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Abstract

In traditional Hawaiian society, the konohiki were a specialized class of chiefs appointed by the Aliʻi Nui (high chiefs) to steward their land, water and human resources. Their self-sustaining and holistic methods of land and resource stewardship became known as the Konohiki System. The System’s principles were governed by the ancient Hawaiian Kapu religion and based on cultural values of Mālama ʻĀina – the deep familial ties and reciprocal stewardship between the ʻĀina (land and environment), the Akua (deities) and kanaka (man).

To date, the konohiki’s history remains fragmented, insufficient, and lacking the Hawaiian perspective. This thesis is the first comprehensive, focused study on the konohiki utilizing a wider range of Hawaiian-language primary sources mainly from 19th century Hawaiian-language newspapers, published in 1834-1948, and the 1848 Māhele land records. These sources uncover invaluable Hawaiian cultural, historical and ancestral knowledge, and provide new information that changes the complex and often misunderstood historiography of the konohiki.
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Chapter 1. Traditional Hawaiian Resource Stewardship of the Konohiki

Introduction

In traditional Hawaiian society, the konohiki were a special class of chiefs who were appointed by the Aliʻi Nui (high chiefs) to steward their lands and resources. They developed holistic and sustainable methods of environmental conservation and preservation known as the Konohiki System. This System was governed by the ancient Hawaiian Kapu religion and laws.

Although the konohiki played a pivotal role in the rise and advancement of early Hawaiian society, their history remains fragmented, insufficient, and nearly forgotten. This is largely due to Western colonialism in Hawaiʻi for over two centuries resulting in the denigration of the culture, loss of Hawaiian ancestral knowledge, the decline of the Hawaiian language and the omission of the Native perspective in Hawaiian history.

To date, there lacks a single, comprehensive study dedicated specifically to the konohiki in contrast to the extensive scholarship on other classes of Hawaiian society. Yet, thousands of konohiki once populated these islands and have left an incredible legacy of ancestral knowledge in sustainable land and resource stewardship and chiefly leadership.

Literature on the konohiki is often limited to minor sub-sections or brief narratives within larger bodies of scholarship, but is not the primary subject of any focused study. The konohiki are frequently stereotyped as cruel and oppressive authorities over important resources of labor, land, food and water.

The goal of my thesis is to disprove these stereotypes, and to expand and deepen the scholarship of the konohiki by establishing a comprehensive, concise and accurate history that they deserve. I will be incorporating a wider range of Hawaiian-language primary sources specific to the konohiki that have been historically neglected. They include ancient Hawaiian texts, the 19th century Hawaiian-language newspapers (HLN), Hawaiian kingdom documents, personal konohiki letters, Māhele land records (MLR), their personal wills, probates, and obituaries. The inclusion of these rich cultural and historical sources will help to answer three important questions of this thesis, 1) who were the konohiki? 2) what was their function?, and 3) how did their chiefly stewardship role transform in the 19th century?
Chapter Reviews

This paper is divided into five chapters forming a chronological, historical arc of the konohiki from pre-contact Hawaiʻi through the 1848 Māhele land division.

Chapter 1 defines and clarifies the traditional role of the konohiki and their ancient origins. It explains their kuleana (responsibilities) as resources stewards based on Hawaiian values of Mālama ʻĀina or familial love and care of the land and natural resources as sacred ancestors. It also examines the konohiki’s administrative role in traditional Hawaiian land tenure governed by a highly stratified social hierarchy during pre-contact Hawaiʻi. The kūlana or rank of the konohiki in chiefly society is also analyzed and how they acquired and maintained their status and authority as resource stewards of the Aliʻi Nui.

Chapter 2 discusses the diverse range and scope of the konohiki’s specialized ʻoihana (job/function) involving religious duties and the administration of labor, tributary “taxation,” communal projects, food cultivation, freshwater, and ocean fisheries.

Chapter 3 examines the digitized HLN collection for new information on the konohiki that adds valuable ancestral knowledge to their scholarship. Published between 1834 and 1948, the HLN form a natural timeline and temporal framework for charting and analyzing the konohiki’s transformation and decline during the 19th century.

Searching on the term “konohiki” in the HLN, I retrieved 532 digitized pages and articles mentioning the konohiki from the “Hoʻolaupaʻi Hawaiian Nūpepa Collection” on the Ulukau Hawaiian Electronic Library website http://www.nupepa.org/. They were catalogued in a database by publication date and title of the newspaper to manage, examine, and annotate these writings. I annotated 150 articles and selected 60 articles that were published in the first two decades of the HLN (1834-1855) from the four earliest newspapers, Ka Lama Hawai, Ke Kumu Hawai, Ka Nonanona and Ka Elele. These 60 chosen articles correspond with important historical periods and events that impacted the konohiki in the 19th century.

This chapter is divided in two sections by decade, 1834-1844 and 1845-1855. The first decade examines the konohiki’s contributions in the successful spread of Christianity and education that was contradicted in the mission-controlled HLN. It also analyzes the devastating effects of Native depopulation from foreign diseases on their lives, the increasing foreign
demands on the konohiki for resources and labor, and the gradual replacement of their positions under new Western laws and a Constitutional government. The second section traces the decline of their class due to the burgeoning foreign-controlled government and its increasingly complex laws and taxation system that replaced traditional konohiki with foreigners and government bureaucrats.

Chapter 4 traces the 1848 Māhele land claim processes of five konohiki who served under King Kamehameha III. The Māhele records, written mainly in the Hawaiian language, contain the land history of the king’s konohiki and their overwhelming challenges with the arduous claim process while dying from foreign diseases.

Chapter 5 synthesizes and summarizes my findings of the konohiki’s reconstructed history and transformation from pre-contact chiefly land stewards to powerless, landless commoners after the 1848 Māhele. It re-examines the methodology of my research, its successes and challenges with the sources used in this paper and recommendations for future research on this topic.

**Literature Review**

The fragmented pieces of the konohiki’s history are scattered throughout numerous sources written in Hawaiian and English. The following primary and secondary sources influenced this research on the konohiki and are valuable to their existing scholarship. These sources are organized and reviewed according to the chapters of this thesis.

Chapters 1 and 2 discuss the origins of the konohiki and define who they were and their functions in traditional Hawaiian society? As an oral culture, ancestral knowledge and cultural understanding of the language has been lost. Therefore, primary sources of pre-contact konohiki information are rare and if located, are cultural and historical gems. The inclusion of ancient texts, like the *Kumulipo* cosmogonic chant, was culturally significant and helped to identify, perhaps, the earliest documented konohiki genealogy of Kuheleimoana and his son Konohiki. The chant traces their chiefly lineage starting with the evolution of the natural world down to illustrious Akua (deities) and Ali‘i Nui.
Primary English sources of early post-contact history include the journals of British explorers Captain James Cook (1778-1779) and Archibald Menzies, a naturalist of Captain Vancouver (1792-1794) who both complimented on the Hawaiians’ highly cultivated and organized landscape of kalo (taro) fields and fishponds. Although many early explorers and visitors make no specific references to the konohiki, there observations indicate evidence of the konohiki’s work and contributions.

Secondary sources include the translated works of 19th century Hawaiian scholars David Malo (1951), Samuel Kamakau (1976, 1986, and 1961) and Kepelino (2007). Their memoirs and eye-witness accounts are informative pieces of cultural and historical knowledge describing the functions of the konohiki and their class in the context of chiefly culture and traditional Hawaiian society. Their writings describe the konohiki as centralized authorities of the ahupua’a which was the most important socio-economic and political land division in Hawaiian society.

Malo, Kamakau and Kepelino received Western educations and served in influential positions in the new foreign-controlled Hawaiian kingdom government. Their Christian and Western biases, at times, influenced their interpretations of traditional culture practices and historical events in their writings.

Of these scholars, Kamakau’s writings, translated to English from 19th century Hawaiian newspapers, are the most extensive ranging from pre-contact Hawai’i to the 1850’s. Kamakau was an important participant in the history he passionately authored as a scholar, educator, government legislator, land commissioner and newspaper writer. His writings are insightful, first-hand accounts of the konohiki’s personal experiences and relationships with the Ali’i, foreigners, and the makaʻāinana (commoner). He details their achievements and challenges adapting to radical foreign changes and weaves culturally and historically rich stories of daily life in 19th century Hawai’i.

Emma Nakuina’s article, Ancient Water Rights and Some of the Customs Pertaining to Them (1893), is the most comprehensive and definitive source of konohiki stewardship regarding fresh water management, conservation and distribution. She explains the cultural significance of freshwater in Hawaiian society and details the strict regulatory system of the konohiki who ensured equitable and sustainable water allocation to wet kalo farmers. Nakuina
was of Aliʻi descent and a respected scholar who was appointed as water commissioner and judge over the Kona district of Oʻahu in 1892 by Hawaiʻi’s last monarch, Queen Liliʻuokalani.

Nakuina’s writings are from a cultural perspective defining each aspect of water management using Hawaiian concepts and terms. Her expertise and authority on this topic is based on her formal training and first-hand knowledge she acquired as a water commissioner adjudicating water rights cases and disputes. Despite her accomplished background, her article is sometimes overlooked by scholars and eclipsed by the writings of Antonio Perry (1912 and 1914) who was an Associate Justice of the Hawaiʻi Supreme Court. Perry’s material is technical and specific to the evolution of modern Hawaiian water laws. Although he references Nakuina’s work in his writings, he fails to fully credit her as a water expert and authority.

E. S. Craighill, E. G. Handy and M. K. Pukui’s Native Planters in Old Hawaii (1972) covers an expansive range of subjects regarding the konohiki’s administration of the land and resources aligned with the hierarchical social structure in pre-contact Hawaiʻi. They also cover a wide range of the konohiki’s ‘oihana in agriculture and aquaculture that were tied to their religious duties. Pukui, a renowned Hawaiian scholar who grew up in the traditional culture and fluent in the language, contributed her ancestral knowledge that enriched the anthropological work of Handy. Together, their scholarship provides cultural understanding of the konohiki’s function in traditional Hawaiian society and the significance of each job they performed.

Pukui’s Hawaiian Dictionary (1986), co-authored with American linguist and educator, Samuel Elbert, is a wealth of rare cultural knowledge that researchers often access for deeper understanding of the language, literature and historical materials written in Hawaiian. In addition, Pukui’s book of 3,000 ‘ōlelo noʻeau (proverbial sayings) (1983) teach Hawaiian cultural values of the konohiki pertaining to proper chiefly behavior, land stewardship, and reciprocal relationships between the chiefs and people.

In her book, Native Land and Foreign Desires: Pehea lā e Pono Āi? (1992), Hawaiian scholar and historian, Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, defines the traditional concept of mālama ʻāina or land stewardship based on the interdependent and familial relationships between the ʻāina (land), Hawaiians and their akua (deities). These were the principles of the Konohiki System which the konohiki implemented to ensure the lands and resources of their Aliʻi were highly
productive and self-sustaining from mountains to ocean. The Aliʻi Nui’s chiefly mana (divine power) and waiwai (wealth, resources) were tied to the harmonious balance between their land, people and the gods. As earthly akua and intermediaries for the spiritual, divine akua, the Aliʻi Nui were ultimately responsible for the care and welfare of the people. The konohiki assisted them in achieving this harmony that was pono (balanced/righteous).

Kameʻelehiwa’s book also includes her exhaustive and detailed research on the 1848 Māhele which remains a formative classic that rigorous scholars rely on. Her comprehensive and detailed synthesis of historical events before, during and after the Māhele shows the complexity of this land tenure revolution from a Hawaiian perspective. The Aliʻi were forced to make difficult decisions and sacrifices while adopting foreign social, economic and political changes to save their dying people. She explains how Hawaiians were dispossessed of lands at the hands of foreigners which is further validated in my study of Kamehameha III’s five konohiki and their Māhele land claims in Chapter 4.

Kameʻelehiwa’s identification of Kamehameha III’s 218 konohiki by name and categorization by genealogy, rank and land information provides quantifiable data and a clearer picture of the lands the konohiki sacrificed and lost resulting in the end of their class after the Māhele. The identification of a konohiki is important in rebuilding their history as it leads to higher accuracy in confirming their information in other sources. A database of konohiki names was created to collect and organize their information for quicker and more efficient reference.

Hawaiian anthropologist, Carolyn Kehau Cachola-Abad’s PhD dissertation, *The Evolution of Hawaiian Socio-Political Complexity: An Analysis of Hawaiian Oral Traditions* (2000) examines the Aliʻi Nui class using ancient oral histories. She creates a socio-political framework that helps define the rank and status of the konohiki within the highly stratified Aliʻi hierarchy and culture. Her research provides insight into the complexities of chiefly society and the konohiki’s duties serving the Aliʻi through the administration of their lands and the people.

Hawaiian historian and scholar, Kanalu Young, examines the kaukau aliʻi class in his book, *Rethinking the Native Hawaiian Past* (1986). The kaukau aliʻi were personal family attendants and high-ranking land stewards of the Aliʻi. He provides invaluable cultural insight into the complex world of chiefly service and their important role in Hawaiian society. As chiefly
land stewards, the konohiki are included in his study and Young examines genealogical ranking and intermarrying between Aliʻi Nui and kaukau aliʻi relatives. The descendants of these unions were the konohiki who were appointed by their Aliʻi relatives to oversee the daily management of their lands and resources. His work also confirms the sub-hierarchical levels within the servant classes of the kaukau aliʻi and konohiki to accommodate the increasing intensification of food production and a rapidly expanding population.

Archaeological studies of Earle (1977, 1978, 1997), Dixon, Gosser, and Williams (2008) and Kirch (1997, 2010, 2012) examine the physical evidence and remnants above and below ground left by the konohiki in the form of ‘auwai systems, loʻi kalo (wet taro fields), kalo maloʻo (dry-land kalo fields), heiau (religious temples), and kauhale (house sites). Modern anthropological and archaeological research of Hawaiʻi explain complex Hawaiian social structures that determined land usage, settlement patterns and the construction of important cultural sites such as heiau that were connected with the konohiki’s function and responsibilities.

Chapter 3 analyzes the transformation of the konohiki in the 19th century using the HLN and other primary and secondary sources to supplement and contextualize the newspaper articles. Researching and “mining” the HLN for information was an incredible “time travel.” Extracted from the Hoʻolaupaʻi Nūpepa Collection website, the 500 plus digitized articles that were found are a fraction of the 125,000 pages of the original HLN collection. According to Hawaiian language scholar, Puakea Nogelmeier (2010), only 20% of these original pages are digitized and word searchable. These 500 konohiki articles are part of the 20% of the digitized HLN pages. There is an incredible amount of information in the remaining 80% of the undigitized HLN pages.

Puakea Nogelmeier’s book Mai Paʻa I ka Leo: Historical Voice in Hawaiian Primary Materials, Looking Forward and Listening Back (2010), Noenoe Silva and Iokepa Badis’ article, “Early Hawaiian Newspapers and Kanaka Maoli Intellectual History 1843-1855” (2008), and Esther Moʻokini’s manuscript “The Hawaiian Newspapers” (1974) are required reading for HLN researchers to help them read, navigate, organize, translate, and understand this collection.
The first two decades of the HLN (1834-1855) that are examined in this thesis were controlled by the Protestant mission and missionaries who dictated the content, titles, authors and use of the HLN. These early papers publicly criticized and denigrated the konohiki for resisting religious conversion and their perceived “heathen” lifestyles.

Despite the negativity in the early HLN, these articles provide interesting details of konohiki names, their different functions, connections to their lands, obituaries, disputes with foreigners and makaʻāinana, and challenges during foreign changes. Obituaries reveal intimate details of the konohiki’s personal life and highlight their achievements and how they were beloved by their people.

The following primary and secondary resources were used to supplement and contextualize the HLN articles. Hawaiian-language primary sources include the Hawaiian Chiefs’ Letters (1834-1854) in the Private Collections of the Hawai‘i State Archives. These correspondences reveal the increasing foreign pressures on the konohiki directed by their Ali‘i for supplies, food, and labor. Letters between konohiki discuss interisland shipping logistics of various supplies for foreign ship provisioning and building materials for church and school construction. However, shipping of food, livestock and personal items requested by the Ali‘i and the organizing of labor for food production was a necessity, not an option, for their people’s daily living. Foreigners often criticized the Ali‘i for exploiting and oppressing their own Native people, ignoring that the chiefs’ pressures on labor were due to increasing foreign demands on the chiefs for resources and food.

Secondary sources for Chapter 3 include *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887* (2002) by Hawaiian historian and scholar, Jon K. Kamakawiwo'ole Osorio. His book covers the political history of the Hawaiian kingdom and how the adoption of Western laws and a Constitutional government disempowered a dying Native population and “dismembered” the lāhui Hawai‘i (Hawaiian nation). He discusses the effects of Christianity, education and Western laws which transformed the konohiki’s role as traditional land and resource stewards for the Ali‘i to Western scholars, law makers and civil servants of the new constitutional government. The function of the traditional konohiki diminished with a shift in power to the “new” konohiki of foreigners and Christianized, educated Hawaiians, including konohiki who transitioned from their traditional role. Like Kame‘eleihiwa, Osorio identifies konohiki by name such as S. P. Kalama, Paul Kanoa and lists members of the House of Nobles and House of Representatives which include many konohiki. The identification of each konohiki is extremely valuable since it verifies them in other sources to reconstruct the konohiki’s personal histories.

The reprint of *Hawaiian Laws 1841-1842* (1994) by Ted Adameck is an informative source for referencing early constitutional laws that diminished the traditional function of the konohiki. Written in Hawaiian with an English translation, this work helps interpret 19th century legal language and concepts.

John Kalei Laimana’s M. A. Thesis, *The Phenomenal Rise to Literacy in Hawa‘i: Hawaiian Society in the Early Nineteenth Century* (2011) is a seminal study that credits Hawaiians, instead of missionaries, for the successful rise of education and literacy in Hawa‘i. Based on primary sources of missionaries and other foreign residents, Laimana provides a detailed accounting of the schools, teachers, students, books, resources, and labor to show the extensive education system that was largely built and sustained by the konohiki and Ali‘i Nui, and not the small minority of missionaries. The Hawaiian kingdom mainly financed the infrastructure of over a thousand schools which does not include the multitude of churches that is examined in Chapter 3. Laimana’s thesis proves the spread of education and literacy in Hawa‘i would not have been achievable without Hawaiians.
Chapter 4 examines the Māhele land records of 5 of King Kamehameha’s 218 konohiki to understand how foreign changes in land tenure negatively impacted their lives, their lands and their heirs. The Māhele records are a cultural and historical treasure trove that contains the most detailed, personal information on the konohiki of any primary source that was researched for this thesis. They specifically identify numerous konohiki by name and are filled with their testimonies, historical land information, traditional place names and terms, their Aliʻi Nui relationships, konohiki class dynamics, chiefly inheritance patterns, traditional land usage and tenure, cultural land knowledge, and the konohiki’s land claim information. A substantial percentage of the Māhele records are now accessible through the following websites:

1) AVA Konohiki http://www.avakonohiki.org/

Dorothy Barrère’s typed manuscript, *The King’s Mahele* (1994), is a compilation of meticulously inventoried lists of land claim information for each of Kamehameha III’s konohiki and Aliʻi during the 1848 Māhele. The Māhele was a momentous transition from traditional Hawaiian subsistence land tenure to Western privatization of land. Each parcel of claimed land required the burdensome process of filing a Land Commission Award (LCA), surveying the land, claimant and witness testimonies to confirm the claim, and the issue of a Royal Patent by the kingdom to gain the title and rights to the land. Barrère includes her personal biographical notes on the konohiki and their genealogies. She was a renowned researcher at the Bishop Museum and the editor of many 19th century Hawaiian classics.

Barrère’s inventoried lists are incredibly useful in managing and cross-checking an overwhelming number of complicated documents and information for each of the konohiki’s multiple land claims.

Edith McKinzie’s *Hawaiian Genealogies Vol. 1 and 2* (2002 and 2003) traces and charts the profiled konohiki’s genealogies. Hawaiians were genealogically tied to their lands and konohiki families descended from high-ranking Aliʻi lineages through intermarriage. Understanding their genealogy provides greater clarity of their land history and records.
Jon Chinen’s book, *The Great Māhele: Hawaiʻi’s Land Division of 1848* (1958), details the process of the 1848 land division between Kamehameha III and his Aliʻi and konohiki. It outlines the tedious and laborious land claim process the konohiki were required to complete to acquire ownership of their lands. Chinen was the Attorney General (1953-1959) during Hawaiʻi’s years as U. S. Territory and his book is from a legal perspective. Although this short, but informative book remains a popular source that is often cited, numerous studies on the Māhele have been conducted since its publication in 1958 that are more comprehensive and updated.

Jon Van Dyke’s book, *Who Owns the Crown Lands of Hawaiʻi?* (2008), is a comprehensive re-examination of the complexities of the 1848 Māhele and the kingdom’s Crown Lands that were illegally taken in the 1893 Overthrow. His work is valuable to Native Hawaiians in gaining new understanding of their land history to reclaim their sovereignty and indigenous rights to these lands. Van Dyke was a law professor at the William S. Richardson School of Law at the University of Hawaiʻi, Mānoa and explains difficult legal concepts that are understandable to the layman. More importantly for this thesis, it is informative in understanding the challenges and losses of the konohiki adopting foreign land tenure.

In their recent journal article, “Toward an Inventory of Ahuʻpuaʻa in the Hawaiian Kingdom: A Survey of Nineteenth-and early Twentieth-Century Cartographic and Archival Records of the Island of Hawaiʻi” (2014), Lorenz Gonschor (Political Scientist) and Kamanamaikalani Beamer (Geographer) provide new analysis and calculations of the number of ahupuaʻa which they estimate to have been 1,825. This new data leads to higher population estimates of the konohiki that are conducted in this thesis that have not been previously explored.

Collectively these aforementioned sources provided cultural and historical pieces in forming a more comprehensive and authoritative history of the konohiki. They offer a deeper and more accurate understanding of these important chiefly stewards which is the goal of this thesis.
Mālama ‘Āina and Konohiki Resource Stewardship

The Hawaiian word mālama means “[t]o take care of, tend, attend, care for, preserve, protect, beware, save, maintain; to keep or observe, as a taboo; to conduct, as a service; to serve, honor, as God; care, preservation, support, fidelity, loyalty; custodian, caretaker, keeper” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 232). Collectively, these meanings accurately define the konohiki’s principle values and practices in their stewardship of the ‘Āina or land known as Mālama ‘Āina. As an oral culture, the konohiki had to learn, retain, apply and impart ancestral wisdom and traditions using these numerous bodies of knowledge from nature and experiences.

The Hawaiian concept of ‘Āina, which means “that which feeds,” holistically included all the natural elements as ancestral akua who reciprocally fed and nourished each other. Animals and plants of the kai (sea) took care of their siblings of the ‘Āina and vice versa expressing the universal dualism and harmonious balance in the Hawaiian worldview. The cultural values of Mālama ‘Āina was the foundation of Hawaiian society. It was especially important to the konohiki, as chiefly resource stewards, who maintained the delicate balance and interdependence between nature, man and Akua.

In the Kumulipo or Hawaiian cosmogonic chant, the ‘Āina was a divine, powerful and dynamic life source. More importantly, it was the sacred maternal ancestor, Papahānaumokuākea or Papa (earth mother) of Hawaiians. Papa, with her primogenitor counterpart, Wākea (sky father), gave birth to the islands of Hawaiʻi, Māui, Kauaʻi, Niʻihau, Lehua and Kaʻula in the pae ʻāina Hawaiʻi (Hawaiian archipelago). They were “the first ancestors of Hawaii’s race and the chiefs” (McKinzie 2003:1). Wākea taught Hawaiians the important cultural lesson of Mālama ‘Āina, that is, the care and stewardship of Papa mother earth. In doing so, she would reciprocally care for, protect and feed Hawaiians (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 24, 33).

In the 15th wā or verse of the Kumulipo, descending eighteen generations from Papa and Wākea, a konohiki named Kuheleimoana is born (Fornander 1920 V6 (III): 431). Kuheleimoana (k) and Mapunaiaaala (w) had a son, Konohiki, who was likely a konohiki by his name and inherited his father’s position. This genealogy is, perhaps, the earliest documented konohiki
lineage to date. Kuheleimoana was also referred as Kalanikuheleimoana, the “kalani” signifying his high status or rank as a konohiki (Kalākaua 2001: 80).

*Mālama ‘Āina* was governed by the strict laws under the ancient *Kapu System* (Hawaiian religion). Kapu laws regulated appropriate and religious periods for planting, harvesting, fishing, and gathering resources from ma uka to ma kai (mountain to the sea). Under the *Kapu System*, the konohiki were granted specific rights and authority by the Ali‘i Nui to kapu (prohibit) access or use of the land, ocean, and resources. It also included managing and supervising the maka‘āinana or labor force to make their Ali‘i Nui’s lands productive, fertile and sustainable. The authority of the konohiki to regulate and access resources was known as *Konohiki Rights* and the sustainable stewardship of resources from ma uka to ma kai by the konohiki was known as the *Konohiki System*.

The konohiki’s authority to kapu and manage a wide array of key resources signified possession of important chiefly mana (power) bestowed by their Ali‘i Nui. However, unlike the divine mana of their Ali‘i, this mana was based on specialization, expertise and rank. It was a vital socio-religious aspect of their kūlana and ‘oihana that is often overlooked or minimized. Moreover, in English sources, konohiki have been historically referred as land agents, landlords, or headmen which marginalizes their chiefly mana, kūlana and kuleana.

In addition to the religious aspects of *Mālama ‘Āina*, there are the deep emotional and familial feelings of *Aloha ‘Āina* or love and affection for the land. The konohiki expressed this aloha (love) in their mālama of a beloved ancestor, the ‘Āina. In the personal will of Kamehameha III’s konohiki, Puhalahua, he referred to his lands as “ku‘u ‘āina,” (my land), “ku‘u kuleana (my kuleana), and “ku‘u mau apana aina” (my pieces of land)) (Puhalahua 1855: 1). The Hawaiian word “ku‘u” means “my, mine... frequently used before... kinship terms and expresses affection” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 187). Therefore, Puhalahua’s use of “ku‘u” expressed his familial ties and deep affection of *Aloha ‘Āina* for his lands.

*Mālama ‘Āina* and *Aloha ‘Āina* are forms of topophilia, a familial love and connectedness to the land and environment that could not exist without the other. In the Hawaiian worldview, the lack of aloha for the ‘Āina and humankind makes it impossible to mālama them in a pono way and vice versa. Therefore, the konohiki’s mindset and ‘oihana was
to mālama the Ōina based on Aloha Ōina. For generations, the konohiki successfully balanced these values in the judicious and prudent stewardship of the Ōina and all the kumu waiwai (resources) that was sustainable for generations.

**Traditional Hawaiian Land Tenure and Social Organization**

Pre-contact Hawaiian society developed into a complex chiefdom with centralized hierarchical polities of hereditary Aliʻi Nui who were revered as earthly Akua. The stratified social hierarchy developed in parallel with a highly organized and tiered land system contributed to intensified food production and distribution by Hawaiians (Cachola-Abad 2000). Remarkably, despite Hawaiʻi’s geographical isolation, it evolved as “the most complex of any Polynesian chiefdoms and probably any chiefdoms known elsewhere in the world” (Earle 1997: 34).

The Aliʻi Nui held ultimate jurisdiction and stewardship over the Ōina on behalf of the Akua while “enforcing all kapu and kānāwai [laws]...training and monitoring aliʻi managers...[and] defending the nation’s lands and populace from aggression of other chiefs” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 153). The konohiki chiefs below carried out the kapu and kānāwai as their service for the Aliʻi Nui. Following territorial conquests,

Each principal chief divided his lands anew and gave them out to an inferior order of chiefs or persons, by whom they were subdivided again and again (often) passing through the hands of four, five or six persons from the King down to the lowest class of tenants (Van Dyke 2008: 427).

The Aliʻi Nui allocated jurisdiction over land divisions of ahupuaʻa and ʻili ōina (land subdivision) to the konohiki “in recognition of loyal and outstanding services” (McGregor 2007: 26). They further allocated their lands to other konohiki relatives and granted usage rights of smaller land divisions to the makaʻāinana. “Often the choicest ʻili lands went to relatives of the konohiki” (Kirch 2010: 49). Therefore, the ahupuaʻa was most closely associated with the konohiki as the central authority of this land division.

The konohiki’s “tenure on the land was dependent upon their benefactor, the chief...[and] the konohiki represented the collective interest of the aliʻi class over the makaʻāinana as well as the individual interest of his patron chief over the ahupuaʻa” (McGregor 2007: 26). They could easily be replaced by the Aliʻi Nui or through conquest by an outside Aliʻi.
In most instances when there was a change of *Aliʻi Nui*, the *makaʻāinana* would not be dispossessed of the ‘Āina upon which they lived and worked, regardless of the Mōʻī. Only the konohiki would change because the new *Aliʻi Nui* would bring in his own people. In this light, loyalty to a deposed *Aliʻi Nui* was unwise, if not nonsensical (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 45).

Understandably, bringing in one’s own konohiki to replace existing ones reduced risks of counter-rebellions or usurpation by the conquered. But, in some instances it seemed socially and economically rational for the incoming *Aliʻi* to retain the existing konohiki and incorporate them into the new regime. The local konohiki were valuable assets who possessed knowledge and experience in the management of the ahupua‘a. They also held ties with the makaʻāinana and established loyalties in the district.

For the konohiki who remained in their ahupua‘a, they risked losing their konohiki position if the new *Aliʻi Nui* did not retain them. Still, some chose “the option of staying on as a kamaʻāina [native born] on his “own land,” that which he had worked domestically, on the condition that he...became a makaʻāinana or common farmer holding “under” the konohiki who superseded him” (Sahlins 1992: 190). In some instances, remaining with their ahupua‘a was worth the sacrifice to stay with their families in hopes of regaining their former konohiki position.

At the eve of foreign contact in 1778, the konohiki were part of an expanding and rising *Aliʻi* class who were competing for prime territories of fertile lands and rich resources. The increasing stratification of the social hierarchy was attributed to the rise of the *Aliʻi*, an expanding population, accessibility to the rich diversity of island resources, and the intensification of food production through new and innovative agricultural and aquacultural technologies (Earle 1978: 172; McCoy and Graves 2010).

To economically and politically sustain this highly organized and growing society, the konohiki class increased and branched into different ranks and specializations serving in every level of land division as “nā konohiki ʻai moku, ʻai kalana, ʻai ʻokana, ʻai ahupuaʻa, ʻai o loko, ʻai ʻili kūpono, ʻai ʻili ʻāina” (Kamakau 1996: 154; 1961: 177; Malo 2006: 4).

Each level of konohiki contributed in administering the *Konohiki System* to mālama the *Aliʻi Nui*’s lands, fisheries, freshwater sources, and labor force. This complex, integrated resource management system consisted of holistic approaches to sustainable resource
stewardship. It was based on cultural, religious and economic controls that respected the land as ancestors and prevented overexploitation of the environment (Jokiel, Rodgers, Walsh, Polhemus, Wilhelm 2011).

**Ahupuaʻa Land Division and the Konohiki**

The ahupuaʻa was the most important land division due to its important socio-economic, political and religious role in Hawaiian society. They typically were pie-shaped divisions running from ma uka to ma kai containing most of the resources for a sustainable, subsistence lifestyle. The konohiki, who managed the daily operations of the ahupuaʻa, had considerable responsibility and accountability to ensure their ahupuaʻa was well organized, efficiently managed and productive. They were accountable to the higher ranking Aliʻi ‘ai ahupuaʻa or Aliʻi ‘ai moku.

The ahupuaʻa is often inaccurately described in Western capitalist terms as a taxable economic unit that supplied its inhabitants with all the resources to subsist. First, not every ahupuaʻa had all the resources for total subsistence living. Each division varied in types of resources, size, shape, and its population living in the ahupuaʻa. Therefore, the konohiki’s livelihood also varied depending on these varying factors. Second, Hawaiians held a deep, familial love and attachment to the ʻĀina of their ahupuaʻa. The people, from chief to commoner, had to work harmoniously and collaboratively in a society and culture based on social interdependence and reciprocal duty.

The ahupuaʻa was not an inanimate, economic entity based solely on production of input and output. Instead, the ahupuaʻa provided the social, political, economic and religious structure of Hawaiian society and holistically interconnected the ʻĀina, the people and their Akua. It “formed the basis of community life, work, taxation and ceremonial activity” (Ralston 1984: 22).

The konohiki are most commonly associated with the ahupuaʻa than any other class of Aliʻi for the following reasons:

The administration of the ahupuaʻa rested with the konohiki. The konohiki enjoyed certain rights to the land and resources of the ahupuaʻa, and to the labor and surplus products of its occupants. The necessity of providing adequately for both himself and the aliʻi nui generally compelled the konohiki
to manage the economy of the ahupua’a in such a way as to both conserve and enrich its human and natural resources (Lam 1989: 243).

Higher ranking Ali‘i Nui, above the konohiki, were responsible for the administration of higher levels of state politics, religion and warfare. Therefore, the konohiki were entrusted by their Ali‘i to administer the daily management of the ahupua’a or sub-divisions of ‘ili ‘āina often situated away from the Ali‘i’s royal center or seat of governance. The konohiki held much autonomy granted by their Ali‘i and served as centralized authorities of their ahupua’a.

It was the konohiki’s kuleana to ensure their ahupua’a produced sufficient levels of food, material resources and labor to sustain the people. In return, the makaʻāinana received usage rights and privileges to the land and resources from the konohiki for their contributions of produce and labor. The ahupua’a boundaries “were adopted and instituted by the ali‘i and konohiki to delineate units for collection of tribute” (McGregor 2007: 27).

The higher Ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a ruled the ahupua’a but, the “[e]ntire ahupua’a, or portions of the land were generally under the jurisdiction of appointed Konohiki or subordinate chief-landlords who answered to an ali‘i-‘ai-ahupua’a (chief who controlled the ahupua’a resources)” (Maly 2001: 7-8). It is important to note, “[t]he title to an ahupuua was not hereditary; these subdivisions were allocated and reallocated to loyal supporters by the chief of the moku at the time of his accession” (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 48).

Like the Ali‘i, the konohiki were supported from the produce and labors of the makaʻāinana in their ahupua’a. Special designated sub-divisions called haku one were specifically reserved and cultivated by the makaʻāinana solely for the konohiki’s support and benefit.

Religion was a vital part of daily life in the ahupua’a and directly tied to the people’s collaborative efforts to keep the land, resources and people healthy, productive, and harmonious. The konohiki helped build and maintain heiau, worshipped specific Akua during appropriate times of the day or seasons to ensure abundant crops and marine life to feed the people.

---

1'The term ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a is not widely used and in fact is not noted by Pūku‘i and Elbert (1986), it is occasionally encountered in texts. An example of this is in the moʻolelo of Kūali‘i when Hāloalena, the ali‘i nui of Lāna‘i, issues a proclamation to all of his district chiefs. In doing so he refers to both ali‘i ‘ai moku and ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a” (Cachola-Abad 2000:91).
One of the most important religious ceremonies pertaining to the ahupuaʻa was the annual Makahiki harvest festival honoring the Akua Lono, god of agriculture, peace, fertility and rain. This was a period when war was forbidden and Hawaiians offered Lono the “first fruits” of their harvest with celebratory feasting, peace-making activities and recreation. The konohiki performed the religious protocols of organizing and collecting the hoʻokupu or offerings of food and craft items from the people of their ahupuaʻa and presented them to the Aliʻi as offerings to Lono. “[E]ach konohiki also brought tribute for his own landlord, which was called waiwai maloko” (Malo 1951: 142).

The word ahupuaʻa means “pig altar” on which the hoʻokupu was presented by the konohiki. The ahu or altar marked the ma kai boundaries of each ahupuaʻa division and comprised of a heap stones with “a wooden block² roughly resembling the head of a hog (puaʻa). The puaʻa was a symbol of Lono, being one of the forms (kino lau) of Lono” (Handy and Pukui 1972: 354).

Ahupuaʻa and Resources

The ahupuaʻa varied greatly in geographic size and shape (Lyons 1903: 23-7; Alexander 1890a: 106) that ranged “from a hundred acres up to thousands, in several instances containing more than one hundred thousand and more than two hundred thousand acres” (Supreme Court re boundaries of Pulehunui: 1879). Sizable ahupuaʻa, with more diverse resources and fertile lands required a larger population with levels of specialized konohiki to manage more labor intensive cultivation zones. Some ahupuaʻa were completely landlocked, or had more ocean shoreline and fisheries, while others had expansive interior kula (pastoral lands).

Ahupuaʻa with fertile river valleys, abundant fresh water sources and extensive ocean shorelines had intensified levels of agriculture and aquaculture requiring a larger network of konohiki specialized to sustain higher levels of food production. These “differences in the local resource base (agricultural land, water resources, stone for tools, and so on) resulted in differences in the production patterns of individual land sections” (Kirch 1985: 2).

---

² “Kukui [candlenut tree] log carved to resemble a pig’s head indicated where the people of each district were to pile their produce, tapa, mats, and feathers” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972:489).
Konohiki had an intimate knowledge of their ahupua’a by living in the area, studying, naming, and memorizing its unique features and boundaries.

In the old days each division of land, large or small, had its own individual name, and it was a matter...for the chiefs to learn and memorize the names of the ahupua’a and ‘iliaina on each island. Because of this memorization, the ancient names of the lands have come down to this day (Kamakau 1976: 8).

Ahupua’a sometimes lacked certain resources for complete subsistence such as koa trees for wa’a (canoes), wauke (bark cloth trees) for kapa (bark cloth) fabric, or birds for their highly prized feathers. Therefore, ahupua’a boundaries “did not restrict access by the ‘ohana [maka‘āinana family] to those natural resources needed for survival that were unavailable within their own ahupua’a” (McGregor 2007: 27). If the ahupua’a lacked certain resources the konohiki arranged access with the konohiki of neighboring ahupua’a for those resources.

One ingenious way Hawaiians solved the lack of resources was with land parcels of ‘ili lele or “jump strips” in another ahupua’a that had certain resources their ahupua’a needed. However, gathering resources from other ahupua’a was strictly regulated by the konohiki who enforced kapu on boundaries and access rights. “Residents of other ahupua’a could not enter an ahupua’a without permission of its konohiki and/or residents” (Cordy 2000: 42). According to Native testimonies in the Boundary Commission Reports to settle land disputes after the 1848 Māhele, “[i]f someone from another land was caught taking resources from a land other than their own, the items were taken from them....[i]nfractions of ahupua’a rights led to fights and death of intruders” (Maly 2004: 7). These reports also revealed “the boundaries were known by native tenants, and the rights to take or hunt resources in traditional times were fiercely protected – individuals without chiefly, genealogical claims, or residency ties to given lands were not allowed to trespass and take resources from the ahupua’a” (Maly 2005: 214).

Ahupua’a and Food Production

Within the chiefly class, the konohiki worked closest with the maka‘āinana who provided the labor force of the ahupua’a in food production. The konohiki were accountable to the Ali‘i for achieving efficient levels of food production and labor. They meticulously tracked the “taxes” or tributary payments collected from each ahupua’a as in the Makahiki festival. In the 1820’s, two visiting English missionaries Daniel Tyerman and George Bennett wrote,
...the king’s tax collectors, though they can neither read nor write, keep very 
exact accounts of all the articles, of all kinds, collected from the inhabitants
throughout the island. This is done by one man, and the register is nothing 
more than a cordage from four to five hundred fathoms [approximately ½
mile] in length. Distinct portions of this are allotted to the various districts,
which are known one from another by knots, loops, and tufts, of different
shapes, sizes, and colors. Each tax-payer in the district has his part in this
string, and the number of dollars, hogs, dogs, pieces of sandal-wood, quantity
of taro, &c., at which he is rated, is well defined by means of marks, of the
above kinds most ingeniously diversified. It is probable that the famous
quippos, or system of knots, whereby the records of the ancient Peruvian
empire are said to have been kept, were a similar, and perhaps not much
more comprehensive, mode of reckoning dates and associating names with
historical events (Tyerman and Bennett 1832: 71).

By this account, Hawaiʻi was engaged in foreign international trade and a market economy
evident by the collections of Sandalwood and monetary currency.

Food production through cultivation and fishing was the main kuleana of the
makaʻāinana with the konohiki administering and regulating these activities for the Aliʻi Nui.

“Ahupuaʻa life was distinguished by shared use of land and resources, regulated jointly by
konohiki...and makaʻāinana....The resulting system included kapu, unwritten rules governing the
behavior of people” (Andrade 2008: 30).

In each ʻohana (family) of the makaʻāinana, the senior male members, or haku,
collaborated with the konohiki planning, organizing and executing the required work of the
ahupuaʻa. Haku were valuable to the konohiki who transmitted important information and
requests of the konohiki to the makaʻāinana. The haku were respected and knowledgeable
kūpuna (elders) who were long-time kamaʻāina (Native resident) of the area. The konohiki
commonly shared and exchanged ʻike, strategies and the workload with the haku and other
subordinate managers or luna. Maintaining this collaborative spirit amongst all level of workers
is an important Hawaiian value known as lōkahi (unity and harmony) which elevated and
benefited society as a whole.

The reciprocal and familial values of Mālama ʻĀina in traditional Hawaiian society
created socio-religious “checks and balances” preventing abuse of rights and privileges
between the classes. “[T]he responsibility of an ahupuaʻa chief was to make the ahupuaʻa
productive, and a stable workforce was necessary to achieve that end, abuses by ahupuaʻa chiefs were minimized” (MacKenzie 1991: 4).

Although the makaʻāinana were bound to the land, they risked losing their land tenure due to under-productivity and indolence. “[I]f the land lay neglected he [the makaʻāinana] was ordered off by the konohiki. The planter thereby lost his right to plant his holding, a right generally inherited from ancestors through successive generations” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 59). This protected the survival of the people and konohiki’s livelihood from unproductive makaʻāinana and uncultivated lands. It also upheld the Hawaiians’ religious duty and reverence to the Akua in nurturing and caring for the ‘Āina. Neglecting the land, in the Hawaiian mind, was sacrilegious towards one’s ancestors and the Akua.

On the other hand, the makaʻāinana were also free to relocate to other districts if treated unfairly by their konohiki and Aliʻi. This was known as ‘imi haku or to search for a pono Aliʻi Nui (Pukui 1983: 632; Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 44-45).

Kamakau further explains,

It was thought a great and worthy object in life to go in search of a chief or for a chief to seek a trustworthy follower, and it was through the faithful care of such servants that chiefs grew strong and multiplied (1961: 207).

This chief and servant interdependence controlled Aliʻi abuse since “the wealth and power of the aliʻi flowed from the labor of the makaʻāinana, who could withhold their services by moving to another division, the aliʻi generally exercised restraint in their demands on the commoners” (Lam 1989: 240). Aliʻi and konohiki were heavily reliant on the makaʻāinana’s labor so “[i]t was wholly to the advantage of the aliʻi landlord and his konohiki (land supervisor) to maintain this permanent bond between planter families and their land” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 41).

The Aliʻi’s tenure was tenuous and less predictable than the makaʻāinana’s. “The chiefs had the right to the fruits of the land and the property of the people, and when a chief was overthrown in war his followers also moved on....[I]t was they [Aliʻi and konohiki] who were the wanderers; [but] the people born of the soil remained...” (Kamakau 1961: 376).
The konohiki also risked being dismissed for failing to care for their people and his Aliʻi’s lands or killed with their Aliʻi in war or rebellion for abuse of power. A konohiki could be dispossessed of his lands for having a lazy mate. According to Malo,

...if the konohiki had a wife who only slept with him and did not work, she was called a ponohanaʻole. These women did not beat or print designs on the kapa. They just relaxed....This was a hewa that was sufficient enough to have the husband’s lands released because of her behavior (2006: 60).

The kapu system greatly aided the konohiki’s efforts in keeping order and structure to mālama the people and environment in the most pono (proper/beneficial) manner. Their strict discipline and oversight under the kapu system was highly effective in controlling and regulating the land, ocean and other natural resources from being exploited. These traditional and integrated practices of customary land use and resource management by the konohiki became known as the Konohiki System.

**Ka Papa Konohiki (The Konohiki Class)**

The konohiki were a distinct class of chiefs which branched off with its own hierarchy of ranks, genealogical lineages, and job specializations. Class seniority depended on many factors including genealogy, alliances and intermarrying with the Aliʻi Nui, the amount and location of ʻĀina they stewarded, and their distinct job specializations.

Although the konohiki are typically associated with the ahupuaʻa, they were involved in every land division with titles corresponding with land divisions. According to Kamakau, in ancient times there were “nā konohiki ‘ai moku, ‘ai kalana, ‘ai ‘okana, ‘ai ahupua’a, ‘ai o loko, ‘ai ʻili kūpono, ‘ai ʻili ʻāina” (1996: 154). Malo similarly referenced them as “na konohiki ai moku[,] ai kalana, ai okana, ai pok, ai ahupua’a...” (2006: 84).

Senior ranking konohiki were referred as “konohiki nui” (Anonymous 1895: 2) who worked at higher administrative levels of the ahupuaʻa with the Aliʻi ʻai ahupua’a (high chief of the ahupuaʻa) and haku ʻāina or haku (land stewards). They had prioritized access to produce and water sources from the ahupuaʻa and haku one parcels cultivated solely for their benefit. They were also allocated sizable ʻĀina with authority over lower konohiki, luna, haku and makaʻāinana of their ahupuaʻa.
Konohiki nui of the ahupua’a resided in large kauhale with a personal hale mua (men’s eating house), imu (earth and stone oven), adze workshops, animal pens that were associated with the religious kuleana and lifestyle of male chiefs. Moreover, the kauhale of the konohiki were spatially isolated from the rest of the populace, signifying their kūlana, kapu authority and mana as chiefs and religious leaders of their ahupua’a (Dixon, Gosser, and Williams 2008; see also Kamakau 1961: 238). Their residences were at times situated on higher slopes or ridges overlooking lower agricultural fields with large terraces and enclosures (Kirch 1997:42). The spatial exclusivity of the konohiki’s kauhale with separate houses for men near a heiau indicates their prestige and religious role dictated by the kapu religion.

An archaeological study in Lualualei, O‘ahu using Māhele records uncovered a “large residential complex or kauhale, usually consisting of a walled habitation compound interpreted as a possible men’s house or hale mua generally within view of a small temple or heiau” (Dixon, Gosser, and Williams 2008: 267, 272, 277). The heiau was likely one for agriculture called heiau ho‘ouluulu ‘ai dedicated to the Akua Lono or Kāne for abundant food growth and rain. These kauhale were, perhaps, the residences of konohiki determined by size and distance from other smaller residences. They included hale mua, hale noa (sleeping house), stone adze workhouse, pig pens and imu.

Puaʻa was an important religious food offering of the Akua handled strictly by men and often by the konohiki. Later, it became “a prime medium of exchange with visiting sailing ships after contact in 1778...control over their production was an important responsibility of the konohiki” (Dixon, Gosser, and Williams 2008: 277).

By the 1820’s higher ranking konohiki lived in more Western-styled homes. Laura Fish Judd, a missionary wife, described the house of a konohiki nui named Auwae who was also principal genealogist of Kamehameha I and advisor to Kamehameha III (Green 1835: 463-464). Judd writes, “[t]he house was large, well furnished with mats and kapa. Screens of furniture calico divided off the bed-rooms. Everything was extremely neat...” (2003: 23). Rev. William Ellis also wrote in 1823, “the house of the headman [konohiki] which was large, and contained several families” (2004: 277).
According to Kamakau, the konohiki’s personal house furnishings were fancy. “For a headman, a firstborn, or a favorite child the sleeping mats were piled high. The women also made the tapa coverings for the sleepers, usually of five layers, the outside sheet called kilohana beautiful in color and design” (1961: 238).

Lower ranking konohiki were referred as “hope konohiki” or “hope luna konohiki.” The Hawaiian newspaper, Ka Hae Hawaii, mentions a “hope konohiki” named Kaiaiweoweo of Kaeleulei, Kailua, Ko’olaupoko, O’ahu and a “hope luna konohiki” named S. Keawe of Keoneula, Honolulu, Oahu (Kaiaiweoweo 1858: 4; Keawe 1857: 4). Both men had the kuleana of protecting the konohiki nui’s kula lands from livestock trespassing on and damaging his property. In the same newspaper, a “luna konohiki” named Poomanu of Ka‘elepulu, Kailua, O‘ahu was also a “luna pa Aupuni” or supervisor of a government livestock yard that held trespassing animals (Kuna 1857: 3). After the Māhele, Poomanu was one of the few fortunate konohiki to secure a government position in the kingdom. As a luna konohiki, he was likely below a konohiki nui but higher than a “hope konohiki” or “hope luna konohiki.”

The konohiki were trained and skilled in a wide range of occupations with titles for these specializations. A konohiki pālauhulu was one who “would gather all the various kinds of fish caught for the ali‘i” from ocean and fresh water sources” (Desha 2000: 492). Kamehameha I appointed Kepa‘alani as his konohiki pālauhulu to “catch fish at Haleʻōhi‘u at Kekaha, North Kona, Hawai‘i while Kamehameha was staying at North Kohala fishing for flying fish (mālolo)” (Desha 2000: 492). There were konohiki experts in ocean fishing called konohiki i‘a (Mokumaia 1920: 8) and kai lawai‘a konohiki.

A konohiki ʻauhau was responsible for the collecting surplus of produce as tributary payments from the makaʻāinana for their usage rights of the ʻĀina, its resources and support the Aliʻi Nui (Kalama 1838: 53).

Other services under the Aliʻi Nui were tied to recreation. “[I]n ancient Hawaii it was the chief or headman [konohiki] of the district who took the initiative in the promotion of the people’s communistic sports and of the hula” (Emerson 1997: 26).

---

3 Pālauhulu – To take all of a fish catch for a chief instead of dividing it. Ua pālauhulu ʻia ka i’a na ke ali‘i, all of the fish were taken for the chief alone (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 310).
In pre-contact Hawaiian society, the rank, mana and kapu of an Aliʻi varied depending on genealogy, accomplishments, specializations, leadership, birth order, and birth place.

The pedigrees (kuʻauhau) of the chiefs in the line of succession (moʻo kuʻauhau) from ancient times down to those of Kamehameha I are not the same. As their descendants spread out, the ranks (ʻano) of the chiefs lessened....One might be an aliʻi kapu, a “sacred” chief of the highest rank, another an aliʻi noanoa, a chief of no particular rank, or an aliʻi hoʻopilipili, a chief who had “grafted himself onto a chiefly genealogy. Or one might be an aliʻi lepo pōpolo, a “lowborn” chief (Kamakau 1991: 4).

The highest ranking Aliʻi Nui were direct descendants of the Akua from whom they received their divine mana. “The close relationship between the gods and the alii made these individuals and the places and things associated with them kapu” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 81).

Kapu was used to protect their mana which was a power that emanates from the spiritual realm and imbues all things animate and inanimate....Those most closely connected to the gods and the spiritual realm possess a greater degree of mana and hence the authoritative position of being aliʻi (Cachola-Abad 2000: 80).

The “Aliʻi who were born of secondary unions were termed the iwi-kua-moʻo (backbone) of the high chief’s entourage, serving as executive officers (ilāmuku), ministers (kuhina), and supervisors (konohiki) of his property” (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 321). As resource managers, the konohiki chiefs were distinctly separate from the Aliʻi Nui due to their lesser genealogies, degrees of mana and kapu that were based more on their specialized function (Cachola-Abad 2000: 92-96). “In the old days it was tabu for the high and low chiefs (aliʻi and kaukaualiʻi) to confer together. In matters of life and death or in difficult questions of policy it was for the high chiefs alone to decide;...” (Kamakau 1961: 396).

The konohiki were “usually of kaukau aliʻi or lesser rank, belonging in some fashion to the lineages of the Aliʻi ‘aimoku, or Aliʻi Nui who ruled the large districts (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 29). The kaukau aliʻi were often genealogically higher ranking than the konohiki “as the progeny of Aliʻi Nui who had secondary and tertiary sexual partners of no chiefly rank. Later, the descendants from the secondary and tertiary alliances had children with one another. This gave rise to at least five different levels of the kaukau aliʻi subgroup” (Young 1986: xiv).
In pre-contact times, although kaukau aliʻi and konohiki were chiefly servers they differed in kūlana, ʻōihana and kuleana. The konohiki’s main ʻōihana was the daily administration of their Aliʻi lands, natural resources and labor force. They oversaw the food production by the makaʻāinana that served as their tributary land rents. In wartime they recruited “fighting men when the aliʻi nui was preparing for war” (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 279).

Their “overseership” of the ʻāina was referred as noho konohiki ʻana, a term used in the context of land and water resource stewardship (Fornander 1919-1920, V6(1): 206-207). Also, the konohiki typically resided and worked in the ahupuaʻa located away from the centralized seat of government or royal center. The Aliʻi Nui entrusted them with the authority and semi-autonomy to govern the ahupuaʻa from distant locations.

In contrast, the higher ranking kaukau aliʻi typically served within the inner circles of the royal court and resided in the Aliʻi Nui’s residences as their spouses, trusted confidantes, and personal attendants. They “cared for Aliʻi Nui children, were land stewards, and went into battle as warriors” (Young 1986: xi). Those Aliʻi “who reside at court often seem to have higher status than those who cultivate their lord’s land” (Valeri 1985: 156).

The konohiki’s rank and function were distinct from the kaukau aliʻi’s during pre-contact times when society was more stratified and rigid. Social roles were specialized with higher socio-religious value on genealogical rank and religious duties under the divine Aliʻi Nui. Following foreign contact, as Hawaiʻi modernized and adopted Western socio-economic and political systems, the status, authority and function of these chiefly servers overlapped and slowly diminished.

The replacement of the traditional Hawaiian society with foreign capitalism, Christianity, Western laws, and land tenure dismantled and compressed the Hawaiian social hierarchy of six to eight tiers down to only three, the Mōʻī, the Aliʻi and makaʻāinana. As a result, class lines overlapped and became blurred. “During the Māhele era, the term “Konohiki” was used to generally refer to any rank of chief (Aliʻi) a usage that is at odds with definitions used in prior times” (Preza 2010: 57).
As Mōʻī, even Kamehameha III declared himself a konohiki, which was in the context and function of land stewardship as ruler and not the distinct position of a lesser-ranking konohiki. Class and rank distinction in traditional times clearly differentiated the paramount Aliʻi or Mōʻī from the konohiki in kūlana, mana and kuleana.

**Konohiki Population Estimates**

A highly stratified Hawaiian society paralleled with a complex tiered land system was well established prior to Western contact in 1778. “It is not surprising, therefore, that an equally complex system of konohiki (Land stewards) arose to administer the ‘Āina” and “each level of ‘Āina designation there was a corresponding konohiki responsible for collecting tribute and for directing the day-to-day activities” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 29).

Traditional moʻolelo and modern archaeological studies suggest a large population of resource managers, like the konohiki, evolved to support a rising class of Aliʻi Nui (Kirch and Sahlins 1992; Kirch 2010, 2012; Earle 1977). As the Aliʻi Nui expanded their territories of ...dispersed ahupuaʻa, these territories needed individuals who could manage them on a daily basis. Such individuals, typically drawn from junior siblings or collateral relatives of the ahupuaʻa chiefs, were called luna (overseers), derived from the old Polynesian word runga, meaning “above.” In later times they came to be called konohiki, another innovation in the Hawaiian language (Kirch 2012: 141).

A complex system requiring a number of konohiki in each ahupuaʻa and sub-divisions of ʻili ʻāina raises an important but, unanswered question. What was the population of the konohiki in pre-contact times and after foreign contact? In researching the konohiki, no historical census data of their population seems to exist. Yet, evidence shows there were thousands of konohiki who were managing large agricultural and aquacultural systems. In the 1830’s, the konohiki were census-taking for the missionaries but their population was not tracked.

At a time as late as the reign of Kaumualii, the local konohiki making a careful census of the valley by villages from the sea mauka [inland] returned upwards of 2000 souls. Enumerating in detail all the communities, he gave the exact quota from each – Naue, Pa-ie-ie, Maunaloa, Pali-elele, Manunahina, Pohakuloa, Opaikea, Homai-ka-lani and ending with Laau the hamlet farthest mauka, in the depths of the mountains...(Lydgate 1912: 125-126).
Pre-contact Hawaiian population estimates by 18\textsuperscript{th} century European explorers and modern archaeological studies are still being intensely debated (Stannard 1989; Kirch 2007: 52-69). However, since the konohiki were closely associated with the ahupua’a, it is reasonable in this research to calculate a population estimate of the konohiki based on the approximate number ahupua’a.

George Kanahele, a 20\textsuperscript{th} century Hawaiian historian, estimated “[i]f each ahupua’a, and even the few large ‘ili, had its own konohiki, about one thousand or more managed the economy of the islands before 1778” (1986: 354). Kanahele combined the number of independent ‘ili with ahupua’a totaling 1,000. Therefore, his ahupua’a count is less than 1,000. According to Māhele records, there were more than just a “few large ‘ili” with many ‘ili in Waikīkī and Mānoa areas where kalo cultivation was highest.

American anthropologist, Robert Hommon estimates there were 973 ahupua’a but claims that “the number of contact-era ahupua’a cannot be determined with precision because the most complete lists of traditional “lands” in government documents of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries include both ahupua’a and certain of their large ili ‘āina…” (2013: 12-13).

There were a multitude of independent ‘ili divisions managed by konohiki. ‘Ili were most abundant on O’ahu (Alexander 1890a: 107) and ‘ili kūpono in Waimea, Hawai’i (Lyons 1903: 28). “The “ili” often had a different owner from that of the ahupuaa in which it was situated” (Lyons 1903: 5). The larger ahupua’a “sometimes contained as many as thirty to forty ilis...” (Lyons 1903: 27). Since ‘ili were commonly managed by konohiki, then dozens of konohiki could be living in large-sized ahupua’a with ‘ili or managing the independent ‘ili as well.

According to the land records of Ka’awahua, a konohiki of an ‘ili in Pāmoa, Mānoa, O’ahu, he was third in rank within a four-tiered konohiki hierarchy. His senior ranking konohiki nui was Charles Kana’ina (Native Testimony (LCA 10613) 10: 373), the father of Mōʻī William Charles Lunalilo and the husband of Kuhina Nui, Kekāʻuluohi.

Contemporary Hawaiian scholar Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa estimates, …there were 1,004 ahupua’a recorded in the Buke Mahele; subsequently after detailed maps began to be made in the 1880’s, it was discovered that there were another 104 ahupua’a divisions that had been unassigned (2010: 12).
An 1848 Māhele land surveyor, Curtis Lyons, claims “[a] rough estimate would give about 2,000 Ahupuaas in the group [Hawaiian islands]” (1903: 5) which is nearly double the amount of Kanahele’s, Hommon’s and Kameʻeleihiwa’s estimates. Therefore, Lyon’s ahupua’a estimate doubles the konohiki population to 2,000 with only one konohiki per ahupua’a.

The most recent ahupua’a count in a study by Gonschor and Beamer (2014) calculated 1,825 ahupua’a which is closest to Lyons’ calculation of 2,000. Since there were typically more than one konohiki per ahupua’a, my conservative estimate of at least 10 to 15 konohiki in each of the 1,825 ahupua’a would place the population as high as 18,250 to 27,375 throughout the pae ʻāina. The population was very likely higher with multiple levels of konohiki administering independent ʻili ʻāina in addition to the 1,825 ahupua’a.

My konohiki population estimate seems highly plausible since a very large population of konohiki were required to sustain expansive lo‘i kalo, loko i’a (fishponds), fisheries, and dry-land kalo and ʻuala field systems. In addition, the konohiki also managed a sizable labor force to build and maintain these food producing areas.

The lack of any konohiki population study means more research is greatly needed on this topic. It will provide better understanding of the konohiki’s invaluable function, ubiquitous presence in Hawaiian society, and why the konohiki “filled the most important position in the socioeconomic system of Hawai‘i” (Kanahele 1986: 351).

By 1848, the konohiki population and their role had rapidly diminished for various reasons. Relentless Native depopulation by foreign diseases, the collapse of traditional society, and newly introduced foreign socio-economic and political systems contributed to the decline of their class and the traditional Konohiki System. Many konohiki died prematurely or were being eliminated and reduced to the lower makaʻāinana class as they lost their lands and status after the 1848 Māhele. This resulted in their functions being taken over by foreigners (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 295). Many of these foreigners were American missionaries who came to save the “heathen” through their Christian ministries but craftily took the power from the konohiki through the Kingdom’s government ministries.

Hawaiian-language sources, like the Māhele land records and newspapers examined in Chapters 3 and 4, provide further evidence of the konohiki’s decline in power, their
replacement by government officials and the loss of more than 50% of their lands in the Māhele.

This chapter has shown for generations, Hawaiian society flourished prior to foreign contact due to the large population of konohiki who successfully administered the land and resources of their Ali‘i Nui under their Konohiki System. Its success was attributed to the Hawaiian values of Mālama ʻĀina, the strict Kapu religion, and the perpetuation and intergenerational transmission of ancestral knowledge, traditional cultural practices and chiefly values within their class.

Chapter 2 discusses the specialized ʻoihana or functions of the konohiki pertaining to their religious duties, and the management of labor, taxation, cultivation, freshwater, and marine resources.
Chapter 2. ‘Oihana of the Konohiki

‘Ike ‘ia no ka loea I ke kuahu – An expert is recognized by the altar he builds. (It is what one does and how well he does it that shows whether he is an expert) – ‘Ōlelo No‘eau 1208 (Pukui 1983: 131).

Food production was an important priority in Hawaiian society and part of daily life.

Hawaiians, to a greater extent than any other Polynesians, exhibited engineering and building skill, ingenuity, industry, and planning and organizing ability in three types of construction: the grading and building of terraces for growing wet taro; construction of irrigation ditches and aqueducts to bring water to these terraces; and construction of fresh and salt-water fishponds (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 25-26).

The ‘oihana of the konohiki were as diverse as the resources and regions they steded. Each ahupua‘a, with their unique natural environment and resources, was governed under different Ali‘i Nui. These variants determined the konohiki’s required skills, knowledge and specializations for their positions in their ahupua‘a. The konohiki memorized all the features and resources of his environment and managed the daily living necessities of their Ali‘i and the people. Their service was vital in keeping the lands, resources and labor productive and efficient. Their Ali‘i were responsible for tending to higher administrative responsibilities in politics and governance. For example,

There was a Konohiki (overseer), Kepa‘alani, who was in charge of the houses (hale papa‘a) in which the valuables of the King [Kamehameha I] were kept. He was in charge of the King’s food supplies, the fish, the hālau (long houses) in which the fishing canoes were kept, the fishing nets and all things. It was from there that the King’s fishermen and the retainers were provisioned. The houses of the pond guardians and Konohiki were situated at Ka‘elehuluhulu and Ho‘onā (Kihe 1914-1924).

According to Kamakau, “Ke-pa‘a-lani was Kamehameha’s navigator...” (1961: 177). A prominent konohiki of Māui, Noa Auwae, was the genealogist and advisor to Kamehameha I, II and III (Green 1835: 463-464). This shows the diversity of a konohiki’s ‘oihana with some requiring close relations with the paramount Ali‘i Nui or Mō‘ī.

The following sub-sections discuss the different ‘oihana of the konohiki pertaining to religion, labor, cultivation, freshwater, and ocean stewardship. As a resource steward, the konohiki’s work was not only physical but spiritually and emotionally interconnected with the
natural environment. The kapu religion was deeply ingrained in their daily life with rituals, prayers, offerings and ceremonies as part of their ‘ōihana. Worship of the four main deities Kū, Lono, Kāne, Kanaloa and many other Akua and ‘aumakua (ancestral spiritual guardians) were ritually performed in the konohiki’s daily life. Therefore, the konohiki’s stewardship of the ‘Āina, on behalf of his divine Aliʻi Nui, was not only a kuleana but a form of religious worship and expression of their spirituality.

The konohiki’s kuleana was ensuring the most sustainable and productive use of their Aliʻi Nui’s resources that would sustain a growing, thriving population of followers. A large population of loyal, content makaʻāinana meant a reliable source of labor to support the ahupua’a. In turn, productive lands and a thriving population signified and validated the mana and kūlana of their Aliʻi Nui. It also afforded the ruler more levels of specialized craftspeople, kāhuna and other chiefly servers of konohiki and kaukau aliʻi. During the reign of Kamehameha I “his craftsmen were as well cared for as were his farmers, and there were many of them. His wish was to obtain prosperity for the people” (ʻĪʻī 1959: 69).

The konohiki managed the makaʻāinana in their daily life of cultivating, harvesting, planting and gathering food within the ahupua’a. They also supervised and participated in large-scale communal projects including the construction of loko iʻa (inland fishponds), loko kuapā (sea-walled fishponds), ‘auwai and, loʻi kalo for the Aliʻi Nui. The makaʻāinana’s labor and produce were their reciprocal obligations to the konohiki and Aliʻi Nui in return for care, tenant and subsistence rights.

The konohiki, in their supervisory role, often labored alongside the makaʻāinana and on occasion, the Aliʻi Nui participated as well.

No Aliʻi had ever been greater in energy, ambition, initiative, and practicality than Kamehameha the Great. After his conquest of Oʻahu, he was keenly aware of the need for revival and promotion of food production throughout the island (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 484).

Kamehameha I beautified the lands throughout Oʻahu and maintained large farms in Nuʻuanu, Mānoa, Waikīkī, and Kapālama. With his royal court, he participated in farming, gardening, fishing, building and repairing heiau and fishponds (Kamakau 1961: 192-3; 1976: 34;

As social and land organization became more hierarchical, due to the intensification of agriculture and aquaculture, a large labor force was required to fulfill the growing demands of these socio-economic changes. For the konohiki, it became increasingly challenging and complex to manage and sustain land, water, and labor resources. The konohiki’s function and their Konohiki System of resource management were constantly evolving to adapt to these changes.

**Religious Duties of the Konohiki**

The konohiki enforced the kānāwai and religious kapu over certain resources and seasons for cultivation, gathering, and protocol of religious observances. They served as “intermediaries between the high chief and the farmers, fishers, and craftsmen” (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 321) while the Aliʻi Nui were intermediaries between Akua and humans (Kameʻelehiwa 1992: 26). The konohiki followed the kānāwai kapu Aliʻi (sacred chiefly laws) and the kānāwai Akua (laws of the gods) dictated by the Aliʻi Nui (Kamakau 1991: 11).

In some instances, if the people of their ahupuaʻa failed to adhere to the strict kānāwai of the Aliʻi, the konohiki suffered the consequences as well. “Sometimes a whole ahupuaʻa or ʻokana land section got into trouble through violating some kapu of the gods,.....All who lived on that ahupuaʻa or ʻokana became subject to death” (Kamakau 1991: 11).

As lower ranking chiefs, the konohiki possessed different degrees and types of mana or authority based on their moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy), the Aliʻi they served and specializations in land and resource stewardship. They may be instructed by the Aliʻi Nui to build monumental civic structures and perform religious ceremonies dedicating new loʻi kalo, ʻauwai, loko iʻa or heiau. The construction of heiau was a chiefly activity and the konohiki were responsible in overseeing the building and maintenance of heiau particularly those for agriculture. Permanent and temporary heiau were erected within areas of food production such as loʻi kalo, kalo maloʻo (dry-land taro) and māla ʻuala (sweet potato fields) or loko iʻa.
The konohiki lived and worked near these areas for worship and religious ceremonies to inspire bountiful crops, an abundance of sea food and, the health and prosperity for their people. A konohiki nui named Holowai, under paramount Ali‘i Nui Kalani‘ōpu‘u and Kamehameha I, “was principally temple keeper, providing fish, pork, and dog, all for ceremonies,... [he] had several men, all chiefs working for him” (Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 142-145).

Konohiki participated in the religious worship and ceremonies centered on the agricultural heiau or ho‘ouluulu ‘ai and ho‘ouluulu ua dedicated to the Akua Lono. Pule ho‘ouluulu or growth prayers were offered for rain, bountiful crops, protection over food sources, and the health and regeneration of life for the ‘Āina and the people.

A service called ho-ʻuluʻulu-ai was to increase all food production. It might be performed before the beginning of a planting season, at times of famine or before an anticipated need such as a long voyage or war. The service was performed in a temporary building called a heiau mao that was used only by chiefs (Gutmanis 1983: 105).

Another important religious kuleana of the konohiki was the annual four-month Makahiki festival honoring the Lonoikamakahiki, the Akua of agriculture and peace. During this time, war was forbidden and “the people rested and feasted joyfully and took part in amusements and in sports that strengthened the body” (Kamakau 1991: 19). The Makahiki was “the most elaborate and complex rituals in the Hawaiian religion...” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 346). The days prior to the Makahiki, hoʻokupu or tributary taxes were gotten ready against the coming of the tax collectors for the districts of the okana, pokō, kalana...into which an island was divided. It was the duty of the konohiki to collect in the first place all the property which was levied from the loa [district] for the king; each konohiki also brought tribute for his own landlord, which was called waiwai maloko [wealth within the district]” (Malo 1951: 142).

The konohiki collected food, natural materials and handcrafted items from the people of his ahupua‘a and presented this hoʻokupu on an ahu (altar) of stones situated on the ma kai

---

4 Malo describes hoʻokupu “taxes” as “tapa, pa-u, malo and a great variety of other things. Contributions of swine were not made but dogs were contributed....The ali‘i did not eat fresh pork during these months, there being no temple service” (1951: 143). However, Kamakau says, “pigs, dogs, fowl, poi, tapa cloth, dress tapas (‘a‘ahu), ‘oloa tapa, pa‘u (skirts), malos, shoulder capes (‘ahu), mats, ninikea tapa, OLONA fishnets, fishlines, feathers of the mamo and the ‘o‘o birds, finely designed mats (‘ahu pāwehe), pearls, ivory, iron (mekī), adzes, and whatever other
corner boundary of the ahupuaʻa. A special section near the altar was marked by two poles of kauila or māmane wood called the ālia. An attendant in the entourage of the Aliʻi and kāhuna circuiting the island and collecting the hoʻokupu “planted the ālia, and the idol [Lono] took its station behind them. The space between the ālia was tabu, and here the konohiki piled their hookupu, or offering, and the tax collectors, who accompanied the akua-makahiki, made their complaints regarding delinquent tax payers” (Malo 1951: 146; 2006: 84).

The following description by Kepelino (2007: 150-151), a 19th century scholar, shows the ascending order in which the hoʻokupu was distributed. He includes nine levels within the highly stratified Hawaiian social hierarchy which correlates with their sub-divided land system.

Eia na ano o ka hookupu ana:
1. O na ai-kihapai, hookupu i na ai-ili.
2. O na ai-ili, hookupu i na ai-moo-aina.
3. O na ai-moo-aina, i na konohiki.
5. O na ai-ahupuaa, i ha haku-aina
6. O na haku-aina, i na ʻlīi aina.
7. O na ʻlīi aina, i na Haku.
8. O na Haku, i na Haku-nui.
9. O na Haku nui, Ke ʻlīi nui
This is the way in which the ceremony took place.
1. The small farmer gave to the head man of his land division.
2. This head man gave to the head man of the larger sub-division.
3. This head man gave to the overseer over the larger piece of land.
4. The overseer gave to his landlord.
5. The landlord gave to the chief landlord.
6. The chief landlord gave to his land chief.

property had been gathered by the konohiki or land agent, of the ahupuaʻa” (Kamakau 1991: 20-21). Kamakau’s mention of iron (meki) refers to the post-contact period during the reign of Kamehameha I. He conducted the Makahiki differently from ancient times adapting to Hawaiʻi Island practices by changing the months, the types of Akua worshipped and enforcing stricter methods of collection (Kamakau 1991: 19).
7. The land chiefs gave to their chiefs from the ranking royal family.

8. These gave to their ranking head.

9. These hereditary chiefs gave to the head chief

The various hoʻokupu were collected from each ahupuaʻa by the ceremonial procession of Aliʻi and kāhuna traveling around the island on the alaloa (coastal trail). They carried the akua loa (long god) and akua poko (short god) that were wooden idols of Lono. “At the time of the Makahiki, the road was traversed by the tax collectors (konohiki), the priests who released the land from kapu after the hoʻokupu or taxes had been received, and the bearers of the symbol Lono” (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 489).

In Malo’s original Hawaiian-language text, the tax collectors in the Makahiki procession are luna ʻauhau and not konohiki (2006: 84). The luna ʻauhau collected the hoʻokupu on behalf of the chiefs from the konohiki of each ahupuaʻa. Later, under Western laws in 1839-1840, the luna ʻauhau were tax collectors of the government appointed by the king and reported to the island governor. They were to “assess the taxes and give notice of the amount to all the people” that were to be paid in money, material resources and labor” (Adameck 1994: 14).

The konohiki ensured these taxes were produced from their ahupuaʻa and paid to the luna ʻauhau. This is an example of confusion arising when time periods are not differentiated and English-language sources and translations use both konohiki and luna ʻauhau interchangeably as a “tax collector.” Although both were tax collectors, they each had specific roles during different time periods. Referencing the Hawaiian text clarifies the distinction between konohiki, the “tax” collectors of the ahupuaʻa, and luna ʻauhau, tax collectors of the Makahiki procession and later, tax officers/collectors of the Hawaiian Kingdom government.

In the final days of the Makahiki, “[w]hen enough property had been collected from the land to satisfy the demands of the tax collector, the kahuna who accompanied the idol came forward and uttered a prayer to set the land free. This prayer was called a hanaiki...” (Malo 1951: 146-147). It praised Lono for his clouds of rain with place-references to Puna, Hawai‘i that were similar to the distant ancestral lands of Kahiki (1951: 146, 154 fn.11).

The amount of hoʻokupu collected from each land division was determined by a district’s size and population, and then redistributed to the Aliʻi and kāhuna (Malo 1951: 143;
Kepelino 2007: 148-149). According to Kepelino, hoʻokupu were reserved by the konohiki for his subordinate konohiki and “men of the land” perhaps the makaʻāinana. The rest passed to the haku ‘āina who reserved hoʻokupu for his konohiki and the rest to the higher Aliʻi Nui.

Mai ia hookupu ana, waiho no ke konohiki i elua umeke poi, hookahi puaa na ka ai-moo-aina me ka ai-ili-aina, a me kona poe kanaka, a o ke koena waiwai, lawe no ke haku aina. Waiho ka haku aina 2 umeke poi, 2 puaa, i ilio na kona konohiki, a o ke koena i na ‘ii mea aina.

As the gifts were presented, the overseer reserved two calabashes of poi and a pig for the two head men under him and for the men of the land; the rest went to his landlord. The landlord reserved two calabashes of poi, two pigs, one dog for his overseer, the rest went to his chief (Kepelino 2007: 151).

The ceremonial protocol of the Makahiki could be demanding and unpredictable for the konohiki. If the hoʻokupu was deemed insufficient or delinquent in delivery, the konohiki “was put off his land by the tax collector” (Malo 1951: 145-146) and his ahupua’a could suffer consequences as well.

If the tribute presented by the konohiki to the god was too little, the attendant chiefs (poʻe kahu aliʻi akua) would complain, and would not furl up the god nor twist up the emblems and lay him down. The attendants kept the god upright and ordered the ahupua’a to be plundered. Only when the keepers were satisfied with the tribute given did they stop this plundering (hoʻopunipuni) [in the name] of the god (Kamakau 1991: 21; see also Fornander 1919-1920 V6(1): 202-207).

Kepelino explains, not only were the konohiki being penalized but, the higher Aliʻi as well. “Ina i nele, e hemo ia hakuaina, e hemo ia aliʻi (If there is a lack the landlord will be discharged, the chiefs will be discharged)” (2007: 148-149).

**Labor and Taxation**

_Aia ke ola i ka hana – Life is in labor. ʻŌlelo Noʻeau 57 (Pukui 1983: 9)_

Ancient Hawaiians flourished in a self-sustaining society when Western concepts of monetary taxation and wages were non-existent. Labor was not dictated by economic and political pressures of a capitalist economy but instead by reciprocal and interdependent relationships with man and his environment. Hawaiians relied on the rhythms and cycles of
nature, their 400,000 Akua and the Kapu religion to guide them in their daily lives of cultivating, planting, fishing, gathering and times of rest.

Close-knit groups of ‘ohana depended on kinship relationships for basic needs. The environment and religious duties dictated the labors and necessities in daily life. According to Hawaiian scholar, Haunani Trask,

“Hawaiian society had been the classic example of what anthropologist Marshall Sahlins has called “the original affluent society” (1972). Long, slow centuries of cultural evolution had produced a society with “an paralleled material of plenty” without the endless work necessary to close what in modern society is the never-ending gap between means and desires” (1983: 112).

According to Kamakau, “in the old days, the people did not work steadily at hard labor but at several years’ interval, because it was easier then to get food from fishponds, coconut groves, and taro patches” (1961: 372).

The ‘ōlelo noʻeau, He aliʻi ka ʻāina; he kauwā ke kanaka, expresses the Hawaiian philosophy that the “land has no need for man but man needs the land and works it for a livelihood” (Pukui 1986: 62). Human material desires were secondary to stewarding and perpetuating the life of the ʻĀina. In the Hawaiian culture, man is a servant to the ʻĀina and if the people care for the ʻĀina, the ʻĀina will care for people.

The intensification of food production by Hawaiians using new and improved innovations of ‘auwai, loʻi kalo, kalo maloʻo and loko iʻa were pivotal economic advancements that resulted in population growth and a ready supply of dependable labor. This burgeoning and robust labor force allowed Hawaiians to develop and maintain the most sophisticated and complex irrigation, agricultural and aquacultural systems in Polynesia (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 27). These economic changes also necessitated a type of “taxation” system on labor and produce. They transformed the konohiki’s role from steward of religious hoʻokupu to collectors of obligatory contributions of food and labor as rents for land and resources.

For early Hawaiians, the lack of heavy, powered equipment, large livestock and metal meant that sheer human labor was the driving catalyst in food production and redistribution, as well as building and maintaining the infrastructure and communal structures. “Their tools were their hands and their backs – these were their cattle, horses, and carts” (Kamakau 1976: 23).
The variety and amount of structures and infrastructure of stone from distant quarries and coral blocks that were hewed and hauled from reefs, demonstrates labor-intensive work by a very large labor force managed by the konohiki. These projects included constructing valleys of loʻi kalo, networks of ‘auwai systems, acres of loko iʻa, miles of rock walls, trail and road systems, monumental heiau and residential royal compounds of the Aliʻi. Moʻokini heiau, in Kohala, Hawaiʻi, was built with stones carried from Niulii located nine miles away. “[A]s an instance of the density of the population at that time,...building-stones were passed by hand from man to man from Niulii,...requiring at least some fifteen thousand working men at three feet apart ” (Fornander 1996: 36).

Construction with stone was used extensively throughout Hawaiʻi and considered an important communal kuleana. Stone carrying and building was an integral part of daily life and shared amongst all members of the community from Aliʻi to makaʻāinana. The konohiki’s kuleana included recruiting, training, mobilizing and retaining labor for many civic projects. These projects included hundreds to thousands of workers transporting primarily pōhaku (stone), coral slabs or massive timber logs from miles away.

The konohiki needed savvy “people skills” and expertise in project management therefore, retaining and increasing the labor force was vital to the konohiki’s success. Without a reliable labor force, the building and maintaining of these expansive civic structures was challenging, if not, impossible.

The konohiki worked directly with the makaʻāinana who were organized in close-knit ‘ohana groups within the ahupuaʻa. Each ‘ohana was headed by a senior male or haku.

The coordinated leadership of the haku and the konohiki was essential in organizing labor for such ahupua’a projects as building, cleaning, and repairing the irrigation network of an ahupua’a, clearing trails to the mountains, and building heiau (places of worship) or fishponds for the district. The konohiki further ensured that the makaʻāinana fulfilled their obligations to the chiefs including providing regular labor for the aliʻi’s kōʻele (cultivated fields). Konohiki also gathered the requisite number of people together to represent the ahupuaʻa for moku or island-wide efforts such as warfare or building heiau for national worship at the highest levels (Cachola-Abad 2000: 93).
The makaʻāinana’s labor partially served as obligatory “rents” to the Aliʻi Nui and konohiki. In return, they secured usage rights to land and resources, and military protection. Collective cooperation and the spirit of lōkahi or unity between the chief and servant the key to social harmony and balance.

The work and priority of the konohiki was mainly focused on food production and the redistribution of food and wealth to the people on behalf of the Aliʻi. This was achieved by keeping the ʻĀina productive and sustainable while ensuring optimal levels of labor from a loyal workforce of makaʻāinana. Maintaining loyalty and satisfaction of the makaʻāinana were important to the konohiki. The efficient organization and management of the makaʻāinana labor by the konohiki helped ensure the completion and quality of the work performed.

The konohiki also needed skills and understanding in structural engineering, hydrology, and project management to execute the project and estimate the amount of labor, time and resources needed for the job. “[T]he responsibility of an ahupuaʻa chief was to make the ahupuaʻa productive, and a stable workforce was necessary to achieve that end, abuses by ahupuaʻa chiefs were minimized” (MacKenzie 1991: 4).

A system of “labor days” was developed allowing the konohiki to secure a predictable source of labor and ensure optimum levels of produce and services from the makaʻāinana. “Such a ready labor force would have allowed the aliʻi to undertake major projects that could benefit the populations of whole districts or regions and which would then have offset the added burden that such requirements entailed for the makaʻāinana” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 302).

According to Kamakau, “[b]efore the written law there was no uniformity in the number of days of work for the king or chief. In some districts only twelve days a year were required, and the work done benefited all alike” (1961: 378).

The origin of “labor days” is said to be traced to an Aliʻi named Kila. He was the son of a famous Kauaʻi chief, Moʻikeha, who inherited the fertile and densely populated valley of Waipiʻo on Hawaiʻi Island. Kila was industrious in agriculture and spared his community from famine by judiciously managing his lands and people. “It is he who started a system of working so many days for the landlords out of every month” (Fornander 1916 V4(I): 136). These workdays were referred as kōʻele days or “landlord days...in ancient times” (Kamakau 1869: 1,
Kōʻele were special land parcels of either wet or dry kalo fields, māla (gardens) and also loko iʻa reserved and cultivated by the makaʻāinana specifically for the Aliʻi (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 158).

The labor or work on the kōʻele days or lā kōʻele were scheduled and supervised by the konohiki. According to an article “No Kekahi Aoao Kahiko” in the Hawaiian newspaper Ka Lama Hawaii (February 28, 1834), the makaʻāinana worked the kōʻele plots at the request of the konohiki and by evening presented the Aliʻi valuable items of puaʻa[pig], ʻīlio[dog], kapa[bark cloth], olonā[cordage], hulu[feathers], and ʻupena[fish nets] (Anonymous author 1834: 4).

The makaʻāinana’s land usage “rights were allocated by the konohiki in accordance with a male’s labor contribution to kōʻele land cultivation and other activities” and “it was...through the male that a household obtained a claim to land” (Earle 1978: 147). This reciprocal and interdependent labor system proved successful, efficient and equitable in pre-contact times.

**Cultivation and the Konohiki**

The konohiki were highly skilled and innovative in agriculture and horticulture. They constantly fine-tuned techniques that were adaptive to Hawaiʻi’s diverse eco-systems. “From Hawaii to Niihau the soil and character are not the same; they differ in one place from that of another. The nature of the lands is of two kinds, dry and wet; of soil and rock; good and bad; and mountainous, abounding in streams valleys, hills and ridges” (Fornander 1919-20 VI(1): 160).

The Aliʻi Nui down to the makaʻāinana participated in agricultural cultivation and received immense pride and joy in their plants and crops. Hawaiians held religious and familial ties with their food and plants and perceived them as either beloved children or life-giving Akua. Their “use and understanding of plants was thoroughly and profoundly religious, based in the strong, polytheistic tradition that was the backbone of Hawaiian culture...” (Abbot 1992: 15).

The Konohiki System, based on sustainable resource management, contributed to advances in cultivation, particularly wet-kalo cultivation, that enabled Hawaiian society to
achieve “the highest levels of intensity and technological achievement of anywhere in Polynesian” (Clark 1986: 5).

Early European explorers in Hawaiʻi described with great admiration the productive and orderly management of extensive terracing and irrigation cultivation by Hawaiians.

British Explorer, Captain Cook (1778-1779) wrote:

What we saw of their agriculture furnished sufficient proofs that they are not novices in that art. The vale ground has already been mentioned as one continuous plantation of taro, and a few other things, which all have the appearance of being well attended to (Cook in Handy and Handy 1927: 406).

Archibald Menzies, a naturalist on British Captain Vancouver’s voyage (1792-1794) commented,

We could not indeed but admire the laudable ingenuity of these people in cultivating their soil with so much economy. The indefatigable labor in making these little fields in so rugged a situation the care and industry with which they were transplanted, watered and kept in order, surpassed anything of the kind we had ever seen before (Menzies in Kanahele 1986: 333-4).

Although early explorers do not specifically identify konohiki by title or name in their writings, the highly intensified degrees of agriculture and aquaculture strongly indicate the konohiki’s labor and skilled management in these well manicured and productive loʻi kalo, māla and loko iʻa kalo.

Most of these great enterprises – and they were great in terms of initiative, engineering factors involved, organization of labor, and maintenance – were undertaken so long ago that there is no record of actual construction, but there is good reason to suppose that all the large operations of this sort were achieved under the direction of the aliʻi and their supervisors, the konohiki (Handy, Handy, and Pukui 1972: 484).

An integral part of the konohiki’s ‘oihana and kuleana was the mālama and mahi ʻai ʻana (cultivation) of the diverse vegetation and cultivation zones of the ahupuaʻa. The environment was well studied, identified, named, catalogued, and the information retained and memorized by the konohiki. This ‘ike was orally passed down through generations of konohiki families, often from father to son (Green 1835: 463-4; Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 142).

A prominent konohiki named Noa Auwae of Wailuku, Māui and the son of a court genealogist, was “in the train of the great conqueror [Kamehameha I], or one of his savants, and keeps in memory genealogists, traditions, and ancient lore. He is an astronomer and
botanist. He placed two long rows of stones to show how they classified plants in sexes, and gave us the native names for each. He seems to be a genuine encyclopedia of Hawaiian science” (Judd, L. 2003: 23).

Another konohiki nui, Holowai of Kahakaʻaulana, Oʻahu (present Sand Island and formerly Ānuenue Island), was temple keeper who inherited ‘ike in astronomy and navigation from his father. “Holowai’s father was Hiapo, konohiki nui under King Kalaniopuʻu. He [Hiapo] was the chief who stripped the bones of Captain Cook” (Johnson and Mahelona 1975: 142-145).

The konohiki regulated the cultivating and raising of plants, animals and food crops in the different ecological zones of the ahupuaʻa. The word “wao” defined the many inland zones or regions extending from the mountainous regions of wao maʻukele (deep forest), wao akua (realm of the Akua), down to the wao kanaka (human realm), the kula (fields and pastures) and finally to the kahakai (coastal shoreline).

Hawaiians cultivated a wide variety of utilitarian and medicinal plants of wauke (mulberry tree), olonā (flax or hemp bark), ipu (gourds), kī (ti plants), pia (arrow root), ʻōlena (turmeric), hala (pandanus), and ʻohe (bamboo). Native trees of koa, kou, ʻōhiʻa, māmane, lama, ʻiliah, kamani, kukui, and niu provided wood for canoes, weapons, instruments, household and recreation items, fire wood and building materials. Their main food crops were kalo [taro], ʻuala [sweet potato], uhi [yam], maiʻa [banana], ‘ulu [breadfruit], kō [sugarcane], and ‘awa [arrowroot] (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 13). Hawaiians used a variety of sophisticated and intensified agricultural methods in food production. These included combinations of intercropping, crop rotation, fallowing, and green fertilization in very diverse ecological zones.

**Kalo Cultivation**

Kalo is a sacred and cherished ancestor of Hawaiians. This main food staple was born Hāloa, the brother and guardian of Hawaiians. Therefore, Hawaiians devoted utmost care, energy and reverence cultivating kalo. They developed approximately 350 kalo varieties (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 83; Winter 2004: 14) by cross-breeding species that adapted in different ecological zones throughout Hawaiʻi. Hawaiians applied empirical and traditional methods of cultivation for hundreds of generations. Kalo cultivation is an excellent example of
how Hawaiians evolved their food production and ensured food security through biodiversity and sustainable resource stewardship long before Western contact.

Hundreds of kalo species flourished and adapted to different environments from cool mountain forests, sunny terraced hillsides, down to warmer stream-fed river valleys or dry rain-fed plains. The islands of Oʻahu, Kauaʻi, and small areas of West Māui, Molokaʻi and Hawaiʻi were famous for their extensive irrigated loʻi kalo systems whereas the south-eastern sides of Māui (Kahikinui, Kaupō) and West Hawaiʻi (Kohala, Kona and Kaʻū) were famous for their extensive dry-land field systems of kalo and ʻuala.

Hawaiians mastered kalo wai (wet taro) and kalo maloʻo (dry-land taro) cultivation using sophisticated technologies that far surpassed other Polynesian societies in agricultural intensification. Practices and methods varied across the pae ʻāina depending on the area’s geographical landscape, soil, elevation, climate and water sources. Both cultivation methods are extremely labor intensive but kalo wai required half the amount of labor and man hours than kalo maloʻo with substantially higher production yields (Ladefoged, Kirch, Gon, Chadwick, Hartshorn and Vitousek 2009: 2381; Kamakau 1961: 237).

More specifically,

“[a]n acre of irrigated pondfields produced as much as five times the amount of taro as an acre of dry-land cultivation. Over a period of several years irrigated pondfields could be as much as 10 or 15 times more productive than unirrigated taro gardens as dry-land gardens need to lie fallow for greater lengths of time than irrigated gardens” (Kelly 1989: 83).

The konohiki were key stewards and authorities under the Aliʻi Nui who oversaw the cultivation of main staple crops of kalo and ʻuala. The following sections describe the vital role of the konohiki in cultivating these important foods.

**Kalo Wai (Wet-land Taro)**

In kalo wai cultivation, the loʻi kalo were expansive, man-made, self-sustaining ecosystems that provided an abundant and readily available food supply. Hawaiians developed advanced irrigation and wet agricultural technologies that allowed them to cultivate extensive kalo field systems to feed a large population.

There was, no doubt, a period of energetic planning of the main systems of taro land a good many centuries ago, under the direction of aliʻi and their
konohiki. Enterprise of this sort definitely required planning and direction of communal labor on a large scale (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 280).

Hundreds of varieties of kalo wai were cultivated from ma uka to ma kai. In the higher, cooler elevations of the ahupua‘a, auala lo‘i or stone terraced lo‘i (UH-CTHAR 2008: 22) were solidly built on rugged hillsides where certain kalo thrived in cooler freshwater streams and springs. Konohiki engineered and managed the building of these intricately built terraced lo‘i with the help of the maka‘āinana. They also planned and oversaw the construction of māno wai (dams) and networks of ‘auwai that flowed at regulated rates to control water flow and temperature. These factors were vital to preserve soil nutrients and sustain the delicate balance of plant and animal life in the lo‘i and ‘auwai that would flow down to the kahakai.

There were many sizes of lo‘i depending on whom it was built for, from small lo‘i for the maka‘āinana to sizable royal lo‘i for the Ali‘i Nui. Hawaiians practiced multi-cropping with other food plants of mai‘a, kō and kī within the lo‘i kalo. Varieties of i‘a (fish and shellfish), such as awa, ‘ama ‘ama, ‘o‘opu, āholehole and ‘ōpae flourished in the shallow waters of the lo‘i creating a loko i‘a kalo or taro field fishpond. Diversifying food sources in this manner was an excellent practice of sustainability and ensured food security on a large scale.

The flat, leveled lo‘i kalo, also referred as lo‘i ʻai, were built in the expansive river valley floors where many types of kalo varieties thrived in shallow, warmer water and climates. “The making of a lo‘i...required much work. If the planter was a chief, the work was easy, for he had from hundred to a thousand workers to do his work for him. The chief’s lo‘i was therefore large” (Kamakau 1976: 33).

The konohiki typically managed and supervised the construction of an Ali‘i’s lo‘i with thousands of laborers. “Any new development would call for the supervision and planning of the landlord [konohiki], for it was the landlord [konohiki] and not the planter who controlled the use of land and water” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 281). The execution and organizing of these labor intensive projects required centralized authorities, like the konohiki, to ensure the project ran smoothly and efficiently.

Early Hawaiians invested much planning and organization for expansive acreage of lo‘i kalo. “Most of the extensive systems of lo‘i must have been planned with a view to developing an overall system rather than allowing the system to grow piecemeal, because ditching had to
be so patterned as to bring fresh water direct to every loʻi planned” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 280-1).

Constructing a large-scale chiefly loʻi required a thousand men and “could take from a month to a couple of years to complete” (Kamakau 1976: 34). The konohiki served as project managers responsible for months of pre-planning and coordination with higher district chiefs of Aliʻi ‘ai ahupua’a and haku ‘āina. In addition, there was collaboration and support from lower luna and haku for recruiting, mobilizing and supporting thousands of workers for the job. Other konohiki tasks included supplying tools, materials, and meals for the makaʻāinana labor. They also designated sacred areas and altars, and provided offerings for religious dedications of these projects.

Once an appropriate site and season to construct the loʻi was determined, the volume and varieties of kalo to be planted were selected. The site was cleared and the loʻi was dug with the side embankments built up. The ground soil was hehi (treaded) by every member of every class before its flooding by the extensive and complex ‘auwai system that continuously fed water through the loʻi.

It was a great day for men, women, and children, and no chief or chiefess held himself too tabu to tread in the patch. Every man, woman and child bedecked himself with greenery, and worked with all his might...rejoicing, shouting, panting and making sport (Kamakau 1976: 34).

This kind of planting was known as “haʻaheo” or aristocratic style of cultivating with the people rising early to consume a heavy meal and “the women strung hala keys and ʻilima flowers and made head leis for them” (Kamakau 1976: 32). These descriptions demonstrate the immense pride and communal enjoyment Hawaiians shared in the cultivation of their food. Therefore, this labor was not coercive or corvée labor, terms used out of cultural context to describe Aliʻi and makaʻāinana labor relations.

During the loʻi’s construction, every stage of the process included religious protocol and worship to specific Akua and ‘aumākua. Offerings of i’a, pua’a, mai’a and other plants were made with prayers for the health of the people, their Aliʻi, the fertility of the ‘Āina, and future prosperity of the new loʻi.
When the Aliʻi’s loʻi became productive, the konohiki maintained full responsibility for its ongoing management and maintenance in coordination with the various haku ʻāina, luna and the makaʻāinana. It was important for the konohiki to monitor soil and water quality, flow and distribution of water through the ‘auwai system from the poʻo wai (head dam) through the loʻi and out to the sea.

Other responsibilities included ensuring the overall health of the plants and animals of the loʻi by cleaning, organically fertilizing, rotating, and replanting the loʻi. Wai, as a life-giving resource, was judiciously stewarded by the konohiki using their unique systems of water management, protection and distribution. Wai stewardship was a very important kuleana of the konohiki based on their Konohiki System of traditional resource management. As a precious and sacred resource, a separate sub-section of this chapter is devoted to wai.

**Kalo Maloʻo and ‘Uala (Dry-land Taro and Sweet Potato)**

Early Hawaiians were highly accomplished in dryland cultivation of rain-fed crops as they were in wet irrigation farming. They adapted incredibly well using agricultural technologies to farm the arid and rugged terrain of lava fields particularly on the leeward sides of Māui and Hawaiʻi. As geologically younger islands, Māui and Hawaiʻi lacked consistent rainfall and perennial rivers and streams that fed expansive river valleys, particularly on Oʻahu and Kauaʻi. But, Hawaiians successfully and systematically cultivated the rich volcanic soil in these hot and barren lands to grow and develop extensive field systems of kalo maloʻo and ‘uala. Kīpuka or small cultivable areas in forests or pockets of rich soil in the lava were also used for growing food and capturing water. An ʻōlelo noʻeau says, “Na ʻilina wai ʻole o Kohala” – The waterless plains of Kohala, where water will not remain long. After a downpour, the people look even in the hollows of rocks for precious water” (Pukui 1983: 243).

The districts of Kaupō and Kahikinui on Māui and Kohala, Kona, Waimea and Kaʻū on Hawaiʻi are renowned areas for intensified dry-land cultivation. In Kohala,

...extending south, west and north as far as your eye can make out – is the imprint left by centuries of intensive farming. Covering more than twenty-three continuous square miles, the leeward Kohala field system is surely one of the greatest archaeological complexes in the entire Pacific. Here the ancient Hawaiians a remarkable agricultural system based on the cultivation of sweet potatoes, dryland taro, surgarcane, and other crops that could be
raised on the fertile volcanic slopes, watered only by the rains blown over the mountain crest on the mumuku winds (Kirch 2012: 188).

Kalo maloʻo farming was more labor intensive with lesser yield than kalo wai farming (Kelly 1989: 82). In leeward areas, weather was harsher and rainfall was unpredictable which could lead to crop failure and famine. But, as the population expanded and settled in the ‘āina maloʻo or dry-land regions, these lands became increasingly developed in food production and more valuable to the Aliʻi Nui.

According to traditional moʻolelo, “[t]he systematic organization of this dryland agriculture may have been developed during the time of ‘Umi-a-Liloa who came to live in Kailua, Kona in the latter part of his life...” (Kelly 1989: 98). The increased intensification and production in dry-land cultivation prompted ‘Umi to move his royal court from Waipiʻo to Kona making it a political and religious center on Hawaiʻi Island. Moʻolelo describes ‘Umi as a highly organized ruler who sustained an expanding and stratified population of chiefs, attendants, and specialized crafts people during periods of extensive dry-land cultivation. The konohiki were part of this stratified social hierarchy who helped develop these dry-land field systems that further advanced Hawaiʻi socially, economically and politically.

Although the historical literature lacks any specific mention of the konohiki associated with dry-land cultivation, research of 1848 Māhele records identify specific konohiki who lived, farmed and managed these lands for the Aliʻi Nui. High levels of food production, labor and religious activities in these areas required a multitude of konohiki who could coordinate and accomplish these tasks. The makaʻāinana alone would not have had the authority or leadership to organize the building, planning, and overall maintenance of extensive field systems and the building of heiau in these areas.

In dry-land cultivation, religious worship of the Akua Lono, Kane-puaʻa (Pig-Kane), Ku-keaolewa (Ku-of-the-floating cloud) and various ‘aumākua were an important aspect of the konohiki’s daily life.

The following pule to Kane-puaʻa asks for blessings on ʻuala crops and the mahi ʻai [farmer]:

E Kanepuaʻa e hoʻi mai no ʻoe a kakou waena,
Ilaila no ʻoe e ʻeku ai;
E malama i ko kaua waena,
I kupu, i ulu, i hua,
I ola na ‘ohana, i ola na malihini
Kipa i ko kakou hale.
He ho’oulu ‘ai, he ho’oulu i’a na Kanepua’a.
‘Amama, ua noa.

O Kanepua’a, come to our patch,
Dig here;
Take care of our patch
So that it will sprout, grow, bear,
And bring “life” to the family, “life” to the strangers
Welcomed at our house
[May there be] abundant “food,”
abundant “fish” from Kanepua’a.
The kapu of the prayer is freed
(Kamakau 1976: 29).

“After the prayer to Kanepua’a had been uttered, the patch became tabu. For perhaps a month or two no one was allowed to throw stones into it, or thrust sticks into it, or to walk about it” (Kamakau 1976: 29). The kapu was likely set by the konohiki who were responsible for overseeing the planting and religious cultivation protocols.

In addition to producing diverse sources of food and plants with the maka‘āinana, the konohiki organized the production, collection and distribution of the sacred ho‘okupu during the annual Makahiki Festival honoring Lono. Lono was the Akua of dry-land agriculture and agricultural heiau of māpele, ho‘o‘ulu‘ulu ‘ai and hale o Lono which were erected throughout these extensive field gardens.

Heiau were situated near the konohiki’s kauhale (residential compounds) in order to maintain and worship the Akua for rainfall and bountiful crops. Archaeological studies of heiau in Kahikinui, Māui revealed evidence of adze and fishhook making in heiau indicating they were
not only for worship but “places where men carried out utilitarian craft activities” (Kirch 2014: 202). Perhaps, these were the remnants of konohiki activity and work in their religious duties.

The expansive dry-land field systems were highly organized along the mountain slopes divided by rows of kuaiwi or mounded lava rock walls. They were also referred as iwi, iwi kuamoʻo, iwi ʻāina or iwi pōhaku (Allen 2001: 8-9; Pukui and Elbert 1986). The walls ran either ma uka to ma kai or perpendicular to the slope of the mountainside connected by trail pathways. The labor, construction and maintenance of these extensive lava wall systems and the mapping of the trails throughout the fields were likely designed and administered under the konohiki supervision and authority.

Kalo and ʻuala were the principal crops grown in these field gardens while other foods and plants were raised in different vegetation zones. These zones included the kuahiwi (mountain forests), the kula (open country), the ʻāpaʻa zone (lower mountain slopes), and the palawai (bottom, rockier lands) (Kamakau 1976: 23). They were ecologically interdependent in capturing moisture and rain, cross-pollination and distributing nutrients to the crops. The palawai zones had rich soil where ʻuala grew exceptionally large and abundantly with little water. Hawaiians were master cultivators of ʻuala and developed over 200 varieties (Winter 2004: 14). The ʻāpaʻa zone was ideal for growing kalo, ʻuala, kō, kī, wauke, and maiʻa and considered the zone “most intensively cultivated and most productive” (Allen 2001: 5).

Cultivation zones that relied heavily on rainfall had to be carefully planned and timed with the anticipation of the winter rains and winds. The konohiki were the ones who determined the types of plants to grow, where to farm and the seasons for planting and harvesting. Traditional methods of moisture retention, water diversion, composting, mulching and fertilizing were used to enrich crops in quality and quantity.

After the ending of the heavy rains in February, the time of drenching (ka-ʻelo) when the ground was soaked, the fields were spaded up with the ʻoʻo [digging stick], and in March the gardens were planted with taro, sweet potato, gourds, paper mulberry, and olona on upper slopes, and yams and arrowroot higher in the uplands (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 31).

In addition to kalo and ʻuala, a wide variety of different food crops were cultivated in different vegetation zones. According to American missionary Reverend William Ellis in 1823, “[t]he level land of the whole district for about three miles, is one continued garden, laid out in
beds of taro, potatoes, yams, sugarcane, or cloth plants [wauke]" (2004: 60). He continues, "fields were planted with bananas, sweet potatoes, mountain taro, paper mulberry plants, melons, and sugar-cane, which flourished luxuriantly in every direction” (Ellis 2004: 46).

Missionary Lorenzo Lyons, on a tour of Kohala in 1835, describes the hardships of living in the drier leeward side in contrast to the windward side.

“The Western shore is hot and barren. They live on fish and on food cultivated in the interior. Water is brackish. Good water is only to be had five or six miles distant….On the North and East the country is very well peopled and beautiful, with streams, verdure, awful majesty” (Lyons in Doyle 1945: 84).

One Hawaiian proudly describes the resourceful methods of his or her kupuna’s dry-land farming on the rugged, but rich volcanic terrain:

“ʻI ka wā o nā kūpuna, ʻo nā ʻāina mahi e waiho ana me na pāhoehoe ma ʻaneʻi a ma ʻō, e uhi paʻapū ʻia ana ia ʻāina i na mea kanu, mai ka ʻāina maikaʻi a ka ʻāina pāhoehoe. He wahi ʻōlelo palaualelo wale ka ʻōlelo aʻe: Heaha ka pono a kela mau pāhoehoe? No ia mau aina pāhoehoe kēia wahi poʻomanaʻo a kāua e kuʻu mea heluhelu. He hana nō ko ia ʻano ʻāina. ʻO kēia pāhoehoe, ma ka wā kahiko, he paepae ʻia mai a puni me nā pōhaku nunui a me ke unu o ka mahakea; i ka puni ʻana i ka pā o ʻelua paha kapuaʻi ke kiʻekʻeʻe, e lilo ana ia i pā hoʻāhu no nā weuweu like ʻole, ʻo ke ʻamaʻu, a pēlā aku, me ka lū ʻia o kekahī lepo ma luna iho a paʻa pono, mai ka mahakea aʻe nō, no ka hoʻopulu ʻana, a ma kekahi ʻōlelo, ka hoʻopopopo ʻana a lilo i lepo i kēia mau ʻōpala a weuweu”

In the days of our ancestors, arable lands on either side of the lava bed were covered with plants from good land to rocky ones. It is an idle thing to say, “What good are rocky lands?” The topic above refers to rocky lands, dear reader. Such lands were tilled. Rocky pāhoehoe lands in the olden days were walled up all around with the big and small stones of the field until there was a wall about two feet high. Piled up in the enclosure were plants of every kind, ʻamaʻu ferns (Sadleria spp.) and so on, which were then topped well with soil taken from the same field to enrich it, in other words to compost the rubbish and plants and make soil (Anonymous author 2003: 8-9).
Mālama i ka Wai – Konohiki Freshwater Stewardship

_Ua ka ua, kahe ka wai – the rain rains, the water flows (Pukui 1983: 308)_

Wai is a precious, life-giving and sacred natural resource to Hawaiians. Early Hawaiians held a spiritual connection with wai and judiciously stewarded it using strict religious kapu and kānāwai under the _Konohiki System._

Kāne-i-ka-wai-ola was the Akua of wai, sunlight, procreation, kalo and the energizing life force for things animate and inanimate. The ‘ōlelo no’eau “he huewai ola ke kanaka na Kāne says, “man is Kāne’s living water gourd – water is life and Kāne is the keeper of water” (Pukui 1983: 68). Literally, man serves as the living “vessel” or steward of wai while Kāne possesses ultimate mana over water.

Lono-wai-makua (father of waters) was another major Akua associated with wai in the form of rain, clouds, and storms. He watered the ‘Āina, the rivers and streams which nourished plants, animals and the people. He was celebrated during the Makahiki harvest festival when the konohiki collected the hoʻokupu or “first fruits” borne from his blessings of wai.

The Hawaiian cultural values of “wealth” are intrinsically tied to man’s ability to grow food from an abundant supply of wai. The reduplication for freshwater in Hawaiian or “waiwai” means value, wealth, prosperity. A “Hawaiian farmer who had all the water he needed for growing taro was indeed a prosperous person” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 57). Moreover, Aliʻi who held ʻĀina with abundant water sources and fertile river valleys with loʻi kalo were deemed prosperous and powerful.

The Aliʻi Nui were the trustees of wai for the Akua and “[i]n ancient times, water was a public trust resource, which means that no one – not even aliʻi – could own water” (Sproat 2009: 5). Ancient Hawaiian kānāwai governed and protected all aspects of wai. Kānāwai “literally translates as relating to water” (Sproat 2009: 4). Later, it evolved to mean “law, code, rule, statute, act, regulation ordinance, decree, edict; legal; to obey a law; to be prohibited; to learn from experience” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 127).

The konohiki served as entrusted caretakers under the Aliʻi Nui to steward wai equitably and sustainably for the benefit of society. They used kānāwai and appropriate kapu as conservation methods to protect wai and ensure fair distribution. Therefore, “under the
ancient Hawaiian systems, more elaborate in some ahupuaas than in others, disputes concerning water were extremely rare. The aim of the konohikis and of all others in authority was to secure equal rights to all and to avoid quarrels” (Perry 1912: 7).

The konohiki had to know all the diverse sources of wai and hydrologic features of their ahupua’a to make it productive and fertile. Well designed and regulated ‘auwai systems ensured food security that strengthened social, economic and political stability. “The hydrology of the stream dominates the economy of the ahupuaa, and the management and conservation of the stream waters and the adjacent soil are prime considerations of the ali‘i ai ahupuaa and his konohiki (Perry 1914: 437-446).

The most detailed and informative writing on traditional wai stewardship by the konohiki is the article Ancient Hawaiian Water Rights and Some of the Customs Pertaining to Them (1893) by Emma Metcalf Nakuina. Nakuina, a 19th century Hawaiian scholar, was appointed in 1892 by Queen Lili‘uokalani as the first woman water judge and commissioner of Kona, O‘ahu. She received training in the kānāwai and mālama of wai under Kamehameha IV and from her father Theophilus Metcalf, a prominent land surveyor during the 1848 Māhele ‘Āina. Nakuina’s article preserves invaluable ‘ike kūpuna (ancestral knowledge) of the konohiki and the lost traditions of wai stewardship.

According to Nakuina, “All auwais (water courses, had a proper name, and was generally called after either the land or the chief of the land that had furnished the most men, or had mainly been instrumental in the inception, planning and carrying out of the required work” (1893: 79). The “chief of the land” was typically the konohiki who oversaw these water projects and recruited the labor. They were respected and celebrated which is evident in these water systems bearing their names. Abner Paki, a lower chief and konohiki, designed and built an extensive ‘auwai in Nu‘uanu Valley on O‘ahu that was named Paki ‘auwai. He “planned it and directed its construction, 700 men were employed, 300 were furnished by Paki, 300 by Kehikili and 50 each by Huakini and Dr. Rooke” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 61). This naming tradition shows the deep aloha of the people for the ‘Āina and their konohiki. Today, many of the ‘auwai systems and other wahi kūpuna have been destroyed and long forgotten. Sadly, the
ancestral knowledge of these places and the people who built and stewarded them have been lost.

In Nakuina’s article, the konohiki held the rights and privileges to manage, protect, settle disputes and distribute wai in their ahupua’a or ‘ili ‘āina. These rights were referred as “konohiki water rights” and an important aspect of the larger Konohiki System of resource management. “All auwais tapping the main stream were done under the authority of a Konohiki of an Ahupuaa, Ili or Ku. In some instances the konohikis of two or three independent lands – i.e. lands not paying tribute to each other – united in the work of auwai making, in which case the konohiki controlling the most men was always the recognized head of the work” (Nakuina 1893: 79).

The konohiki were sometimes referred as “luna wai” or water managers. Therefore, “[t]he konohiki of the land controlling the most water rights in a given auwai was invariably its luna” (Nakuina 1893: 80; see also Perry 1912: 7). In other instances, “konohiki appointed lunawai…to manage water distribution within and between land divisions” (Sproat 2009: 4). Larger ahupua’a with high food production and dense populations had the luxury of specialized levels of managers like the konohiki and luna wai.

The mālama of wai was a spiritual and religious kuleana dedicated to the different Akua associated with wai. The completion and dedication of new waterways and structures was a religious and celebratory event. The konohiki or luna wai and the kahuna wai conducted the consecration ceremony and festivities for all who contributed to a newly constructed māno wai (dam) and ‘auwai.

When the digging of an auwai was completed to the satisfaction of the luna in charge of the work, a day would be set for the building of the dam. This was an occasion for rejoicing and feasting, and was never hurriedly done. The water kahuna or priest had to be first consulted in regard to a favorable day, which being settled, the konohiki was required to furnish a hog large enough to supply a good meal to all workers of the auwai, red fish (ahuluhulu), amaama and aholehole, as well as awa root for the use of the priest at the opening ceremonies (Nakuina 1893: 84).

At the end of the festivities, “singers of both sexes would chant songs composed in honor of him [konohiki] who had planned and carried out the beneficial undertaking that would be the means of a supply of food for many” (Nakuina 1893: 84).
Water rights and laws pertained mainly to kalo cultivation. “The right to use it depended entirely upon the use of it” and “[i]f the family did not use it, it no longer had a right to claim it” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 63-64). The konohiki had to ensure the delicate ecosystems of the rivers and streams which fed the loʻi kalo down to loko iʻa and coastal shorelines were maintained to ensure proper flow and water quality.

Water was shared by everyone and the people upstream had to be respectful of those downstream. Therefore, water right holders shared the kuleana with the konohiki or luna wai in the care of the entire ‘auwai system or faced punishment for neglecting their water duties.

To neglect, steal, monopolize, or waste wai was sacrilegious and reprehensible in ancient times. Punishment by the konohiki for water use offenses included withholding water from one’s ‘Āina which could result in starvation, the dispossession of one’s lands and home, or the loss of community respect as a “kuewa” or outcast. Being a kuewa was “a condition very much dreaded by the Hawaiian agriculturist, who generally inherited his holding from ancestors who had lived on the land in successive generations, paying tribute of service and produce to successive konohikis” (Nakuina 1893: 82).

Punishment by death was the consequence for more serious violations. “Any one in the olden times caught breaking a dam built in accordance with the Hawaiian’s idea of justice and equity, would be slain by the share holders of that dam, and his body put in the breach he had made, as a temporary stopgap, thus serving as a warning to others who might be inclined to act similarly” (Nakuina 1893: 82).

Those directly in service to the Aliʻi Nui, including the konohiki, were not exempt from punishment. During the reign of Kamehameha I, anyone who dishonored the laws related to fishing, agriculture and labor, and disrupted the peace of the people would be penalized, including his retainers (Nakuina 1893: 83).

The konohiki designed, constructed and maintained irrigation systems from ma uka to ma kai with the help of the people. Rivers and streams mainly defined the boundaries of the ahupua’a and the konohiki, at times, collaborated with other ahupua’a in the sharing and managing of wai.
The irrigation system was composed of many sections beginning ma uka with the poʻowai (head water source), the mānowai (dams), the kahawai (streams), hāwai (aqueducts, flumes), ʻauwai (ditches, canals), and makawai (water outlets in a loʻi) (Pukui and Elbert 1986). It was the konohiki, not the makaʻāinana, who mapped and charted the waterways based on the geographical landscape, the water sources and the distribution to water users.

It was unlikely that a single family would have been permitted to carve out a new set of terraces for their own use, because of pre-existing water and land rights. Any new development would call for the supervision and planning of the landlord, for it was the landlord not the planter who controlled the use of land and water (Handy, Handy, Pukui 1972: 281).

When the planning was finished the “[a]uwais, were generally dug from makai – seaward or below – upwards. The konohiki who had the supervision of the work having previously marked out where it would probably enter the stream, the diggers worked up to that point” (Nakuina 1893: 79). Hawaiian values of laulima (cooperation) and lōkahi (unity) were important in all communal projects (see Handy, Handy Pukui 1972: 307). The konohiki, as a chiefly leader, depended on the loyalty and cooperation of his workers. According to Hawaiian legal scholar and water expert Kapua Sproat,

The konohiki’s and lunawai’s powers were tempered by reliance on, and the cooperation of, makaʻāinana for labor. It was the konohiki’s responsibility to facilitate the work necessary to make the ahupua’a productive and to pay tribute to the aliʻi. Therefore, konohiki endeavored to treat makaʻāinana fairly and to avoid disputes. Konohiki were also remiss to impose unreasonable burdens because makaʻāinana were free to leave the land if they became dissatisfied, and without a strong work force the ahupua’a would not thrive. Under these circumstances, water disputes were rare, and for the most part, a system of mutual support and interdependence developed between makaʻāinana and aliʻi (2009: 5).

The distribution and amount of wai allotted by the konohiki or luna wai was based on 1) personal labor contributed, 2) rotating timed schedules, and 3) distance from the water source. “[A] strong middle-age man having three or four grown up sons living on the land, and sharing in whatever konohiki work was undertaken, would naturally be entitled to more water than the one who had only his own personal labor to depend on...” (Nakuina 1893: 80). Water users were required to work closely with the luna wai or konohiki during their rotation to inspect, clean, and repair sections of the ʻauwai system and help distribute water (Nakuina 1893: 83).
Rotations and timed schedules were ways of allotting wai fairly. Divisions of time...varied in the cases of mooaina, ku, ili or ahupuaa from a few hours, half a day, night, or both, to two or three days. The divisions of the day were regulated by the sun, the night by the stars. The konohiki of each independent land subdivided his water time among the holders of mooainas, (now kuleanas) on his ahupua’a, ili or ku” (Nakuina 1893: 80).

Distance from the water source determined the allotment of wai. “No auwai was permitted to take more water than continued to flow in the stream below the dam. It was generally less for there were those living makai or below the same stream, and drawing water from it, whose rights had to be regarded” (Nakuina 1893: 79).

As a precious, life-sustaining resource, wai was meticulously monitored down to tiny droplets or “kulu.” Smaller upstream loʻi on terraced hillsides were “awarded kulu or drops; that is, they are entitled to continual driblets of water and no one having a water share may turn the water entirely away from them unless in time of scarcity” (Nakuina 1893: 81). Any surplus water that remained in the stream after water users had been allotted their share remained under the authority of the konohiki (Castle and Murakami 1991: 156). The lunawai or konohiki could divert surplus water to kula lands for kalo maloʻo and ʻuala fields “but this was never done if any loi or lois should be needing the water” (Nakuina 1893: 83).

For Hawaiians, wai was the perpetual life force that continuously flowed and connected the ʻĀina with the rest of the environment and all living things. The konohiki ensured the diverse sources of wai were protected and respected as the manifestation of the Akua. As stewards, they served their Aliʻi through judicious water management and conservation to ensure their lands were momona or productive. This is in turn elevated their Aliʻiʻi’s status and mana.

The konohiki’s kuleana to steward and guarantee clean and fresh wai were essential for the people to produce food from their loʻi kalo, down to the loko i’a and the ocean. The loko i’a along the shoreline were natural extensions or an ecological continuum of the loʻi kalo that formed an interdependent and holistic ecosystem between ʻĀina and kai. Together, these systems worked in ecological and spiritual harmony that sustained a thriving, robust Hawaiian society.
Mālama i ke Kai – Konohiki Fishery and Fishpond Stewardship

Fishponds, loko i’a, were things that beautified the land, and a land with many fishponds was called “fat land (ʻāina momona) – Samuel Kamakau (1976: 45).

Loko I’a (Fishponds)

Loko i’ā (inland fishponds) and loko kuapā (sea-walled, brackish water fishponds) were unique and innovative achievement by Hawaiians that significantly increased aquatic food production while sustaining resources from ma uka to ma kai.

...Ancient Hawaiians and their extensive system of fishponds are cited as one of the premier examples of successful fish farming in the world. Hawai’i is reputed to be the only known place in Oceania where the people practiced such a highly sophisticated form of pond aquaculture...” (Farber 1997: 6).

The development of complex agricultural irrigation systems revolutionized the way Hawaiians cultivated kalo on an expansive scale. Kahawai and ʻauwai systems for kalo cultivation were vital “life lines” that connected the ʻĀina with kai. Hawaiians integrated highly advanced aquacultural systems of loko i’a as an ecological continuum of the lo‘i kalo. Together, they created a holistic ma uka to ma kai sustainable eco-system that further advanced and expanded Hawaiian society.

Hawaiian dualism in the environment such as ‘Āina [land] and kai [sea] also pertained to fishponds and cultivation. “[F]ishponds became the aquacultural equivalent of the “kōʻele” or cultivation plots strictly reserved for the Aliʻi Nui” (Kikuchi 1976: 298). Kōʻele were not only a chiefly plot of cultivable land but also “a small pond, reserved for a chief, where fish could be kept alive until required” (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 158).

The konohiki were involved in many aspects of stewarding loko i’a particularly the large royal ponds of the Aliʻi Nui. “The ponds cultivated for a chief, puʻuone haku koʻele belonged to the holder of the land, haku ʻaina, as did the taro patch ponds [on koʻele lands]” (Kamakau 1976: 49). Although the “holder of the land” could have been either haku ʻāina or konohiki, the konohiki typically managed the kōʻele for the Aliʻi. The konohiki’s kuleana of the Aliʻi’s fishponds “included instructing the tenants of the land when and where to construct, repair, and clean the different aquacultural structures. In many instances the konohiki also served as the warden to control poaching” (Kikuchi 1976: 296).
The kiaʻi loko or pond caretakers helped the konohiki with the larger loko kuapā. “Each
loko kuapā fishpond apparently had one or more kiaʻi loko, who lived with their families on site.
These men patrolled the pond, cleaned it, and, when instructed to do so, harvested the fish”
(Kikuchi 1976: 298). The ‘ōlelo noʻeau “ke ola no ia o kiaʻi loko” says the stewarding of a pond is
the life or livelihood of the kiaʻi loko. “Certain fish in a pond were reserved for the owner, but
shrimps, crabs, and such could be taken by the caretaker” (Pukui: 1983: 190). The “caretaker”
could also have been the kiaʻi loko and/or the konohiki.

It is believed the “traditional purpose of these ponds were to provide a “reliable,
convenient and ever-ready supply of fresh seafood for the ruling aliʻi (chief) and the royal
court” (Keala, Hollyer and Castro 2007: 7; see also Cobb 1905: 746). The abundance of loko iʻa
signified times of peace and prosperity for the Aliʻi and his ‘Āina. In times of war, loko iʻa were
destroyed by the enemy, or difficult to build and maintain with resources and labor diverted
towards warring. But, in times of prosperity, fishponds were abundant and “beautified the land,
and a land with many fishponds was called a “fat” land (‘aina momona) (Kamakau 1976: 47).

An Aliʻi whose lands were ‘āina momona with monumental fishponds, loʻi kalo and
heiau was considered very wealthy in status and mana. It was the kuleana of the konohiki to
elevate and maintain his Aliʻi’s station through the development of their resources. These
structures reflect the konohiki’s impressive and innovative works, stewarding the resources of
their Aliʻi, the Akua and even the people.

Prior to foreign contact, it is estimated there were 340-360 fishponds throughout
Hawaiʻi (Keala, Hollyer and Castro 2007: 7). Hawaiians used at least seven types of natural and
man-made ponds for raising aquatic foods5 and five types of ponds for salt-making.6 Fishponds
of the Aliʻi were mainly loko wai (freshwater), loko puʻuone (brackish water) and expansive loko
kuapā (sea water, stone-walled). In addition to royal fishponds, the konohiki and haku ‘āina also

5 Types of natural and man-made Hawaiian fishponds from ma uka to ma kai included 1) Loko wai (inland,
freshwater ponds); 2) Loko iʻa kalo (taro patch ponds); 3) Hāpunapuna (ponds from springs and pools); 4) kiʻo pua
(holding ponds for fish fry); 5) Loko puʻuone (brackish water ponds); 6) Loko ʻumeʻiki (saltwater fish trap ponds); 7)
6 Types of salt-making ponds included, 1) ‘Āina paʻakai; 2) ‘Ālialia paʻakai; 3) Hāhā paʻakai; 4) Kāheka; and 5) Loʻi
paʻakai (Maly 2003, V1: vi).
cared for fishponds used by the makaʻāinana. “Puʻuone ponds and taro patch ponds, loko iʻa kalo belonged to...the makaʻāinana, haku and konohiki” (Kamakau 1976: 49).

Fishponds varied in size and shape ranging from “less than one to six hundred acres” (Keala, Hollyer and Castro 2007: 7; see also Sterling and Summers 1978: 270). Extensive kuapā were built in deep and shallow water that were 1200 to 2500 meters long or approximately 4,000 to 5,000 feet and 3 to 19 feet wide (Kelly 1989: 83; Farber 1997: 11). Constructing fishponds was extremely labor intensive requiring tremendous amounts of manpower, resources, planning and time. Intricate stonework of the massive double-faced kuapā required the skill of knowledgeable stone craftsmen and masons. Thousands of foundational boulders, filler stones of basalt and coral were strategically placed to control tidal flows, filter the pond and protect the interior ecosystem from predators and rough seas.

Hawaiians were spiritually intuitive to the natural elements and listened carefully to the pōhaku and the kai to guide them in building the kuapā. Pōhaku were quarried and transported sometimes miles from the site. “ Builders stood in line from the source of the rock to the construction site and passed the rock along the human chain” (Farber 1997: 7).

Kamehameha I’s fishponds on Hawai‘i “required the labor of more than ten thousand men. Some fishponds covered an area of sixty or seventy acres more or less” (Kamakau 1976: 47). The coordination of such a monumental project and directing 10,000 people to execute this job would definitely require the konohiki’s expertise, skill and knowledge.

It is difficult to date the origins of the first fishponds in ancient times or the Aliʻi who built them. But, these ambitious fishpond projects, undoubtedly, involved the work and expertise of the konohiki (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 484). “The actual work to assemble the labor and carry out the aliʻi’s orders was conducted by the konohiki. The konohiki also controlled the food production, distributed the harvests from the fishponds to the ʻohana and pond workers living in the ahupuaʻa” (Farber 1997: 17).

Hawaiians held deep, spiritual relationships with their fishponds as physical manifestations of Akua and ʻaumakua. These guardian spirits protected different bodies of water and provided a wide array of marine food sources. If chief or commoner exploited,
polluted, overharvested ocean resources or were stingy and oppressive, these guardians would deplete the resources or food sources as a lesson and punishment.

Kū, the male of Akua of the sun and his wahine Hina, Akua of the moon and tides, were associated with fishponds, fishing and the ocean. Hina is also the “[a]kua of reef fishing, while Kū, or Kū‘ula, is an Akua of deep sea fishing” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1999: 31). Kū‘ula and koʻa fishing shrines were erected near ponds and along the sea coast for attracting fish and worshipping these two Akua. Kāne, Akua of wai, and Kanaloa, Akua of kai were also associated with fishponds which utilized both water sources.

Moʻo wāhine were the ‘aumakua of loko iʻa and the many different bodies of water. They transformed from lizard goddesses into human forms of beautiful, young maidens or elderly women to disguise their identity and punish anyone denying the poor and elderly of food. “Walinu‘u, Walimanoanoa and Kalamainu‘u and Kihawahine were ancestral moʻo and moʻo rulers” (Kamakau 1991: 85). Moʻo wāhine protected fishponds from exploitation and the people from abuse. Sometimes the konohiki were the perpetrators but, as caretakers of the resources and food supply they were still expected to be pono chiefs and were answerable to their Aliʻi and more importantly the Akua.

Kanekuaʻana was the guardian of ‘Ewa and fishponds of Puʻuloa...; she brought an abundance of pipi (oysters) ʻōpae (shrimp), and nehu (anchovy). Laniwahine was the guardian of the ‘Ukoʻa fishpond in Waialua; Hauwahine guarded the ponds of Kawainui and Kaʻelepulu in Kailua, Koʻolauapoko; and Laukupu the pond at Maunalua, on the east end of Honolulu.... When the chiefs or their agents [konohiki] abused the poor and the fatherless, the moʻo guardians took the fish away – until the wrongdoers showed penitence and made restitution to their victims (Kawaharada 1999:20-21).

Stories and legends regarding interactions between moʻo wāhine with the konohiki are lessons in resource conservation but more importantly, honoring the strong interdependent relationships between the ‘Āina, Akua, Aliʻi and the makaʻāinana. In one moʻolelo, the moʻo goddess, Kanekuaʻana, took away most of the pipi from Puʻuloa and returned to Kahiki in anger when a konohiki punished her poor, elderly woman relative for gathering pipi that were kapu. He forced her to empty her basket of pipi (a shellfish) in the ocean but still demanded payment for the returned pipi (M. K. Pukui in Sterling and Summers 1978: 50).
In another moʻolelo, Pele, the volcano and fire goddess is disguised as an elderly woman who requests fish from Kamehameha I’s fishpond, Pāʻaiea, in Hoʻonā, Kona, Hawaiʻi. His konohiki, Kepaʻalani, denies the woman fish since they are kapu for the king. Pele is angered by his denial of food to her as an elderly woman and destroys the king’s fishpond and houses with her lava flow (Kihe: 1914, 1924). Kamehameha realizes this woman is Pele and scolds his konohiki, “You were very wrong in withholding fish from that old woman...you should have given it all to her. You did not act with aloha toward the request of an old woman” (Desha 2000: 496).

In these moʻolelo, the konohiki are often portrayed as pono ‘ole (unjust) in their stinginess and heavy handedness with the people. But, as stewards and enforcers of the rules and regulations over precious resources they are lessons to teach cultural values and pono behavior. From a conservation and stewardship perspective, the konohiki were adhering to the strict kapu of their Aliʻi to protect resources from overexploitation. It was their kuleana to prevent overfishing and overharvesting that was counter to Hawaiian cultural values. Breaking an Aliʻi kapu could also cost the konohiki his life. The konohiki faced difficult challenges trying keep harmonious balance in society but often faced comprising, “no win” situations.

The konohiki’s kuleana was a complex balancing act of conserving resources while caring for the people, serving their Aliʻi and appeasing the Akua. The Akua and Aliʻi, like Kamehameha I, taught that being stingy with food is not pono chiefly behavior or pleasing to the Akua. To mālama and hoʻomaluhia (protect) each other is far more valuable than material wealth and personal gain. These cultural values were vital while living in an interdependent and reciprocal society. But, Hawaiians knew the specific roles dictated by societal norms and clearly understood a person actions had far reaching effects that could adversely affect not only one’s self but their community. These lessons also demonstrate that konohiki were not exempt from punishment by their Aliʻi and the Akua even while fulfilling their kuleana as stewards of resources and the people.

*The Konohiki System* had religious, socio-ecological checks and balances that protected and conserved the diverse sources of wai. But, with the loss of the *Konohiki System*, wai became privatized, commoditized, polluted, illegally diverted, and hoarded for generations by
foreigners particularly for sugar plantations. “By the late 1860’s, private land ownership had replaced traditional Hawaiian land tenure system, with profound and far-reaching effects on Hawaiian society” (Moffat and Fitzpatrick 2004: 11).

The transition of traditional Hawaiian land tenure from a reciprocal, interdependent society to a capitalist market economy had devastating long-term effects on Hawaiians. It was dominated by monopolistic and profit-driven sugar plantations owned by wealthy, rapacious haole which led to the disintegration of the Konohiki System and social class ties between Hawaiians.

**Konohiki Fisheries and Fishing Rights**

Hawai’i’s near-shore and deep sea fisheries were extensive and bountiful with diverse aquatic food sources in early times. Fish, crustaceans, shellfish and seaweed were important foods in the Hawaiian diet and fishing was a vital part of daily life. “The Hawaiian people were a race of expert fishermen. The art had been handed down from their ancestors. Agriculture and fishing were the two main professions always passed on by the grandparents to the boys” (Kamakau 1976: 59).

Typically men fished while women gathered seafood and limu (seaweed) along the shorelines and reef. When the fishermen returned home with a catch, sacred rituals were performed of personal cleansing and dressing, then offerings were made to the Akua, and fish was distributed to those who helped with the kapu fish for the mua and “free” fish for the hale ʻaina (Kamakau 1976: 66, 73-74).

In ancient times, the konohiki managed and protected the fisheries of the Aliʻi nui. They held exclusive rights known as “konohiki fishing rights” under the Aliʻi “to regulate the taking of fish and other marine life from the reefs and fishing grounds abutting the ahupuaʻa” (Murakami 1991: 173). The konohiki knew the ocean currents, the tides, winds, weather, and the diverse marine life in their ahupuaʻa. They determined who could fish and gather what, when and where from the fisheries of their ahupuaʻa to conserve and sustain these marine ecosystems for future generations. For example, “[f]rom February to late May, during the spawning season, inshore fishing had been restricted. Beginning with June, summer was the season for deep-sea fishing” (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 30).
Hawaiians had distinct divisions of the ocean, from the kahakai to the moana, for gathering and fishing. The *kai luʻu* areas were for diving, *kai paeaea* for pole fishing, *kai ʻo leho, kai ʻokilo heʻe,* and *kai lūheʻe* for octopus fishing, and *kai lawaiʻa* for deep sea fishing (Kamakau 1976: 11). Although the konohiki regulated shoreline and deep sea fisheries, near-shore fisheries, included *loko iʻa,* required more controlled management.

One Hawaiian resident, J. K. Mokumaia, writes of the abundance of konohiki in Waiʻalae Iki ahupuaʻa of Oʻahu in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa.*

Many people lived along the shores and they worked at farming and fishing. There were many konohikis in former days....Kamamalu was Waialae-ikiʻi’s konohiki of fishing. There were ever so many people on the shores when these chiefs came to spend a while with the common people. There was a pool that Kamamalu used to bathe in. I went to see its beauty for myself. There are two springs, one....is on Waialae-iki. These appear to be good sites, there is much water, but its beauty of the time of the konohikis is gone. Now the kapu is freed and the kapu places are trodden underfoot.


The konohiki of Waiʻalae Iki, Kamamalu, is specifically referred by his ʻoihana as a “konohiki of fishing” or in the original text as a “konohiki iʻa” (Mokumaia 1920: 8). The original article also mentions Chief Abner Pākī as the “konohiki iʻa” of Waiʻalae Nui.

Mokumaia confirms the existence of a large population of konohiki that was needed to manage the heavily populated and resource rich shoreline of this ahupuaʻa. More importantly, it shows the mutual aloha between these konohiki chiefs and their people. Mokumaia mourns the loss of the traditional *Konohiki System* that once beautified the land and the decline of the konohiki’s ability to kapu resources which resulted in exploitation of the shoreline.

The management of the Aliʻi Nui’s private *nā kai lawaiʻa konohiki* or “konohiki fisheries” was an important kuleana for konohiki. In addition to keeping them productive and healthy, the konohiki also fulfilled the requests of the Aliʻi for specific kinds of fish or seafood at a moment’s notice. The Aliʻi would advise the konohiki what seafood they desired during specific seasons and how the catches would be distributed.

Kamehameha I “placed restrictions on sea fisheries for periods of five months, and on the sixth month when the restriction was removed and fishing was allowed all over the land, the king and the commoners were usually the only
ones to share the first day’s catch, and the landlords [Aliʻi konohiki] day’s catch. After this the restrictions were removed, allowing all to fish for six months. At the end of this period restrictions were again placed over certain fish in order that they might increase. These restrictions were also extended to the deep-sea fishing grounds where the kahala were caught and the fish that go in schools, such as deep-sea squid, uhu, aku, and flying fish” (Kamakau 1961: 177-8).

Interestingly, the makaʻainana enjoyed special privileges from the Mōʻī over the konohiki. Typically, they “had the right to take fish subject to the right of the konohiki to manage and conserve the fisheries” (Murakami 1991: 173). The makaʻāinana routinely paid a portion of their marine food sources as obligatory tribute to the konohiki and Aliʻi for subsistence rights to the land and resources. During the yearly Makahiki Festival they also contributed a variety of sacred sea foods requested by the konohiki as hoʻokupu in honor of Akua Lono.

Stewardship of the fisheries by the konohiki was highly regulated and structured by the Kapu System, the Aliʻi’s “kauoha” or commands, the Hawaiian lunar calendar, seasons, tides and the breeding habits of aquatic life.

There were kapu intended to protect the spawning season of particular fish, such as the mullet, during the rainy season and when they were spawning in the mouths of streams opened by freshets; and there were local kapu laid upon particular varieties of fish at other times by konohiki on behalf of the aliʻi (Handy, Handy and Pukui 1972: 442).

One method of designating kapu fishing areas by the konohiki was the use of unuunu or kapu markers made of bamboo, white cloth or hau branches:

How the tabu was made known – Sometimes it was laid on by fixing certain marks called unu unu, the purport of which was well understood, on the place or things tabued. When the fish of a certain part of tabued, a small pole is fixed in the rocks on the coast, the centre of the place, to which is tied a bunch of bamboo leaves, or a piece of white cloth (Ellis 2004: 97).

Hau tree branches distinguished the kapus during heʻe (octopus) season. Heʻe was a delicacy and popular food of Hawaiians with strict kapu and protocol for spearfishing this prized animal.

During the months the hau branch was posted, it was tabu for canoes to go out fishing; tabu for women to go to the beaches; tabu to fish with nets. Only
the overseers, the konohiki and the luna, went to look at the heʻe, which had come up to the sandy shores” (Kamakau 1976: 70).

When the fishermen were finished spearing heʻe, they “went ashore, some in canoes – from ten to forty of them – but most on foot. When all were gathered in one place, the heʻe were portioned out, fifty to a hundred to each. In this way they were divided among the konohiki; the land holders, haku; the chiefs, and those who had done the spearing” (Kamakau 1976: 71).

This description confirms the strict social hierarchy and protocol for food gathering and distribution of the incredible bounty of heʻe and seafood accessible to Hawaiians. By the mid 1800’s, foreign introduced system of laws, government and land tenure would change the traditional Konohiki System that would conserve food and water sources that Hawaiians survived on. Konohiki were replaced with government officials who regulated marine resources and shorelines.

In 1839, The Declaration Rights was enacted by the Kamehameha III providing protection to all people and their property under the new laws of the kingdom. Later, the 1848 Māhele privatized the lands of Hawaiʻi and were divided between Kamehameha III, his chiefs (Aliʻi and konohiki) and the makaʻāinana. Privatizing and purchasing the ‘Āina was a foreign concept to Hawaiians that was later opened to foreigners who acquired large tracts of land.

The adoption of Western laws and 1848 Māhele land revolution severely restricted the konohiki’s exclusive authority and rights to steward the ‘Āina, the fisheries and other natural resources that they previously protected under the Kapu System. Now, they were limited to kapu only two items during certain seasons for themselves in their ahupuaʻa. These items included one tree species from the mountains and one marine species from the ocean. The konohiki were also required to regularly report these two items to the Minister of Interior that were published in the Hawaiian newspapers. These were severe and radical changes that continued to strip the konohiki of their chiefly status, livelihood, and lands.

By 1848, this swift and radical decline of traditional Hawaiian society and the introduction of foreign systems resulted in the eventual collapse of the konohiki class and the end of the Konohiki System. The progression of Western laws and restructuring of the Hawaiian government, with Native depopulation, were oppressive and limited Hawaiians to live a quality
life of interdependent subsistence they once enjoyed. The adaptation to these foreign changes during the first half of the 19th century will be chronologically examined in Chapter 3 using the Hawaiian-language newspapers.

A timeline of the konohiki’s history during this period follows the socio-economic and political events that impacted their lives and the eventual decline of their class. (See Appendix A).
Chapter 3. Konohiki in the Hawaiian-Language Newspapers (HLN)

This chapter is a continuation of the konohiki’s history in the 19th century that was documented and preserved in the Hawaiian-language newspapers (HLN). The chronological publication of the HLN forms a natural timeline and temporal framework that traces the konohiki’s historical transformation in a cohesive and comprehensive way. The HLN reveal the overwhelming challenges the konohiki experienced during devastating depopulation from foreign diseases and foreign pressures for religious, socio-economic and political change in just half a century.

The chapter examines the first twenty years of the HLN (1834-1855) and is divided in two sections by decade titled, “1834-1844 Konohiki and the Spread of Christianity and Education,” and “1845-1855 The Māhele Land Division and Decline of the Konohiki.”

The first decade includes the early history of the newspapers and the konohiki’s role in the spread of Christianity and education after the arrival of American Protestant missionaries in 1820. Under the leadership of their Christianized Aliʻi, many supported the mission as converts, teachers, missionary assistants, and resource managers for the schools and churches.

Despite their significant contributions to the mission, the missionary-controlled HLN harshly criticized the konohiki and Aliʻi aiming to decrease the public’s confidence in their leadership and purpose. However, missionary journals reveal a different story of the konohiki who were generously supplying missionaries with an abundance of living necessities, gathering thousands for church worship and school, managing their district schools and churches, and provisioning resources for building and maintaining the mission’s extensive infrastructure of churches, schools, meeting houses, and personal residences island-wide.

This section also analyzes the impact of other external forces including the constant influx and settling of foreigners that added new burdens and hardship on Hawaiians and their resources. One example is the arrival of thousands of foreign ships and their ever increasing demands for provisioning. Ship provisioning for whaling, trading and merchant ships overburdened and exploited Hawaiʻi’s limited resources managed by the konohiki and the makaʻāinana labor force. Foreigners also introduced many fatal disease epidemics throughout the 19th century that nearly decimated the Hawaiian population and totally disrupted their once
thriving subsistent society. The devastating impact of Native depopulation on the konohiki class affected their ability to properly steward the land, resources and labor for the Ali‘i and the greater population. It also meant the loss of irreplaceable ancestral knowledge.

The second decade, 1845-1855, includes the foreign introduction of new Western laws, a constitutional government, a burdensome taxation system, and land tenure. In less than fifty years, these foreigners restructured traditional Hawaiian society using their Western systems to ultimately promote their Christian and later capitalist agendas.

Although their intentions were allegedly aimed to protect the makaʻāinana from the Ali‘i, in reality they disempowered the Ali‘i Nui and konohiki from protecting the makaʻāinana from encroaching, opportunistic foreigners, domestic and abroad. For the konohiki, these foreign systems also diminished their traditional power and authority over the land, taxation, labor and natural resources. These traditional responsibilities were replaced by increasing layers of government ministers, governors, judges, school agents, teachers, tax officers and collectors. Some of the highest Kingdom positions were held by the following missionaries, Reverends Richard Armstrong, William Richards, and Gerrit Judd. These crafty foreigners transitioned with ease from spearheading Christian ministries to controlling government ministries. Worshiping Jehovah quickly transformed to worshiping capitalism and money.

The chapter concludes with analysis of HLN articles pertaining to the Māhele and its negative impact on the konohiki. Although the Māhele has been researched by many modern scholars, new information extracted from the HLN includes the Native and the konohiki’s perspective which is lacking in Hawaiian scholarship. The Māhele was a disastrous and irreversible “land loss” for most Hawaiians, including the konohiki, who were forced into this system designed and controlled by foreigners. New evidence contradicts the historical record that the majority of konohiki were coercive land-grabbers who were preventing makaʻāinana from filing land claims. Or, as American anthropologist Marshall Sahlins calls them “parasitic” (1992: 114).

In reality, the increasing layers of “parasitic” foreign ministers, land commissioners, surveyors, judges, land agents and missionaries orchestrating the Māhele were draining the life blood of Hawaiians through Native depopulation and the dispossession of their lands and
resources. The makaʻāinana were used as pawns by foreigners to disempower the Mōʻī, his Aliʻi and konohiki, and to breakdown interdependence of Aliʻi and their people. It seemed the land tenure system was rigged by foreigners’ in their favor to acquire expansive the tracts of lands that were relinquished by the Mōʻī, Aliʻi and konohiki, and intended for the makaʻāinana. The radical shift of Hawaiian lands into foreign hands discussed in Chapter 4 provides new evidence and quantified data that Kamehameha III’s konohiki, who were the highest ranking in their class, lost most of their lands, were dying off from foreign diseases and being disempowered and replaced by foreigners.
Hawaiian-Language Newspapers (HLN)

Published between 1834 and 1948, the HLN “make up the largest known repository of Hawaiian writings” (Nogelmeier 2010: 63). It is an invaluable primary source of cultural, historical, and ancestral knowledge that has been greatly underutilized in Hawaiian scholarship (Nogelmeier 2010: xi; Silva 2008: 107).

In just over a century, Hawaiian writers filled 125,000 pages in nearly 100 different newspapers with their writings. While literacy was at its highest, Hawaiians embraced the Hawaiian-language newspapers as the main venue for news, opinions, and national dialogue, but also as an acknowledged public repository for history, cultural description, literature and lore (Nogelmeier 2010: xii).

Hawaiians and foreigners from different walks of life published first-hand accounts of the konohiki which influenced the nation’s perceptions and treatment of them. Suddenly, it became acceptable to publicly criticize and denigrate the konohiki as chiefs that became permanently documented in writing.

Early Hawaiian newspapers were mission-controlled and used as teaching material for converting and educating Hawaiians in mission schools. They were also intended to transform Hawaiians into a “civilized” society through Christianity and education. According to Education professor, Linda Menton, in her article “A Christian and ‘Civilized’ Education: The Hawaiian Chiefs’ Children’s School, 1839-50,”

In the missionary worldview, no aspect of a “heathen” culture was too trivial – or too important – to escape being scrutinized in the context of the Christianity/civilization mind-set – and invariably to be found wanting. “Civilization” dictated how people should eat, work, dress, use their time, govern their lives. It mandated qualities like sobriety, cleanliness, and industry, and forbad such “heathen” practices as polygamy, nomadism, and “indolence.” “Civilization” also prescribed the establishment of a whole panoply of institutions that both characterized civilized societies and allowed them to flourish. Chief among these were schools and churches. One of the most important means missionaries used to transform native cultures throughout the world was, of course, education, and more specifically, schooling (1992: 216).

Missionaries and Christianized Hawaiian students published negative articles of the konohiki portraying them as incompetent, unsupportive of the Mission and practicing
“heathen” lifestyles. But, contrary to these articles, konohiki of Christianized Ali‘i Nui became highly literate and key contributors in spreading Christianity and education throughout the Kingdom. “The chiefs saw the value of education and of the observance of the Sabbath. They learned to repeat the Lord’s prayer, and teachers were sent all about the country districts” (Kamakau 1961: 270).

According to the private journals of missionaries Lorenzo Lyons, William Ellis, Laura Judd, William Chamberlain, and Artemis Bishop, the konohiki gathered worshippers for church or students for school, built the mission’s expansive infrastructure, became teachers, ran schools in their districts and provided missionaries with housing, food and transportation.

The HLN includes the perspective of the konohiki that has been omitted from the historical record. More importantly, the HLN revitalizes the konohiki’s personal stories, their names and knowledge that will now be passed to future generations. Rediscovered information on the konohiki in the newspapers will broaden and deepen existing scholarship and improve our understanding of the konohiki’s experiences in the 19th century.

Methodology and Use of the HLN

Since the HLN collection is extensive, this chapter is a survey of konohiki-related articles published from 1834, the year of the first newspaper, through 1855 following the 1848 Māhele land revolution. The newspapers in this study were accessed from the “Hoʻolaupaʻi Hawaiian Nūpepa Collection” on the Ulukau: Hawaiian Electronic Library website http://www.nupepa.org/. This collection is comprised of 15,000 pages (12%) of the 125,000 pages of original newspapers that were computer digitized and converted into searchable text files (Nogelmeier 2010: xii, 160).

A word search of “konohiki” retrieved 532 pages and articles in fourteen different newspapers. Of these fourteen newspapers, only the first four newspapers, Ka Lama Hawaii, Ka Kumu Hawaii, Ka Nonanona, and Ka Elele Hawaii,
Ke Kumu Hawaii, Ka Nonanona and Ka Elele applied to the time period examined in this chapter.

In researching the HLN and other ancillary sources, numerous konohiki names were appearing and needed to be organized to rebuild the histories for each konohiki. A database was created to index information of the konohiki’s names, lands, significant dates, notes, and reference sources of this information. (See Appendix B).

A histogram was created to plot and identify the publication frequency of the digitized konohiki articles that were retrieved from the HLN from 1834 to 1927. (See Appendix C). The years with the highest number of published articles were in 1857 (61 articles), 1858 (66 articles) and 1876 (60 articles). A high concentration of articles was published between 1857 and 1862 in three newspapers, Ka Hae Hawaii (1856-1861), Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika (1861-1863) and Ka Nupepa Kuokoa (1861-1927). These newspapers were the first independent newspapers unlike the early mission-controlled HLN.

Ka Hae Hawaii was a government publication of the Department of Public Instruction. It was “a central venue for written expression and interchange among Hawaiians” (Nogelmeier 2010: 77). The other two were independent newspapers published by Hawaiians for Hawaiians. David Kalākaua, who became king in 1874, was editor of Ka Hoku o Ka Pakipika. Although these years are not within the examined time period of my thesis, the remaining 382 articles from 1856-1927 contain new konohiki information for future research.

A database was created to chronologically index the newspapers by publication year with article information categorized by title, konohiki names, places names, Ali‘i Nui associations, the author(s) and an annotation of the article. (See Appendix D).

Since translating or annotating hundreds of konohiki articles would be a tremendous task and outside the parameters of this thesis, I annotated 60 articles during the first 20 years of the HLN. These 60 chosen articles correspond with important historical periods and events, like the Māhele, that impacted the konohiki in the 19th century.

1877); 10) Hawaii Holomua (1891-1895); 11) Ka Makaainana (1887-1893); 12) Ka Lei Rose o Hawaii (1898); 13) Home Rula Republalika (1901-1902); and 14) Ke Kiai (1902) (Mookini 1974).
In addition to the newspapers, this section includes ancillary writings of 19th century Hawaiian scholars and historians, missionary writings, and contemporary scholarship to expand and build on the content of the articles and to historically and culturally contextualize them.

1834-1844 Konohiki and the Spread of Christianity and Education

The konohiki were instrumental in the spread of Christianity and education with the arrival of American Protestant missionaries to Hawai‘i in 1820. Without the konohiki’s dedication of time, labor and resources, it would have been impossible for the small minority of missionaries to have succeeded in the phenomenal rise and spread of Christianity and literacy (Laimana 2011). Yet, despite their significant contributions, the konohiki have remained nearly invisible in this narrative of Hawaiian history with credit and recognition given mainly to the missionaries.

The early Hawaiian newspapers were missionary-controlled and although articles were published about the konohiki, they often reflected a negative, biased portrayal of them as unsupportive of the mission to the public. Ironically, private missionary journals and letters contradict this and provide evidence that the konohiki worked closely with missionaries in their churches and schools and were key contributors to the rise of Christianity and education. Other writings of 19th century Hawaiian scholar Samuel Kamakau (1961) and contemporary scholarship by Hawaiian scholars Lilikalā Kame‘elehiwa (1992), Jon Osorio (2002), John Laimana (2011), also show konohiki supported the missionaries in allegiance to their Aliʻi who supported the American mission.

Prior to 1834, the year the first Hawaiian newspaper was published, Hawai‘i had been inundated with ships of foreign explorers, traders, whalers, merchants and missionaries for half a century. From the first foreign arrival in 1778 to 1819, the year Kamehameha I’s died, 130 foreign ships arrived in Hawai‘i (Judd 1974: 1-17). Between 1820 and 1840, ship arrivals sharply jumped by 95% due to international trade of Sandalwood, furs and whaling. Honolulu harbor, alone, accommodated 3,203 ships of which 1,535 or 48.9% of them were whaling ships (Richards 2000: 12-15). Overall, total ship arrivals in Hawai‘i from 1824 to 1861 (37 years) was 13,994 of which 10,301 or 73% were whaling ships (Morgan in Sahlins 1992: 103).
Foreign visitors quickly became settlers in Hawai‘i and began influencing the Ali‘i leadership to adopt Western systems of capitalism, religion, laws, government and land tenure. Foreigners also infected Hawaiians with many diseases, beginning with venereal diseases by Captain Cook’s crew in 1778. This was followed by a host of other horrific diseases including measles, small pox, dysentery, cholera, tuberculosis, mumps, whooping cough, influenza and later, leprosy. The following table shows rates of Native depopulation starting with foreign contact in 1778 when the population was estimated to be as high as 1,000,000 (Kameʻelehiwa 1992: 141).

Missionary reports and censuses starting in 1823 (Kuykendall 1938: 336; Schmitt 1967: 468) reflect a sharp decline in Native population by 86% to only 134,750 people in the first fifty years of foreign contact. The Hawaiian population continued to collapse with relentless waves of foreign disease epidemics which nearly decimated the Native Hawaiian population down to approximately 40,000 in just a century.

Table 3.1. Population Decline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>134,750</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>107,954</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>86,593</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>71,019</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>47,508</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Samuel Kamakau wrote in 1867,

...foreign ships which arrived at Oahu during Kamehameha’s occupation of that island brought in many diseases, especially the severe pestilence of 1804 when so many chiefs and commoners perished. In Liholiho’s time when the missionaries arrived in Hawaii a large number of old chiefs were still living, and a great number of young chiefs and chiefesses. The country districts were thickly populated by lesser chiefs and chiefesses....In 1831 the school teachers began to take the census. Although it was not complete, they reported a little under 200,000. It is therefore evident that the population declined after the arrival of missionaries even though all wars ceased, and robbery and murder were wiped out (1961: 236).
Kamakau lists the epidemics and years when “thousands died, especially in the country districts” (1961: 236, 418). In 1804 (cholera or dysentery), 1826 (cough, congested lungs, and sore throat), 1839 (mumps), 1844 (colds, severe headache and dizziness), 1848 (measles), 1853 (small pox), 1857 (colds, dull headaches, sore throat, and deafness), and 1860 (leprosy) (1961: 236-237). (See Appendix E).

Missionary, Laura Judd, reports an influenza epidemic in 1845 that killed Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi (2003: 109). In 1848, missionary Amos Cooke, head of the Chief’s Children’s School, reported “[t]hree chiefs lie unburied; nearly 10,000 of the people of all the Islands are, or will be, carried away by the epidemic” (Cooke 1987: 356). Even with the aid of vaccinations, Rev. Sereno Bishop reported from ‘Ewa, O’ahu, “[t]he greatest destruction of [the] Hawaiian population took place in the summer of 1853 by an invasion of small-pox....But more than half the population of Ewa perished in a few weeks” (1901: 88).

In Ke Kumu Hawaii, an author W. P. A. reports with hopelessness of the devastating depopulation across Hawai‘i:

Ina me ia ka make ana, a me ka hanau ana, mai Hawaii a Niihau, ina ua make ma keia pae aina, i ka makahiki hookahi, 6838; a ua hanauia mai, i ka makahiki 3335; nolaila ua emi na kanaka o Hawaii nei 3503 i ka makahiki hookahi. Auhea oukou, e ka poe ola? E hoomakaukau oukou e make (W. P. A. 1835: 164).

If the dying and birthing is like this from Hawaii to Niihau, [and] if deaths across the islands in a year were 6,838 and the births were 3,335, then the decline of people in Hawaii in a year was 3,503. Where are the healthy, living people? Prepare to perish! [Translation by author]

Native depopulation resulted in socio-economic and political upheaval for Hawaiians. It affected every aspect of the konohiki’s lives killing them, their families, and entire districts. Suddenly, large sections of the population were suddenly gone, with survivors displaced and migrating to new districts in order to survive. The death of a konohiki meant the loss of a leader and generations of irreplaceable knowledge and wisdom of land and resource stewardship. Moreover, the rapid and perpetual dying of Hawaiians made the konohiki’s job extremely difficult to fulfill their kuleana maintaining lo‘i kalo and auwai systems, dry-land field systems, forests, fisheries and performing communal projects. Survivors struggled to produce life’s simplest necessities and many could no longer subsist and forced to abandon their lands.
Rev. Sereno Bishop writes “[o]wing to the decay of population great breadths of taro marsh had fallen into disuse, and there was a surplus of soil and water for raising food” (1901: 87).

While Hawaiians were dying off, their resources were increasingly burdened by high demands of foreigners for ship provisioning and supporting the mission. In addition to stewarding their ahupua’a, the konohiki built and maintained the mission’s infrastructure of churches, schools, student boarding houses, meeting houses and residences throughout the islands. Kamakau writes in 1869,

We build churches, labor day and night, give offerings to charity and the Sabbath dues, but the land is become empty; the old villages lie silent in a tangle of bushes and vines, haunted by ghosts and horned owls, frequented by goats and bats (1961: 416).

Ship provisioning was a tremendous burden on the konohiki, the maka‘āinana and the environment diverting a dying labor force, declining food supply, water and other scarce resources away from their subsistent lifestyles in their ahupua’a. Further research is needed to examine the socio-economic and environmental price tag of over a half century of generous ship provisioning by Hawaiians compared to the Sandalwood trade (1810-1830) for which the Ali‘i are harshly criticized for.

Rev. Charles Stewart noted the food crops “are cultivated almost exclusively for the refreshment of ships, and the tables of foreign residents” (1989: 138). In 1825, he writes of a Captain Beechey whose

...own ship, and all other vessels in port, were receiving from the native market every refreshment, both animal and vegetable, that they needed and desired. The numerous foreigners resident at Honolulu were also living in abundance on the same resources (Stewart 1831: 206).

Ke Kumu Hawaii (1837) published a list of 67 ship arrivals in O‘ahu from August 1st to December 15th in 1836. Letters between two high-ranking konohiki, Paulo Kanoa in Honolulu and Gideon Laanui in rural Waialua (1835-1838), discussed large supplies of fish, pigs, poi, kalo, uala, kapa, timber, stone, and various resources collected from rural areas and shipped to Honolulu. The konohiki oversaw the production, mobilization, loading, and transporting of these supplies for foreign ships and, for churches and schools. The following letter from Kanoa
Dear G. Laanui

Honolulu October 12, 1838

The steamer is coming and will dock in Waimea. Let some of the men go and help load the timber on the steamer. Also, you are to load the sweet potatoes from your farm tenants.

Also, you have given the stones for the church, the donation from your work committee. That is what I have told our people and they, Wahineaea them, are hauling it. I was asked to join the working committee in your place. I did not accept, but am supervising the work of our men. We shall continue working on your portion of work because the work is a group effort. Kahekili is the chief of the group work from the committee.

Kaniua is the chief below him, like when you were all here before. For this reason I am telling you that I am furnishing the food for our men. But I say we won’t have food when the work load increases. We will likely be without food because there is no food at Kikiwelawela.

All the prisoners have been employed in fishing for the King. That is why I am worried over our men, regarding our portion of the work due to the lack of food, because the King’s food is limited. It will be each man receiving a little due to the number of working crews.

It would be better for you to send over Kamai to look after one of the taro patches of the tenant and inform me in order that our work can be maintained from now on.

Also the bundles of sandalwood which Pole had mentioned, send them. Tell me what things are taken from the steamer. Also whether or not the cane field is fully planted. Also, what part of the wharf and the road is completed.

Regards to both of you,

From P. Kanoa

(Hawaiian Chiefs Letters 1834-1854).

Following the death of Kamehameha I in 1819, his Mōʻi wāhine Kaʻahumanu and Keōpūolani, his son Liholiho, and other Aliʻi Nui abolished the Kapu System and the ‘Ai Kapu (separate eating of men and women). To the Aliʻi leadership, the Akua were not sparing their people from massive suffering and death from diseases. Kaʻahumanu and her Aliʻi Nui replaced the ‘Ai kapu with ‘Ai noa (eating without kapu) perhaps believing “the ‘aina noa was the white man’s secret to life” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 82). This event set Hawaiian society on a radical
course that redefined chiefly status, disrupted power over the ʻĀina and paved the way for a new religion. According to Kameʻeleihiwa,

If there was no ʻAikapu, then the Aliʻi Nui ceased to be Akua, for the proclamation negated the very existence of Hawaiian divinity. If as creators the Akua had before “owned” the ʻĀina, and the Aliʻi Nui were but konohiki to the Akua, who now “owned” the ʻĀina? In theory, the answer was that with ʻainoa, “ownership” of the ʻĀina was in limbo and the Aliʻi Nui were no longer konohiki of the Akua...Hawaiian society could not find pono [stability, harmony] in this state where there were no Akua, no Kahuna Nui, nor any religious advice (1992: 82).

For the konohiki, changes from the ʻAi noa also placed their role in limbo and weakened the fundamental principles of the Konohiki System under kapu laws by the Akua and Aliʻi. “ʻAinoa soon became a metaphor for changing any aspect of Hawaiian society and encouraged an eternal ʻimihaku, that search for new paths to mana” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 83).

In 1820, shortly after the ʻAi noa, the first of twelve companies of American Protestant missionaries arrived in Hawaiʻi. They introduced their Christian god who promised “ola hou” or “new, eternal” life for Hawaiians. It was divine timing as Hawaiians were in the midst of a religious ʻimi haku or search of a new religion with the loss of their Akua and the massive dying from foreign diseases.

Missionaries also introduced a new technology, the printing press, and helped Hawaiians form an alphabet in their language. Hawaiians were intrigued to see their thoughts and spoken words on paper. Printed materials, particularly the newspapers, became a powerful tool for the missionaries to convert Hawaiians souls and “enlighten” them through literacy.

Christianity and education were effective ways missionaries “civilized” the “heathen” and influenced the chiefs with new ways of governing and caring for their people. These institutions spread rapidly in Hawaiʻi under the leadership of Kaʻahumanu and other high-ranking Aliʻi Nui and their konohiki.

Christianity also shaped the Aliʻi’s new ideals of pono chiefly behavior defined by Christian laws instead of kapu laws. “The new pono was everything the puritanical missionaries

---

9 The twelve missionary companies were sponsored by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM) and arrived in 1820, 1823, 1828, 1831, 1832, 1833, 1835, 1837, 1841, 1842, 1844, and 1848 (Andrews 2003: 564-567).
considered moral or right, including heterosexuality, monogamy, patriarchy, and a disdain for any kind of entertainment” (Silva 2008: 110).

While not all of the Aliʻi Nui wanted to convert, by 1837 Christianity had so transformed the definition of pono that the Mōʻī and Aliʻi Nui were obliged to conform to the advice of their new kāhuna [missionary leaders], regardless of their personal opinions (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 141).

Traditional kāhuna and the 400,000 Hawaiian Akua the konohiki previously worshipped, were suddenly replaced by Christian kāhuna (missionary ministers) and one Akua, Jehovah. For the konohiki, to have the natural environment suddenly devoid of the 400,000 Akua and the loss of cultural and spiritual ties to them must have been radical and unnatural.

Under this new religious order, Rev. Hiram Bingham of the first missionary company became the Kahuna Nui (head religious leader). He and his network of ministers dictated to the konohiki, through the Aliʻi, their needs for land, food, housing, transportation, labor and resources to build Jehovah’s kingdom of churches and schools. The missionaries added new layers in the socio-political and religious order which further reduced konohiki to lower levels in status and authority (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 46, 175).

Later, Kaʻahumanu adopted Christian-based laws from the biblical Ten Commandments prohibiting murder, theft, adultery, idolatry, and honoring the Sabbath. Also, “[m]any of the laws the missionaries advocated criminalized activities tolerated by the mercantile community” (Merry 2000: 69) including prostitution, gambling, producing, selling and consuming liquor and tobacco.

Beginning in 1825 she [Kaʻahumanu] and her chiefs initiated a system of laws based on Christian morality and behavior known as prohibitionary or sumptuary laws. These laws not only altered traditional morality and custom, but also resulted in the Natives’ abnegation of their own culture and values as well as in their reliance on foreigners to tell them what was pono (Osorio 2002: 11).

Christian doctrine, with aims to “civilize” Hawaiian society, were the main themes of the first three mission newspapers Ka Lama Hawaii (The Hawaiian Luminary 1834), Ke Kumu Hawaii (The Hawaiian Teacher 1834-1839), and Ka Nonanona (The Ant 1841-1846). These papers were instrumental in the mission’s Christianizing campaign and used as educational and religious material for the first mission school in Lāhaināluna, Māui and later on other islands.
The editor of *Ka Lama Hawaii* and principal of Lāhaināluna Seminary, Rev. Lorrin Andrews, clarified the paper’s objective,

First, to give the scholars of the High School the idea of a newspaper – to show them how information of various kinds was circulated through the medium of a periodical. Secondly, to communicate to them ideas on many objects directly and indirectly, such as we should not put into sermons, nor into books written formally for the nation. Thirdly, it was designed as a channel through which the scholars might communicate their own opinions freely on any subject they chose. The last page has been exclusively devoted to their use (Andrews in Mookini 1974: iv).

The “last page” often served as a “pulpit” for missionaries and Christianized Lāhaināluna students to publicly sermonize and shame the konohiki and their Aliʻi into action. Articles were seldom positive with the exception of a few by Rev. Lorenzo Lyons, who sometimes recognized the konohiki’s good works. In his essay “No Na Kula ma Kohala” he writes “ua kokua mai na Konohiki i na kumu a me na haumana,” or “the konohiki assisted the teachers and students” (1836: 19).

Writers encouraged konohiki to be Christian role models for the makaʻāinana by forsaking their traditional “heathen” lives. A few describe the konohiki building churches and schools, teaching, hosting traveling missionaries in their districts, gathering the people for worship or school, and providing food and resources for the churches and schools. The goal of these articles was to reinforce Christian values of hard work and servitude by industrious konohiki who were “building” God’s kingdom. However, this support was mainly at the expense of the Hawaiian kingdom not the ABCFM and on the backs of Hawaiians not the missionaries.

More often writers were critical of the konohiki and accused them of overworking and taxing the people, being stingy and corrupt, unsupportive of the teachers, and indulging in “sinful” acts of drinking ʻawa, smoking tobacco, and disobeying the Sabbath (Puaaiki 1835: 143; Bishop 1835a: 56; Naleipuleho 1836: 44; Kalama 1838: 53; Forbes 1839: 77-78). It seems Christianized Hawaiians were caught in a moral tug-of-war between foreign traders who introduced and promoted liquor and tobacco and foreign missionaries condemning it.

Missionary attitudes against drinking and smoking were influenced by the American Temperance Movement back in their American New England homeland. The movement promoted “civilized” and “moral” living through abstinence from alcohol and tobacco that was
believed to encourage drinking. “The temperance movement in the Hawaiian islands closely parallels and nearly synchronizes with the same movement in the United States. It started in the 1820’s and in the 1830’s became a potent force” (Kuykendall 1938: 161-162).

Despite this movement, every class of Hawaiians, from Mōʻī to makaʻāinana, indulged in liquor. Kamakau writes, “during Liholiho's time was the extravagant use of liquor among the chiefs and commoners, they almost bathed in it” (1961: 250). He further reveals, foreign ship captains, traders and prominent haole settlers “led the King to drink and to get the country in debt....They enticed him to drink liquor, and soon all the chiefs and chiefesses had taken to drinking, and not one of them heeded the word of God as taught by the missionaries” (Kamakau 1961: 251).

In 1834, Ka Lama Hawaiʻi published monthly anti-tobacco and liquor articles by missionaries and Hawaiian converts condemning its use as “hewa” (sinful/evil). A Hawaiian writer, Manono, described in Ke Kumu Hawaii (July 6, 1836) an incident to show consequences of death and poverty due to smokers accidently burning down their houses with valuables and killing their families.

Despite anti-tobacco and alcohol campaigns, the konohiki remained under the rule of their Aliʻi Nui and followed their leadership regardless of the strict laws and regulations against their use. Tobacco cultivation and consumption are good examples of the people’s steadfast loyalty to their Aliʻi and Mōʻī who, at times, exercised authority over Christian laws and totally ignored them.

“Baka” or tobacco was a profitable crop for the kingdom and freely enjoyed by every class despite it deemed “sinful” and illegal by the sumptuary laws. Rev. Lorenzo Lyons reveals in his journal, that even church-going Aliʻi and the Mōʻī fully advocated it and required church members to support them or risk severe consequences.

Most of the chiefs are in favor of tobacco. Some of them in church smoke it and order it to be planted....The King [Kamehameha III]... commands his subjects to plant it. Many of them church members. If they refuse to obey his commands they are condemned; perhaps cast off their lands, are perhaps stripped of everything. Some fearing God more than man will not comply with this command (Lyons in Doyle 1945: 102).
In *Ke Kumu Hawaii* (1835-1836) writers reported the konohiki’s entanglements with the tobacco laws and risking lawsuits. In the following article, a Hawaiian writer named Manono questions the reader, who is more guilty, the one who plants it or smokes it?

I hai mai ke konohiki alaila maluna o ka mea nana i kanu ka hihia, aka i huna ke konohiki, a he ike ole paha kekahi nona, alaila, pili no paha ia ia ka hihia....

Ea, e koʻu hoamoe, e alaʻe oe, hai mai iaʻu i ka mea i oi ka hewa o laua nei mamua o kekahi laua, o ka mea nana i kanu ka baka, a me ka mea nana i puhi? Hai mai ia kela. “O ka mea nana i kanu.” I aku ia au, Oia ia nana i kanu a nui a haawi aku i ka poe i noi aku ia ia. No ke aha la i hoopaiolei’i ka mea nana i kanu, ao ka mea wale no mamua nana i puhi ka houku ea nei? (1836: 53).

If the konohiki tells who planted the tobacco then the lawsuit is on that person. However, if the konohiki conceals it and no one knows about it then the lawsuit will pertain to him.

Say, my bedfellow [ally], arise, tell me which of them is more wrongful of the two, the one who planted the tobacco or the one that smoked it? He says “it’s the one who planted [it].” I said, true, he is the one that planted a lot, and gave [it] to the people who requested it of him. Why was the one that planted not punished and previously, only the one that smoked is being made to pay?

[Translation by author]

Another article by Lāhaināluna student, I. Naleipuleho, tells of konohiki being investigated for raising tobacco and teachers interfering with growing it. It seemed the konohiki were accountable to their chiefs who valued the economic and social benefits of this cash crop and ignoring the missionaries and their laws that deemed it “sinful” and illegal.

Ua oʻi aku ke kanu baka o Honuaula mamua o na aina o Maui nei a pau. Kanu no na konohiki, kanu no na lopa. Ke uhuki nei no na kumu i ka baka, aole e pau, ua nui loa.

Eia ke ano a o nui ana. Ua olelo lakou, he mea waiwai. Ua manaʻo no na konohiki he mea ʻole ke kanawai baka. Ke ʻhookolokoloia nei na konohiki. Hui no o ka manaʻo me ka makaainana. – O koonei iho nei enemi nui ka baka. Ua ku e na kanaka o kea aina. Ua haalele ka pono a ke Akua (1836: 44).

Tobacco cultivation in Honuaula is more extensive of all the lands in Maui. The konohiki plant [it] and the farmers plant [it]. The teachers are pulling up the tobacco, it is not finished, there is much more.

Here’s why it’s increasing. They said, it is a thing of value. The konohiki think the tobacco law is inconsequential. The konohiki are being investigated. They agree in thought with the makaainana. Tobacco is the enemy of this place.
The people of this land are resisting. They have forsaken god’s righteousness. [Translation by author]

Missionaries and Christianized Hawaiians also criticized the taxation by the konohiki as oppressive and excessive. Traditionally, it had been a communal, reciprocal exchange of produce and labor. These writers were ignoring the increasing foreign demands on finite amounts of labor and natural resources managed by the konohiki that inevitably forced higher production and taxation. Increasing foreign demands added even greater social, physical and psychological stresses on a dying population. A noted Lāhaināluna scholar and konohiki, S. P. Kalama, wrote a two page “fire and brim stone” essay in Ke Kumu Hawaii referring to his fellow konohiki as “auhau hoʻopunipuni” (deceitful tax collectors) and the Aliʻi as “kamaniha” (rude, hostile). He questions them,

Pehea oukou e naʻlii a me na konohiki ai aina? Ke malama nei anei oukou i na kanaka o ka aina a lehova i haawi mai ai e malama, e like me kana i olelo ai?
What about you, Aliʻi and konohiki, who are ruling the land? Are you caring for the people of the land whom Jehovah gave to you to steward according to his word? (1838: 53-54).

It seems Christian Aliʻi and their konohiki, like Kalama, were becoming increasingly outspoken and divided from non-Christian Aliʻi which weakened chiefly class solidarity.

“Typically those who led in the ʻainoa became Christians, approved of the Land inheritance system, and followed Calvinist advice. The Anti-Christian Aliʻi Nui argued for some retention of tradition,...” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 84). Kalama questions the Aliʻi’s ability to rule and steward the land according to the new Christian ideals of pono under Jehovah.

Traditionally, “[t]he Aliʻi determined the correct uses of the ʻĀina. The pono, or righteous Aliʻi Nui, was one who established order upon the ʻĀina so that it might be more productive” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 26). In ancient times, if Kalama had questioned his Aliʻi Nui’s authority it could have cost him his lands or worse, his life.

Christianity divided and weakened the Aliʻi class with Christians versus non-Christians. The division created mistrust and bitter rivalries between Aliʻi leaders that led to rebellion and death threats. One example is the war of Pahikaua in 1831, led by Oʻahu governess Liliha with other non-Christian Aliʻi against Kaʻahumanu and her powerful faction of Christianized Aliʻi Nui and missionaries. It seems Liliha’s group had revived Kū’s ancient path of war to pono.
leadership and “plotted to disembowel Ka-ʻahu-manu and cut off her head” (Kamakau 1961: 301). Līliha’s plot failed showing Christianity prevailed with little hope of reining back the power of the missionaries.

The important question “pehea lā e pono ai?” or “how shall we be pono?” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992) had become a very complex and challenging one for the Aliʻi in all their future decisions and efforts to save their people and nation. It seemed impossible Aliʻi and konohiki to be a pono leaders with horrific Native depopulation from foreign diseases, the loss of their religion to Christianity, the denigration of their people and culture by foreigners and later, the loss of their lands and sovereignty. These factors continue to weaken and threaten the solidarity of Native Hawaiians today creating dissension and rivalries. We often turn against one another yet, ironically, we are all fighting for the same goals towards the betterment of our people.

Lāhaināluna students published traditional knowledge in hopes of preserving what was quickly vanishing with Native depopulation (Nogelmeier 2010: 75; Silva 2008: 109, 123). In Ka Lama Hawaii (February 28, 1834), a two-part essay titled “No Kekahi Aoao Kahiko” (Concerning Some Ancient Ways) first recalls the ancient skills of foot racing and the long distance kūkini runners who were messengers for the Aliʻi Nui. But, the following section honors the bond of chief and servant showing the makaʻāinana’s swift response to the konohiki’s request for produce from the Aliʻi’s kōʻele. Clearly, the author is Hawaiian who proudly speaks of his culture and people. He pines for the “wa kahiko” or “days of old” when serving the konohiki was a mutual kuleana, labor was communal and the ʻĀina was abundantly rich.

Ina e olelo ke Konohiki i na makaainana, apopo kakou koele a pau, a ahiahi iho, hoike i ka waiwai: Alaila, hana iho la lakou i ua mau mea nei a ke Konohiki i olelo mai ai, o ka puua, o ka ilio, o ke kapa, o ke olonā, o ka hulu, o ka upena, o kela mea keia mea a pau. Oia ka waiwai, a makou i hoike ai i ka wa kahiko (Anonymous 1834: 4).

If the konohiki says to the makaainana, “tomorrow we will work all the chief’s gardens and at evening present all the rich produce!” Then they produced the things the konohiki requested, pigs, dogs, cloth, cordage, feathers, fishnets and everything else. It is the wealth that we presented in the days of old. [Translation by author]
However, missionaries’ “requests for cultural or historical information were often couched in statements about how sharing such information would allow readers to appreciate the progress of the Hawaiians from “na‘aupō,” or ignorance, to “mālamalama,” or enlightenment of civilization and religious awareness” (Nogelmeier 2010: 76-77). Hawaiian scholar, Noenoe Silva explains, “the page four essays...often concern the “pono hou” or the new morality or puritanical Christian sense of what constitutes rightness or righteousness” (2008: 110).

Konohiki newspaper articles reflected this conflict between the “pono hou” of the missionaries and “pono kahiko” the Hawaiian traditional life based on principles of the Konohiki System and Mālama ʻĀina. Hawaiian writers began expressing self-deprecating feelings of remorse for their traditional lifestyles and unworthiness as Christians.

A Ka Lama Hawaii article, “Ka Hope o ke Kōena” or “The Final Conclusion,” describes an anonymous author’s mission travels and visit with a konohiki named Kumuokekipi in upland Waimea, Hawaiʻi. He describes the konohiki as a “kanaka manao maikai,” or “morally upright man” who is committed to helping the schools and churches and is building a large church in the area. Although the author praises the konohiki, he is remorseful of his own “naʻau pō” or “ignorant” past of drinking rum and ‘awa, smoking tobacco and disobeying the Sabbath (Anonymous 1834b: 4).

In their own internal conflict, Christianized Hawaiians went against traditional cultural values of respecting your Aliʻi and publicly ridiculed and criticized them in newsprint. Missionaries’ attempts to pit Christianized Hawaiians against non-Christian konohiki were effective and instilled the belief that they were sinful and incompetent. Any work performed for the konohiki was deemed oppressive and any taxation was excessive. Oddly, the missionaries had no qualms of exploiting the Aliʻi, their lands, resources, or their people who were serving the mission every day including the Sabbath! Missionaries believed they were entitled to the service and generosity of the konohiki and convinced many Hawaiians their labor was a path to their eternal salvation.

An unsigned letter, in Ka Lama Hawaii to Rev. Lorrin Andrews, the editor and school principal of Lāhaināluna School, accuses the Aliʻi and konohiki of abusing the poor, elderly and
children and taxing the people large amounts of kapa (Anonymous April 25, 1834). The unknown author ignores the generous support of the Aliʻi and konohiki who sacrificed land, labor, and livelihoods for the mission.

According to Rev. Dibble, the “head-man of each land where a teacher went was commanded to furnish him with a house to dwell in, with a school house, with kapas and food” (1909: 217). Rev. Lyons writes in his journal, “several head men [konohiki] and chiefs from the region around arrived,...[t]hey brought their offerings of poi, taro, watermelons, potatoes, fowls, kapa” ( Lyons in Doyle 1945: 60).

Kapa, a type of bark cloth traditionally made by women, was highly desirable for its diverse uses as clothing, furnishings, taxes, currency, gifts, and offerings. The author omits that large amounts of kapa were commonly collected and given to support the schools and churches in lieu of money. Rev. Lyons writes “[t]hese people have no money to contribute to the church. Money is very seldom seen,...”(Lyons in Doyle 1945: 101). He also admits, [if] kapa could be disposed of I might have in a single month 1,500 or 2,000 kapa – worth 3 or 4 hundred dollars” (Lyons in Doyle 1945: 107) which was a large sum of money in the 1800’s.

In addition to generous tithings and daily support from Hawaiians, missionaries also received significant salaries from the ABCFM. In comparison, Hawaiians in urban areas like Honolulu were earning only 12 ½ cents a day or $3.87 a month. For many Hawaiians, particularly in rural areas, who were supplying the labor for missionaries, “money wages for labor were nearly unknown” (Bishop 1901: 87). Rev. Sereno Bishop writes in his memoirs,

Perhaps along the wharves in Honolulu, laborers [Hawaiians] might earn a real [rial] or hapawalu [12 ½ cents] a day. Domestic servants or ohuas were glad to be employed for their keep....In the later thirties, Missionaries began to be paid regular stipends of four hundred dollars for each couple, and a small addition for each child. This was found comparative opulence, with our very plain way of living. Our servants cultivated the little glibe, and so fed us and themselves (1901: 87).

Bishop also reveals that his parents Rev. and Mrs. Artemis Bishop “left about $7,500 apiece to their two children. A third of this, however, grew from avails of city lots in Rochester, N. Y....and these old people were counted among the “rich missionaries” who had “robbed the poor Hawaiians”” (1901: 86).
The condemnation of the konohiki continued in the second mission newspaper *Ke Kumu Hawaii* by missionaries and new Hawaiian converts like Batimea Lalana Puaaiki, the blind preacher of Maui. He strongly urges Hawaiians church members to separate themselves from the sinful lifestyles of the konohiki and kia ‘āina (governors). His condescending tone and long list of the konohiki’s “transgressions” reads like a sermon and expresses a religious duty to separate the “saved” from the “sinners.”

*Eia keia manao hoʻomaopopo ia kakou, e na hoahānau iloko o ka ekalesia. E hooki aku oukou i ko oukou hoʻonoho ana i na konohiki moekolohe, inu uala, hoomanakii, hoomaloka, hoowahawaha, hoauwaepuu, apuapaleleo, a me na kiaaina a pau e hele ana i ka huaawaawa maluna o ko oukou mau aina” (Batimea 1835: 143–144).

Here is an idea that will make it clear to us all, those congregants within the church. End your residences with the konohiki – who engage in promiscuity, drinking sweet potato liquor, idolatry, being non-believing, contemptuous, indolent, disobedient, and all the governors acting in bitter jealousy over your lands. [Translation by author]

Yet, prior to his conversion, Batimea loved to drink ʻawa, was skilled in the traditional arts of hula pahua (spear dance), lua (hand to hand fighting) and kake (secret encrypted chants for and by chiefs) (Green 1844: 6-7, Pukui and Elbert 1986: 119, 213, 301). In his speech to a mission school in 1837, Batimea said with shame and remorse, these ancient traditions were “in a time of dark hearts...I learnt mischief in those days” (Batimea in Green 1844: 6-7).

In 1835, Rev. Artemis Bishop disapproves of the aliʻi, konohiki, luna, and makaʻāinana for their “evil” ways in his article “No ka hana e hoihoi mai a i ke aupuni o ka Diablo” or “The devil’s work is returning to the nation” (1835a: 56). Although they support Bishop with land, labor and daily living necessities, he still chastises them for practicing games, hula, chanting, drinking rum, and promiscuity. In a separate article, he seems happy these same “sinful” Hawaiians desire to build a new stone church with their governor Kuakini (1835b: 154).

Church and school construction, dictates by the missionaries and directed by the Aliʻi Nui, became a frequent and expensive communal activity across the islands. “Buildings went up over night to serve as school houses; if a landlord [konohiki] refused to build he lost his post”

---

Churches replaced heiau and were often built on ancient temple sites (Kameʻeleihiwa 2015). They became referred as “luakini,” after the most prestigious heiau of the highest chiefs and used for human sacrifices in ancient times.

The konohiki with the makaʻāinana became consumed with building numerous churches, meeting houses and residences for the missionaries made of thatch, adobe, wood, stone and coral limestone blocks. They also managed the lands, labor, materials and other resources for these different structures. In ʻEwa (Oʻahu), Rev. Lowell Smith, with the help of Hawaiians, “erected the adobe walls of a church, capable of holding an audience of about one thousand people….The timbers of the roof were long beams dragged from the mountains entirely by...the labor being secured by volunteering, under the leadership of the chiefs” (Bishop 1901: 86).

Rev. Lyons reports, “[m]eeting houses & Missionaries’ houses were built...by the orders of the chiefs and konohikis without compensation. If any refused to work, his property was liable to be confiscated” (1862: 6). He also notes, “[t]he chiefs and konohikis also ordered the school houses to be built and kept them in repair” (1862: 8).

The following article by Kamakau in 1864 describes the church-building efforts of three konohiki, Kaauwai, Wahie and Kahaleʻohu on Māui under Governor Ulumaheihei in 1834.

In 1834, Ulumaheihei went with Rev. Armstrong folks for this purpose. There was already a large church erected by Kahaleʻohu, but later Ulumaheihei urged the building of a stone church, and that called Kalaniʻohua was built by Kaʻauwai and others. He ordered Wahie, the konohiki who was over Hana district to build a large church at Kuakaha on Kaʻuiki. So [also] at Kaʻanapali and on Molokai (Kamakau 1869a: 1).

In Rev. Charles Stewart’s memoirs, an American merchant reported to him that the people on the west side of Oʻahu were ordered by the chiefs to cut timbers for a new chapel in Honolulu resulting in famine from the neglect of their fields and burdening the whole region.
(Stewart 1831: 204). On a visit to the area, he estimated “2,200 men bearing into town, in one uninterrupted procession, while some 800 to 1,000 other followed during the day” (1831: 204) for the procurement of timber for the chapel.

Stone churches were the most expensive and labor intensive to build according to Rev. Armstrong who priced two stone meeting houses in Wailuku, Māui at $500 and took nearly three years to finish (Gulick 1918: 183). Kawaiahaʻo Church in Honolulu, Oʻahu was a place of worship for Hawaiian royalty and called “The Great Stone Church” for its massive coral-block walls. It was the largest and most expensive church costing $6,000 and requiring five years to complete (1837-1842) (Damon 1995: 40, 44).

Hawaiians from Waikīkī to Moanalua, quarried, hewed, and hauled 14,000 coral slabs from the nearby reef with some weighing 1,200 pounds (Damon 1995: 48). Stephen Reynolds, an American merchant, described in his journal, “the reefs literally covered with natives cutting stones for the new meeting house...Several natives injured on the reefs – legs and arms were broken going after the stones for the Church” (May 26-27, 1837).

The Oʻahu Governor, Kekūanaoʻa, oversaw the colossal project which required 872 men. He lists the names of 29 overseers or konohiki and tabulated 843 workers who built nine lime ovens for the mortar. The 29 konohiki included, Kekūanaoʻa, Kahekili, Mailou, Kahunapo, Maalahia, Kaawahua, Apii, Ehu, Ieki, Opunui, Pia, Honokaupu, Kanoa, Kalaaulana, Lehuanui, Unauna, Kahaaulono, Kaiaawaawaa, Kuaana, Kuhia, Kaniua, Hoaai, Keoki, Paniani, Kaiwi, Mahinauli, Mauae, Kuaana, Keaulana (Damon 1995: 47). This list has historical significance which identifies each konohiki and celebrates the great works of the konohiki that are still standing today.

For churches and schools, Kamakau writes in 1869, “missionaries were given land by the chiefs without any payment” and “such generosity was common to all the chiefs and to the king as well; a tract of a hundred acres was sometimes given” (1961: 354-355). One konohiki in Kohala was dispossessed of his land when he objected to Rev. Isaac Bliss’ request to exchange his land with the konohiki’s. Bliss complained to Ulumaheihei Hoapili, the governor of Māui, and Bliss was allowed to keep his lands and given the konohiki’s as well (Kamakau 1961: 354-355).
The socio-economic and environmental burdens on Hawaiians and their environment for the mission’s island-wide infrastructure seem comparable to the Sandalwood Trade (1810-1830). Historically, the Ali‘i have been criticized for exploiting their people, destroying the forests and accruing debt. Yet, building and maintaining the mission’s extensive infrastructure while supporting its missionaries and their families for most of the 19th century also exploited natural resources and a dying Hawaiian population. Like ship provisioning, these activities diverted precious and scarce resources and labor away from subsistent living of Hawaiians that also resulted in famine.

Deforestation for large amounts of timber and thatching, and irreparable destruction to reefs and shorelines for coral blocks and lime mortar permanently scarred and destroyed natural habitat that once sustained vital food sources. Although, the chiefs approved the land and resources to build churches and schools, ultimately it was the mission creating the constant demand for them.

The mounting negativity and criticisms of the konohiki in the HLN continued to vilify them and created public misconceptions that they were not fit to rule or non-supportive of the mission and education. Of the 50 konohiki articles that were annotated from *Ka Lama Hawai‘i* and *Ke Kumu Hawai‘i*, 30 articles or 60% were disparaging and critical.

The newspaper writers, both Hawaiian and missionaries, seemed to overgeneralize all konohiki as bad which discredited those who were genuinely good and dedicated to the mission. However, the few obituaries of konohiki in the newspapers were complimentary of their good works and character but, credited these attributes to their religious conversion by the missionaries.

An obituary was printed in *Ka Lama Hawai‘i* (December 17, 1834) for Noa Auwae, a prominent konohiki of Wailuku who was Kamehameha I’s principal genealogist. The anonymous author described Auwae as “kanaka no‘ono‘o, naauao, akamai a me ikaika i kana hana ana” (a thoughtful, educated, intelligent man and hard working).

In 1834, Rev. Green of Wailuku, Māui writes in a mission report, “Auwae was a man of great dignity of character. His intercourse with Tamehameha and other chiefs of like character was of great benefit. Like them Auwae was a wise man, capable of holding the reins of
government” (1834: 463-463). Although this obituary describes Auwae’s remarkable life, high rank and good work as a konohiki, his strong family dynamics and close relationships with high ranking Aliʻi Nui, Green expresses doubt of Auwae’s religious convictions and is critical of his illiteracy. (See Appendix F).

Another obituary in *Ka Nonanona* (January 18, 1842) by a konohiki and tax assessor named Opunui speaks highly and fondly of his friend, Samesona Maoheau, a prominent konohiki of his ahupua’a in Kalauao, ‘Ewa, O‘ahu. Although Maoheau was a Christian, Opunui poetically interweaves and honors the ancient Akua, Kanaloa with Jesus Christ in his farewell to Maoheau.

Figure 3.1 Obituary of Konohiki, Sameson Maoheau

These obituaries show a stark contrast from the konohiki who historically perceived as cruel and oppressive. More often, they were men of upright character, respected experts in their work, loyal, who were beloved by family and friends.

Missionaries, in their private journals, letters, and reports describe in detail the daily work and support of konohiki for the mission and their generous hospitality extended to many visiting missionaries (Chamberlain 1822-1849; Bishop 1916; Lyons 1945; Ellis 2004). However, their descriptions were simultaneously condescending and denigrating.
For example, missionary E. W. Clark wrote in 1829 to the ABCFM about his trip to Kahuku in Kaʻū on Hawaiʻi Island.

We were kindly received by the head man. The appearance of neatness & comfort about his house & yard far surpassed anything we had seen since leaving Hilo. Our host & his family were well dressed, & furnished with a chair, a writing desk, chest, slate & the books published by the Mission. We were surprised to find so much appearance of civilization in this distant & obscure part of the Island (1819-1837: 764).

More often the konohiki’s contributions of labor, time and resources went unnoticed and unappreciated by the mission. Perhaps, the missionaries resented their heavy reliance on the konohiki who they considered inferior and ignorant. Or, perhaps, they were envious of the konohiki’s authority and easy access to coveted resources or potential Hawaiian converts and students for the mission.

Reverends Lorrin Andrews and William Richards reported to the ABCFM, the people’s “disposition to learn depends in a great measure on the chief or head man to whom the people belong. If he discourage[s] them, they can see no use in it, and will make no effort; if he encourages them, they are ready to go any length” (Andrews and Richards 1819-1837: 1004). This demonstrates the loyalty the makaʻāinana held for their konohiki and Aliʻi despite strong outside influences.

Undeniably, without the support of the konohiki the missionaries would not have been able to carry out their daily responsibilities or building and maintaining the mission’s expansive infrastructure. By the 1840’s, missionaries became key advisors to the king, crafting laws and influencing changes in land tenure that would eliminate the konohiki while empowering themselves to assume “konohiki” roles over land and resources.

Hawaiian scholar John Laimana, in his M. A. thesis, “The Phenomenal Rise to Literacy in Hawaiʻi: Hawaiian Society in the Early Nineteenth Century,” credits the konohiki and argues, “...the Aliʻi through the konohiki built the schools, employed the teachers. They provided the leadership that directed the Makaʻāinana and the missionaries that resulted in a highly successful partnership that brought literacy to the Hawaiian people with phenomenal swiftness (2011: 77).

As chiefs, konohiki were instructed by the Aliʻi to attend school to gain literacy in order to teach and run the schools. “By 1831, there were 1,103 schools with an estimated 52,000
pupils and most likely represented the nearing of the climax of the literacy phenomenon” (Laimana 2011: 73). As a small minority, the missionaries lacked their own teachers to administer all these schools. The multitude of konohiki, as centralized district authorities, were ideal candidates to teach and assist the missionaries. Male and female konohiki attended special adult schools for training. In 1837, Rev. Lyons on Hawai‘i Island writes,

I can report 2500 children in schools, and as many adults. One adult school conducted by a native teacher is rather amusing. It consists of 120 konohikis, that is, head men of different lands. Some by the way are women; for Paul’s injunctions are not observed on the Sandwich Islands. Women often usurp reins of government over large districts (Lyons in Doyle 1945: 100).

As teachers, the konohiki worked closely with the missionaries and other teachers on a daily basis. Rev. Levi Chamberlain collaborated with the konohiki in every district he toured and writes of their generosity and dedication to the schools and churches. They accommodated him and his entourage with housing, food, and gathered thousands for worship. As teachers, they helped prepare and administer examinations to track the progress of the schools. The konohiki teachers on O‘ahu identified by Chamberlain were Kekaha (Waipi‘o), Kahehuna (Kahuku), Kapuiki and Koa (Wai‘anae), and Kahalau, Kao and Maio (Waialua) (Chamberlain 1822-1849).

According to Kamakau, Kaʻahumanu also made island circuits

...to instruct the land agents [konohiki] to take care of the teachers and use the resources of the chiefs’ lands to maintain teachers, and not to overburden them. Anyone who did not give heed to these words or heed the teachers’ instruction was threatened with dismissal as land agent (konohiki) (1961: 298).

**Luna Kula (School Agents) and Luna ʻAuhau (Tax Officers)**

By the 1830’s, newspapers began publishing secular laws, Constitutions, and legislation of the kingdom. On July 6, 1836, *Ke Kumu Hawaii* announced the “Kanawai hou no Maui” or “New laws of Māui” concerning education by Governor Ulumaheihei Hoapili. School attendance became legally mandatory for children by age four. Teachers and konohiki monitored and enforced penalties for truancy. The law advised parents,

...ina ia aua oukou ia lakou, aole i hoʻokomo i ke kula, eia ka pono, nana kumu a me na konohiki e nana pono ina he keiki, ua aha makahiki a aua ia ai: ehoukuia oia malaila (1836:}
...if you have withheld them [the children] and [they] were not entered in school, here’s the proper thing to do, the teachers and the konohiki will inspect if there is a child who is four years and he or she is being held back [from school]; that person shall be fined for that. [Translation by author]

By 1841, more education laws and regulations were published in the third mission newspaper Ka Nonanona. Konohiki and those who served as teachers were now replaced by luna kula (school agents). The luna kula could easily confiscate the konohiki’s lands or dismiss them after a trial by the school committee for perceived lack of competency and failure of duty (Adameck 1994: 40, 42). Attending school, by children and adults, began to take precedence over the labor days for the king and konohiki. Cultivation and food production was in direct competition with education and church worship.

With growing demands for land and resources by foreigners and the Ali‘i Nui’s accrued debts from foreign trade, the labors of the makaʻāinana became increasingly exploited under these new pressures. In 1839, “He Kumukanawai a me ke Kanawai Hooponopono Waiwai no ko Hawaii Nei Pae Aina” or the “Declaration of Rights of 1839” was enacted by Kamehameha III with the aid of his missionary advisors. They included missionaries William Richards, Gerrit Judd and Richard Armstrong (Osorio 2002: 25).

These laws were Christian-based civil codes instigated by missionaries to protect the rights of all people, specifically from the chiefs. In reality, protection was enforced through convoluted Western-based taxes by the government to wrest the traditional powers and rights of taxation from the Ali‘i Nui and konohiki. Kamakau wrote,

When there were no written laws the chief also had a right to a share of the taxes. When all the taxes had been collected in the presence of the ruling chief a part was portioned out by the treasurer among the chiefs….All the personal property of the chief…belonged to him and his chiefs; and the chiefs portioned them out each to his own people according to what had been given them….When the constitution and the written laws were made, then the power of the chiefs were thrown down and only that of the king remained (1961: 345).

The foreign system of taxation seemed far more complex and burdensome than the traditional tributary “taxes” administered by the chiefs. If the people failed to abide by Western laws of the government they faced harsh penalties. Moreover, these laws were counter to the
principles of the Konohiki System, governed by kapu laws and administered by the konohiki instead of layers of government bureaucrats over the konohiki.

Published in the Hawaiian Spectator newspaper (July 1839), the law stated,

Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people together with their lands, their building lots and all their property, while they conform to the laws of the kingdom, and nothings whatever shall be taken from any individual except by express provision of the laws. Whatever chief shall perseveringly act in violation of this Constitution, shall no longer remain a chief...and the same shall be true of the governors, officers and all land agents [konohiki] (Achiu 2002: 3).

For many Hawaiians, Western laws disempowered the chiefs, including the konohiki, and were culturally incompatible with their interdependent, subsistent lifestyle. “[T]he ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of the land and the people in Hawai‘i passed from the ancient line of Ali‘i and the gods...to the newer and much less understood authority of law” (Osorio 2002: 25).

The laws seemed to restrict the power of the chiefs instead of foreigners who were taking over the government. In theory, the laws were to protect the maka‘āinana from the Ali‘i but not Hawaiians from encroaching, opportunistic foreigners. The Mō‘ī, Ali‘i Nui and konohiki were reduced to citizens with equal vested rights in the land and resources with the maka‘āinana. The Konohiki System could no longer function under Western laws without a hierarchical structure of cooperative interdependence between the Hawaiian classes.

By law, the konohiki’s traditional responsibilities for taxation and labor were significantly minimized and taken over by luna ʻauhau (tax officers) who were appointed by the King and Kuhina Nui. However, in 1829, a missionary report by Revs. Richards, Andrews and Green tells of one konohiki having charge of their district’s revenue under the governor. “The head man of this district acts as Treasurer to the governor of the Island. He was raised to this post of honor by a former Governor with whom he lived in an incestuous manner and the present governor retains him in his office” (Richards, Andrews and Green 1819-1837: 873).

In 1831, “tax collectors were assigned, one to each island, but the right of collecting taxes did not belong to the king” (Kamakau 1961: 256). By the 1840’s, there were multiple luna ʻauhau who reported to the island’s Governor (Ka Nonanona, August 6, 1844; The Polynesian,
July 20, 1844). The governors reported to the Minister of Finance, Gerrit Judd, who was a missionary physician and a foreign advisor of Kamehameha III.

Daily communal labor was reduced to only three days each month for the king and three days for the konohiki under the authority of the tax officers. The law stated,

The tax officers shall also have charge of the public labor done for the King, though if they see proper to commit it to the land agents [konohiki] it is well, but the tax officers being above the land agents shall be accountable for the work (Adameck 1994: 14).

Government tax collectors, serving under the luna ‘auhau (officers), now dictated to the konohiki of each ‘ai moku, ‘ai ‘okana, ‘ai kalana, ‘ai ahupua’a, ‘ai ‘ili the required public labor days and the types of crops to cultivate in their district (Adameck 1994: 29, 26; see also Kamakau 1996: 154, 1961: 177; Malo 2006: 4). By law, the luna ‘auhau restricted the konohiki’s access to resources which stated “of all the things which grow spontaneously on the mountains the landlord [konohiki] can taboo nothing for himself except one kind of timber” (Adameck 1994: 35).

Access to freshwater was now restricted through taxation with the law stating “the allowance of water shall be in proportion to the amount of taxes paid by the several lands...” (Adameck 1994: 33). Traditionally, communal investment of time and labor by the people in building and maintaining ‘auwai systems determined how water was shared and allotted under the Konohiki System. It also conserved water and preserved natural aquatic ecosystems in a sustainable manner to benefit all. But, the new law was counter to the Konohiki System equating access to resources with monetary tax revenues. Thus, “this law condemns the old system of the King, chiefs, land agents and tax officers. That merciless treatment of common people must end” (Adameck 1994: 33).

For ocean fisheries, “his majesty the King takes the fishing grounds from those who now possess them, from Hawaii to Kauai, and gives one portion of them to the common people, another portion to the landlords and a portion he reserves to himself” (Adameck 1994: 26). Although the law protected fishing rights of the maka‘āinana, it significantly limited the konohiki’s full traditional rights to kapu marine resources and shorelines according to appropriate seasons for fishing and gathering.
The luna ‘auhau enforced government duties on shoal fish, regulated fishing seasons, determined types of fish to kapu for the king, and distributed the catch (Adameck 1994: 27). If the konohiki violated the law by “unduly seizing or taxing the people for his catch, the law provided penalty” (Murakami 1991: 174). The legal penalty was “one full year his own fish shall be taboo’d for the tenants of his own particular land, and notice shall be given of the same, so that a landlord who lays a duty on the fish of the people may be known” (Adameck 1994: 26).

The luna ‘auhau adjudicated cases between the makaʻāinana and konohiki regarding any disputes or abuses. If the konohiki was guilty, they were tried by other luna ‘auhau and sentenced by the district’s governor or by the higher Supreme Court. By law, luna ‘auhau could strip the konohiki of their title and lands (Adameck 1994: 14, 30).

Landlords, to whom lands are given in charge, no longer rule your tenants in ignorance, lest the tax officers being enlightened in the principles of this book nullify your title as landlord, and we give the lands to those who are ready to aid the feeble portions of the community. The ignorant shall receive their proper reward, poverty, and the lands shall be given to other lords. This penalty, poverty, shall be the reward both of chiefs and people...(Adameck 1994: 30).

Ultimately, these laws were administered by missionary Gerrit Judd, the Minister of Finance, and reflected his animosity towards the konohiki. It was a double-standard for the government to legally impoverish the konohiki as punishment yet, deem it illegal for konohiki to impoverish the makaʻāinana. They also denigrated the konohiki as “ignorant,” incompetent rulers, and the makaʻāinana as “feeble” or helpless while the tax officers were educated and “enlightened.”

“Enlightened” officers indicated only those formally educated and Christianized qualified as government luna ‘auhau. Therefore, it is not surprising that Christianized, mission-educated konohiki were recruited for the job. However, this placed them in compromising positions of regulating, adjudicating, and penalizing their fellow konohiki likely causing class dissension and rivalries. On the flip side, it may have promoted favoritism amongst konohiki and abuses of power over the makaʻāinana.

Also, abuses by the tax officers against the konohiki were reported by a writer, Polebe, in an article “Kekahi Mau Mea Pono Ole Au i Ike ai” (Some Injustices I Witnessed) in Ka
Nonanona (May 1842). In either case, these increasing layers of government bureaucrats and the subjugation of the konohiki’s role and power further weakened their class relationships and solidarity.

By law, education and literacy requirements were divisive forces within the konohiki class similar to religion with Christian and non-Christian konohiki. The law clearly separated the educated from the non-educated by declaring,

No man born since the commencement of the reign of Liholiho who does not understand reading, writing, geography and arithmetic shall hold the office of Governor, Judge, Tax officer, nor land agent nor hold any office over another man (Adameck 1994: 42-43).

Requirement of a Western education for government service had replaced ancestral knowledge for chiefly service. It seemed to further diminish the chiefly status for those konohiki who lacked a formal, mission-based education. It devalued generations of inherited knowledge by the konohiki in land and resource stewardship that was already being lost by Native depopulation.

Ka Nonanona (August 6, 1844) published the names of 21 Native Hawaiian luna ‘auhau for O‘ahu, Kaua‘i, Māui and Hawai‘i. Further research revealed that they were graduates of Lāhaināluna mission seminary (Ke Kumu Hawai‘i, 1835: 132). Lāhaināluna became the official training ground for kingdom officials, leaders and educators.

The tax officers of O‘ahu were Nehemia Hooiliamanu, Kuaana, Keliiiwaiiole, Keliihuluhulu, and Kulepe who each attained four years of education at Lāhaināluna (Ka Hae Hawaii, May 19, 1858). Ho‘oiliamanu and Kuaana were konohiki of Kamehameha III having signed the Buke Māhele (1848: 83, 118, 149). It should be noted there were two konohiki named Kuaana, Ioela Kuaana and Rikadi Kuaana in the Buke Mahele which was not distinguished in the HLN article. The other three officers, Keliiiwaiiole, Keliihuluhulu and Kulepe, were likely konohiki or prominent men of the King to receive the distinguished appointment of tax officer.

According to Hooiliamanu’s obituary, by J. H. Kaehu in Ka Elele Hawai‘i (December 2, 1848), he was a highly respected Christianized konohiki and teacher of the chiefs at the fort in Honolulu. He worked with Opunui, a konohiki and tax assessor of ‘Ewa and Wai‘anae. Following
Hoʻoiliamanu’s death from measles and whooping cough (Probate 384), his luna ‘auhau position was filled by fellow konohiki, Kuluwailehua, under Kamehameha III (Buke Mahele 1848: 48) and his Lāhaināluna classmate (Ke Kumu Hawaii 1835: 132).

The konohiki role had transformed from traditional gatherers of hoʻokupu (offerings) for the Aliʻi and Akua to government tax officers who collected revenues for the kingdom’s capitalist economy. New codified tax laws in the 1840’s infiltrated every aspect of Hawaiian life that was intrusive, burdensome and incompatible with Hawaiian cultural values. According to Kamakau in 1869, “the government tax is their [the people’s] new master” (1961: 375). “Money is the standard by which all taxes and assessments are to be estimated, and it would be very well if all men would pay their taxes in money” (Adameck 1994: 53).

Many Hawaiians, including the chiefs, did not possess currency and were at a significant disadvantage with foreigners. Kamakau writes in 1869,

…the dollar is become the government for the commoner and for the destitute. It will become the dish of relish and the foreign agents will suck it up. With so many foreign agents the dollar will be lost to the government through the cleverness of foreigners and their cunning, and instead of good coming to the Hawaiian people, stranger will get the benefit from the wealth of the government (1961: 400).

In 1840, Kauikeaouli promulgated Hawaiʻi’s first constitution that “marked the establishment of a constitutional monarchy in the Kingdom, with power shared between the Mōʻī and the people through elected representatives” (Van Dyke 2008: 27). Some konohiki became legislative representatives such as S. P. Kalama, Paulo Kanoa, Zorabella Kaauwai and J. W. H. Kauwahi (Osorio 2002: 45, 69, 118). For the konohiki, the Constitution continued to restructure the socio-economic and political landscape in which they were slowly being eliminated from through laws and added layers of government bureaucrats of ministers, governors, land agents, tax officers and collectors.

The 1839 Declaration of Rights and 1840 Constitution in theory established the Hawaiian Kingdom as a “civilized” Christian and literate nation in the eyes of foreigners. But, in reality, it strengthened the power of domestic foreigners and weakened Hawaiians and the Aliʻi leadership, increasing their vulnerability to international powers. Kamakau clearly foresaw the agenda of the foreigners and the dire future of his people when he wrote,
To the foreigners the establishment of a constitutional form of government was very gratifying. Perhaps, they foresaw the passing to them of the land under the constitution and its laws, and the benefits which the government and the chiefs would share with them, leaving the old natives of the land a slavish people whose voice was scarcely heard and whose petitioning was but a useless journey for all the attention they got (Kamakau 1961: 377).

Between 1842 and 1852, thousands of makaʻāinana filed petitions on different islands appealing to the Mōʻī and Aliʻi to prohibit foreigners from owning land, becoming citizens and kingdom officials (Kameʻelehiwa 1992: 193; Osorio 2002: 30-33; Silva 2004: 38; McGregor 2007: 305, 308-309). They feared foreigners, particularly in high positions, would take an oath of allegiance to the Hawaiian kingdom and become their new “chiefs.” A petition by the makaʻāinana on Māui appeared in Ka Elele (July 15, 1845) with the English translation published in the mission newspaper The Friend (August 1845). They addressed the Mōʻī as their father and prophetically voiced their concerns that if foreigners took the oath, Hawaiʻi would become a nation of opportunistic foreigners who would buy up their lands and replace their Aliʻi and konohiki.

Foreigners come on shore with cash, ready to purchase land; but we have not the means to purchase lands; the native is disabled like one who has long been afflicted with disease on his back....who are they who take the oath suddenly?...Those who want a building spot, or a large piece of land for themselves; those who wish to become Chiefs or head men [konohiki] upon the lands, and those who wish to marry wives immediately. These are the persons who are quick to take the oath of allegiance under this government (The Friend August 1, 1845).

These petitions reveal how prophetic and wise the makaʻāinana were and fully aware of the dangers of encroaching foreigners. They also expressed the makaʻāinana’s unwavering aloha and loyalty to their Mōʻī, the Aliʻi and konohiki. Kamakau writes,

The Hawaiian nation loves its king and chiefs. If a chief expresses a wish, his people see to it that his words are not spoken in vain. The foreigners saw this and made this country their home and never thought of returning to their own land (1961: 411).

Articles in Ka Nonanona (November 1841, February, May and June 1842) by the Kamehameha III and Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi, reminded konohiki and luna of the labor tax laws with warnings against excessive taxation and forcing people to travel far for government labor. Under these conditions, the makaʻāinana were not reporting to work which resulted in
monetary fines they were unable to pay. On February 15, 1842, Oʻahu Governor Kekūanaoʻa and Aliʻi Nui, Keliʻiahonui, published instructions to the konohiki and luna paʻahao (labor officers) regarding absenteeism and labor fines.

Auhea oukou e na luna paahao a me na Konohiki o Oahu nei a puni; eia koʻu manao hoaka aku ia oukou, no ka poe hele ole i na KOELE o oukou, o ka HAPAWALU ka uku pono e like me Kanawai, aao 69, pauku 13; mai hoole oukou i ka Hapawalu a ka mea noho, me ko oukou lohe mua

Listen labor officers and konohiki throughout Oahu; here is my explanatory thoughts to you. Concerning the people not going to your labor days for the chiefs [koele], 25 cents is the correct fine according to the Law, page 69, section 13; do not refuse the 25 cents from the resident, if you previously received notice [heard of them]. [Translation by author]

Konohiki who were disobeying the laws were, perhaps, trying to retain what little authority they had that was slipping away or, resisting against foreign laws that seemed personally unbeneﬁcial, burdensome and illogical.

In 1843, the illegal military seizure of the Hawaiian kingdom by a British warship was instigated by a disgruntled British consul named Richard Charlton. Tensions came to a head after years of foreigners bickering over lands generously granted by the chiefs. After unauthorized military threats by British captain Lord George Paulet, Kamehameha III temporarily ceded the sovereignty of his kingdom to Great Britain on February 25, 1843. British Rear Admiral Thomas was summoned to restore the kingdom to Kamehameha III on July 31, 1843.

The king held a service of thanksgiving at Kawaiahaʻo Church to express his happiness and reassure his people with his famous words “Ua mau ke ea o ka aina i ka pono” (the life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness). For the Mōʻi and his Aliʻi, the traditional concept of pono and chiefly leadership over their lands, resources and people radically changed due to foreign religion and laws. Five years later, the 1848 Māhele land division would result in the tremendous and permanent loss of lands and resources by Hawaiians of every class. This made it impossible for the Aliʻi leadership to care for their lāhui in a pono way.

On August 3, 1843 a great feast was held by the king to celebrate the kingdom’s restoration called “Ka Lā Hoʻihoʻi Ea” or “Restoration Day.” The festivities at the King’s home in Luakaha, Nuʻuanu drew 2,000 guests. A descriptive article, titled “Ahaaina a Ke Lii” (Feast of the
King) was published in *Ka Nonanona* on August 8, 1843 by Secretary, I. H. Paehewa. It includes detailed lists of Kamehameha III’s 52 konohiki and O’ahu Governor, Mataio Kekūanaoʻa’s 44 konohiki.

The abundance of food these konohiki contributed was remarkable and carefully tabulated in the article. Interestingly, Paehewa notes many konohiki of the king and governor failed to help with the celebration. They were perceived as lacking aloha and happiness in the kingdom’s restoration. Why would the king’s konohiki not attend or contribute towards such a momentous royal occasion? Were they busy managing their ahupuaʻa or perhaps, not on O‘ahu? Was the party planned at short notice making it difficult for those traveling from afar?

Although we may never know the reasons, the article is historically and culturally important which identifies 96 konohiki who are rarely recognized so publicly for their generosity and chiefly service on a large scale.
Figure 3.2 “Ahaaina a ke Lii” (Feast of the King) in *Ka Nonanona*, August 8, 1843
Figure 3.2 “Ahaaina a ke Lii” (Feast of the King) in Ka Nonanona (continued)
Here is the food that M. Kekuanaoa's overseers [konohiki] contributed for the feast of the King upland of Nuuanu at Luakaha on the 3rd of August.


Here is the food that Kamehameha's very own konohiki contributed for his feast.


Those were the konohiki who contributed to the king's celebratory feast, and there were many konohiki of the King and M. Kekuanaoa who did not contribute to this celebratory feast of the king for the return of the land to him. And these konohiki who did not contribute, are without aloha, and without joy for the return of the nation to our king.

At perhaps 11 o’clock was when the King went up with his men in their glory; and the haole of the warships, in their best; and the musicians. And when they reached the uplands and entered into the grass house [hale pili], that was when the celebration began with music.
When the food was ready on the table spread over with greenery, it was 32 feet long and 2 feet wide. And the amount of food placed on this table was: 60 pigs, 300 chicken, 40 turkeys, 58 ducks. With all the supplies necessary to prepare this food; Kamamalu 1 set of supplies [?] ukana, Lota 1 ukana; Liholiho 1 ukana; Mose 1 ukana; Lunalilo 1 ukana.
The number of servants was over forty per ukana. There were 250 plates, 250 knives, 250 forks, 250 bowls, 250 cups, 150 spoons. And the number of those who ate were probably over 250; there were two prominent haole: Commodore Kearny from the American man-of-war, and the head of the United States warships in East India. Ana Admiral R. Thomas of the British warship, the head of the British warships in the Pacific.

There were four flags raised above the troops while the feast went on: one British flag, one American flag, one French flag, and one Hawaiian flag; and the king’s standard stood near to where the king was.

When the feast was over, most on foot went back; all together the men, women, and children totaled 2000 or perhaps more. The number of horses were 270, and the riding on the horses on the return was by fours, with two flags and the musicians, while from their mouths came hip hip hurrah [hipi hipi hulo] with great joy all the way until Haliimaile. Written by I. H. Paehewa, Secretary
The Fort. August 5, 1843.

http://nupepa-hawaii.com/?s=konohiki

Following Charlton’s and Paulet’s illegal seizure of the kingdom, its future sovereignty was becoming increasingly vulnerable with the recent annexation of Aotearoa by the British in 1840 and the takeover of Tahiti by France in 1842.

With his people and Kingdom on the brink of extinction, relying on the wisdom of missionaries and other foreign advisors, Kauikeaouli made yet another attempt to protect his Kingdom’s sovereignty and Hawaiian control of the ‘Āina by changing the system of land tenure (Van Dyke 2008: 30).

The culmination of foreign changes beginning with religion and later Western laws during devastating Native depopulation inevitably resulted in the further dismantling of the Konohiki System and the konohiki class. To the satisfaction of foreigners, these laws not only made foreigners equal to the Ali‘i and maka‘āinana but also protected foreigners’ rights and paved the way for changing Hawaiian land tenure in their favor. The laws were supposedly designed to establish a constitutional government to empower the maka‘āinana and make them independent of the Ali‘i. But, in reality they disempowered the Ali‘i and the konohiki while increasing the vulnerability of the maka‘āinana to further exploitation by foreigners. The
1848 Māhele brought an end to the konohiki class and their chiefly positions. They lost the majority of their lands and ties with Aliʻi and the makaʻāinana with whom they had shared reciprocal relationships of stewardship and interdependence for generations.
1845-1855 – The Māhele Land Division and Decline of the Konohiki

For this decade, eight konohiki articles were accessed from the “Hoʻolaupaʻi” website, two in Ka Nonanona and six in Ka Elele. The following article is a complaint

The Konohiki are quarreling with the schoolteachers here in Kalaupapa, regarding the farming of the teachers and students on vacant lands.

Kalaupapa, Mokolii, March 22, 1848.

Greetings to the publisher in the Elele and the Minister of Public Instruction (R. Armstrong), also the Minister of the Interior, peace be with you, and with us benefits and victory.

I have a humble clarification for you both regarding a problem that arose in Kalaupapa; here’s the problem. In the month of January 3, 1848, Armstrong spoke in our teacher’s meeting. His thoughts were said as follows, “Keoni Ana has declared that teachers and students work together on vacant lands and small reserved parcels of the government” we listened to this opinion, but we didn’t carry out this idea, and not much time transpired when Keoni’s speech was in the Elele paper 18 similar to those words above, then, I took the students to a land section in the Ahupuaʻa, Makanalu, and the name of the land section is Paaole, when I was taking them I finished one garden, and my plants sprouted, a watermelon, and later we planted a sugarcane field, but the Konohiki didn’t try at this time to withhold the place that we planted, and when we were replanting the sweet potato patch, it was at this time the Konohiki tried to withhold our sweet potato patch, and in his way of taking, part of the poalima land [cultivated for the konohiki with community labor] was included in our sweet potato patch, then he was angry at us and the students and troubled us.

He came before me, W. N. Pualewa, and said with a strong voice; “who gave you this land?” I said, look in the Elele paper 18, the place where this land was given to us, and there were no other people on this land parcel. I spoke again, if you are thinking to petition your landlord, that is your idea. He spoke as follows, “don’t occupy and cultivate on my land again, because Kekauonohi decreed on her lands, that teachers and students are not to farm.” Then, I said, you mistakenly assume this land was conveyed to me, so it seems, I certainly was not granted that, here is all I’ve been allowed, to farm and once our plants are consumed, then the dirt is yours. Furthermore, this land parcel is Paaole and is uninhabited, a land that is only abandoned, from the year 1844 of my originally residing here in Kalaupapa until the year 1848, I didn’t see this land farmed, never, but when we took and cultivated it,
against the konohiki who are restricting teachers and students from farming vacant lands in Kalaupapa, Molokai (Ka Elele, June 8, 1848). It describes the increasing tensions over land use rights and taxation during the Māhele land division. There seems to be confusion amongst the people due to changes in the land use laws, labor taxes, land tenure and those in positions of authority. The author, Pualewa, wants clarification of land-use rights from Rev. Armstrong, the Minister of Public Instruction who had no authority over land, and Keoni Ana, Minister of the Interior.

Keoni Ana, a Hawaiian-haole Ali‘i Nui, declared in the article “teachers and students work together on vacant lands and small reserved parcels of the government.” But, the vacant lands in question were privately owned by Kaua‘i Governess, Kekauʻōnohi. According to the konohiki in the article, she prohibited farming of her vacant lands by the teachers and students. This showed division between Christian-based governmental power and chiefly political power.

Although the konohiki was perceived as “cold” and uncaring, he was within the law which gave him authority over his Ali‘i’s land. He was exercising his legal rights as konohiki while obeying the traditional “kauoha” (command) of his Ali‘i. Also, his taking of their crops for the required poʻalima labor tax was also within the law at that time. Later, this tax was abolished by the 1850 Kuleana Act. Moreover, as konohiki, he performed his stewardship duties over his Ali‘i’s lands despite overwhelming opposition against the konohiki’s power.
which was diminishing under new foreign laws, land-use rights, land tenure, and layers of
government administrators.

An article in *Ka Nonanona* (March 1845) references the labor tax days of the konohiki.
According to law, these days were now administered by the government’s luna ʻauhau or tax
collectors instead of the konohiki. The konohiki were often accused of overtaxing the people by
the missionaries. Yet, missionaries had no qualms with the labor tax so long as it was
benefitting their mission and filling their own “pockets.” In 1847, Rev. Artemis Bishop happily
reported,

...the government had expended about forty thousand dollars in paying
teachers and erecting school-houses. This sum was appropriated from the
avails of the labor tax, the whole which has been absorbed in the support of
schools (Bishop 1848: 186).

Five articles in *Ka Elele Hawaiʻi* pertain to the 1848 Māhele and announcements by
Kamehameha III to his people regarding the momentous land division.

Prior to the 1848 Māhele, a series of Organic Acts (1845-1847) were passed with one to
“Organize the Executive Ministry” into five main governmental departments with an appointed
minister. They included the Department of the Interior by Keoni Ana, Foreign Relations by
Robert C. Wyllie, Finance by Gerrit P. Judd, Public Instruction by Rev. William Richards, and
Attorney General by John Ricord (Kuykendall 1938: 263; Van Dyke 2008: 33-34). Four were
foreigners and one British-Hawaiian (Keoni Ana).

Keoni Ana was the cousin of Kamehameha III and son of John Young, the British advisor
and personal friend of the king’s father, Kamehameha I. His mother was high chiefess
Kaʻoʻanaʻeha and his niece was Queen Emma, the wife of Kamehameha IV. Keoni Ana often
followed the leadership of the foreigners, perhaps, influenced by his British blood.

The Organic Acts were drafted mainly by Attorney General Ricord which secured
foreigners as Executive Ministers to run the kingdom. This reflected little faith by foreigners
that Hawaiians would ever be qualified to fill these positions. They convinced Kamehameha III
that his Native people were incapable of holding executive positions in the kingdom and
foreigners were better qualified than Hawaiians to fill them. As foreigners gained the reigns of
the kingdom, they were able to pursue their personal economic and political agendas that kept the majority of Hawaiians powerless, impoverished, voiceless and landless.

The kingdom’s departments of the Interior, Finance, and Public Instruction were additional bureaucratic layers of power which eliminated the necessity for konohiki. The konohiki were now severely restricted under Western law to kapu only one type of fish or tree. In stark contrast with the traditional Konohiki System, the konohiki held significant authority and discretion under their Aliʻi to kapu a wide range of diverse resources from ma uka to ma kai. On a whim, they could request specific resources in abundance for the Aliʻi from the people. According to Kamakau,

...the restriction of certain seas for the chiefs to fish in worked no hardship in the old days when there was so much fish that it was often used for firewood....the wood was free; the large trees as well as the small could be cut by the people for canoes and paddles (1961: 372).

The socio-political hierarchy of the new constitutional monarchy had replaced the hierarchical structure of traditional Hawaiian society. Kamakau wrote, “[t]he chiefs objected to placing the new constitution over the kingdom, seeing that little by little the chiefs would lose their dignity and become no more than commoners” (1961: 370).

This restructuring shifted the konohiki’s power over taxes, resources and labor to foreigners through Western laws. Influential foreign advisors of the Mōʻī helped craft these laws and enact these changes. Kamakau warns, “[t]he king has chosen foreign ministers, foreign agents (luna). This is wrong. The Hawaiian people will be debased and the foreigner exalted” (1961: 400).

In 1845, a second Organic Act established a five-member Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles also known as the “Land Commission.” Members were appointed by Kamehameha III “for the investigation and final ascertainment or rejection of all claims of private individual, whether natives or foreigners, to any landed property...” (Chinen 1958: 8). For the next three years preparation for the 1848 Māhele were underway to divide and privatize approximately 4,000,00 acres of Hawaiʻi’s lands by the Land Commission, the Mōʻī, his Aliʻi and foreign advisors. There are varying estimates of the total acreage of Hawaiʻi’s lands
that were divided in the Māhele. They include 4,010,000 (Thrum 1898: 34-35), 4,000,000 (Lam 1985: 103), and 4,126,000 (Van Dyke 2008: 42).

The first five commissioners, appointed in 1846, were John Ricord, James Young Kanehoa, Ioane Papa Īʻī, Zorababel Kaʻauwai and William Richards (Van Dyke 2008: 34). Ricord and Richards held ministerial positions as Attorney General and Minister of Public Instruction respectively. They were members of the king’s Privy Council and now held power over the land as Commissioners. According to Kameʻeleihiwa,

The Land Commission headed by Richards, entrusted various American missionaries with konohiki responsibilities that had formerly been assigned to kaukau aliʻi. The latter stepped down in position to join the ranks of the makaʻāïnana (1992: 186).

The Māhele was yet another foreign-designed and controlled system that eliminated the need for the konohiki and their Konohiki System based on familial, reciprocal relations between the chiefs and the people. “Missionary advisors who designed the land division intended to destroy the interdependence between konohiki and Makaʻāïnana” (Osorio 2002: 44).

The Māhele also failed to protect the sovereignty of the kingdom which was one of its main purposes through the privatization of land. In 1893, the Hawaiian kingdom was illegally overthrown by American missionary descendants and foreigners in Hawaiʻi aided by the unauthorized military force of the U.S. marines. Of the thirteen members of the Committee of Safety who instigated the illegal Overthrow, six were American citizens who were not naturalized, nor had they taken an oath of allegiance to the Hawaiian Kingdom (Alexander 1894: 161).

In January of 1848, the Māhele land division commenced with the Mōʻī and his 34 Aliʻi Nui and 218 konohiki signing and registering their ʻāina to be relinquished and awarded in the Buke Mahele (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 227; Chinen 1958: 20). The lands given to the Aliʻi and konohiki were designated as “Konohiki Lands.” By March, Kamehameha III had reserved his private lands and distributed lands to his 252 chiefs (10 Aliʻi Nui, 24 Kaukau Aliʻi and 218 konohiki) (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 227).
Two months (January to March) was an incredibly inadequate amount of time for the konohiki to fully comprehend the complexity and monumental changes of Western land tenure. Nor did they understand or have a choice in the life-altering decisions of sacrificing over 50% of their wealth. The konohiki definitely did not have sufficient time to file their claims, evident in the four deadline extensions. It seemed they had little choice or influence in approving the Māhele which was designed by foreigners and approved by the king and his Aliʻi Nui advisors. The konohiki’s acceptance of the Māhele seemed more out of traditional chiefly duty and honoring their Mōʻi’s leadership.

The king further divided his lands for the Hawaiian government which “remained subject to any claims by the makaʻāinana” (Van Dyke 2008: 42). It should be noted the exact acreage that was initially divided by the King and his Aliʻi/konohiki is difficult to calculate because the ‘Āina distributed at the time of the Mahele was not surveyed but was instead selected by name (with natural boundaries based on community knowledge), awards are generally examined by the number of ‘Āina selected as opposed to a figure based on acreage (Van Dyke 2008: 42).

Furthermore, “in all awards of whole Ahupuaʻa(s) and Ili(s) the rights of Tenants [makaʻāinana] are expressly reserved, “Koe na Kuleana o Kanaka...” (Alexander 1890a: 114). Later, in the 1850 Kuleana Act, the makaʻāinana were granted specific rights to resources for their private use and “were also guaranteed the right to water and right of way but not the right of pasturage on the land of the Konohiki” (Alexander 1890a: 114-115). This led to disputes and tensions between the makaʻāinana and the konohiki with some makaʻāinana abandoning their lands.

The signing of the Buke Mahele confirmed and documented the agreement between Kamehameha III, his Aliʻi and konohiki to reciprocally quit-claim and separate out their land interests in perpetuity. However, the Aliʻi Nui and konohiki were still required to file their land claims with the Land Commission and the only ones required to pay a commutation fee to receive a Royal Patent and fee title to their lands.

The commutation fee could be paid by relinquishing 1/3 of their lands to the government or paying the government in money 1/3 of the unimproved value of their land. “In many cases, commutation was paid in land, especially high-ranking konohiki with a lot of land
claims from the Māhele, so that several ahupuaʻa or ʻili declared konohiki lands were turned over to become government lands” (Gonschor and Beamer 2014: 59).

In addition to initially relinquishing at least 50% or more of their lands to Kamehameha III and the Kingdom, the commutation fee was another foreign-designed mechanism to take more land from the Aliʻi and konohiki that they sacrificed for the makaʻāinana. However, the majority of makaʻāinana failed to claim lands, for many reasons, which were later purchased by foreigners, particularly missionaries. The great sacrifice of land made by the Aliʻi and konohiki refutes accusations and criticisms that they had lost aloha for their people and abandoned them.

Today, giving up more than half of one’s wealth or assets would be inconceivable by upper class Americans and probably bankrupt most of the middle and lower classes that are only one paycheck from homelessness. America’s extreme income inequality, with most of its wealth in the hands of less than 1% of the mega rich, is a modern example of how people would be unwilling to sacrifice as much as the Aliʻi and konohiki did to benefit their people and country.

The tremendous loss of land by the Mōʻī, Aliʻi and konohiki in the Māhele which ended up in the hands of wealthy foreigners instead of the makaʻāinana, laid the groundwork for their illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

In her book Native Lands and Foreign Desires (1992), Hawaiian scholar, Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa conducted extensive research on the land distribution and losses of the king’s 218 konohiki during the Māhele. She categorized them into three groups by genealogy and land holdings of ahupuaʻa and ʻili they received and relinquished (1992: 274-285). Each konohiki “received very little ʻĀina” ranging from 1 to 13 ahupuaʻa or ʻili (1992: 274-276). Yet, the king’s 28 highest ranking konohiki sacrificed 50-92% of their lands totaling 156 ahupuaʻa (1992: 278-279). Her research of the Land Indices (1929) also reveals that “of the 218 konohiki of the Buke Mahele, 52 failed to present their ʻĀina to the Land Commission to receive their Land Commission award” (1992: 306).
Another study recently conducted by Lorenz Gonschor and Kamanamaikalani Beamer explains the complexities of the Māhele and inconsistencies in granting land titles for konohiki lands in their article, “Of the Inventory of Ahupua’a in the Hawaiian Kingdom” (2014).

In a few ahupua’a, the original title granting process was even more complex. In some cases, individual ahupua’a were divided into halves. Thirty-seven were divided between a konohiki and the government. An additional eight were divided between a konohiki and the government but the konohiki half should have forfeited to the government for lack of a proper RP [Royal Patent] (2014: 68).

They calculated 1,825 ahupua’a and during the Māhele “[t]wo hundred thirty-eight (13.0%) were awarded and patented as konohiki lands” (2014: 67). They also note that “125 ahupua’a, originally deeded to konohiki, should have been forfeited to the Government for lack of a proper LCA and Royal Patent” (2014: 67). This meant that 52.5% of konohiki lands were lost for failing to complete their claims.

Both studies indicate the king’s konohiki were having difficulty processing their claims and receiving their lands. “Until an award for these lands was issued by the Land Commission, title to such lands remained with the government” (Chinen 1958: 20-21). Therefore, these unclaimed lands would further increase the government’s land inventory for foreigners to purchase starting in the 1850’s. Five legislative acts were passed in 1852, 1854, 1860, 1892 and 1895 (Indices 1929: 1-2; Chinen 1958: 21-24) to extend the filing deadlines and ease the process for the konohiki.

According to W. D. Alexander (Superintendent of Government Survey),

To lighten the arduous labors of the Land Commissioners and to hasten the settlement of titles, they were empowered by the Act passed June 19th, 1852, to grant titles to Konohiki(s) for whole "Ahupua'a(s) or Ili(s) received by them in the Mahele of 1848, by their proper names without survey." In fact the greater part of this class of lands were awarded in this way. As many of these Konohiki(s) had failed to present their claims before the Land Commission previous to the 14th day of February, 1848, and had consequently forfeited their lands, a law was passed for their relief August 10th, 1854, giving them an opportunity to present their claims between that date and the 1st of November following. As before stated, the Board of Commissioners to quiet Land Titles was finally dissolved on the 31st of March, 1855.
Even then a second Act had to be passed August 24th, 1860, "For the relief of certain Konohiki(s)," whose names appear in the Mahele Book of 1848, but who had failed to present their claims before the Land Commission. As the Commission had long ceased to exist, the Minister of the Interior was empowered to grant Awards to claimants of this class, provided they presented their claims before the last day of June, 1862; and those who failed to do so were declared to be "forever barred, and their rights under the Mahele Book to have reverted to the Government." About 70 Awards were issued under the provisions of this Act, which are styled "Mahele Awards," and form a distinct series. (1890a: 115-116).

Konohiki who still failed to file their claims by 1860 were granted more time and relief. In 1892, “the legislature authorized the Minister of Interior to issue Royal Patents to all konohikis or to their heirs or assigns” (Chinen 1958: 24). However, they would be issued provided that 1) their lands were listed in the Buke Mahele, 2) they were not sold off by the government, and 3) their commutation fee was paid. Issued Royal Patents required surveys approved by the Surveyor General or certified by the Commissioner of Boundaries (Chinen 1958: 24). The deadline had been further extended allowing konohiki “until January 1, 1895, to present their claims to the minister of interior, and anyone who failed to file his claim before that date was forever barred and his rights reverted to the government” (Chinen 1958: 24).

The konohiki’s failure to file their claims for nearly 50 years after the Māhele seems contradictory to accusations and criticisms that konohiki were land-grabbing and preventing the makaʻāinana from claiming land. In some instances, makaʻāinana willingly “continued to live under their landlord (konohiki)” (Kamakau 1961: 410). If anyone was guilty of land-grabbing it was foreigners when they were allowed to buy land starting in 1850.

Foreigners became government land agents of the kingdom for surveying, managing and performing financial land transactions which made them privy to the best land deals. The Europeans and Americans in Kamehameha III’s Privy Council proposed having land agents as government appointed positions. Later, these positions were to be held more often by foreigners instead of the Aliʻi, kaukau aliʻi or konohiki.

If the king’s konohiki had difficulties claiming their few land holdings, how were the konohiki of other Aliʻi faring throughout the pae ʻāina? Who were these konohiki and how many were also competing for lands with the makaʻāinana and foreigners? As previously
discussed in Chapter 1, my population estimate of the konohiki ranged between 18,000-27,000 but, could easily be higher.

By the mid-1800’s, the number of konohiki was significantly lower due to ongoing Native depopulation from disease epidemics,\(^1\) the socio-political collapse of the konohiki class, and the decrease in ahupua’a from the reorganization of the land. Gonschor and Beamer claim that “the number of ahupua’a fluctuated considerably during the nineteenth century” and “ahupua’a was significantly reduced during that period [Māhele]” (2014: 80).

On June 8, 1848, *Ka Elele Hawaii* published a speech “Ahaolelo Hawaii” by Kamehameha III to the House of Nobles and the Representatives at Kawaiahaʻo Church on April 29\(^{th}\) regarding the Māhele ʻĀina. The king, with his konohiki, expressed aloha for the people in making this significant change in land tenure to benefit Hawaiians and the kingdom.

Ua mahele ololu ia na aina, a holo iwaena oʻu a me koʻu poe Konohiki, a ma ia hana ua wehea kekahi hihia nui o ka aina. Ua hookawaale au i kekahi poe aina i waiwai no koʻu poe Aliʻi a me na kanaka, aia no nae ia oukou ka hooholo i na rula no ka hoʻoʻoponopono ana.

E nana pono auanei makou i ka mahele aina i hooholo maikai iwaena ou, e ka Moi, a me kou poe Konohiki, a e hana i ka makou olelo me ka manao nui i kou pono, i ka pono on na Konohiki a i ka pono o na Makaainana a me na mea kuleana i na aina (*Ka Elele*, June 8, 1848: 2-3).

The lands were amiably divided, and agreed on between myself and my Konohiki, and in the process, many other difficulties of the land were settled. I set aside certain lands as property for my Aliʻi and people, but, it depends on you to decide the rules for administering this.

We shall observe the land division that was agreed upon by you, the Moi and your Konohiki and shall prepare our speech with great thought for your benefit, the benefit of your Konohiki and benefit of the Makaainana and those who have interests in the land. [Translation by author]

The following month *Ka Elele Hawaii* published “He Kanawai no na Aina Pono o ka Moi, a me Na Aina o ke Aupuni” (An Act Relating to the Lands of his Majesty the King and the Lands of the Government). This lengthy four page article is another important historical document for

\(^{1}\) From 1848-1849, “an epidemic of measles accompanied by dysentery occurred...of which several thousand died, some chiefs and prominent persons among them” (Kamakau 1961: 410-411). In 1853, small pox was brought by a foreign ship and “[t]en thousand of the population are said to have died of this disease” (Kamakau 1961: 416-418).
Hawaiian land and Māhele scholarship which preserves the names of lands, ahupuaʻa, kalana, and mokupuni in Hawaiʻi (July 1848: 17-20).

On July 10, 1850, an “Act to Abolish the Disabilities of Aliens” was passed granting foreigners rights to purchase lands one month before the makaʻāinana. “The timing of this decision...suggests the favoritism with which haole were treated over the Makaʻāinana” (Osorio 2002: 50). The president of the Land Commission and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court “Judge William Little Lee persuaded the Privy Council and the Legislature to enact the law granting such rights to foreigners” (Van Dyke 2008: 51).

Lee’s influential positions enabled him to structure laws and pass legislation in favor of his self-interests and his wealthy fellow foreigners. In 1849, Judge Lee “persuaded Kauikeaouli to sell him the Līhuʻe Plantation on Kauaʻi, containing thousands of acres of choice lands for $9,350, which Lee [and close friend/business partner Charles Reed Bishop] used to grow sugar” (Van Dyke 2008: 39). According to Privy Council meeting minutes (1848 and 1850), foreign advisors, like Lee, were applying for large tracts of land and privy to information for acquiring prime real estate before the makaʻāinana were allowed to claim and purchase land in 1850.

In August 1850, The Kuleana Act finally allowed makaʻāinana to purchase lands and acquire fee simple title to the 1.5 million acres of government lands from the king (Chinen 1958: 31). The inventory of government lands continued to increase as the relinquished and unclaimed lands of the Aliʻi Nui and konohiki were being reverted to the Kingdom government.

Judge Lee, who held different high level positions in the kingdom

...helped draft the Kuleana Act of 1850 which granted some gathering and use rights to the makaʻāinana but excluded the important right of pasturage, causing substantial hardship to them. Later, he was buying Kuleana at the same time that he was serving on the Land Commission and the Court adjudicating such claims (Van Dyke 2008: 39).

This seemed a blatant conflict of interest that was duplicitous on Lee’s part.

Missionaries were equally guilty of similar activities according to Māhele surveyor and missionary descendant, Curtis Lyons. Lyons writes,

Agents were appointed in the different districts to receive applications, to attend to the surveys and to report, also to collect money for the land and forward to the Interior Office....The agents were some of them the American
missionaries, who considered it not inconsistent with their position to assist the people in obtaining lands, in advance of mere speculators (1903: 41).

These injustices prevented the makaʻāinana from claiming their lands and as a result, they collectively received only 28,658 acres (less than 1%) of the 1.5 million acres of government lands reserved for them (Chinen 1958: 31; Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 295; Van Dyke 2008: 48). In addition, the head start that foreigners had in purchasing land before the makaʻāinana gave them a greater advantage to buy up vast amounts of choice lands with their ready sources of cash and experience in transacting real estate. Kamakau metaphorically writes in 1869,

The fish of Piwwale are stranded; the sea has left them high and dry. Some people [makaʻāinana] were just ignorant, but the foreigners who had waited a long time to take the land for themselves were all ready, when the door was thrown open for natives and strangers alike they [foreigners] could well laugh; land was what they wanted (1961: 407).

The Māhele was yet another foreign solution for the host of many foreign problems that negatively impacted Hawaiians e.g. diseases, environmental exploitation, taxation, and laws. “From the 1820’s on the missionaries were adamantly in favor of individual rights and of Land succession as it would eventually lead to private ownership of ‘Āina. The latter being the cornerstone of capitalism, would thereby lift the “heathen” from their stupor” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 98). In the foreigners’ eyes, it was a means to eliminate the traditional konohiki chiefs and make every private landowner, including foreigners and the makaʻāinana, a konohiki.

After the makaʻāinana received rights to claim lands, Rev. Armstrong, the Minister of Public Instruction, victoriously declared in The Polynesian newspaper, “The Konohiki has no claim upon the tenant, and the poalima [konohiki labor tax] is at an end. Each man will be his own konohiki” (1850: 1). Armstrong’s Western perception of a “konohiki” was a role easily attained and available to anyone who could afford to own land. His maha ʻoi (presumptuous/rude) attitude disrespected not only the konohiki, but the Mōʻī and Aliʻi leadership who rightfully identified themselves as konohiki of the ‘Āina. It was no surprise that Armstrong placed himself at the same level of the highest ranking chiefs. Despite Western changes, the Aliʻi leadership struggled to retain their genealogical ties to the land and retain their traditional chiefly stewardship responsibilities that will be discussed in Chapter 4.
Armstrong’s message reflected the genuine disdain missionaries held towards the konohiki and their own desires to wrest power away from them. In their eyes, the konohiki were the gate-keepers or middle-men who kept them from accessing and controlling the land, natural resources and labor. As missionaries began losing financial funding from the A.B.C.F.M., these resources became even more valuable to them as wealth-generating commodities to buy and sell.

For the konohiki, these changes likely increased resentment and bitterness towards foreigners and their Western systems that slowly stripped them of nearly everything vital in their lives. As foreigners suddenly became konohiki, the makaʻāinana also must have felt uneasy and disloyal to their chiefs serving foreigners or worse, becoming their own “konohiki.”

In the same edition of *The Polynesian* newspaper, Judge Lee, gave the following advice to the makaʻāinana with reassurance they would forever be severed from the “oppressive” traditional konohiki.

> When you have secured your land, and taken your Patents, your poalima (or landlord) tax will be at an end. Two courses then are open for you. Either to secure your lands, work on them and be happy, or to sit still, sell them and then die. Which do you choose? (1850: 1).

In theory, Lee believed land ownership for the makaʻāinana would elevate their standard of living and free them from the perceived “enslavement” of the konohiki. But in reality, many Hawaiians, including the konohiki, lacked the economic means or experience to transact real estate and fully understand private land ownership.

Foreigners who became “konohiki” purchased or given large tracts of land yet, had little cultural and historical knowledge of the ʻĀina they were acquiring. Some who befriended the Mōʻi and Aliʻi Nui became their “trusted” advisors and were appointed as konohiki. Foreign konohiki included Joaquin (Joakini) Armas, a Spanish-Mexican bullock catcher for Kamehameha III in Waimea and Lāhainā (Frost and Rossie 1977), Captain H. S. Howland (Haulani) of Lāʻie (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1862), and Rev. William Richards, advisor to Kamehameha III (Na Hale 1848: 12; Paehewa 1843: 28).

Eric A. Knudsen (Kanuka), a Norwegian, was appointed by Kamehameha IV as konohiki over an ahupuaʻa in Kauaʻi (Knudsen and Noble 1999: 35-36). Knudsen “knew nothing of the
valleys or uplands” and “amazed at this land over which he was to rule” (Knudsen and Noble 1999: 36-37). He announced to his people, “Your King, Kamehameha [IV]...has appointed me Konohiki of all this western land, over the villages of Kekaha, Pokii, Kaunalewa, Kolo, and Mana – and all the lands between far up into the mountains and valleys” (Knudsen and Noble 1999: 36-37). Interestingly, Knudsen’s reference of “western land” may have meant the Western concept of privatized land.

Wealthy foreigners and entrepreneurial missionaries in the 1850’s were poised for years to amass large tracts of land.

By 1852, thousands of acres of prime Hawaiian land were in the hands of foreigners. More importantly, Western property concepts were imposed on the legal structure and would facilitate the rapid, steady takeover of Hawaiian-owned lands during the next several decades (Levy 1975: 857).

In researching the *Indices of Awards made by the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles in the Hawaiian Island* (1929), I randomly selected 16 foreigners who were each awarded over 500 acres on various islands during the Māhele. Five were missionaries, including one award for the ABCFM, nine American and Europeans, and two were part-Hawaiians. Collectively their lands totaled 36,086.70 acres. (See Appendix G).

The Māhele was a Western land tenure system introduced for the foreigner’s benefit but unachievable for the konohiki and especially the makaʻāinana. Later, missionaries who had come to “save” Hawaiians justified their dispossessing them of their lands as God’s will.

According to missionary Amos Cooke, founder and teacher of the chiefs’ children, Hawaiians were ill-prepared for the Māhele and were in a state of confusion and disbelief of their tremendous losses, socio-economic upheaval and displacement caused by yet another foreign change.

In February of 1850, Amos Cooke wrote,

While the natives stand confounded...and doubting the truth of it all [the Māhele]...the foreigners are creeping in among them, getting their largest and best lands, water privileges, building lots, etc. The Lord seems to be allowing such things to take place that the Islands may gradually pass into other hands. This is trying but we cannot help it.... His ways are our ways. The will of the Lord be done (Cooke in Richards 1987: 384).
Other influential foreigners who became large land owners include Charles Reed Bishop and John Palmer Parker. They married high-ranking chiefesses, Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop and Rachel Kipikane, who were descendants of Kamehameha I. They inherited expansive landholdings through their Aliʻi Nui wives and purchased additional tracts of government lands to expand their estates.

Table 3.2 below lists these five foreigners by land grants and the acreage they acquired during the Māhele.

### Table 3.2. Land Grants of Foreigners in Thrum (1897: 40-41)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2769</td>
<td>J. P. Parker</td>
<td>Hamakua</td>
<td>37,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2791</td>
<td>C. C. Harris</td>
<td>Kau</td>
<td>184,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 3343</td>
<td>C. Spreckels</td>
<td>Wailuku</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 3146</td>
<td>C. R. Bishop</td>
<td>Molokai</td>
<td>46,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant 2944</td>
<td>J. M. and F. Sinclair</td>
<td>Niihau</td>
<td>61,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>353,724</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to P. R. Holiohana in *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* (June 4, 1864), the island of Niʻihau was sold to James Francis Sinclair for $10,800. Kuakanu was the konohiki over the lands situated in Halewela and Kahuku. These konohiki lands and the rest of the island of 61,038 acres were sold as government lands to Sinclair. The writer, Holiohana, was a likely a konohiki and tells of being sent from Hana Māui to be a hoa ʻāina on Niʻihau to perform duties on the three konohiki labor days. He expresses opposition to foreigners, like Sinclair, who bought up large tracts of land leaving Hawaiians with nothing. He writes,

> ...pau na mea a pau maluna iho o ka aina, aole he mea i koe iho ia makou i na kanaka malalo aku o na haku haole...

> ...everything on the land is possessed or bought, not a thing remains for us Hawaiians under the haole owners [Translation by author]

Foreigners, particularly missionary families, continued to acquire vast private land holdings and valuable natural resources of fishponds and freshwater sources for their plantations after the Māhele. For more than a century, they have held power over land and have hoarded and destroyed island resources, denying Hawaiians their inherent rights to their
ancestral lands and a quality life. Today, some of these wealthy estates remain intact and increasing in worth with Hawai‘i’s extraordinary high land values.

In contrast to the thousands of acres claimed by foreigners during the Māhele, the next chapter examines the lands of King Kamehameha III’s five konohiki during the Māhele to show the large disparity in their modest land holdings they acquired and their personal struggles to retain and pass what little lands they had to their heirs.
Chapter 4. Kamehameha III’s Five Konohiki and the Māhele Land Division

Chapter 4 completes the historical arc of the konohiki in this thesis with a study of five of King Kamehameha III’s konohiki and their lands during the 1848 Māhele Land Division. In addition to their Māhele lands, this chapter includes research of their personal lands which they claimed independently on various islands.

The Māhele is often mistakenly thought to have been from 1848 through the 1850’s when foreigners and then makaʻāinana were able to purchase land. But, the land records of these profiled konohiki show the Māhele process extended from 1848 to as late as 1910 requiring 62 years to finalize their claims.

The purpose of this study is to examine in-depth and synthesize the information in their Māhele land records (MLR) to correct and rewrite the historiography of the konohiki. This new research will help to understand, quantify and explain the complex history of their lands and the catastrophic effects of Western land tenure on their lives, lands, families and class.

These five konohiki were members of Kamehameha III’s 218 elite konohiki who received lands from the king and signed the Buke Mahele (1848). In exchange for these lands they had to relinquish at least 50% of their personal lands including multiple ahupua‘a and ʻili ʻāina over which they traditionally held administrative control but not ownership. As the king’s konohiki, their lands were highly valued due to their rich natural resources and food producing potential.

In addition to these relinquished lands, some konohiki were forced to give up more lands and monetary assets to pay an expensive commutation fee for the allodial title to their lands. In the end, many konohiki sacrificed 60 to 90% of their original lands that were reverted back to the government and later purchased mainly by foreigners (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 276, 298-306). Many konohiki who failed to file their Māhele claims lost 100% of their lands which reverted back to the government and purchased often by foreigners.
The five konohiki profiled in this study include:

1) Paulo W. Hīnau (k)
2) Kaʻaha (k)
3) Kaʻahumanu (k)
4) Kaʻawahua (k)
5) Iona Pehu (k)

These konohiki were selected based on similar backgrounds as high ranking konohiki of the king and as Christian converts who worked with Protestant missionaries as assistants, leaders, students, teachers, and resource managers supporting the American mission and their spread of education.

As Christianized konohiki, they lived near Kawaiahaʻo Church in downtown Honolulu by the urging of Rev. Hiram Bingham, the head pastor of the mission and founder of the church. Kaʻawahua testified to the Land Commission in 1845, “it was because the word of God, therefore we gathered [around Kawaiahaʻo] because the Teacher [Bingham] said for the brethren to gather round” (Native Register (LCA 139), Book 1: 122-23). Another land claimant, Kekuinau (LCA 138) similarly testified,

...many people are living at this place [Kawaiahaʻo] because of the word of God; therefore there are many houses on this kula [open field/plain]. We are living close to the Church because the Teacher [Rev. Bingham] called the brethren to gather round close (Native Register (LCA 138), Book 1: 122).

In ancient times, Kawaiahaʻo (lit. the freshwater of Haʻo) was the sacred grounds of high chiefs and chiefesses and a favorite bathing place of chiefess Haʻo for its freshwater springs. The area became the epicenter of the Protestant mission in the early 1820’s and later, the kingdom’s seat of government at ‘Iolani Palace in 1845. Kawaiahaʻo transformed into a place of religious and political status for Christianized and educated Aliʻi and konohiki who were supporting the mission and the new foreign-controlled government.

The konohiki’s strong desires to be near the church and Bingham showed a conflict between serving their Aliʻi and serving missionary leaders and the government. The map below, of downtown Honolulu in 1847 (Greer Map 1986), designates each konohiki’s houselot by their Land Commission Award (LCA) number – Hīnau 639, Kaʻaha 280, Kaʻahumanu 735, Kaʻawahua 139 and Pehu 685.
The konohiki’s land records trace the transformation and decline of the konohiki during this momentous land tenure revolution. Like the newspapers, these records establish a chronological timeline and temporal framework to better synthesize the complex and intricate details of the konohiki’s history during this period that is often conflicting and misunderstood.

Written mainly in Hawaiian, they are invaluable primary sources that have preserved the konohiki’s cultural knowledge, their personal stories in their words, their personal names, family genealogies, chiefly relationships, inheritance patterns, social class dynamics, place names, and traditional land tenure and usage. The ability to identify the konohiki by name and connect them to their lands increases accuracy in piecing together their history in order to re-envision them back into the ʻĀina. Personal claimant and witness testimonies reveal broader social networks within the konohiki class and close relationships with Aliʻi families that were severed from the Māhele.

The lengthy and arduous claim process for their lands during the Māhele involved filing land registrations, Land Commission Awards, surveys, Royal Patents, providing claimant and witness testimonies, and paying claim fees. If the konohiki encountered any disputes over their lands or boundaries, it resulted in expensive, time-consuming court hearings, with more documents, testimonies and legal fees. This only added expenses and years to their claim process that many konohiki could not afford or did not survive long enough to complete.

Their personal wills, probates, court cases, and genealogy records offer a rare and intimate perspective of the final stages of the konohiki’s life, their private wishes for their heirs, close family relationships, an accounting of their assets, and the distribution of their wealth. Four of the five konohiki died premature deaths from foreign diseases that prevented them from finalizing their claims and burdened their heirs to complete their claims. The execution of wills, testaments, probates and court cases were additional burdens but, shows their adaptation to and understanding of Western inheritance practices and estate planning. Despite their high-ranking chiefly status as the king’s konohiki, they collectively acquired and passed on very little land ranging from .58 to 6,596 acres in contrast to many foreigners.
Figure 4.1 Greer Map of downtown Honolulu in 1847 with land parcels of five konohiki in the Kawaihaʻo District
Konohiki 1 - Paulo W. Hīnau

Paulo W. Hīnau (k) was a konohiki of Kamehameha III and a member of the ‘Aha Ali‘i or Council of Chiefs in 1829. The council included,

Kauikeaouli, the King, Governor Poki [Boki], Ka‘ahumanu [Kuhina Nui], Governor J. Adams Kuakini, Manuia, Kekūanao‘a, Hīnau, ‘Aikanaka, Pākī, Kīna‘u, John ʻĪi, James Kahuhū (Kaukeaouli 1819-1837: 1058).

Hīnau was a younger cousin of Boki, the governor of O‘ahu who accompanied Kamehameha II to Europe in 1823. Under Boki, “Na-wai-lau, Ke-ani-ani, Uwahi-nui, Hīnau, and Ka-leo-hano also held high rank” (Kamakau 1961: 273).

As the Ali‘i became more in debt due to the Sandalwood trade, Boki chose Hīnau as a member of his crew in 1829 to sail to New Hebrides in search of more sandalwood. According to Kamakau, “Boki’s younger cousins, Hīnau, who was named for the hair of Kekaulike, and Kaleohano, who was named for the voice of Ka-hekili, his cousin Ka-wohi-moku, his favorite cousin Manuia, Ka-huhu, the commander of the soldiery, Ka-po-kini of the ships and other prominent men of the land made up the company” (Kamakau 1961: 294).

Tragically, Boki and most of his crew perished at sea in 1829 during their voyage to New Hebrides with only a few survivors returning to Hawai‘i (Kamakau 1961: 294). Although Hīnau was not mentioned as one of the survivors his date of death in 1868 confirms he did not perish in that voyage or perhaps, Hīnau did not accompany Boki on that fateful trip. Later, Hūnau became the konohiki under Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi and her husband Kana‘ina, the parents of Mōʻī, William Charles Lunalilo (Native Register (LCA 541, 2: 237).

Hīnau’s probate states he died December 17, 1868 in Lāhainā around the age of 50 (Probate 412, April 6, 1869). This would put his birth year ca. 1818 with his age during the 1848 Māhele at approximately 30 years old. Hīnau’s wife was L. Kamaipuupaa and they had two adopted sons named John and William.

Information on Kamaipuupaa was not found in Edith McKinzie’s Hawaiian Genealogies Vol. 1 and 2 (2002 and 2003). His wife should not be confused with King Kamehameha V’s female kahuna named Kamaipuupaa (w) who resided in his royal household (Bliss 1873: 70).
Hīnau’s probate states his wife died around 1868 and in 1873, Kamehameha V’s female kahuna was legally challenging his estate for personal assets of horses, carriages, furniture, jewelry and calabashes (Kamaipuupaa vs. C.R. Bishop and J.O. Dominis 1873: 2).

Prior to the Māhele, Hīnau was the konohiki of an ‘ili in Liilipuna, Kāne’ohe, O’ahu and an ahupua’a in Keawanui, Moloka’i (Buке Mahele 1848: 109-110). On February 7, 1848, Hīnau signed the Buке Mahele and relinquished his ‘ili in Liilipuna, Kāne’ohe, O’ahu (acreage unknown). He received and claimed the ahupua’a of Keawanui on Moloka’i from Kamehameha III. The table below lists Hīnau’s Māhele lands followed by descriptions of land transactions by Hīnau and his heirs.

**Table 4.1. Māhele Lands of Hīnau**

| Pre-Māhele Lands – | 1 ‘Ili in Liilipuna, Kāne’ohe, O’ahu (acreage unknown). |
| 1 Ahupua’a in Keawanui, Moloka’i (537 acres). |

| 1848 Māhele Lands – |
| **Relinquished:** |
| 1 ‘Ili in Liilipuna, Kāne’ohe, O’ahu to Kamehameha III and Kingdom government. |
| **Claimed:** |
| 1 Ahupua’a in Keawanui, Moloka’i from Kamehameha III (537 acres). |

### Māhele Lands

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 2715/Royal Patent (RP) 8160 (Keawanui Ahupua’a, Moloka’i)**

Hīnau testified before the Land Commission,

I hereby state my claim for land on the Island of Molokai in the land of Keawanui. I have two house lots there which I claim. No one has disputed them. Also, on the island of Maui at Ukumehame, I have a claim for one lo’i (Native Register 7: 28).

He received Land Commission Award 2715 for the ahupua’a Keawanui, Moloka’i on June 19, 1852 and paid $5.00 in claim fees (Book 10: 615).

**Kaauwai**, a member of the Board of Land Commissioners (Kamakau 1961: 396) and the House of Representatives from 1851-1855 (Osorio 2002: 34-35), testified for Hīnau, “the king has given Keawanui entirely to claimant for his own” (Foreign Testimony 6: 23).
Royal Patent 8160 was granted to Hīnau’s heirs in 1904, 36 years after his death in 1868 (Probate 412) and 56 years after he signed the Buke Māhele in 1848. They paid his commutation fee of $44.75 on March 29, 1904 for his ahupua’a in Keawanui totaling 537 acres (Book 35: 273-5). Therefore, Hīnau and his heirs did not relinquish additional lands to pay his commutation fee. The entire claim process for his Māhele land received from King Kamehameha III took 56 years to complete (1848-1904).

On this land, Hīnau maintained a large fishpond spanning 54.5 acres (Cobb 1902: 430) with a wall that was nearly 2,000 feet long (RP 8160, 35: 273-275). “The fishpond was built in about 1500, before the time of Kiha-a-Pi’ilani, and has been in continual use since then” (Pukui, Elbert and Mookini 1974: 104-5).

In the following Olelo Hoolaha or newspaper notice, published by Hīnau in Ka Hae Hawaii (August 6, 1856), he describes his fishpond and konohiki duties of managing and enforcing laws within his ahupua’a in Keawanui.

E ike auanei na kanaka a pau, owau o ka mea nona kainoa malalo iho nei, ko papa aku nei au i na kanaka mea lio, pipi, hoki miula, puaa, aole e hele wale ma kuu loko, a me kuu kuleana Pahale, a me na apana kula o’u, a me na mea apau e ulu ana maluna o ua mau wahi nei i hai ia ae nei maluna, ua kapu loa. E malama oukou i ko oukou mau holoholona ina loaa i kuu luna e hele ana maluna o ua mau wahi nei i olelo ia, e hopu no kuu luna. O ka uku no ka mea e kue i na olelo maluna, hookahi $1 pakahi no ke poo.

P. Hinau, Kewawanui, Molokai, Iulai 26, 1856.

Know all persons that I, the person named below, hereby forbid any owners of horses, cattle, donkeys, mules or pigs, not to go upon my fishpond, houselot or my field lots, or anywhere upon those places mentioned above, for they are completely restricted. Keep track of your animals and if my supervisor finds them going upon those places mentioned, my supervisor will seize them. The fee for anyone opposing the above terms shall be $1 per head.

P. Hinau, Keawanui, Molokai, July 26, 1856. [Translation by author]

In his notice, Hīnau uses “kuʻu” the Hawaiian possessive word for “my” or “mine” to describe his lands which expresses a deep familial affection for them (Pukui and Elbert 1986: 186). For example, his pond (loko) was referred as “kuu loko” and his homestead (kuleana pahale) was “kuu kuleana pahale.” By 1856, when this article was published, the traditional konohiki role and status had ended due to the 1848 Māhele. However, Hīnau retained his
konohiki status, authority and a hierarchy of konohiki under him in his privately owned ahupua’a.

According to Hīnau’s konohiki Keoai [Kekowai], on May 22, 1849, Hīnau gave parcels of ‘ili, lo‘i kalo, kula lands and pā hale (housetlots) to his people in Keawanui (Foreign Testimony 6: 24). These claimants included Kawainui (LCA 138-B), Kahookano (LCA 4187), Kekoholua (LCA 4187-B), Uluhani (LCA 4187-C), Kaalepo (LCA 4823) and Kikoikoi (LCA 4821). This shows Hīnau’s chiefly aloha and kuleana towards his hoa ‘āina (tenants) by giving them land. It contradicts false accusations that konohiki were taking lands from their own people or preventing them from acquiring land.

**Non-Māhele Lands**

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 5387/Royal Patent (RP) 3356 (‘Ōhi’a iki, Ukumehame, Māui)**

Hīnau’s LCA 5387 lists another claimant “Keone,” likely Hīnau’s adopted son John, for three pieces of land. The following testimonies were made on May 29, 1849 for 1 kalo patch at Ukumehame, Māui; 1 ahupua’a [with houselot] in Keawanui, Moloka‘i; and 1 ‘ili in Līlīpuna, Kāne‘ohe, O‘ahu (Foreign Testimony 7: 19).

The first witness was [Robert] Kaleipaihala, a konohiki who signed the Buke Māhele for lands in Makawao, Māui, an ahupua’a of Kuilei in Hāmākua, Maui and an ahupua’a in Wainee, Lāhainā, Māui (Buke Māhele 1848: 107-108). He testified,

> I know claimant lands at Molokai and Oahu. He owned “Keawanui” Molokai & Līlīpuna Oahu – but gave his Oahu land [Līlīpuna] to the King in the division – and the King confirmed claimant’s title to Keawanui to him and his heirs for ever – (Lee Office Book) The bounds cannot be defined of that land. Ilis in Kona – I do not know claimants land at Ukumehame (Foreign Testimony 7: 19).

The second witness, Kamaunu, was a teacher sent to Lāhaināluna Seminary by Kamehameha III “to learn deeper wisdom and become leaders in the affairs of the government” (Kamakau 1961: 271). He was likely a konohiki teacher but no information was found to determine this nor did he sign the Buke Māhele. Kamaunu testified the following,

> I know Hinau[‘]s loi in Ukumehame – It was a teacher name Moo 10 or 12 years since, and from him it came to claimant through the widow of Moo who is his wife – Kahaiaohoe – I never heard his right disputed. It’s a large loi – Mauka is waste land, Maalea side a creek, Makai paahao loi; Lahaina D.
Malos. I think now that David Malo claims this patch in his capacity of Kahu Kula. Kaleiwalahua has the care of it for claimant (Foreign Testimony 7: 19).

Hīnau’s LCA 5387 was granted in March 1851 for his ‘Ili in ‘Ōhi’aiki, Māui and paid $2.00 in land claim fees (Book 8: 371). The above testimony mentions lo‘i pa‘ahao or kalo patches cultivated by prison labor that were supervised by the konohiki. His survey exhibited two sides of his ‘Ili bordered by “lo‘i poalima” and “poalima” which were taxable cultivation plots by the konohiki for the chiefs’ food. Hīnau’s Royal Patent 3356 was listed in the Indices (1929: 228) for 1 kalo patch in ‘Ōhi’aiki, Ukumehame, Lāhainā, Māui of 1 rood and 6 rods which calculates to approximately .25 acres and 96 feet (Lucas 1995: 99). However, I did not locate a copy of his Royal Patent 3356 in the State Archives for this LCA 5387.

Land Commission Award (LCA) 278-B/Royal Patent (RP) 1859 (Polanui, Lāhainā, Māui)

Hīnau received LCA 278-B on November 27, 1852. He paid $7.00 in fees for this 0.20 acres of kuleana land in Polanui, Lāhainā, Maui (Book 10: 101). He received Royal Patent 1859 on January 20, 1855 for this small houselot (Book 7: 393) and testified his “houselot is 145 long, 83 feet and 5 inches wide (Native Register 2: 45).” On December 26, 1848, [Lazaro] Nāmauu, a konohiki of Māui, who signed the Buke Māhele (1848: 111-112) for lands in Ko‘okā, Māui, testified the following for Hīnau,

I mai ke ali‘i ia‘u e hele aku oe e ana i wahi no ka poe o lakou; Hele no au ana a ike no au e ana ana o Puhi ke konohiki he umi anana a o Puniwai he umi anana o Papa umi anana, o ko ia anei wahi ekolu lakou a haalele lau a liko no ia wahi a pau no ia anei aole mea nana i keakea o ka pau noia o kau ike.

The chief said to me, go survey the area for their people; I went to survey and saw Puhi the konohiki surveying ten fathoms, and Puniwai ten fathoms and Papa ten fathoms, his [Hinau’s] place, there were three of them, and the two left and it all conveyed to him [Hinau]; no one has shown opposition, and that is the extent of my knowledge (Native Testimony 2: 71).

Lazaro Nāmauu should not to be confused with Nueku Nāmauu, the high-ranking konohiki and cousin or brother of Kekūanao‘a who died on October 6, 1848 (Probate 885). Lazaro Nāmauu’s testimony was given on December 26, 1848 after Nueku’s death in October 6, 1848. Lazaro, aka Lasaro or Lazarus, was a high-ranking konohiki of Māui under Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi. According to Rev. Lowell Smith, “[t]he Island was said to belong to Kekauluohi.
(Auhea)...Our chiefess did not reside on her property, but placed over the Island one of her servants [Lazaro Namauu] and his wife (Frear 1934: 82).

Land Commission Award (LCA) 639/Royal Patent (RP) 4466 (Kawaiahaʻo, Oʻahu)

Hīnau received LCA 639 on April 10, 1849 and paid $10.50 in fees (Book 2: 3). This was a 1.01 acre lot (Indices 1929: 316) situated in the Kawaiahaʻo area of Honolulu, Oʻahu on the corner of Puowaina [Punchbowl] street and Mauka (Beretania) street (Greer Map 1986). It is the present day site of the State of Hawaiʻiʻs Kalanimoku Building.

Hīnau testified this land was “on the northeast is Kaahaʻs lot, on the North is the Government Road going upland; on the east is the Government Highway; on the south is John Iiʻs lot. This is my claim for my lot” (Native Register 2: 310).

In a separate LCA 541 for Zorababel [Kaauwai], Hīnau testified,

Here is how the right [to his land] was acquired - - Auhea [Kekāuluohi] brought me to live with her. After this stay, I sought a separate place for myself, and finding it made myself a houselot....Auhea said to me, “your place is made...we shall assist....Kanaina is the witness for my place” (Native Register 2: 237).

The following testimonies for Hīnau were given on December 3, 1847. John ʻĪʻī, a kaukau aliʻi and prominent advisor of the Kamehameha family and Kingdom testified,

I have known this place from 1835, it was then laying vacant. Hinu enclosed it and built an adobe house on it, which was partly washed down after. It is mauka – Alanui puuaina [Puowaina?], ewa side Hale Konia and Kaahaʻs [a konohiki] lands are makai, and my land is on Waikiki side. I know of no other claims at any time” (Foreign Testimony 2: 81).

Hīnau’s neighbor, Konia, was a high chiefess and granddaughter of Kamehameha I and the mother of Princess Bernice Pauahi. Two other witnesses [Lazaro] Namauʻu and second witness Kaimana confirmed John ʻĪʻī’s testimony (Foreign Testimony 2: 81). Hīnau received Royal Patent 4466 for this land on September 3, 1860 and paid $37.50 for the allodial or fee title to this land (Book 18: 373-4); Indices 1929: 316). Hīnau spent 11 years to process and complete this land claim (1849-1860).

Mortgage (LCA 639)

On November 27, 1855 Hīnau mortgaged his houselot near Kawaiahaʻo Church to Stephen Spencer for $200 with interest (Record Book 9: 112-115). Spencer was a clerk of the Interior
Department for Kamehameha V who served as Minister of the Interior (1855-1863) during the reign of his brother, Kamehameha IV (Alexander 1890b: 92-96). The mortgage documents were signed by P. W. Hinau and his wife L. Kamaipuupaa. Spencer paid the mortgage in full on June 4, 1857 and received full title to this property. This houselot is not mentioned in the following will of Hīnau and is further evidence that it was sold.

**Will and Probate of Hīnau (412)**

Hīnau died on December 17, 1868 only two months after making his will on October 20, 1868 in Waialua, Moloka‘i (Probate 412). Hīnau designates Kamehameha V, and his two adopted sons, William and John Hinau, as legal heirs of his lands in Lāhainā, Māui, and Keawanui, Moloka‘i. His will states:

To King Kamehameha R. [Kapuaiwa] belongs all my land situate on the Island of Molokai which is the ahupua‘a of Keawanui. And to my beloved children William Hinau and John Hinau belongs my houselot situate at Lahaiana and my purchased land situate in the valley of Kauaula in the ahupua‘a of Ko‘okā in Lahaina and my kuleana land at ʻŌhi‘a in the ahupua‘a of Ukumehame, Island of Maui, and my horses. Only they three are entitled to my estate, and no one else.

According to his probate records dated April 6, 1869, Paulo Hīnau of Lāhainā, Māui, died on December 17, 1868 from injuries after a fall from his horse while in Moloka‘i. The following two probate witnesses were, perhaps, neighbors of Hīnau and did not file for any lands in the Buke Mahele. Kaniau testified that Hīnau left his property in Lāhainā (Māui), Moloka‘i and Ukumehame (Māui) to his children John and William and estimated Hīnau was 50 years old at death. Kaniau also claimed Paulo died and his wife died before him leaving his property in Lāhainā and Moloka‘i to his two hānai sons John and William.

Charles Palu testified,

I saw him last at Molokai... he came to my house before he fell off his horse & was carried to my house..., [h]e said he had come to see me about some food that was stolen and had fallen from his horse & was injured,...the next day he said he felt...badly where he asked me to make a will. I asked him to whom he desired to leave his property, he said to John Hinau, William Hinau and Kamehameha 5th – he said I desire to give my lands in Maui to my two adopted children John & William...my Ahupuaa Keawanui at Molokai I desire to give to the King,... (Probate 412).
Although Hīnau purchased land in the district of Kauaʻula in Koʻokā, Lāhainā, Māui, I did not conduct further research on this land purchase. He retained his Māhele lands, the ahupuaʻa of Keawanui (537 acres) from Kamehameha III, during his lifetime. In his will, he returned this ahupuaʻa to Kamehameha V and the Kingdom government. By doing this, Hīnau upheld the traditional chiefly custom of returning the land to the Mōʻī or one’s higher chief. Kamakau wrote in 1869,

The land, under ancient custom, had been held by the ruling chief alone, and parceled out by him to his followers, subject to return to the ruling chief at the death of the follower, or treason on his part toward his chief. At the death or subjugation of the ruling chief the land reverted to his heir or conqueror for redistribution (1961: 403).

Hīnau’s two sons received a small amount of land in ʻŌhiʻa, Ukumehame, Māui, a houselot in Pola Nui, Māui that totaled .45 acres. The acreage and information of lands in Kauaula, Māui is unknown. His houselot in Kawaihaʻo was not included in his will since it was mortgaged and sold to Stephen Spencer, a clerk of the Interior Department.

The following table summarizes Hīnau’s land transactions, the total amount of land acreage he passed to his heirs and the Aliʻi Nui connected with his lands.
### Table 4.2. Lands of Hīnau Passed to Heirs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Māhele Lands –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Līlīpuna, Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Keawanui, Molokaʻi (537 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1848 Māhele –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relinquished:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Līlīpuna, Kāneʻohe, Oʻahu to Kamehameha III and Kingdom government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claimed:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Keawanui, Molokaʻi from Kamehameha III (537 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Māhele Lands –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Keawanui, Molokaʻi returned to Kamehameha V and government (537 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Large loʻi in ʻŌhiʻa, Ukumehame, Māui (0.25 acres and 96 feet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kuleana houselot in Polanui, Lāhainā, Māui (0.20 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Houselot in Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu, Oʻahu (1.01 acres – Sold in 1857).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land purchased in Kauaʻula, Koʻokā, Lāhainā, Māui (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total ʻĀina of Hīnau to 2 Heirs:** 537.45 acres.

**Land ties to Aliʻi Nui:** Governor Boki (Oʻahu), Kuhina Nui Kekāuluohi and husband Kanaʻina, Kamehameha III and V.

---

**Konohiki 2 – Kaʻaha**

Kaʻaha (k) descended from a family of konohiki and was a kahu in the household of Kekāuluohi (Kamakau 1961: 394). Kekāuluohi was “an Aliʻi Nui daughter of Kaheiheimālie of Māui and Kalaimamahū of Hawaiʻi” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 59). She was also the wife of Kamehameha I, his son Kamehameha II Liholiho and later Charles Kanaʻina, a konohiki nui and the father of Mōʻī, William Charles Lunalilo. Kekāuluohi was the Kuhina Nui (premier) under Kamehameha III and according to Kamakau,

> Her father Kalaimamahuʻ made his trusted kahu, Kahī-kaheana, and his household her kahu. This man’s children and grandchildren, Ka-niuhi and Ka-ʻaha and their families, became Ke-ka-ulu-ohi’s kahu through her father Kalaimamahuʻ (Kamakau 1961: 394).

However, this translation of Kamakau’s writing is incorrect since Kahikaheana was a woman and the mother of Kaʻaha and his father was Mano. Therefore, it should read “this
woman’s children and grandchildren Ka-niuhi and Ka-‘aha [brothers] and their families became Kekauluohi’s kahu” (Barrère 1994: 81).

Kahikaheana’s brother, Keawekaapali, had a son named Kanehiwa who was a konohiki and whose wife, Kaulunae, was a konohiki. Kaulunae’s sister was Julia Alapa’i, a konohiki and the wife of Keoni Ana (Genealogy 106 in Barrère 1994: 82). Julia was the daughter of Alapa’imaloiki, aka Alapa’ikupalumano, the younger brother of Kona Uncle Ke’eaumoku who helped Kamehameha I unite the Hawaiian kingdom (Kamakau 1961: 124). Keoni Ana was the son of John Young, the British foreign advisor to Kamehameha I. He was also the uncle of Queen Emma, the wife of Kamehameha IV. Keoni Ana served as Kuhina Nui (1845-1853, 1855-1863) and Minister of the Interior (1845-1846).

Ka’aha had three children Kahele (w), [Lucy] Muolo (w) and Hiram Kahanawai (k). His daughter Muolo married William Luther Moehonua (Genealogy Record 106 in Barrère 1994: 82) who was a prominent kingdom official and the uncle of King Kalākaua through his grandfather ‘Aikanaka. ‘Aikanaka was the grandson of one of Kamehameha I’s Kona Uncles, Keaweaheulu (Liliuokalani 2013: 439) who helped him conquer and unify the Hawaiian kingdom.

Ka’aha’s son, Hiram Kahanawai, married Kapoʻoloku and had no children (Genealogy Record 106 in Barrère 1994: 82). Kapoʻoloku, aka Poʻomaikelani, was one of the younger sisters of Queen Kapiʻolani [Kalākaua] and they were the granddaughters of Kaumualiʻi, the last King of Kauaʻi. Queen Kapiʻolani was also the wife of King Kalākaua who reigned from 1874-1891. Prior to Kalākaua’s reign, Hiram and Kapoʻoloku were personal attendants of Queen Emma and Kamehameha IV. Kapoʻoloku, also called “Kapo” by Queen Emma, served as her lady-in-waiting (Korn 1976: 175).

Hiram had been chief steward in the royal household under Kamehameha IV and continued to serve Emma in that capacity during her widowhood. In 1874, after the election of Kalākaua to the throne, Hiram married Kapoʻoloku, a younger sister of Mrs. David Kalākaua (Queen Kapiʻolani), and received official appointment under the new dynasty (Korn 1976: 15).

According to a deed “H. Kahanawai & Kapooloku to Kaauwai, Z.” dated 1856 for Ka’aha’s houselot in Kawaiahaʻo (Book 8: 404-5), Kapoʻoloku is stated as Kahanawai’s wife. Therefore, the couple was married by 1856 and not 1874 as written in Korn (1976).
On August 7, 1874, Ka‘aha’s son Hiram died unexpectedly at the age of 34 while a member of King Kalākaua’s court. According to his obituary,

Capt. Hiram Kahanawai died very suddenly, as is supposed from an aneurism. He had just entered the King’s presence, and bowed to His Majesty, when he dropped on the floor, and was carried out dead” (H. Kahanawai Obituary 1874: 3).

In a letter between Queen Emma and her cousin Peter Kaeo, there were speculations that Hiram was poisoned since his death was during the contentious election for the throne in 1874 between Queen Emma and King Kalākaua (Korn 1976: 230). But, “no criminal charges were ever brought against anyone for being implicated in the death of Hiram Kahanawai” (Korn 1976: 231). Information regarding Ka‘aha’s genealogy was not found in McKinzie’s Hawaiian Genealogies, Vol. 1 and 2 (2002 and 2003).

Prior to the Māhele, Ka‘aha was the konohiki of two ahupua’a and three ‘ili on O‘ahu, Hawai‘i, Māui and Kaua‘i. On January 31, 1848, he signed the Buke Mahele and relinquished ½ the ‘ili of Kawananākoa in Honolulu, O‘ahu; the ahupua’a of Nene in Hilo, Hawai‘i; and the ‘ili of Kaulehua in Holualoa, Kona, Hawai‘i. He claimed the remaining ½ ‘ili of Kawananākoa, the ahupua’a of Kaulalo in Lāhainā, Māui and the ‘ili of Kuiloa in Hanapēpē, Kaua‘i that he received from Kamehameha III (Buke Mahele 1848: 45-46).

He testified to the Land Commission for these lands on February 1, 1848 (Native Register 5: 77). However, he died almost a year later, in January 1849 (Probate 1327), leaving his heirs to complete his land claims.

The table below lists Ka‘aha’s Māhele lands followed by descriptions of land transactions by Ka‘aha and his heirs.
Table 4.3. Māhele Lands of Kaʻaha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Māhele Lands –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kawananākoa, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Nene, Hilo, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kaulehua, Holualoa, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ʻĀpana in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (10 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (67 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1848 Māhele –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relinquished:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ ʻIli in Kawananākoa, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Nene, Hilo, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kaulehua, Holualoa, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ ʻIli in Kawananākoa, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu with two ʻāpana (6.33 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ʻĀpana in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (10 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (67 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māhele Lands

#### Land Commission Award (LCA) 1280/Royal Patents (RP) 8178 and 8205 (Kawananākoa, Oʻahu)

Kaʻaha’s heirs received LCA 1280 on March 15, 1855 for his ½ ʻili in Kawananākoa, Nuʻuanu situated in the ahupua’a of Honolulu, Oʻahu. It comprised of two ʻāpana or parcels, ʻĀpana 1 was 0.35 acres and ʻĀpana 2 was 5.78 acres totaling 6.33 acres (Book 9: 673-4). However, his Royal Patent 8178 for ʻĀpana 2 lists 4.63 acres, a decrease in 1.15 acres, with a new total for both ʻāpana of 4.98 acres.

The following testimonies for his claim were given on September 6, 1848 to confirm Kaʻaha’s land. Neither witnesses received land through the Buke Mahele as konohiki but one was a neighbor of Kaʻaha named Pi’ilani.

**Kaluahine** testified,

[Apana 1] - This land is in two pieces – This lot is in Nuuanu Valley called Kawanananakoa partly bargained for Judge Andrews. It is one large piece bounded mauka by John Il’s [konohiki and land commissioner] – Kekuanaoa’s [Oʻahu Governor] and Government land; Waikiki [boundary] by Nuuanu Road. Makai [boundary] by Robinson & Co. land, Kinimaka’s [konohiki] and Dr. Rooke’s, Ewa [boundary] by Palama (see division of lands by the king)” and [Apana 2] - “1 Kula 1 Kalo patch 1 fishpond in one lot bounded mauka by Waititi road; Waimanalo [boundary] by Kealoa’s, John Michener’s and a native; makai by fishponds of Kaluahinenui, Ewa [boundary] by Piikoi’s lands.
Claimant has had these lands from time of Kamehameha I and has ever since held them without dispute.

Piʻilani [Kaʻahaʻs neighbor] was “sworn and confirmed in full the testimony above” (Foreign Testimony 2: 464-5).

Kaʻahaʻs heirs received Royal Patent 8205 and paid his commutation fee of $8.75 for ʻĀpana 1 on March 21, 1910 (Book 35: 447-449). They also received Royal Patent 8178 and paid his commutation fee of $78.00 for ʻĀpana 2 on December 5, 1905 (Book 35: 333-5). Therefore, Kaʻahaʻs heirs did not relinquish additional lands to pay his commutation fee. The entire claim process for his Māhele lands required 62 years for ʻĀpana 1 (1848-1910) and 57 years for ʻĀpana 2 (1848-1905).

Land Commission Award (LCA) 5572-B/Royal Patent (RP) 4515 and 8148 (Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui and Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi)

Kaʻahaʻs heirs also received LCA 5572-B on March 15, 1855 for two ʻāpana in the ahupuaʻa of Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (Book 9: 674-5). ʻĀpana 1 was six acres near the ocean shoreline and ʻĀpana 2 was nearly four acres, with one side bordered by a “kahawai” or river. Together, the two ʻāpana totaled nearly 10 acres.

A Royal Patent 4515 for his two ʻāpana in Kaulalo, Māui was listed in the Land Indices (1929: 229). However, I was not able to locate a copy of his Royal Patent in the Hawaiʻi State Archives. Therefore, the issuance of a Royal Patent and whether a commutation fee was paid is undetermined.

Kaʻahaʻs heirs also claimed under this same LCA 5572-B for his ʻīli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi of 67 acres on March 15, 1855 (Book 9: 674-5). They were granted Royal Patent 8148 and paid his commutation fee of $100.00 on October 15, 1902. His heirs did not relinquish additional lands for Kaʻahaʻs commutation fee.

His Royal Patent 8148 was signed by Sanford Dole, key leader in the 1893 overthrow of the Hawaiian Kingdom (Book 35: 217-219). Kaʻahaʻs Māhele claim process for this land required 54 years to complete (1848-1902). Together, his lands on Māui and Kauaʻi totaled approximately 77 acres.

In 1870, Kaʻahaʻs son Hiram and his wife Kapoʻoloku deeded Kaʻahaʻs Māhele lands in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (LCA 5572-B) to Kapoʻoloku’s eldest sister, Kapīʻolani Kalākaua (Queen
Kapiʻolani) on October 10, 1870 (Deed H.K. Kaaha to Kapiolani Kalakaua (Record Book 31: 288-9). Perhaps, Kapoʻoloku gave this land to Kapiʻolani since the couple had no children and in chiefly tradition returned it to a higher ranking Aliʻi. Kapiʻolani was the wife of King Kalākaua, who reigned from 1874 to 1891.

**Non-Māhele Lands**

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 280/Royal Patent (RP) 590 (Kawaiahaʻo, Oʻahu)**

Kaʻaha and his wife Kamaile received LCA 280 for their son Kahanawai on July 21, 1851 and paid $9.00 in claim fees. This houselot was 1.35 acres and situated in Honolulu near Kawaiahaʻo Church on the corners of Punchbowl and Beretania Streets (Book 2: 1326). His son was referred as Hiram (Hairama) Kahanawai and his elder brother Kuluwailehua was his executor (Probate 1327).

Kuluwailehua was Hiram’s cousin and later became his elder hānai brother. He was a konohiki who signed the *Buke Mahele* and relinquished the ahupua’a of Kalawao, Molokaʻi for an ‘ili in Kamoku, Waikīkī, Oʻahu (1848: 47-48). In *Ke Kumu Hawaii* newspaper (August 19, 1835), Kuluwailehua was listed as a student of Lāhaināluna Seminary on Māui.

Kaʻaha testified to the Land Commission “[w]e have a little houselot. When we lived there, there was no home, and no lot. One house, of Waiakea ma, on this side of Laanui. They two are the eyewitnesses” (Native Register 2: 66). The following Native testimonies, confirming this claim for Kaʻaha and Kamaile, were given on October 6, 1847.

**John ʻĪʻī** testified,

I have seen this house site on the eastern side of Kawaiahaʻo, on the north side is Hinau’s [konohiki] lot, on the east, A. Waiakea’s, on the west side is Konia’s lot. This group of people built the fence. I had seen them living there in the year 1818. While Kaaha was establishing his residence there, he dug a well, planted crops and made a patch [loʻi]. There are five houses standing on that lot with one property possessor name Moehau living under Kaaha and Kamaile. They both have adobes [houses] on the lot and they are the only interest holders there. The word of God is the reason for their residence there (Native Testimony 2: 323-4).

As Christianized konohiki, Kaʻaha desired to live near Kawaiahaʻo Church to support Rev. Hiram Bingham, who was the founder of the church and leader of the mission. Kaʻaha was likely a konohiki teacher and also an assistant to Rev. Levi Chamberlain with other konohiki. In
1833, Chamberlain described his tour of the schools in Honolulu and said, “[m]y attendants are Kaaha, Opunui, Kahaleohia, Kaawahua and Naone” (Chamberlain, Vol. 17, 1832-1833: 12). Ka’aha’s son was named Hiram, likely after Rev. Hiram Bingham. Ka’aha’s heirs received Royal Patent 590 on January 26, 1852 and paid $75 commutation fee for the allodial title to his houselot in Kawaiaha’o (Book 3: 193-4).

Later, a deed dated May 26, 1856, signed by Ka’aha’s son, Hiram Kahanawai and his wife, Po’oloku, indicates they sold his houselot in Kawaiaha’o to Z. [Zorababela] Kaauwai. The deed stipulated “saving and excepting always the rights of the assigns of Kuluwailehua estate in the building upon the said premises now used as the American Hospital” (Deed H. Kahanawai & Kapooloku to Kaauwai, Z., Grantee Book 8: 404-5). Po’oloku was Princess Po’omaikelani Kapo’oloku, the younger sister of Queen Kapi’olani who was the wife of King Kalākaua (Barrère 1994: 82).

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 265/Royal Patent 1609 (King Street, Honolulu, O’ahu)**

Ka’aha and another konohiki Pahau, who signed the *Buke Māhele* (1848: 119-120), both received a LCA 265 on July 25, 1848 and paid $11.00 in claim fees (LCA Book 1: 219-20). This land parcel was situated in downtown Honolulu near the corner of Mauna Kea and King Street and approximately .06 acres (Indices 1929: 318).

**Maalahia**, a konohiki who signed the *Buke Māhele* (1848: 98-99) and brother-in-law of konohiki, Ka’awahua (Genealogy 601 in Barrère 1994: 436), testified this land is situated in Honolulu, East is land of John Meek, North is Kaluahinenui’s, West is Kaehu, South Broadway. The claimants have had possession since time of Rihoriho from whom they obtained it. It was formerly stucked but has now an adobie fence. Claimants found it waste and settled as others did with the King’s consent. There are seven houses on it. Claimants have lived upon it to the present time without any opposition to their right. A Chinaman named Aiona is now living on a corner of it, his wife is a tenant of claimants who lives with him he pays not rent” (Foreign Testimony 2: 21). Maalahia also claims Kaaha and Pahau were “he mau kanaka laua no ke ali‘i” servants or attendants of the chief [Kuhina Nui, Kekâluohi?].

**John li** testified with Maalahia,

...the claimants lived on the land till 1827 and then removed to the Chapel part of the town. While the place is occupied by their people instead. Witness knows of no counter claimant, except possibly the Chinaman.
Z. Kaauwai testified on oath to the correctness of the two preceding statements (Foreign Testimony 2: 21).

Kaʻaha and Pahau were granted a Royal Patent 1609 for this land on August 30, 1853, (Book 6: 41-42; Indices 1929: 1442) four years after Kaʻaha’s death in 1849. Their heirs paid $50 for the allodial title to this land.

**Will and Probate of Kaʻaha (1327)**

In Kaʻaha’s probate hearing on May 22, 1852, his personal will, dated January 6, 1849, declared his Māhele lands from the Mōʻī [Kamehameha III] are for his youngest child, Kahanawai, and his wife, the child’s mother, Kamaile. His eldest child S. Kuluwailehua, was appointed executor of his estate. These Māhele lands included ½ the ‘ili of Kawanākoa, 2 ‘āpana in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui and the ‘ili of Kuiloa in Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi.

The houselot at Waiahao [Kawaiahaʻo] was given to his youngest child Kahanawai and his wooden house for his older hānai son S’amuela Kuluwailehua. Kaʻaha also left a piece of kapa and two loʻi for Aneru (Rev. Lorrin Andrews) who was a prominent missionary teacher and Kaʻaha’s neighbor in Nuʻuanu.

Samuela Kuluwailehua was a konohiki of the ahupuaʻa of Kalawao in Molokaʻi and signed the *Buke Mahele* for an ‘ili ‘āina in Kamoku, Waikīkī (1848: 47-48). He was the son of Kaʻaha’s brother, Kanaloa, and therefore the nephew, not biological son, of Kaʻaha (Genealogy Record 106 in Barrère 1994: 82). It was konohiki tradition for Kaʻaha to hānai his konohiki nephew and likely supported his education at Lāhaināluna School (*Ke Kumu Hawaii* August 19, 1835). Kaʻaha may have mentored him throughout his life within their konohiki family and naturally chose him as executor for his son Hiram and his estate.

Kaʻaha’s will was signed and witnessed by Hitiau, Hepa, Kamaile [his wife] and S. Kuluwailehua [nephew and hānai son]. Hitiau, aka Hikiau, was also a konohiki of three ahupuaʻa of Kaupō, Lāhainā and Kaupokulua in Māui. He signed the *Buke Mahele* and retained his ahupuaʻa in Kaupokulua, Hāmākua Loa, Māui (1848: 101-2). He came from a family of konohiki and served under Kamehameha I and II. Hikiau died in 1873 at the age of 96 (Probate 1867 of Hikiau III).
In Kaʻaha’s probate hearing, Hikiau explained that Kaʻaha died in January of 1849 at the house of his elder hānai son Kuluwailehua in Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu. “He heard Kaʻaha’s will - it was drawn up by Samuel Kuluwailehua and read to him.... [S.] Kuluwailehua was appointed guardian of Hanawai (Hairama or Hiram). Kaʻaha was of sound mind and body at the time of making the will - S. Kuluwailehua is now dead” (Probate 1327). Kaʻaha’s cause of death was not specified in his Probate but likely due to the measles epidemic in 1848-1849.

Kaʻaha’s probate also includes legal documents, dated May 29, 1852, regarding the transfer of guardianship over his son Hairama Kahanawai to W. L. Moehonua. Moehonua was principal, and Hikiau surety of Honolulu, Island of Oahu, Hawaiian Islands, [who] are held and firmly bound unto Hairama Kahanawai in the penal sum of two thousand dollars, to be paid unto the said Hairama Kahanawai, on to his heirs, executors, administrators or assigns to [sic. the] which payment will and truly to be made, we bind ourselves...” (Probate 1327).

William Luther Moehonua was married to one of Hiram’s sisters Lucy Muolo (Barrère 1994: 82). He served as the Governor of Māui and was a close relative of King Kalākaua through his grandfather ‘Aikanaka (k) (Mckinzie 2003: 61-62).

Kaʻaha’s family is a prime example of the intermarrying and loyal service between konohiki and Aliʻi families. As the descendant of a prominent konohiki lineage, Kaʻaha and his family served in the households of the highest ranking Aliʻi Nui. He served Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi, her husband Kanaʻina (a konohiki nui) and their son William Charles Lunalilo, a future Mōʻi.

Kaʻaha’s son, Hiram, and wife Kapoʻoloku were personal attendants of Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma. After King Kalākaua ascended the throne in 1874, Hiram and Kapoʻoloku served in his royal court. Kaʻaha’s hānai son, Samuel Kuluwailehua, was a konohiki, likely groomed by Kaʻaha in land stewardship and supported his education at Lāhaināluna. He later served as a government luna ‘auhau or tax assessor (Ke Kumu Hawaii 1835: 132).

Kaʻaha and his heirs retained his Māhele lands despite his premature death only a year after the Māhele. The claim process took 54 and 62 years for his heirs to finalize his separate claims. The following table summarizes Kaʻaha’s land transactions, the total land acreage he passed to his heirs and the Aliʻi Nui associated with these lands.
Table 4.4. Lands of Kaʻaha Passed to Heirs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Māhele Lands –</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kawananāko, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Nene, Hilo, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kaulehua, Holualoa, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (10 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (67 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1848 Māhele –</th>
<th>Relinquished:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ ʻIli in Kawananāko, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Nene, Hilo, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kaulehua, Holualoa, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claimed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>½ ʻIli in Kawananāko, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu with two ʻāpana (6.33 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ʻĀpana in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (10 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (67 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Māhele Lands –</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 ʻIli in Kawananāko, Nuʻuanu, Oʻahu with two ʻāpana (4.98 acres, see R.P.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupuaʻa in Kaulalo, Lāhainā, Māui (10 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kuiloa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (67 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 House lot in Kawaiahaoʻo, Honolulu, Oʻahu (1.35 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Small land parcel on King Street, Honolulu, Oʻahu (0.06 acres).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total ʻĀina of Kaʻaha to 3 Heirs: 83.39 acres

Land ties to Aliʻi Nui: Kalaimamahū (k), Kekāuluohi (Kuhina Nui), Kamehameha III, and Kamehameha V.

Konohiki 3 - Kaʻahumanu

Kaʻahumanu (k) was a male konohiki and should not be confused with Queen Kaʻahumanu (w), the wife of Kamehameha I who appointed her as Kuhina Nui to co-rule with his son Liholiho.

Kaʻahumanu (k) descended from a very high ranking genealogy as the grandson of Aliʻi Nui, Kamanawa I. Kamanawa I was one of Kamehameha I’s four “Kona Uncles” who were his key elder counselors in politics and warfare. Kamanawa, his twin brother Kameʻeiamoku,
Keʻeaumoku and Keaweaheulu were four prominent chiefs of Hawaiʻi Island who helped Kamehameha I conquer and unite the Hawaiian Islands.

For their loyalty and support, “the four Kona Uncles were also given the highest positions on his council. They were also given extensive ʻĀina throughout the islands; these ʻĀina were known as pānalaʻau, or conquered Lands” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 58). Kamehameha “gave them the right to pass their ʻĀina on to their descendants upon their deaths instead of the ʻĀina reverting to the Mōʻī” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 58).

Kamanawa I and Kameʻeiamoku were the twin Akua sons of high ranking Hawaiʻi Island chief and chiefess, Keawepoepoe (k) and Kanoena (w) (Mckinzie 2002: 20). This royal couple was a chiefly nīʻaupiʻo (brother-sister) relationship as children of Kalanikauleleaiwi and Lonoikahaupu (Mckinzie 2003: 47). A nīʻaupiʻo mating elevated Kamanawa I and Kameʻeiamoku’s rank to divine chiefly status. “[T]he offspring of a nīʻaupiʻo (brother-sister mating) was an Akua” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 40).

Kaʻahumanu’s father, Amamalua, was the son of Kamanawa I (Kamakau 1961: 109) and Kekelaokalani (Mckinzie 2003: 71). Amamalua’s brother, Koahou, inherited the political position of their father, Kamanawa I, after his death (Kamakau 1961: 190). Another genealogy source says Amamalua and Koahou’s mother was Kaehukielei (Genealogy Record 601 in Barrère 1994: 84). Amamalua and Koahou’s half-sister, Peleuli (daughter of Kekelaokalani), became the wife of Kamehameha I (Kamakau 1961: 127). Kamehameha I’s “first daughter, Ka-pu-liko-liko, and a son, Ka-hoano-ku Kinaʻu, he had by Pele-uli before he became ruling chief. Later Pele-uli became the wife of Kamehameha’s brother Ka-welo-lani, but she continued to live in Kamehameha’s household” (Kamakau 1961: 311).

On his maternal side, Kaʻahumanu’s mother was Walawala. She was the daughter of Naeole (k) and Kauko (w). Naeole was the son of Kalanikapuaunui (k) and Kepoo (w). Kepoo was the daughter of Keakaainalu (k) and Wahine (w). Wahine (w) and Hao (k) were the children of Kanainanui and Hakau (w). Hakau was the daughter of Heulu (k) and Moana (w)” (Mckinzie 2002: 59).

Kaʻahumanu was married to Hilina and they had two daughters, Maraea Koaopa and Hamukoki (Mckinzie 2002: 59, 62). In his probate, two other daughters are mentioned, Keoua
and Manaku (Probate 1307). Maraea became the hānai daughter of the high-ranking konohiki, Puhalahua, of Waikele, O‘ahu (Ke Au Okoa 1869: 2). He adopted Maraea before he married his wife Nakuapaa [aka Nakuapa].

Ka‘ahumanu died in 1853 from small pox (Probate 1307). After Nakuapaa’s death, Kaoaopa tried to legally prove she was a legitimate heir to Puhalahua and Nakuapaa’s estate as their hānai child. The court ruled that Puhalahua and Nakuapaa’s wills did not entitle her to Nakuapaa’s estate she inherited from Ka‘ahumanu (Hawaiian Reports 1877: 401). An article, “He Aha Kiekie,” of Kaoaopa’s court case was published in the Hawaiian newspaper, Ke Au Okoa, on July 29, 1869.

Although Kaoaopa did not inherit land from her hānai konohiki father, Puhalahua, she and her sister Keoua inherited from Ka‘ahumanu, their biological father, his house lot in the Kawaiha‘o, O‘ahu and his Māhele land of a ½ ahupua‘a in Hilo, Hawai‘i.

Prior to the Māhele, Ka‘ahumanu was the konohiki of the ahupua‘a of Kaoma in Hilo, Hawai‘i (Buke Mahele 1848: 124-5). On February 8, 1848, Ka‘ahumanu signed the Buke Mahele relinquishing ½ the ahupua‘a of Kaoma, Hilo Hawai‘i to Kamehameha III (1848: 124-5). He was given the other ½ of this ahupua‘a by Kamehameha III. The table below lists Ka‘ahumanu’s Māhele lands followed by descriptions of land transactions by Ka‘ahumanu and his heirs.

Table 4.5. Māhele Lands of Ka‘ahumanu

| Pre-Māhele – |
| 1 Ahupua‘a in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawai‘i (acreage unknown). |
| Various lands in Kanekiki, Puna, Hawai‘i; Honokohau and Kukio in Kona, Hawai‘i; Wai‘anae in Lahaina, Maui; Waimalu on Oahu (acreage unknown). |

| 1848 Māhele – |
| Relinquished: |
| ½ Ahupua‘a in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawai‘i (acreage unknown) to Kamehameha III and Kingdom government. |
| Various lands in Kanekiki, Puna, Hawai‘i; Honokohau and Kukio in Kona, Hawai‘i; Wai‘anae in Lāhainā, Māui; Waimalu in Oahu (acreage unknown). |

| Claimed: |
| ½ Ahupua‘a in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawai‘i from Kamehameha III (acreage unknown). |
**Māhele Lands**

**LCA 7684 (Māhele Award 17)/Royal Patent in Māhele Award 17 (Kaoma, Hilo, Hawai‘i)**

On January 3, 1848, Ka‘ahumanu testified before the Land Commission to claim ½ the Ahupua‘a in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawai‘i from Kamehameha III (Native Register 5: 432).

After Ka‘ahumanu’s death in 1853, his heirs finally received a Māhele Award for his ½ ahupua‘a in January 15, 1862 by Kamehameha IV. Māhele Awards were issued to konohiki who were delayed in filing their land claims by specified deadlines. Additional deadline extensions were granted through Legislative Acts in 1854, 1860, 1892 and 1895 (Chinen 1958: 23-25). Ka‘ahumanu’s heirs paid $2.00 in fees for filing his Māhele Award (Book 3: 330).

A Royal Patent or “Palapala Sila Nui” was granted in his Māhele Award by Kamehameha IV. It appears no commutation fee was paid for acquiring the fee title to his land. The acreage of his ahupua‘a in Kaoma, Hilo was not documented in his Māhele Award or in the Land Indices and other land documents that I researched. The entire claim process for Ka‘ahumanu’s Māhele lands took 14 years to complete (1848-1862).

**Non-Māhele Lands**

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 735/Royal Patent (RP) 5722 (Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu)**

Ka‘ahumanu testified before the Land Commission on September 30, 1847 (Native Register 2: 395-6) to claim his various lands on different islands. His mother, Walawala, was one of three witnesses who testified for his land claims.

**Ka‘ahumanu** testified,

The interest was from Kamehameha I, through Kamehameha II, until Kamehameha III.

It was inherited land for Amamalua and for me, his keiki, Kaahumanu. Akopuluia was under Koahou, and on his death it was bequeathed to Kekauonohi, not to me, the heir. I remained, and this Landlord [Kekauʻōnohi] of mine withheld mine and returned his, at Hilo.

Therefore I am independent in the claim of these six lands. Their names are,

- Okanekiki [Kanekiki] at Puna [Hawaiʻi]
- Honokohau and Kukio at Kona [Hawaiʻi]
- Waianae at Lahaina [Māui]
- Waimalu at Oahu.
The sixth is the houselot at Honuakaha on Oahu. I urge that this claim be awarded. Kaʻahumanu, Subject of the Moi.

Here are the names of the witnesses for the inherited land: First, Okauhola, Second Walawala [his mother], Third, Namaka (Native Register 2: 395-6).

**Kamaka** testified February 25, 1848,

I know this place, it is a houselot in Honolulu, called Honuakaha. Claimant got it from Keʻeaumoku before Rihoriho’s death (1824) Keʻeaumoku possessed it a long time before claimant lived on it, in peace from that time to this. It is partly fenced and has two houses on it belonging to Claimant...I know of no counter claims (Foreign Testimony 2: 213).

**John ʻĪʻī** testified with Kamaka,

I know the land and Claimant’s title to it and is as has been stated by Kamaka. I know of no counter claimant. (Claimant relinquished his claim to the other pieces named in his statement to the Board; they are old land, long ago lost (Foreign Testimony 2: 213).

Of the six pieces of land Kaʻahumanu tried to claim, he was only awarded the small houselot at Honuakaha near Kawaiahaʻo Church (Greer Map 1986). He received LCA 735 on April 10, 1849 for this parcel that was only 0.58 acres and he paid $9.75 in claim fees (Book 2: 123). The Land Indices (1929) list a Royal Patent 5722 (Book 22: 351) for this land but I found no record of this Royal Patent in the Hawaiʻi State Archives.

As witness Kamaka testified, Kaʻahumanu received this houselot from Keʻeaumoku who was his granduncle. Keʻeaumoku was the half-brother of two other Kona Uncles, Kamanawa I who was Kaʻahumanu’s grandfather and Kameʻeiamoku, his granduncle (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 106). This shows chiefly hereditary and inheritance patterns of the Kona Uncles who shared and passed lands to their extended family members as well as to their immediate family.

**Will and Probate of Kaʻahumanu (1307)**

In Kaʻahumanu’s will, dated August 5, 1853 (Probate 1307), he left his lands and assets to his daughters Kaoaopa and Keoua of Honolulu. They include a house lot in Honolulu [Kawaiahaʻo], one land section on Hawaiʻi [½ an ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo], a cow and two horses (male and female). He does not mention his wife Hilina or other daughters Manaku and Hamukoki in his will. He died one week later on August 12, 1853 from small pox that was spreading throughout the islands (Kamakau 1961: 236-7).
In Kaʻahumanu’s Probate hearing on August 8, 1856, his daughter Keoua presented her father’s will.

Keaweluole testified,

I knew the deceased, I saw him die in Honolulu. He died at the time of the small pox [1853-1854]. He left a widow Hilina is her name and three daughters Kaoaopa, Keoua and Manaku. I know that a will was made, Honolulu wrote it....The property in the will consists of a house lot in Honolulu, a cow, 2 horses, a tract of land on Hawaii....He died a week after the will was signed in sound mind.

J.W. Honolulu testified,

I know the deceased I saw his corpse I was at his funeral. He died in August of the year of the small pox on the 12th of that month I think – He left a wife who is now present – her name is Hilina, and also three children. A will was made I wrote it.....The property consisted of a house lot in Honolulu. Another tract of land on Hawaii, 2 horses. Other property in the house not mentioned in the will. The property was given to Kaoaopa and Keoua. I know of no opposition to the will. The court considered the will as proved and admitted same to Probate. Hilina the widow to receive her dower [lifetime rights to a spouse’s estate] (Probate 1307).

The following table summarizes Kaʻahumanu’s land transactions, the total amount of land he passed to his heirs and the Aliʻi associated with these lands.
Table 4.6. Lands of Kaʻahumanu Passed to Heirs

| Pre-Māhele Lands – | 1 Ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown). |
| | Various lands in Kanekiki, Puna, Hawaiʻi; Honokohau and Kukio in Kona, Hawaiʻi; Waiʻanae in Lāhainā, Māui; Waimalu on Oʻahu (acreage unknown). |

1848 Māhele –

Relinquished:
½ Ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi to Kamehameha III and Kingdom government (acreage unknown).
Various lands in Kanekiki, Puna, Hawaiʻi; Honokohau and Kukio in Kona, Hawaiʻi; Waiʻanae in Lahaina, Maui; Waimalu on Oahu (acreage unknown).

Claimed:
½ Ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi from Kamehameha III (acreage unknown).

Post-Māhele Lands –
½ Ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi from Kamehameha III (acreage unknown).
1 Houselot in Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu, Oʻahu (0.58 acres).

Total ʻĀina of Kaʻahumanu to 3 Heirs: 0.58 acres plus ½ the ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).

Land ties to Aliʻi Nui: Kamanawa I (k), Kamehameha I, II and III, Keʻeaumoku (k) and Kekauʻōhnohi (w).

The acreage of Kaʻahumanu’s Māhele Award 17 for his ½ ahupuaʻa in Kaoma, Hilo, Hawaiʻi is unknown. This makes it difficult to determine the total acreage of his lands that were passed to his heirs. However, it seems odd that he only received ½ an ahupuaʻa as the grandson of a prominent Kona Uncle, Kamanawa I, who was given substantial landholdings and inheritance rights from Kamehameha I.

In two generations, Kaʻahumanu’s family rank decreased to a konohiki servant from his grandfather’s prestigious Aliʻi Nui status. Perhaps, this was due to his paternal ancestors’ marriages with a lesser ranking chiefesses resulting in lands going to offspring of higher ranking siblings or relatives. Sometimes power and wealth went to the eldest sibling, as with Kamanawa I passing his political position and his lands to his son Koahou and not his younger son Amamalu, Kaʻahumanu’s father.
Among the higher ranking konohiki were descendants of Ali‘i such as Kalanihelemailuna, Ka‘ulahea, Keawema‘uhili, Kaupekamoku, Kame‘eiamoku, Keawepoepoe [Ka‘ahumanu’s great grandfather], Kekuamanohā, and Kalani‘ōpu‘u. While they had been Ali‘i Nui, when they mated with lower ranked kaukau ali‘i women, their lineage fell in rank. In this way their children became servants of the Ali‘i Nui and in order for them to rise in lineage they must attract an Ali‘i Nui female long enough to have a child by her (Kame‘elehiwi 1992: 285).

Although Ka‘ahumanu testified to the Land Commission in 1847 for his land, he was one of the konohiki who died (1853) before he completed his Māhele claim. His heirs finalized his Māhele Award in 1862, nine years after his death and 14 years after he signed the Buke Mahele.

**Konohiki 4 - Ka‘awahua**

Ka‘awahua (k) has limited information on his genealogy and I need to conduct further research of Māhele or genealogical records at the State Archives and Bishop Museum. I did not find his genealogy information in McKinzie’s *Hawaiian Genealogies Vols. 1 and 2* (2002 and 2003). However, according to Māhele records he did serve as konohiki under Charles Kana‘ina, a high-ranking konohiki (Foreign Testimony 3:545) and likely had family ties with Kana‘ina or his wife Kekāuluohi, the Kuhina Nui.

He was a Christianized konohiki, possibly a teacher, who served as an assistant to Rev. Levi Chamberlain with other konohiki. Ka‘awahua resided in Honolulu to be near Kawaiahao Church and other church leaders like Hiram Bingham. In 1833, Chamberlain wrote of his visits to schools in downtown Honolulu and said, “[m]y attendants are Kaaha, Opunui, Kahaleohia, Kaawahua and Naone” (Chamberlain 1832-1833 (V17): 12).

Of the five konohiki in this study, he and Ka‘ahumanu (k) were the only two who received a Māhele Award from Kamehameha III. Māhele Awards were issued to konohiki who were delayed in filing their claims after 1860 (Chinen 1958: 23). For Ka‘awahua, the delay was due to his death in 1849 resulting in the responsibility of his claims being inherited by his heirs.

Prior to the Māhele, Ka‘awahua was a konohiki of the ahupua‘a of Ka‘apahu, in Hāmākua, Hawai‘i (*Buke Mahele* 1848: 97-8; Indices 1929: 55). On February 4, 1848, he signed the *Buke Mahele* relinquishing ½ of his interest in this ahupua‘a and claiming the other ½ of the
ahupuaʻa he received from Kamehameha III (*Buke Mahele* 1848: 97-8). The acreage of ½ the ahupuaʻa that Kaʻawahua claimed was 355 acres (*Indices* 1929: 55). Therefore, the total acreage of his entire ahupuaʻa is estimated at 700 plus acres.

The table below lists Kaʻawahua’s Māhele lands followed by descriptions of land transactions by Kaʻawahua and his heirs.

**Table 4.7. Māhele Lands of Kaʻawahua**

| Pre-Māhele – | 1 Ahupuaʻa in Kaʻapahu, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi (700+ acres). |
| 1848 Māhele – | **Relinquished:** ½ Ahupuaʻa in Kaʻapahu, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi to Kamehameha III (355 acres). |
|               | **Claimed:** ½ Ahupuaʻa in Kaʻapahu, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi from Kamehameha III (355 acres). |

**Māhele Lands**

**Māhele Award 52 (LCA) 6229/Royal Patent (RP) 7281 (Kaʻapahu, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi)**

On February 23, 1848 Kaʻawahua claimed his ½ ahupuaʻa in Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi totaling 355 acres. He testified,

> Greetings to the Land Commissioners, I am presenting my land interest in the *Buke Waihona Waiwai* [*Buke Mahele*] for my land from the King, Kaapahu (Native Register 5: 260)

In 1849, Kaʻawahua died very likely from the measles epidemic (Probate 1292). Kaʻawahua’s heirs had to complete his claim process and granted LCA 6229 that was approved and signed by Keoni Ana (Minister of the Interior) on September 2, 1854 (Book 10: 379). On May 26, 1862, his heirs received a Māhele Award 52 for LCA 6229 which was signed by Kamehameha V for the ½ ahupuaʻa in Kaʻapahu, Hawaiʻi. They paid $2.00 in claim fees on June 24, 1862 (Book 3: 335).

Māhele Awards were granted to konohiki delayed in filing their land claims after 1860 (*Chinen 1958: 23*). On May 5, 1879, his heirs were granted Kaʻawahua’s Royal Patent 7281 signed by King Kalākaua (Book 25: 157-8). They paid a $1.00 commutation fee for his lands,
which was less than his claim fees. They did not relinquish additional lands to pay his commutation fee. The entire claim process for his Māhele lands required 31 years (1848-1879).

**Non-Māhele Lands**

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 139/Royal Patent 4367 (Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu, Oʻahu)**

Kaʻawahua claimed 1.13 acres (Indices 1929: 320) in the Kawaiahaʻo area, situated midway between Beretania and King Streets, in downtown Honolulu. He received LCA 139 for his houselot at Kawaiahaʻo on April 10, 1849 and paid $9.75 in claim fees (Book 2: 15).

On April 28, 1846, Kaʻawahua testified to the Land Commission,

...we explain the rights to our lot at Wai-a-hao. It was because of the word of God, therefore we gathered because the Teacher [Bingham] said for the brethren to gather round. This is my thought to you. It is finished. Farewell. Live in God. Kaawahua” (Native Register Book 1: 123).

It seems Rev. Hiram Bingham, head pastor of Kawaiahaʻo Church, instructed the Christianized chiefs to reside near him and the church ensuring support of the Mission.

In March 1847, two witnesses presented testimonies for Kaʻawahua’s claim (Native Testimony 1: 184).

**Kalei** testified,

I have known this land for fifteen years as an idle pasture. Immediately after he had received it, he built a fence for it. There was no other claimant and no one has objected.

**John Ii** testified,

My testimony is similar as the one just given by Kalei. The property was enclosed with a fence, no other claimant was there and no one has objected to him.

Royal Patent 4367 was awarded to his heirs on May 4, 1858 for this houselot and paid a $25 commutation fee for the alodial or fee title to this land (Book 18: 21-22). He and his heirs spent 12 years processing and finalizing this claim (1846-1858).

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 2218/Royal Patent Grant 3787 (Pāmoa, Mānoa, Oʻahu)**

Pāmoa was the name of a land division in Mānoa, Oʻahu. It is the present site of St. Francis School and part of the University of Hawaiʻi campus. Pāmoa literally means “chicken enclosures” (Pukui, Elbert and Mookini 1974: 178).
Kaʻawahua applied for his lands and testified in 1847 to the Land Commission “I have 4 loi, 3 house lots, 1 kula there” (Native Register 3: 402). But, Kaʻawahua died, likely in 1849 from measles (Probate 1292), before receiving his LCA 2218. It was granted to his heirs on September 15, 1854 for an ʻili with four ʻāpana totaling 2.5 acres (Book 9: 386-7). Kaʻawahua’s heirs also received Royal Patent 3787 for the alodial title to his land on June 24, 1857 signed by Kamehameha IV (Book 16: 333-4). It took 9 years to complete Kaʻawahua’s claim process (1847-1857) and 8 years after his death (1849-1857).

On April 6, 1854, three testimonies were given to confirm Kaʻawahua’s land in Mānoa (Foreign Testimony 3: 545).

**Kuihelani** testified,

...he knows the kuleana of claimant in “Pamoa,” Manoa Valley. It consists of 3 loi and 3 pieces of cultivated land. The kula land is in grass [fallow] at the present time. The 3 patches of Kalo form 3 pieces. The first piece is bounded. The patches are surrounded by the land of the Konohiki.

**Kalaweaumoku** testified,

...he knows this kuleana. Claimant received this land from Kanaina [husband of Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi], the Konohiki, in the time of Kinau [younger ½ sister of Kekāuluohi], and held it in peace up to the time of his death in 1848, since which time his widow, Kailikole, had held it.

**Kalawaia**, the Luna of the Konohiki, approved this claim.

Charles “Kanaina” was the husband of Kekāuluohi, the Kuhina Nui from 1839-1845 and the father of Mōʻī, William Charles Lunalilo. Kekāuluohi’s younger ½ sister, Kīnaʻu, was Kuhina Nui from 1832 until her death in April 1839 (Kamakau 1961: 348).

As konohiki nui, Kanaʻina took care of his lower konohiki by giving them valuable kalo lands, as in the case of Kaʻawahua. In a different LCA 2216 for claimant named Kaohe, who was claiming land in Pāmoa, Mānoa, his witness **Kalaweaumoku** testified, “Kaohe received this land from Kaawahua the Konohiki before 1839” (Foreign Testimony 3: 545). As a lesser ranking konohiki under Kanaʻina, Kaʻawahua still held authority to pass lands to Kaohe, a fellow konohiki at his discretion. Kaohe served under Kuihelani, a prominent konohiki of Kamehameha I after the battle of Nuʻuanu. In a Native testimony for a boundary dispute of Abner Paki (konohiki and father of Princess Bernice Pauahi), “Kuihelani was Luna of Kamaile [an
ʻili in Mākahā, Oʻahu] for Kamehameha I...Kaohe was luna under Kuihelani – after Kaohe, then Kapuipui – then Kaumaumakea and Maalahia, then to Kaapuiki” (Native Testimony (LCA 10613), Book 10: 373).

Despite the declining power of the konohiki during Western changes, this testimony describes konohiki retaining traditional class structure and power with the succession of only Native Hawaiian konohiki in their positions.

However, it also shows growing dissension and competitive rivalries over land boundaries and power amongst the konohiki due to the Māhele. Settling boundary disputes on the konohiki level would not have occurred in ancient times. Redistribution of lands or the Kālai‘āina was determined and executed by the ruling Aliʻi Nui and their ‘Aha Aliʻi or council of chiefly advisors.

Moreover, the palena or land boundaries were traditionally memorized and inventoried by the konohiki for their Aliʻi Nui not by a Western Land and Boundary Commission of foreigners who had little, if any, ties or understanding of the cultural significance and history of the land. The Māhele severely devalued the konohiki’s power and ancestral knowledge of the land, forcing them to fight over boundaries they intimately knew but were now adjudicated and defined by foreigners. This was yet another factor of many that weakened their class solidarity and led to the collapse of the konohiki after the Māhele.

**Will and Probate of Kaʻawahua (1292)**

Although there is no specific date of death for Kaʻawahua in his Probate (1292) a witness Naiapaakai, claims Kaʻawahua was sick in 1849. His cause of death was likely from measles. A widespread epidemic of measles and dysentery was introduced by a foreign ship in 1848 and killed many high-ranking Aliʻi Nui on various islands (Kamakau 1961: 410-11).

Kaʻawahua’s will, dated April 23, 1849, was drafted by Rev. Kekela in Honolulu, Oʻahu and signed by witnesses, Naiapaakai, Kauwealoha, and Kahaha. They were Hawaiian missionaries who went on mission trips to the Marquesas Islands with Rev. Kekela. His will states the following assets are to be passed to his wife Kailikole,

1) his houselot in Kawaiahaʻo, Honolulu

2) ½ ahupuaʻa of Kaapahu in Hāmākua, Hawaii from Kamehameha III
3) six mares in the care of Kaaialaau in Hauula Koolauloa, [O‘ahu]
4) one cattle steer to Poipi [?]. All the rest of my wealth at this time to my 
wife.
5) our three kalo patches in the ‘ili of Pamoa, Manoa named Kahelepo, [and] 
Kinau. For my wife, our loʻi right below, the aimoʻo [smaller loʻi plot].

On April 8th and 13th in 1865, Ka‘awahua’s Probate (Case 1292) hearing was conducted 
by Supreme Court Justice Robertson. David Naiapaakai from Kohala, Hawai‘i testified that 
Ka‘awahua was married to Kailikole and lived near Kawaiaha‘o Church in Honolulu. He had not 
seen Ka‘awahua in 16 years [since 1849] and the last time he saw him he was ill. He died and his 
wife remarried. When Naiapaakai was living with Ka‘awahua he saw him make a will giving his 
personal lands to his wife Kailikole. His will was written by Kailikole’s relative Rev. Kekela, a 
missionary who traveled to the Marquesas, and Naiapaakai was present and one of several 
people who witnessed the signing of his will.

The following table summarizes Ka‘awahua’s land transactions, the total amount of land 
he passed to his heirs and the Ali‘i Nui associated with these lands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.8. Lands of Ka‘awahua Passed to Heirs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Māhele</strong> –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Ka‘apahu, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i (700+ acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1848 Māhele</strong> –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relinquished:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Ahupua’a in Ka‘apahu, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i to Kamehameha III (355 acres?).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claimed:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Ahupua’a in Ka‘apahu, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i of 355 acres from Kamehameha III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post-Māhele Lands</strong> –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ Ahupua’a in Ka‘apahu, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i from Kamehameha III (355 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Small houselot in Kawaiaha‘o, Honolulu, O‘ahu (1.13 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili in Pāmoa, Mānoa, O‘ahu with four lo‘i, three houselots and a field (2.5 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ‘Āina of Ka‘awahua to 1 Heir:</strong> 358.63 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land ties to Ali‘i Nui:</strong> Charles Kana‘ina, Kekāuluohi, Kamehameha III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I did not find information of Ka‘awahua’s family lineage and need to do further research of the genealogy records at the State Archives and Bishop Museum. Edith Mckinzie’s Hawaiian Genealogies Vol. 1 and 2 (2002 and 2003) contained no information on Ka‘awahua. However, he served as konohiki under Charles Kana‘ina and Kekāuluohi and further research of their land or probate records may provide clues to Ka‘awahua’s family lineage.

Ka‘awahua was able to receive, retain and pass to his wife nearly 360 acres of valuable lands in Hāmākua, Hawai‘i, a houselot near Kawaiaha‘o Church, and rich kalo lands in Mānoa, O‘ahu.

Testimonies for Ka‘awahua’s LCA 2218 in Pāmoa, Mānoa indicate the hierarchy of konohiki was at least 4 levels which was necessary in high food-producing areas of kalo cultivation and fishponds. Ka‘awahua served under Lawaia, the Luna Konohiki, while Lawaia served under Charles Kana‘ina, the konohiki nui. Although Ka‘awahua was third in rank, he distributed land to others, as one witness testified, “Kaohe received this land from Kaawahua the Konohiki before 1839” (Foreign Testimony 3: 515). Kaohe could have possibly belonged to another lower level of konohiki.

**Konohiki 5 - Pehu, Iona**

Pehu, Iona (k) was a long-time steward and high ranking konohiki under Kamehameha I, II and III. He received the largest amount of land of the five konohiki in this study totaling over 6,600 acres. A testimony by Pehu on December 2, 1846 for Kaua‘i Governess, Miriam Kekau‘ōnohi’s lands in Honolulu (LCA 191) provides an intimate look into his life as a prominent konohiki.

Pehu testified,

I was an officer of Kamehameha [I] previous to 1812… I travelled backwards and forwards, communicating the orders, and attending to his business. (Foreign Testimony 1: 119-120).

During Kamehameha’s I’s reign I was living on O‘ahu here and that was the time I was living up here in Honolulu and we would return together with Kamehameha I to Hawaii, then come back here to investigate problems. I lived on Uilama’s place which was a forbidden area and no foreigners were permitted to live there. We only were allowed to live there. I was living on O‘ahu when the Russians arrived and Kamehameha I died. We went to Hawaii
and returned with Liholiho. I did not live there again, but my wife [Keekapu] remained with four houses, some of which were storehouses. When Kalaimoku [Kalanimoku] went to Hawaii because of illness, my wife went along. The houses were standing on the lot where the new stone house is standing, where Kaniua had lived in the front side of Kauila’s house....No one had given Sumner (land), but he had noted a vacant land and because King Kamehameha I who forbade the use of that place was dead, it was permissible for anyone to do as he chooses for a place...(Native Testimony 2: 39).

When Kamehameha I was living on Oahu here four houses were built as have been mentioned previously and when he returned to Hawaii, those houses were broken apart. I had built those four houses (Native Testimony (Native Testimony 2: 40).

His testimony includes a side note by the Land Commission transcriber, “[t]he witness [Pehu] is an elderly man; therefore, he does not understand the new testimonies but he has testified to the earlier things only” (Native Testimony (LCA 191, Book 2: 40).

Pehu originally received his lands in downtown Honolulu from Boki, the governor of Oʻahu, under Kamehameha I and II. When Boki was lost at sea searching for Sandalwood in 1829, his wife Līliha, the daughter of Māui Governor Hoapili, inherited the governorship. But, Līliha was replaced by Kuakini, brother of Kuhina Nui Kaʻahumanu, after she participated in a rebellion against Queen Kaʻahumanu known as the “Pahikaua War” (Kamakau 1961: 301-302). After this rebellion, the ‘Aha Aliʻi (Council of Chiefs) headed by Kaʻahumanu, replaced Līliha with her brother John Adams Kuakini as governor. “Kuakini...was made Kia‘aina of Oʻahu and his people were made konohiki of the choice ‘Āina” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 90). Although Pehu had previous loyalties to Boki and Līliha, Governor Kuakini retained him as a highly respected, personal konohiki of Honolulu. “O Pehu, ia ia ka inoino ke konohiki o Honolulu malalo o Kuakini” (Kamakau 1961: 303; 1868: 1).

Prior to the Māhele, Pehu was the konohiki of 6 substantial pieces of land (3 ahupuaʻa and 3 ‘ili) on Oʻahu and Hawaiʻi Island (Buke Mahele 1848: 37-8). On January 31, 1848, Pehu signed the Buke Mahele (1848: 37-38) and relinquished 4 of the 6 parcels of land to Kamehameha III. They include,

1 ‘ili of Okai in Mananaiki, ‘Ewa, Oʻahu,
1 ahupua’a of Puheemiki in Koʻolauloa, Oʻahu,
1 ahupua’a of Makaula in Kona, Hawai’i
1 ‘ili of Papalele in Honuaina, Kona, Hawai’i

Pehu retained the remaining two pieces of land from Kamehameha III, 1 ‘ili Kekio in Waikīkī, O’ahu and 1 ahupua’a in Kukaiau, Hāmākua, Hawai’i. He was awarded ‘Āpana 2 of this ahupua’a in Hāmākua totaling 6,188 acres (Indices 1929: 2). Pehu relinquished 66% of his lands due to the Māhele (Kame‘elehiwa 1992: 278). According to his probate records, he died in December of 1848, likely from measles. His death was less than a year after signing the Buke Mahele and Pehu did not live to see the completion of his land claims (Probate 1095).

The following table lists the Māhele lands of Pehu, followed by descriptions of land transactions by Pehu and his heirs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.9. Māhele Lands of Pehu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Māhele</strong> –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili in Okai, Mānanaiki, ‘Ewa, O’ahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Puheemiki, Koolauloa, O’ahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili in Papalele, Honuaina, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Maka’ula, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Kūka’iau, Hāmākua, Hawai’i (6,188 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1848 Māhele –</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relinquished:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili in Okai, Mananaiki, ‘Ewa, O’ahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Puheemiki, Koolauloa, O’ahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili Papalele in Honuaina, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Maka’ula, Kona, Hawai’i (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Claimed:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘Ili Kekio in Waikīkī, O’ahu (407.75 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Kūka’iau, Hāmākua, Hawai’i (6,188 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māhele Lands**

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 5931/Royal Patent (RP) 5667 (Kekio, Pālolo, Waikīkī, O’ahu)**

Pehu applied for his Māhele lands on February 3, 1848 which included an ‘ili in Kekio, Waikīkī and the ahupua’a in Hāmākua, Hawai’i. He testified,

I hereby state my claim for land from the division by the Moi and his representatives.
1. Kekio, an ‘Ili in Waikiki on Oahu and
2. Kukuiau, an Ahupua’a at Hamakua Hawaii (Native Register 5: 182).

His ‘ili in Kekio, Waikīkī was 407.85 acres (Indices 1929: 364; R.P. 5667) with four ‘āpana (parcels), 3 of which were referred as “lele” or jump strips of cultivable land belonging to a separate ahupua’a.

Following his death in December 1848 (Probate 1095), Pehu’s heirs applied for his land in Waikīkī 3 ½ years later. They received LCA 5931 on June 19, 1852 and paid $5 in claim fees (Book 10: 380-1). According to his LCA, this land was subject to the government’s ¼ commutation fee of the unimproved value of this land to acquire the allodial or fee title. Pehu’s heirs received Royal Patent 5667 in February 20, 1872 listing Pehu and his wife Keekapu. It was signed by King Kamehameha V and the Minister of the Interior, F. W. Hutchinson. They paid a $100 commutation fee for this land (Book 22: 235-6; Indices 1929: 364). Therefore, his heirs did not relinquish additional lands to pay his commutation fee. The entire claim process of his Māhele lands in Waikīkī took 24 years to complete (1848-1872).

**Land Commission Award (LCA) 5931/Royal Patent (RP) 7606 (Ahupua’a of Kūka’iau, Hāmākua, Hawai’i)**

Since Pehu died in 1848, his claim process for the ahupua’a of Kūka’iau, in Hāmākua was completed by his heirs. They were awarded LCA 5931 on June 19, 1852 for his ahupua’a from Kamehameha III (Book 10: 380-1). This ahupua’a totaled 6,188 acres (R. P. 7607, Book 25: 287-8).

According to his LCA 5931, Pehu estate or heirs were granted land interest less the allodial title until he paid the government ¼ of its value for Royal Patent 7606 (Book 25: 287-8). Pehu’s heirs paid $5.00 in claim fees for his LCA (Book 10: 380-1). On May 25, 1882, his heirs paid a commutation fee of $500 for Pehu’s ahupua’a in Hāmākua and received Royal Patent 7606 signed by King Kalākaua (Book 25: 287-8; Indices 1929: 92). The entire claim process for his Māhele land took 34 years to complete from the 1848 when he signed the Buke Māhele until 1882 when his Royal Patent was granted.
Non-Māhele Lands

Land Commission Award (LCA) 540/Royal Patent (RP) 10 (Fort and Church [King] Streets)

This land claim was under Keekapu as principal claimant with Pehu. On September 10, 1848, they received LCA 540 for this small houselot in Honolulu on the corner of Fort Street and Church [King] Street (Book 1: 314-5; Greer Map 1986). They testified in their claim that they received this place long ago, in the time of Kamehameha I in 1817 and possessed it until this time. The Land Commissioners granted Keekapu and Pehu this land claim less the allodial or fee interest and they paid $10.50 in claim fees.

To satisfy the government’s ¼ commutation fee, they paid $75 for this houselot of only 0.19 acres and received Royal Patent 10 on October 21 1848 (Book 1: 35-6).

A woman named Malau testified,

...she knows the place situated near the store of John Ladd. Claimant has lived there ever since the building of the fort. It was then waste land and it was taken up like other parts. It belongs to Keekapu and her husband Pehu from that time (Foreign Testimony 2: 47).

Pehu also had a fishpond that was fed by Nu‘uanu Stream (Greer Map 1986). This pond is also described in LCA 274 of Joseph Booth with a map of several fishponds in Koula, Honolulu in the district of Kewalo (Book 1: 385-9). These fishponds include those belonging to Pehu, Pi‘ikoi and Kalaau. The specific name of Pehu’s fishpond was not identified in his or other land documents.

Land Commission Award (LCA) 685/Royal Patent (RP) 2691 (Kawaihaʻo, Oʻahu)

On April 10, 1849, Pehu’s heirs applied for and received LCA 685 for a houselot near Kawaihaʻo Church and paid $10.50 in claim fees (Book 2:77). Pehu’s small plot of 0.20 acres (Indices 1929: 364) was located in back of the present day Mission Houses on Mission Lane (Greer Map 1986). They also received Royal Patent 2691 for this land (Book 12: 361).

On September 14, 1847 at Kawaihaʻo, Pehu testified,

This lot is for Pehu, at Kawaiiaha,...My interest in this lot is from my wife’s parents. Her father is Honokaupu and her mother is Kaneikaawa, they are still living, and they gave us this place. They lived in this place without completing the fence, it was weed grown kula, and then afterwards the fence was completed. They were living with Bingham ma at this place...” (Native Register 2: 350).
The following three testimonies confirm Pehu’s claim (Foreign Testimony 2: 164).

Niau testified,

I have saw this place which is in Waiahao, bounded mauka by the Mission Cattle yard, Waititi lio lane, makai a road leading to the... Ewa side vacant lands. There is one house on it claimant has had possession ever since Kamehameha II...

John Ii a konohiki testified,

...claimant lived there with his wife in 1825 and has held it ever since.

Paul Kanoa, a konohiki says,

...the place was vacant land when the claimant took it in 1826. I know no counter claimant.

Paul [aka Paulo] Kanoa (1802-1885) was a prominent konohiki of Kamehameha III who signed the Buke Mahele (1848: 39-40). His Māhele lands were an ahupua’a in Halepua’a, Puna, Hawai’i, an ʻili Kainapua’a in Kapālama, Honolulu, Oʻahu and an ʻili in Kaholona, Manana, ʻEwa, Oʻahu. He relinquished his ahupua’a in Puna, Hawaiʻi but held his two ʻili in Kapālama and Manana, ʻEwa on Oʻahu.

Kanoa was “the first cousin of Kekūanaoʻa (their father Kaiwiopu and Nahioleʻa were brothers)” (Kameʻeleihiwa 1992: 279). Kekūanaoʻa, the governor of Oʻahu, was the husband of Kuhina Nui, Kīnaʻu, whose sons were Kamehameha IV and V. Paulo adopted a son named Paulo F. Kanoa (1832-1895), who was raised in Kekūanaoʻa’s household and served the Kingdom as a tax assessor and became governor of Kauaʻi (Obituary 1895: 1). The junior Paulo should not be confused with his father, the konohiki of Kamehameha III.

Land Commission Award (LCA) 709/ Royal Patent (RP) 1125 (Kapauhi and Kaliu, Downtown Honolulu, Oʻahu)

Pehu testified to the Land Commission on September 22, 1847 for his land claim of two ʻĀpana. ʻĀpana 1 was a pa hale or houselot in Kapauhi and

...there are three houselots at Peleula12 in Honolulu...another houselot claim of mine is at Kawel[e]” and “I have a claim to a house lot mauka of Honolulu Aina, the place where I lived from ancient times until present... (Native Register 2: 369).

---

12Peleʻula was “lane and old section of downtown Honolulu, named for a chiefess seer who lived here and who vainly tried to steal Lohiʻau from Hiʻiaka in a kilu game; ...many healing heiau were here (Ii 46). Lit. red Pele” (Pukui, Elbert and Mookini 1974: 183).
**Umiokalani** testified on November 16, 1850,

Ua loaa ia ia keia mau Apana aina pahale no Poki mai i ka M. H. 1827, a ua noho oluolu oia malaia a hiki i kona make ana i ka M. H. 1848.

These land parcels/houselots were given to him from Boki in 1827 and he [Pehu] lived there peacefully until his death in 1848 (Native Testimony 2: 496-7).

Pehu received LCA 709 for these lands in Kapauhi and Kaliu in downtown Honolulu from Boki, Governor of Oʻahu. The two ‘āpana with 3 houselots totaled 2.16 acres. ‘Āpana 1 in Kapauhi was 1.34 acres and finalized on December 21, 1850. ‘Āpana 2 in Kaliu included a houselot that was 956 fathoms or 0.82 acres. It was finalized on September 17, 1852. His heirs paid $15.00 in claim fees for these lands (Book 10: 73). A Royal Patent 1125 (Indices 1929: 363) was not located in the State Archives for this LCA.

**Will and Probate of Pehu (1095)**

In Pehu’s will, dated November 25, 1848 (Probate 1095), he designated his lands to be passed to his son Kekua. These lands included his houses, horses, cattle, mules, sheep, goats and other assets. He was in good health when he signed his last Will and Testament but died one month later in December 1848 “the time of the great sickness,” during the measles epidemic. Kamakau estimates “it carried away a third of the population” (1961: 237).

The following three testimonies are for Pehu’s land and assets after his death (Probate 1095),

I. **Piikoi** testified,

I saw him die, he died in 1848 in the time of the great sickness [measles]. I think he died in the month of December – His widow Keekapu is now in Court. He left one child a boy...named Kekua. I know the will presented for probate, I wrote it and signed it as a witness at his request. He executed it by making his mark opposite his name on the 25th of November 1848. He was of sound mind and memory, and in good health...He owned an ili of land at Waikiki known as Kekio and one at Koe Hawaii at Hamakua it is an Ahupuaa and known as Kukaiau [Kūkaʻiau]. He owned five house lots in Honolulu.

**Keekapu** testified,

---

I am the widow of Pehu...He left four horses, two hundred and fifty sheep, fifteen meat cattle, about three hundred tame and wild goats, two mules, two trunks and a few clothes. I have since married. Mano who was a friend of Pehu’s.

Mano testified,

I knew Pehu and lived with him from the time of Kamehameha II. I saw him die. He died during the great sickness [measles] in 1848...His property is correctly described by Piikoi and Keekapu.

The following table summarizes the land transactions by Pehu and heirs, the amount of land passed to his heirs, and the Aliʻi ties to those lands.

Table 4.10. Lands of Pehu Passed to Heirs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Māhele –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Okai, Mananaiki, ʻEwa, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Puheemiki, Koʻolauloa, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 ʻIli in Papalele, Honuaina, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown). |
| 1 Ahupua’a in Makaula, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown). |
| 1 Ahupua’a in Kūkaʻiau, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1848 Māhele –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relinquished:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Okai, Mānanaiki, ʻEwa, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Puheemiki, Koʻolauloa, Oʻahu (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Papalele, Honuaina, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a in Makaula, Kona, Hawaiʻi (acreage unknown).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Claimed: |
| 1 ʻIli in Kekio, Waikīkī, Oʻahu (407.75 acres). |
| 1 Ahupua’a (ʻĀpana 2) in Kūkaʻiau, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi (6,188 acres). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Māhele –</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 ʻIli in Kekio, Waikīkī, Oʻahu (407.85 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ahupua’a (ʻĀpana 2) in Kūkaʻiau, Hāmākua, Hawaiʻi (6,188 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Land parcel on Fort and King Street, Honolulu, Oʻahu (0.19 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 House lot in Kawaihaʻo, Honolulu, Oʻahu (0.20 acres).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total ʻĀina of Pehu to 1 Heir: 6,596.24 acres. |

Personal ties to Aliʻi Nui: Kamehameha I, II, III, and Oʻahu Governors Boki, his wife Līliha, and John Adams Kuakini.
Pehu’s heirs inherited nearly 6,600 acres, houses and a large amount of various livestock compared to the other four konohiki in this study. He paid a total of $600 in commutation fees for both of his Māhele lands and did not have to relinquish additional lands for his commutation fee. He owned “two trunks and a few clothes” which contradicts criticisms of the chiefs stockpiling storehouses of foreign luxury goods and practicing conspicuous consumption. Pehu built and was placed in charge of Liholiho’s storehouses and therefore would have likely acquired much more than what his probate reveals.

Pehu was reported to be elderly at the time of the 1848 Māhele however, his exact age was undetermined by his records. He died in December of 1848 from measles, one of many foreign-introduced diseases that decimated the Hawaiian population. Sadly, he was unable to witness the completion of most of his land claims that were finalized, likely by his wife Keekapu.

As an experienced and prominent konohiki of the Kamehameha family, he was retained as a highly respected steward during changes of power between rivaling chiefly families of Governors Boki and wife Līliha with Kuakini and his sister Kaʻahumanu (w), the Kuhina Nui.

Information of Pehu’s genealogy is limited and was not listed in Mckinzie’s *Hawaiian Genealogies Vol. 1 and 2* (2002 and 2003). I need to conduct more genealogy research in the Hawaiʻi State Archives and Bishop Museum of this prominent and well respected konohiki who lived a long life serving three Kamehameha rulers.

**Findings from the Konohiki Study**

The results of this study prove the foreign-induced Māhele ʻĀina or “land division” resulted in a great “land loss” for the konohiki which is contrary to criticism that they were buying up or taking away lands of the makaʻāinana. It was found that Kamehameha III’s five konohiki collectively passed less than 10,000 acres of land to their 10 heirs. Four of the five konohiki died early in their claim process by foreign disease epidemics of measles in 1848-1849 and smallpox in 1853. All five did not survive long enough to complete their claims and experience private land ownership.

The sudden and tremendous land loss of the King’s konohiki was likely the case for many of his 200 plus konohiki and perhaps, worse for the hundreds of konohiki under other Aliʻi
Native depopulation by foreign disease coupled with the loss of land and power was like a double death and could be perceived as a socio-economic genocide. After conducting this research, the loss of sovereignty really began in 1778 with the arrival of foreigners and the start of the massive dying off of Hawaiians.

For the konohiki, the loss of life and lands meant the significant loss of pono stewardship and leadership resulting in disenfranchisement of their families, their communities and their class. Ancestral knowledge of the environment, that was generationally passed down in konohiki families was no longer valued and not compatible with foreign ideals of capitalism.

Despite the loss of lands by these konohiki, each retained and passed their Māhele lands from Kamehameha III totaling 7,576.29 acres to only 10 heirs. The following is the estimated land acreage their heirs inherited.

Table 4.11. Total Acreage of Profiled Konohiki Passed to Heirs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Konohiki</th>
<th>Total Acreage Passed to Heirs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. Hīnau</td>
<td>537.45 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaʻaha</td>
<td>83.39 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaʻahumanu</td>
<td>0.58 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaʻawahua</td>
<td>358.63 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Pehu</td>
<td>6,596.24 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,576.29 acres</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A detailed calculation of the time these konohiki and their heirs spent claiming their Māhele lands from King Kamehameha III revealed multiple decades ranging from 14 to 62 years. This period was calculated from the time each konohiki signed the King’s Buke Māhele in 1848 until their Royal Patent or commutation was paid and finalized.

For example, Hīnau and heirs spent 56 years for his ahupua’a in Keawanui, Molokaʻi (LCA 2715). Kaʻaha and his heirs took 62 and 57 years for 2 ʻāpana in Kawananākoa, Honolulu, Oʻahu (LCA 1280) and 54 years for his ‘ili in Kuilaʻa, Hanapēpē, Kauaʻi (LCA 557B). Kaʻahumanu and his heirs spent 14 years claiming his ahupua’a in Kaoma, Hilo (LCA 7648). Kaʻawahua and heirs spent 31 years for his ½ ahupua’a of Kaʻapahu in Hāmākua, Hāwaiʻi (LCA 6229). Pehu and his heirs took 24 years to finalize his claim for a large ‘ili in Kekio, Pālolo, Waikīkī (LCA 5667) and
34 years for his ahupua’a in Kūka’iau, Hāmākua, Hawai‘i (LCA 5931). Ironically, this lengthy and overwhelming process seems very similar to the current Hawaiian Homelands process with extremely long waiting periods for claimants who are dying waiting for their lands.

Due to their deaths, the claim processes of these five konohiki were inherited by their spouses, children or relatives who may have lacked experience in land transactions, finances or patience to complete the process. The Māhele system was not only tedious, complex and expensive but, a radical foreign concept and was culturally offensive to purchase and own land with unrealistic deadlines to file. Other reasons for claim delays were, perhaps, apprehensiveness or a lack of urgency to start the lengthy, complicated process. If life for the konohiki in his or her ahupua’a remained the same, and the maka‘āinana continued to serve their konohiki, then logically there was no incentive or motivation to change the status quo.

Other findings include a complex class structure and culture with multi-levels of konohiki especially in intensive food producing areas in Mānoa and Waikīkī on O‘ahu. Testimonies for their claims were often supported by fellow konohiki who were neighbors, relatives and sometimes Ali‘i Nui. As descendants of close-knit konohiki families or high-ranking Ali‘i, they were tightly networked through long years of loyal service and intermarriages. These konohiki not only held ties with King Kamehameha III but other royal households and circles of high ranking Ali‘i Nui which included Kamehameha the I and II, Kamehameha IV and Queen Emma, Kamehameha V, Keʻeaumoku (Kona Uncle), Kuhina Nui Kekāuluohi and husband Charles Kanaʻina, O‘ahu Governors Boki and wife Līliha, Kekūanaoʻa and Kuakini.

This study concludes that these konohiki received very little land based on new quantifiable data and evidence proving the Māhele benefited foreigners far greater than the konohiki. The Māhele solidified foreigners’ long desired plans to amass vast tracts of Hawai‘i’s prime lands and resources for their private islands, plantations, ranches and estates. The large disparity of land ownership between foreigners and Hawaiians put foreigners at an even greater advantage to increase their wealth and power over Hawaiians. Not surprising, their expansive landholdings from the Māhele never satisfied their desires until they were able to illegally overthrow the Hawaiian Kingdom and its Mō‘ī in 1893.
Throughout the 19th century, Hawaiians continued to have deep aloha for their chiefs and the chiefs for their people despite missionary attempts to sever this bond and blame the chiefs for the demise of their people. Queen Liliʻuokalani, who was deposed and her kingdom overthrown by missionary and foreign businessmen in 1893, refutes their claims and blames foreign ways for the destitution of her people. Her words are still relevant and prophetic to the present condition of Native Hawaiians today who are poor, being evicted and homeless.

In her memoirs, *Hawaii’s Story by Hawaii’s Queen Liliuokalani* (2013), she writes of her father, Kapaʻakea, and the loyalty and love that he shared with his people as a konohiki. It also shows the large number of his loyal servers which was the sign of a great chief.

For the purpose of enhancing the value of their own mission, it has been at times asserted by foreigners that the abundance of the chief was procured by the poverty of his followers. To any person at all familiar either by experience or from trustworthy tradition, with the daily life of the Hawaiian people fifty years ago, nothing could be more incorrect than such assumption. The chief whose retainers were in any poverty or want would have felt, not only their sufferings, but, further, his own disgrace. As was then customary with the Hawaiian chiefs, my father was surrounded by hundreds of his own people, all of whom looked to him, and never in vain, for sustenance. He lived in a large grass house surrounded by smaller ones, which were the homes of those the most closely connected with his service. There was food enough and to spare for every one. And this was equally true of all his people, however distant from his personal care. For the chief always appointed some man of ability as his agent or overseer [konohiki]. This officer apportioned the lands to each Hawaiian, and on these allotments were raised taro, the [sweet] potatoes, the pigs, and the chickens which constituted the living of the family; even forests, which furnished the material from which was made the tapa cloth, were apportioned to the women in like manner. It is true that no one of the common people could mortgage or sell his land, but the wisdom of this limitation is abundantly proved by the homeless condition of the Hawaiians at the present day. Rent, eviction of tenants, as understood in other lands, were unknown; but each retainer of any chief contributed in the productions of his holding to the support of the chief’s table (2013: 6-7).
Chapter 5. Conclusion

The moʻolelo or history of the konohiki is ‘aʻole i pau, unfinished or incomplete, with volumes of archival materials waiting to be revitalized and shared. I have found this topic is to be very extensive and complex with the potential to branch into different schools of indigenous knowledge and academic disciplines.

Despite the tremendous amount of work that remains, this research is an important start that has uncovered a wealth of new information and quantifiable evidence from Hawaiian sources. This knowledge changes the often biased and misunderstood historiography of the konohiki and reverses many denigrating konohiki stereotypes profiling them as rapacious, ignorant, and oppressive henchmen. This research has shown the konohiki were highly intelligent, savvy leaders who had diverse expertise to administer a complex, sustainable resource management system for a thriving society. They were also loyal, respected chiefly stewards who deeply loved and cared for the land, their Aliʻi, the makaʻāinana.

The konohiki made heroic sacrifices during the 19th century, struggling to maintain their traditional roles while losing their power, status, lands and life from foreign changes and diseases. As mid-level chiefs, they became vulnerable and caught in the middle of power shifts between the Aliʻi leadership and foreigners. In addition to the daily management of their ahupuaʻa, they were forced to accommodate the increasing demands of foreigners, dictated through the Aliʻi Nui, in the 19th century.

More importantly, this research has finally established a more comprehensive, concise and accurate history that the konohiki deserve. The inclusion of ancient Hawaiian texts, 19th century Hawaiian newspapers and Māhele land records, and other personal documents has significantly expanded and solidified their fragmented and deficient scholarship on the konohiki.

These Hawaiian sources provided more accurate and relevant information to answer the three questions of this thesis, 1) who were the konohiki, 2) what was their function in Hawaiian society, and 3) how did their role and class change during the 19th century?

The konohiki’s ancient origins are preserved in the oral traditions of genealogies, chants, legends, stories, prayers and songs. The Kumulipo cosmogonic chant offered new
evidence of the konohiki’s genealogical origins that was not previously detected or analyzed in previous scholarship. The *Kumulipo* and a mele for Kamehameha II titled, *Hoolea ia Liholiho*, identified, perhaps, the earliest documented konohiki named Kuheleimoana and his son Konohiki. This finding also shows an early example of the intergenerational inheritance of the konohiki role from father to son.

As this research has shown, the konohiki were members of a complex, stratified chiefly class who ruled and administered a highly organized land system. The konohiki were often relatives of the Ali‘i who entrusted them to steward a wide range of resources in different land divisions, not only ahupua‘a. Recall, 19th century Hawaiian scholars, Kamakau and Malo, identified levels of konohiki ‘ai moku, ‘ai ‘okana, ‘ai kalana, and ‘ai ahupua‘a who managed each of these sub-divisions of land.

The development of innovative agricultural and aquacultural technologies by Hawaiians in wet kalo and large-scale fishpond cultivation enabled them to sustain a very large population. This rise in population forced the expansion of the konohiki class into sub-levels of konohiki nui, hope konohiki, luna konohiki, and hope luna konohiki.

As late as 1847, when the Hawaiian population had declined to 95,000 from foreign diseases, one of Kamehameha III’s konohiki, Ka‘awahua, testified there were at least 3 levels of konohiki in his small 2.5 acre ‘ili in Pāmoa, Mānoa, O‘ahu. As they were dying off, the konohiki were still trying to retain their traditional class structure and functions.

In traditional times, the konohiki’s advanced and sustainable *Konohiki System* of land and resource stewardship successfully supported a sizable population estimated to be as high as 1,000,000 (Kame‘eleihiwa 1992). Recent land research by Gonschor and Beamer (2014) helped establish plausible konohiki population estimates in this thesis that were in the tens of thousands. Recall, 19th century scholar, Kamakau, wrote 1,000 people were required to build a high chief’s lo‘i and 10,000 men to build Kamehameha I’s fishpond on Hawai‘i Island. Fornander estimated 15,000 laborers built Mo‘okini heiau.

These descriptions show evidence of thousands of konohiki across the islands managing these ambitious projects while maintaining daily ahupua‘a operations. It also shows a large labor force for these large-scale projects that required the oversight of many konohiki of
different ranks and specializations from neighboring districts to collaboratively execute these projects. Later, communal construction turned to church and school building.

The abolishment of the Kapu System and ‘ai kapu with the adoption of the ‘ai noa in 1819 by Queen Ka’ahumanu, removed the foundational principles and laws of the Konohiki System. It instantly eliminated 400,000 Hawaiian Akua who were directly tied to the livelihood and religious life of the konohiki.

The konohiki’s religious duties are often limited and commonly associated with the annual Makahiki festival collecting the offerings of their ahupua’a for Lono, the Akua of agriculture and rain. But, the konohiki had many religious responsibilities as builders and caretakers of heiau, royal genealogists, and performed consecration ceremonies with kāhuna for new ‘auwai systems, lo’i kalo or loko i’a.

The arrival of foreigners, beginning in 1778, brought many infectious diseases including venereal infections, measles, small pox, mumps, dysentery, whooping cough, pneumonia, influenza, tuberculosis and leprosy which nearly decimated the Hawaiian population in the 19th century. Native depopulation had devastating effects on the konohiki, killing them, their families and whole districts of people who were the labor force of the ahupua’a.

The traumatic upheaval from depopulation displaced thousands of Hawaiians for nearly a century and resulted in the collapse of Hawaiian society. This led to the loss of ancestral knowledge, their culture, language, lands and sovereignty. Today, Hawaiians are still suffering from the lasting effects of Native depopulation and struggling to survive as a destitute minority in their own homeland.

The large konohiki population likely experienced a high percentage of death from diseases. The study of Kamehameha III’s five konohiki revealed four died from measles and small pox. The death of a konohiki meant a significant loss of leadership to administer and care for the land and resources that sustained the people. More importantly, it was a loss of irreplaceable cultural knowledge that was not passed down to future generations. It seems the loss of Hawaiian sovereignty began in 1778 with the great dying off of Hawaiians instead of the 1893 illegal Overthrow over century later. How could Hawaiians possibly secure and maintain
their own Native independence and sovereignty in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century as a weakened and dying population?

Thousands of foreign merchant and whaling ships arrived in Hawaiʻi trading Sandalwood, fur and other foreign goods during the 19\textsuperscript{th} century demanding ship provisioning. These relentless activities destroyed and exploited Hawaiʻiʻs scarce resources and a dying Hawaiian labor force. Claims that “[a] growing number of chiefly officials were exacting from a declining number of producers a greater variety of goods and an increasing toll in labor” (Sahlins 1992: 113) is totally nonsensical since the konohiki and Aliʻi were dying at high rates along with the makaʻāinana.

The only group that was “growing” was the healthy foreign population who were driving Hawaiʻiʻs new capitalist economy and making hefty profits. It was the foreigners’ relentless exploitation and increasing demands for resources and labor from the chiefs’ that resulted in an “increasing toll in labor” from the makaʻāinana. The “greater variety of goods” desired by a declining number of chiefs seemed to pale in comparison to the significant diversion of scarce resources by foreigners away from Hawaiians subsistence living causing famine and hardship.

Letters between konohiki Paulo Kanoa and Gideon Laʻanui are evidence of the increasing foreign demands for resources from a dying Hawaiian labor force who were struggling to survive. Missionaries were requesting the exaction of timber, coral blocks and other building materials by Hawaiians to construct hundreds of churches and schools. This continuous building development permanently destroyed ocean reefs and forest ecosystems and is still occurring today with Hawaiʻiʻs uncontrolled urban development.

Ship provisioning and the building of the mission’s infrastructure consumed the lives of the konohiki for half a century. It proved far more destructive to the environment and was exploitive of Hawaiians than two decades of the Sandalwood trade.

Foreigners were also greatly benefitting from the Sandalwood trade and exploiting the Aliʻi with its negative effects trickling down to their people. In the foreigners’ eyes, it was problematic when the Aliʻi were “exploiting” the makaʻāinana but, completely acceptable when they exploited the Aliʻi, the konohiki, the makaʻāinana and the environment. Foreigners did not see themselves as exploiting Hawaiians but rather “helping” the poor “ignorant heathens.”
Foreigners contributed to the Aliʻi’s debt, knowing Sandalwood would be depleted and the chiefs would have difficulty repaying them. This was economic oppression of a weaker debtor nation by a dominant colonial power. The Aliʻi’s lack of other capital sources to pay their debts would force Hawaiʻi, as a small, vulnerable nation, into larger global economies they could not compete in. Foreigners were preying on and taking advantage of all Hawaiians classes at a time when they were disenfranchised, disempowered, in debt and dying.

The arrival of missionaries in 1820 added more increasing demands and burdens on the konohiki for resources. Christianity was totally incompatible with the Konohiki System and seemed radical for the konohiki to steward an environment devoid of Akua. The new Christian religion and literacy came at an opportune time when Hawaiians had abolished their religion. The foreigner’s one god, Jehovah, promised eternal life and seemed the perfect solution for the Aliʻi to save their dying people. The Aliʻi also desired the palapala (reading and writing) that was a new, intriguing technology making education a consuming priority of the kingdom. The social and economic costs of supporting the mission and schools, for nearly a century, seemed to far outweigh the benefits of the palapala.

The konohiki, in loyal service to their chiefs, obediently supported the Protestant mission and education by building and maintaining their expensive and expansive infrastructure of churches and schools throughout Hawaiʻi. Many konohiki became teachers and missionary assistants but, were still criticized and denigrated as “heathens” and “sinful.” However, missionaries had no hesitation accepting ongoing support from the konohiki for all their daily living necessities. Without the konohiki and the Aliʻi, the Protestant mission would not have been successful in the spread of Christianity and education.

In some instances, konohiki, both Christian and non-Christian, ignored the strict conformities of Christian laws and under the direction of the Aliʻi and Mōʻī planted and smoked tobacco (in church), distilled and consumed liquor, and had multiple wives. However, those who served under stricter Christian Aliʻi risked losing their position and lands for not abiding by Christian laws and supporting the mission.

A konohiki in Rev. Ellis’ journal claimed he would be put to death for his lack of hospitality towards visiting missionaries to his district. It seemed they were now answerable to
new chiefs, the entourages of missionaries arriving in their districts with constant requests for food, shelter, labor, transportation, and resources.

The introduction of the printing press and the publication of the HLN by the missionaries changed how Hawaiians disseminated knowledge and information. The early Hawaiian newspapers were mission-controlled and intended to educate and “enlighten” Hawaiians through literacy. They also served as the new “pulpit” for missionaries and Hawaiian converts to publically chastise and vilify the konohiki. Ironically, missionaries described the generous contributions of the konohiki in their private journals and in obituaries. Rev. Green of Māui wrote admirably of Noa Auwae, the konohiki and premier genealogist of Kamehameha I.

The HLN became a divisive means for missionaries to segregate Christianized konohiki from non-Christian ones which weakened their class solidarity. New Western laws further divided educated konohiki, who became “civilized” and “enlightened” servants of the new foreign-controlled government, from the uneducated, disempowered konohiki who became makaʻāinana commoners. The educated konohiki became a separate konohiki class serving the new, foreign-controlled kingdom government as tax officers and collectors, judges, land commissioners, and legislative policy and lawmakers. Western education and the palapala were valued over genealogical rank and intergenerational konohiki mentoring and training in traditional knowledge. This resulted in a great loss of the konohiki’s knowledge and practices in land and resource stewardship that was once vital to Hawaiian society.

The enactment of Western laws in 1839, and the establishing of a constitutional government in 1840, Executive Ministries in 1845-1847, a Land Commission in 1845 and a Boundary Commission in 1862 placed foreigners in very high positions within two decades. These positions gave them tremendous power to shift control over land, resources, labor, and taxation from the konohiki and the Ali‘i to themselves, under the guise of protecting and elevating the makaʻāinana.

The Minister of the Interior (Keoni Ana) enforced laws to control the land and resources reducing the konohiki’s authority to kapu one species of tree and fish. In 1856, appointed commissioners under this ministry adjudicated private ways which included freshwater. Traditionally, the konohiki were authorities over water rights. The Minister of Public Instruction
(William Richards) ensured labor days could not interfere with school attendance. School taxes collected by government luna ʻauhau or tax officers became a large percentage of the kingdom’s budget to support the mission schools. The Minister of Finance (Gerrit Judd) assigned the konohiki’s duties of taxation to government tax officers, collectors and judges. Some of whom were Western educated, Christianized konohiki and graduates of Lāhaināluna mission seminary.

By the 1848 Māhele, the konohiki’s traditional functions were eliminated and replaced under new foreign laws and a constitutional government. In 1850, when foreigners and later makaʻāinana could claim land, Rev. Armstrong publicly proclaimed the makaʻāinana were finally their own konohiki and encouraged them to rise up against their konohiki as private land owners. This was counter to Hawaiian social values of service between chief and servant. However, the missionaries and other foreigners had finally achieved their long-held desires to become konohiki.

The focus-study of King Kamehameha III’s five konohiki and their Māhele records tell an entirely different story of konohiki stealing land from the makaʻāinana and discouraging them from filing their land claims. How was this possible, when the konohiki were dying off from foreign diseases, disempowered by foreign laws, replaced by the foreign-controlled government, and dispossessed of their lands by foreign land tenure? Moreover, the konohiki were granted five deadline extensions (1854-1895) since they were not filing their clams. How could the konohiki be taking away lands from the makaʻāinana when they were failing to claim their own lands?

The five konohiki received and retained a small amount of their Māhele lands and collectively passed only 7,576.29 acres to 10 heirs. The length of their claim processes collectively ranged from 14 to 62 years to finalize. The lengthiest claim was completed in 1910. By this time, nearly two decades had passed since the 1893 illegal Overthrow by missionary descendants, foreigners and U. S. Marines. Hawaiʻi’s government had transitioned four times as the Hawaiian Kingdom, the Provisional Government of Hawaiʻi (1893), the Republic of Hawaiʻi (1894) and a U. S. Territory (1900).
Although, the five konohiki paid their commutation fees in money instead of relinquishing more land, they still sacrificed monetary assets and a substantial amount of prime real estate at the onset of the Māhele which could have passed to their heirs.

Many of the king’s konohiki delayed or failed to file their land claims because many were dying off. The system was also deemed dysfunctional on many levels by Māhele surveyor Curtis Lyons (1903) that was complex and lengthy. Some konohiki were still honoring traditional land tenure and did not want to claim land and compete for them with their Aliʻi Nui. Whatever the reason, five deadline extensions for land claims did not seem to help these konohiki.

Four of the five konohiki died of foreign diseases and none of them lived long enough to complete their Māhele land claims and experience private ownership of their lands. History is being repeated today as Hawaiians are dying while waiting for their rights and possession to lands, housing, resources, education and health care.

Pehu, the eldest konohiki, passed on the most land, nearly 6,596 acres, to his wife while the other four konohiki collectively passed only 981 acres to their 9 heirs. Collectively the five passed on 7,576.29 acres.

In stark contrast, five wealthy foreigners, J. P. Parker, C. C. Harris, C. Spreckels, C. R. Bishop and J. M. Sinclair, listed in Table 3.2., were awarded a total of 353,714 acres. Bishop and Parker married high chiefesses Bernice Pauahi and Rachel Kipikane. Kipikane was the granddaughter of Kamehameha I and Pauahi his great-granddaughter. Sinclair purchased the entire island of Niʻihau of 61,000 acres which still remains privately owned.

It seems the true competition for land was not between Hawaiians, as Kamakau and the makaʻāinana petitions prophetically warned but, with greedy and opportunistic foreigners who were taking over as the new “chiefs” and “konohiki” of the land and people.

More importantly, the five konohiki’s Māhele records reveal traditional konohiki roles and functions were still being practiced while their class was nearing extinction. They also managed to retain knowledge of land boundaries, cultural sites, land history, place names, and genealogies that are permanent record in their Māhele documents. These konohiki were all described in land testimonies as loyal servants of their Aliʻi who tried to maintain their chiefly relationships.
The five konohiki remained closely interconnected with their Aliʻi through their lands and as their personal stewards or intermarrying with Aliʻi and high-ranking konohiki families. Kaʻaha descended from generations of konohiki who served the family of Kuhina Nui, Kekāuluohi. Kaʻawahua was a konohiki of Charles Kanaʻina, the husband of Kekāuluohi. His Māhele witness, Kalaweauumoku, testified of the close-knit relationships of Hawaiian konohiki who passed on positions and lands to retain loyalty and traditional class solidarity. Hīnau returned his entire ahupuaʻa on Molokaʻi to Kamehameha V, an ancient chiefly practice of honoring one’s Aliʻi. The other four passed their lands to their wives and children. Some referred to their land as “kuʻu kuleana” (my land parcel), “kuʻu loko” (my fishpond) which were familial expressions of love for their land.

As Christianized konohiki, they all claimed houselots near Kawaiahaʻo Church. They were instructed by Rev. Hiram Bingham, their new Christian “kahuna” and head of Kawaiahaʻo Church, for “the brethren to gather round.” The seat of government was across the street at ʻIolani Palace and the Kawaiahaʻo area became a place of new chiefly status for educated and Christianized Aliʻi and konohiki.

Today, for Native Hawaiians, the konohiki’s knowledge of the landscape and wahi kūpuna (sacred ancestral sites) has been nearly lost and long forgotten. But, the revitalization of the Hawaiian-language, the increased interest in Hawaiian Studies and the digitization of archival collections and records has revolutionized land research with easier accessibility to a wider selection of materials both in Hawaiian and English.

More scholars are now able to research, translate, and interpret Hawaiian-language sources and rewrite Hawaiian history. As Hawaiian scholar and cultural practitioner Pua Kanahele explains, “[w]e, as Native Hawaiians, must continue to unveil the knowledge of our ancestors. Let us interpret for ourselves who our ancestors are, how they thought, and why they made certain decisions. In the process we treat them with honor, dignity, love and respect—whether they be akua aliʻi or kānaka—because they are our ʻohana, our family” (2011: xv).

Although the digitization of archival records has made research easier, the reconstruction of the konohiki’s fragmented history was challenging in managing, organizing
and synthesizing numerous and often inconsistent pieces of information from a multitude of secondary sources. In addition, researching, translating and incorporating Hawaiian-language primary sources of ancient texts, and materials from extensive collections of 19th century newspapers and Māhele land records was very labor intensive and time consuming. However, the Māhele records provided the most specific and detailed information on the konohiki. Digitizing the remainder of these collections and many other materials, like the Hawaiian Chiefs’ letters, will be invaluable to future research of the konohiki.

Creating databases in this thesis research was required to manage large volumes of fragmented information. The creation of a newspaper database helped to organize the newspaper articles for annotation and to track the konohiki’s transformation. Of the 532 digitized HLN articles that was retrieved and indexed, 150 were annotated and 60 were used. There are 382 remaining articles in the database, published from 1855 to 1927, that still require analysis.

Another database was created and will be maintained to continue collecting konohiki names and their information. This database provides easy reference, accurate identification and verification of the konohiki to rebuild their individual histories.

The histogram (Appendix C) showed the publication frequency of HLN articles, with the highest publication of articles in the 1860’s during the introduction of the independent Hawaiian newspapers. These papers were published by Native presses and no longer censored and controlled by the American mission. Researching these later articles will prove to be interesting, informative following the Māhele and leading up to the Kingdom’s 1893 overthrow.

The following resources that were not researched in this thesis but would be valuable in future konohiki research and scholarship are:

- Reports of the Boundary Commission – Hawaiʻi State Archives and the State Department of Land and Natural Resources (Kalanimoku Building).
- Historical 19th century maps – Land Survey Division, State of Hawaiʻi Department of Accounting and General Services (Kalanimoku Building).
- Genealogy Records – Hawaiʻi State Archives and Bishop Museum.
• Land Grantee and Grantor Records – Bureau of Conveyances, Department of Land and Natural Resources (Kalanimoku Building).
• 19th Century English Newspapers in Hawai‘i – Electronic databases, Hawai‘i State Library and U. H. Hamilton Library.
• Hawaiian Kingdom Tax Records and Ledgers – Hawai‘i State Archives
• Archaeological and Cultural Reports – Department of Land and Natural Resources and Bishop Museum

In closing thoughts, Hawaiians nānā i ke kumu, look to the “source” or their kūpuna’s ancestral knowledge they have left behind. The konohiki have left an incredible legacy of wisdom and knowledge that teach us to mālama and aloha the ‘Aīna. Many of the traditional practices and their philosophies of environmental stewardship are applicable in the 21st century. We must be innovative, like the konohiki, adapting to new technologies and developing our ideas of the 21st century sustainable ahupua‘a.

The konohiki’s past is not only in archives but imprinted in the Hawaiian landscape of ahupua‘a boundaries, mountains, river valleys, forests, and shorelines they once stewarded. Their incredible works exist in remnants of fishponds, lo‘i, miles of rock walls, heiau, dry-land field systems, ‘auwai, trail systems, land boundaries, and historic Hawaiian churches and schools. Revitalizing and celebrating their names, their lands and stories will help us reconnect with and re-envision them back into the ‘Aīna and our lives.

Understanding an accurate and complete history of the konohiki will help Hawaiians to heal from centuries of past hewa (wrongs and injustices). As a Hawaiian scholar, I have a tremendous kuleana to bring the konohiki’s knowledge and stories to the forefront and pass it down. Although thousands of konohiki have long passed, generations of their descendants are still alive. They should know their konohiki ancestors’ historical and cultural legacy. Perhaps, this research will reconnect them with their kūpuna, who once stewarded our beloved ‘Aīna and heroically served their Hawaiian people.
### Appendix A. Konohiki Timeline

#### Table A.1. Konohiki Timeline

**1839 – Declaration of Rights or “Magna Carta of Hawaii” Enacted**
- Rights of the people defined and protected. The Act further states that the “landlord cannot causelessly dispossess his tenant,” (Chinen 1958: 7).
- “Protection is hereby secured to the persons of all the people, together with their lands, their building lots and all their property, and nothing whatever shall be taken from any individual, except by express provision of the laws” (Kuykendall 1938: 271).

**1840 October 8 – First Constitution of the Hawaiian Kingdom**
- Absolute Monarchy becomes a Constitutional Monarchy with bicameral legislature of a house of nobles and a representative body chosen by the common people (Chinen 1958: 7).
- Declaration of Rights and laws of 1839 and 1840 designed to secure people in possession of their lands and other property and to prevent the abuses which had been common up to that time (Kuykendall 1938: 272).
- According to the Board of Land Commissioners, “neither the laws of 1839 nor of 1840 were found adequate to protect the inferior lord and tenants (Kuykendall 1938: 272).

**1841 – Leases to Foreigners, Proclamation by Kamehameha III and Kuhina Nui Kekāʻuluohi**
- Some foreigners had written leases for their building lots and farms but there were many such lands possessed without any written title.
- “The soil of all such house lots and farms belongs to the king....”
- The governors were directed to make agreements with foreigners for leases.
- Foreign leases not to exceed 50 years.
- Proclamation seen by foreigners as an attempt to deprive them of their rights. (Kuykendall 1938: 275).

**1845 December 10 to April 27, 1846 – Act to “Organize the Executive Departments” Passed by Kamehameha III.**
- Created a five-department executive branch – the Departments of the 1) Interior (Kuhina Nui), 2) Foreign Relations, 3) Finance, 5) Public Instruction, and 5) Attorney General – each directed by a Minister. Five ministers, along with four Kia ʻĀina (Governors) of the four main Mokupuni (islands) and other individuals appointed by the Mōʻī, as members of the Privy Council.
- Role of the Mōʻī changed from all-powerful warrior-chieftain serving as the human embodiment of and trustee for the Akua to that of a political and cultural leader guiding the government and working closely with other elected and appointed officials (Van Dyke 2008: 32; Kuykendall 1938: 262).

**1845 December 10 – Board of Commission to Quiet Land Titles or “Land Commission”**
Created by Legislature to address and resolve all land claims as a separate section of a long organic act designed to organize executive branch departments, which was promulgated by the Mōʻī on December 10, 1845 to take effect on February 7, 1846 (Van Dyke 2008: 28).
1846 – First five appointed members of the Land Commission
2 Foreigners, 3 Hawaiians (Van Dyke 2008: 34).
1) John Ricord (Attorney General) – American
2) William Richards (Minister of Public Instruction) – American
3) Ioane Papa ʻĪʻī – Hawaiian
4) Zorobabel or Zorobalea Kaʻauwai – Hawaiian
5) James Young Kanehoa – Part-Hawaiian

1846 February 11 – First meeting of Land Commission
Members analyzed the existing land tenure system and elected William Richards (Minister of Public Instruction) as their president (Chinen 1958: 9).

1846 March 4 – “The Commissioners held their first meeting for regular business.”
They visited the islands, met with people presenting their claims and testimonies. They were “not authorized to grant patents for land or to receive commutation” instead, “to ascertain the nature and extent of each claimant’s rights in land, and to issue an Award for the same which prima facie evidence of title…” (Alexander 1890a: 110; Sai http://www.hawaiiankingdom.org/land-system.shtml),
• A total of 11,309 claims were confirmed during the Māhele (Alexander 1890a: 110).

1846 August 20 – Land Commission enacts “Principles Adopted by the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles in their Adjudication of Claims Presented to Them”
• Seven principles to govern the processing of claims. Guidelines based on the civil code, the oral testimony of Aliʻi and claimant witnesses, customs and traditions of the community, that was designed to provide the people with an understanding of how land disputes would be resolved (Van Dyke 2008: 35).
• Identification of three classes with interests in ʻĀina: the Mōʻī, the Aliʻi, and the makaʻāinana (Van Dyke 2008: 35).


1847 September 7 – Organic Act passed to “An Act to organize the Judiciary Department of the Hawaiian Islands.”

1847 December – Māhele Land Division Receives Final Approval

1848 January 7 – Māhele or Land Division Begins
• Kamehameha III separated out his private lands and quit claimed the balance of his lands to his konohiki and Aliʻi Nui. Records them in the Buke Mahele.
• 245 Aliʻi and konohiki receive lands from Kamehameha III and quit claimed the balance of their lands to the King. Their lands are referred as “Konohiki Lands” and recorded in the Buke Mahele.
• Konohiki received awards to their lands by name only, with ancient boundaries controlling (MacKenzie 1991: 7).
• Konohiki still required to make claims to Land Commission, pay commutation fee either in currency or land (1/3 value of their unimproved land).
• Makaʻāinana who filed an appropriate claim with the Land Commission had the right to continue to use such land, subject to the traditional labor and produce owed to the konohiki (Banner 2005: 291).
• Lands of Mōʻī, Aliʻi, konohiki and government became subject to the rights of tenants (MacKenzie 1991: 7).

1848 February 14 – Māhele Land Claim Deadline (Only 38 days to File Claims)
• Deadline, for those qualified, to file land claims with Land Commission.
• “This law would have been better had the time for registering titles been extended for twenty years. Very few of the people living in the country were educated and knew how to apply for their titles” (Kamakau 1961: 407).

1848 March 8 – Kamehameha III Further Divides his ʻĀina
• 1 million acres known as “Crown Lands” for his own private ʻĀina.
• 1.5 million acres the king gave and set apart forever to the chiefs and people, known as “Government Lands,” subject to control of the legislative council or of agents appointed by it, to be “managed, leased, or sold in accordance with the will of said Nobles and Representatives (Kuykendall 1938: 288-9; Chinen 1958: 25).

1848 September to July 1849 – Measles Epidemic and Dysentery Outbreak across Hawaiʻi
• Started in Hilo brought by American warship.
• Several thousand died, some chiefs and prominent persons among them. Deaths occurred especially among old people.
• High chiefs who were affected - Leleiōhoku (heir of Kuakini), Moses Kekuaiwai (son of Kīnaʻu and Kaikioʻewa, Kauaʻi Aliʻi), Kaʻiminaʻauao (son of Kamehameha III), Hilo Aliʻi Kanuha, Kaiwi, Māui Aliʻi Kaiheʻekai. Spread to Oʻahu, where men fell in masses, then to Kauai and Niihau (Kamakau 1961: 410-11).
• Depopulation affects the rate of Hawaiians and their ability to successfully file claims.

1849 October 19 – Privy Council Meets and Discusses the Shortcomings of Māhele and Problems Faced by Makaʻāinana
• Adopts four resolutions to secure title for makaʻāinana to any ʻĀina “occup[ied] and improved[d]” (Van Dyke 2008: 46).


1850 July 10 – Alien Land Ownership Act Passed
• Authorized the sale of lands in fee simple to resident aliens. (Chinen 1958:12).
• This “...set the stage for a swift and massive transfer of land title from Hawaiian to Western hands” (MacKenzie 1991: 9).
• 1849-1850, [William Little] Lee played a major role in promoting the enactment of legislation allowing foreigners to own land (Van Dyke 2008: 39, 50).
• Judge Lee proposed the Act, Privy Council approved it, but long debated in Legislature. Nobles in favor but House against it, afraid the unnaturalized foreigners would buy up all the land (Kuykendall 1938: 298).
• “...the foreigners who had waited a long time to take the land for themselves were all ready, and when the door was thrown open for natives and strangers alike they could well laugh; land was what they wanted” (Kamakau 1961: 407).

1850 August 6 – Kuleana Act or “Enactment of Further Principles” Passed (After Foreigners)
• Land Commission authorized to award fee simple title of kuleana land parcels to native tenants.
• “The konohiki has no claim upon the tenant” and “Each man will be his own Konohiki” (Armstrong 1850: 1; Banner 2005: 291).
“No chief or land agent has power to disturb their [makaʻāinana’s] holding. It belongs to them within and without, above and below; it is theirs to sell or not; the government alone is king over them and has power to tax them” (Kamakau 1961: 410).

No commutation fee required. Only includes lands which a tenant had actually cultivated plus a houselot of not more than a quarter acre (MacKenzie 1991:8).

William Little Lee helped draft the Kuleana Act...which granted some gathering and use rights to the makaʻāinana but excluded the important right of pasturage, causing substantial hardship on them (Van Dyke 2008: 39).

Section 4 of the Act mandated segments of the Government Land on each Mokupuni be available for Native Hawaiians who did not file, or did not otherwise qualify, for Kuleana Awards to purchase lots in fee simple (1-50 acres) (Van Dyke 2008: 51).

Out of 8,205 awards by Land Commission, 7,500 awards involved kuleana lands (MacKenzie 1991: 8).

1852 June 19 – “An Act Relating to Land Titles of Konohiki”
- Filing extension - legislature authorizes konohiki who participated in the 1848 Māhele to obtain awards to their land by their ancient names, with the understanding that the ancient boundaries were to control until a survey could be made. This act, however, did not apply to ahupua’a or ʻili kūpono which had to be divided between the king and a konohiki or between two konohiki, or between the government and a konohiki (Chinen 1958: 21; Indices 1929: 53).

1853 – Epidemic of Small Pox – “The greatest destruction of Hawaiian population took place in the summer of 1853, be an invasion of small-pox....More than half the population of Ewa perished in weeks. The earliest cases are pathetic” (Bishop 1901: 88).

1854 July 20 – “An Act to provide for the Dissolution of the Board of Commissioners to Quiet Land Titles” Approved (Indices of Awards 1929: 1).

1854 August 10 – “An Act for the Relief of Certain Konohikis” (Indices of Awards 1929: 53)
- Filing extension for konohiki who received lands from King Kamehameha III and signed the Buke Mahele but failed to file claim(s) for their lands to the Land Commissioners to quiet their titles.

1854 November 1 – Deadline for Extension of Konohiki Who Participated in 1848 Māhele to Present their Claims.


- Approved by Kamehameha IV and Kaahumanu [Victoria Kamāmalu].
- Notices to be continually published in Hawaiian and English newspapers to “all konohikis, their heirs, executors and administrators, to present their claims on or before the last day of June 1862.”
- “…all parties receiving awards shall pay all expenses of the hearing publication and decision thereof.”

1862 - Boundary Commission Established
- To settle questions of the boundaries of the ahupua’a and ʻili kūpono awarded by name only (MacKenzie 1991: 8).
1862 June 19 – Deadline Extension for Kamehameha III’s Konohiki to Present their Claims
(Indices of Awards 1929: 54).

1892 December 16 - Statute passed for Commutation Fee
“...many konohiki simply failed to make the payment [in land or currency]. In 1892, after much of the land had passed into non-Hawaiian hands, a statute was passed setting the commutation to one-third the value of the land at the time of the Mahele, without interest (Levy 1975: 854fn.).

1895 January 1 – Final Deadline for Kamehameha III’s Konohiki or Heirs to Finalize their Māhele Claims (Van Dyke 2008: 35; Chinen 1958: 24).
Appendix B. Database Sample of Konohiki Names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Konohiki</th>
<th>Period of Tenure</th>
<th>‘Āina: Mokupuni, Moku, Ahupua’a</th>
<th>Ali’i ties to Konohiki</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahiki</td>
<td>Olomana, Kailua, Oahu. Ahiki is the peak</td>
<td>Olomana (Ali’i)</td>
<td>Informant Mrs. Charles Alona says Ahiki was a peak of Mt. Olomana named after a konohiki of Olomana over Ka’elepulu and Kawainui. In the legend of Makalei.</td>
<td>Sterling, Elspeth and Catherine Summer. 1978. <em>Sites of Oahu</em>. pg. 234-235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahukai (w)</td>
<td>ca. 1837</td>
<td>Pa’ala’a, Waialua, O’ahu</td>
<td>Kahekili’s granddaughter</td>
<td>&quot;For until 1837 Ahukai was &quot;the konohiki of Pa’ala’a,&quot; meaning she held the charge of the land for the owning chiefs&quot; (LC/NT 3:722); Ahukai aka Ka’u’ukuali’i (Kamakau 1961:165).</td>
<td>Sahlins, M. 1992. <em>Anahulu Vol. 1</em>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pg. 49; see also Kamakau 1961: 165.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apii (k)</td>
<td>ca. 1835</td>
<td>Kualakai ‘ili and Pu’uloa</td>
<td>Konohiki from Pu’uloa and managed ‘ili of Kualakai - article about his drowning in Ke Kumu Hawaii Nupepa Mar 16, 1836. While fishing he dove and hit his head on coral.</td>
<td>David Kaope reported 1835 but published in <em>Ke Kumu Hawaii</em> Mar 16, 1836 pg. 24.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Konohiki</td>
<td>Period of Tenure</td>
<td>‘Āina: Mokupuni, Moku, Ahupuaʻa</td>
<td>Aliʻi ties to Konohiki</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Konohiki</td>
<td>Period of Tenure</td>
<td>‘Āina: Mokupuni, Moku, Ahupua‘a</td>
<td>Ali‘i ties to Konohiki</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auwae, Noa (k)</td>
<td>ca. late 1770s-1834</td>
<td>Wailuku, Maui</td>
<td>Wailuku, Maui</td>
<td>Born on Hawai‘i in 1770's and died Nov. 16, 1834 in Wailuku. He was a beloved konohiki of Wailuku, per Rev. Green (Auwae 64 yrs.) and &quot;man of great dignity of character.&quot; Born on Hawaii of low rank. Father [Kaaloa?] was Kamehameha I principal genealogists. Auwae trained &amp; became king's genealogist. Elder brothers. Awarded lands for helping Kamehameha I in O‘ahu conquest in 1795. They gave lands in Moloka‘i, Wailuku and other lands in Māui to Auwae. These lands were confirmed by Kamehameha III and Liholiho who recognized Auwae's skill in land management. He assigned to Wailuku by June 1823 (Stewart's Residence, 1839:99). Wife is Mikahala Kao, who was also &quot;married&quot; to Auwae's bro. Kuihelani considered an &quot;aipuupuu nui&quot;, &quot;luna nui&quot;, &quot;kanaka koikoi&quot; by Kamehameha I who</td>
<td>Obituary by Rev. Jonathan Green in Wailuku, Māui In Missionary Herald Sandwich Islands: Journal and Letters of the Missionaries 1835 p.463; see also Kamakau 1961: 229,389; Land Commission Award 5235 of Simeona Kaapuiki in Buke Mahele 1848: 47-48; Judd, Laura F. 2003. Honolulu: Sketches of Life in the Hawaiian Islands, 1828-1861. Pgs. 22-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Konohiki</td>
<td>Period of Tenure</td>
<td>‘Āina: Mokupuni, Moku, Ahupua’a</td>
<td>Ali‘i ties to Konohiki</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckley, William</td>
<td>ca. 1848</td>
<td>‘Ili at Anaehoomalu, Waimea, HI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Akahi testifies Sep. 13, 1848 &quot;There are four kou trees, five coconut tree, three salt making ponds. To the uplands and Kona, is the land of William Beckley, the Konohiki; on the shoreward and Kohala sides is Kanaina.&quot;</td>
<td>Maly, Kepa &amp; Onaona in report Nā Ala Hele Ma Kai o Kohala Hema (The Coastal Trails of South Kohala). 1999: 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damon, Samuel</td>
<td>Reign of King Kalākaua</td>
<td>Ahupua'a of Moanalua, fishery of Kaliawa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bernice Pauahi in her will bequeathed to &quot;my friend Samuel M. Damon, of said Honolulu, all of that tract of land known as the Ahupua'a of Moanalua...and also the fishery of Kaliawa; to hold with the appurtenances to him his heirs and assigns forever.&quot;</td>
<td>Kanahele, George Hue'eu Sanford. 1986. Pauahi: The Kamehamea Legacy (2002). Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press (pg. 186-187).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Konohiki</td>
<td>Period of Tenure</td>
<td>‘Āina: Mokupuni, Moku, Ahupua‘a</td>
<td>Ali‘i ties to Konohiki</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehu</td>
<td>ca. 1848</td>
<td>Puukapu, Waimea</td>
<td></td>
<td>He testifies “I know from my own and my father's knowledge.... I knew Kahanapilo w. wife of George Davis-she was not konohiki of the ilis on Waikaloa-nor of Waimea-I was in Kona when she died.”</td>
<td>Maly, Kepa and Onaona in report <em>Nā Ala Hele Ma Kai o Kohala Hema (The Coastal Trails of South Kohala)</em>, 1999: 90.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Publication Frequency of Digitized Konohiki Articles in HLN

Table C.1. Publication Frequency of Digitized Konohiki Articles in HLN

Frequency of Articles with "Konohiki" in Digitized Hawaiian Language Newspapers 1834-1927
## Appendix D. Database Sample of Konohiki Hawaiian Newspaper Articles

### Table D.1. Database Sample of Konohiki Hawaiian Newspaper Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helu (Number)</th>
<th>Nūpepa (Newspaper)</th>
<th>Makahiki (Year)</th>
<th>Poʻoʻōlelo Atikala (Article Title)</th>
<th>Inoa Konohiki &amp; ʻĀina (Konohiki Name &amp; Land)</th>
<th>Inoa o ke Aliʻi (Name of Chief)</th>
<th>Inoa ʻĀina (Land Name in Article)</th>
<th>Mea Kākau (Author)</th>
<th>Unuhi Laulā Loa (Annotation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ka Lama Hawaii: KA LAMA HAWAII. Makahiki 1, Helu 3, Aoao 1. Feberuari 28, 1834. (28 Pepeluali 1834): ʻaoʻao 4</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>“No kekahi aoao kahiko”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unsigned</td>
<td>Some Ancient Ways - Article describing kukini runners. Konohiki requesting makaʻāinana to show their resources/tribute from all the kōʻele for chiefs. They provide puaʻa, kapa, olonā, hulu, ʻupena those things of value in the old days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu (Number)</td>
<td>Nūpepa (Newspaper)</td>
<td>Makahiki (Year)</td>
<td>Poʻoʻōlelo Atikala (Article Title)</td>
<td>Inoa Konohiki &amp; ʻĀina (Konohiki Name &amp; Land)</td>
<td>Inoa o ke Aliʻi (Name of Chief)</td>
<td>Inoa ʻĀina (Land Name in Article)</td>
<td>Mea Kākau (Author)</td>
<td>Unuhi Laulā Loa (Annotation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ka Lama Hawaii: KA LAMA HAWAII, Makahiki 1, Helu 24, Aoao 1, Dekemaba 20, 1834. (20 Kekemapa 1834): ʻaoʻao 4</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>&quot;Ka hope o ke koena&quot;</td>
<td>Kumuokekipi o Waimea</td>
<td>Gov. Kuakini</td>
<td>Waimea, Kailua, Puako, Kona, Kawaihae,</td>
<td>Unsigned</td>
<td>&quot;The Final Conclusion&quot; - the author (unknown) visits konohiki Kumuokekipi who lives in uplands of Waimea on their travels spreading the gospel. Described konohiki as a man of moral/righteous beliefs. He involved in schools and churches. Building a large school in the area. The author is reflecting on his sins of drinking rum and awa, smoking tobacco, disregarding the Sabbath. But in 3 years since living with the teachers has given up these sinful things and habits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helu (Number)</td>
<td>Nūpepa (Newspaper)</td>
<td>Makahiki (Year)</td>
<td>Poʻoʻōlelo Atikala (Article Title)</td>
<td>Inoa Konohiki &amp; ʻĀina (Konohiki Name &amp; Land)</td>
<td>Inoa o ke Aliʻi (Name of Chief)</td>
<td>Inoa ʻĀina (Land Name in Article)</td>
<td>Mea Kākau (Author)</td>
<td>Unuhi Laulā Loa (Annotation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ke Kumu Hawaiʻi: KE KUMU HAWAII. Buke 1, Pepa 5, Aoao 33, Ianuari 7, 1835. (7 Ianuali 1835): ʻaoʻao 40</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>&quot;Kahi Mele&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kailua, Kona</td>
<td>A.B. (Artemis Bishop?)</td>
<td>&quot;A Song&quot; an article with song &quot;New Jerusalem.&quot; On education and haole teachers not supported by Konohiki and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ke Kumu Hawaiʻi: KE KUMU HAWAII. Buke 1, Pepa 7, Aoao 49, Feberuari 4, 1835. (4 Pepeluali 1835): ʻaoʻao 56</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>&quot;No ka hana e hoioho mai ai i ke aupuni o ka Diablo&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Condemning and urging the Alii, luna, konohiki, the worshippers, and commoners to be more religious and God fearing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix E. Foreign Disease Epidemics in Hawai‘i 1778-1853

Table E.1. Foreign Disease Epidemics in Hawai‘i 1778-1853

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Venereal Diseases introduced by British explorer Captain James Cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>“In 1826 thousands died, especially in the country districts, of an epidemic of ‘cough, congested lungs, and sore throat.’ Luanu‘u Lahalai’a, George Hume Humme, and other chiefs died of this disease” (Kamakau 1961: 236).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>“Mumps and fever have prostrated some in almost every family and sometimes all in a family at the same time” (Lyons 1945: 100).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838-1839</td>
<td>Mumps – Kīnā‘u dies April 4, 1839 (ʻĪ‘ī 1959: 163). “In February, 1839, a ship arrived from Valparaiso whose Captain, Henry Peck, had died at sea. This ship brought a pestilence from which many died, Kīnā‘u among others” (Kamakau 1961: 236, 345).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>“In 1844 there came a severe epidemic of colds, severe headache, and dizziness” (Kamakau 1961: 237). Missionary teacher, Amos Cooke, of the Chiefs Children’s School reports Typhoid fever in May 1844, “at present I have a family of 22, 3 whom are sick with fever. A kind of typhus...” (Cooke in Richards 1987: 278).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848-</td>
<td>Measles and dysentery - “In September, 1848, an American warship brought the disease known as measles to Hilo, Hawaii. It spread and carried away about a third of the population. Among the chiefs who died were Moses Ke-kuaiwa, W. P. Lele-io-hoku, and Ka-ʻimi-naʻauao. I know personally of two families in Kipahulu, those of ʻIli-mai-hea-lani and Kukui-ʻula, in which only three persons were left out of fourteen. In Ka-pule’s home at Papauluna nine died out of thirteen. At this rate more must have died than survived” (Kamakau 1961: 236-237; 410-411).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Whooping Cough – Amos Cooke headmaster and founder of the Chiefs Children’s School, “[o]ur children all are down with whooping cough and measles and our scholars too. The measles has swept through the islands, and carried off scores and hundreds” (Cooke in Richards 1987: 351).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Small Pox – “The greatest destruction of Hawaiian population took place in the summer of 1853, be an invasion of small-pox.... More than half the population of Ewa perished in weeks. The earliest cases are pathetic” (Bishop 1901: 88).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Decease and Character of a Head-Man.

Mr. Green, whose station is at Wailuku, on Maui, makes the following entry in his journal.

Sabbath evening, November 16, 1834, near the going down of the sun, Auwae, the head-man of Wailuku, died. His family and servants are greatly afflicted, and the people generally, as is common on such occasions, give vent to their feelings by loud and extravagant wailings. I will fill this sheet in giving you some account of this man, as he was, in some respects an extraordinary character, and merits, at least, a brief notice.

Auwae was born on Hawaii, probably not far from the year 1770. By birth he was a chief of low rank. His father was attached to the interests of Tamehameha, was one of his principal genealogists, and in various ways rendered him signal service. Auwae was instructed in the profession of his father, and on his death succeeded as one of the king's genealogists, and became one of the principal men of his profession on the islands. The elder brothers of Auwae, on the conquest of the islands by Tamehameha, were put in possession of considerable land, and one of them, a few years before the death of the king, committed some part of Molokai, Wailuku, and other lands on Maui to the care of Auwae. The king confirmed him in these possessions, on the death of his brother. Rihorih, having had proof of Auwae's skill in the management of his land, on the death of his father, continued to him the care of Wailuku, of which he had the undisturbed possession till his death.

Auwae was a man of great dignity of character. His intercourse with Tame...
hameha and other chiefs of like character was of great benefit. Like them, Auwae was a wise man, capable of holding the reins of government. Had the successors of Tamahameha gathered such men around them, and listened to their counsel, their kingdom might have been established. Auwae and his wife made a profession of religion in the year 1828. He had always been friendly to the mission from its establishment, and acted the part of a friend in seasons of difficulty. But he was unaffected with religious considerations till a year or two before he united with the church. His overi acts of sin, which were not few, he abandoned; and till the time of his death, I know of no particular act by which he may be said to have affixed a stain to his christian character. The king, within the last eighteen months, sent for him twice to counsel him at Oahu. He went down with great reluctance, and while there maintained a christian character; and in his intercourse with the king, conducted, I believe, with his accustomed discretion. In this I greatly rejoice, yet I must say the evidences of his piety were rather of a negative character. He had not learned to read with any facility, and he seldom said anything by which we might learn what were the feelings of his heart. In the time of his sickness he was not able to converse much. He did express to his wife, his convictions that he should not survive this sickness, also a doubt of his acceptance with his Lord. To this latter I attach some value, as it is exceedingly uncommon for a native to express the least doubt of his good estate, however deformed may have been his life. Alas! of the multitude at Hawaii, how applicable the words of Watts,

"Like brutis they live, like brutis they die!"

I do hope, tremblingly hope, that it will appear in the great day, that our dear friend, who has in some sense become a father to us at this station, had been washed in atoning blood, and at death united with many others, who, we trust, have been carried from these islands to the bosom of everlasting love. In the hope of a joyful resurrection to life eternal, we are about to commit to dust all that remains of our friend, Noa Auwae. We are bereaved. May God, our guide, our father, sanctify to us this affliction, and make us more faithful to our surviving people, who are so rapidly following each other to the eternal world.

19. I have just returned from the funeral of Auwae. I addressed a vast multitude from 1 Peter iv, 7. O', that men would learn the frailty of life, and seize the present fleeting moment to prepare for their account. But alas, the dormant mind of my people, when will it awake?

On his death bed Auwae desired that a nephew of his, Kawailepoa by name, should come into possession of this place. This, however, depended, as Auwae well knew, upon the will of the king. Kawailepoa was, in accordance with the advice of David Malo and others, dispatched to Honolulu, before Auwae was in his grave, to inform the king of his death, and after informing him of Auwae's dying request, to wait his decision. We all prayed that God would incline the heart of the king to give the land to Kawailepoa, as he is a very superior man—one of the first scholars in the high school, and a man of very consistent piety. To our surprise and joy, he returned last week, as the head-man of the place. I hope much from him, and I have great confidence that unless the king should dispossess him, I shall find a real helper in school and in other ways. He is very anxious to improve, to civilize and christianize the people, and he is about to encourage the cultivation of cotton, and he very much wants some one to teach the people to manufacture cloth.

In a letter dated November 25th, 1834, Mr. Armstrong gives a

Description of his Station and the Character of the Surrounding People.

At the close of the general meeting I came to Maui, and in company with Mr. Green made a tour around the eastern peninsula of this island, with a view to select a spot for my station. After spending a week in exploring the different destitute places, looking at the situation of the people, and consulting the brethren on this island, Haiku, in Hamakua, was fixed upon, not because in itself considered, it is the most eligible, but because other places, preferable in themselves, were thought to be too remote and difficult of access to be occupied by a single missionary. We came to this station in September, and were kindly received by the people, especially by two members of the Lahaina church, who have not failed thus far to supply our temporal wants pretty well. They had built us a native house, and a small house for cooking, but we have suffered.

Figure F.1 Obituary of Konohiki, Noa Auwae (Continued)
Appendix G. Foreigner Land Awards and Acreage from *Indices of Awards* (1929)

Table G.1. Foreigner Land Awards and Acreage from *Indices of Awards* (1929)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Foreigner</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Mokupuni</th>
<th>Moku</th>
<th>Location &amp; Notes</th>
<th>Indices of Awards BCQLT page no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sumner, William &amp; heirs</td>
<td>British ship captain</td>
<td>6,918.00</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Kona</td>
<td>Richards St., Richards &amp; Hotel, Kuilei (Waikiki), Moanalua (Conditional Award)</td>
<td>p. 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABCFM</td>
<td>American Mission</td>
<td>5,552.00</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>Punahoa 2</td>
<td>p. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philips, Thomas</td>
<td>Foreigner</td>
<td>3,778.00</td>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Lahaina</td>
<td>Launuiopoko</td>
<td>p. 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Rees</td>
<td>British foreigner</td>
<td>3,453.00</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>Hoaeae &amp; Ulalena</td>
<td>p. 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Charles</td>
<td>American Ship Captain</td>
<td>2,650.00</td>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Kaanapali</td>
<td>Honokohau</td>
<td>p. 206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams, Alexander</td>
<td>Scottish Sea Captain</td>
<td>2,442.00</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>Niu</td>
<td>p. 229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coan, Rev. Titus</td>
<td>American Missionary</td>
<td>1,908.98</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>Punahoa 2</td>
<td>p. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmore, Charles</td>
<td>Missionary Physician</td>
<td>1,840.90</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>Punahoa 2</td>
<td>p. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyman, Rev. D.B.</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>1,796.00</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Hilo</td>
<td>Ponahawai</td>
<td>p. 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbottle, William</td>
<td>½ Hawaiian/Scot</td>
<td>1,468.00</td>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Hamakualoa</td>
<td>Opana part 7</td>
<td>p. 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meek, John</td>
<td>American Ship Captain</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td>Kalauao (Ahupuaa)</td>
<td>p. 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, William</td>
<td>Irish Shipman</td>
<td>675.40</td>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>Kaanapali</td>
<td>Haenanui, Honokowai</td>
<td>p. 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy, Harry</td>
<td>Irish Cattleman</td>
<td>640.00</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>S. Kohala</td>
<td>Puukapu</td>
<td>p. 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd, Rev. Gerrit P.</td>
<td>American Missionary</td>
<td>622.00</td>
<td>Oahu</td>
<td>Ko'olaupoko</td>
<td>Kualoa, all the sea and fishing grounds. The island of Mokoli'i</td>
<td>See Sites of Oahu by E. Sterling and C. Summers pg.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevenson, J.</td>
<td>½ Hawaiian/British</td>
<td>522.42</td>
<td>Ewa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kukona, Waimano</td>
<td>p. 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln, Lorenzo B.</td>
<td>American whaler</td>
<td>520.00</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>S. Kohala</td>
<td>Kawaihae</td>
<td>p. 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Acreage     | 36,086.70                   |             |          |      |                                                                 |                                   |
Glossary

Ahu – Altar, shrine, heap, pile, collection, mound.
Ahupua’a – Typically a pie-shaped land division from mountain to sea with smaller sub-divisions of land. Lit. pig altar which was designated on the seaward boundary of each ahupua’a for offerings to Lono during the annual Makahiki Festival.
‘Ai kapu – Separate eating between men and women, a law of the traditional Hawaiian religion.
‘Āina – Land, the earth also the female mother earth, Papahānaumokuākea.
‘Āina malo’o – Dry-land areas used for taro and sweet potato cultivation.
‘Āina momona – Fertile, productive lands. Lit. rich, fruitful, sweet.
Akua – Gods, deities.
Akua Loa – Long Akua. Wooden idol of the god Lono in the Makahiki Festival.
Akua Poko – Short Akua. Wooden idol of the god of the Lono in the Makahiki Festival.
Ālia – A section of an altar between two poles of wood for ho‘okupu or offerings to Lono in the Makahiki circuit.
Ali‘i ‘ai ahupua’a – High chief of the ahupua’a.
Ali‘i ‘ai moku – High chief or chiefesses of the moku or largest land division.
Ali‘i Nui – High chiefs or chiefesses.
Aloha ‘Āina – Familial love for the land.
Auala lo’i – Stone-faced, terraced taro patches on hillsides.
‘Aumākua – Ancestral guardians.
‘Auwai – Freshwater irrigation canals for cultivation.
Ha’aheo – Aristocratic style of cultivation with adornment of flower lei.
Haku ‘āina – Chiefly land steward.
Haku – Senior male member of a family.
Hale mua – Men’s eating house.
Hale o Lono – Agricultural heiau or temple for the god Lono.
Hāwai – Freshwater aqueducts, flumes.
Heiau – Religious temple.
Heiau hoʻouluulu ʻai – Agricultural temple.
Hina – Female goddess of the moon, tides, reef fishing, fishponds.
Hoʻokupu – Religious offerings of produce to the gods, as in the Makahiki harvest festival.
Hope konohiki – A lesser ranking konohiki under a senior konohiki nui.
Hope luna konohiki – An assistant supervisor of a senior konohiki.
Iʻa – Fish or marine animal.
ʻIke kūpuna – Knowledge of Hawaiian ancestors and elders.
ʻIli ʻāina or ʻili – Typically a sub-division smaller than an ahupuaʻa.
ʻIli kūpono – an independent ʻili land division of an ahupuaʻa whose konohiki owes no tribute to the konohiki of the ahupuaʻa it is situated in.
ʻIli lele – “Jump” strips of land in different ahupuaʻa but part of the same ahupuaʻa.
ʻImi haku – To search for a new chief to serve under.
Imu – Earth and stone oven.
Kahawai – Stream or river.
Kahuna – Ancient Hawaiian priest.
Kāhuna – Ancient Hawaiian priests.
Kai – Sea.
Kai lawaiʻa konohiki – A konohiki specialized in ocean fishing.
Kalo – Taro. Main food staple and ancestor of Hawaiians.
Kalo maloʻo – Dry-land taro and cultivation.
Kalo wai – Irrigated freshwater taro and cultivation.
Kamaʻāina – Native born, Lit. child of the land.
Kanaloa – God of the ocean, canoe voyaging. One of the four major Hawaiian deities.
Kānāwai – Laws, regulations.
Kānāwai Akua – Laws of the Akua or gods.
Kānāwai kapu – Sacred laws of the chief.
Kāne – God of water, life, agriculture. Also refers to man. One of the four major Hawaiian deities.
Kapa – Bark cloth material for clothing and utilitarian purposes made by women from the bark of the Mulberry tree.
Kapu – Taboo or prohibited, forbidden and sacred.
Kapu System or Religion – Traditional Hawaiian religion based on kapu laws.
Kauhale – Residential house sites.
Kaukau Aliʻi – High ranking personal attendant and land steward of the high chiefs.
Kiaʻi Loko – Guardians and caretakers of fishponds.
Koʻa – A fishing shrine located near ponds, streams and sea coast. Also fishing grounds.
Kōʻele – Parcels of land cultivated by the makaʻāinana for the chief and administered by the konohiki.
Konohiki ‘ai ‘ili – Chiefly land steward of the ‘ili or smaller sub-division often of an ahupua’a.
Konohiki ‘ai moku – Chiefly land steward of the larger moku districts of an island.
Konohiki ‘ai ‘okana – Chiefly land steward of the ‘okana sub-division.
Konohiki ‘auhau – Chiefly land steward who collected tributary offerings for the gods and produce to support the chiefs.
Konohiki i’a – A konohiki specialized in fishing.
Konohiki Nui – Senior ranking konohiki.
Konohiki pālauhulu – A chiefly steward who gathers fish for the chiefs and chiefesses.
Konohiki Rights – Laws and authority of the konohiki to steward and access the land and resources.
Konohiki System – Holistic and sustainable system of land and resource stewardship.
Kū – Male god of war, politics, and deep sea fishing. One of the four major Hawaiian deities.
Kula – Pastoral land, open fields.
Kūlana – Rank.
Kuleana – Responsibility.
Kumu waiwai – Wealth or resources.
Kumulipo – Ancient Hawaiian cosmogonic chant.
Kūpuna – Hawaiian elders.
Kūʻula – A stone fishing god to attract fish. A heiau near the sea to worship fishing gods.
Lā kōʻele – Labor days by the makaʻāinana of the kōʻele lands supervised by the konohiki.
Lāhui Hawaiʻi – Hawaiian Nation.
Loʻi ʻai – taro fields that are ground level in river valley floors.
Loʻi kalo – Taro paddy or field.
Loko iʻa – Inland or near shoreline fishponds.
Loko iʻa kalo – taro paddy fishponds.
Loko kuapā – Large sea-walled, shoreline fishponds of brackish and freshwater.
Lono – God of peace, rain, and agriculture. Celebrated in the annual Makahiki Festival. One of the four major Hawaiian deities.
Luna – A supervisor or leader of a land division under the konohiki.
Luna konohiki - A konohiki supervisor or leader of a land division.
Luna pā aupuni – Supervisor of a government livestock yard.
Luna wai – Manager or konohiki of freshwater.
Ma kai – Seaward.
Ma uka – Inland, towards the mountains.
Māhele Land Division – Division of land in 1848 by King Kamehameha III changing traditional Hawaiian subsistent land tenure to Western privatization of land.
Mahi ʻai ana – Cultivation.
Maka wai – Freshwater outlets in loʻi kalo or taro patches.
Makaʻāinana – Commoners who were the labor force under the konohiki.
Makahiki Festival – Religious harvest celebration of agricultural god Lono.
Māla – Garden, patch of cultivable land.
Mālama – To take care of, tend, attend, loyalty, preserved, protect, preservation, caretaker.
Mālama ʻāina – Familial-based stewardship of the land.
Mana – Divine power of the gods.
Māno wai – head waters or freshwater dam.
Māpele – An agricultural temple.
Mōʻī – Paramount ruler, king.
Moʻo wāhine – female spiritual guardians of water. Transforms into lizard forms or elderly women.
Moʻokūʻauhau – Genealogy and lineage of ancestors.
Moʻolelo – Story or history.
Nā Kai Lawaiʻa Konohiki – Konohiki Fisheries.
ʻOhana – family.
ʻOihana – Work or duties.
ʻŌlelo Noʻeau – Proverbial sayings.
Papa Konohiki – Konohiki class.
Papahānaumokuākea or Papa – female god or earth mother of Hawaiians. Mate of Wākea.
Pono – Good, proper, in perfect order, balanced, righteous, just, prosperity, beneficial, resources.
Poʻo wai – Head dam.
Pule hoʻouluulu – Supplication prayers for growth of food crops.
Unuunu – Bamboo and white cloth markers prohibiting fishing areas to conserve marine resources.
Waʻa – Canoe.
Wai – Freshwater.
Waiwai – Wealth, valuables, worth, importance.
Wākea – Male god or sky father of Hawaiians. Mate of Papahānaumoku.
Wao – Inland ecological regions or zones. Earthly realms of the gods.
Wauke - Species of Mulberry trees used for kapa or bark cloth making.
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