs to be revealed in order for Kānaka to truly understand the disenfranchisement that we were victim to. Many of the land laws that were put into place during this time period have had consequences that continue to impact Kānaka negatively currently. Property values have been driven to the point that many Kānaka, myself included, will probably never be able to afford land in the place that we come from. It is my hope that this project has begun the process of exposing the contents of the covered imu, even if we aren't sure what is being cooked within.

_E ola ka lāhui Hawaiʻi! E ola, E ola, E ola mau nō!_

---
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