

TWO VIEWS OF ANCIENT HAWAIIAN SOCIETY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

HISTORY

MAY 2012

By

Mark Alfred Kawika Fontaine

Thesis Committee:

John Rosa, Chairperson

David Chappell

Kerri Inglis

Keywords: Ancient, Hawaiian, Society

Abstract

Since 1950, two opposing views of Hawaii's history in pre-western-contact times have developed. One view is that a dramatic change occurred around the year 1450 CE with the implementation of the ahupuaa system. A culture that had been based in a kinship relationship between chiefs and commoners changed. Power was gathered into the hands of an elite who then exploited and extracted labor and the fruits of that labor from a larger group of workers in order to maintain a privileged lifestyle and pursue political goals. In opposition is another picture of Hawaii's history. This view is that power was shared between chiefs and commoners in a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship. Balancing mechanisms functioned to move the society towards the good, a state sometimes referred to as the Hawaiian word "pono." In this study I will compare and contrast the two views.

Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Introduction	1
1. Background and the Second Migration: Years up to 1450 CE.	10
Background	11
The Second Migration.	28
2. Anthropologist views: Internal developments culminate in the ahupuaa system.	44
Cordy	45
Earle	58
Goldman	62
Hommon	67
Kirch	74
Sahlins.	79
3. Comparison and Contrast I: The Causes of Societal Change. Aspects of Genealogy, Societal Rank, and Chiefly Kapu.	83
The Causes of Societal Change	86
Aspects of Genealogy	91
Aspects of Societal Rank	109
Aspects of Chiefly Kapu	121

4.	Comparison and Contrast II: The Formation of the Ahupuaa System, Elements of Food Production and Reciprocal Relationships, Balancing Mechanisms, and the Alii-Makaainana Relationship.	130
	The Formation of the Ahupuaa System	130
	Elements of Food Production and Reciprocal Relationships	136
	Balancing Mechanisms	143
	The Alii-Makaainana Relationship	154
	Conclusion	158
	Glossary	172
	Biographical Appendix	174
	Reference List.	177

Introduction

Since 1950, two opposing views of Hawaii's history in ancient, pre-western-contact times have developed.¹ One view is that a dramatic change occurred in the Hawaiian Islands around the year 1450 CE with the implementation of a societal system commonly called the ahupuaa system.² A culture that had been based in kinship relationships between chiefs (Hawaiian: alii) and commoners (Hawaiian: makaainana) changed as a two-class structure developed.³ The governing dynamic of this view of ancient Hawaiian society is that power was gathered into the hands of a small group of elite who then exploited and extracted labor and the fruits of that labor from a larger group of workers in order to maintain a privileged lifestyle and pursue political goals.⁴ Some of the scholars that hold these views are the widely read anthropologists Ross Cordy, Timothy K. Earle, Robert Hommon, Irving Goldman, Patrick V. Kirch, and Marshall Sahlins. These writers bring together much evidence from a variety of academic fields, including the study of Hawaiian oral traditions, to substantiate their

¹ The common term "pre-contact" is used in this thesis only to distinguish years prior to 1778. It is intended to have no other meaning or implication. I have chosen to begin this study with what has been written since 1950 as that was the decade that radiocarbon dating, and modern Pacific archaeology began.

² To simplify the many dating schemes commonly used in the works I have referenced, I will use BCE, meaning "before the common era," and CE, meaning "in the common era." These will replace the terms BC and AD.

³ Because Hawaiian is an official language of the State of Hawaii, Hawaiian words and phrases will not be italicized. Because the use of diacriticals in Hawaiian is inconsistent in the sources I have used, I have chosen to exclude them.

⁴ When the word "extraction" is used in this study, it is not meant to refer to the extraction of natural resources from the land or the sea, but is to be thought of as the extraction of labor or anything produced using the labor of the makaainana by the alii.

claim.⁵ The majority of their work has been done since 1950, the year when new techniques using radiocarbon provided dates of archaeological sites. Although Cordy and Kirch have received degrees in archaeology, I accept the general opinion that archaeology is a sub-branch of anthropology, and will therefore refer to this group as the “anthropologists.”

In opposition is the picture of Hawaii’s history presented by other prominent and popularly read scholars such as Carlos Andrade, Kehaunani Cachola-Abad, John Charlot, Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, George Kanahale, Herb Kawainui Kane, Marion Kelly, Kepa Maly, Davianna McGregor, Jonathan Osorio, Mary Kawena Pukui, Haunani-Kay Trask, and Kanalu Young.⁶ These authors come from a wide variety of fields and primarily draw their information from two sources. They rely most heavily on the Hawaiian oral traditions. But as most of them have spent the bulk of their lives in the islands, they also use knowledge found in a “cultural repository” that still informs modern Hawaiian culture. These writers, hereinafter referred to as the “traditionalists,” maintain that ancient Hawaiian society after the formalization of the ahupuaa system was not characterized by the development of an oppressive class of alii who exploited makaainana. Instead, balancing mechanisms helped insure that power was shared in a reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship that worked to preserve the good, a state sometimes referred to as the Hawaiian word “pono.” In contrast to the dramatic transformation seen by the anthropologists, the traditionalists tend to see more continuity

⁵ Only one of the anthropologists chosen for this study, Ross Cordy, has spent most of his professional life in the Hawaiian Islands. All received their advanced degrees outside the Hawaiian Islands. The latest any of them received their advanced degree was in 1978, with four of the six receiving degrees in the 1970s. Please see the Biographical Appendix for more information.

⁶ Most of the traditionalists have spent the bulk of their professional lives in the Hawaiian Islands. While two of the thirteen do not have advanced degrees, six received their advanced degrees at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Two received their advanced degrees in the 1950s, two in the 1960s, and seven from 1981 to 2000. Please see the Biographical Appendix for more information.

in the Hawaiian past of the pre-contact era. For them, that past is animated by an impulse towards pono, which had as a primary component a kinship relationship between alii and makaainana that did not rupture with the ahupuaa system but endured. In presenting this information, my first objective is to compare and contrast what the anthropologists and traditionalists write in widely available works about the nature of ancient Hawaiian society, while showing some of the nuances and variations within each group. My second objective is to offer evidence that shows that while there are some similarities between the anthropologists and traditionalists, their views of ancient Hawaiian society are largely in opposition.

There are many instances in which writers like Carlos Andrade, John Dominis Holt, Haunani-Kay Trask, and Kanalu Young have spent a few paragraphs explaining some of the differences in viewpoint of those trying to describe ancient Hawaiian society. However, these are not complete studies, but sections embedded in studies possessing other objectives. One reason a complete study has not yet been attempted may be that the anthropologists and traditionalists draw their information from very different sources. The anthropologists use evidence from the academic fields of historical linguistics, comparative ethnography, and archaeology, as well as generally drawing information from the Hawaiian oral traditions. The first three fields generally do not inform the work of the traditionalists. Although some traditionalist writers mention archaeological information, it is not a seminal element of their narrative except in the work of Marion Kelly. Instead, their knowledge comes from two places, the Hawaiian oral traditions and a “cultural repository” that is present in Hawaii even today. By "oral traditions" I am referring to the poetry, chants, genealogies, stories, legends, proverbs, and other literature

that was passed down orally until it was recorded in writing in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Nineteenth-century scholars living in Hawaii such as Abraham Fornander, Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, and David Malo did much to record these traditions. The “cultural repository” as a source is less tangible. Part of this repository is the knowledge that has been passed down orally in families but not necessarily recorded in writing or on audiotape. This repository can be accessed in various ways - by being born, raised, adopted into, or being a part of a family and community that is informed by this knowledge. The other aspect of the “cultural repository” is knowledge passed down orally in families but which has been recorded in interviews. It is difficult for a person not immersed in or intimately familiar with Hawaiian culture to achieve any degree of mastery over the information in this repository. As a result of these two very different knowledge bases, evidence used and explanations given by anthropologists and traditionalists is often incongruent. This has resulted in many occasions in which writers from the two groups are writing about different things, or the same things in different contexts, and are not directly responding to elements in the narratives of the other group. This is a problem because it has proven very difficult to glean those details and conclusions in which a valid comparison and contrast can be done without taking what has been written out of context.

But this is not to say that there is a total disconnect in what has been written by scholars from the two groups. The anthropologists, for example, use the oral traditions, but come to different conclusions than the traditionalists. In some ways many contrasting elements of what has been written by the two groups cannot be described as absolute rules without exceptions, but are inclinations, tendencies, or differences in emphasis. But

there are differences in background. In general, the anthropologists have lived mostly in the continental United States, while the traditionalists have spent most of their lives in Hawaii. The anthropologists have been trained in the scholarly discipline of anthropology, while the traditionalists come from a wider background including history and art. In general, the traditionalists received their training later in the twentieth century. In general, the anthropologists have been exposed less than the traditionalists to the culture of Hawaii.

Another basic difference between the two groups can be seen in the way they approach their subject matter. While subtle and perhaps not readily apparent, it does exist and can be described as affecting the tone of what has been written. These differences may have to do with prose style, or with an impression of scientific detachment, or a difference in the use of and emphasis on genealogy, or with concepts like mana (spiritual energy) and kapu (prohibitions). With this in mind, the anthropologists as a group can be described as academics that are investigating something other than from their personal past. There is little mention in their work that they wish to approach Hawaii's history from an insider's point of view, or that they feel a personal as opposed to an academic connection to Hawaii. Kirch in *How Chiefs Became Kings* (2010) seems to be the major exception, and he writes that he is proceeding from an insider's perspective because he uses the oral traditions. But this is not evidence of a connection beyond academic analysis. The traditionalists tend to be different. When a reader has engaged with what they have written, it is clear that the traditionalists somehow personally identify with the Hawaiian past in some way. Some like John Dominis Holt and Herb Kawainui Kane identify with the people of the past in

genealogical terms as their ancestors had lived in Hawaii in pre-contact times. Others like Kepa Maly and Mary Kawena Pukui, speak of a subjective identification with nature inseparable from culture. Some like Kehau Cachola-Abad and Edith McKinzie have spent years researching the oral traditions to gain and then to pass down to future generations the knowledge of chiefly lives and their genealogies. Those like Rubellite Kawena Johnson and Davianna McGregor have also become links to the past as they recorded the insights of elders from secluded areas who still possess the old knowledge, which they are still passing down to future generations. Still others like John Charlot, Lilikala Kameeleihiwa, Marion Kelly, and Kanalu Young have written about cultural values that have persisted over time and still resonate in modern lives. This sense of personal identification, so apparent in the traditionalists, seems not to be a part of the anthropologist narrative. This lack of basic common ground between the two groups makes analysis difficult.

But an analysis of what has been written by scholars from the two groups is possible. In brief, what is clear in the traditionalists' presentations is their basic understanding that the universe is essentially one family. The cosmogonic chants, the Kumulipo being the best known, show the genealogical relationships between all things that existed prior to and including the advent of human beings (Beckwith 1972; Johnson 1981). When all elements of the universe are in balance, this familial unity functions properly and is good. This balanced state has been called pono, and includes human society.⁷ Over time, that society developed balancing mechanisms that tended to bring it

⁷ Pono has been used as a noun to mean uprightness, righteousness, the good; an adjective as in a pono alii; and as a nominalizing phrase as in the word hooponopono, meaning the process of making correct or healing. See Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Charlot 1985: 1; Handy and Pukui 1958: 200; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 13, 25; Kanahale 1992: 398 ff; Kane 1997: 30; McGregor 2007: 12-17; Osorio 2002: 10; Silva 2005:

back into pono when balance was lost. The way that this was done generally consisted of establishing a distance between elements more properly kept separated. In the very early times of the primordial parents Papa and Wakea, this can be seen in the institution of the aikapu religion with its separation of male and female elements that helped facilitate the establishment of social order.⁸ In the years just after the second migration, the movement back towards pono is seen by some traditionalists in the re-establishment of the natural distance between alii and makaainana that had become blurred. And in later times, traditionalists emphasize the balancing mechanisms that developed and tended to insure responsibility and accountability of each group to the other and to the whole. The governing dynamic in this view of the world, and therefore in human affairs in ancient Hawaii is the impulsion towards balance, a movement back towards the good. These abstract and sometimes difficult concepts are at the core of the view of ancient Hawaiian society as seen by some traditionalist writers, and will be referenced many times in various contexts throughout this study.

An example that may facilitate understanding of the seminal concept of pono, and the governing dynamic of the movement back towards pono, can be seen in the concepts of homeostasis and autoregulation from Western medicine. Homeostasis can be defined as, “The tendency of a system, especially the physiological system of higher animals, to maintain internal stability, owing to the coordinated response of its parts to any situation or stimulus that would tend to disturb its normal condition or function”

(<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/homeostasis>). And the closely related concept

16; Young 1998: 74-75, 79. Cachola-Abad and McGregor use the word lokahi, meaning balance, and Kane uses the word balance, but the extremely close similarity in the presentations of this main idea by these traditionalists is too striking to ignore.

⁸ A name of the basic religious system in pre-contact Hawaii. It was characterized by a separation between basic elements designed to keep polluting elements separated so balance in the world would be maintained.

auto-regulation is defined as, “The continual automatic adjustment or self-regulation of a biochemical, physiological, or ecological system to maintain a stable state” (<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/autoregulation>).⁹ These two concepts are very similar to what many traditionalists see operating in ancient Hawaii. As I will detail below, they see not a complete actualization of pono in an unblemished and perfect society, but a dynamic towards it - a movement towards a balanced and proper functioning of all parts.

But the anthropologists seem not to see this. They do not write about a good and original state of balance in the universe that encompasses human society, they see only human society in isolation. Further, the dynamic that the anthropologists see governing human society in old Hawaii is the not the impulsion back to the good, but rather the exercise of power by one particular group over another group. This exercise has as its primary attribute might makes right, which the anthropologists see concluding in exploitation and extraction, which for them is the essence of what Hawaiian society became in pre-contact times. Therefore their focus is not to describe the inclination towards balance, but only to describe imbalance. This lack of basic common ground goes far in explaining the origin of the opposing conceptions of history and society in ancient Hawaii held by the two groups.

The analysis presented in this thesis is not to be intended as comprehensive, but only a beginning. Only a few of the many well-known scholars who have written about ancient Hawaiian society have been chosen for this study, and only a few of their more popular or seminal works will be examined. At times information from a few other

⁹ This information was taken from discussions with Dr. Robert Nagoshi, instructor at the John A. Burns School of Medicine in October 2011, and Dr. Mark Szasz, Emergency Care physician at the Kaiser Permanente Moanalua Medical Center and Clinic in July - November 2011.

scholars has been included as well. In Chapter One I provide background information to the history of anthropology in the Pacific generally and in the Hawaiian Islands in particular, and outline the basic methodology of the anthropologists. I provide the views of the anthropologists and traditionalists about the years from first landing in Hawaii up to approximately 1100 CE, the beginning of the migratory period. I also present the two general views of the years from 1100 CE to about 1450 CE, the approximate date that saw the formalization of the ahupuaa system, by focusing on the traditionalist view of the importance of a second migration bringing societal change, and the anthropologist critique of this position. In Chapter Two I detail the anthropologists' take on Hawaii's society and history from the approximate date of the implementation of the ahupuaa system up to Western contact, from about 1450-1778 CE, in which they think internal developments led to the large-scale transformation seen occurring with the imposition and development of the ahupuaa system. In Chapter Three I present the basic traditionalist view of Hawaiian society during these years, and compare and contrast it with details from anthropologists' views presented in the previous chapter. I focus on the causes of societal change, genealogy, societal rank, and chiefly kapu, and show that while there are some similarities between the groups, there is much more difference. In Chapter Four I continue to compare and contrast in order to examine the views of each group regarding certain aspects of food production and the relationships between makaainana and alii. In the conclusion I critique aspects of the views of each group and present possible avenues for further research that may enrich discussions about the nature of pre-contact Hawaiian society.

1. Background and the Second Migration: years up to 1450 CE.

In this chapter I will provide a background of some of the highlights of the field of Polynesian studies in western academia as it pertains to pre-contact Hawaii. I will also discuss the widely accepted methodology of using information from a variety of fields, sometimes called triangulation, and that archaeology since 1950 seems to have been the linchpin that facilitated the development of Polynesian studies in general. I will show how historical linguistics and comparative ethnography have enabled researchers to theorize about the social structure in ancestral Polynesia, thus providing a sort of baseline that informs all ideas about later social development of Polynesian places. Key to this baseline is the general idea that all Polynesian societies proceeded from an origin in which all people in a given area were related, and lived in a societal structure sometimes referred to as a chiefdom, or conical clan, or ramage. Almost all of what has been written about these very early times is found in anthropologist rather than traditionalist sources. I will then discuss commonly recognized difficulties in recovering information from these early times, both about ancestral Polynesia and about the first few centuries after Polynesian arrival in Hawaii.

I conclude this section of Chapter One with three different opinions about societal structure in Hawaii up to the migratory period. In the second half of Chapter One, I explore the debate over the “second migration” to Hawaii. Some traditionalist writers believe that peoples from southern Pacific islands came with a stricter religious and societal system, and this led to an increasing distance between chiefs and commoners.

The anthropologists hold that while there was contact and influence, the second migration did not affect society to any great extent. Of all the anthropologists, Cordy presents the most developed critique of the traditionalist position.

Background

Polynesian origins and identity have baffled many a Western explorer and thinker and has provided a context for much study of Polynesia. Captain James Cook was astonished that "...the same nation should have spread themselves..." over an area of almost a quarter of the world (Beaglehole 1969: 354 in Kirch 1984: 1; Kirch 1985: 2; Kirch 2000: 14).¹⁰ Those interested in language like Lieutenant King who sailed with Cook in the 1770s, Horatio Hale from the Wilkes Expedition in the 1840s, and Otto Dempwolff in the 1930s wrote about linguistic similarities and possible origins and development of Polynesian languages (Kirch 1984: 1; Kirch 1985: 2, 9, 52; Kirch 2000: 13-41). Societal practices and material culture were recorded in early ethnographies by scholars like William Ellis in the early nineteenth-century, and Edwin G. Burrows and Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa) in the first half of the twentieth-century, who also speculated about origins and put forth migration theories (Kirch 1984: 10; Kirch 1985: 14; Kirch 2000: 16, 214). Those interested in story, genealogies, and oral traditions like whaler Abraham Fornander who made Hawaii his home in the late nineteenth-century,

¹⁰ The citation style used in this study is somewhat unusual. This is primarily due to the nature of this study in which so much is dependent on information from the oral traditions. My objective is to provide a more complete body of references. Therefore, in general, I have chosen to show where the anthropologists and traditionalists have obtained their information. As a result, there is a preponderance of parenthetical citations in which one source quoted or referenced in another: for example, Fornander in Goldman, Kamakau in Cachola-Abad, or Sahlins in Cordy. I feel this is important primarily because it shows how often and when primary sources such as Fornander and Kamakau are used, and by whom.

and S. Percy Smith in the early twentieth-century wrote about history and migrations as well (Kirch 1985: 9; Kirch 2000: 16). Institutions like the Polynesian Society and the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, both established in the late nineteenth-century, have furthered research into all aspects of Polynesian studies (Kirch 1985: 9; Kirch 2000: 17). Largely under the auspices of the Bishop Museum, early twentieth-century researchers like William T. Brigham, John F. G. Stokes, and Kenneth Emory began archaeological surveys of Hawaiian and other Polynesian sites (Kirch 1984: 9-13; Kirch 2000: 9-15; Kirch and Green 2001: 3).

Like Cook, most scholars from the West have now accepted that the Polynesians are one people. This, coupled with the relative isolation of Polynesian island places until western contact, validates the method that to compare and contrast aspects of Polynesian society and culture is sound (Kirch 2000: 300; Kirch 2010: 8; Kirch and Green 2001: 213). But the various perspectives and methodologies of the academic disciplines listed above and many others have proven problematic to those trying to correlate widely varying information into a coherent whole. American scholars like anthropologist Franz Boas and linguist Edward Sapir have called for investigation along multiple lines, and to combine evidence from diverse fields and sources to further knowledge of Polynesian identity (Kirch and Green 2001: 2). This multi-disciplinary approach, popularly known as triangulation, is the standard accepted by many scholars of Polynesia (Kanahele 1995: 10; Kirch 1984: 1-5; Kirch 1985: 66; Kirch 2000: 3; Kirch and Green 2001: 6; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 1; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 10; Kolb 1992; Kolb 1994; Kolb 2006). However, to provide not just comparative sequencing and evolutionary analysis of Polynesian societies, but to ground these concretely in time took the unique dating

methods of archaeology. And it was archaeological discoveries in the middle of the twentieth-century that turned much what had been believed about Polynesian origins and identity upside down.

Over the years, it was becoming clear to the scholarly community, like it had been to Cook, that striking similarities in physical characteristics, language, material culture, imported biota, religious expression, and literary traditions yielded overwhelming evidence that the Polynesians were closely related peoples with a common point of origin (Kirch 1985: 62-64; Kirch 2000: 213; Kirch and Green 2001: 14-16, 73). But up until the 1950s, most researchers believed that the homeland of the peoples who eventually became to be known as the Polynesians had been generally in Asia or island Southeast Asia, where the essentials of culture had developed (Kirch 2000: 208). They held that these people fanned out from this area into the Pacific at a rapid rate over a few hundred years while bringing cultural forms already complete and intact (Kirch 2000: 27-28). But in the 1950s, the startling archaeological discovery of a stamped pottery eventually to be called Lapita would provide evidence to the contrary: that the Polynesians had their origins in a different set of circumstances than had widely been believed. Researchers like Edward W. Gifford found unexpected time depth as they investigated the record of this culture. The newly invented technique of Carbon 14 dating would show that these peoples had flourished and expanded throughout the area from the Bismarck Islands through Vanuatu and New Caledonia from about 1500 BCE (Kirch 2000: 27-28). They then moved with their culture into the islands on the eastern edge of the Lapita Cultural Complex, the Tonga-Samoa area, by about 1000 BCE (Kirch 1997: 54; Kirch 2000: 28).

Most of the area inhabited by the Lapita peoples consists of islands in close proximity to one another, and there is evidence that regular contact occurred between the various island groups. But from Vanuatu in the west to the Tonga-Samoa area in the east is open ocean for 530 miles. Scientists speculate that this distance eventually led to the separation of the two groups. In this isolation, these colonizers faced new challenges. The islands of this area were smaller. Flora, fauna, and rock types for tools were different and more limited. As these people adapted to the new challenges, their culture changed. Over the years design motifs developed that were different from those found in western Lapita sites, and eventually pottery fell out of use altogether. Most researchers hold this as evidence that a separate culture developed, and these eastern Lapita peoples changed over about a thousand years into what has become known as the Proto-Polynesians (Cachola-Abad 2000: 78-79; Kirch 2000: 212-219). Modern scholarly consensus then is that this area is the homeland of all Polynesians, variously known as Ancestral Polynesia, *Pulotu*, or *Hawaiki* (Kirch and Green 2001: 95-96).¹¹

What had been long suspected by researchers was now reinforced by evidence from archaeological dating, that a specific Polynesian point of origin had in fact existed, and was now pinpointed in time and space (Kirch and Green 2001: 1). Scholars now believed that a thousand years of isolation had provided enough time for the core systemic patterns inherited from the ancestral Lapita peoples to further mature, the basic social groupings, land tenure patterns, religious concepts like mana and kapu, basic cosmogonic creation myths, and hereditary chiefdoms, which would be further developed in the offspring Polynesian cultures over the following two millennia (Cachola-Abad

¹¹ Words like “Pulotu,” “Hawaiki,” “kainga,” “kainanga,” and “tupunga” are italicized in the text because they are from the language of the Proto-Polynesians. See Kirch and Green 2001 for more information.

2000: 78-79; Kirch 2000: 213). Analytic focus in the field changed as well. Instead of describing the functions of various institutions as they interacted within a supposedly static society, scholars moved towards theorizing about the change of those institutions from their Proto-Polynesian seeds within a changing society. Instead of exploring the various inter-related aspects of food production, the evolution of production was now the focus. Instead of using cross-cultural comparisons on which to base guesses about historical reconstructions, scholars could rely on what they considered to be more concrete methods, like radiocarbon dating, that could provide dates as evidence to back up proposed sequences of cultural change (Earle 1978: 1; Kirch 1984: ix, 12; Kirch 1985: 14; Kirch 2000: 13-41, 249, 301).

Yet little has been gleaned from the archaeological record that yields much information about society in ancestral Polynesia (Kirch 2000: 218). The information from the oral traditions is likewise sparse. Linguistic evidence and comparative ethnography are needed to provide more data that researchers can use to reconstruct Ancestral Polynesian Society (Kirch 1985: 293; Kirch 2000: 218; Kirch and Green 2001: 201). Based on these techniques, many anthropologists think that the social structure of Ancestral Polynesian Society (hereinafter to be referred to as APS), in large part inherited from its Lapita progenitors, was based in kinship and land tenure (Kirch 1985: 293; Kirch 2000: 218, 248-249; Goldman 1970: 437 in Kirch and Green 2001: 208, 9). They believe that at the foundation of this society was a small group, perhaps a household or extended household, called the *kainga* (also referred to as the *kaainga*) (Cordy 2000: 114; Kirch 1984: 65; Kirch 2000: 218; Kirch 2010: 16-19; Kirch and Green 2001: 211, 235). The *kainga* held rights to land usage based on residence, and cultivated one or more areas of

land in common (Kirch 1984: 65; Kirch 1985: 293; Kirch 2000: 218; Kirch 2010: 16-19). Larger than the *kainga* was the *kainanga*, or ramage, or conical clan (Kirch 1984: 65-66; Kirch 2010: 16-19). This larger group was composed of several allied *kainga* (Cordy 2000: 114; Kirch 1985: 293; Kirch 2010: 16-19; Kirch and Green 2001: 235). Many scholars think that all the members of the *kainanga* could trace their ancestry back to a founding ancestor, the *tupunga* (Kirch 1985: 293; Kirch 2000: 218; Kirch 2010: 16-19; Kirch and Green 2001: 224). Over time some ancestors were elevated to become gods (Kirch 1984: 67). As this social group was kin based, all members were considered family (Cordy 2000: 114; Kirch and Green 2001: 225).

While distinctions between members of both the *kainga* and *kainanga* family groupings were minimal, neither was the society egalitarian (Hommon 1976: 53-54; Kirch 2000: 248-249). The leader at the level of the *kainga* was the *fatu* [Hawaiian: haku]. Some think that this person was a mature person, perhaps a family elder or patriarch (Kirch 2010: 19-20; Kirch and Green 2001: 231-234). At the level of the larger *kainanga*, the evidence is very sound that the leader was called the *ariki* [Hawaiian: alii] (Cordy 2000: 115; Cordy 2002: 16; Kirch 2000: 248-249; Kirch 2010: 19; Kirch and Green 2001: 232-236). His role as leader was inherited, and his rank and seniority flowed from his genealogical proximity to the founding member of the group (Cordy 2000: 115; Kirch 1984: 37, 64, 67). As the senior ranking male, first born of the senior line, closest to the often deified ancestor, the *ariki* then possessed a greater degree of mana or spiritual power, which afforded him a measure of authority over the rest of the group (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79, 80; Kirch 1984: 63, 64; Kirch 2000: 218, 248-249).

Although he was highest in rank, this was not reflected in elaborate behavioral or material ways at this early time (Kirch 1984: 67).

The *ariki's* primary function was as much spiritual as secular; he was the intermediary between the family and apotheosized clan ancestors (Kirch 2010: 19; Kirch and Green 2001: 226, 247). In this precursor to Hawaiian society, the *ariki* had a special responsibility to ensure that there was balance and harmony in all aspects of the interconnected spiritual, natural, and human worlds (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80). He did this by receiving and transmitting the offerings of the people to the ancestral deities and by reciting the appropriate ritual formula for securing bountiful harvests from land and sea and victory in war (Kirch 1984: 37, 166). By fulfilling his duties that would then ensure care of those of lower rank, the *ariki* maintained his own rank (Hommon 1976: 53-54). In reciprocation for these services to his family, the *ariki* received a portion of the offerings to the ancestral spirits, and the right to certain rare and valuable goods that were symbols of his rank (Goldman 1970: 485; Hommon 1976: 53-54; Kirch and Green 2001: 226). Some hold that the later cross-Polynesian pattern of an authoritative ruling elite was inherited from the ancient office of the *ariki*, and became a cultural mainstay of the entire ancestral Polynesian social order, which is discussed below (Goldman 1970: 4 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80).

General scholarly consensus is that sometime between 200 BCE -300 CE, at least a few Polynesians left the ancestral land of *Hawaiki*, sailed eastward, and landed in the Marquesas (Kirch 1985: 58). Archaeologists have unearthed and dated remains of the crops they carried, as well as pigs, dogs, and chickens, and a few plain ceramic pots (Kirch 1985: 58). Just as their Lapita forebears had to adapt to new conditions in the

Hawaiki homeland, so too did these colonizers adapt. The general absence of the protecting reefs and thus of abundant reef fish meant that new techniques and technology had to be developed to secure food from the sea (Kirch 1985: 58). Although there was some change, the core beliefs and practices inherited from APS remained.

Archaeologists believe that it was from here that Polynesian colonizers purposefully voyaged to other Pacific Islands within Polynesia, and landed in Hawaii between 300-600 CE (Charlot 1983: 21; Cordy 2000: 103-9, 165; Cordy 2002: 8, 9, 15; Handy and Handy 1972: 8-13, 267-278; Kirch 1984: 77, 87, 244-5; Kirch 1985: 58, 67, 87-88, 298; Kirch 2000: 230, 291; Kirch and Green 2001: 80; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 13; Maly 1999: 10).

But recovering information about the first centuries after the Polynesian colonization of Hawaii is difficult. Many researchers feel that an archipelago-wide social and political upheaval began about 1100 CE. Populations grew tremendously and moved, different production systems were implemented, ruling dynasties were replaced, and religious change occurred. As a result much was lost (Cordy 2000: 86; Handy and Handy 1972: 77-78, 484; Kane 1997: 16). Nineteenth-century historians of Hawaii like Abraham Fornander and David Malo both specifically write about the vague and obscure nature of any information that had been passed down from early times (Fornander 1878: 165 in Cordy 2000: 86-87; Malo 1951: 1). Many agree that there are difficulties with extracting information from the oral traditions that did survive (Chun 1988: 14 in Cordy 2000: 72). Other nineteenth-century indigenous scholars like John Papa Ii, Samuel Manaiakalani Kamakau, and Kepelino, who along with Fornander and Malo worked to gather historical information, found only limited success because so many

elders knowledgeable about pre-contact times were already gone by the time they had started their work (Cordy 2000: 71-72, 75). Conflicting accounts and widely varying versions made coordinated systemization almost impossible (Charlot 2005b: 175-176; Cordy 2000: 72-82). Many potential informants during these years were reticent to share information about important events involving their own ancestors (Cordy 2000: 80). And most of these historians set down the old stories in Hawaiian. Many consider the translations and editing of articles and serials from Hawaiian language newspapers problematic, and have called attention to dubious translations of Fornander and Malo (Cordy 2000: 82-83; Charlot 2005b: 727; Nogelmeier 2003: 3-4; Silva 2004: 12-13, 17-23). The record existing in English translation today is still only a small fraction of what is available in Hawaiian (Cordy 2000: 77; Nogelmeier 2003: 3-4, 89). Further, unknown accounts surely remain, hidden away as family journals, letters, and heirlooms (Charlot 2005b: 494; Cordy 2000: 87; Johnson 1957: 27).

Information recovered through archaeology is problematic as well (Kolb 1992: 9). Because so much of this record is based on plant sources, optimal conditions need to be present or over 80% of these fragile substances break down in a few years (Kirch and Green 2001: 164). Desiccation that occurs in some caves can help preserve this record, but such conditions are rare (Kirch and Green 2001: 164). Not only is the testimony from plant-based sources easily lost, but stone structures are easily destroyed. Floods, tsunamis, tides, and high waves can break apart the most sturdily constructed stone remains. (Kirch 1985: 33, 67). Later peoples can reuse materials for their own purposes (Kirch 1985: 67). Large-scale agriculture and urban or resort developments can easily level valuable sites, even when such places are clearly marked on maps and afforded

legal protections (Kirch 1985: 107, 245; Noborikawa 2009; Trask 1999: 125). Reliability of archaeological information varies considerably with completeness of survey coverage, accuracy of site description, amount and nature of laboratory analysis, and problems with accurately dating archaeological finds (Cordy 2000: 91). Quality and focus of interpretation can be dubious. Some reports may be based on only a few findings, fail to present the logic behind conclusions, but then are used to support broad statements about social ranking or relationships between groups or populations (Cordy 2000: 93).

A strength of archaeology is that many finds can be dated. Radiocarbon dating is the primary technique. Dates are reported as calibrated calendar dates, with 95% probability that the true date of the sample lies in that range. However, dated samples, especially from charcoal, can be older than the site within which it is found, for example if the sample is from driftwood (Cordy 2000: 94). Another dating technique, volcanic glass hydration dating, is proving valuable. When a flake of lava is broken to make a tool, it begins to alter at a fixed rate based on chemical makeup of the glass and the temperature of the site. This can provide dates theoretically more accurate than using radiocarbon, but there are still flaws with this newer technique (Cordy 2000: 95).

Another difficulty of dating is the widely varying dates used for first colonization. Recent information from the re-dating of key sites in Hawaii shows settlement as late as 800-1000 CE (Kirch 2010: 126-127).

Despite the fragmentary record, most researchers accept that archaeological evidence clearly shows that from the time of initial settlement until about 1100 CE, permanent habitation in the Hawaiian Islands was largely limited to the windward coastal areas, like the Bellows and Kawainui areas on Oahu, Hanalei and Lumahai on Kauai,

Halawa on Molokai, and Waipio and Hilo on Hawaii Island (Cordy 2000: 116, 130; Cordy 2002a: 17; Cordy 2002b: 17-21; Earle 1997: 41-43; Handy and Handy 1972: 267-278; Kanehele 1995: 12; Kirch 1984: 244; Kirch 1994: 256; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 13-14; Maly 1999b: 10). In these areas the newly arrived Polynesians could depend on food from protected bays with rich reef habitats full of shellfish, turtle, reef fish, from hunting native birdlife, gathering native foodstuffs, and as time passed, meat from imported pigs, dogs, and chicken (Cordy 2000: 117; Handy and Handy 1972: 69-263, 268; Hommon 1976: 229-33; Kanehele 1995: 16-17; Kane 1997: 16; Kirch 1984: 244-5; Kirch 1985: 67; Kirch 2000: 293; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 7, 13). The imported Polynesian horticultural complex consisting of taro, banana, coconut, and other useful items for food and daily necessities also became important in the daily lives of the colonists as they adapted to life in the Hawaiian Islands (Handy and Handy 1972: 12-16, 69-263; Kirch 1994: 256). The well-watered windward areas with its higher rainfall and perennially flowing streams could easily support this fairly limited but slowly increasing agricultural production (Cordy 2002b: 11; Handy and Handy 1972: 484; Kirch 1984: 172). There is only a small amount of contested archaeological evidence for any irrigation prior to 1100 (Handy and Handy 1972: 268; Kirch 1984: 172; Kirch and Green 2001: 130). There is evidence for limited leeward habitation in such well-watered leeward areas such as the Waialua Bay and Manoa areas on Oahu (Cordy 2002a: 8; Kanehele 1995: 14; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14). Some think that native forests were being cleared in Kalihi, Halawa, and Anahulu valleys on Oahu beginning around 900 CE (Cordy 2002b: 14). Some evidence shows the existence of temporary campsites in dry leeward areas like Puu Alii, Waiahukini, and Anaehoomalu on Hawaii Island, and Ko

Olina and Pokai Bay on Oahu, where resources such as rich fishing and shellfish areas, timber stands, nesting and habitation areas of birds for feathers and meat could be exploited (Cordy 2000: 116-123, 127; Cordy 2002a: 8, 9; Cordy 2002b: 14; Kirch 1985: 298). But it was not until about 1100 CE that the population in the islands had expanded so that permanent settlement had begun to be established in the leeward and inland areas (Cordy 2002a: 8; Kirch 1994: 256; Maly 1999b: 10).

Most researchers feel that not only did the early Polynesian colonizers import their horticultural complex, they also brought the traditional social structure, inherited from ancestral Polynesia, to Hawaii as well. But there seems to be at least three different opinions as to the nature of Hawaiian society in the first centuries after colonization as seen in alii-makaainana relationships. One group, made up of anthropologists, holds that this early society was characterized not by separation but by unity between chiefs and commoners. A second group, made up of some traditionalist writers, believes that what the early Hawaiians primarily inherited from APS was separation in the relationship between alii and makaainana. A third group, also of traditionalists, holds that alii did not even exist during this early time, but came in from southern climes only after centuries had passed. This is not to say that these groupings are completely exclusive, there are aspects of the theories that are used interchangeably, and in some cases information is taken from the same primary sources. But one can see disagreements about later Hawaiian society, discussed more fully below, presaged here as the main idea of each of the three positions is clear. Despite being based on a general dearth of information, and its complicated character, the three opinions are worth exploring.

One group holds that the relationship between the alii and makaainana in early Hawaii was characterized not by distance but by unity. Anthropologists like Cordy, Earle, Hommon, and Kirch reason that although there were changes in population, settlement patterns, and material culture, the kinship structure of society remained stable until about 1100 CE, or while the population of a modern district remained under approximately 3000 (Cordy 2000: 126; Cordy 2002a: 15; Cordy 2002b: 15; Earle 1978: 168; Earle 1997: 43; Hommon 1976: 234). The people of the ancestral *kainanga* composed of *kainga* households, were still one family, tracing ancestry back to a common ancestor, and the leaders of the group, now known by the Hawaiian cognate alii were still considered members of that family (Barrere 1961: 1; Cordy 2002b: 24; Earle 1978: 168-169; Earle 1997: 43, 143; Hommon 1976: 7, 8, 175, 229-232; Kirch 1984: 65; Kirch 1985: 294). The alii were usually male, first born of the senior line (Cordy 2000: 125-126; Cordy 2002a: 15; Cordy 2002b: 15). They were still genealogically closer than others to the founding ancestor, who in some cases had been apotheosized into an ancestral family god called aumakua (Barrere 1961: 1; Kirch 1985: 294). This gave the alii some measure of authority, following the pattern established in APS (Earle 1978: 169; Kirch 1984: 64-66; Kirch 1985: 302; Kirch 2000: 213). But most importantly for these writers, the alii held only limited power (Cordy 2002a: 15; Cordy 2002b: 15). There was only minimal isolation of the alii from the rest of the family as this was still prior to the implementation of strict kapu (Cordy 2000: 125-126; Cordy 2002a: 15; Cordy 2002b: 15). There is no evidence for any elaborate deference, or major differences in housing, burial, or power, and there is no general scholarly consensus that such a hierarchical social system existed anywhere in Polynesia at this early time (Cordy 2000:

115). Even if it did, the small number of people involved, in either ancestral Polynesian communities, or in colonizer communities in early Hawaii would have leveled any elaborate ranking system (Cordy 2000: 115). The alii fulfilled their role as leaders in the same way as they had done in APS, providing direction for community affairs from cooperative economic ventures to religious ceremonies (Earle 1978: 169). The alii still received part of the first fruits tribute for his services. In these early times, the alii were still part of the family; they were not yet a different class (Hommon 1976: 234). The attention of this first group is focused on a close relationship between chiefs and commoners, quite different from that of the next group.

Many traditionalists like Carlos Andrade, John Charlot, and Kapa Maly write about the stories of the primordial parents, Papa and Wakea.¹² Some emphasize that the descent of both alii and makaainana from this divine source lends a connection and kinship bond between the two that animates much of Hawaiian life (Andrade 2009: 73-74; Charlot 2005b: 726; Davenport 1994: 2; Kanahale 1992: 17; Maly 2001: 2; McGregor 2007: 264; Young 1998: 76-77). This reasoning is not a modern invention of these writers, but instead is based on genealogies and explanatory text, usually from David Malo (Beckwith 1976: 294; Kepelino 1932: 190-192; Malo 1951: 244). But in the context of this particular discussion, what sets scholars like Cachola-Abad, Kameeleihiwa, and Young apart from these others is that they see in the legacy of Papa and Wakea not only unity between alii and makaainana but also separation, and these three make up the second group.

¹² Although there are many versions of the Papa-Wakea story, the version referred to here is that Papa and Wakea produced a son, Haloa, from whom came all the peoples of the earth, chiefs and commoners alike. See Malo 1951: 244. This story will be discussed more fully in Chapter Three.

Cachola-Abad, in her exhaustive analysis of many of the translated oral traditions done as a Ph.D. candidate in Anthropology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, holds that this tendency towards alii-makaainana separation proceeds from an earlier time (Beckwith 1972: 293-294; Cachola-Abad 2000: 78-79). She writes that the Polynesian idea of a ruling elite is not a political contrivance but a cultural conviction of the whole social order, and that the notion of a chiefly society is embedded in the very origins of the Polynesian worldview (P. Buck 1949, Handy 1923, Henry 1928: 229-230, Kirch 1984 Goldman 1970 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 80). As introduced above, and as will be further explained below, at the core of this worldview is the interconnectedness of the realms of the gods, the natural order, and the lives of people; indeed, the entire universe. Because alii can specifically recall their genealogical lineages that link them to the divine parents and the godly realms, they have a closer connection to these realms than others who cannot trace their lineages (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Van Dyke 2008: 16). This affords them not only senior status, but also a greater share of the spiritual energy and power, or mana, from those realms. With this greater power then comes greater responsibility to maintain pono in which all forces are in balance, so they and all others can prosper. These beliefs, Cachola-Abad writes, necessitated a distance between alii and makaainana to keep defiling influences from polluting the mana of the chiefs so they could properly fulfill their responsibilities of perpetuating pono. She writes, “As with ancestral Polynesian culture, Hawaiian society maintained the basic distinction between the hereditary alii and makaainana classes ...” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 87). The Polynesian voyagers who came to the Hawaiian archipelago brought this belief of the natural

separation between chief and commoner with them and it was therefore inherited by Hawaiians (Cachola-Abad 2000: 78-80).

According to scholars like Cachola-Abad, Kameeleihiwa, and Young, Hawaiians expressed and explained the need for societal structure through the separation between alii and makaainana by going back to the stories about Papa and Wakea. Kameeleihiwa explains how in one version, the sacred (niaupio) mating of Wakea with his daughter Hoohokukalani was proof of divinity (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 40-41). Their issue, Haloa, possessed of a greater share of mana from this divine union, was the first alii nui quite distinct from the mass of commoners or even other chiefs. Following this ancient pattern, all alii who came after aspired to raise their mana by mating with those of greater mana, or with a close relative, until the ultimate was produced, a godlike being, truly fit to rule (Kamakau 1961: 208, Malo 1951: 54-56, 190 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 40-41).

Commoners were not allowed this type of close mating as alii guarded this privilege jealously (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 40; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 87). She also explains, as does Young, that from this mating came the aikapu religion, with its foods forbidden to women, and other separations between the sexes to keep their dangerous defiling influence, proceeding from the menstruation, from polluting the mana of males.

The highly respected folklorist Martha Beckwith further explains that the Wakea and Hoohokukalani story is important because of its connection with the establishment of social order that yields social harmony. This mating also set up the kapu nights which developed into the practice in later times during which only the celebrants in the most important heiau were allowed to move about; all others were to be silent in their homes (Kamakau 1870b, Kepelino 1932: 64-66, 98-113, Malo 1951: 50-61, in Beckwith 1976:

299; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 23-25; Young 1998: 76-77). These scholars therefore do not emphasize the kinship ties between chiefs and commoners, but instead focus on the differences between them, based on the necessary separation of polluting elements, practiced from foundational times. However, it is not separation for its own benefit, or to allow one group to lord it over others; rather separation was necessary so balance in the universe and therefore in the human realm as well could be maintained, which benefitted all.

A third group of scholars writes something else quite different from either of the first two groups. Traditionalists like George Kanahale, and the authors of the seminal *Native Planters in Old Hawaii*, E. S. Craighill Handy, his wife E. G. Handy, and Mary Kawena Pukui, focus on the leader in these early times as not being the alii but the haku. They clearly state their belief that the haku as family elder and leader was not only found in some places in post-contact times, but also in ancient times, and that another system, that of alii rule, was imposed on to the older society at some later date. They write that only after the alii arrived in a second migration and imposed themselves as overlords on the older system, sometime after 1000 CE, that large food production systems, including terraced irrigation, began to be constructed (Handy and Handy 1972: 77-78, 484). Kanahale writes something similar, that as food production grew to meet the needs of an expanding population, the leadership of the old haku patriarchs was replaced with alii and their agents the konohiki (Kanahale 1995: 33). Evidence from the oral traditions also point to a different social system existing in those former times. Kanahale writes that in very early years, there were few people, and each family governed themselves. Only

after hundreds of years were chiefs set up over the land (Kamakau 1964: 3-4 in Kanehele 1995: 15-16).

Further evidence supporting this theory exists. Charlot and Kanehele reference Malo's statement that in the beginning, all were chiefs as all had come from the primordial parents, Papa and Wakea, and that the separation into chief and commoner ranks came only later (Malo 1951: 60-61 in Charlot 2005b: 726-727; Malo 1951: 60 in Kanehele 1995: 15-16). In another place Malo opines that in the early days there were no alii but the people raised them up to respond to problems in the populace (Malo 1951: 53). Fornander writes that alii arrived only centuries after first settlement (Fornander 1919 VI: 251-252). And Kelly comments on the Lailai period, early times in which the social values of aloha aina and family were laid down, and that the later period of the great chiefs, commencing only after centuries had passed, finally set the Hawaiian nation on a path tangential to that early period (Beckwith 1976: 276-277 in Kelly 1989: 103-104). As an example of information from the cultural repository, many Hawaiians today accept the idea that an earlier and simpler society existed in ancient times that was changed by alii strangers arriving from the south in a second migration.

The Second Migration

There is an ongoing debate about the validity of the two-migration theory in Hawaii's history that directly impacts questions about the development of ancient Hawaiian society. Most researchers from both sides of this debate accept the idea that a first wave of migrations occurred some time before 1000 CE, probably from the

Marquesas. Most researchers also believe that there was some contact between people from the Hawaiian Islands and other islands to the south, perhaps Tahiti, occurring roughly between 1000-1300 CE. But then the viewpoints diverge. Many traditionalist writers like Cachola-Abad, Kane, and Pukui hold that this immigration was undertaken by a more aggressive people who imposed their culture on the ones already here, and changed Hawaii to a place in which a stricter and more violent religious and social system became predominant, which had as one of its elements a greater separation between alii and makaainana than had existed previously. Some of these writers believe that this increased separation was imposed as a response to societal disorder. Of the anthropologists, Cordy most intensively develops a critique of this migration theory. He and the other anthropologists think that although there is evidence that there was some contact between Hawaii and Tahiti in those years, it had minimal impact on the development of Hawaiian society. In this section I will first provide the basics of the traditionalist view, then examine Cordy's critique.

Cachola-Abad and Cordy both spend many pages discussing the early oral traditions that tell about the second migration, but come to very different conclusions. Cachola-Abad uses much the same information as does Cordy, but includes material from Kalakaua, who is seldom used by anyone. Cachola-Abad concludes that the information from these traditions is valid, highly consistent, and that even the early stories and genealogies should be given the same weight as evidence from a complementary archaeological study (Cachola-Abad 2000: vii, 31, 49). She is not simply indulging in sentimentality, but reasons that alii were so conscious of status and rank dependent on a detailed and accurate knowledge of genealogies that fabrication or even mistake simply

would not have been tolerated (Cachola-Abad 2000: 31-35). Cordy examines the oral traditions, mostly those collected by Fornander, and criticizes the work of later scholars who took his conclusions to what he believes is a very inaccurate end.

There are several points that need to be understood in order to grasp why some believe that a change in alii-makaainana relationships came as a result of external elements brought in by a second migration. The first point is again metaphysical in nature. For Polynesians in general and Hawaiians in particular, everything in the universe is immanent, present right now at this time (Andrade 2009: 22; Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80, 116; Charlot 2005b: 85-87; Kane 1997: 29; Meyer 1998: 32-37; Mitchell 1972: 67). There is no consensus that pre-contact Hawaiians conceived of a separate reality of Platonic ideas, or believed in a creator god who was other than his creation, or possessed a myth of the Fall of Man. Their universe was not structured into separate realms of heaven and earth. As explained previously, harmony and unity existed as a natural attribute of the universe in pono (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; McGregor 2007: 25). One important feature of the immanent universe to the ancient Hawaiian was mana. Although definitions and examples abound, mana can be described as an invisible force flowing from the most senior powers to energize everything in the universe, animate or inanimate (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Charlot 1999: 58). It becomes manifest in humans as outstanding talents, intelligence, leadership ability, or charisma (Kane 1997: 26; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 227, 296). Mana can be accessed and transferred to an individual, place, or activity through ritual (Cachola-Abad 2000: 83-84). But more importantly, a genealogical tie to the most powerful forces, the major gods of the Hawaiian pantheon, who possess a larger share of mana, allows one access to mana

(Kane 1997: 35). The ability to prove this genealogical tie gives the person the inherited capacity for leadership and the authority to make decisions (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Van Dyke 2008: 16).¹³

But to those to whom much was given, much was expected, and with the ability to command came heavy responsibility (Kane 1997: 35). As explained earlier, the Hawaiians of old understood that the chief had a duty to insure that the natural state of universal harmony, pono, was maintained (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Kane 1997: 35; Van Dyke 2008: 16). To insure the flow of mana from more powerful forces into the human realm, he needed to engage in proper personal behavior, correctly perform rituals, and take proper care of those who had been given over to his charge (Cachola-Abad 2000: 142-143; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 48; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 152; Trask 1999: 4-5; Van Dyke 2008: 16; Young 1998: 74-76). For mana to flow uninterrupted into the human realm, it needed to be separated and protected from defiling elements. This separation was kapu (Barrere 1961: 31-34; Cachola-Abad 2000: 81, 111-118; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 36-37; Kane 1997: 26). When kapu was observed, mana could flow unimpeded, harmony prevailed, and in this righteousness the life of the land was perpetuated. When the boundaries maintained by kapu failed, the flow of mana into human society was disrupted, and things began to fly apart. The gods who presided over the various crafts and families did not provide inspiration and guidance, the great gods devastated the land through famine, drought, natural disaster, or war, and peace and

¹³ The above information is not to suggest that anthropologist writers do not recognize or write about the concept of mana. Their views will be more fully presented beginning in Chapter Two).

harmony was replaced with oppression and chaos (Barrere 1961: 31-34; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 48; Kanahale 1992: 43; Kane 1997: 32-34; Trask 1999: 4-5; Young 1998: 80-81).¹⁴

According to tradition, this is what occurred prior to the arrival of the chiefs from the south in the second migratory wave, at least on Hawaii Island. When the chiefs from the first migration intermarried with commoners, the mixing of genealogical elements more properly kept separate disrupted the flow of mana into the human realm, and anarchy was the result (Kalakaua 1990: 20 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 169; Kamakau 1991: 156 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 276; Malo 1951: 53 in Charlot 2005b: 727; Fornander 1880: 33, in Kanahale 1995: 53; Kane 1997: 18; Fornander 1880: 22, Malo 1951: 6-7, Stokes 1928: 41 in Kelly 1956: 39-40; Kamakau 1991: 100 in McGregor 2007: 150-151; Kamakau 1996: 33 in Silva 2004: 18). The alii were in discord, makaainana were being oppressed, and society was in constant commotion (Fornander 1996: 66, Kalakaua 1990: 98, Kamakau 1991: 100 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-277, 300; Malo 1951: 53 in Charlot 2005b: 727; Fornander 1880: 33 in Kanahale 1995: 53). These were the conditions found by the kahuna Paa, who arrived from the south at the beginning of the migratory period in about 1100 CE.¹⁵ For human society to be set right, the pollution that had disrupted the

¹⁴ Just as with mana, anthropologist writers also discuss kapu at length. Their views will again be presented in beginning in Chapter Two.

¹⁵ Dating people and events according to the genealogies from the oral tradition has always been problematic. Approaches using an average number of years per generation have been made. Fornander dated events and people using a thirty-year generation (See Kelly 1989: 94-96; Fornander 1919-1920: 312-316 in McGregor 1997: 324). Others like Cartwright, Cordy, Hommon, and Stokes have used a twenty year per generation count (Cordy 2000: 193, 288, 292; Cordy 2002a: 20-23; Hommon 1976; Kelly 1989: 94-96; Stokes 1933). For purposes of this thesis, when a date is supplied, the source which that date was taken is cited. An example of the variety can be seen with attempts to date Paa. Apple places Paa at around 1200 (Apple 1995: 8). Barrere puts him at 1275 (Barrere 1961: 75). Many stories say that Paa brought the alii Pilikaaiea (Pili) from the south. Many researchers have dated Pili's reign on Hawaii so it is reasonable to assume Paa arrived at about the same time. Fornander also places Pili's reign at 1090 CE, using 30 years per generation (Fornander 1919-1920: 312-316 in McGregor 1997: 324). Kalakaua places his reign about 1090 CE (Kalakaua 1990: 72-73). Kamakau places Pili in the eleventh-century (McGregor 2007: 151). Pili will be discussed more fully below.

flow of mana into a previously harmonious situation had to be separated out. The primary way this had to occur was that the inappropriately close relationship between the alii and makaainana had to be curtailed, and the distance between chief and commoner had to be widened (Beckwith 1976: 370; Kalakaua 1990: 98; Kamakau 1991: 100, Malo 1951: 6, Fornander 1996: 18 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-275; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 296; Van Dyke 2008: 15). This distance was based in genealogy, and this is what Paoa furthered. Just as had occurred in the time of Papa and Wakea and the institution of the aikapu religion and the resulting establishment of social order, Paoa also carried out an agenda of separation to benefit the entire people. Kapu enlarging the distance between alii and makaainana were made stricter (Kalakaua 1990: 98). The personal space of the chiefs with the purest genealogies needed to be protected or mana would be drained from them, so the practice of prostration, the kapu moe, was first introduced (Beckwith 1976: 370; Kalakaua 1990: 124 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 282-283; Kamakau 1992b: 223 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 375; Kane 1997: 32-34; Kelly 1956: 40; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 212). The puloulou, or kapu sticks now marked off boundaries of heiau and alii dwellings to protect those within from commoner defilement (Beckwith 1976: 370; Fornander 1996: 63, Kalakaua 1990: 97-98 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 278-279; Cordy 2000: 148, 160, 165). For those guilty of violating the chiefly kapu, there was an introduction of capital punishment, also referred to by some as human sacrifice as the norm was to execute lawbreakers in heiau dedicated to war (Beckwith 1976: 370; Ii 1983: 35, K. Kamakau 1999: 10, 11, Kamakau 1976: 134, Malo 1996: 245, 250 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 89; Kanahale 1995: 53; McGregor 2007: 150-151).¹⁶ And

¹⁶ Not all agree that it was Paoa who introduced this, but there is almost universal agreement among traditionalists and anthropologists that it was introduced during the migratory period. For more detail see

with the introduction of the walled heiau, the first ones built by Paaō at Wahaula and Mookini commoner participation and even the ability to view ceremonies was now limited (Apple 1994: 18-19; Barrere 1961: 75; Beckwith 1976: 370; Fornander 1996: 37, 100, Kamakau 1991: 100 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-275; Fornander 1996: 36, 59, Kalakaua 1990: 98 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 280-281; Cordy 2000: 148; Fornander 1880: 33 in Kanahēle 1995: 53; Kane 1997: 18; Kamakau 1993, 100 in McGregor 2007: 150-151; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 212). To many traditionalists, this greater distance between the people and the chiefs would have done much to bring order to the chaos found in human society at that time.

The movement toward a more structured society through separation continued with the institution of the council of chiefs, or aha alii. In the early part of the migratory period, Paumakua arrived, perhaps about 1090 CE (Kalakaua 1990: 71-72 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 275). He settled his family first on Maui, and a generation later his son Haho established the aha alii there (Kalakaua 1990: 71-72 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 275).¹⁷ It was then quickly adopted across the archipelago (Fornander 1996: 28, Kalakaua 1990: 84, Kamakau 1991: 156 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 159). The histories give conflicting reasons for the founding of the aha alii. One explanation is that the native chiefs wanted to differentiate themselves from foreigners who had been arriving from the south (Fornander 1996: 30 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 275). Another explanation posits that the foreigners wanted to protect their status from the Hawaiian alii that had debased their

Cachola-Abad 2000: 279; Cordy 2000: 146-182; Kirch 2010: 84.

¹⁷ This Paumakua is to be distinguished from the head of the Paumakua family who arrived on Oahu at about the same time, see Kalakaua 1990: 71-72. Beckwith writes that Haho was Paumakua's grandson, see Beckwith 1976: 378. Also see Kalakaua 1990: 72, 84; Fornander 1996: 28, 78; Kamakau 1991: 156 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 159, 275; Cordy 2000: 160.

bloodlines by intermarrying with commoners (Kalakaua 1990: 84, Kamakau 1991: 156 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 275-276).

Whatever the reason for its founding, the aha alii, like the changes Paa'o introduced, was based on genealogy. It was a venue in which alii would establish their identity through pedigree and therefore assure that only those of pure bloodlines who could trace their ancestry back to the gods would be recognized as alii (Fornander 1996: 30; Kalakaua 1990: 84 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 160). The applicant was required to recite his genealogy back to an ancestor of unquestioned nobility; those who could not were classed as makaainana (Kalakaua 1990: 23, Malo 1996: 262 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 160). On acceptance into the chiefly council, a determination of the gradations of rank and kapu to which alii were entitled would be made (Kalakaua 1990: 84-85 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 160). They could then be adorned with the appropriate rank insignia (Beckwith 1976: 378; Fornander 1996: 29 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 160; Kalakaua 1990: 85). They would also be able to learn a metaphorical form of speech that was not understood by the common people (Beckwith 1976: 378; Kalakaua 1990: 85 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 160). These practices, like the changes brought by Paa'o, would further the difference between the alii and makaainana which had become blurred in the generations prior (Fornander 1996: 30; Kamakau 1991: 156). But again, as before, this purification of polluting elements to be accomplished by separating alii from makaainana would go far in reestablishing the flow of mana into human society which would then yield an orderly and therefore thriving society, in which all would prosper.

The marriage practices of these chiefs increased their distance from the commoners as well. Given the general genealogical context from which the

establishment of the aha alii proceeded, that stronger mana flowed from higher lineage, it is understandable that alii would want to assure the perpetuation and increased rank of his family by producing offspring with an equal or higher ranking mate (Cachola-Abad 2000: 286). Examples abound during these times of migration that show the mixing of the bloodlines of the older chiefs with the bloodlines of the new arrivals (Cachola-Abad 2000: 286-288). The grandson of Pili, Kanipahu of Hawaii Island, took Hualani descendent of Maweke of the older bloodline (Kalakaua 1990: 97 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 514). Another chief, Moikeha, took two wives, Hinaaulua and Hooipoikamalanai of the Puna family that had recently arrived on Kauai (Fornander 1996: Appendix IX, Kamakau 1991: 77, 106, Kamakau 1992b: 449; in Cachola-Abad 2000: 287). In contrast, there is a noticeable lack of stories in which chiefs married into commoner families, as the traditions relate as having occurred in previous years.

Another example of a practice that shows more distance in the relationship between chiefs and commoners is a division of labor, and there are specific examples of alii managing the labor of makaainana. One story records that in the building of Mookini heiau, stones were passed hand to hand from a site nine miles away, a task that would have taken an estimated 15,000 men standing three feet apart (Fornander 1996: 36 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 281). Another story, again from Hawaii Island, has to do with events seven generations after Paa and Pili but still falling within the migratory period (Fornander 1996: 95 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 290). Kila, son of Laamaikahiki of the line of Paumakua of Oahu, is noted for being industrious alii that cultivated Waipio Valley in Hamakua, Hawaii Island. He did this by requiring the commoners to farm, and by instituting the practice of labor days, in which makaainana would give services to the

landlords for a number of days a month for farming projects (Fornander 1999 IV: 134-136 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 191). This difference in roles, a differentiation between managers and workers, is evidence of an increased difference between chiefs and commoners. These practices would become established as the norm in later Hawaiian society.

From this evidence, it is clear that there was a definite movement towards separation in the alii-makaainana relationship in the migratory era. And to many traditionalists, as detailed above, the goal of separation was not to enhance alii power at the expense of makaainana, but it was to help bring about an orderly and harmonious society; separation was only the tool that would allow mana to flow again into the human realm. The power wielded to establish the separation was therefore not to benefit one group. When the flow of mana was re-established, peace and prosperity would reign, benefitting not only some, but all. This point cannot be overemphasized.

Not only did order through separation based on genealogy come as a result of the migrations, but it was imposed during this time by curtailing oppression. Again, Paa is a key player. He found Hawaii without a sovereign chief. Although accounts vary in detail, all agree that Paa brought a ruler of unquestioned heritage, Pili to rule as high chief, or alii nui (Apple 1995: 8; Barrere 1961: 75; Fornander 1996: 18, Kalakaua 1990: 98, Kamakau 1991: 99, Malo 1951: 6 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-274; Fornander 1880: 33 in Kanahale 1995: 53; Kane 1997: 18; Malo 1951: 6 in Kelly 1956: 39-40; Maly 1999b: 10-11; Kamakau 1996: 33 in Silva 2004: 18). But Pili did not simply dictate order by force of arms; he is not described as a conqueror (Kamakau 1991: 99 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-275). Rather, he achieved rule of Hawaii Island because he

gained the support of the makaainana. Although the information from the oral traditions is sparse, Kalakaua does state that Pili by releasing makaainana from the burdens that they had borne under the older line of chiefs, assured himself of a successful rule (Kalakaua 1990: 98 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 273-275). Therefore, the theme inherited from the days of Papa and Wakea, that social order yields social harmony, was not only reinforced but something else was added, that social order also depended on a strong leader who would insure that all were treated properly.

Other information from the oral traditions supports this interpretation. Malo writes that kings were set up to not only to settle difficulties, but to lift burdens, help the oppressed who appealed for help, succor those who did right and punish those who did wrong (Malo 1951: 53 in Charlot 2005b: 727). While Malo does not name the first king who did this, another tradition points to Pili (Kalakaua 1990: 98 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 300). Further, in the new institution of the aha alii the one who possessed the most impeccable pedigree was titled alii nui or moi (Fornander 1996: 64, Kalakaua 1990: 97 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 276-277). It was to this one person, not before seen in Hawaii that all other alii had to prove themselves through recitation of their own bloodlines (Fornander 1996: 64, Kalakaua 1990: 127 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 276-277). There was then some kind of authority that the moi possessed over other alii beginning at this time. He was first among equals who was owed at least a nominal if not real allegiance by other chiefs of that island.¹⁸ To be sure, this practice became dominant later and was only initiated at this time (Fornander 1996: 64 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 270). Alii nui did not yet possess the power to control large territories of each island; each chief during this

¹⁸ Fornander uses the term *primus inter pares*, “first among equals,” in Fornander 1996: 64 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 270.

time was supreme lord over the territory he possessed (Fornander 1996: 64, Kalakaua 1990: 77 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 270). But this new development shows that while the close relationship between alii and makaainana was lessened, the bond between the two groups was strengthened in that the alii in general, with the authority and in the particular person of the alii nui were now conscious of the duty to see to the well being of the makaainana by protecting them from oppression and exploitation. This furthered the tradition seen in APS in which the ariki also had the same duty. This must be taken into account in determining the character of the changes said to have occurred during those times, and which would set the pattern seen in later times in which the highest alii inherited a duty to protect the lowly.

In contrast, others like Goldman and Kirch, while accepting that there is historical validity to the traditions of the migratory period, disagree with the idea that societal change could have occurred as the result of a second migration. Goldman holds that Tahitian influences introduced in the early years of this epoch, called the migratory period, introduced a new stimulus but not a new direction (Goldman 1970: 211). He finds evidence for foreign invasions is not in the oral traditions themselves, but that Fornander had shrewdly deduced that foreign invasions had upset the relative calm of the earlier period (Goldman 1970: 205). Kirch wrote that the voyaging traditions were probably rooted in historical events, and cites linguistic and archaeological data as evidence for contact during these years (Kirch 1985: 65, 259, 304; Kirch 2000: 238, 291). He also accepts the validity of the oral traditions describing the migratory period. He writes, "Recently, the weight of scholarly opinion has shifted toward the recognition of the likely historical validity of the traditions (of the Migratory Period)... the traditions

recount the introduction of the temple drum (pahu), human sacrifice, and related temple ritual by Paoa and Laamaikahiki, and breadfruit by Kauai-i-Hookamalii” (Kirch 2010: 87-88). Kirch also seems to accept the idea that cultural change could possibly come with migrations. He writes that “...both isolation and interaction are fundamental concepts for the interpretation and understanding of cultural change in Oceania”, but the context in which he makes this statement seems quite general (Kirch 2000: 41). He gets much more specific in his work of 2010 when he states,

...the events they recount (the traditions about the migratory period) precede the period in which Hawaiian chiefship and society were radically transformed.... the indigenous accounts credit all later changes in Hawaiian culture as stemming from the actions of Hawaiian alii themselves. In other words, after approximately AD 1400 the further evolution of Hawaiian society, economy, politics, and religion was a strictly endogenous affair. One can thus rule out external contact, influence, trade, or exchange, as causative factors in Hawaiian cultural change after the end of the fourteenth century. (Kirch 2010: 88).

The implication is clear, and is consistent with statements from earlier works: Kirch favors not migrations but internal developments as the source for societal change. This will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

Hommon and Cordy take another view. Hommon writes of the migratory period in which voyages between Hawaii and Polynesia were relatively frequent (Hommon 1976: 125). But he does not address the possibility of cultural change coming from the Tahitian migrations as recorded by Fornander. He states that, “Whatever the nature of the ‘migratory period,’ the genealogical, historical, and cultural information found in the oral traditions is insufficient for this present study” (Hommon 1976: 125). Cordy is different still. The primary piece at the heart of Cordy’s position is the unreliability of those particular oral traditions as a historical resource of those times, even more when

they are interpreted erroneously (Cordy 2000: 139-181). Cordy begins by tracing how the Tahitian migration theory entered popular consciousness. He states that Fornander was the person who started this, and reconstructs his research and reasoning. Cordy explains in some detail that Fornander had gathered a vast amount of information from the oral traditions. From these he gleaned that there were two periods in Hawaii's history separated by the traditions describing voyaging. Although there existed only sparse information about the earlier period, he felt that the society was a simple patriarchy with open worship up to about 1000 CE (Fornander 1919 VI: 251-252 in Cordy 2000: 147). The second period described in these traditions, from about 1200 CE to the time of western contact, was characterized by island-sized polities under powerful rulers, strict kapu, restricted worship in state heiau, human sacrifice, and social stratification separating chiefs and commoners (Cordy 2000: 147; Goldman 1970: 205). These two very different times were separated by a period of voyaging. Using the genealogies and a figure of thirty years per generation, Fornander concluded that the voyages took place between 1000-1200 CE, began with Maweke of Oahu and Paumakua of Maui and ended with Paa'o and Pili of Hawaii Island and Laamaikahiki of Oahu (Cordy 2000: 143-144). Correlating all the information, and following the established theory at that time that societal change resulted from migrations, Fornander concluded that the complex society must have been established by outside immigrants who arrived during the voyaging period (Cordy 2000: 147).

Cordy continues by asserting that retellings and further research contributed to the popular version of migrants from Tahiti deeply impacting Hawaiian society. Prior to 1920, Nathaniel Emerson and William Westervelt retold some of these stories but also

embellished them with additions not found in the original sources. An example of this embellishment was that Paa'o had brought the god Kukailimoku (Emerson 1893: 5-12, Westervelt 1913: 57 in Cordy 2000: 161). In the 1920s, John F. G. Stokes wrote that Paa'o had introduced the puloulou, prostrating kapu, the walled enclosure heiau, human sacrifice, and Kukailimoku (Stokes 1921: 75-85, Stokes 1925: 24-35, Stokes 1928: 41 in Cordy 2000: 161). In the 1930s and 1940s, Cordy writes that scholars like Beckwith, Peter Buck (Hiroa), and E. S. C. Handy further consolidated the migration theory. They concluded that a chiefly wave of migrants had come out of the Society Islands and had brought their superior culture to the simpler societies already established in Hawaii and had forced those inhabitants from power (Beckwith 1940: 370, P. Buck 1938: 255, Handy 1930: 6 in Cordy 2000: 166-167). In the 1950s and 60s, further evidence was added. Samuel Elbert provided information from linguistics to the growing body of evidence that showed a dispersal coming from the Society Islands to Hawaii occurred around 1000 (Elbert 1953: 165-166 in Cordy 2000: 168). Archaeologists Kenneth Emory and Yoshiko Sinoto found a change in Hawaiian fishhook styles that dated to the years between 1200 and 1500 CE that matched styles found in Tahiti from approximately the same period (Emory and Sinoto 1964: 159 in Cordy 2000: 167).

Many other well-known researchers not mentioned by Cordy have written about contact with Tahiti in this era. Russ Apple and Dorothy Barrere both wrote of the Paa'o-Pili migrations (Apple 1994: 18-26; Apple 1995: 8; Barrere 1961: 75). George Kanahale and Herb Kane especially wrote about the migratory period in which Paa'o, finding a society in chaos, responded by installing Pili as King (Kanahale 1995: 53; Kane 1997: 18). And Rubellite Kawena Johnson, Kepa Maly, Davianna McGregor and Mary

Kawena Pukui all have mentioned Pao in works they have authored or co-authored (Handy and Handy 1972: 77-78, 484; Johnson 2001: 261; Maly 1999b: 10-11; McGregor 2007: 25; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 296-297; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 215). Furthermore, many Hawaiians today believe in the second migration scenario.¹⁹

In this chapter I have explored some of the background to the study of Polynesia. I have shown that there are varied opinions, not just between anthropologists and traditionalists but within those groups as well, regarding Hawaiian societal structure prior to the migratory period, and how much societal change came as a result of those migrations. A dichotomy can be drawn here between the two groups. It is clear that some traditionalists think that migrations from Tahiti greatly influenced the development of Hawaiian society, and like Cordy says, this view has become well established. But it is also clear that Cordy and the other anthropologists believe that societal change came not from the migrations but from internal developments. This is the topic of the next chapter.

¹⁹ This is another example of information from the cultural repository discussed earlier.

2. Anthropologist views: Internal developments culminate in the ahupuaa system.

In this chapter, I will detail the views of several prominent anthropologists as they discuss internal developments and the evolution of ancient Hawaiian society up to 1778. It is important to include this information in this particular context so the reader can get a feel for their reasoning in and ‘flavor’ of anthropologists’ narratives. For them, it is internal developments and not change coming from migrants that was the primary cause for large-scale and dramatic societal evolution in ancient Hawaii. As will become abundantly clear, they see this transformation as a negative for the people of Hawaii. Kirch perhaps sums it up best when he states, “ By the time of European contact, Hawaiian society had undergone two fundamental departures from Ancestral Polynesian Society.... Both of these changes can be couched in negative terms from the viewpoint of the common people: they lost their genealogies, and they lost direct control of their land” (Kirch 1984: 257). Commoners then had to provide more food and labor to support the chiefs, and if they did not bend to the chiefs’ will, would face harsh consequences. Although there is some variation of opinion among the anthropologists, there is much more similarity. For them, the result of this societal rupture was exploitation and extraction of commoners by chiefs, and this is the dynamic that the anthropologists see governing the evolution of Hawaiian society.

Cordy

When Ross Cordy completed his history of Hawaii Island *Exalted Sits the Chief* in 1991, there were no overview histories of individual islands written by professional historians for general readers.²⁰ Trained as an archaeologist and a veteran of many digs throughout the Hawaiian Islands, Cordy gives several reasons why a focus on individual islands, as opposed to the archipelago-wide accounts, is needed. An island view avoids many of the over generalizations common in archipelago studies (Cordy 2002a: 45). One example is with reconstructions of population. Cordy maintains that between 1000-1300 CE on Oahu, population increased in windward areas, and there was a large movement of people into the lower valleys of the leeward side (Cordy 2002a: 46). Then another jump in population island wide occurred between 1400-500 CE (Cordy 2002a: 46). These points suggest rapid and differential population booms rather than a gradually increasing populace with a single large jump in 1400 to 1600 CE as is commonly found in archipelago wide studies (Cordy 2002a: 46-47). Further, there are signs of increasing habitation and agricultural expansion right up western contact. This is not the case for models taking in the whole archipelago. These studies show a leveling off, or in some cases a population decline after 1600 CE (Cordy 2002a: 47).

Cordy believes that a focus on individual islands allows a more in-depth look at environmental variations, subsistence development, population changes, political and social organization, and the interrelations between them (Cordy 2002a: 45). He explains that Oahu is a wet island with perennial streams even on leeward sides. Settlement and agriculture on Oahu generally took place in the coastal plains and lower valleys with only

²⁰ Cordy essentially completed this study in 1991. See Cordy 2000: vii.

limited development of inland agriculture. This contrasts with the drier islands of Maui and Hawaii Island where streams were generally lacking and where primary agricultural development was inland, and where elevations would insure enough rainfall for reliable dry land cultivation. Therefore the idea of inland expansion being a major factor in the establishment of self-sufficient communities and changes within those communities, as in the development of the ahupuaa system, is less applicable on Oahu (Cordy 2002a: 46-47). However, as I will show, Cordy does bring in information from other islands, calls attention to sometimes striking similarities between development on different islands, and makes generalizations about developments that he sees as applicable across the archipelago.

Cordy writes that although there was some contact with Tahiti in the migratory period, he believes the main changes in Hawaiian society were caused by internal factors stemming from population growth and resulting political changes. He pulls from several archaeological studies as he writes that population was growing and moving on Oahu and Hawaii Island between 900-1300 CE (Cordy 2000: 130-136, 140; Cordy 2002a: 17-20). In windward areas like Kailua and Kaneohe on Oahu, more complex irrigation systems were being built in lowland areas, and there was a marked spread of dry land farms, irrigated terraces, and permanent habitations further up into valley heights (Cordy 2002a: 17-20). During these centuries, people were also moving to the leeward sides to live (Cordy 2002a: 17-20). Taro pond fields were being established in low lying places around the Pearl River basin on Oahu, and pollen studies show that coastal forests in some places were in rapid decline, probably indicating clearing for farming (Cordy 2002a: 17-20). On Hawaii Island, radiocarbon dating of remains from coastal house

platforms and middens support the conclusion that in most leeward areas, permanent housing was being established near the coast, probably to exploit abundant ocean resources (Cordy 2000: 130-136). On both islands, Hawaiians were also moving into leeward upland areas as well (Cordy 2000: 140; Cordy 2002a: 17-20). On Oahu, permanent homes, burial sites, and farms were becoming established in wetter upland areas like Halawa and Manoa Valleys (Cordy 2002a: 17-20). On Hawaii Island from Waiohinu to Punaluu in Kau, in the Lapakahi area of Kohala, and in areas near Kealakekua, upland fields of sweet potato and hardier varieties of taro were constructed to take advantage of rainfall of at least 40 inches per year (Cordy 2000: 130-140). By 1300 CE, much of Oahu and most of the leeward coast of Hawaii Island was inhabited (Cordy 2000: 140; Cordy 2002a: 17-20;).

Cordy believes that the oral traditions indicate that political centralization had begun by about 1300 CE (Cordy 2000: 141; Cordy 2002a: 20-23). Applying an estimate of twenty year per generation to the genealogies, the sons of Maweke, Mulielealii, Keaunui, and Kalehenui were in control of all the districts of Oahu except Koolauloa from 1320-1340 CE (Cordy 2002a: 20-23). On Hawaii Island, it seems that two competing polities in the district of North Kohala were combined under Hikapoloa in the mid to late 1200s, and that Hamakua was united under a series of leaders out of Waipio (Fornander 1880: 21, 49, Fornander 1919-1920: 286, Malo 1951: 5 in Cordy 2000: 141; Cordy 2002a: 20-23). Cordy feels that the oral traditions for both islands indicate a ruler, lesser chiefs, and commoners, but states that at least for Oahu, the polity was still based in kinship (Cordy 2000: 142; Cordy 2002a: 20-23). Following the ancestral Polynesian pattern, the district ruler would still be the senior man from the senior lineage, and those

in charge of the lands which comprised the district would be relatives but on junior lines (Earle 1978: 168-70; Green 1980: 72-75 in Cordy 2002a: 20-23). This conical clan organization would still be in control of land use on which they lived (Hommon 1986 in Cordy 2002a: 20-23). But there are some indications that some type of separation between the leaders and their followers was occurring on Hawaii Island at this time. Kila, one of the rulers of Waipio, first established the koele tax, in which commoners were required to work in the ruler's taro fields during certain days (Fornander 1916: 134-136 in Cordy 2000: 142). Looking at similar patterns in Polynesia at western contact, and on estimates from the Kau District on Hawaii Island in the 1800s, Cordy extrapolates that district-sized or larger polities held between 1000-3000 people (Hommon 1976: 234 in Cordy 2002a: 20-23).

From about 1300-1500 CE on both islands, coastal settlements expanded, the number and size of inland fields increased, fishponds were beginning to be constructed, and there was more permanent habitation on leeward sides (Cordy 2000: 21, 216, 217; Cordy 2002a: 28; Cordy 2002b: 29). In windward areas, taro pond fields expanded in area and complexity, and Cordy directly ties this increased agricultural output due to population growth (Cordy 2000: 217; Cordy 2002a: 29; Cordy 2002b: 29). The 1400s saw wholesale changes on Oahu. Oral traditions show that the unification of Oahu into one polity under Maweke's descendent Laakona (Lakona) occurred between 1420-1440 CE (Fornander 1880: 88 in Cordy 2002a: 24; Cordy 2002b: 26). With island unification, there would have been at least three levels of chiefs, the paramount, the district chiefs, and the local chiefs placed over ahupuaa (Cordy 2002a: 25). Cordy concludes that social stratification became more pronounced as each strata of chief would have been set off

from the others and from the commoners (Cordy 2002b: 27). He believes that the paramount appointed his junior kinsmen over the districts and ahupuaa (Cordy 2002a: 25). However, these outside chiefs replaced as leaders any chiefs that had arisen from within the kin groups, and this led to the breakdown of the corporate control over lands that they had once enjoyed (Cordy 2002a: 25). As a result, kinship ties between commoners and their leaders began to break down as those who had risen to authority from within the family were replaced by outsiders (Cordy 2002a: 25). The lower level chiefs were appointed to provision their higher ups with food, status items, weapons, and other things drawn from lands and labor over which they had been given charge (Cordy 2002a: 25). These changes resulted in a land holding and political order called the ahupuaa system that Cordy believes was established in 1400-1500 CE (Green 1980: 75 in Cordy 2002a: 25). Cordy uses other evidence to show increased distance between chiefs and commoners. Several small heiau on Oahu have been dated to the years between 1400-1600 CE (Cordy 2002a: 26-28; Cordy 2002b: 28). Coastal fishponds, another type of large public works project, were initially constructed under the sponsorship of the ruler or high chiefs in the 1400s (Cordy 2002a: 28; Cordy 2002b: 29). Both types of public works projects would have relied on the labor of the commoners under the management of the chiefs.

As previously mentioned, the priest Paa'o brought Pili from the South Pacific and set him up as ruler over the polity on Hawaii Island in Kohala, based in Waipio Valley, between 1300-1400 CE (Cordy 2000: 144-186). For Cordy, the main story politically in the years following is that Pili's descendents consolidated their power until that line finally produced Liloa, who became paramount chief of Hawaii Island ruling from

Waipio Valley from 1580-1600 CE (Fornander 1917: 19, Kamakau 1961: 1, Malo 1951: 258 in Cordy 2000: 186-195). It is fair to conclude that with Liloa, according to the oral traditions, there were at least three levels of chiefs: Liloa the paramount or alii nui the district chiefs, sometimes called alii ai moku, and the ahupuaa chiefs, sometimes called alii ai ahupuaa. Cordy asserts that of the district chiefs known in Liloa's reign, none were Liloa's children (Cordy 2000: 192). The same process that was occurring on Oahu in these years may also have been happening on Hawaii Island - the district and ahupuaa chiefs that the paramount was appointing over commoners were not of commoner families, and the old kinship structure began to break down.

Cordy writes that Liloa consolidated his power in several ways. He frequently moved around his Hawaii Island kingdom to check on the status of chiefs and people (Cordy 2000: 193). He used the religious system as a support base by rededicating many heiau in his reign, and observed the religious cycles of the gods Ku and Lono, which Cook found in practice 200 years later (Cordy 2000: 193). Liloa married chiefesses of high-ranking families from Maui and Oahu to form alliances that extended his power base to other islands (Cordy 2000: 194). During this time marriages between Oahu, Maui, and Kauai alii were becoming increasingly common. These further isolated the highest chiefs and rulers from the commoners (Fornander 1880: 84-91, Kamakau 1991: 46-50 in Cordy 2002a: 26). Liloa had his residence at the royal center in Waipio Valley, which included the luakini heiau Pakaalana, and houses for his court retinue, taro patches and fishponds (Cordy 2000: 197-203). The concentration of power in a central location would be seen many times in the following years.

From 1600-1700 CE, trends that had been established in earlier times continued to be solidified. Archaeological work on both islands show that population continued to grow, dry field and irrigated agriculture continued to expand, and more houses were built further away from the coast (Cordy 2000: 248-258, 308-313; Cordy 2002a: 35-37; Cordy 2002b: 31). These years also saw the crystallization of the sharp division between the bulk of the population and the elite. Intermarriage between the nobility of all islands was common, but commoner marriages took place largely within the populace of the ahupuaa (Fornander 1880, Kamakau 1961: 1991 in Cordy 2002a: 33; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 206-207 in Cordy 2002a: 36). Rulers traveled periodically around the islands and often dedicated heiau during their periodic tours, while commoners as a rule did not move around (Cordy 2002a: 34; Cordy 2002b: 36). But more importantly, it became clear that societal power rested in the hands of the alii although they made up only five percent of the total population (Cordy 2000: 51, 55).

At the top of society was the paramount, sometimes referred to as moi, separate and apart from all others as a special being. He played the pivotal role in national religious ceremonies (Cordy 2000: 55). Only the paramount could initiate construction of the large luakini national temples (Malo 1951: 150 in Cordy 2000: 56). Only he could wear capes made solely of rare yellow feathers from honeycreepers (Kaeppler 1985: Malo 1951: 77 in Cordy 2000: 57). He did not usually engage in subsistence work, but his food came from the special koele plots situated in various ahupuaa which were worked by the commoners, and from the annual makahiki tax collection (Malo 1951: 195 in Cordy 2000: 57). His meat had to be specially prepared in a major heiau (Malo 1951: 189 in Cordy 2000: 57). The ruler was afforded special respect behavior: there were bans

on casting a shadow on his back, house or belongings, on using his clothes and possessions, and on entering his residential compound without permission (Cordy 2000: 56). Failure to sit or prostrate when the ruler passed was dangerous, and sitting was required even when his food, water, or clothing passed by (Campbell 1967: 94, Ii 1959: 28, Menzies 1920: 91 in Cordy 2000: 56). Even high chiefs had to stand in silence until invited to sit or speak (Ellis 1963: 30 in Cordy 2000: 56). Violations, at least by lower ranked chiefs and commoners were punishable by death (Ii 1959: 23, Malo 1951: 56 in Cordy 2000: 56).

On succession of a new paramount to the throne, the hale naua ritual would identify those individuals who could prove a genealogical tie to the paramount within ten generations (Cordy 2000: 57).²¹ These would become the bulk of the kingdom's chiefs; those who could not would be the commoners (Cordy 2000: 50). The highest chiefs, who Cordy refers to as alii nui could acquire power and social rank by genealogy or special skills (Cordy 2000: 57). They were frequently close relatives of the paramount, were also given special respect behavior, and did not engage in subsistence activities (Malo 1951: 152, 192 in Cordy 2000: 57). Many of them would reside at the well-equipped royal centers, following the pattern seen in Liloa's Waipio Valley residence on Hawaii Island. Keauhou was the primary residence of Lonoikamakahiki the chiefly center at Honaunau before and after the reign of Keawe, and the Mookini and Kokoiki area during the time of Alapainui are good examples of sacred and secular power being concentrated at a core

²¹ Malo details an account of the hale naua ritual. He writes that a hale (Hawaiian for house) was built for the new king in which an investigation into what persons were related to him was carried out. The king would be seated amidst a large gathering which included many skilled genealogists. A questioning session would then ensue in which the applicant would be required to give his pedigree to the tenth generation. If the genealogists recognized a suitable relationship, the applicant would be admitted to the house, and take his place as a chief (Malo 1951: 191-192).

location, again on Hawaii Island (Cordy 2000: 236-239, 261-277, 283-285). Although many chiefs resided with the paramount, they also had their own residences, and there would be subject to periodic visits by their superior. Umi (r. 1600-1620 CE), Liloa's son continued his father's practice of touring his domain to check on conditions away from his central residence (Cordy 2000: 186-195, 211).²² Paramount chiefs like Alapai (r. 1740-1760 CE) and Kalaniopuu (r. 1760-1782 CE) also toured Hawaii Island frequently, seeing to the nation's affairs (Cordy 2000: 193, 288, 292).

The new ruler would redistribute districts and ahupuaa to major chiefs (Ellis 1963: 302 in Cordy 2000: 55). Although often residing with the paramount, they also possessed residences in the lands that had been assigned to them (Cordy 2000: 57). Beneath these high chiefs were lesser chiefs. Sometimes these junior relatives of the ruler or high chiefs would be assigned one or two ahupuaa. But highly skilled warriors and commoners of great skill could be elevated to chiefly rank (Cordy 2000: 50, 55, 58). Some of these lesser chiefs became on-site managers for the alii who had been assigned the ahupuaa, and were called konohiki or haku aina of that particular ahupuaa (Ellis 1963: 301 in Cordy 2000: 58). It was these chiefs who had direct control of the resources of the ahupuaa, in contrast to the earlier system in which the family elder was leader (Cordy 2000: 33).

In each ahupuaa, farm plots were claimed and used by individual households (Cordy 2000: 37). A household would hold a number of plots in different agricultural zones within an ahupuaa, thereby having access to different types of crops and other resources for subsistence (Cordy 2000: 37-38). Near shore marine resources were

²² This particular King of Hawaii will be referred to several times. Umi a Liloa in Hawaiian means "Umi of Liloa," or "Umi son of Liloa." Many refer to Umi a Liloa as Umi. Because of the various dating schemes, the dates of his reign also vary. When a date is supplied, it is taken from the source cited.

accessible to all residents of an ahupuaa within the fishery assigned to that ahupuaa, which extended at least a short distance offshore (Campbell 1967: 142 in Cordy 2000: 39). Areas beyond the reef seemed to be usually accessible to all, but chiefs could restrict community access to fisheries by placing certain fish under kapu (Cordy 2000: 39). Some items were restricted for use only by the king, like whale bone used for pendants, the lei niho palaoa, and large trees which had washed ashore to be used for the double hulled canoes (Malo 1951: 47, 189; Buck 1957: 5 in Cordy 2000: 39). Use rights to agricultural and house lots were inherited, but had to be reaffirmed by the agent of the chief of that ahupuaa, the konohiki (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 192-208 in Cordy 2000: 38). However, superior rights to these land parcels were held by the overlord chief, and the chief gave the right of use to the household head (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 204-205 in Cordy 2000: 52). These rights could be removed if households failed to meet tax, service or behavioral expectations of the chiefs. Before removal, threats were made, and sometimes dwellings were burnt (Ii 1959: 29, Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 71, 87 in Cordy 2000: 53). In this system the paramount ultimately controlled all land, quite different from the earlier land tenure system (Valeri 1985: 154 in Cordy 2000).

Not only was the bulk of the population dependent on a small elite for use and access rights for subsistence purposes, but the 1600-1700s saw an increase of alii control over their labor and the fruits of their labor as well (Cordy 2000: 248). Cordy ties the expansion of the Kona field system not only to meet increasing population growth, but to provide sustenance to the alii living at the new chiefly centers along the coast centered from Kailua Kona to Kealahou to Honaunau (Cordy 2000: 248). New fishponds were built and had to be maintained, but the produce of these was much more restricted for

chiefly use than open ocean fishing (Cordy 2000: 40, 54, 316). Cordy thinks that forest exploitation of bird feathers for the elaborate chiefly cloaks, and tree felling for canoes used in the armed expeditions of the chiefs increased during these years, but these products were only gathered by the commoners, and their use was under the control of the chiefs (Cordy 2000: 41). Other public works projects were undertaken as many heiau were expanded (Cordy 2000: 54, 316-317). Kaneaki in Makaha was rebuilt to over 1000 square meters, and Kawaewae in Kaneohe encompassed over 2800 square meters, and Popoiwi heiau on Maui increased to 4727 square meters, all with makaainana labor (Cordy 2002a: 26, 34; Cordy 2002b: 36). Every few days, labor was required in the fields of the local and overlord chief, the koele plots, and these requirements were increased if the district chief or paramount were in residence nearby (Cordy 2000: 54).

Commoners were also obliged to present produce during the annual makahiki season. Between October and January, the national heiau was dismantled and shut down, the image of Ku was removed, pork was not eaten, and there was no warfare or human sacrifice (Malo 1951: 142, 143, Valeri 1985: 200-213 in Cordy 2000: 61). Tribute from each ahupuaa was gathered in the second month of makahiki brought to the king, and dedicated and redistributed by him to the god Lono carried in procession, the celebrants, and the court (Malo 1951: 143-144 in Cordy 2000: 161). Tribute included feathers, kapa, hard poi, pigs, dogs, and chickens, and other foodstuffs (Cordy 2000: 54, 61). In January the god in procession was returned to the ruling center and ceremonies would begin to resanctify the national heiau to Ku (Cordy 2000: 62). Numerous offerings, including human sacrifice, would accompany the return of Ku to prominence (Cordy 2000: 62). Within the luakini, rituals were conducted for success in warfare and agriculture.

Participants were the ruler, chiefs and commoner aides, and priests. The general commoner populace and women did not participate (Sahlins 1981, 52-53 in Cordy 2000: 62). If signs were favorable for war, messengers were sent to the chiefs placed over the ahupuaa who would gather an army from among the commoners to be placed under the chief's leadership (Ellis 1963: 99 in Cordy 2000: 63). Once the army was gathered, human and other sacrifices were offered to the war god at the luakini heiau (Cordy 2000: 63).

Although there was much volcanic activity especially in the Puna District on Hawaii Island in the 1600 to 1700s, life was disrupted to an even greater extent across the entire chain by the increase in warfare as the struggle for power among the chiefs intensified (Cordy 2000: 317). The oral traditions show a pattern of single island rulers alternating with periods of two or more competing and independent factions as political centralization was attempted time and again through warfare and marriage. On Hawaii Island, Liloa's son Umi became paramount of the island in about 1600 (Cordy 2000: 205-211). Umi's son Keawenui (Keawenui a Umi) secured the throne of the island only after war, and the same occurred with his son Lonoikamakahiki in about 1660 (Cordy 2000: 221-222, 225-229).²³ In 1720 Oahu was reunited once again under Kualii after he defeated all rivals (Fornander 1880: 278-281 in Cordy 2002b: 34). Marriages between rival chiefly families occurred periodically as well. In 1640, Kakuhihewa (Kakuhihewa) united Oahu under his rule through marriage (Fornander 1880: 272-273 in Cordy 2002a: 31; Cordy 2002b: 33). Keawenui a Umi married high ranking chiefesses and cemented ties at least for a time with other powerful chiefly families (Cordy 2000: 222). The Kona chiefess Keakealaniwahine's son Keawe married a granddaughter of the I family of Hilo

²³ Just as with Umi a Liloa, Keawenui a Umi means "Keawenui of Umi" or "Keawenui son of Umi."

in about 1720, sealing a breach and stopping a war between the two chiefly families (Cordy 2000: 243).

But the desire for power did not stop only at island borders during these years. Several attempts were made to expand to other islands through warfare and marriage. Maui forces under Kamalalawalu landed on Hawaii Island during Lonoikamakahiki's reign (Cordy 2000: 279). Kualii of Oahu fought with the Koolau District on Molokai and raided Hilo (Fornander 1880: 277, 281-282, 288, 293 in Cordy 2002a: 32; Cordy 2002b: 34). Kualii's son Peleioholani became sole ruler of Oahu and conquered Molokai at the height of Oahu's power (Fornander 1880: 289 in Cordy 2002a: 32-33; Cordy 2002b: 35). Kekaulike of Maui landed a force in Kona, burned villages, cut down coconut trees, and plundered and killed (Fornander 1880: 133 in Cordy 2000: 283). But as in intra-island politics, wars were sometimes avoided, at least for a time, through marriage. Keawenui a Umi married chiefesses from Maui and Oahu (Cordy 2000: 222). Alapainui's half sister Kekuiapoiwanui married Maui's Kekaulike between 1740 and 1760 (Cordy 2000: 279). Centralization of power was therefore taken to a new level with the extension of sovereignty to parts of other islands, to culminate in the ascendancy of Kamehameha over the entire archipelago by the first years of the nineteenth century. Over the years then, not only did commoners have to do more work to meet the subsistence needs of the chiefs, but had to participate in the chiefs' wars to gratify their need for political domination. For Cordy then, societal power indeed became concentrated in the hands of the chiefs.

Earle

In discussing widespread social change, Timothy Earle also begins with population movement to the drier areas and the expansion and intensification of agriculture, but in much less detail than Cordy or Kirch (Earle 1997: 41). He writes that between 1200-1500 CE, archaeological evidence gathered from settlement pattern studies shows a rapidly expanding population moving to leeward areas that required sustained agricultural expansion with the slash and burn techniques used to clear areas for new fields (Earle 1997: 41-43). Archaeological evidence shows some irrigation during these years, but it was limited and small scale (Earle 1997: 41-43).

But it was from 1400 -1500 CE that rapid change took place. On Maui and Oahu, similar developments were occurring. Societal stratification appeared as a chiefly elite began to separate from the clan structure (Earle 1997: 44). The oral traditions show that the old clans, which to a large extent had previously acted independently, began to consolidate (Earle 1978: 169; Earle 1997: 44). Chiefdoms expanded then came into conflict until an island-wide Maui chiefdom was established around 1500 CE, and what had been a decentralized power base moved to a more focused center (Earle 1978: 11, 167, 169, 193; Earle 1997: 44). The increase of chiefly power over the masses increased in other ways. During these years, archaeological evidence shows that the construction and use of irrigation systems soared, that dry land field systems were begun and then intensified under the direction of the chiefs (Earle 1997: 85-86). There was an increase in grander burial monuments, house platforms for the elite, and a dramatic increase in heiau construction (Earle 1997: 44). Earle interprets these as signs of an increased control over

commoner labor which shows a growing differential between the commoners who did the work and the chiefs who managed their efforts and benefitted while consolidating their political power (Earle 1997: 44).

By 1500 CE land tenure began to change as well. Upon succession, the paramount chief would distribute pieces of land called okana, or districts, and within those districts, smaller pieces of land called ahupuaa, to lower ranked chiefs who had supported him (Earle 1978: 15).²⁴ Still lower ranking members of the chiefly elite, the konohiki were placed as on-site managers over ahupuaa (Earle 1978: 16-20). They became the leaders of the local kin-based communities, but had no kinship ties to the local community. Instead, they were a part of the imposed structure of chiefly leadership that eventually came to control community affairs (Earle 1978: 169). Earle unfortunately does not provide a date or a name by which to establish a date, but does quote Goldman who puts this change in kinship and power at about 1450 CE (Goldman 1970: 200 in Earle 1978: 12).

The whole mechanism of war is another example that Earle uses to show the development of a carefully managed system of extraction at the hands of a powerful elite. While there is little archaeological evidence for warfare, the oral histories are filled with accounts of battle. It was not just territory that was important, but the productive capacity of that territory with its improved agricultural field, fishponds, and commoner labor that produced the surplus that funded the lives of the chiefly elite (Earle 1997: 132-142). Earle reasons that warfare was a critical means to centralize political power because a whole productive unit with its resources would be captured. But he rejects the

²⁴ “Okana” is a term used along with “kalana” and “moku” to refer to various tracts of land larger than an ahupuaa but smaller than an island. “Moku” is sometimes used along with “mokupuni” to refer to an island (Pukui, and Elbert 1971: 113, 232, 258).

explanation that increased population was the primary mover for this wholesale change in Hawaiian society. Earle explains that if both dry land and pond field food production had been increased to meet the needs of an expanding population, there would have been a rapid expansion coinciding with the rapid increase in population, beginning in 1200 CE. But the growth in production had occurred 200 years after population began rapidly expanding, and only when political centralization was occurring (Earle 1997: 45).

Earle believes that although dry land and irrigated food production systems continued to be elaborated until at least 1650 CE, they were not large enough to require an increase in management for either their construction or maintenance (Earle 1978: 108-109, 135, 141; Earle 1997: 78-79). But management in the chiefly agent of the konohiki was instituted (Earle 1997: 70-82). In addition, population growth had peaked around 1500 CE, so the expanded production was not needed to feed the populace (Earle 1997: 45). The real reason for these changes, Earle asserts, is that production designed to produce a surplus was instituted and organized by the chiefly agent, the konohiki which was then siphoned off to fund the political ambitions of the emerging chiefly class (Earle 1978: 135-141, 168-173, 191; Earle 1997: 78-79, 86-87).

Earle presents much evidence for the assertion that a system of extraction was formed to support a privileged chiefly life. The chiefs and the members of their court, family members, retainers, craft experts, warriors, held rights to food and other materials produced and gathered by the commoners who lived on the land divisions assigned to each chief, whether from the commoner subsistence plots gathered as taxes several times a year, or from the chief's koele lands made productive with commoner labor (Earle 1978: 15-19). Although commoners held usage rights to small pieces of land for

subsistence purposes, this use was contingent on meeting obligations in labor and produce assigned by the konohiki which then went to the chiefs (Earle 1978: 15, 19, 191; Earle 1997: 79). If these obligations were not fulfilled, the commoner farmer was risking expulsion (Earle 1978: 70-82). Although lesser chiefs were responsible for providing management to keep production at healthy levels, and for providing subsistence to the commoners in case of natural disaster, they were also responsible for presenting a portion of the goods collected to higher ups. If they did not, their rights to land could be revoked (Earle 1978: 18-19). This pressure from above kept the pressure on the producers themselves, the commoners, and for Earle the entire society was geared to this end.

When looking at the wider canvas of pre-contact Hawaii, Earle interprets the intensification of agriculture, the political conflict, and the rise in the use of directed commoner labor as not arising from the need to feed an expanding population, but as a recurring pattern of political strategy which had as its object the increase of surplus production to finance the efforts of competing regional chiefdoms in their quest to expand (Earle 1978: 168-173, 183; Earle 1997: 86-87). For Earle, ideology provided a glue to keep the whole system of extraction legitimized. The increasingly elaborate ceremonies, filled with goods produced by commoners then extracted from them, held in increasingly splendid heiau built with commoner labor, would show the people that their chiefs were earthly manifestations of the gods who possessed the power to insure productivity so all could eat (Earle 1997: 191-192). Earle then holds that these things, along with the change in the structure of kinship, points to a radical remaking of Hawaiian society. In contrast to the simple decentralized Polynesian chiefdom from which it evolved, Hawaiian society was at Western contact marked by class stratification

in which power was concentrated in the hands of a small group of elites (Sahlins 1958: Goldman 1970 in Earle 1978: 11, 167, 193). Earle states unequivocally that the long term trend, beginning after 1200 CE, was that by solidifying power and by holding a monopoly on status positions, the chiefs secured ownership of land, resources, and domination of a world in which, "...the land and its people were theirs." (Earle 1997: 191).

Goldman

Another anthropologist, Irving Goldman, places Hawaii in a Polynesian context. This informs his reliance on comparative ethnographic evidence that allows him to compare Hawaiian society to that of other Polynesian peoples. He finds that although the centralization of authority and power had always been a trend in Polynesia, Hawaii was at the apex of Polynesian societies because traditional forms became further elaborated and political capabilities had come to final realization (Goldman 1970: 200-205). Goldman spends little time exploring archaeological evidence for any kind of relationship between cultural development and the expansion and intensification of agriculture or increased population in Hawaii. He mentions the differences between the wet and dry islands, and that population densities varied in different places on individual islands (Goldman 1970: 201-202). But his approach clearly is more general, to describe archipelago-wide societal development. Perhaps this is the reason for the noticeable lack of citations when compared to Cordy or Kirch. Goldman relies heavily on the genealogical traditions collected by Fornander in the mid 1800s, but states that they must

be used with caution for two reasons. First, genealogical traditions had been rearranged by ambitious chiefly families in the past. And second, two generations had passed since Christianity had become the state religion, so accuracy within the genealogies may have been impaired as sequences may have been rearranged and European viewpoints introduced (Goldman 1970: 204).

Goldman describes the years from arrival of the first Polynesians to 1100 CE as an early period. Although seniority ruled succession to title, authority, and land holdings, and chiefs were sacred and held religious prerogatives, their power was largely formal and ritual. As a result social distinctions between chiefs and commoners had not yet reached their full prominence (Goldman 1970: 211). But in the middle period from 1100-1450 CE, Goldman states that what the oral traditions clearly indicate is that status rivalry among the chiefs became the prime mover for change in Hawaiian society (Goldman 1970: 205-207, 211). But he spends much more time telling the story of the growing separation between chiefs and commoners. Both status rivalry among chiefs and the growing separation between chiefs and commoners, when taken in concert, radically changed Hawaiian society, which had largely been based in kinship, into something highly stratified and therefore completely different when compared to its beginnings (Goldman 1970: 558).

In discussing the separation of chiefs and commoners, Goldman references Malo and again Fornander. The chiefs and people originally had shared a common origin and organic link (Goldman 1970: 227). The traditions say that makaainana had been alii in the beginning but had carelessly given themselves up to the pursuit of gratification and pleasure, and had lost interest in preserving their status, therefore the genealogical

connection between them and chiefs was lost (Goldman 1970: 227; Malo 1951: 87 in Goldman 1970: 230). Fornander attributes the separation as occurring after the migratory period. He saw a gradual political process in which the status of chiefs became more prominent, chiefly prerogatives increased, both at the expense of the makaainana who were systematically debased and set down (Fornander 1880: 63 in Goldman 1970: 227).

Goldman runs with Fornander's reasoning by explaining that the rise of priestly power contributed to the separation of chiefs and commoners. This can be seen in the change in the form of heiau. Previously, the heiau had been an open court in which those outside could see the ceremonies. Then walls were added, making viewing difficult or impossible. Only presiding chiefs, priests and other privileged persons were admitted, all others remained outside (Fornander 1880: 16 in Goldman 1970: 206, 211). Further, the offices of high priest fell to aristocratic families, and those kahuna held rank and prestige parallel to that of the alii further separating out the powerful from the masses (Goldman 1970: 223). Not only in the religious and social sphere was change occurring, but also in labor and production. A son of Moikeha, perhaps Kila, began the system of having farmers work a particular number of days each month for the alii landowner, setting a precedent which in time would further the difference between the two groups (Goldman 1970: 209).²⁵

Another element in these years that contributed to the stratification of society was the inauguration of the chiefly council, the aha alii. It was first formed on Maui to authenticate the genealogical record, preserve chiefly rank, and safeguard the rights and privileges of the chiefs (Goldman 1970: 212). It therefore established a broader line of

²⁵ Goldman does not cite the specific reference, but probably took his information from Fornander. See Fornander 1916: 134-136.

demarcation between the nobility and the commonality (Fornander 1880: 30 in Goldman 1970: 205). Along with the aha alii the office of the paramount chief or moi came into being around the time of the migrations. Goldman, again following Fornander, explains that previously, the chiefs were independent of each other, and the term alii nui was used to describe just the most powerful chief on that island. Then the term moi (also referred to as alii nui by other writers) began to appear in the traditions. The moi was in time acknowledged as first among equals (*primus inter pares*) to whom was owed at least a nominal if not real allegiance and fealty. Territorial possessions and power were not always the source of this dignity as it had been for the alii nui of previous times (Fornander 1880: 64 in Goldman 1970: 206). So not only was stratification occurring within society as a whole, separating chief from commoner - but was occurring within chiefly society itself, and the importance of ranking within that society increased (Goldman 1970: 228).

The era of the fully stratified society, during which all Hawaiian polities moved progressively into the form seen at western contact, began in 1450 CE with the reign of Umi (Umi a Liloa) on Hawaii Island (Goldman 1970: 207). Goldman states that the traditions describe Umi's reign in some detail. He calls attention to the division of land into districts under this well-known king, and asserts that while this may not have been the first land distribution by higher ranking to lower ranking chiefs, it is the earliest record of such an apportionment based not on kinship but on politics. Lands were not given out to family members but rather to chiefs who had provided support to Umi in his conquests (Goldman 1970: 207, 212, 234). This developed into an archipelago-wide system similar to the European feudal system in which the lord granted lands to the

vassal who then owed allegiance and fealty (Fornander 1880: 64 in Goldman 1970: 206; Goldman 1970: 557). But as chiefly lines were consolidating their authority, alii began asserting, above all, their rights to claim lands reallocated on the death of the moi.

Goldman thinks that the social upheaval caused by the dislodging of landowners at the succession of each moi and the dissatisfaction among some with the redistributed lands touched off rivalries among the chiefs which caused the increase of warfare that would not stop until Kamehameha (Goldman 1970: 204-212, 558).

Further examples of chiefly authority and power over commoners are described in the traditions from this later period. The power of the paramount to organize society was seen in Umi's reign. He separated the laborers and those in government according to the work they did, commoners, warriors, priests and chiefs alike, the cultivators, fishermen, spear-warders, district superintendents and governors, setting all in order (Fornander 1916: 228 in Goldman 1970: 208). Chiefs intermarried widely, and lines were dispersed among all islands, forming a vast, interrelated family network (Goldman 1970: 234). The highest chiefs inherited prerogatives that demanded extreme deference. Among the most extreme was the kapu moe, the prostration, which gave that chief the right to impose the death penalty for its violation, and the right to call for human sacrifice to the gods of that chief (Goldman 1970: 217, 225).

Commoners labored and produced food for the chiefs. Farmers continued to be required to labor on the chiefs' land holding, the koele and hakuone (Goldman 1970: 240). They gathered tribute to be presented at makahiki pigs, dogs, fowl, poi, kapa, malo, shoulder capes, pearls, ivory, red and yellow feathers. If the chief judged the tribute to be insufficient, he had the area plundered (Kamakau 1964: 20 in Goldman 1970: 222).

Commoners had to support the chief's household, which included guardians, foster parents, wet nurses, a keeper of household goods, a chief executioner, night guards, a steward, an orator, massagers, and the administrative positions of counselor, a chief priest, a war leader, a council of military strategists, warriors, and historians (Kepelino 1932: 124 in Goldman 1970: 222). The condition of the common people was that of subjugation to do the heavy tasks, burdened and oppressed, some even to death (Malo 1951: 87 in Goldman 1970: 226).

By the time of European contact, the territorial organization of Hawaii had become altogether political. The Hawaiian chiefs had developed their skills for the quick and efficient organization of commoner labor, in heiau construction, agricultural terracing, and irrigation (Goldman 1970: 200-201). The descent group organization seen in early years in which chiefs were kin to the people no longer applied even in the broadest possible sense; the nature of chiefship had changed (Goldman 1970: 558). The district had no reference at all to traditional kin groupings but was strictly political. Chiefs and commoners were two distinct classes, ruler and ruled, landed and landless, titled and menial, distinguished and without distinction, no longer related by fact or sentiment (Goldman 1970: 20, 213, 234).

Hommon

Another seminal anthropologist who has written about pre-contact Hawaiian society, Robert Hommon, was interested in examining the transformation of a pre-state society into a state (Hommon 1976: 2). Analyses of Mesopotamian and Mesoamerican

primitive states showed the existence of common essential features, which he applied to determine if a primitive state existed in Hawaii. He traced the development of two of these features, a government that exercised a monopoly of power, and a society made up of two socio-economic classes. He concluded that these two features definitely existed in Hawaiian society in the late 1700s prior to Western contact (Hommon 1976: 1, 2, 4, 20).

Hommon does not posit population growth as the ultimate cause of societal change. Other factors like agricultural technology, the natural environment, and social organization all interacted with each other to contribute to the development of Hawaiian society (Hommon 1976: 249-250). Like Cordy, he concedes that there are limitations to an approach that generalizes about the development across the entire archipelago. He states that archaeological data is problematic because the sites that have been studied constitute only a small fraction of what is still existing, most of which have yet to be investigated (Hommon 1976: 287). Like Kirch, he also calls attention to the differences between wet and dry areas throughout the islands, and how the differences in environment impacted agricultural development (Hommon 1976: 66, 261-266). But despite mentioning these factors, Hommon's focus is on generalizing the changes in society across the Hawaiian Islands.

Hommon writes that from first settlement to about 1300 CE, population on Hawaii Island was slowly expanding in primarily coastal areas until the average populations of each of the six districts would have been about 3000 (Hommon 1976: xiii, 234). At this time, the entire district was probably a kinship group, and followed the basic governmental pattern of most Polynesian and the early Hawaiian types in which the leaders of these families were still kin (Hommon 1976: 174, 233, 276-277). But between

1400-1500 CE, archaeological evidence from seventy-six sites and information from the oral traditions shows population moving to inland areas not only on Hawaii Island but on Oahu and Molokai as well (Hommon 1976: 229-230, 249). This led to what would become the fundamental economic unit, the ahupuaa, a land division smaller than a district, running from the uplands out to reef areas (Hommon 1976: 55, 57, 230). Because most of the basic resources for daily life existed within most ahupuaa, a pattern of self-sufficiency then developed among the commoner families occupying each particular ahupuaa (Hommon 1976: xiii, 68, 71, 82, 229-235, 251, 273). As a result, kinship ties that had held the district-wide family groups together began to break down by 1500 CE (Hommon 1976: 230-231). Inland expansion was therefore the first and most important step in the development of the ahupuaa, which was directly related to the development of two distinct socioeconomic classes (Hommon 1976: 272-277).

By 1600 CE, approximately around the reign of Umi a Liloa, the disintegration of the kinship relationship between chiefs and commoners was well under way (Hommon 1976: 277; Hommon 2001: 147). Although the leaders of the district and ahupuaa were still the political and economic administrators as well as representatives and mediators to the gods, they were no longer part of the family of that area. Instead, chiefs from other areas were assigned to administer those lands based on a relationship between them and the paramount (Fornander 1969; Malo 1951: 191-192 in Hommon 1976: 90). The dissolution of kinship bonds between alii and makaainana was constantly reinforced by differences in lifestyle. Alii regularly engaged in archipelago-wide activities, while the borders of the ahupuaa defined to a large extent the world of the makaainana (Hommon 1976: 96). Alii depended on elaborate and carefully preserved genealogies for rank and

status (Hommon 1976: 175, 279). Absolute accuracy of recitation was ritually necessary, even a misplaced pause or mispronounced word would bring misfortune to the alii being honored (Beckwith 1976: 36 in Hommon 1976: 122). In contrast, the concept of rank was virtually non-existent among makaainana, and genealogies in any meaningful sense did not exist among them (Hommon 1976: 105, 175, 279; Hommon 2001: 147). In examining the marriages of 318 politically important chiefs from the late 1300s to the late 1700s, Hommon finds that 57% were either direct participants and/or offspring, and/or produced children from inter-island marriages (Hommon 1976: 104-105). Commoners tended to marry within ahupuaa, the major exception being to partners from the adjacent ahupuaa (Hommon 1976: 82, 105, 273-274). A cleavage between the classes had then developed, and a definite disconformity existed between alii and makaainana which was clearly recognized by all Hawaiians (Malo 1951: 54-55 in Hommon 1976: 92-95; Hommon 1976: 175).

Whereas kinship ties had previously defined the relationship between alii and makaainana, now the relationship was based on force. Instead of being granted authority over the community because of senior status in the family, the leader was now a chief from outside the community (Hommon 1976: 16, 231, 277). Economic functions were now sharply segregated along class lines, subject to enforcement by the ones who held power. Hommon posits that a primary function of the chiefly government was to maintain the flow of goods and services to maintain and increase the power and prestige of the aristocracy who made up the government (Hommon 1976: 9-10). Makaainana were responsible for virtually all agricultural production: food, apparel, status goods like the brightly colored feathers for cloaks and capes, logs for the double-hulled canoes often

used in warfare, while the alii filled virtually all administrative positions (Malo 1951: 18, 61 in Hommon 1976: 68; Malo 1951: 60-61, 64 in Hommon 1976: 72-73; Hommon 1976: 89; Buck 1964: 578-80, Kamakau 1961: 62, Malo 1951: 76-77 in Hommon 1976: 116). Commoners had to work in the fields set aside for exclusive use of alii, the ili kupono, koele, and hakuone areas, but received no part of the produce (Malo 1951: 18, 61 in Hommon 1976: 68). A commoner's right to use land for the subsistence of his family was still inherited, but had to be ratified by the ahupuaa chief or konohiki (Hommon 1976: 80). While the alii nui and his government did not own the territory they administered, their rights to the produce of the land were superior to the usufruct rights of the makaainana (Hommon 1976: 153). If a makaainana's production was below the expected level, or if he displayed an inordinate accumulation of goods, he could be expelled or executed (Kamakau 1961: 229; Malo 1951: 35, 61 in Hommon 1976: 153-154, Hommon 1976: 175, 281-283).

The retinues of the alii nui and district chiefs, which contained a large number of retainers, some of whom were craft specialists drawn from commoner ranks, were all supported by the produce and labor of the commoners living outside the courts (Malo 1951: 58-61, 64 in Hommon 1976: 62; Hommon 1976: 72-73, 115-116, 195, 281-282). The courts of the alii nui could become so large, perhaps in some cases several hundred people, that they had to move periodically to spread the burden of their support by makaainana of the area (Kamakau 1961: 77, 105 in Hommon 1976: 116-117). But sometimes even this was not enough, and the subsistence goods produced by makaainana would be exhausted. Then the alii nui had the right to expropriate, seize and reap at pleasure, and hardship or local famine could result (Fornander 1969: 200, Kamakau

1961: 105-106, Malo 1951: 53 in Hommon 1976: 117). The condition of the commoners was that of subjugation to the chiefs, compelled to do heavy tasks, burdened and oppressed, holding the chiefs in great dread, looking upon them as gods (Malo 1951: 60-61 in Hommon 1976: 72-73).

This system of extraction permeated not just the makaainana but chiefly ranks as well. Any action that interfered with the right of the alii nui to goods within the boundaries of the political unit he administered might be perceived as a threat to the political hierarchy (Hommon 1976: 153). If the alii or his agent in charge of the ahupuaa did not meet the quota expected at makahiki he could be replaced (Malo 1951: 145). If a lesser chief seized the products reserved for the alii nui it was considered an act of rebellion and dealt with as such. Imakakoloa of Puna in 1781 seized products reserved for Kalaniopuu, alii nui of Hawaii Island, and was eventually caught and executed (Kamakau 1961: 106-109 in Hommon 1976: 155). Hommon holds that population growth had ended or had been drastically reduced by the early 1600s, and that no new food production techniques with increased efficiency were forthcoming (Hommon 1976: xiii-xiv). The only method of economic expansion available was to capture other territory through conquest warfare, hence its increase across the archipelago in the 1600 and 1700s (Hommon 1976: xiv). The goal of military conquest was not just an expansion of territory, but also its productive capacity, with farmers, craftsmen, fishermen, fields, fishing grounds, and natural resources (Hommon 1976: 141, 158-160, 281-282). This can be seen in the rivalry that existed between the windward and leeward districts of Hawaii Island during this period. The Kona chiefs desired the windward lands because of the abundance of feathers, materiel to make war canoes, and fine kapa, and the

windward chiefs desired leeward lands because of warm food, drinking water, and fine fish (Kamakau 1961: 62 in Hommon 1976: 155). There are many examples from this era in which the destruction of the productive capacity of the enemy, including the laborers, was used as a weapon of war, parts of all major islands were devastated by raids, most occurring in the 1700s (Hommon 1976: 157-158, 281). The greater the amount of produce collected, the larger the army that could be raised to increase the territory and hence the productive capacity controlled by that government (Hommon 1976: 282). Further, the makaainana might be called up as soldiery but had no voice in inter-district or inter-island politics, or in military strategy (Elbert 1956-1957: 309 in Hommon 1976: 72). The development of the entire government was therefore geared to extraction, which was then enforced by the power that had centralized in the hands of the alii (Hommon 1976: 9-10, 175).

But in the general breakdown of kinship ties between chiefs and commoners over the duration of this history, Hommon sees ideological components as well. Most of the government officials, the alii in charge of the districts and the ahupuaa and their agents still lived in these areas, and co-residence served to further the ideological fiction that kinship ties still existed (Hommon 1976: 277). When produce was collected during makahiki commoners believed that the offerings were being given through the alii nui to Lono, god of agricultural fertility, to insure ample rainfall and an increase in crops. Accordingly, such offerings were called hookupu, meaning “to cause to grow, sprout, and increase” (Pukui, and Elbert 1973: 171 in Hommon 1976: 114). But in reality, the collected goods and commandeered services went to fulfill the needs defined by the elite for their own purposes (Hommon 1976: 165, 281-285). It kept them well satiated with

succulent pig and dog from the land and tender mullet from the fishponds, clothed with fine kapa and splendid feather garments, supplied with materiel for war, and viewed as superior beings by the populace who had a right to special treatment, all enforced (Malo 1951: 60-61, 78, 172-173 in Hommon 1976: 67). Over the long duration, Hommon sees an early societal system in which chiefs and commoners of a district were family members from a single corporate unit, from which developed a society characterized by a sharp cleavage between the government and the governed, between the economic producers and those for whom they produced, between the upper and lower classes. (Hommon 1976: xii, 7-8, 16, 89, 95-96, 175, 276-277; Hommon 2001: 146-147).

Kirch

Of the anthropologists considered, Patrick Kirch synthesizes the most material. He constantly references Earle, Goldman, Hommon, and Sahlins, as well as scholars who have written more particularized studies, like William K. Kikuchi on fishponds and Michael J. Kolb on heiau. He is the most comprehensive, exploring topics from the migrations prior to the Austronesian expansion, through the Lapita and ancestral Polynesian cultures and the spread of Polynesians across the Pacific, up to post-contact times in Hawaii. He has command of vast quantities of information from comparative ethnography and linguistics, uses the oral traditions cautiously, but favors archaeology. He calls attention to differences in environmental conditions and how these impacted development in various Hawaiian places, but definitely draws archipelago-wide conclusions. He sets the stage for further scholarship by favoring a synthetic approach,

exploring how ecological, political, demographic, technological and many other methodological paradigms can all add to the discussion of the evolution of societies (Kirch 1984: 283; Kirch 2010: 11).

Kirch calls the years between 1100-1650 CE the expansion period (Kirch 1985: 304; Kirch 2000: 293; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14). He holds that more change occurred during this era than during any other time prior to western contact (Kirch 1985: 303; Kirch 2000: 293). He acknowledges that new fishhook forms and linguistic borrowings provide evidence of the arrival of immigrants from the Society Islands in the 1100s CE, and that oral traditions point to the immigration of some who may have been raised to the status of chiefs (Kirch 1985: 304-305; Kirch 2000: 291). However, he rejects the conclusion that any significant change came about because of this immigration; instead, the internal processes that had been building momentum from initial colonization to 1100 CE would prove far more important to the development of Hawaiian society (Kirch 1985: 304-305).

Kirch believes that this period may have seen population across the island chain grow rapidly from perhaps 20, 000 to 200, 000 people (Kirch 1984: 107-111; Kirch 1985: 303-304; Kirch 2000: 293; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14).²⁶ Archaeological evidence shows that by 1300 CE, people were not only living in the fertile and wet windward coastal areas and valleys, but were establishing permanent residences in the drier leeward coasts and valleys of all major islands (Kirch 1985: 304-305; Kirch 2000: 293; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14). Nualolo on Kauai, Makaha and Anahulu valleys on Oahu, Halawa valley on Molokai, the Kahikinui slopes on Maui, Lapakahi and Anaehoomalu on Hawaii

²⁶ See Kirch 1994: 256 and Kirch 2000: 313 for more information about the ongoing debate over pre-contact population.

Island, and even Kahoolawe all show evidence of permanent settlements at this time (Kirch 1985: 304; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14).

Along with population growth and expanding settlement, all aspects of production would see extensive development (Kirch 1985: 305; Kirch 2000: 293; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14). The first direct archaeological evidence for taro irrigation comes from these years, and perhaps earlier on Oahu (Kirch 1985: 305; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 119). Stone-faced pond fields and irrigation channels were constructed in Makaha and Halawa Valleys on Oahu and in Hanalei on Kauai (Kirch 1985: 305; Kirch 2000: 295). While some pond field construction began around 1200 CE, the main phase began about 1400 CE (Kirch 1994: 257). Dry land forests were also being cleared, and field systems in the Lapakahi and Kona areas on Hawaii Island as well as on the upland plateau of Kahoolawe were being established by about 1400 CE (Kirch 1985: 305; Kirch 2000: 295). The oral traditions and archaeological dating indicate about 1400 CE for the beginning of construction of large-scale coastal fishponds, which could yield several hundred pounds per acre annually (Kirch 1985: 305; Kikuchi 1976, Summers 1964 in Kirch 2000: 295; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 16). All of these forms of agricultural intensification relied on the labor of the commoner (Kirch 2000: 248-249, 295). Kirch states that during this era, agricultural production moved from a domestic mode, inherently anti-surplus, to what some Marxist scholars have called the Asiatic mode of production, in which a steady surplus is extracted from the society's producers to finance and support the activities, political aspirations, and prestige of the elite households, courts, and persons (Kirch 1984: 164, 258-259; Kirch 2000: 248, 318-319).

Social and political organization during this period changed radically as well (Kirch 1985: 305-306). Kirch holds that the expansion of population over to the leeward sides and more importantly up into inland areas resulted in the formation of the mountain-to-the-sea ahupuaa as the primary unit of territorial organization (Kirch 1984: 258; Kirch 1985: 306; Kirch 1994: 256; Kirch 2000: 293, 298; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 14). This development underlay the territorial and political reorganization, and dates from about 1450 CE (Kirch 1985: 306). Kirch reasons that as population grew, lands ideally suited for food production were taken which resulted in competition and warfare (Kirch 1985: 306). This led to successful chiefs winning command of increasingly large areas, who then placed ahupuaa units in the hands of junior alii (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 1985: 306; Kirch 2000: 296). In this way, the old kinship groups which had formerly held lands were broken up and replaced by the new territorial units of ahupuaa under the control of junior chiefs who owed allegiance and support to a district or island paramount (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 1985: 306; Kirch 2000: 298). These commoner groups had then lost control of lands on which they lived and held only usage rights which were dependent on tribute of labor and produce paid on demand to the chiefs (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 2000: 248-249, 298; Kirch 2010: 24). The ahupuaa were then subject to redistribution to other alii on the death or defeat of said paramount when a new ruling regime took over, but the pattern of extraction continued under whatever chief happened to be in power (Kirch 1984: 258; Kirch 1985: 306).

Religious changes also fit into this general societal transformation. The older and simpler first fruit type rites designed to gain favor of the agricultural gods were transformed into a ritualized system for the extraction of surplus produced by the

commoners at the hands of the chiefs, most notably at makahiki (Kirch 1984: 260; Kirch 1985: 306; Kirch 2000: 295). Kirch holds that redistribution of the produce collected essentially went to the chiefly class (Kirch 1984: 260). The archaeological record shows that heiau expanded in size, and design became increasingly elaborated during the expansion period. The largest heiau were associated with paramount chiefs and the cult of war, but all types depended on mobilized labor laid on the backs of commoners which shows increasing chiefly domination (Kirch 2000: 248-249; Kolb 1991, 1992, 1994 in Kirch 2000: 295-296). This era saw the increasing elaboration of the kapu system which was used as part of an ideology to legitimize chiefly rule (Kirch 2000: 323). Members of this class regarded themselves as directly descended from the gods traceable back through elaborate and lengthy genealogies, were internally ranked into seven or eight different grades, and the highest chiefs practiced sibling or half sibling marriage to concentrate bloodlines (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 2000: 248-249). The highest ranks were increasingly set apart from the mass of commoners and had the right to possess rank insignia like the elaborate feather cloaks and finely carved food bowls, and required all others not specially excused to perform the kapu moe, the prostration (Kirch 2000: 248-249). The end result of this was that the highest chiefs were considered to be divine (Kirch 2010: 5). In contrast, the makaainana claimed no genealogical depth nor were they organized on any corporate descent model as they had been before this era commenced in about 1400 CE (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 2010: 35).

Kirch holds that archaeological evidence from settlement pattern and site studies and corroborating information from oral traditions confirm that the transformation from 1100-1600 CE moved a society that had been based on kinship groups to one in which a

powerful upper class had as its principal objective the creation of a surplus, which was then extracted from a downtrodden class of producers to maintain a privileged lifestyle (Kirch 1984: 257-263; Kirch 1985: 306; Kirch 1994: 257; Kirch 2000: 319, 323). Kirch asserts that although these changes developed further during the last 200 years before contact, it was by 1600 that the basic societal structure seen at western contact was solidified. The result was that Hawaii, of all Polynesian places, had moved furthest away from its ancestral roots (Kirch 1985: 294, 305-306; Kirch 1994: 251; Kirch 2000: 299-300; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 54).

Sahlins

Although Marshall Sahlins has examined societies other than those from Polynesia over his career, he has focused on Pacific cultures. In his classic study *Social Stratification in Polynesia* (1958), Sahlins compares, contrasts, then ranks Polynesian societies on the basis of productivity and social stratification. He describes productivity being best understood as the ability to produce food (Sahlins 1958: 107). He argues that the greater the productivity, the greater the ability to produce a surplus that is greater than the needs of the producers (Sahlins 1958: 108). This surplus is then siphoned off by chiefs who use it to support themselves and the craftsmen engaged to make specialty items for the chiefs. The rest is distributed back to the producers themselves in conjunction with religious feasts and other community events (Sahlins 1958: 109-110). For Sahlins, the difference between the chiefs and the commoners is greater in the most productive Polynesian societies. Sahlins concludes, then, that leadership continually

generates surplus, and that the development of rank and chieftainship moves together equally with the development of productive forces.²⁷ For Sahlins, then, Hawaiian society, as the most productive, was also the most stratified, and therefore possessed the greatest social difference between chief and non-chief (Sahlins 1958: 248).

Earlier in his career, Sahlins focused on comparing the end stages of already developed Polynesian cultures that he then ranked (Sahlins 1958). But later, he began to transition to exploring development over time within Hawaiian culture itself, and he pursued the evolution of the differences between chiefs and people in Hawaii's history by writing about historical patterns that reassert themselves across the centuries (Sahlins 1981). He briefly mentions that Kapawa was the first chief set up as a ruling chief, a practice that was then adopted across the chain (Kamakau 1964: 3 in Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 23). He finds many stories of older kings in the oral traditions, who in general took better care of the people, but who were invariably replaced by violent outsiders. He references the king Mailikukahi, ruling out of Waialua, Oahu. He and the other chiefs of that area did not practice human sacrifice which came in only in the usurpation of their rule in the mid to late 1700s CE, imposed by the conquerors and kings of violence from Maui and Hawaii Island, Kahekili and Kamehameha, the "sharks who travel on land" (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 22-25).

Another pattern Sahlins writes about was that the king establishes order in the land through the setting of territorial boundaries. Sahlins finds in the traditions the kings Mailikukahi of Oahu and Kakaalaneo of Maui who instituted or at least reformed the separation of the lands into divisions of districts, sub-districts and smaller parcels while assigning them to lesser chiefs, which became the land tenure pattern practiced at contact

²⁷ Sahlins uses the term *pari passu*, Sahlins 1972: 140.

(Beckwith 1976: 383; Kamakau 1991: 54-55 in Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25-27).

However, the chiefs to whom the lands were given would normally have no kinship to the people occupying those lands; they were kinsmen not of the people but of the ruling chief (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 26). Although good kings like Mailikukahi would take steps to bring the people into a kinship relationship with the chiefs, by outlawing, on pain of death, theft by the chiefs, this was the exception. The rule, Sahlins believes, was one of oppressive exaction of the people by the chiefs, in which all the production of the people went to the chief, who when dissatisfied, had the power to expel the long-suffering commoner from the land and rob him of possessions (Malo 1951: 60-61 in Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 27). Sahlins concludes then that the kinship society of the classic Polynesian sort, where relationships between people and land tenure were organized by kinship descent, was eroded by the development of chiefship. Although he does not directly date this, it is clear from his narrative that this process was formalized during the reigns of Mailikukahi and Kakaalaneo. For Sahlins, the chief, intruding from the outside, reduces the older lineage order in scale, function, and coherence while usurping the collective rights of land control from the people (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 192).

Although varying in details and presentation, the anthropologist take on Hawaii's history before European arrivals is consistent. Societal changes came not as a result of outside influences from a migration but internally. The small group of chiefs gathered power that they wielded for their own benefit at the expense of the commoners: this is the governing dynamic that the anthropologists see operating in ancient Hawaii. As a result, the close kinship relationships that had characterized Hawaii's people in the first few centuries after contact was radically changed as chiefs became the ruling class, extracting

what they needed from the exploited class of commoners. But this is only one take. In the next two chapters I will show that the vision held by traditionalist scholars is in many ways a direct contrast to the one above.

3. Comparison and Contrast I: The Causes of Societal Change. Aspects of Genealogy, Rank, and Chiefly Kapu.

The writing of many of the traditionalist authors chosen for this study in general does not lend itself to the same type of analysis that has been done for the anthropologists in the previous chapter. Many traditionalists like Andrade, Kameeleihiwa, Maly, McGregor, Osorio, and Trask have focused on Hawaii of the post-contact era, and have consequently used information about pre-contact Hawaii as background and context to contrast changes that occurred after 1778. Although there is substantial information about pre-contact times in these writers, it needs to be gleaned from their work. Exceptions here are Kameeleihiwa (*Native Land and Foreign Desires: How Shall We Live in Harmony?*, 1992) and Kelly (*Changes in Land Tenure in Hawaii: 1778-1850*, 1956), who spend more time than these other scholars discussing pre-contact times, but who also do so in the context of events of the mid-nineteenth century. In contrast, in the works chosen for this thesis, the anthropologists have focused on pre-contact times for the bulk of their research. However, this is not absolute. A glance at Kirch and Sahlins (*Anahulu: the Anthropology of History in the Kingdom of Hawaii*, 1992) reveals that most of that work is dedicated to times in the nineteenth century. However, it still contains information about pre-contact times as well.

But just as with the anthropologists, there are exceptions to the rule with the traditionalists. Some of them in the works chosen for this study have focused on pre-

contact times. Cachola-Abad (*The Evolution of Hawaiian Socio-political Complexity: An Analysis of Hawaiian Oral Traditions*, 2000) undertakes a close examination of some of the oral traditions and builds a history of pre-contact times from the times of the second migration, about 1100 CE, up to western contact in 1778. In his work *Classical Hawaiian Education* (2005b), Charlot spends most of his time discussing education in pre-contact Hawaiian society. Kanahale in *Waikiki 100 BC to 1900 AD: An Untold Story* (1995) spends much of the time writing about pre-contact times. The book *Ancient Hawaii* (1997) by Herb Kane is primarily about times before 1778. And Mary Kawena Pukui worked with the Handys on agricultural and societal information, much of which was taken from the pre-contact era (*Native Planters in Old Hawaii: Their Life, Lore, and Environment*, 1972, and *The Polynesian Family System in Kau, Hawaii*, 1958). With Haertig and Lee, she has written about Hawaiian religious and cultural beliefs, many of which come from the time before 1778, which continue to shape the psychology and well-being of many modern Hawaiians (*Nana I Ke Kumu: Look to the Source*, 1972). She has also collected information about Hawaiian sayings and proverbs, many from pre-contact times, in *Olelo Noeau: Hawaiian Proverbs and Poetical Sayings* (1983). And of course the *Hawaiian Dictionary*, co-authored with Samuel H. Elbert in 1971, remains the standard in the field. But for our purposes, a topical approach perhaps better suits the work of the traditionalists, and yields a compare and contrast format that is the focus of the rest of this study.

In this chapter I will compare and contrast views of the anthropologist and traditionalist groups as those scholars write about genealogy, rank, and chiefly kapu after the formalization of the ahupuaa system took place during the years from about 1450 CE

to western contact. The anthropologists see radical societal changes that primarily affected the makaainana. They hold that both genealogical and societal ranking practices disintegrated among that group, which conversely were maintained or even elaborated among the alii. In general, the anthropologists see this as evidence of the growing differential in the daily lives of the alii and the makaainana, which supports their view that a powerful transformation occurred in Hawaiian society with the implementation of the ahupuaa system.

Although the anthropologists describe these occurrences using language that varies in degree and detail, and although not every one examined in this study writes that every one of the following changes occurred, the main ideas are clear and consistent. But it is also clear that many of the traditionalists see other things happening. As with the anthropologists, there is variation of language and in emphasis. But in the main, the traditionalists do not see genealogical practices or ranking considerations breaking down in makaainana society. Instead, the traditionalists see a society continuing more along established lines, where genealogies and rank continued to exist among makaainana. It then follows that if there is disagreement as to how much makaainana society changed, then there is disagreement over whether such a dramatic change as described by the anthropologists did occur. Nor do the traditionalists interpret the elaboration of rank and high kapu among alii as primarily demonstrating distance between the ruling class of chiefs and laboring class of commoners as do the anthropologists. Instead, some write that this distance served to help insure a balanced and properly functioning universe in which all prospered, which again shows continuity with a deeper past.

Much of the information drawn from anthropologist narratives has been presented previously. At times a short recap of this information may be helpful to clearly show comparisons and contrasts with what has been written by traditionalist writers, most of which is being examined in this study for the first time. The differences between the two groups are not absolute. Although the anthropologists draw from archaeological data, they also rely heavily on the oral traditions, and the traditionalists do the same.²⁸ It is clear from the information presented in the writing of some traditionalists that they see some of the same things that the anthropologists see. And there are statements made by some of the anthropologists that could well have been found among traditionalist narratives. But I will demonstrate that while there are some similarities in description, these in most cases are emphasized to different degrees, seen in different contexts, and therefore interpreted differently. And it is these differences that finally put the traditionalists in general disagreement with much of what the anthropologists have written.

The Causes of Societal Change

Before exploring the debates over genealogy and rank, an examination of the causes of societal change may be informative. Here one can see much variability in the views of scholars in each of the two groups, as well as change over time in individual

²⁸ Mary Kawena Pukui, is a special case. She has obtained much of her information from her own personal experience of life in Kau on the island of Hawaii. She also traveled around the islands interviewing elders, as did Rubellite Kawena Johnson and Davianna McGregor. Some of these audiotapes are available at the Anthropology Department, the Audio-Recording Collection, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii. Another collection of audiotape interviews done by Larry L. Kimura is available at Language Telecommunications, Resource and Learning Center, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii.

scholars. As stated earlier, in general the anthropologists do not believe that deep societal change came as a result of an influx of settlers during the migration period. Cordy certainly does not. Instead, he uses archaeological data and information from oral traditions to conclude that internal developments caused change (Cordy 2000: 140-182). It is difficult to find in Cordy's works used here a definitive statement favoring a single internal 'prime mover,' although Kirch writes that Cordy favors population growth as that single cause (Kirch 1985: 233). In his narratives, Cordy seems to tie population growth and political centralization together to account for cultural change. Although Earle, like Cordy, does write about changes in agriculture and population, he favors the political ambitions of the chiefs as the primary mover for societal evolution. He uses primarily archaeological information as evidence, and holds that even when population declined, agriculture was expanded and intensified as increased surplus was necessary for to satisfy the political aspirations of the chiefs (Earle 1978: 135-141, 168-173, 191; Earle 1997: 78-79, 86-87). Goldman uses ethnographic evidence from across Polynesia and from the Hawaiian oral traditions, especially those recorded and presented by Fornander, to arrive at the conclusion that although there was some change from the influx of Tahitians, it was primarily a new impetus and not a new cultural direction (Goldman 1970: 211). Instead, he believes that status rivalry among the chiefs was the primary cause for societal change (Goldman 1970: 205-207). Hommon uses details from archaeology as well as information from the oral traditions, primarily Malo, as he concludes that multiple factors internal to Hawaii like agricultural technology, limitations in the natural environment, and social organization played a part in the development of Hawaiian society (Hommon 1976: 249-250). Like Hommon, Kirch does not favor a

single cause for societal change, and rejects population growth as a prime mover (Kirch 1984: 160; Kirch 2000: 318-319; Kirch 1994: 260-261, 306; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 171). He favors a more dynamic model with variables like population, technology, environment, and political ambitions interacting, so he does not reduce societal change to simple linear causality (Kirch 1984: 160). However, Kirch in 2010 (*How Chiefs Became Kings*) seems to lean heavily towards the political ambitions of the chiefs as a more important factor in societal evolution, which shows that individual writers may change their opinions over time. Like Cordy, Sahlins may be more difficult for some who wish to tease causes for cultural change from his narratives. In his later works, however, he does spend more time discussing the growth of chiefly power, and seems to favor this as the primary impetus for change over the long duration of centuries.

The traditionalists take a different tack than do the anthropologists. Not all the traditionalists in the works used in this study mention Paa and possible societal changes coming from the second migration, but many do. Cachola-Abad probably spends the most time on the issue. She feels that society changed as a result of influence from Tahiti. She writes that, “The last generation of chiefs who arrived from Kahiki redefined the roles of alii” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 264). Kanahele also feels some societal change came from Tahiti. He writes that Paa directed several significant changes in Hawaiian religion and sociopolitical practice, among them an introduction of human sacrifice, a new type of heiau, and new kapu for royal protocol (Kanahele 1995: 53). Kane also feels that Paa from Tahiti instituted new religious rites and built temples, and installed the king Pili who founded the dynasty that eventually produced Kamehameha (Kane 1997: 18). The authors of *Native Planters of Old Hawaii*, the Handys and Mary Kawena

Pukui, write that the alii, which according to Hawaiian tradition migrated from Tahiti or other southern islands, found in Hawaii the ohana system with the haku as head. They brought from the south the dynastic patterns and superimposed them on the landmen (Handy and Handy 1972: 77-78). Pukui holds that Paa'o brought stricter ways, more separation between alii and commoner, the war god Kukailimoku, and introduced or increased human sacrifice (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 296-297).

Aside from the changes that many traditionalists feel came in during the second migration, some favor population growth as an important mover for societal change. They draw their information regarding societal change almost exclusively from the oral traditions. Marion Kelly is the major exception as she has done much archaeological work in the Hawaiian Islands, and that data seems to inform much of her writing. Kanahale seems to favor a growing population as a cause for societal change. He writes that population growth led to competition over natural resources, so to prevent or reduce the danger of conflict, centralized power and authority was needed to manage allocation and distribution of resources in an orderly and equitable manner (Kanahale 1995: 32-33, 49-50). Kelly writes that any cause and effect relationship between the intensification of food production and the creation of the great chiefs is difficult to prove (Kelly 1989: 104). But she also writes that the three technological developments of the primary food-producing innovations: fishponds, dryland field, and irrigated taro systems were achieved in response to a rapidly growing population in the 1500-1600s CE, and that these resulted in changes in the sociopolitical structure which produced a hierarchical class structure unmatched in Polynesia (Kelly 1983: 98). Many also seems to think there was a primary connection between expanding agriculture to feed an increased population and the

development of land use and resource management under an increasingly stringent political and religious system (Maly 2001: 3; Maly 1999b: 10-11). Young also seems to posit population growth as primary when considering the development of a hierarchical society. He writes that, "As the population grew the chiefly hierarchy developed an ano (nature, essence) of complexity..." (Young 1998: xiv). But Cachola-Abad seems to criticize the whole endeavor of finding causes because of a general lack of hard evidence. She writes that many like Cordy, Earle, Hommon, Kirch, and Sahlins, among others, have sought to identify a "prime mover or causal mechanism" that initiates societal evolution (Cachola-Abad 2000: 10). But "One study's prime mover is described as another study's effect of a different prime mover" (Cachola-Abad 2000: 11). She favors less of a theoretical approach and more archaeological research so variables can be placed in proper sequence (Cachola-Abad 2000: 11).

The anthropologists are more interested in describing societal change in pre-contact times, and think it came internally as described above. Most do not favor population growth as a first cause of societal change. The traditionalists do not emphasize societal change as much as do the anthropologists. When they discuss it, some discuss changes coming via the second migration, and others see changes coming internally from a growing population. But unlike the anthropologists, societal change before 1778 is not the focus of their writing. More differences between the two groups will become apparent as other topics are examined.

Aspects of Genealogy

The anthropologists selected for this study find a growing differential between the alii and makaainana when they examine genealogical practices in ancient Hawaii. I will show that some anthropologists hold that after the formalization of the ahupuaa system, the chiefs maintained extensive genealogies while the commoners lost them. Some traditionalists write that chiefs definitely maintained extensive genealogies, but that makaainana did not lose them. Some of the anthropologists think that because makaainana lost their genealogies, they no longer maintained mookuauhau, the genealogical specialists, as did the chiefs. Some traditionalists write that these specialists persisted in chiefly society, but that they also survived among the commoners. Some anthropologists seem to emphasize that mana comes through a high chiefly genealogy. There is much evidence in traditionalist writings that they believe that this was also the case, but some traditionalists also write that mana came through action and performance and was not limited to the chiefly sphere. Some of the anthropologists write that genealogies differentiated chiefs from commoners. Again, some of the traditionalists have no problem with this, but many emphasize that both groups proceeded from the same source. So while the traditionalists agree with some of what the anthropologist write, they consider and emphasize other information that gives a picture in which the differences in genealogical practices between the alii and makaainana are not as extreme as the anthropologists portray. And again, if the differences between the two groups are not as pronounced, then perhaps the societal change that was supposed to have occurred with the ahupuaa system was also not as pronounced.

Some anthropologists write that although the chiefs kept extensive and detailed genealogies after the formalization of the ahupuaa system, this was no longer the case among commoners. Cordy writes that on succession of a new paramount to the throne, those who could prove a genealogical tie within ten generations became the bulk of the chiefs; those who could not became commoners, and states that commoners preserved only “shallow lineages” of perhaps of three generations (Cordy 2000: 50, 53). Earle states that commoners were prohibited from keeping genealogies which might demonstrate his distinction, and that this contrast in kinship knowledge emphasized the sharp division between the chiefs and the commoners (Kamakau 1961: 242, Malo 1951: 60 in Earle 1997: 36). Goldman writes that the ability to trace genealogical lines gave one the authority to rule. He uses the Kamehameha pedigree as an example, which reached back ninety-nine generations to the gods (Goldman 1970: 216). He also writes, like Cordy, that makaainana had “little genealogical depth” (Goldman 1970: 235). Hommon, like Earle, writes that commoners, “were forbidden to keep genealogies” while chiefs maintained meticulous ones (Hommon 1976: 175). He continues by saying that “The cleavage between the classes was constantly reinforced by the great dependence of the alii on genealogies in contrast to the severe truncation of genealogies among the makaainana” (Hommon 1976: 175). Kirch holds that chiefs distinguished themselves as a class from commoners by claiming descent from the gods and internally differentiated themselves through elaborate genealogies (Kirch 2000: 300). He states that, “. . . a distinguished pedigree—a genealogy that could be traced back through an unbroken line of named ancestors—was the hallmark of the chiefly class” (Kirch 2010: 35). And that “Unlike the chiefs, commoners did not lay claim to any genealogical depth...” (Kirch

1984: 257). And like Earle, Kirch also references Kamakau when he writes that commoners were “absolutely denied the right to cite a pedigree” (Kamakau 1991: 80 in Kirch 2010: 79).

It is clear from the writing of traditionalist scholars, like the anthropologists, that many believe that alii kept detailed and extensive genealogies. Cachola-Abad writes about the importance of genealogies to the chiefs of olden times, saying that knowledge of them could alleviate tense family situations (Kamakau 1991: 80 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 32-33). Charlot calls attention to the importance of genealogies as families would establish identities and claims using them (Charlot 2005b: 486). Kameeleihiwa writes that the search for divine mana led alii to carefully consider genealogical lines (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 41). Pukui writes that if the child was alii the bloodline was known in detail (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 49-50). And Young writes that the role and place of chiefs in alii society depended on the knowledge of genealogies (Young 1998: 28). Further evidence that elaborate and detailed genealogies of the alii were kept can be seen in McKinzie’s *Hawaiian Genealogies*, drawn from Malo, Kamakau, and from some of the Hawaiian language newspapers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Although the information that chiefs kept elaborate genealogies is consistent with many anthropologists and traditionalists, this is not the case over the issue of whether the makaainana also kept genealogies. Much information that shows the persistence of makaainana genealogies is found in the work of some traditionalist writers who say that knowledge of genealogies was retained. Although this discussion proceeds, as others, from the metaphysical, these concerns underlie much of what some traditionalists write not only about kinship in particular but about ancient Hawaiian society in general. For

example, Kanalu Young writes that genealogy cannot be fully appreciated if one takes the view that it is only a simple charting of biological parentage (Young 1998: 58, see also Maly 2001: 1). To some traditionalist writers like Charlot, Kameeleihiwa, and Maly, genealogy is much more (Charlot 2005b: 65-66, 85-87; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 19-21; Maly 2001: 3). Genealogy provides insight into the very nature and structure of the universe (Charlot 2005b: 487; Handy and Pukui 1958: 122). This structure expressed in the cosmogonic chants is that the universe is an interrelated whole (Andrade 2009: 6; Charlot 2005b: 85-87; Davenport 1994: 2; Dudley 1986: 8; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 26; Trask 1999: 5). There is no conception in Hawaiian thinking of a transcendent creator god whose essence is beyond human knowing. Instead, everything in the universe is present, accessible, and immanent (Andrade 2009: 22; Cachola-Abad 2000: 79, 80; Charlot 2005b: 85-91; M. Kanahale 1987; Kane 1997: 29; McGregor 2007: 13; Meyer 1998: 36, 37; Kamakau 1961: 433-435, Kamakau 1964: 3-4, 57 in Mitchell 1972: 67). Not only is there nothing apart from this world, but all things are descended from the same source and are therefore genealogically related (Charlot 2005b: 65-66, 85-87, 144; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 23; Maly 2001: 3; McGregor 2007: 18; Young 1998: 76-77). The cosmogonic Kumulipo details this history shared by all things in the universe, including man, and provides him with his place and identity within and as a member of the universal family (Andrade 2009: 25; Beckwith 1972: 3; Charlot 2005b: 85-91; Davenport 1994: 2; Kepelino 1932: 192, Malo 1951: 320 in Handy and Handy 1972: 80; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 2, 25; Kane 1997: 26, 29; Maly 2001: 2; McGregor 2007: 13, 264; Beckwith 1976: 293-306 in Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 173; Trask 1999: 5).

According to traditionalist scholars like Charlot and Kameeleihiwa, not only do genealogies tie man to the universe in a universal and genealogical history, but they also detail human history (Charlot 2005b: 486-488; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 19-21). The exploits and struggles of the chiefs were widely known to commoners as stories of distant, but keeping in mind the general conception of the universe explained above, still related members of the universal family. The evidence can be seen in the stories that fill the published volumes of Fornander, Kamakau, Malo, and others, who in many cases traveled around the countryside interviewing elders for much of their source material. But even these many pages pale in comparison to the corpus still unpublished and uncorrelated from the nineteenth and early twentieth-century Hawaiian language newspapers.²⁹ In this light, albeit metaphysical but still valid when discussing makaainana genealogies from the traditionalist viewpoint, anthropologist statements that these were lost can be reevaluated.

Other perhaps more accessible evidence is readily available which shows that commoners possessed genealogies even into the nineteenth-century, and material from even the small percentage of Hawaiian language newspapers already translated from those years details this. In several articles from the 1860s in the Hawaiian language newspapers *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* and *Ke Au Okoa*, Kamakau refers to the genealogies of the commoners. He writes that there is much ignorance about the genealogies of the chiefs and the commoners, about non-chiefly genealogies and those of prominent commoners and in general about commoner genealogies and genealogical chants (Kamakau 1867a in Charlot 2005b: 489; Kamakau 1867b, Kamakau 1868a, Kamakau

²⁹ In total, about 125, 000 pages were published in Hawaiian language newspapers from 1834 to 1948. See Nogelmeier 2003: 93 for more information.

1868b, Kamakau 1869 in Charlot 2005b: 728). He writes about the liaisons between chiefs and commoners that produced children who would only be known if a genealogical record were preserved (Kamakau 1865, Kamakau 1867b, Kamakau 1870d, Kamakau 1870e, Kamakau 1871 in Charlot 2005b: 731). Other evidence shows more: that commoners possessed knowledge of their lineages up to the tenth generation at the Hale Naua to apply for land with a newly ascendant paramount chief (Malo 1951: 192). Aumakua were often deified ancestors who had lived in the remote past, definitely not in recent generations (Andrade 2009: 23; Beckwith 1976: 108; McGregor 2007: 23; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 36). And genealogies had to be known so makaainana did not mingle their blood with the outcaste kauwa (Charlot 2005b: 732-733).

In later times, commoner lineages passed down orally from earlier times were eventually preserved in family Bibles after the early nineteenth-century. Sometimes these books were kept as sacred possessions, and not only contained lists of who begat who, but other detailed knowledge such as names of family aumakua, dates of births, marriages, and deaths, and meaning of family names and under which conditions those names would be bestowed (Kinney 1957: 25-33). And Pukui writes that although makaainana did not chant their genealogies in the formal style of the chiefs, they knew their lineages (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 286). This evidence shows that anthropologist claims that makaainana lost their genealogies needs to be reevaluated. And if makaainana did not lose them, then there perhaps was not as great a difference between alii and makaainana as the anthropologists suggest.

Another topic related to genealogy that shows similarities and differences between the anthropologist and traditionalist groups is over the mookuauhau, the

genealogical specialists. Anthropologist writers definitely believe that genealogical specialists existed in chiefly society. Cordy discusses the hale naua ritual, in which specialists would identify those individuals who could prove a genealogical tie to the paramount within ten generations (Malo 1951: 188-191 in Cordy 2000: 50, 57). These would become the bulk of the kingdom's chiefs; those who could not would be the commoners (Cordy 2000: 50). Earle also describes the hale nauwa (naua) ceremony in which a chief would recite his genealogy, especially how he was related to the paramount, before a group of genealogical specialists. If the genealogists considered the relationship to be legitimate, the chief would become eligible for political appointment (Malo 1951: 191-92 in Earle 1978: 14; Earle 1997: 5). Hommon, like Earle, mentions skilled genealogists being important in chiefly society. They determined the rank of chiefs relative to the new paramount in the hale naua ceremony (Malo 1951: 191 in Hommon 1976: 90). Kirch writes that genealogical specialists, called poe moolelo, translated as 'historian,' had the task of memorizing the genealogies of elite families, along with accounts of their deeds and achievements (Beckwith, ed., 1932: 134 in Kirch 2010: 35; Malo 1951: 261 in Kirch 2010: 79). Some traditionalists also write about the existence of genealogists in chiefly society. Cachola-Abad holds that they would recite the genealogies to explain the complex family relationships among chiefs (Kamakau 1991: 80 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 32-33). She calls these specialists kuauhau, who would assess and retain genealogical pedigrees at court (Malo 1996: 221 in Cachola-Abad 129-132). Charlot also writes about the genealogists and historians at court (Charlot 2005b: 486). It seems clear that both anthropologists and some traditionalists write that court genealogists trained in the lineages and histories of the chiefs existed.

But the disagreement over genealogists is if they existed among makaainana. Nowhere in the works that I have chosen to use from these particular anthropologists do they write that this is the case. Earle states that makaainana did not possess the genealogical specialists as did the chiefs (Kamakau 1961: 242, Malo 1951: 60 in Earle 1997: 36). Goldman also does not believe that commoners had genealogical specialists. He writes of the elder in commoner society described by Handy and Pukui (1958: 196) known as the meapaa-kiauhau, or genealogist, but rejects that they possessed knowledge of genealogies when he states that, "...they are speaking only of relatives, since chiefs and commoners did not share a common genealogy" (Goldman 1970: 235-236). Kirch writes that the, "... poe moolelo (the term might properly be translated as 'historian') had the task of memorizing the genealogies of elite families, along with accounts of their deeds and accomplishments." And that "...a genealogy that could be traced back through an unbroken line of named ancestors-was the hallmark of the chiefly class." (Kirch 2010: 35).

However, other evidence shows that at least some commoner families had their own experts who preserved knowledge of family lineages. Charlot writes that families of all ranks depended on genealogies to establish identities and claims and that family histories were kept (Charlot 2005b: 486-487). He believes that a family member would be entrusted with learning its genealogies and stories, and contrasts this person with the more broadly knowledgeable person who would hold similar positions at chiefly courts (Charlot 2005b: 488-490). Mary Kawena Pukui also calls attention to this person who was known as the hanau mua, literally translated as "first born."³⁰ She describes the

³⁰ This information was supplied by Mary Kawena Pukui, who herself was trained as the hanau mua of her family. See Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 126-131, 190.

hanau mua as usually being the elder in the senior branch of the family, chosen in childhood and specially trained, usually by a grandparent or other elder, to be the one whose task it was to preserve family history and traditions. Hanau mua were responsible for memorizing all the relatives, whether living, passed on, or aumakua, and learned the family prayers, names, and legends (Pukui 1983: no. 2107, no. 2171, no. 2484; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 190). This evidence needs to be considered before coming to a conclusion that the makaainana did not possess genealogical specialists.

Another topic in genealogy that shows similarities and differences between the views of anthropologists and traditionalists is over the issue of how mana entered human society. Scholars from both groups are in agreement that mana came through genealogies of note. But they seem to differ over the issue of whether makaainana could also possess mana. Earle writes that “The chiefs held mana, power that flowed through the individual and demonstrated their feared divine essence” (Earle 1997: 45). But he makes no mention of makaainana holding mana as well. Goldman states that, “Deep genealogies, straight genealogies, and genealogies richly staffed with illustrious persons transmit the full charge of mana. Mana moves most powerfully down the senior lines, causing them to grow and proliferate” (Goldman 1970: 418). Hommon writes that, “The division between the alii and the makaainana was sharply defined, all-pervasive and self-perpetuating. This division can best be introduced in relation to the principle of genealogical seniority that underlay the ranked hierarchy of chiefs” (Hommon 1976: 89). He continues, “The majority of the population were makaainana who lacked mana (supernatural power), prestige and political power that were concomitant with chiefly rank” (Hommon 1976: 72). Kirch states his understanding as he writes, “Closest to the

gods, the chief is their earthly representative, the means by which supernatural efficacy, mana, is conveyed to the society at large.... All Polynesian chiefs were set apart from commoners by their mana..." (Kirch 1984: 37-38). "But mana did not flow equally to all persons; quite the contrary, mana followed the pathways of rank and genealogical descent that also ordered Polynesian societies... In all Polynesian societies, mana was concentrated in persons of rank, but in the more highly stratified societies the chiefs came to occupy particular roles as sources or vehicles of mana on which the society at large depended for its well-being. Nowhere was this more so than in late Hawaiian society" (Kirch 2010: 38). Sahlins writes that, "Chiefs are direct descendents of divinity; consequently, they are imbued with certain sacred powers (mana)" (Sahlins 1958: 14).

Some traditionalist writers seem to be in agreement with the anthropologists when they write that mana in humans proceeds through chiefly genealogy. Cachola-Abad writes that, "Those most closely connected to the gods and the spiritual realm possess a greater degree of mana and hence the authoritative position of alii" (Cachola-Abad 2000: 79, 80). Kane writes of chiefly mana, "...Of the highest class were those whose lineages were the most impeccable, believed to offer the least disruption to the flow of mana to them from their divine patrons. This was chiefly mana, an invisible force flowing through the persons of men and women of perfect pedigree...(Kane 1997: 32-34). And Pukui, Haertig, and Lee write that "Closest to the gods and imbued with the highest mana were the ruling alii (aristocracy). Kings viewed mana as a genetic inheritance from god to king to king's descendent (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 150. See also Barrere 1961: 20-21, 31-34).

But the disagreement lies over whether or not the alii were the only ones that possessed mana. The anthropologists make some statements that can be interpreted to show that they believe that the makaainana possessed mana. Goldman and Kirch seem to theorize that mana is not specially limited to those humans possessing chiefly genealogies. Goldman writes, "All (Polynesians) share in the common respect for the expert, the tohunga (Hawaiian: kahuna). Respect for skill is surely a basic human trait. But the Polynesian concept of tohunga is more than general respect. By conferring this title, the Polynesians have converted a general human concept into a specific system of status, drawing the expert into the orbit of aristocracy" (Goldman 1970: 491-492). He continues, "The craft specialist, on the other hand, was an independent status and developed along with, or as a parallel social group. Tonga and Hawaii illustrate the emergence of strong and independent statuses of craftsmen" (Goldman 1970: 494). Although Goldman does not specifically state that craftsmen had mana, he does not deny it either, and seems to afford them status towards the aristocracy, who did possess mana. Goldman seems to further theorize about mana when he writes that "...there is acknowledgement of mana inherent in capability in Polynesia, Micronesia, and Indonesia" (Goldman 1970: 11). He continues by specifically discussing mana in Polynesia, and seems to hold that it is not a purview only of chiefs through their genealogies but also others through accomplishment when he writes that "Supreme status, then, in Polynesia, would be ideally defined as an endowment with the greatest amount of mana by virtue of seniority of descent from a line of males and the demonstration of mana by skills and valor" (Goldman 1970: 16). But he makes a stronger statement later, "Whoever made an offering to a god received mana. Mana was

thus not simply or directly an attribute to pedigree, but a benefice of the gods granted to whom they would favor” (Goldman 1970: 220).

Like Goldman, Kirch also discusses what can be considered a theory of mana in which he does not specifically limit it to chiefs. Speaking of APS, he writes, “Chiefs were by definition receptacles of mana, but theirs was not a monopoly, leaving open the possibility for rivals (such as the toa, warriors) to usurp some of their social and economic power that accompanied the control of mana” (Kirch 1984: 196-7). Not confining his comments to ancestral Polynesia, but putting them in context of later Polynesian practice, he continues, “Warfare in Polynesia was therefore a means of preserving the mana and status of chiefs, as well as an opportunity for their rivals to usurp that same mana and status, and for toa (warrior) [Hawaiian: koa], to achieve a position in society not open to them by birth” (Kirch 1984: 196-7). So Kirch, like Goldman, seems to accept theoretically that mana when it manifests in the human realm is not specially limited to those with chiefly genealogies.

If mana is attributable to skills or performance, as Goldman and Kirch seem to hold, then those who are skilled or excel in performance should be considered to have some measure of mana. Goldman mentions craft specialists, but makes no statement that attributes mana to them. Similarly, Hommon mentions skilled craftspersons as he writes about a secondary definition of kahuna as, “ It can be translated as specialist or expert in a wide variety of professions, such as canoe-building, wood-carving, medicine and agriculture (Pukui, and Elbert 1973: 106 in Hommon 1976: 108). Therefore Hommon is aware of Hawaiian craftspersons, but, like Goldman, does not go as far to state that they possess mana because of skills. Similarly, Kirch mentions skilled persons in a number of

places. He writes in 1984 about the word *tufunga* (Hawaiian: *kahuna*) that, in ancestral Polynesia, “Aside from the chief, a number of other Polynesian social statuses can be reconstructed from the lexical table...among these is *tufunga*, with a gloss of ‘expert, specialist, craftsman” (Kirch 1984: 64). More specifically about Hawaiian craftsmen, Kirch writes, “The Hawaiian economy also displayed considerable craft specialization, with such experts as canoe-makers, adz-makers, bird-catchers, wood-carvers, and tattooing experts (Kirch 1985: 3). And in 2010: he goes into more detail about craftspersons. He writes that they produced spectacular objects of great sophistication, most notable in featherwork (Kirch 2010: 42). He quotes Peter Buck (Hiroa) who writes about the skill of the Hawaiian craftsmen who worked barkcloth, *kapa*, “Polynesian barkcloth manufacture reached its apogee in Hawaii with the greatest variety of texture and colored designs” (Buck 1957: 166 in Kirch 2010: 45). Buck also writes about the canoe builders, “...an expert guild known as *kahuna kalai waa*, whose tutelary deity was a manifestation of the war god *Ku*, *Kupulupulu* (Buck 1957: 254 in Kirch 2010: 46). Kirch describes the war canoes as “...complex constructions requiring skilled carpentry and other crafts” (Kirch 2010: 46). Sahlins also writes of Hawaiian craftsmen, and lists many: house-builders, adz makers, and bird snarers, among others (Sahlins 1958: 115-116).

Therefore, some of the above anthropologists in these particular works accept that *mana* is available not just to chiefs but to those with talent, and are aware of skilled craftspeople who possess various talents, but nowhere do they explicitly state that these skilled commoners possess any measure of *mana*. But Kirch is more explicit. He seems to hold that *mana* is limited to chiefs and at best, to those *toa* who would challenge the

chiefs for rule. He writes in 1984: “Warfare in Polynesia was therefore a means of preserving the mana and status of chiefs, as well as an opportunity for their rivals to usurp that same mana and status, and for toa to achieve a position in society not open to them by birth” (Kirch 1984: 196-7). He also writes in the same work that, “The structural principles of chieftainship, genealogical rank, primogeniture, mana, and tapu, permeated the social fabric, organizing production and mobilizing labor in ways that counteracted the centripetal tendencies of the elemental domestic unit” (Kirch 1984: 197). Organizing production and labor in late pre-contact Hawaiian society for Kirch and the other anthropologists is the prerogative solely of chiefs. Other statements make clear that Kirch sees mana in the context of differentiating between those who possessed it, the rulers, or those who would challenge for rule, and those who did not rule. He writes, “...for understanding the origins of divine kingship in later Hawaiian society, mana and tapu provided the critical basis for distinctions between those who were more closely related to (ascended from) the ancestors, and who enjoyed both the privileges and responsibilities of controlling mana, and those who did not” (Kirch 2010: 21). He continues, “But mana did not flow equally to all persons; quite the contrary, mana followed the pathways of rank and genealogical descent that also ordered Polynesian societies, and the more hierarchical these became, the more differentiated the distribution of mana across the social order. In all Polynesian societies, mana was concentrated in persons of rank, but in the more highly stratified societies the chiefs came to occupy particular roles as sources and vehicles of mana on which the society at large depended for its well-being. Nowhere was this more so than in late Hawaiian society” (Kirch 2010: 38). Therefore, while these anthropologists recognize the theoretical possibility of those

other than chiefs possessing mana, they do not provide any examples, and Kirch seems to make statements to the opposite. In their view, there is a large difference between chiefs and commoners when examining mana.

In contrast, there are clear statements in some traditionalist writers that mana is indeed found in makaainana. Kanahale writes that “mana pervaded the entire technological process, from the tools used and the skills displayed in their use, to the quality of the end products, the labor that went into their creation, and most of all, to the technician himself” (Kanahale 1992: 293-94). Similarly, Kane writes that “...[mana becomes] manifest in humans as outstanding talents, intelligence, strengths, and leadership charisma” (Kane 1997: 26). Mary Kawena Pukui, also describes the mana that is found in the skilled person.

Pukui describes ha, a ritual in which mana can be passed on. This was not the general, diffused mana of power, charisma or authority. This was not skill or proficiency, for skills came from training and practice. Rather, the mana of ha was a talent or natural aptitude. This mana was hand-eye coordination for the craftsman. Insight, keen perceptions, hands sensitive to tactile messages for the various medical kahunas (doctors, priests). A ‘feel for the soil’ for the farmer. Color sense, spatial perception, perfect pitch, bodily grace, a feel for rhythm, a natural singing voice—all these are examples of specific mana... A person about to die expelled his breath into his chosen successor’s mouth. With this, the mana that made him an expert in an art or craft passed directly to one particular person, not to the family in general. The mana imparted by the ha kept the art alive. (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 44, 150).

Therefore, while some anthropologists and traditionalist writers recognize the mana that proceeds from a chiefly pedigree, only traditionalists write that mana could be accessed by the skilled person not of alii rank. Therefore what is apparent is that there is a different conception of mana, one limited to rulers or those who would rule, and the other

wider ranging. It follows then that to the traditionalist holding that makaainana could access mana, there is less difference between alii and makaainana.

Another difference is seen in how both groups view the distance between chiefs and commoners as shown in genealogies. Scholars from both groups write that there was distance, but the traditionalists discuss information not emphasized by the anthropologists, so their take on this issue tends to be different. The anthropologists feel that genealogies definitely differentiated chiefs from commoners. Cordy writes that those individuals who could prove a genealogical connection to the paramount chief would become chiefs; all those who could not became commoners (Cordy 2000: 50). Earle believes that while the chiefs maintained extensive and detailed genealogies, commoners could not, and “This contrast in kinship knowledge emphasized the sharp division between the chiefs and the commoners (Earle 1997: 36). Goldman also writes about the difference in alii and makaainana as seen in their genealogies. He states that the Kamehameha pedigree reached back 99 generations, but that makaainana had “little genealogical depth” (Goldman 1970: 216, 235). Hommon writes that, “The cleavage between classes...was constantly reinforced by the great dependence of alii on genealogies in contrast to the severe truncation of them among commoners” (Hommon 1976: 175). Kirch writes in 2000 that “Chiefs distinguished themselves as a class from commoners...” because of genealogies (Kirch 2000: 300). Again in 2010 he writes that “... a distinguished pedigree - a genealogy that could be traced back through an unbroken line of named ancestors - was the hallmark of the chiefly class” (Kirch 2010: 35).

Like anthropologist writers, some traditionalists write that the extensive genealogies differentiated the alii from makaainana. Cachola-Abad writes that although

all people are genealogically connected to the gods, it is only the alii who can specifically recount those connections which afford them greater seniority above those who are commoners, and therefore that Hawaiian society therefore maintained the basic distinction between alii and makaainana seen in APS (Cachola-Abad 2000: 80, 81, 87, 129-132, 278-279). Kameeleihiwa writes that all Native scholars have agreed that alii are chiefs because they know their genealogies (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 22). Kane thinks that makaainana families lost their genealogical connection to the major spirits, but chiefly families remembered them (Kane 1995: 32).

But some traditionalists write that alii and makaainana proceed from the same source. This conception would tend to lessen the distance between the two groups. Andrade writes that alii and makaainana were the same people, and that both Malo and Kamakau both state they were descended from Papa and Wakea (Andrade 2009: 73-74). Cachola-Abad writes that in Hawaiian cosmogonic genealogies, "... all people are genealogically connected to the gods" (Malo 1996: 173 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 80-81). Charlot discusses Malo's theories regarding the reason for the later separation of chiefs and commoners since all were originally descended Papa and Wakea (Malo 1951: Chapter 18, 40, 41 in Charlot 2005b: 726). The Handys and Pukui write that commoners were of the same stock as alii according to genealogical history (Malo 1951: 88 in Handy and Handy 1972: 323-324). Kameeleihiwa says commoners and chiefs are all descended from the same source, Papa and Wakea (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 23). Kanahale writes that all peoples are descended from Papa and Wakea (Kanahale 1995: 17, 18). Maly writes that, "In Hawaiian genealogical accounts we also find that the same god-beings, or creative forces of nature who gave birth to the islands, were also the parents of the first

man (Haloa), and from this ancestor all Hawaiian people are descended (Maly 2001: 2). Van Dyke writes that each Hawaiian could claim ancestry from Wakea and Papa (Van Dyke 2008: 15-16).

But there is little mention in the anthropologist writers about the creation myth that specifies that alii and makaainana are descended from the same genealogical source, the primordial parents Papa and Wakea. Goldman appears to be the exception. He writes that the traditions say that makaainana had been alii in the beginning but had carelessly given themselves up to the pursuit of gratification and pleasure, and had lost interest in preserving their status, therefore the genealogical connection between them and chiefs was lost (Goldman 1970: 227; Malo 1951: 87 in Goldman 1970: 230). He also references Fornander, who wrote that the separation occurred after the migratory period. Fornander saw a gradual political process in which the status of chiefs became more prominent, chiefly prerogatives increased, both at the expense of the makaainana who were systematically debased and set down (Fornander 1880: 63 in Goldman 1970: 227). Kirch writes that the “great cosmogonic myths of Wakea and Papa recount the creation of the world from the primal, chaotic darkness, Po” but does not mention that they were the primordial parents from whom both alii and makaainana descend (Kirch 1985: 7). Sahlins writes that the commoners . . . were frequently distant, inferior relatives of the chiefs and stewards” but, like Kirch, does not mention the tradition that both chiefs and commoners descend from Wakea and Papa (Sahlins 1958: 13). It is therefore easier to see a gulf between alii and makaainana if their common origin is not emphasized. There then seems to be a pattern, that what is emphasized makes a big difference in the conception that a dramatic difference existed between genealogical practices of alii and

makaainana. Just as with the issue of whether or not makaainana lost their genealogies, possessed genealogical specialists, and if they were able to access mana, one can see some similarity between the two groups. But there is more contrast.

Aspects of Societal Rank

Just as there are variations within the anthropologist and traditionalist groups, and both similarities and differences between the groups as they view items related to genealogy, so do these exist when examining what both groups write about societal rank in Hawaiian society after the formalization of the ahupuaa system. And just as with genealogy, the split between the two groups of scholars is not always razor-sharp, but again, there is a clear pattern. For example, the anthropologists write that alii maintained a rank structure, and there is much information that shows that many traditionalists believe the same thing. But the disagreement lies when some of the anthropologists write that rank structure was lost among commoners, whereas much information in some traditionalist sources shows the persistence of ranking in commoner society. There are few differences between the two groups regarding the idea that among alii rank considerations via the most impeccable genealogies culminated in the highest chiefs, the pio/niaupio alii of the highest rank, which afforded these highest of chiefs divine status. But as before, eventually the differences between the anthropologists and traditionalists cannot be glossed over. And in this case, a major difference lies not in the details of rank but in what context these details are discussed.

After the formalization of the ahupuaa system, Cordy thinks that not only did the distance between the chiefs and commoners grow, but "... each strata of chiefs would be set off from the others..." as well, which shows the elaboration of rank among alii (Cordy 2002b: 27). Earle speaks of ranking within alii society, as lower-ranked chiefs would be placed as 'on-site managers of ahupuaa...' (Earle 1978: 169). Goldman provides details of "eleven grades of alii..." (Goldman 1970: 228-229). Hommon writes that of alii "... one's rank depends on the genealogical proximity to the paramount chief ..." (Hommon 1976: 53-54). Kirch discusses the seven or eight ranks of chiefs in several places (Kirch 1984: 36-38, 257; Kirch 2000: 248-249; Kirch 2010: x, 6). Traditionalists also write of ranking within alii society. Andrade writes about the many grades of alii (Andrade 2009: 70). Cachola-Abad references eleven alii rankings (Cachola-Abad 2000: 95). Charlot writes that chiefs were ranked by complex systems (Charlot 2005b: 1-2). Kanahele writes of the many ranks of chiefs that became "...even more stratified and complicated..." over time (Kanahele 1995: 51). Pukui, like Kirch, writes of eight ranks of alii (Kamakau 1964: 4-6 in Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 287). Young refers to eleven grades of alii (Kamakau 1964: 4-6 in Young 1998: 34-35). It is clear that both anthropologist and traditionalist writers agree that rank was vitally important to alii. But the disagreement about rank comes not within alii society but among makaainana.

When Cordy discusses rank in Hawaii of the contact era, he focuses on alii. In his section entitled "Social Stratification," Cordy mentions that, "...highly skilled warriors and other commoners and foreigners of great skill could be elevated to chiefly rank" (Cordy 2000: 50). He writes that, "Full time specialists may have existed, but they were usually attached to a high chief's or the ruler's court..." (Cordy 2000: 54). This is as far

as Cordy goes in these works to describe any type of rank that may have existed among makaainana, and he provides no examples of commoners receiving chiefly rank. Earle is clearer. He writes that, “In direct contrast [to the chiefs], commoners...recognized no rank distinction” (Kamakau MS, 173 in Earle 1978: 14). Goldman, like Cordy, spends very little time discussing anything that may be considered rank among makaainana. He does mention the “...haku, a term meaning leader or director in the strictly secular sense, without reference to either sanctity or to genealogical distinction, and altogether distinct, therefore, from alii” (Handy and Pukui 1958: 6-7, in Goldman 1970: 237). He continues that, “There is no specific suggestion [in Handy and Pukui, 1958] that the households [of the ohana] were ranked, other than the statement of the superiority of status of the household of the haku” (Goldman 1970: 237). Hommon, like Earle, states unambiguously that “All available evidence indicates that the concept of rank was virtually non-existent among the makaainana” (Hommon 1976: 105). Kirch mentions the haku, and states that, “Since the kaainga-type residential, land-holding ascent groups had ceased to exist in late prehistoric Hawaii there could be no leadership position” (Kirch 2010: 26). Like Goldman, Kirch holds that the term haku “had become a kind of synonym for chief, alii” (Kirch 2010: 26). Sahlins, like Cordy and Goldman, implies that rank distinctions may have existed in commoner society. He writes, “Like the great chief in his domain, the father is in his own house a sacred figure, a man of superior mana...Polynesians know innately how to honor the chief, for chieftainship begins at home: the chief’s due is no more than elaborate filial respect (Sahlins 1968: 64 in Kirch 1984: 34). Although Cordy, Goldman, and Sahlins, unlike Earle and Hommon leave open the possibility that rank may have existed in commoner society, they do not affirm

that it did in fact exist, and they certainly do not develop the possibility as part of their narrative.

But in contrast, the work of some traditionalists includes clear evidence that societal rank existed in commoner society. This evidence, like some issues with genealogy above, has its basis in Hawaiian cosmology. Some Hawaiian creation myths tell about the origin of human beings. Wakea (sky-father) mated with Papa (earth-mother). A child, Haloa (Haloa-naka), was born but died. He was buried and up sprang the taro. The next child, also named Haloa (also known as Haloa lau kapalili), lived to become the ancestor of humans (This version can be found in these sources: Andrade 2009: 5-6; Beckwith 1976: 298; Dudley 1986: 103; Kepelino 1932: 192 in Handy and Handy 1972: 80-81; Malo 1951: 244 in Kanahale 1995: 17-19; Malo 1951: 244 in Van Dyke 2008: 11-12). However, because the taro was born first, it was genealogically superior to human beings according to Hawaiian belief and practice (Barrere 1961: 18-20; Cachola-Abad 2000: 79-80; Goldman 1970: 4-9; Handy and Handy 1972: 74-75). As a result of being first-born, the taro possesses more mana, and is to be deferred to as senior (Handy and Handy 1972: 74 in Dudley 1986: 103; McGregor 2007: 13; Handy and Handy 1972: 80-81 in Van Dyke 2008: 11-12). Seniority and therefore rank due to birth order permeates all of human society, and is so basic to Hawaiian life that it is involved even in eating. When the poi bowl was uncovered, Haloa the first-born is present in the poi. The offspring of Haloa the second born, humans, are not to argue, discuss business, or speak of anything unpleasant or the god in the poi would be upset and deny any human endeavors spoken of (Handy and Handy 1972: 81; Kanehele 1995: 17-19; Pukui 1983: no. 1700). In this instance, Haloa the first-born outranks Haloa the second born, and

shows that the general conception of rank proceeding from the story of the first humans was one basis of the belief and practice of rank in commoner society.

More evidence that shows rank in commoner society involves the difficult concept of aumakua. Here, as before, and with so much of Hawaiian thinking, metaphysical perceptions are involved. Moreover, a systematic view of Hawaiian religious or philosophical beliefs is as difficult to describe clearly as is Hinduism (Charlot 1983: 35). In both there are a multitude of beliefs and practices, and many ways in which these have been communicated, some contradictory (Beckwith 1976: 2; Charlot 1983: 21-22, 25, 32-35). Aumakua, commonly known as ancestor or family gods, are one particular example of this multiplicity. However, by looking at commonalities of description, one can deduce some things about aumakua that are pertinent to the concept of rank in makaainana society.

Primary among these is that aumakua are members of particular human families (Andrade 2009: 23; Beckwith 1976: 82; Charlot 1983: 82; Handy and Pukui 1958: 35; McGregor 2007: 14, 23; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 35, 55, 123). In this conception, it is incorrect to say that family is only the people present in human flesh on the earth. Instead, family includes those members already departed from life as human beings but still present and accessible, though usually not in human form (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 36). Not only are they family members, they are ranking members, and this can be seen in several ways. The aumakua had been born earlier, and in Hawaiian genealogical theory explained above, earlier birth means higher rank (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 36). Not only theoretically do aumakua have higher rank, but in capability. They can manifest in plant and animal forms while still retaining their godly powers

(Andrade 2009: 23; McGregor 2007: 75; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 36; Tabrah 1970). They can show themselves in other natural phenomena such as winds, lava, and clouds (Andrade 2009: 23; Barrere 1961: 25-28; Beckwith 1976: 82; Cachola-Abad 2000: 83; Handy and Pukui 1958: 35). These extraordinary capabilities equate to extraordinary mana, and this gives aumakua higher rank in the family than ordinary human beings.

Another way that rank is found in commoner society can be seen in the roles within the family that aumakua fulfill. Aumakua guide, protect, guard, watch over, warn, and assist family members (Andrade 2009: 23; Barrere 1961: 25-28; Beckwith 1972: 82, 106; Handy and Pukui 1958: 35; McGregor 2007: 75; Pukui 1983: no. 1740; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 37). They reprimand and punish (Andrade 2009: 23; Barrere 1961: 27; Beckwith 1972: 323-324; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 38). And they assist with keeping the family together. When a family member placed his desires ahead of the good of the larger group, stepped out of line and transgressed, the aumakua as part of the reconciliation process would put him back in his place and assist with repentance and healing (Handy and Pukui 1958: 49-50; Pukui 1983: no. 1077; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 60-70). If the family elder abused his authority, the other members would pray to the aumakua to take his power and authority away so the family could again flourish (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 152). Even the word aumakua carried the connotation of authority. The derivation of au is from era or eon, and makua is from parent or ancestor (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 35). It is clear that aumakua acted as parental figures, and was due respect and deference as only one with rank would be given. Therefore by considering aumakua as it is discussed in the work of some traditionalists,

the idea that rank was lost among commoners held by the anthropologists needs to be modified.

Not only was rank found in the realm of religious belief and convention, it was also seen in functional relationships between commoners. Some general background about land tenure will be helpful. There were many terms for individual pieces of land, but for the purposes of this discussion, we can simplify. The largest is the moku, sometimes referred to as moku, or individual island, for example the island of Oahu. Next in size is the moku, one of the terms for a district, for example the moku of Kona on the island of Oahu. This area, commonly known as the South Shore, runs from the spine of the Koolau to the fringing reef, and from the airport area to near Makapuu (apps.ksbe.edu/enrichment/sites/apps.ksbe.edu/enrichment/files/Oahu.jpg). A paramount chief who through conquest or appointment commanded an entire island or district was known as alii ai moku, or the chief who “consumes” the moku. Then there is the ahupuaa, the land divisions within the district. For example, the ahupuaa of Waikiki in the Kona District of Oahu ran from the Koolau to the reef, from near Punchbowl to the Niu Valley area. The alii in charge of an ahupuaa was called the alii ai ahupuaa. He was assisted by agents, the konohiki who were his ministers and interfaced directly with the commoner families living on the land to coordinate food production, public works, and taxation. The next land division in size was the ili, but there was no alii ai ili. Instead, some traditionalist writers refer to the haku, the heads of the extended commoner families who lived in that area (Beechert 1985: 7; Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Handy and Handy 1972: 20, 288; Handy and Pukui 1958: 6; Kikuchi 1973: 106).

Rank was implicit in the person of the haku. The haku was the elder male of the senior line of the family (Handy and Pukui 1958: 6; Kikuchi 1973: 106). The first choice of a person as haku therefore came by seniority, and in Hawaiian genealogical understanding, this gave him the mana and rank that necessarily implied deference (Cachola-Abad 2000: 80-81; Handy and Handy 1972: 288; Kane 1997: 50-65). There were haku in alii, kahuna, farming, and fishing families; there was no relation to class, politics, or occupation, and haku were found throughout Hawaiian society (Handy and Pukui 1958: 6). As a ranking member, it was the haku's responsibility to be spokesman and representative for the commoner family and he interfaced directly with the konohiki (Handy and Handy 1972: 20; Kane 1997: 51; Kikuchi 1973: xvii, 106). He was responsible for coordinating family efforts to meet the taxes levied by the konohiki (Beechert 1985: 6-7; Handy and Handy 1972: 288). The haku worked directly with the konohiki and kiai loko, the fishpond supervisor, to maintain the food production systems for the area worked by his family, and supervised work (Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Handy and Pukui 1958: 6-7; Kikuchi 1973: 106, 221).

Not only did the haku interface with other members of society on behalf of the family, but his status gave him the authority to direct activities internal to the family (Barrere 1961: 22; Kanahale 1992: 350-351). He divided the catch among participants, supervised worship, planned community activities, presided over family councils, had authority over individuals and households, and settled family disputes (Kane 1997: 50-65; Handy and Pukui 1958: 6-7). Although seniority and ranking status gave authority to the haku to be family elder, he was not a dictator. He was subject to the opinions and advice of other family members (Handy and Pukui 1958: 6). His continued tenure

depended on competence (Handy and Handy 1972: 288). If the haku did not perform, or was abusive, the family would pray to the aumakua, the family member who outranked the haku, to take back the mana which had afforded the haku to rise to family leadership in the first place, and he would be replaced (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 152).

Rank in commoner society can also be seen in the elaboration of various crafts and the experts who excelled in them. As above, some of these details are also found in anthropologist writings, but they stop short of attributing rank to makaainana. The traditionalists, however, interpret some of these details differently. The makaainana as a group were heterogeneous (Kamakau 1870e in Charlot 2005b: 729; Kelly 1956: 28). One could increase one's status and rank in makaainana society by deeds. This can be seen clearly if we examine specialists in commoner society. In Hawaiian thinking, specialists possessed more mana than other commoners because of their skills and performance. Sometimes they were known as kahuna, but for the purposes of this discussion, are to be distinguished from the popular version of kahuna, the high priests who officiated at the luakini and other large heiau in state rituals (Charlot 2005b: 3, 409; Davenport 1994: 1; Goldman 1970: 491-494). These other kahuna, or masters, experts, specialists, and teachers, received special recognition and rewards for their accomplishments (P. Buck 1938: 149 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 82; Charlot 1983: 32; Kanahale 1992: 357).

There was a formalization of specialists that occurred under Umi a Liloa of Hawaii Island, mentioned previously. He separated out the farmers, fisherman, canoe builders, and other skilled artisans in the work to which they were best suited (Fornander 1999 IV: 228, Kamakau 1992b: 1 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 353; Elbert 1959: 171ff. in Charlot 2005b: 409). But in the context of this discussion, and given the Hawaiian

understanding about the acquisition of mana which then led to ability, excellence, or mastery in any endeavor or field, the experts would rank above others in their field because of their increased mana that was evident in their accomplishment (Cachola-Abad 2000: 82). These varying occupations and specializations often had their own gods, further differentiating them from others who did not possess those particular talents (Charlot 1983: 32; Charlot 2005b: 407).

Commoners with specialized skills that excelled in making bowls, mats, and especially feather garments and helmets, would receive the chiefs' support (Charlot 2005b: 550; Kirch 1985: 3; Sahlins 1958: 15-16). Especially knowledgeable genealogists and historians, most important in chiefly culture, were found at court (Charlot 2005b: 487-491). Experts in the martial arts were recruited and instructed others there as well (Charlot 2005b: 425-428). Athletic and talented youth would be observed by chiefs during the makahiki games and be selected for this special training (Alexander 1891: 100 in Kelly 1956: 39). The most skilled of any of these were often made members of the chief's retinue, and some could be elevated to chiefly rank (Charlot 2005b: 77; Malo 1951:191-192 in Cordy 2000: 55; Goldman 1970: 213). To traditionalist writers, then, expertise and accomplishment and accompanying prestige and rank were indeed found among makaainana.

As above, general agreement with some anthropologists and traditionalists with this next topic, that rank was vitally important in alii society. Writers in both groups discuss this complex ranking system that in late pre-contact times culminated in the epitome of the chiefly genealogies, the pio/niaupio chief of the highest rank.³¹ Cordy

³¹ There is substantial detail and variation in Malo, Kamakau, and Fornander about what exactly comprised the pio/niaupio unions. For our purposes, we can simplify by considering the pio/niaupio close

writes that chiefly, "... marriages were frequently intended to consolidate power, sacredness, and alliances. Unions with full sisters ... and half-sisters ... were common, with resulting offspring of extremely high genealogical rank" (Malo 1951: 56 in Cordy 2000: 56-7). Hommon discusses the progeny produced by such pio/niaupio mating as the highest in the chiefly ranking system (Hommon references Fornander 1969: 156, 212; Kamakau 1961: 208; Kamakau 1964: 5-6; Malo 1951: 54-56, 135; Pukui, and Elbert 1973: 357 in Hommon 1976: 92-96). Kirch writes about the chief of the pio rank, the offspring of a full-sibling marriage, and quotes Kamakau, "The children born of these two were gods, fire, and raging blazes..." (Kamakau 1964: 4 in Kirch 1984: 38; see also Davenport 1994: 1; Kirch 2010: 36; Sahlins 1958: 9).

Traditionalist writers also spend much time discussing ranking within the alii class, culminating in the highest of chiefs, the pio/niaupio sacred chiefs. Cachola-Abad references eleven alii ranks described by Kamakau, culminating in the "...full brother-sister marriage..." which would produce a niaupio chief (Kamakau 1964: 4-5 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 95). Charlot writes that, "In the Kumulipo, the story is told of a chiefess married to her brother. This union, termed pio, produced the highest-ranking children in the Hawaiian aristocratic system" (Charlot 1983: 42). Likewise Kelly writes that the highest ranking chiefs, "... were the result of brother-sister and uncle-niece marriages..." (Kelly 1956: 40-41). The authors of *Native Planters in Old Hawaii* write, "Supreme rank and sanctity required the union of full brother and sister of the highest rank born of the same two parents. This was termed pio (to loop back on itself), and the offspring was termed niau pio (coconut-leaf looped-back)" (Malo 1903: 80-81 in Handy and Handy

consanguineous mating as being between any blood relatives closer than first cousins. See Davenport 1994: 21-30 for more detailed information.

1972: 320-321). Young, like Cachola-Abad, writes about the eleven grades of alii while referencing Kamakau, including the highest, the niaupio (Kamakau 1964: 4-6; Fornander II: 217-225 in Young 1998: 34-35. See also Johnson 2001: 36 and Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 151 for similar information).

Both anthropologists and traditionalist writers agree that ancient Hawaiians did not consider the pio/niaupio alii to be just another human being, albeit special, but he or she was of a different kind (Cordy 2000: 55). This being was described as godlike by some, by others as being a god. Cordy, Hommon and Kirch quote Malo who writes that, “The people held the chiefs in great dread and looked upon them as gods” (Malo 1951: 61 in Cordy 2000: 55; Hommon 1976: 72; Kirch 2010, 74). Earle writes that to the Hawaiian, “The chiefs held mana, power that flowed through the individual and demonstrated their feared divine essence” (Earle 1997: 45). Similarly, Goldman writes, “The chiefs were divine manifestations of the gods, to cite Kamakau” (No citation from Kamakau provided, Goldman 1970: 218). Kirch states that these highest chiefs were called alii akua, “god-kings” (Kamakau 1961: 4; Malo 1951: 54; Valeri 1985: 143). Many traditionalists write similar things. Cachola-Abad writes that the highest pio and niaupio alii were considered closest to the gods and were called akua (Malo 1996: 174 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 116). Kameeleihiwa writes that the offspring of a niaupio mating was an akua (Kamakau 1961: 208; Malo 1951: 54-56 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 40; Kepelino 1932: 132 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 41). Similarly, Kanahale writes that these chiefs were divinely endowed, and that, “... the highest ranking alii came to be regarded as na akua alii or god chiefs...” (Kanahale 1995: 51). The Handys and Pukui write that, “Supreme rank and sanctity required the union of full brother and sister of the highest

rank born of the same two parents.... who was regarded as a god (akua)...” (Malo 1903: 80-81 in Handy and Handy 1972: 320-321). And Van Dyke cites Kalakaua as he writes that the pio mating was the most desirable among alii, and that the offspring would be a divine akua (Kalakaua 1990: supra note 7 at 53 in Van Dyke 2008: 15-16).

Aspects of Chiefly Kapu

It appears then that many of the anthropologists and traditionalists agree in general on some of the details regarding rank among alii and that the highest ranks, the pio/niaupio chiefs, were regarded as divine. And as I will show, writers from both groups also go into detail about the strict kapu that accompanies these godly chiefs, especially the prostrating kapu described below. But then differences emerge. Cordy, Hommon, and Sahlins see the kapu in the context of separating alii and makaainana, but they do not provide an explanation about the origin of the separation or why it was necessary in ancient Hawaiian society. Kirch does offer an explanation, but it is quite different than the explanation offered by some traditionalist writers. Similarly, the traditionalists write about the separation between alii and makaainana as seen in kapu, but some of them see the separation in a very different context than does Kirch. They write that the separation that kapu provides is a means to keep order and balance in the universe.

These chiefs of special rank and status possessed very high and strict kapu. Cachola-Abad writes of the very highest pio and niaupio chiefs, closest to the gods and called akua, who possessed the prostrating kapu, not only for their bodies but for their personal belongings and dwellings (Malo 1996: 174-176 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 116).

Kameeleihiwa writes about the personal kapu of the alii nui so strict that if a shadow falls, or if the person stands above, or refuses to prostrate, the slightest infraction was death for the transgressor (Malo 1951: 56-7 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 37). Kelly writes something similar about the highest chiefs, who possessed the kapu of "...prostration, even when the chief's clothes passed by. The punishment for those failing to comply was instant death (Kelly 1956: 40-41). And the authors of the seminal *Nana I Ke Kumu* write that a "... a man's shadow contained some of his mana (spiritual power). No one, commoner or lesser alii (aristocracy), dared let his shadow fall on the highest ranking, kapu (sacred) chief, possessor of the greatest mana" (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 10). These same authors also provide detail for the grisly punishment of those who were unwary or unlucky enough to break these strictest of kapu, of "...flesh stripped off bones...", and of "burning men for not observing chiefly kapu..." (Kamakau 1961: 223; Kamakau 1964: 37 in Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 215).

In a discussion entitled, 'Na Alii the Chiefs' (Cordy 2000: 55-58), Cordy writes, "At the top of society was the paramount, sometimes referred to as moi, separate and apart from all others as a special being" (Cordy 2000: 55). He goes on to describe various kapu surrounding the paramount. "He was afforded special respect behavior: there were bans on casting a shadow on his back, house or belongings, on using his clothes and possessions, and on entering his residential compound without permission (Cordy 2000: 56). Failure to sit or prostrate when the ruler passed was dangerous, and sitting was required even when his food, water, or clothing passed by (Campbell 1967: 94; Ii 1959: 28; Menzies 1920: 91 in Cordy 2000: 56). Even high chiefs had to stand in silence until invited to sit or speak (Ellis 1963: 30 in Cordy 2000: 56). Violations, at

least by lower ranked chiefs and commoners were punishable by death” (Ii 1959: 23; Malo 1951: 56 in Cordy 2000: 56). But in this section, and in the section entitled The Gods (Na Akua) and The Priests (Na Kahuna) that follows (Cordy 2000: 59-62), Cordy does not explain the reasons for the kapu around the paramount, but only includes the above information in a general discussion about the differences between alii and makaainana. Goldman, like Cordy provides some detail about the kapu of the highest chiefs. He writes, “The highest chiefs inherited prerogatives which demanded extreme deference. Among the most extreme was the kapu moe, the prostration, which gave that chief the right to impose the death penalty for its violation, and the right to call for human sacrifice to the gods of that chief” (Goldman 1970: 217). But like Cordy, he does not explain a reason for the kapu. Hommon discusses the prostrating kapu of the highest chiefs of the pio/niaupio rank as well as other kapu of lower ranking chiefs, drawing most of his information from Malo (Malo 1951: 54-55 in Hommon 1976: 92-95). But like Cordy and Goldman, he offers no explanation of why the kapu existed in the first place. He does however provide a context, more clearly than either Cordy or Goldman, for these details of kapu. He writes, “The data presented here illustrate a definite disconformity between alii and makaainana that clearly was recognized by all Hawaiians. One belonged to either one horizontal segment or the other; one was either a chief or one was not” (Hommon 1976: 95). Sahlins also writes about the high kapu. He writes in an early work, “The Polynesian tabus concerning approaching, touching, or otherwise violating the sanctified chiefly personage, were elaborate and rigidly enforced in Hawaii. Malo indicates that death was the usual punishment for a breach of the personal tabu of the chief” (Sahlins does not provide a specific citation from Malo. Sahlins 1958: 21-22).

But like Hommon, the context Sahlins places this information is to use the kapu as an example of the power and authority of the chief over others. This is apparent as he continues “The native social system of the Hawaiian Islands has gained notoriety for the marked social distinctions between statuses, and for the personal despotism and authority of the chiefs...Malo repeatedly writes of the despotism of the chiefs and the life and death powers that the paramount chief held over those of low rank (Malo 1951: 34, 53, 57, 61 in Sahlins 1958: 18-19). But like Cordy, Goldman, and Hommon, Sahlins in this early work does not explain why the kapu was necessary to the ancient Hawaiian in the first place.

Kirch seems to go further by putting chiefly kapu in context of societal practices in general. In 1985 he writes “The actions of chiefs and commoners were further governed by an elaborate system of sanctions, kapu. Commoners, for example, were required to prostrate themselves (kapu moe) in the presence of the highest chiefs, who consequently often traveled at night so as to avoid disrupting the general populace. The kapu system also governed the behavior of ordinary men and women in their daily lives, prohibiting women from consuming such items as pork or bananas, and requiring that the food of men and women be cooked in separate earth ovens” (Kirch 1985: 7; Kirch gives very similar information in 2010: 40). But in 2010 Kirch provides an explanation for the reason for the kapu system, and references Kameeleihiwa. He writes,

What is sometimes referred to as the ‘kapu system’ was in reality a whole series of socially and ritually prescribed practices that controlled the daily lives and bodily practices of all ranks in late Hawaiian society. At its core was the ai kapu, the ‘eating taboo’ that controlled gender relations, and specified that men and women could not eat together, and that their foods must be cooked in separate ovens, and that certain foods (pork in particular, but also certain kinds of bananas, fish, and so on) were prohibited to women. As Kameeleihiwa argues, however, the aikapu was a metaphor that provided ‘... the

underpinnings of the entire kapu system. It was the Alii Nui [divine kings] who had to follow the dictates of the Aikapu most closely, because they were the Akua [gods] on earth who mediated between ordinary humans and the destructive-reproductive forces of the unseen divinities of the cosmos.’ (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 36 in Kirch 2010: 175-176).

Kirch then interprets Kameeleihiwa by writing that, “Thus the prohibitions regulating the ‘horizontal’ relations between genders became amplified on a vertical plane as a parallel set of prohibitions and strictures regulating contact between the alii (kapu) and the commoners (noa)[without kapu].”

But Kirch unfortunately has taken Kameeleihiwa’s comments out of context. In the passage he cites, Kameeleihiwa does not stop with just a separation of male and female, but provided a broader context that is absolutely fundamental: that kapu is essential for social order and harmony. She writes, “The metaphor of Aikapu, however, is much more than the separation of male kapu from the desecration of the female essence. It is the underpinning of the entire kapu system...while the Aina, Alii Nui and makaainana are by the genealogies mystically unified, they are also in the practical reality of things quite distinctly set apart. In a world where everyone cannot be both Akua and field laborer, *such separation is essential for the ordering of society* [emphasis added]” (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 36). Other traditionalists vary in their details, but the general idea of kapu promoting order, harmony, balance, in which all parties benefit is central to their narrative, and is quite in contrast to what the anthropologists write. As above, some traditionalists use the word lokahi, others use the word pono to describe this state of balance, but the main idea is the same. Cachola-Abad writes that kapu was a system of understandings and behavioral rules that defined and maintained appropriate relationships between people and the gods, people and the natural environment, alii and makaainana,

men and women, individuals and the rest of the community, deceased individuals and their living family and the place of internment. But for Cachola-Abad and for the context of this discussion, “Kapu addressed these relationships...to promote lokahi or the balance, unity, and harmony of the spiritual, natural, and human realms...” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 114). Kameeleihiwa writes that, “In order for the Moi to be pono, which was to ensure the well-being of the people, he or she must carefully uphold the aikapu (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 36). Kane explains that the purpose of the chiefly kapu was to keep mana flowing into the world, “[The chiefly kapu was] not simple snobbery, but the attempt to keep the conduits for chiefly mana open was the whole object.... Of the highest class [of chiefs] were those whose lineages were the most impeccable, believed to offer the least disruption to the flow of mana to them from their divine patrons. This was chiefly mana, an invisible force flowing through the persons of men and women of perfect pedigree to benefit the entire community, manifesting as good governance, security, and prosperity for all” (Kane 1997: 32-34). And Young explains that, “Kapu, its meaning often misinterpreted as forbidden, actually were principles for enforcing pono conduct in life that defined boundaries of propriety and by extension, quantified forms of freedom and framed the spaces of license within society. Kapu set parameters for the what, how, and why of doing something.... High chiefs equated pono with providing for the general populace. All Oiwī Maoli [pre-contact Hawaiians] knew their place in relation to Aikapu, the overarching system that organized society, established guidelines for individual and collective accountability, and enforced proper conduct through specific codes of behavior (Young 1998: 74-76).

These traditionalists recognize, like the anthropologists, that the kapu system culminated in the pio/niaupio chiefs of the highest rank, and that these chiefs were considered to be divine. They also recognize that in the kapu surrounding these divine chiefs, and in the kapu system in general, there indeed existed a separation between the alii and makaainana. But like in the days of Papa and Wakea, and Pao and Pili, separation was not the goal of kapu; instead, separation was the means by which the entire universe would remain balanced and orderly. Kapu, for the traditionalists, is not separation for its own sake, or to enhance the power of the alii over the makaainana, but its function is to keep human society pono. And it is here that one can see another example of the stark differences in the views of the governing dynamics operating in ancient Hawaiian society. The anthropologists see kapu functioning as a means to keep alii apart and privileged over and above the makaainana. The traditionalists do not deny the existence of kapu, or that it kept alii and makaainana apart, but they see something more: that kapu functioned as a means to move the universe back to order and harmony, in which both alii and makaainana would benefit. For them, this is the governing dynamic that they operating in ancient Hawaiian society.

Sahlins in 1992 appears to be the exception to the general anthropologist view of kapu, and seems to have similar views to the traditionalists when he writes that kapu encouraged social order. He states, “The order introduced by good chiefs gone by was a peaceful and prosperous society ... in which nobody exploited anybody. Order was very much part of this social conception, the making of boundaries and distinctions.... In these respects, the reign of Mailikukahi was again paradigmatic” (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25). He seems to state that this imposition of order was repeated on installation of a new

paramount, “Indeed every Hawaiian reign recapitulates the social creation, as it begins with the king’s restoration of the tabus that had been suspended in the ritual license following the death of his predecessor” (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25). Although Sahlins seems to be very close to the traditionalists here, the frank assessment must be made that he does not see this as a recurring pattern important enough in Hawaii’s history to develop a narrative around it for more than just a few pages, or to change his view of the dynamic governing this ancient society.

In this chapter I have presented the views of several anthropologists and traditionalists as they have examined genealogy and rank in ancient Hawaiian society after the formalization of the ahupuaa system. I have shown examples of variation within each of the two groups, and places where their views are quite similar. But I have also shown that the traditionalists tend to consider information that is not emphasized by the anthropologists, and that this other information throws issues relating to genealogy and rank into quite a different light in which the views of the two groups of scholars are quite different. With genealogical practices and some aspects of societal rank, the anthropologists tend to see much more change that occurred in the practices of the makaainana as a result of the formalization of the ahupuaa system than is seen by the traditionalists. With other aspects of societal ranking, the anthropologists see the kapu system functioning as a means to enhance the separation between chiefs and commoners. And as I have previously shown, the anthropologists see that the chiefs then used this separation to their own advantage to maintain a privileged lifestyle, which for the anthropologists is the governing dynamic that they see in action in ancient Hawaii. In contrast, the traditionalists do not see the rupture in genealogical practices and some

aspects of societal ranking among the makaainana, but see much more continuity. It follows that if makaainana society did not experience the dramatic changes described by the anthropologists, then perhaps the overall societal rupture described by them did not occur as well. And while the traditionalists recognize that other aspects of ranking in society separated the alii and makaainana, they see in that separation continuity from previous times which provided a way to preserve pono and the means by which all could prosper.

**4. Comparison and Contrast II:
The Formation of the Ahupuaa System, Elements of Food Production and
Reciprocal Relationships, Balancing Mechanisms,
and the Alii-Makaainana Relationship**

In this chapter, I will continue comparing and contrasting the views of anthropologists and traditionalists about the nature of certain aspects of pre-contact Hawaiian society. I will start by showing the views about the formation of the ahupuaa system. I will continue by examining how anthropologists and traditionalists view the roles of makaainana, konohiki and alii nui in elements of the food production system. The anthropologists see the konohiki role as insuring the makaainana produced enough to keep both konohiki and alii nui satisfied. In contrast, the traditionalists see much more reciprocity between groups and a much more balanced system in which each group had duties to fulfill so all could prosper, and that this was enforced by balancing mechanisms which tended to move the entire society towards the ideal of pono in which the kinship relationship between all the groups was preserved.

The Formation of the Ahupuaa System

In examining views about the formation of the ahupuaa system, there is a definite disconnect between traditionalists and anthropologists. According to information in the oral traditions as gathered by Fornander and Kamakau, the ahupuaa system was first created to answer a need for order and stability. Traditionalist scholars like Kelly, Maly,

and McGregor call attention to this in the division of lands under Mailikukahi of Oahu, Kakaalaneo of Maui, and Umi a Liloa of Hawaii Island. Sometime around 1450 CE, Oahu was in a state of confusion as the various land units were not well defined (Kamakau 1991: 54 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 313).³² The paramount Mailikukahi responded to this disorder by causing the island to be thoroughly surveyed into districts, ahupuaa, and smaller land divisions, in which boundaries were defined and permanently marked out (Fornander 1996: 89; Kamakau 1991: 54-55 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 313; Fornander 1880: 89 in Frear 1906: 16; Fornander 1969 II: 89 in Kelly 1983: 96-98; Kelly 1989: 94-96; Kamakau 1961, Fornander 1996 in Maly 2001: 3). He imposed this order to avoid future disputes between chiefs and landholders (Fornander 1969 II: 89 in Kelly 1983: 96-98; Kelly 1989: 94-96, 100-103; Beckwith 1976: 383 in McGregor 2007: 94). He set administrators over larger divisions and assigned lands to commoners (Kamakau 1991: 54-55 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 313). Similar structure was imposed at about the same time on other islands. On Maui as well, the high chief Kakaalaneo divided the lands into districts, ahupuaa, and smaller divisions (Kamakau 1991: 152 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 318-319; Beckwith 1976: 383 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 26; Beckwith 1976: 383 in McGregor 2007: 94). On Hawaii Island, Umi formalized the land divisions and set up governors and headmen to watch over okana, ahupuaa, ili aina, and smaller parcels, and set all in order (Fornander 1999 IV: 228; Kamakau 1961: 19 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 353; Kamakau 1961: 19 in Handy and Handy 1972: 46; Maly 1999b: 10-11; Kamakau 1961, Fornander 1996 in Maly 2001: 3).

³² Fornander places Mailikukahi's birth at about 1360 CE using a 30 year per generation estimate, and Stokes provides 1514 as a date, using a 20 year count. See Kelly 1989: 94-96.

This is not to say that similar reasoning is absent from the work of the anthropologists. Sahlins writes that Mailikukahi and Kakaalaneo divided the lands and moved land tenure from confusion to order, at least for a time. But from the context in which he places this information, he seems to view this as an isolated instance of prosperity for and good treatment of the common people in the main story of pre-contact Hawaii (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25-27). What is therefore emphasized in the writings of some traditionalists is the idea that the ahupuaa system was formalized to benefit all by facilitating societal order and stability. And this information is absent, except for the exception of Sahlins, in the narratives of the anthropologists.

Instead of meeting a need for societal order, a primary result of the formalization of the ahupuaa system seen consistently by the anthropologists is the growth of alii control over makaainana labor and production. Although details of this have been presented for each anthropologist in Chapter Two, a brief recap may be helpful here. Cordy writes that the 1600s and 1700s CE saw an increase in alii control over makaainana labor and what that labor produced (Cordy 2000: 248; Cordy 2002a: 25). Earle sees the increase of chiefly control over makaainana labor and production not as a means to feed a growing population, but instead to finance chiefdoms competing to expand their territory (Earle 1978: 168-173, 183; Earle 1997: 86-87). Similarly, Hommon believes that the government primarily worked to insure the flow of goods and services from the commoners to enhance the power and prestige of the chiefs (Hommon 1976: 9-10). Kirch writes that agricultural production was increased to provide a steady surplus to support the chiefly class (Kirch 1984: 164, 258-259; Kirch 2000: 248, 318-319). Sahlins sees the extraction of the people by the chiefs (Malo 1951: 60-61 in Kirch

and Sahlins 1992 I: 27). Although again varying in details and language, what the anthropologists present is clear and consistent: that Hawaiian society was geared towards the extraction of the labor and produce of a large underclass by a small elite. But many traditionalist writers have another perspective. They see the formalization of the ahupuaa system not as win-lose, in which a small group of elites benefits from the work of the masses, but instead they see a win-win dynamic in which all parties prosper.

This is not to say that traditionalists are blind to the sometimes harsh realities of pre-contact Hawaiian society. On the contrary, some have written things that could very well be found in anthropologist narratives. Cachola-Abad writes that the chiefs had the power to request anything they wanted at any time (Cachola-Abad 2000: 501). Charlot holds that although ideals are found throughout the oral traditions, the repeated injunctions against chiefly abuses show that these existed, and constantly needed to be guarded against (Charlot 2005b: 93). Kameeleihiwa says that the old society was not perfect (*Act of War* 1993). Kanahele writes that conspicuously consuming chiefs relied heavily on the toil and loyalty of lesser-status people (Kanehele 1995: 52). Kelly states that during the last two centuries prior to western contact, catastrophic changes took place within Hawaiian society that put it on a path tangential to earlier times in which the core values proceeding from aloha were established (Kelly 1989: 103). McGregor admits that there are records of arbitrary, irresponsible, and self-serving chiefs (McGregor 2007: 29). Pukui writes about chiefs who abused their mana, and demanded too much work and food (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 52; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 216). But the difference is that with the traditionalists, these statements are not the primary story of ancient Hawaiian society as they are for the anthropologists. Instead, the traditionalists

see another governing dynamic in operation, that of reciprocal relationships in which the performance of duties to all were enforced, which served to move things toward the higher good, pono.

In contrast to the anthropologists who see the formalization of the ahupuaa system as a crucial step in the chiefs gathering of power into their own hands, many traditionalists see it as a beneficial step towards an orderly society in which everyone contributes and benefits. This is evident in an examination of how the chiefs who the traditions record as formalizing the ahupuaa system are remembered. Far from being looked on as tyrants acting on behalf of a power hungry class looking to maintain a privileged lifestyle at the expense of the workers, these kings have been lauded in the Hawaiian oral traditions. Mailikukahi was known for wise and judicious government, and there was no rebellion or even grumbling from the highest to the lowest for the remainder of his reign (Fornander 1996: 89 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 313; Kamakau 1991: 54-55 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 313; Fornander 1996: 89 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 26). Kakaalaneo is depicted as a compassionate and effective ruler, renowned for thrift, energy, and justice that kept order on Maui (Fornander 1996: 82, Kalakaua 1990: 229 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 321). And Umi a Liloa exemplifies some of the best traits found among alii. He was religious, kind hearted, humble, just, ready to seek and follow the advice of advisors, and willing and able to labor with his own hands (Fornander 1999 IV: 182, 184, 230; Kamakau 1992b: 5, 9, 19, in Cachola-Abad 2000: 353). If Hawaiians viewed the act of dividing the lands as a move towards exploitation, a power grab by the chiefs, or anything of the kind, as the anthropologists would have it, then these kings would have not been praised but vilified as stepping out of line and hindering pono.

Again, Sahlins is the primary exception. He writes about the good king Mailikukahi and about his descendent Kalamakua who built taro patches in Waikiki (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25-27). But he certainly does not see this as a recurring pattern important enough to develop as a main theme animating pre-contact times.

Some traditionalists reason that not only did the ahupuaa system address a problem at the point of its creation, but also met a crucial need of an expanding population with a limited land base, that of resource management. And over time, this allowed the population to prosper so that Cook and early Western observers were impressed with its health and organization. Traditionalists like Andrade write that, “The [ahupuaa] system developed out of a desire to create order, encourage peace, and support prosperity. It made administering the land easier by clarifying resource use and designating responsibilities among different groups of people” (Andrade 2009: 29-30). Cachola-Abad writes that the ahupuaa system insured the pooling of resources and labor done for the benefit of alii and makaainana, like fishponds and irrigation systems, and other products to meet the needs of the administrative system” (Cachola-Abad 2000: 97-101). Kameeleihiwa specifically references Mailikukahi as she writes, “The reign of Mailikukahi was renowned for peace, abundance of food, care of the makaainana, and favorable increase of population. The key to his fame, no doubt, was organization of the Aina and its productivity” (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 26). Maly describes the ahupuaa system by writing, “Over the generations, the ancient Hawaiians developed a sophisticated system of land and resources management” (Maly 1999a: 11; Maly 2001: 3). And in the documentary *Ahupuaa, Fishponds, and Loi* featuring Marion Kelly, there is the statement that, “The Hawaiian ahupuaa system of land use permits access to all resources from

mountains to sea. The sharing of these resources created a social system in these islands that insured survival from generation to generation” (*Ahupuaa, Fishponds, and Loi*: 1992). But there is little of this reasoning in the writings of the anthropologists selected for this study. Kirch is the exception. He writes that tapu allowed the Polynesian chief to take charge of the economic forces...in the interests of the community as well as in the interests of the chiefs (Kirch 1984: 166). But just as with Sahlins, this information is only mentioned and not developed. So here again, information is emphasized by some traditionalist writers that is not by the anthropologists, and when combined with other examples, shows that the two groups hold quite different views of ancient Hawaiian society.

Elements of Food Production and Reciprocal Relationships

As shown above, the anthropologists emphasize the extraction of commoner labor and produce by the chiefs under the ahupuaa system. For them, the fields worked by the makaainana to produce food especially for the alii, the koele and other plots, are a clear example of this extraction. Cordy writes that commoners were required to labor in these fields every few days (Cordy 2000: 54). Earle writes something similar, that foodstuffs from the koele fields made productive by commoner labor would go to the chiefs (Earle 1978: 15-19). Goldman writes about farmers laboring in the koele and hakuone fields as does Hommon (Goldman 1970: 240; Malo 1951: 18, 61 in Hommon 1976: 68). Kirch also writes about the koele, the productions of which were used for the support of the alii (Kirch 2010: 67). Sahlins as well writes about the koele, fields set aside for the benefit of

the great alii, tilled by a corvee of the people living under them (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 50).

Many traditionalists write about these fields also, and how makaainana would labor in them, usually one day a week, to supply the konohiki and other alii with food. This detail is not the source of disagreement. Rather, the disagreement is the context in which this detail is discussed, the larger issue of makaainana labor as seen by some traditionalists. In contrast to the anthropologists' view that the work in the koele and other fields and the subsequent production was to benefit the alii class, the context that many of the traditionalists write about can perhaps be summarized as a mutually beneficial arrangement of payment for services rendered. For the traditionalists the roles of the makaainana are clear: they labor and produce the food and other supplies needed by the konohiki and the alii nui. But in return, the konohiki provide the centralized management that will make makaainana efforts coordinated and productive, and the alii nui provide the religious services that keep the gods placated so they will continue to send the rain necessary to make the land bear fruit. So each party, both makaainana and alii have their roles, all of which are vital for the survival of the entire group. In this scenario, work done by the makaainana is a necessary component for the good of the whole. In the traditionalist view then, pre-contact Hawaiian society is much more balanced than is portrayed in the works of the anthropologists chosen for this study. The difference in the governing dynamics of that society seen by both anthropologists and traditionalists is evident as well: one group exerting its power at the expense of another group, or all parties pulling together for the common good. Although perhaps a simplified explanation, this is the basic dichotomy separating the two groups of scholars.

This more balanced view of a give and take in which all parties had responsibilities to help insure that the whole would prosper can be clearly seen in how some traditionalist writers describe the role of the konohiki in ancient Hawaii.

Traditionalists like Kelly and the Handys and Pukui spend much time explaining the role of the konohiki in food production of the ahupuaa system. This person had many duties. He was responsible for directing all communal activity in the ahupuaa. Group effort, or laulima, literally “many hands,” was essential in constructing the larger loi/taro pond fields and their attendant irrigation systems that fed much of the population (Handy and Handy 1972: 58, 59, 484). This group effort needed centralized leadership, and this was provided by the konohiki (Nakuina 1893: 79-84 in Handy and Handy 1972: 58-59; Handy and Handy 1972: vii, 307, 484; Kelly 1983: 99-101).

Vigilance was necessary for the proper performance of the konohiki’s many duties in managing this irrigated food production system (Handy and Handy 1972: 71-101; Kelly 1989: 89-94). He was responsible for recruiting and directing the labor necessary in construction of the irrigation canals and the pond fields (Nakuina 1893, 79-84 in Handy and Handy 1972: 58, 59; Handy and Handy 1972: 320-322, 484; Kelly 1983: 99-101). He was responsible for fair allotment of water to the individual patches, and had the right to adjust the irrigation schedule based on need and in the dry season (Handy and Handy 1972: 58, 59, 279; Kelly 1956: 34, 35; Kelly 1983: 99-101).

Maintenance was organized and directed by the konohiki as well (Handy and Handy 1972: vii; Nakuina 1893, 79-84 in Handy and Handy 1972: 58, 59). He was responsible for insuring that cleaning and repair was done, and would issue a call to the farmers using the water when necessary so these tasks would be accomplished (*Ahupuaa, Fishponds,*

and Loi: 1992; Handy and Handy 1972: vii, 58-59; Kelly 1989: 99-102). Failure to heed this call, or to contribute appropriately could result in temporary suspension, or in total dispossession of the delinquent farmer (Handy and Handy 1972: 58-59; Kelly 1956: 34-35).

The konohiki was responsible for insuring that makaainana fulfilled their obligations to work in the land areas set aside specifically for chiefly support, the koele and the hakuone plots cultivated by the commoner farmer for the alii nui and the konohiki of the ahupuaa, respectively (Handy and Handy 1972: 6-7 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Malo 1951: 16 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 27, 28; Malo 1951: 16 in Kelly 1956: 25). Some traditions record that Umi a Liloa of Hawaii Island established this system in which the produce from the work of the commoner compensated the alii nui and konohiki for their administration of the whole system (Handy and Handy 1991: 534 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 355). The traditions also record that the fifth day was set apart from the commoner schedule to work on these plots (Malo 1951: 16 in Kelly 1956: 25). The chiefs could then rely on their sustenance, the commoners could rely on management, and would also know how much the alii could rightfully request (Cachola-Abad 2000: 353; McGregor 2007: 28).

The konohiki had other duties as well. He was charged with relaying makaainana concerns to the alii nui (Van Dyke 2008: 15). He could issue and enforce prohibitions on certain items to conserve resources (Kanahele 1992: 350). He directed the daily activities of cultivation and fishing (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 29). When a communal fishing project was undertaken, he supervised the distribution of the catch, what portions went to the alii, kahuna, and to the families who participated (Handy and Handy 1972: 320-322). He

summoned fighters when the alii nui was preparing for war (Handy and Handy 1972: 6-7 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Handy and Handy 1972: 279; Kane 1997: 50-65.)³³ The konohiki was also responsible for imposing and collecting taxes for the yearly makahiki (Malo 1951: 52-63, 187-204 in Barrere 1961: 24; Beechert 1985: 9-10; Handy and Handy 1972: 320-322; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 29; Kanahale 1992: 350; Van Dyke 2008: 15). And when the land lay neglected, or if the tenant farmers did not provide the required labor or taxes, the konohiki could order the commoner families off the land (Handy and Handy 1991:59 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 92; Kanahale 1992: 350; Malo 1951: 159 in Kelly 1956: 42-43). The traditionalist interpretation of this information is that the konohiki was fulfilling a function necessary for the well being of all, to ensure that the makaainana would do their part, to feed and clothe those whose work it was to manage so production levels would be sufficient so all had enough to eat. In contrast, as seen in Chapters Two and Three, the anthropologist interpretation of the role of the konohiki to a one is that it is an example of alii exploitation and extraction of makaainana.

Similarly, many traditionalists write that the alii nui had many duties to the whole of the people. It was their work to fulfill religious obligations that would secure the favor of the gods, indispensable in feeding the nation and therefore maintaining pono (Barrere 1961: 28-29; Cachola-Abad 2000: 335; Davenport 1994: 3-4; K. Kamakau 1919: 42-43, Malo 1951: 160, 172 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 38-40; Malo 1951: 52-53 in Van Dyke 2008: 12-13, 15; Young 1998: 74, 79-80). Famous high chiefs like Manokalanipo of Kauai and Mailikukahi of Oahu are always described in the traditions as religious (Cachola-Abad 2000: 335; Malo 1951: 190 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 38-40). The good chief would build and refurbish heiau, like Liloa did at Pakaalana Heiau in Waipio,

³³ Not all agree that makaainana participated in warfare, see Andrade 2009: 71; Trask 1999.

Manini Heiau at Koholalele, and in Hamakua (Kalakaua 1990: 302, Kamakau 1992b: 1-2 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 329). Alii often trained for years with kahuna so they would be able to perform the sometimes exhausting rites flawlessly, making them acceptable to the gods (Malo 1951: 190; Malo 1996: 226 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 141, 142). At makahiki the alii nui would present all the gifts (hookupu, literally “to make grow”) gathered from the land to Lono so the aina (literally “the feeder”) would produce abundantly, feeding all (Dudley 1986: 109; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 44-45; Pukui, and Elbert 1971; Van Dyke 2008: 15; Young 1998: 77-78). The alii nui was expected to secure the agreement of the kahuna nui his high priest, for all major decisions (Barrere 1961: 24; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 38-40; Kelly 1956: 45). This primary spiritual advisor guided the alii in worship and maintained peace by assuring the people that all services had been properly conducted (Malo 1951: 190 in Kelly 1956: 45). If the alii nui did not follow the advice of the kahuna nui the people would reject him as irreligious (Cachola-Abad 2000: 295; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 38-40). If alii nui could not perform their religious duties as directed by the kahuna, if they were unsuccessful in their attempts to secure the favor of the gods, they did not remain long as leaders (Malo 1996: 261 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 141, 142; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 26; Van Dyke 2008: 15). If an alii lost the favor of the gods, another could challenge his right to rule through war (Cachola-Abad 2000: 142, 143; Kameeleihiwa 1992: 48). Hakau of Hawaii Island abused the priests, as did Kuamanuia of Oahu, and they were executed for their transgressions (Fornander 1999 IV: 190, Kalakaua 1990: 74, Kamakau 1992b: 10 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 339; Fornander 1996: 270, Kamakau 1991: 61 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 349; Fornander 1996: 76).

But some of the anthropologists see these religious duties as a fiction, and view them in quite a different way. To them, building and refurbishing heiau are not viewed as religious acts meant to secure the good will of the gods, but instead show the power of and distance between the upper class of chiefs who ordered the work and the laboring class of commoners who had to comply and build (Cordy 2002a: 26-28, 34; Cordy 2002b: 28, 36; Earle 1997: 44, 191-192; Goldman 1970: 200-201, 211; Fornander 1880: 16 in Goldman 1970: 206; Hommon 1976: 165, 281-285; Kirch 2000: 248-249, Kolb 1991: 1992: 1994 in Kirch 2000: 295-296). They do not see in the makahiki a feeding of the gods, the hookupu, designed to placate the spiritual forces which when pleased would favor the land and people with plentiful rain. Instead, they see an ideological construct of the chiefs designed to dupe the people into providing more and more surplus to keep alii well-fed and splendidly-clothed, to demonstrate the wealth of the chief, and to provide resources to fund the political economy based on territorial expansion (Earle 1997: 9, 169-171, 203-208; Goldman 1970: 222; Malo 1951: 60-61, 78, 172-173 in Hommon 1976: 67, 165, 281-285; Kirch 1984: 164, 258-259; Kirch 2000: 248, 318-319).³⁴

Far from being the tool of the alii to maintain a privileged lifestyle as asserted by the anthropologists, the traditionalists see the labor in the koele and other plots, as well as the produce given during the makahiki as just compensation provided in reciprocation for the management duties of the konohiki and religious duties rendered by the alii nui.

³⁴ Sahlins discusses the makahiki at length in *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities*, 1981. He mentions the placating of the god Lono in the hookupu offerings, but the context in which this discussion is placed shows how Cook's arrival and death corresponded to the Hawaiian ritual calendar and beliefs. This context is quite different than the contexts that the makahiki are discussed in both the other anthropologists or traditionalists, therefore does not fit in this analysis.

Balancing Mechanisms

In the previous section I have shown that the anthropologists primarily see the ahupuaa system functioning for the benefit of one group, the chiefs, at the expense of the larger group of commoners. I have also shown that the traditionalists mainly see that the ahupuaa system benefitting both chiefs and commoners. To use the analogy of balance, the anthropologists see a system weighted toward the benefit of the alii while the traditionalists see a system that is much more balanced so both benefit. The view that both groups have of the governing dynamics of that society then is generally in opposition. Some traditionalists see a movement towards a balance that benefits all, and this is not seen by the anthropologists. This balance seen by the traditionalists is also evident in other facets of ancient Hawaiian society, which again is not emphasized by the anthropologists. The governing dynamic of pono can be seen in what may be termed balancing mechanisms, or checks on the behavior of not only makaainana but konohiki and alii nui. The anthropologists generally emphasize these mechanisms only in terms of alii controls on makaainana. They emphasize that if the makaainana did not work or produce, then they were risking consequences at the hands of the alii including expulsion, having their lands plundered, and death. These facts are not absent from traditionalist narratives. But many of them bring other information to the discussion that is not emphasized, developed, or sometimes even mentioned in these works by these particular anthropologists. Some of the traditionalists write about balancing mechanisms existing in controls on konohiki and alii nui as well, which are certainly not emphasized in the work

of the anthropologists. And these different emphases again point to the different views of the society as a whole.

The anthropologists excel at providing much detail that shows consequences for makaainana when they failed to labor or produce for the alii. As above, much of this information has been presented in Chapter Two but a recap here may be helpful. Cordy writes that after the ahupuaa system was in place, use rights to agricultural and house lots were inherited by commoners, but had to be reaffirmed by the agent of the chief of that ahupuaa, the konohiki (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 192-208 in Cordy 2000: 38). These rights could be removed if households failed to meet tax, service or behavioral expectations of the chiefs. Before removal, threats were made, and sometimes dwellings were burnt (Ii 1959: 29, Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 71, 87 in Cordy 2000: 53). Like Cordy, Earle writes that the usage rights of commoner to land for subsistence was dependent on meeting obligations for labor and produce which went to the chiefs (Earle 1978: 15, 19, 191; Earle 1997: 79). If these obligations were not fulfilled, the commoner farmer was risking expulsion (Earle 1978: 70-82). Goldman holds that commoners labored and produced food for the chiefs, and supplied tribute during makahiki. If the chief judged this to be insufficient, he had the area plundered (Kamakau 1964: 20 in Goldman 1970: 222). Hommon writes that a commoner's rights to use land for subsistence were inherited, but had to be ratified by the ahupuaa chief (Hommon 1976: 80). If a makaainana's production was below the expected level, or if he displayed an inordinate accumulation of goods, he could be expelled or executed (Kamakau 1961: 229, Malo 1951: 35, 61 in Hommon 1976: 153-154; Hommon 1976: 175, 281-283). Kirch writes that commoners held only usage rights to lands on which they lived, and these

were dependent on tribute of labor and produce paid on demand to the chiefs (Kirch 1984: 257; Kirch 2000: 248-249, 298). Even when the ahupuaa were redistributed on the death or defeat of the paramount, the pattern of extraction continued under whatever chief happened to be in power (Kirch 1984: 258; Kirch 1985: 306). And Sahlins, referencing Malo, believes that the “system of land and society” was one of oppressive exaction of the people by the chiefs, in which all the production of the people went to the chief, who when dissatisfied, had the power to expel the long-suffering commoner from the land and rob him of possessions (Malo 1951: 60-61 in Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 27). In this conception, overwhelming societal power lay in the hands of the chiefs, both konohiki and alii nui.

But what is largely absent in the work of the anthropologists examined in this study is that there were many confines on the power of the konohiki. Examples of these balancing mechanisms are instead found in the work of some traditionalists. The konohiki did not arbitrarily issue demands to the commoners, subordinate though they were. Rather, he consulted the haku, the leader of the various makaainana ohana (Kane 1997: 50-65). Working together, the konohiki and the haku coordinated management of the ahupuaa by organizing labor for the building, cleaning, and repairing the irrigation networks, clearing trails, and building heiau or fishponds (Handy and Pukui 1972: 6-7 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93). But if the konohiki was unreasonable, the makaainana were far from helpless. If the demands placed on commoner labor and production were too high, they could refuse to work or sabotage projects (Kanahele 1995: 51-52). Neither were they bound to the land. They had the right to leave and seek another place under another chief if the work demands were onerous (Andrade 2009: 71, 74-75; Handy and Handy

1972: 323-4; Kane 1997: 50-65; Kelly 1956: 26, 42-43; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 216; Trask 1999: 5, 115; Van Dyke 2008: 13). If the commoners whose role it was to gather and produce slowed work or moved away, then the quantity and quality of produce presented at makahiki would diminish (Andrade 2009: 74-75; Handy and Handy 1972: 321-322; Kane 1997: 50-65; Kelly 1956: 26). As the konohiki was responsible for the collection, the fault would be his, and he would have to answer to his superior and the priests who required bountiful offerings to secure the favor of Lono for abundant production so all could eat. This is not to say that this concern is absent from the anthropologists. Earle also writes that lesser chiefs were responsible for presenting a portion of the goods collected to higher ups. If they did not, their rights to land could be revoked (Earle 1978: 18-19). But again, the larger contexts in which these passages were written differ dramatically. Whereas the traditionalists emphasize the role of the konohiki in the dynamic of meeting the needs of all, Earle emphasizes that role in meeting the needs of the few. In the eyes of the traditionalists, there were indeed balancing mechanisms in operation to keep konohiki in line.

There is other evidence that commoners could also go up the chain of command if dissatisfied (Frear 1894: 2; Ellis 1984: 423 in Charlot 2005b: 76). When an injured party had a grievance against a konohiki or someone of superior rank, he could appeal to an even higher ranking chief on the local or district level, or to the king on the national level, for justice (Frear 1894: 3). Upon complaint, both parties would be summoned and be seated in front of the chief acting as judge to argue his own case without attorneys. Judgment would be rendered and swiftly executed (Frear 1894: 3).

Another check on the konohiki's power is seen in the custom of alii nui touring their assigned lands. The purpose of this common practice was to assure that the humblest were being protected and to maintain the integrity of the government, a consideration of alii nui since the time of the aha alii (Kalakaua 1990: 265, 274, Kamakau 1992b: 1 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 329; Cachola-Abad 2000: 335, 503). The traditions record that Liloa of Hawaii Island was the first chief to begin these tours (Kalakaua 1990: 265, 274, Kamakau 1992b: 1 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 329). Piilani of Maui and Alapai of Hawaii Island were among the many other alii nui remembered for traveling frequently around their respective islands to monitor the condition of the makaainana, insuring that they had access to the resources to meet their needs, encouraging positive relations with lower level alii and evaluating the chiefs responsible for the designated lands (Fornander 1996: 87 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 331; Fornander 1996: 269 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 332-333; Cachola-Abad 2000: 335; Kalakaua 1990: 291 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 340; Kamakau 1992b: 75 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 417; Cachola-Abad 2000: 503). If the makaainana did not receive any benefits from public works projects like fishponds and the larger irrigation systems, or if they were not having their needs met and were being exploited by lesser chiefs, it was the duty of the alii nui to put a stop to it (Cachola-Abad 2000: 155, 156; Kalakaua 1990: 98 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 278, 279; Malo 1951: 53 in Van Dyke 2008: 12-13). And as above, Sahlins does mention something similar. He writes of the reign of the good Mailikukahi of Oahu, who commanded the lesser chiefs not to steal from others on pain of death (Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25-27).

If the konohiki were found lacking in the proper management of the makaainana and the ahupuaa, he would be dismissed by the alii nui (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 31; Kelly 1980: 80-82; Malo 1839: 125, Pukui 1983: no. 1150 in McGregor 2007: 29). Here again, the duty of the alii to insure proper care of the less powerful abides, a duty inherited from Ancestral Polynesian Society, through Papa and Wakea, through the legacy of Pili and the aha alii. But not only were konohiki accountable to both makaainana and alii nui he could also expect a reciprocal relationship from his superior. After the institution of the aha alii at the end of the migratory period, alii nui were now more responsible not only to each other and to makaainana, but also to the lesser chiefs, the konohiki (Cachola-Abad 2000: 372). Punaai of Kauai, Liloa of Hawaii Island and many others were remembered in the traditions as catering to the needs of the lesser chiefs and respecting their rights to the lands to which they had been assigned (Kalakaua 1990: 124 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 282; Cachola-Abad 2000: 335; Fornander 1996: 143, Kamakau 1992b: 75 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 417). But this reciprocal relationship was enforced. Haka of Oahu proved to be a bad chief who did not take care of the lesser chiefs, so they rebelled and killed him (Fornander 1996: 88, Ii 1983: 97, Kamakau 1991: 53-54 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 309-312). Here again for traditionalists, balancing mechanisms were in place, tending to move all towards balance, toward pono.

Another example of a mechanism that functioned within the ahupuaa system that tended to balance out the power of the alii nui can be seen on the replacement or death of the paramount chief. The first important political duty of a new paramount was to judiciously assign land and position to other high chiefs. This was the kalaiaina, the division of lands (Barrere 1961: 24; Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Handy and Handy 1972: 41;

Kameeleihiwa 1992: 51-52; Malo 1951: 194 in Kelly 1956: 43-44). On the succession of a new paramount to the throne, moku or larger districts, and ahupuaa or smaller divisions of the districts would be assigned to other high chiefs (Chinen 1958; Kamakau 1961: 372-377, Malo 1951: 63-67 in Maly 1999a, 10). These lands were in turn assigned to the konohiki chiefs in their own right but of lesser rank, who would then act as stewards, managers, and administrators, and were responsible for the day-to-day operations of the ahupuaa (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 29; Maly 1999a: 10, 53). The alii nui and the konohiki then assigned smaller pieces of land to the tenant farmers (Handy and Handy 1972: 320-322; Maly 1999a: 53).

There is no general disagreement between the traditionalists and the anthropologists on the procedure of the kalaiaina described above. But there are two important differences: the first concerning the role of advisors, and the second concerning possible consequences of a poor land distribution. The paramount chief had to treat other chiefs with proper respect beginning with this first political act. In this delicate process, the new king was dependent on the advice of kuauhau, masters of the intricate chiefly genealogies who were called on to help determine which alii had the proper genealogical credentials to receive land and office (Kamakau 1991: 80, Kepelino 1932: 134-135, Malo 1996: 261 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Handy and Handy 1972: 320-322; Malo 1951: 192 in Kelly 1956: 43-44). He used the services of the haku moolelo, historians and antiquarians, who would assist with their knowledge of relevant historical precedents (Charlot 2005b: 486, 491; Kamakau 1961: 79, Kepelino 1932: 131, 135, Malo 1951: 75, 140 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 22). He relied on the kalaimoku, the primary secular counselor, to help him assign lands so none of the other chiefs would take umbrage

(Charlot 2005b: 485). If lands were not distributed properly in accordance with what the other chiefs felt was their rightful due based on ancient pedigree and their proper place in chiefly society as they saw it, they would be tempted to right the wrong and usurp the king's position. War would likely ensue, all society would be thrown out of balance, and the new paramount could likely lose his life (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 38-40, 51-52, 56; Kelly 1956: 45). This limit on the power of the paramount seen in the advice from counselors and the possible consequences from disgruntled chiefs is an essential part of the traditionalist presentation. In contrast, the lack of discussion about these particulars in the anthropologists generally leads readers of their works to believe that the new paramount had absolute authority to do what he wanted arbitrarily, without thought of consequence, which is quite contrary to what is written by some traditionalists. In the traditionalist descriptions of these particular occurrences, there is much more awareness of a check on the power of the alii nui from day one of his ascendancy.

Another balancing mechanism that some traditionalists write about is in the role of advisors to the ruling chiefs. Although the konohiki was an important middle manager, the overall responsibility of meeting the needs of the tenant farmers fell on his superiors. The alii nui did this in part by again heeding the advice of experts and counselors in many areas of governance, including food production (Van Dyke 2008: 15; Young 1998: 74). Kuhikuhi puuone, experts knowledgeable about the land and its natural systems, what to plant and where, the nature of the soil, and placement of structures on the land, advised the king (Kepelino 1932: 134 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Kamakau 1968: 8, 27, 47, Malo 1951: 161 in Maly 2001: 2). Alii nui who heeded the advice of these specialists and increased food production were lauded in the stories.

Kauai a Hookamalii, grandson of Moikeha, is said to have brought from southern islands the first ulu, breadfruit, and planted it at Puuloa in Ewa, Oahu (Fornander 1999 IV: 392, Kamakau 1991: 110 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 298). Kakaalaneo of Maui is remembered for planting a grove of breadfruit at Lahaina, Maui (Fornander 1996: 82; Pukui 1983: no. 53 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 318-319). Kalamakua of Oahu constructed large pond fields in Waikiki (Kamakau 1991: 45 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 325; Kanahale 1995: 55; Fornander 1969 II: 89 in Kelly 1983: 98). On Hawaii Island, Umi a Liloa constructed taro patches in Waipio, and initiated or expanded the dry land field system in Kona (Fornander 1999 IV: 229 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 353; Fornander 1917: 230 in Kelly 1983: 99). These chiefs and many more were remembered in the traditions for these good acts that benefitted chief and commoner alike.

When political difficulties arose, alii nui were expected to consult experts as well. Poe moolelo (also referred to as haku moolelo), the historians, were important advisors at court. They would be versed in stories and lessons from the past, how successful kings governed, and how unsuccessful chiefs lost their rule and oftentimes their lives (Kamakau 1991: 80, Kepelino 1932: 134-135, Malo 1996: 261 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 93; Kalakaua 1990: 137 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 295; Fornander 1916: 337, 347, Kepelino 1932: 135 in Charlot 2005b: 491; Kamakau 1961: 79, Kepelino 1932: 131, 135, Malo 1951: 75, 140 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 22). When the king faced a problem, these specialists would be called in to recite the appropriate historical anecdotes (Kamakau 1961: 79; Kepelino 1932: 131, 135, Malo 1951: 75, 140 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 22). By observing the lessons of these stories, the king would insure greater political stability, improved administration of land and people, and an overall organization that would have

been absent had the paramount considered himself independent from the needs of other chiefs or makaainana (Cachola-Abad 2000: 278-279).

But just because expert advice based on lessons from the past was available, it is clear from the stories that not all rulers paid attention. The chief who disregarded the advice of his counselors was called alii hookuli, an unhearing chief (Charlot 2005b: 13). Many cautionary tales warned alii of the disastrous consequences of being headstrong in wielding power and ignoring advice from learned counselors (Charlot 2005b: 13). One of the most graphic involved Umi a Liloa in about 1600 (Cordy 2000: 205). His older brother Hakau had inherited the government from their father, Liloa. But in his later years Hakau's contempt for the rights of his subjects and mistreatment of two faithful advisors rendered him unfit to rule. For his transgressions he was overthrown in a rebellion led by Umi. Hakau and his slain warriors were laid on the heiau at Pakaalana in Waipio, and Kukailimoku's wagging tongue in thunder and lightening licked up that worthy sacrifice (Fornander 1996: 76, Fornander 1999 IV: 190, Kalakaua 1990: 74, Kamakau 1992b: 10 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 339; Fornander 1916: 247 in Charlot 2005b: 183).

Malo describes the backcountry people studying the chiefs and distinguishing well between those who were pono, correct, and those who were hewa, faulty or immoral (Malo n.d.: 38, 48, 98-105 in Charlot 2005b: 76). This scrutiny meant that tyranny and oppression did not go unanswered for long (Handy and Handy 1972: 323-324; Kane 1992: 444). If the offending chief were lucky enough, he could escape with his life. Many Hawaii Island chiefs sailed to Oahu, Maui, and Molokai to escape the wrath of those no longer willing to take abuse (*Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1865 in McKinzie 1983 I: 13,

14). But others were not so fortunate, and many kings were put to death by the makaainana because of oppression (Malo 1951: 195 in Beechert 1985: 9; Cachola-Abad 2000: 142, 143; Handy and Handy 1972: 63; Malo 1951: 88 in Handy and Handy 1972: 323-324; Kanahale 1995: 69-71; McGregor 2007: 52-53; *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* 1865 in McKinzie 1983 I: 13, 14; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 216; Van Dyke 2008: 12-13). The people of Kau on Hawaii Island were especially known to hold their chiefs to a high standard, and would not tolerate those who mistreated them. Those who were unreasonable in their demands for labor or produce like Halaea, Koihala, and Kohaikalani met violent ends (Pukui with Green 1995: 131-133 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 445; related by Mary Kawena Pukui, in Kelly 1956: 36-37). Alii nui who did not respect the property rights of their subjects eventually had to face the consequences. Kuamanuia of Oahu wanted the lands of his brothers for himself and became unpopular with the priests and country people for his greed, and was executed for his crimes (Fornander 1996: 270, Kamakau 1991: 61 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 349). Haka of Oahu was heedless of the property of his subjects and took whatever he wished, and faced an uprising and eventual death (Fornander 1996: 76; Fornander 1999: 4: 190, Kalakaua 1990: 274, Kamakau 1992b: 10 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 339). On Hawaii Island, Keliokaloa of Kona, son of Umi a Liloa, and Kamaiole and Kamakaohua of Kohala were killed for confiscating the property of commoners (McKinzie 1983 I: 13, 14). Being heedless of the possessions of others, and overstepping the bounds of acceptable behavior, even with high chiefs, met with some tolerance, but not for very long. Here again, it is clear that traditionalists emphasize controls on the power of the alii in the form of consequences dealt out when

abuse occurred, which in their view tended to move society back towards a balanced and harmonious state in pono.

The Alii-Makaainana Relationship

Another topic that is worth exploring is what scholars from the two groups write about relationship between the chiefs and commoners after the formalization of the ahupuaa system. The main idea found in the narratives of the anthropologists is that the kinship relationship that tied chiefs and commoners together as a family unit and which characterized Hawaiian society before the formalization of the ahupuaa system was dismembered. Again, much of this has been explored above, but a comparison side by side with what traditionalist scholars have written is instructive and shows clear differences in the views of the two groups. Cordy writes that “Most researchers believe that the appointment of outside chiefs would have replaced the local lineage chiefs, led to the breakdown of the local kin groups’ corporate control of community lands, and ended community ties to the ruling chiefs” (Hommon 1976, Earle 1978: 169, Green 1980: 73 in Cordy 2002a: 25). Earle holds that with the ahupuaa system, konohiki were placed as on-site managers of the ahupuaa. But they had no kinship ties to the people of the local community, and were part of the imposed structure of chiefly leadership that eventually came to control community affairs (Earle 1978: 16-20, 169). Goldman writes that the land division under Umi was the first one to have been done based not on kinship ties but on politics, and that this developed into an archipelago-wide system which eventually led to the subjugation of the commoners (Goldman 1970: 207, 212, 226, 234). Hommon

writes that the ahupuaa system led to the cleavage between the kinship relationship between commoners and chiefs which eventually developed into a two-class system in which control lay in the hands of the chiefs (Hommon 1976: 55, 57, 229-231, 272-277). Kirch holds that the Hawaiian socio-political system was transformed from a simple ancestral Polynesian chiefdom to a highly stratified society with virtual class distinction between chiefs and commoners (Kirch 1994: 257; see also 1984: 34; 1985: 294; 2000: 289-290, 298-300). Sahlins writes that Mailikukahi of Oahu and Kakaalaneo of Maui instituted or reformed a land division system in which chiefs would normally have no kinship to the people occupying those lands, while eventually taking control of the lands from the people (Beckwith 1976: 383; Kamakau 1991: 54-55 in Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 25-27, 192).

Contrary to this, many traditionalist writers believe that the relationship between the alii and makaainana was not broken, but that kinship bonds between them endured. Andrade writes that in the Hawaiian language, o-class possessive markers, indicative of kin, were used in the oral traditions when describing alii which demonstrates that the kinship relationship endured (Andrade 2009: 73, 74). Charlot writes that, "Although relations between levels of society naturally varied with time, place, and personality, the bulk of evidence indicates that they were usually close, marked by respect and aloha, affection, the expressed ideal was certainly one of solidarity and hospitality" (Charlot 2005b: 1, 2). Handy and Handy and Pukui write that, "The relationship between the planter and his family and the high chief, and to the alii class in general, was a very personal one in which ardent affection was the prevailing feeling unless the alii was a despicable one, which was rare. The alii in Kau, for instance, were looked up to as senior

relatives who were revered and venerated” (Handy and Handy 1972: 326). McGregor writes that although there are records of arbitrary, irresponsible, and self-serving chiefs, they were the exception, and were quickly replaced with chiefs who cared for the well being of the people (McGregor 2007: 22). Mary Kawena Pukui, writes, “The loved, respected, and obeyed alii were apparently the rule; the cruel alii one abandoned or murdered, the exception” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 233).

As has been demonstrated, many traditionalists point out that in general, the chief’s reward for fulfilling his many duties would be the aloha of his subjects (Charlot 2005b: 113). He would also earn the respect of other alii and be remembered in the histories as a just and worthy ruler (Fornander 1996: 71 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 324; Charlot 2005b: 113). But not only in general terms is this seen, good chiefs were named many times in the traditions. Punaaikea of Kauai was loved by the people for being compassionate to the makaainana, catered to the needs of the lesser chiefs (Kalakaua 1990: 124 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 282). Kakaalaneo of Maui won the love of the people for his mercy and benevolence (Kalakaua 1990: 229 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 321). The people had great affection for Kalamakua of Oahu for his generosity to the makaainana and for his works of cultivation (Kamakau 1991: 45 in Cachola-Abad 2000: 325).

It is apparent then, that in the reciprocal relationship seen functioning between alii nui, konohiki and makaainana, enforced to be sure but in operation nonetheless, in which all parties had responsibilities to each other, that many traditionalists believe a kinship dynamic informed the entire societal structure in ancient Hawaii. And just as with so many examples above, there are similar statements that can be found in the other camp. Among the anthropologists, Hommon writes, “Despite the paramount chief’s semisacred

character and his rights to goods that he himself did not produce, he is always restrained by the ties of kinship” (Hommon 1976: 53-54). In an early work, Kirch writes that, “...the chiefs were still expected to work for the communal welfare, and an overly bloated chieftainship might raise the spectre of rebellion. While the more advanced Polynesian societies pushed the evolution of the chiefdom to its organizational limits, they never fully divorced the system from its ancestral kinship ideology” (Kirch 1984: 167, 260-261). And Sahlins writes that the ruling chiefs never broke completely with the people at large, so they might dishonor the kinship morality only on pain of mass disaffection (Sahlins 1972: 148). However, it would be inaccurate to consider these statements an essential part of the narratives of these anthropologists. It is more accurate to say that the obligations of alii to makaainana are sometimes mentioned but not emphasized. The idea of a reciprocal relationship is not developed, few examples are offered, any discussion takes up little space, most of which is devoted to showing that the chiefs did indeed extract from and exploit the commoners. Further, these statements are in seeming contradiction to the bulk of the writing, seem appended on to the structure, and would not damage the overall narrative of the work if excluded. Kameeleihiwa is correct, then, when she writes that the social scientists miss this reciprocal responsibility between chiefs and commoners (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 31-33). Therefore, as stated earlier, there are exceptions, but the evidence presented above shows that there are indeed two interpretations of ancient Hawaiian society, essentially in opposition.

Conclusion

I have presented evidence that shows that there are two opposing views of ancient Hawaiian society. To recap, the view of the anthropologists selected for this study is that there was a rupture in Hawaiian society about 1450 CE with the advent of the ahupuaa system. This impacted all aspects of society in which the relationship between chiefs and commoners radically changed from one that was characterized by kinship ties to one in which the small group of chiefs gained power which they used to exploit and extract labor and the fruits of that labor from a much larger class of commoners, which then augmented a privileged lifestyle and the pursuit of political goals. The view of the traditionalists is quite different, and they see a past not governed by this rather bleak dynamic. Instead, Hawaii's history in pre-contact times was characterized not so much by a rupture but by continuity with a past in which alii and makaainana had responsibilities to each other, in which society was governed by balancing mechanisms which helped insure all parties did their duty. Traditionalists believe that these mechanisms facilitated a movement towards the ideal of pono, in which all survived, prospered, and maintained a relationship based on kinship.

This second view may be characterized by some as a whitewash. In their view, the past portrayed by the traditionalists is a creation and glorification of ideals that in fact never existed. Historian Lawrence H. Fuchs exemplifies this as he explains that some Hawaiians after contact were unable to adjust to many aspects of haole life (Fuchs 1961: 68). Left with only memories of what may have been, many Hawaiians after western

contact retreated from the frustration with the new life and society into an unreal past where fact and fiction were often blurred. Out of this came impossible efforts to recapture the glories of the past (Fuchs 1961: 75-85). It is understandable that some would think that some of the details presented previously which characterize the life and people of the olden days as tending to move back towards pono, back into harmony with each other and the wider world, are fanciful distillations of what those living after western contact think pre-contact times as like. This reasoning should be carefully considered. One place to start is with an evaluation of the evidence used most consistently by the traditionalists, the oral traditions themselves.

One problem is found in the oral traditions gathered and presented by David Malo. He is used heavily by both anthropologists and traditionalists. But it must not be forgotten that Malo, like any other person, was a product of his times, and inherited biases based on that background. One of the most important was that he was a newly-converted a Christian, so understandably may have been subject to the zealous flights of any convert. Nathaniel Emerson, first translator of Malo's *Moolelo Hawaii* from Hawaiian into English in the 1890s, certainly thought this.³⁵ Never one to be silent on what he felt was the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon tongue and race, Emerson nonetheless wrote that Malo was so taken with Christianity that he seemed warped in his negative judgments of the old system (Malo 1951: viii). Another bias may come from the fact that Malo witnessed the sandalwood era, in which many of the balancing mechanisms on chiefly power were simply gone. Very few would argue that exploitation and extraction was not the order of those chaotic days. Finally, Hawaiian society had been savaged by catastrophic depopulation, the extremely rapid replacement of a

³⁵ One translation of "*Moolelo Hawaii*" is "Hawaiian Antiquities." See Malo 1951.

centuries old religious system with another, the growing use of a new language, the introduction and quick adoption of an unfamiliar economic and land tenure system, and threats to sovereignty. These changes within the span of two or three generations took a tremendous toll on the nation, and for this catastrophe Malo blamed the chiefs (Malo 1839 in Osorio 2002: 38). It is quite possible that he projected his disappointment in their leadership back into history, and that this may account for some of his quite extreme criticisms of the olden days.

A second problem with the oral traditions is in their widely varying nature. There are so many various and contradictory stories that systemization or final agreement is difficult. Papa and Wakea are described as being the primordial parents in many sources, but in others were residents of a Hawaii already peopled (Barrere 1961: 10; Kamakau 1870a in Sterling 1998: 2). Some have dismissed many of the old accounts because they were thought to have been corrupted by the beliefs of Christian missionaries while they were being recorded and set down in writing (Goldman 1970: 204; Kanahale 1992: 68; Silva 2004: 16). The sometimes vitriolic debate in the Hawaiian language newspapers of the 1860s between Kamakau and Unauna was over the accuracy of their published historical accounts and genealogies, or even if they should be made public at all (Charlot 2005b: 489-499). The genealogies themselves are inconsistent, and individuals could graft themselves on to existing high chiefly lines where only tenuous connections existed, or perhaps none at all (Charlot 2005b: 491; Goldman 1970: 204). And Malo himself admits that the larger part of the traditions is vague, obscure, uncertain, and contradictory (Malo 1951: 1-2).

But while the oral traditions cannot be accepted as absolutely accurate, other information supports the idea that the oral traditions contain valuable historical data. This can be seen when considering the cultural milieu in which they were created and passed down. Martha Beckwith, the authoritative scholar on Hawaiian mythology, writes that chants were memorized with such accuracy that they could be gathered from different places but showed little variation (Beckwith 1976: 312, 319; Charlot 2005b: 198-203; Handy and Handy 1972: 196; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 55). Kepelino tells about the historians (poe moolelo) whose task was to memorize the histories of all the governments so that they would not disappear (Kepelino 1932: 134, 135 in Charlot 2005b: 199). Delicate political decisions were made only after searching through historical precedent; to lose a story was therefore to lose a possible solution to a problem (Charlot 2005b: 486; Kamakau 1991: 79-81; Kepelino 1932: 131, 135 in Kameeleihiwa 1992: 22; Malo 1951: 75, 140). The ones possessing this knowledge held prestigious positions at court, showing its importance (Charlot 2005b: 487-491). The ancients recognized levels of security for the various literary forms as well. Narrative prose was the least secure, followed by chants. But genealogies (Hawaiian: mookuauhau) and wills (Hawaiian: kauoha) were both contested until consensus was reached, then memorized in set literary forms (Charlot 1999: 57; Charlot 2005b: 497). If a chant was in danger of being lost, important elements might be incorporated, or it was attached in its entirety to a genealogy, thereby insuring an almost certain preservation. The great cosmogonic genealogical chants like the Kualii and the Kumulipo are composed of several ancient chants grafted onto the genealogical name listings so they would be remembered (Dudley 1986: 7). Some traditionalists feel that far more than just prosaic lists of begats, the

genealogies are much more: they are the history of the people (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 21; Young 1998: xii, xiii, 28).

Another reason to think that the historical information found in the traditions is valuable can be seen in the realism with which the characters are portrayed. Stories of sometimes the highest chiefs are not of angelic supermen but of imperfect humans with foibles and sometimes serious weakness, and they were identified not in vague terms but by name. Kahavari, chief of Puna, engaged in a contest with a comely young woman, but did so unfairly. Little did he know that the cheated contestant was Pele, who proceeded in her heated wrath to chase him all the way to Kauai (Kalakaua 1990: 505-507).

Kalaniopuu was so taken with rich and riotous living in his later years that food became scarce at whatever place he moved his court. His excesses caused much discontent in the makaainana and lesser chiefs, so Imakakoloa and Nuuanupaaha led a revolt of those tired of the abuse (Fornander 1969 II: 200-202). Lonoikamakahiki was so overcome with rage at his wife's suspected infidelity that he beat her to death, and lost his mind as a result (Kamakau 1961: 48). Ehunuikaimalino was executed for his exactions of the commoners of South Kona (Malo 1951: 195). A reading of any of the collections shows that stories of these fallible people are common, and that their portrayal is far from whitewashed.

Further, the nineteenth-century historians were not content just to be mere anecdote gatherers, but summarized and contextualized the challenges faced by Hawaiian society without pulling punches. Fornander saw a gradual process in which the power of the chiefs increased at the expense of the makaainana who were set down (Fornander 1880: 63 in Goldman 1970: 227). Kalakaua describes the people of old as being as barbarous as they were brave, warm-hearted, and hospitable (Kalakaua 1990: 371).

Kamakau writes that in former times wars between the chiefs were frequent and entailed robbery and murder of the common people (Kamakau 1961: 230; Kamakau 1992b: 234, 235, 396, 412 in Osorio 2002: 4-5). And Malo writes that the kings lived in fear of the people and many were put to death because of their oppression (Malo 1951: 195). These writers cannot be labeled revisionists, looking to portray their ancestors in glowing terms by rewriting history.

Another reason to think that the oral traditions are valuable as historical text is that the ones who know most about the traditions, the experts who have spent many years in its intensive study, say that this is so. Cachola-Abad holds that the historical information is highly consistent and forms a cohesive and reliable picture of the past (Cachola-Abad 2000: vii). Charlot writes that the vast amount of unwritten literature passed down and collected shows that the ancestors possessed a keen historical sense (Charlot 2005a, 2). Kameeleihiwa posits that until recently, writers examining watershed events like the mahele proceeded from western models, but that another starting point comes from the historical traditions of Hawaiians themselves, which when understood, afford quite a different interpretation of this conjuncture (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 13). Young says that oral traditions as moolelo, which itself means to say or speak from succession, are drawn from 2000-year-old treasury further rooted in an even deeper past (Young 1998: 5, 11). Some anthropologist voices confirm this view of the native historical tradition. Goldman holds that the indigenous oral traditions at the very least represent the Polynesian viewpoint on their own history (Goldman 1970: xii). Kirch writes that Pacific Islanders have always promulgated their own forms of indigenous history that are encoded in the oral traditions, and that these may help in ethnographic

and archaeological formulations (Kirch 1984: 6; Kirch 2000: 12). And in 2010 he makes even stronger statements about the validity of some of the information in the oral traditions. He writes, “Recently, the weight of scholarly opinion has shifted toward recognition of the likely historical validity of the traditions [describing the voyages of the migratory period]” (Kirch 2010: 84).

The traditionalists definitely think the oral traditions are valuable, and some glean from them what they consider to be core values of the Hawaiian people as they have developed over the millennia. These values can go a long way in making clear how Hawaiians viewed their own history that they themselves experienced. Andrade writes that the old stories hint at what traditional values might have been (Andrade 2009: 21). Cachola-Abad holds that ancestral voices can be heard in the traditions (Cachola-Abad 2000: 22). Charlot finds that the traditions contain the ideals of the Hawaiian people, even though these ideals were not always realized (Charlot 2005b: 93). Kameeleihiwa finds common elements that she calls cultural metaphors, ways through which the ancients experienced the world (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 3-13). Kelly references Beckwith as she writes about the social values and core beliefs that were developed in the early times of the Lailai period, which have survived and continue to guide the society and behavior of many modern Hawaiians (Kelly 1989: 104). McGregor describes how knowledge was passed down in the traditions that make up the core values of Hawaiians and which still animate some who are alive today (McGregor 2007: 2). And Young writes that the basic character of the Hawaiian is found in the traditions (Young 1998: 10).

From the oral traditions, then, some of these writers derive core values. Besides pono, and the necessity of societal structure being accomplished through appropriate separation, and the need for limits to ensure harmony, many traditionalists like Andrade, Maly, McGregor, and Trask also write about the special relationship that Hawaiians have had with their environment. Phrases like “aloha aina” and “malama aina,” love and care for the land, refer to the feeling and respect that Hawaiians have for their natural surroundings, and that it must be treated properly as it is the one that feeds, which is the literal translation of aina: the feeder. These phrases, appearing constantly in their narratives, speak to a subjective identification with aspects of the environment (Andrade 2009: 25; Handy and Pukui 1958: 28; Maly 2001: 1, 2; McGregor 2007: 2; *Ahupuaa, Fishponds, and Loi* 1992; Trask 1999: 5, 120).

So if there is evidence that the oral traditions contain valid information, then perhaps it is the traditionalists themselves who are taking this information and presenting it inaccurately, thus perpetuating the whitewash. This certainly seems to be the case described by anthropologist Jocelyn Linnekin. She holds the core values so often written about by traditionalists, like malama aina and aloha aina, are idealizations proceeding from an inauthentic projection of culture which has been created to mobilize a group that has as its goal the acquisition of political power (Linnekin 1985: 8-11).³⁶ But this conclusion is flawed because the traditionalists also comment negatively on the old ways. Cachola-Abad writes that although the chiefs had the power to request anything they wanted at any time, to do so was not good form (Cachola-Abad 2000: 501). Charlot holds that although ideals are found throughout the oral traditions, the repeated injunctions against abuses show that these existed, and constantly needed to be guarded

³⁶ For information about criticism of Linnekin’s views, see Trask 1986: 232-235.

against (Charlot 2005b: 93). Kameeleihiwa says that the old society was not perfect (*Act of War* 1993). Kanahale writes that conspicuously consuming chiefs relied heavily on the toil and loyalty of lesser-status people (Kanahale 1995: 52). Kelly states that during the last two centuries prior to western contact, catastrophic changes took place within Hawaiian society that put it on a path tangential to earlier times in which the core values proceeding from aloha were established (Kelly 1989: 103). McGregor admits that there are records of arbitrary, irresponsible, and self-serving chiefs (McGregor 2007: 29). Pukui writes about chiefs who abused their mana, and demanded too much work and food (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 I: 52; Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972 II: 216).

Perhaps then it is the anthropologists who are off base about Hawaii's history. This is certainly not an isolated opinion. Hawaii historian Edward Beechert writes that many westerners have applied Western models and analysis more appropriate to capitalist societies, and the result has been distortion and confusion (Beechert 1985: 10). Charlot asserts that perhaps the worst distortion of the anthropological approach is its ignorance of the pervasive historical dimension in Polynesian cultures (Charlot 2005b: 497). Kameeleihiwa observes that it was not until 1980 when Greg Dening published *Islands and Beaches* that the native viewpoint about important events from their own history was given equal consideration (Kameeleihiwa 1992: 4-6). Pualani Kanakaole Kanahale, hula master and Hawaiian activist says that archaeologists are essentially data collectors, but they do not yet understand the data they have collected (Meyer 1998: 93). Some like Kanalu Young agree with Ngugi wa Thiongo, who wrote that one effect of foreign domination is that the past of the ones now dominated becomes rewritten as a wasteland of non-achievement (Thiongo 1981, 3, 12, in Young 1998: 21-22). And Young himself

writes that history as a western academic discipline in any of its forms simply does not capture the deeper meaning of the oral traditions (Young 1998: 3).

Further evidence that calls anthropologist conclusions about Hawaii's history into doubt can be seen in other biases that may inform their writing. Some anthropologists characterize times before western contact as "prehistory," and the times after as "history" (Kirch 1985: 7; Kirch 2000: 3; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 I: 2; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 30). But this rather subjective attitude may be considered by some as dated, and has drawn other criticism. David Hanlon says that it is time to put aside the western scholarly distinction between history and prehistory as it is a largely meaningless qualification imposed on the islands' past from the outside (Hanlon 1988: xviii). Kanalu Young writes that academic categories of prehistory and history are deterrents to understanding the indigenous past from an indigenous perspective (Young 1998: xii-xiii, 3). Elizabeth Buck holds that the dominant ethnocentric view of most western scholars about Pacific societies before Western contact is that they are simple, primitive, and static, somehow waiting for the action to begin, which of course is inaugurated by the arrival of Westerners themselves (E. Buck 1993, 32). Other writers call attention to other possible bias. Carlos Andrade holds that modern American writers have inherited a dislike of anything hinting of monarchy from the European past that they wholeheartedly rejected. In the alii nui they see the divine right of kings, in the alii ability to direct large groups of people they see feudal noblemen lording it over serfs (Andrade 2009: 70). David Stannard has another perspective as he calls attention to political mythology, the tendency of colonizing nations to describe indigenous people in derogatory terms to establish and increase the power of the new regime (Stannard 1992: 14). Haunani-Kay

Trask sees a process in which the imperialistic colonizer comes to remake through destruction. She writes, “For people who suffer the yoke of imperialism, it is a total system of foreign power in which another culture, people, and way of life penetrate, transform, and come to define the colonized society. The results are always destructive, no matter the praises sung by the colonizer” (Trask 1999: 41).

But bias can certainly be found in some traditionalist writers as well. At one extreme, a few like Holt and Young seem to posit in places that there is something in the physical makeup of the person, in the blood or bone, passed from the ancestors, that is necessary for one to understand what it means to be Hawaiian (Holt 1964: 9-11; Young 1998: 18-19). Perhaps those thinking along these lines need to make themselves familiar with the work and character of those like Pat Namaka Bacon, John Charlot, and Kepa Maly, not Hawaiian by genealogy but certainly in their thinking, or read modern DNA studies that show we are much more alike than different, and then be open to the possibility that there is no evidence whatsoever that shows that something physical facilitates understanding of culture. Other criticism can be found in voices from the cultural repository and wider community in Hawaii which is not commonly discussed or easily accessed. Some from that community feel that the overtly accusatory tone found in some of the more volatile writing and discussions is improper at best. Anger in presentation tends to invalidate a message that may contain valid points, especially when it is seen as an attack, and any aspect of the message that gets through is not because of anger but in spite of it. Statements that non-Hawaiians should leave Hawaii turn many off, especially those from the older generation. And calls for a moratorium on legitimate research into the past lead some to think, “What are they afraid of finding out?”

Others in the larger community may feel that there is an arrogance implicit in some traditionalist writers, and in many moderns, especially from the younger generation, who think they know what the ancestors thought and felt without qualification or caution. But the vast majority of us do not speak Hawaiian as a first language, instead we have taken classes. Unlike the people of old, we do not walk or paddle or sail, but rather speed through landscapes and past sacred sites where gods and ancestors dwelt. Most of us do not work in the taro patch or fish for our food but go to supermarkets; if we are lucky we may have a few plants or a garden. Not many worship the old gods if we worship anything at all, we do not cower in our homes or keep pets and children quiet on sacred nights, and certainly no one prostrates to his betters. If we do not live like the old ones, caution needs to be observed if we think we understand them, even more when we claim to speak for them. Perhaps Ulu Kanakaole Garmon, cultural expert and practitioner, summed it up best when she said that we were and still remain a people struggling to find the right way, to find pono (Garmon, 1998). But here, as before, what is emphasized makes all the difference in how the ancient history is portrayed, by those seeing primarily the dynamic of abuse and its corollary, a sundered relationship between the classes, or by those seeing abuses being corrected and in that correction relationships maintained and a nation preserved.

I have shown that there are two largely opposing views of ancient Hawaiian society. And something perhaps to be expected is found in the bibliographies of the writers examined. Although not absolute, in general there is a notable lack of sources used which have come from the other camp: anthropologists generally do not use traditionalists and vice versa. Of course exceptions are found: some anthropologists use

the important works *The Polynesian Family System in Kau, Hawaii* but label the information about makaainana family structure as inaccurate or at best vague (Goldman 1970: 235-238; Hommon 1975, 77-78; Kirch and Sahlins 1992 II: 192ff). And Marion Kelly and Kehau Cachola-Abad do use archaeological information that is emphasized to a much greater degree by anthropologists. But again, to say this makes up a substantial part of the narratives of each group is inaccurate. However, this challenge can be overcome by those willing to engage both sides. Perhaps a starting point would be to explore the places, primarily in Sahlins, but also in Hommon and Kirch, where common elements are found. In this regard, both anthropologists and traditionalists can adjust their methods to expand their research and look at other possibilities. Both groups can make use of the work of the other group, and consider other points of views to a much greater extent than is being done presently. The anthropologists can look at the oral traditions from a different perspective, and become aware of connections that do not readily present themselves, but are found in other presentations. There seems to be a strong tendency that underlies much of modern historical scholarship: to see the world and its cultures in terms of the struggle of groups for resources, wealth, and power. It certainly makes sense, but there are alternate readings, and one alternate reading is being presented by the traditionalists. The traditionalists can improve their presentation by drawing information from sources other than the oral traditions and the cultural information passed down in their families and communities. It follows then that because some may not be familiar with the information used by the anthropologists about the early centuries after first landing, they may assume that Hawaiian society was always like it was in the last centuries prior to contact, the period that produced most of the

information found in the oral traditions. They may be unaware that there is good evidence that dramatic changes in society took place, as the anthropologists believe. If the traditionalists were aware of information from those other fields, they may come to the conclusion, like the anthropologists do, that changes that took place in Hawaii with the implementation of the ahupuaa system benefitted the alii and not the makaainana.

But it is not enough to simply continue to point out flaws from the past. Instead, observations like these, if taken in the right spirit, can further dialogue. All knowledge is not exhausted in a single school, and likewise it is difficult to listen when one's mouth is open. But there is starting to be more engagement. Academics are becoming increasingly sensitive to the body of information that animates the traditionalists. Similarly, there are more opportunities for younger scholars already immersed in Hawaiian culture to access such academic fields as archaeology and linguistics. Those interested in oral traditions can learn about anthropological research and analytical methods, and those versed in those fields can attempt to truly understand what that history is saying about itself in its own terms. All these are examples of possible avenues that might enrich discussions of ancient Hawaiian society and history. Further, we are coming to the point in the life of our species and planet where we need to do things differently or will be faced with disaster. The ancients in these islands did something correct to be able to survive with limited resources and thrive to a degree that astonished the first visitors, and with only stone-age technology. Although we may not have their clear view of how the world is supposed to operate and what it takes to get there, we certainly have the same capacity to learn.

Glossary

Aha Alii The aha alii was a council of chiefs whose purpose was to authenticate the genealogical record and preserve chiefly rank. It was originally formed on Maui about 1200 CE, then spread rapidly to the other islands. It led to a greater distance between the chiefs and the commoners.

Ahupuaa: A cairn of stones sometimes marked with the bones or wooden effigy of a pig. This cairn was placed at the borders between the land divisions known as ahupuaa. Ahupuaa were also parcels of land usually running from the mountains to the sea that contained many of the resources needed for the people who lived within it.

Aikapu: A name of the basic religious system in pre-contact Hawaii. It was characterized by a separation between basic elements designed to keep polluting elements separated so balance in the world would be maintained. This religion has also been referred to as the “kapu system.”

Alii: A general term for nobility or chief.

Alii Ai Ahupuaa: A designation for chiefs who ruled over ahupuaa.

Alii Ai Moku: A designation for chiefs who ruled over districts, islands, and/or parts of other islands.

Alii Nui: Sometimes translated as “ruling chief.” These chiefs ruled over islands, districts, and sometimes ahupuaa. They gained this privilege through war or through genealogical rank.

Aumakua: Ancestral spirits or guides of individuals or families. They could take the form of plants, animals, shapes, or colors.

Cosmogonic: a type of myth that relates the origins and/or development of the universe.

Haku: The head of the ohana or family.

Hale Naua: A house in which applicants could prove their relationship to a new paramount by reciting their genealogy back to the tenth generation.

Hookupu: Literally “to cause to grow.” The offering made from the people through the chiefs to the gods to insure plentiful rain and a bountiful harvest.

Kahuna: A religious specialist or priest. Also refers to any specialist or expert in a wide variety of professions, such as canoe building, wood carving, medicine, and agriculture.

Kalaiaina: The process by which lands were divided up and assigned to chiefs and commoners on the ascension of a new paramount.

Kapu: Prohibitions, that which is prohibited.

Konohiki: Chiefly managers of the ahupuaa. They were usually lower ranking alii under the alii ai ahupuaa or alii nui to which ahupuaa had been assigned in the kalaiaina. They were responsible for keeping agricultural production at healthy levels and managing the community labor of the commoners.

Luakini: Often referred to as a heiau dedicated to war, and dedicated with human sacrifice.

Makaainana: The term for the commoners. Literally, “on the landers,” or “the ones of the land.” Many translate this term as “the eyes of the land.”

Mana: Spiritual energy, charisma, or power. Mana is often acquired through genealogical connections to illustrious ancestors or gods, or through deeds. Mana can be lost through misdeeds.

Makahiki: The season running from late October to early February when taxes or offerings were collected. It is usually described as a period during which warfare was outlawed. Heiau dedicated to Ku were either re-consecrated to Lono or abandoned until the makahiki season was over.

Moku: Usually refers to as district, but could also mean an island.

Pono: Refers to the proper functioning of all elements in the universe that occurs when all forces are balanced. Sometimes translated as righteousness. Pono has been used as a noun to mean uprightness, righteousness, the good; an adjective as in a pono alii; and as a nominalizing phrase as in the word hooponopono, meaning the process of making correct or healing.

Biographical Appendix

Carlos Andrade received the Ph.D. in Geography from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 2001 (University of Hawaii at Manoa 2011a). He was a crew member on the Hokulea's 1986 voyage from Aotearoa/New Zealand to Tonga and Samoa and the 1992 voyage from Rarotonga to Hawaii (George Kahumoku Jr's. Slack Key Show: Masters of Hawaiian Music 2011; Wikipedia 2011d). He currently teaches at the Hawaiiinuiakea School of Hawaiian Knowledge (University of Hawaii at Manoa 2011b).

Kehaunani Cachola-Abad received the Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 2000. She has worked on digs in Hawaii and in the Pacific. (HonoluluAdvertiser.com 2011b).

John Charlot received the Dr. Theol. from the University of Munich in 1968. He has published many articles and books on Christianity, but most of his work has been investigating the Hawaiian oral traditions. He currently teaches in the Religion Department at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. (University of Hawaii at Manoa: Department of Religion 2011).

Ross H. Cordy received the Ph.D. in Anthropology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1978. He has participated in numerous digs throughout the Hawaiian islands (Wikipedia 2011h). He currently teaches at the University of Hawaii West Oahu (University of Hawaii-West Oahu 2011).

Timothy Earle received the Ph.D. from Michigan in 1973. He has conducted multi-year, international field research projects in Polynesia, Peru, Argentina, Denmark, and Hungary. He is a Professor in the Department of Anthropology at Northwestern University. (Northwestern University: Department of Anthropology 2011).

Abraham Fornander was born in Sweden in 1812, served on a whaler, settled in Hawaii in 1842, and married the Molokai chiefess Alanakapu in 1847 (Cachola-Abad 2000: 41; Fornander 1969: x-xi). He served as Circuit Judge and General Inspector of Schools for the Kingdom of Hawaii and edited the newspapers *Weekly Argus* and *Polynesian* (Fornander 1969: ix-xi).

Irving Goldman received the Ph.D. at Columbia in 1934 (Wikipedia 2011e). He has done fieldwork in British Columbia, Oregon, Mexico, and the Northwest Amazon (Sarah Lawrence College: news and events 2011). He taught at Sarah Lawrence College from 1947 until his retirement in 1980 (Sarah Lawrence College: news and events 2011).

Robert J. Hommon received the Ph.D. from the University of Arizona in 1976. He has worked as a Pacific Area/Pacific Islands Cluster Archaeologist for the National Park

Service (Google Books 2011b). He has served as President of The Society for Hawaiian Archaeology (Society for Hawaiian Archeology 2011).

Samuel Manaiakalani S. M. Kamakau was born in Waialua, Oahu in 1815 (Chun 1993, 17). He entered Lahainaluna seminary when he was seventeen and worked under Reverend Sheldon Dibble (Cachola-Abad 2000: 39). He was selected to gather stories from elders for Dibble's history of Hawaii (Hommon 1976: 128-129). He later traveled to all the major islands where he collected traditions, lore, and genealogies (Chun 1993, 18). He served as a district judge and as a member of the legislature (Chun 1993, 20). He wrote many newspaper articles that were gathered, translated, edited, and published over the years in works like *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii Works of the People of Old*, and *Tales and Traditions of the People of Old* (Hommon 1976: 128-129).

Lilikala Kameeleihiwa received the Ph.D. in History from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1986. She has served as protocol officer for the voyaging canoes Hokulea and Hawaii'loa (Wikipedia 2011f). She is currently working on an inventory of Ceded Lands, and teaches at Kamakakuokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies.

George Kanahale received his Ph.D. in Government and Southeast Asian Affairs from Cornell University in 1967. He was active in promoting business and tourism in Hawaii and Guam. (HonoluluAdvertiser.com 2011a; Wikipedia 2011a).

Herb Kawainui Kane received the M.A. in Art in 1953 from the University of Chicago. He has been involved in publishing and painting about Hawaii and the Pacific, and is a founding member of the Polynesian Voyaging Society (*Herb Kawainui Kane* 2011; Wikipedia 2011c).

Marion Kelly received her M.A. from Columbia in 1954. She is Professor Emeritus of Ethnic Studies at University of Hawaii at Manoa. She is a recognized expert in Pacific and Hawaiian Studies, has co-written several works with anthropologists, and has been active in issues surrounding Makua Valley (Dkosopedia 2011).

Patrick Vinton Kirch received the Ph.D. in Anthropology in 1975 from Yale University (Oceanic Archaeology Laboratory at the University of California Berkeley 2011). He has worked on many archaeological digs in Hawaii and the Pacific (Kirch 1985: back flap). He has been the director at Burke Museum in Seattle and has headed the Division of Archaeology at Bernice P. Bishop Museum (Kirch 1985: back flap). He has taught Anthropology at the University of Washington and is currently Professor of Anthropology at the University of California at Berkeley (University of California Berkeley 2011).

David Malo was born in North Kona, Hawaii in 1795 (Cachola-Abad 2000: 37). He spent much of his youth in Kuakini's court, and there began to develop an intimate acquaintance with the history, tradition, legends and myths of old Hawaii (Chun 1993, 1; Malo 1951: vii). He moved to Lahaina, Maui in 1823 and there studied under William Richards (Cachola-Abad 2000: 37). He entered Lahainaluna Seminary in 1831 and

researched and recorded more from the oral traditions (Chun 1993, 5). He served in the legislature and as Superintendent of Schools (Chun 1993, 6). His major work *Ka Moololo Hawaii* was written about 1840 and was translated into English in 1898 by N.B. Emerson under the title *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Hommon 1976: 128).

Kepa Maly has co-authored several studies for the Hawaii State Division of Forestry and Wildlife with his wife Onaona Pomroy-Maly. Together they founded Kumu Pono Associates LLC, an organization specializing in cultural and historical research. (Kumupono.com 2011).

Davianna McGregor received the Ph.D. in History from University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1989. She has been active in the Protect Kahoolawe Ohana. She currently teaches in the Ethnic Studies department at the University of Hawaii at Manoa (University of Hawaii at Manoa: Ethnic Studies Department 2011).

Jonathan Osorio received the Ph.D. in History from University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1996. He currently teaches at the Kamakauokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies. He continues to perform music and be active in legal and political issues.

Mary Kawena Pukui worked at Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum from 1938-1961 as a translator (Bishop Museum 2011b; Wikipedia 2011g). A chanter and hula expert, she also interviewed hundreds of Hawaiian elders in the 1950s and 1960s which have been preserved on audiotape (Bishop Museum 2011a). She served as informant for numerous anthropologists (Wikipedia 2011g). Along with Samuel H. Elbert, Pukui, published the definitive *Hawaiian Dictionary*.

Marshall Sahlins received the Ph.D. in Anthropology from Columbia in 1954. He is Professor of Anthropology (Ret.) at the University of Chicago, and is presently doing research that is focused on the intersection of culture and history (University of Chicago: Department of Anthropology 2011).

Haunani-Kay Trask received the Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981. She has written poetry and has been active in the sovereignty movement. She is Professor Emeritus at Kamakakuokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies (Wikipedia 2011b).

Kanalu Young received the Ph.D. in History from the University of Hawaii at Manoa in 1995. He taught at the Kamakakuokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies (University of Hawaii System, 2011). He was a faculty advisor for the Hawaiian Society for Law and Politics (Hawaiian Kingdom Info, 2011).

Reference List

apps.ksbe.edu/enrichment/sites/apps.ksbe.edu.enrichment/files/Oahu.jpg. 2011.

About UNPFII and a brief history of indigenous peoples and the international system. 2011. Accessed Aug 14, 2011. <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/history.html>.

Act of War: the overthrow of the Hawaiian nation. 1993. Honolulu: Na Maka o ka Aina in association with the Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawaii-Manoa.

Ahupuaa, Fishponds, and Loi. 1992. Na Maka O Ka Aina.

Alexander, William DeWitt. 1891. *A brief history of the Hawaiian people.* New York.

Ancient Hawaiian Civilization: a series of lectures delivered at the Kamehameha Schools, by Handy, Emory, Bryan...and Others. 1933. Honolulu: The Kamehameha Schools.

Andrade, Carlos. 2009. *Haena: through the eyes of the ancestors.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Apple, Russ. 1994. *Ala kahakai, A phrase in the Hawaiian language meaning trail by the sea: a walk through five hundred and fifty years of history on the island of Hawaii.* Hawaii National Park, Hawaii Macapuleville Press.

----- . 1995. *Hele wawae, walk feet: Historic resource values report on shoreline foot-paths of the island of Hawaii.* The National Park Service, Pacific West Field Area.

----- . 1973. *Mountain trails: The Ainapo and Mauna Loa.* Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Banner, Stuart. 2005. "Preparing to be colonized: Land tenure and legal strategy in nineteenth-century Hawaii." *Law & Society Review* 39: 1-28.

Barrere, Dorothy B. 1961. *Summary of Hawaiian history and culture.* Hawaiian and Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii at Manoa. Honolulu.

Beaglehole, J. C., ed. 1967. *The voyage of the Resolution and Discovery, 1776-1780, part one.* Cambridge: the Hakluyt Society.

Beckwith, Martha Warren. 1972. *The kumulipo, a Hawaiian creation chant.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- . [1940] 1976. *Hawaiian mythology*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Beechert, Edward D. 1985. *Working in Hawaii: A labor history*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Bellwood, Peter. 1979. *Man's conquest of the Pacific*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bishop Museum. 2011a. *Audio Collection*. Accessed August 10, 2011. <http://www.bishopmuseum.org/research/library/archsamples.html>
- Bishop Museum. 2011b. *Hawaiian Ethnographic Notes*. Accessed August 31, 2011. <http://data.bishopmuseum.org/HEN/index.php>
- Buck, Elizabeth. 1993. *Paradise remade: The politics of culture and history in Hawaii*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Buck, Peter Henry (Te Rangi Hiroa). 1938. *Vikings of the sunrise*. New York: F.A. Stockes.
- . 1949. *The coming of the Maori*. Wellington: Maori Purposes Fund Board, Historical Branch of the Department of Internal Affairs and Whitcombe and Tombs.
- . [1957] [1964] 2003. *Arts and crafts of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2003.
- Cachola-Abad, Kehaunani. 2000. *The evolution of Hawaiian socio-political complexity: An analysis of Hawaiian oral traditions*. Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Campbell, Archibald. [1822] 1967. *A voyage around the world (1806-1812)*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Cartwright B. 1930. "Note on Hawaiian Genealogies." *38th annual report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the year 1929*: 45-47.
- Charlot, John. 1983. *Chanting the universe: Hawaiian religious culture*. Honolulu and Hong Kong: Emphasis International.
- . 1985. *The Hawaiian poetry of religion and politics: Some religio-political concepts in postcontact literature*. Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for Polynesian Studies.
- . 1987. Review of *Kingship and sacrifice: Ritual and society in ancient Hawaii* by Valerio Valeri. *Pacific Studies* 10, no. 2: 107-147.

- . 1999. Classical Polynesian thinking. In *A companion to world philosophies*, eds. Eliot Deutsch and Ron Bontekoe, 49-62. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- . 2005a. *Approaches to the academic study of Hawaiian literature and culture*. Laie, Hawaii: The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawaii.
- . 2005b. *Classical Hawaiian education: Generations of Hawaiian culture*. Laie, Hawaii: The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawaii.
- . 2005c. *Moses Kuaea Nakuina: Hawaiian novelist*. Laie, Hawaii: The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawaii.
- Chinen, Jon J. 1958. *The great mahele: Hawaii's land division of 1848*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Chun, Malcolm Naea. ed. and trans. 1988. *I ka wa o Kamehameha, in the time of Kamehameha: selected essays by Samuel M. Kamakau*. Honolulu: Fold Press.
- . 1993. *Na kukui pio ole, the inextinguishable torches: The biographies of three early native Hawaiian scholars, David Malo, S. N. Haleole, S. M. Kamakau*. Honolulu: First People's Productions.
- Cordy, Ross H. 2000. *Exalted sits the chief: The ancient history of Hawaii Island*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- . 2002a. *The rise and fall of the Oahu kingdom*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- . 2002b. *An ancient history of Waianae. Ka moku o Waianae: He Moolelo o ka Wa Kahiko*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- Crosby, Alfred W. 1986. *Ecological imperialism: The biological expansion of Europe, 900-1900*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daws, Gavan. 1968. *Shoal of time: A history of the Hawaiian islands*. New York: Macmillan.
- Davenport, William H. 1994. *Pio: An enquiry into the marriage of brothers and sisters and other close relatives in old Hawaii*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Davis, Eleanor Harmon. 1979. *Abraham Fornander, A biography*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Dening Greg. 1980. *Islands and beaches: Discourse on a silent land, Marquesas, 1774-1880*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Dening, Greg. 1991. A poetic for histories, transformations that present the past. *In Clío in Oceania: Toward a historical anthropology*, ed. A. Biersack, 347-80. Washington DC, Smithsonian Institution Press.

Devaney, Dennis M. 1976. *Kaneohe: a history of change, 1778-1950*. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Diamond, Jared. 2003. *Guns, germs and steel: The fates of human societies*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Dictionary.com. *Homeostasis*. Accessed January 20, 2012.

(<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/homeostasis>).

----- . *Autoregulation*. Accessed January 20, 2012.

(<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/autoregulation>).

Dkosopedia. 2011. *Marion Kelly*. Accessed August 13, 2011.

http://www.dkosopedia.com/wiki/Marion_Kelly

Dudley, Michael Kioni. 1986. *A philosophical analysis of pre-European-contact Hawaiian thought*. Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii at Manoa.

Earle, Timothy K. 1978. *Economic and social organization of a complex chiefdom: The Halelea district, Kauai, Hawaii*. Ann Arbor: Museum of Anthropology, University of Michigan.

----- . 1997. *How chiefs came to power: The political economy in prehistory*.

Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Elbert, Samuel. 1953. "Internal relationships of Polynesian languages and dialects." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 9: 147-173.

----- . 1956-1957. "The chief in Hawaiian mythology." *Journal of American Folklore* 69: 99-113, 341-355; 70: 264-276, 306-322.

----- . ed. 1959. *Selections from Fornander's Hawaiian antiquities and folk-lore*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Ellis, William. [1827] 1963. *Narrative of a tour of Hawaii or Owhyhee*. Honolulu: Advertiser Publishing.

----- . 1984. *Polynesian researches: Hawaii*. Rutland and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.

Emerson, Nathaniel. 1893. "The long voyages of the ancient Hawaiians." *Papers of the Hawaiian Historical Society* no. 5: 5-12.

Emory, Kenneth, and Yoshiko Sinoto. 1964. "Eastern Polynesian burials at Maupiti." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 73 no. 2: 143-160.

Fornander, Abraham. 1878. *An account of the Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* Vol. 1. London: Trubner. (For later publications, see 1969 and 1980).

------. 1880. *An account of the Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* Vol. 2. London: Trubner. (Alternate title: *Ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* 1996. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing). (For later publications, see 1969 and 1980).

------. 1885. *An account of the Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* Vol. 3. London: Trubner. (For later publications, see 1969 and 1980).

------. [1878: 1880: 1885] 1969: 1980. *An account of the Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* 3 vols. in 1. Rutland, Vermont: C. E. Tuttle Co. (Originally published as 1878: 1880: 1885. *An account of the Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* Vol. 1, 2, 3. London: Trubner).

------. [1916] 1985. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Trans. Thomas G. Thrum. Vol. 4 part 1. Millwood, New York. (Alternate title: *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.* 1918-1919. Vol. 4. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press).

------. [1917] 1974. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Trans. Thomas G. Thrum. Vol. 4 part 2. Millwood, New York. (Alternate title: *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.* 1917. Vol. 4 part 2. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press).

------. [1918-1919] 1986. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Trans. Thomas G. Thrum. Vol. 5. Millwood, New York. (Alternate title: *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.* 1918-1919. Vol. 5. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press).

------. [1919-1920] 1974. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Trans. Thomas G. Thrum. Vol. 6. Millwood, New York. (Alternate title: *Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum.* 1919-1920. Vol. 6. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press).

------. 1996. *Ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I.* Honolulu: Mutual Publishing. (Originally published as 1880. *An account of the*

Polynesian race: Its origins and migrations, and the ancient history of the Hawaiian people to the times of Kamehameha I. Vol. 2. London: Trubner).

------. 1999. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Memoirs of the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum. Vol. 4-6. Honolulu: Ai Pohaku Press. (Originally published as 1916: 1917: 1918-1919, 1919-1920. *Fornander collection of Hawaiian antiquities and folklore.* Trans. Thomas G. Thrum. Vols. 4-6. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press).

Frear, W. F. 1894. "The evolution of the Hawaiian judiciary." *The Hawaiian Historical Society* 7: 1-25.

Frear, W. F. 1906. "Hawaiian statute law." *The Hawaiian Historical Society* 13: 14-61.

Fuchs, Lawrence H. 1961. *Hawaii pono: A social history.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Garmon, Ulu Kanakaole. 1998. Personal communication. Hilo, Hawaii.

George Kahumoku Jr's. slack key show: masters of Hawaiian music. 2011. *Slack-key master: Carlos Andrade.* Accessed August 26, 2011.
http://slackkey.com/about_carlos.php.

Goldman, Irving. 1970. *Ancient Polynesian society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Google Books. 2011a. *Haena: through the eyes of ancestors by Carlos Andrade.* Accessed August 26, 2011.
http://books.google.com/books?id=QoN6QG2QYRkC&pg=PA159&lpg=PA159&dq=carlos+andrade+geography&source=bl&ots=IFXPoI-gCN&sig=v5h9u-s9DxknGe98YOc9XYXLDI&hl=en&ei=dfZXTqOhKrDZiALZytjKCQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=4&ved=0CDQQ6AEwAw#v=onepage&q=carlos%20andrade%20geography&f=false

Google Books. 2011b. *Nonlinear models for archaeology and anthropology: continuing the revolution.* Accessed August 11, 2011.
http://books.google.com/books?id=YYVF0j6UGKsC&pg=PR12&lpg=PR12&dq=rob+hcommon&source=bl&ots=_JT3DyWLTh&sig=fXMinFRVLWM-mYB8MU6vyaCWF9A&hl=en&ei=thtETr6xA4XRiAKRopTaAQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=9&ved=0CEUQ6AEwCA#v=onepage&q&f=false

Green, R. C. 1980. *Makaha before 1880 A.D. Makaha valley historical project—summary. Report 5.* Pacific Anthropological Records 31. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Handy E. S. Craighill. 1923. *The native culture in the Marquesas*. Bishop Museum Bulletin 9. Honolulu: B. P. Bishop Museum.

------. 1930. *History and culture of the Society Islands*. Bishop Museum Bulletin 79. Honolulu: B. P. Bishop Museum.

Handy, E. S. Craighill, and Elizabeth Green Handy. [1972] 1991. *Native planters in old Hawaii: Their life, lore, and environment*. With the collaboration of Mary Kawena Pukui,. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Handy, E. S. Craighill, and Mary Kawena Pukui,. [1958] 1972. *The Polynesian family system in Kau, Hawaii*. Polynesian Society.

Hanlon, David L. 1988. *Upon a stone altar: A history of the island of Pohnpei to 1890*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Hawaiian Kingdom Info. 2011. *Rest in peace Kanalu Young*. Accessed September 15, 2011. <http://Hawaiiankingdom.info/C1126750129/E20080903201502/index.html>
Henry, Teiura. 1928. *Ancient Tahiti*. Bishop Museum Bulletin 48. Honolulu: B.P. Bishop Museum.

Herb Kawainui Kane. 2011. *Herb Kawainui Kane*. Accessed August 12, 2011. <http://www.herbkanestudio.com/gallery/>

Holt, John Dominis. 1964. *On being Hawaiian*. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing Co.

Hommon, Robert J. 1976. *The formation of primitive states in pre-contact Hawaii*. Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona.

------. 1986. Social evolution in ancient Hawaii. In *Island Societies: archeological approaches to evolution and transformation*. Ed. P.V. Kirch, 55-68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------. 2001. The emergence of large-scale society in Hawaii. In *Pacific 2000. Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Easter Island and the Pacific*. Ed. Christopher M. Stevenson, Georgia Lee and F.J. Morin, 141-149. Los Osos, CA: Bearsville Press.

HonoluluAdvertiser.com. 2011a. *George Kanahale*. Accessed August 8, 2011. <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/150/sesq6kanahale>

HonoluluAdvertiser.com. 2011b. *The Voices of heiau*. Accessed August 10, 2011. <http://the.honoluluadvertiser.com/article/2006/Jun/20/il/FP606200305.html>

Ii, John Papa. [1959] 1983. *Fragments of Hawaiian history/ as recorded by John Papa Ii*. Trans. Mary Kawena Pukui,. Ed. Dorothy B. Barrere. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

Imua. "Lands-on Learning." Accessed August 26, 2011.
http://www.ksbe.edu/newsroom/imua/winter11/imua_winter11.pdf.

Indigenous peoples indigenous voices: Frequently asked questions, Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. 2011. Accessed August 30, 2011.
<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/FAQsindigenousdeclaration.pdf>

Johnson, Rubellite Kawena (Rubellite Kawena Kinney). 1957. "Changes in the social setting of the Hawaiian oral tradition." *Social Process in Hawaii* 21: 25-33.

----- . 1981. *Kumulipo: The Hawaiian chant of creation. Vol. 1*. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing Co.

----- . 2001. *Essays in Hawaiian literature, Part 1*. Honolulu: R. K. Johnson.

Kaepler, Adrienne. 1985. "Hawaiian art and society, traditions and transformations: featherwork." *Transformations of Polynesian Culture*, memoir 45: 105-131.

Kalakaua, David. 1990. *The Legends and myths of Hawaii the fables and folklore of a strange people*. Ed. R. M. Daggett. Honolulu: Mutual Pub.

Kamakau, Kelou. 1999. Concerning ancient religious ceremonies. In *Fornander Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore*. Vol. 6: 2-45. Honolulu: Ai Pohaku Press. First Published in 1919 by the Bishop Museum Press, Honolulu.

Kamakau, Samuel Manaiakalani. 1865. Kumumanao, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, October 28.

----- . MS. Na moololo o ka poe kahiko. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

----- . 1867a. Untitled, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, January 26.

----- . 1867b. Ka moololo o Kamehameha, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, December 28.

----- . 1868a. Ka moololo o Kamehameha, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, April 25.

----- . 1868b. Ka moololo o Kamehameha, *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*, May 2.

----- . 1869. Ka moololo o Kamehameha, *Ke Au Okoa*, June 24.

----- . 1870a. Ka moololo Hawaii *Ke Au Okoa*, March 10.

----- . 1870b. *Ke Au Okoa*, March 24.

----- . 1870c. Ka moololo Hawaii *Ke Au Okoa*, November 3.

----- . 1870d. Ka moololo Hawaii *Ke Au Okoa*, November 10.

----- . 1870e. Ka moololo Hawaii helu 54, *Ke Au Okoa*, December 22.

----- . 1871. Ka moololo Hawaii *Ke Au Okoa*, January 12.

----- . 1961. *Ruling chiefs of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.

- . [1964: 1968] 1992a. *Ka poe kahiko (The people of old)*. Translated from the newspaper *Ke Au Okoa* by Mary Kawena Pukui,. Ed. Dorothy B. Barrere. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 51. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- . 1976. *Works of the people of old (Na hana a ka poe kahiko)*. Translated from the newspaper *Ke Au Okoa* by Mary Kawena Pukui,. Ed. Dorothy B. Barrere. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 61. Honolulu: Bishop P. Museum Press.
- . [1991] 1993. *Tales and traditions of the people of old (Na moololo o ka poe kahiko)*. Translated from the newspapers *Ka Nupepa Kuokoa* and *Ke Au Okoa* by Mary Kawena Pukui,. Ed. Dorothy B. Barrere. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- . 1992b. *Ruling Chiefs of Hawaii*. Rev. ed. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.
- . 1996. *Ke Kumu Aupuni: Ka moololo Hawaii no Kamehameha ka nai aupuni a me kana aupuni i hookumu ai*. Honolulu: Ke Kumu Lama, Ahahui Olelo Hawaii.
- Kameeleihiwa, Lilikala. 1992. *Native land and foreign desires: How shall we live in harmony? Ko Hawaii aina a me na koi puumake a ka poe haole: pehea la e pono ai?* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Kanahele, George S. 1992. *Ku kanaka, stand tall: A search for Hawaiian values*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- . 1995. *Waikiki 100 BC to 1900 AD: an untold story*. Honolulu: Queen Emma Foundation.
- Kanahele, Mileka. 1987. Personal communication. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Kane, Herbert Kawainui. 1997. *Ancient Hawaii*. Captain Cook, Hawaii Kawainui Press.
- Ka Nupepa Kuokoa*. 1865. *Ka Moololo o Hawaii nei helu 14*. September 30.
- Kelly, Marion. 1956. *Changes in land tenure in Hawaii: 1778-1850*. M.A. thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- . 1974. *Historical survey of the Waimea to Kawaihae road corridor, island of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- . 1980. *Majestic Kau: Moololo of nine ahupuaa*. Honolulu: Dept. of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- . 1983. *Na mala o Kona, gardens of Kona: history of land use in Kona, Hawaii*. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

------. 1989. Dynamics of production intensification in precontact Hawaii. In *What's New? A Closer Look at the Process of Innovation*, 82-106. London.

Kelly, Marion, and Nancy Aleck. 1997. *Makua means parents: A brief cultural history of Makua valley*. Honolulu: American Friends Service Committee, Hawaii Area Program.

Kelly, Marion, and Dorothy B. Barrere. 1980. *Background history of the Kona area, island of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Kepelino. 1932. *Kepelino's traditions of Hawaii*. Ed. Martha Warren Beckwith. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin no. 95. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Kikuchi: William Kenji. 1973. "Hawaiian aquacultural system." Ph.D. diss., University of Arizona.

------. 1976. "Prehistoric Hawaiian fishponds: Indigenous aquaculture influenced the development of social stratification in Hawaii." *Science* 193: 295-299.

Kinney, Rubellite Kawena. See Johnson, Rubellite Kawena.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton. 1984. *The evolution of the Polynesian chiefdoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

------. 1985. *Feathered gods and fishhooks: An introduction to Hawaiian archaeology and prehistory*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

------. 1994. *The wet and the dry: Irrigation and agricultural intensification in Polynesia*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

------. 1997. *The Lapita peoples: Ancestors of the oceanic world*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

------. 2000. *On the road of the winds: An archeological history of the Pacific islands before European contact*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

------. 2010. *How Chiefs Became Kings: Divine kingship and the rise of archaic states in ancient Hawaii*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton, and Roger C. Green. 2001. *Hawaiki, ancestral Polynesia: An essay in historical anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton, and Marshall Sahlins. 1992. *Anahulu: The anthropology of history in the kingdom of Hawaii*. Vol. 1, Marshall Sahlins with the assistance of Dorothy B. Barrere, *Historical ethnography*. Vol. 2, Patrick V. Kirch with the

assistance of Marshall Sahlins, Marshall Weisler, and Matthew Spriggs, *The archeology of history*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kleiger, P. Christiaan. 1995. *Na maka o Halawa: a history of Halawa ahupuaa, Oahu*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.

Kolb, Michael J. 1992. "Diachronic design changes in heiau temple architecture on the island of Maui." *Asian Perspectives* 31, no. 1: 9-37.

----- . 1994. "Monumentality and the rise of religious authority in precontact Hawaii." *Current Anthropology* 34, no. 5: 521-547.

----- . 2006. "The origins of monumental architecture in ancient Hawaii." *Current Anthropology* 47, no. 4: 657-665.

Kumupono.com. 2011. *Kumu pono associates LLC*. Accessed August 31, 2011. <http://kumupono.com/>

Life in early Hawaii The ahupuaa. 1994. 3rd ed. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press.

Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1985. *Children of the land: exchange and status in a Hawaiian community*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Lydecker, Robert C. 1918. *Roster legislatures of Hawaii 1841-1918*. Honolulu: The Hawaiian Gazette Company.

Malo, David. n.d. *Hawaiian antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)*. Photocopy of manuscript, Hawaii-Pacific Collection, Hamilton Library, University of Hawaii.

----- . 1839. "On the decrease of population in the Hawaiian islands." *Hawaiian Spectator* 2, no. 2: 121-130.

----- . 1951. *Hawaiian antiquities (Moolelo Hawaii)*. Trans. N. B. Emerson. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.

----- . 1996. *Ka moolelo Hawaii*. Trans. Malcolm Naea Chun. Honolulu: First People's Productions.

Maly, Kepa. 1999a. *Coastal trails of South Kohala*. Hilo, Hawaii Kumu Pono Associates.

----- . 1999b. *The historic Puna trail – Old Government Road (Keaau Section)*. Hilo, Hawaii Kumu Pono Associates.

- . 2001. *Malama pono i ka aina – an overview of the Hawaiian cultural landscape*. Hilo, Hawaii Kumu Pono Associates.
- McGregor, Davianna Pomaikai. 2007. *Na kuaaina: Living Hawaiian culture*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- McKinzie, Edith Kawelohea. 1983. *Hawaiian genealogies extracted from Hawaiian language newspapers*. Vol. 2. Ed. Ishmael W. Stagner, II. Laie, Hawaii: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University—Hawaii Campus.
- Menzies, Archibald. 1920. *Hawaii nei 128 years ago: journal of Archibald Menzies*. Honolulu: New Freedom Press.
- Merry, Sally Engle. 2000. *Colonizing Hawaii: the cultural power of law*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Meyer, Manulani Aluli. 1998. *Native Hawaiian epistemology: contemporary narratives*. D.Ed. diss., Harvard University.
- Mitchell, Donald D. Kilolani. 1972. *Resource units in Hawaiian culture: a series of studies covering sixteen important aspects of Hawaiian culture*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools.
- Nagoshi, Robert. (M.D.) October 2011. Personal Communication. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Nakuina, Emma Metcalf. 1893. "Ancient Hawaiian water rights and some of the customs pertaining to them." *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual for 1894*: 79-84. Honolulu: Press Publishing.
- Noborikawa, Kaylee. 2009. "Protection urged for heiau." *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*. Jun 20. Accessed 2009.
http://archives.starbulletin.com/content/20090620_protection_urged_for_heiau
- Nogelmeier, Puakea. 2003. *Mai paa i ka leo: Historical voice in Hawaiian primary materials, looking forward and listening back*. Ph.D. diss., University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Northwestern University: Department of Anthropology. 2011. *Faculty 2011: Timothy Earle*. Accessed August 10, 2011.
<http://www.anthropology.northwestern.edu/faculty/earle.html>.
- Oceanic Archaeology Laboratory at the University of California Berkeley. 2011. *People: Patrick Vinton Kirch*. Accessed August 31, 2011.
<http://arf.berkeley.edu/projects/oal/people/Pat/Kirch.htm>

- Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwoole. 2002. *Dismembering lahui: A history of the Hawaiian nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pogue, John F. 1978. *Moolelo of ancient Hawaii*. Trans. Charles W. Kenn. Honolulu: Topgallant Publishing Co.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena. 1983. *Olelo noeau: Hawaiian proverbs and poetical sayings*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 71. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert. 1971. *Hawaiian dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, Samuel H. Elbert, and Esther T. Mookini. 1974. *Place names of Hawaii*. 2nd ed. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, with Laura C.S. Green, trans. 1995. *Folktales of Hawaii He mau kaa'o Hawaii*. Bishop Museum Special Publication 87. Honolulu: Bishop Museum.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, E.W. Haertig, and Catherine A. Lee. 1972. *Nana i ke kumu: Look to the source*. 2 vols. Honolulu: Hui Hanai.
- Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Alfons L. Korn. 1973. *The echo of our song: chants and poems of the Hawaiians*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Sahlins, Marshall David. 1958. *Social stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- . *Stone age economics*. 1972. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton.
- . 1973. *Historical anthropology of the Hawaiian kingdom*. Grant proposal submitted to the National Science Foundation.
- . 1981. *Historical metaphors and mythical realities: structure in the early history of the Sandwich Islands kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . *Islands of history*. 1985. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Said, Edward W. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Sarah Lawrence College: news and events. 2011. *Remembering Irving Goldman*. Accessed August 10, 2011. <http://www.slc.edu/news-events/archived/2001-2002/2002-04-15.html>
- Schmitt, Robert C. 1977. *Historical statistics of Hawaii*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

- Schweitzer, Sophia V. 2003. *Kohala aina: A history of North Kohala*. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing.
- Silva, Noenoe K. 2004. *Aloha betrayed: Native Hawaiian resistance to American colonialism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Society for Hawaiian Archeology. 2011. *Society for Hawaiian archeology newsletter, November 1999*. Accessed August 11, 2011.
http://www.Hawaiianarchaeology.org/newsletter/News99_11.pdf
- Spriggs, Matthew. [1988] 1995. The Hawaiian transformation of ancestral Polynesian society: conceptualizing chiefly states. In *State and society: the emergence and development of social hierarchy and political centralization*. Ed. John Gledhill and Barbara Bender, 57-73. London: Routledge.
- Stannard, David E. 1989. *Before the Horror: the population of Hawaii on the eve of Western contact*. Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii.
- . 1992. *American Holocaust: Columbus and the conquest of the New World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stauffer, Robert H. 2004. *Kahana: How the land was lost*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Sterling, E.P. 1998. *Sites of Maui*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Stokes John. 1921. *Notes of Polynesian featherwork*. Bishop Museum Special Publication 7(1): 75-85.
- . 1925. "Notes of Polynesian featherwork." *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 34: 24-45.
- . 1928. "Whence Paoa?" *Hawaiian Historical Society Papers* 15: 40-45.
- . 1933. "New Bases for Hawaiian Chronology." *41st annual report of the Hawaiian Historical Society for the year 1932*: 23-65.
- Summers Catherine C. 1964. *Hawaiian Archeology: Fishponds*. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Special Publication 52. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.
- Szasz, Mark. (M.D.) November, 2011. Personal Communication. Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Tabrah, Ruth M. 1970. *The red shark*. Honolulu: Press Pacifica.
- Thiongo, Ngugi wa. 1981. *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. London: James Curry.

Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1986. Review of *Children of the land: exchange and status in a Hawaiian community*, by Jocelyn Linnekin. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 20, 1986: 232-235.

Tuggle, H. David and P. Bion Griffin, eds. 1973. *Lapakahi: Hawaii Archeological studies*. Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute.

----- . 1999. *From a native daughter: Colonialism and sovereignty in Hawaii*. Rev. ed. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, 2011. Accessed August 14, 2011. http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

University of California Berkeley. 2011. *Anthropology: People*. Accessed August 10, 2011. http://anthropology.berkeley.edu/people/person_detail.php?person=19

University of Chicago: Department of Anthropology. 2011. *Faculty and staff: Marshall Sahlins*. Accessed August 10, 2011. http://anthropology.uchicago.edu/faculty/faculty_sahlins.html

University of Hawaii at Manoa. 2011a. *Carlos Andrade PhD*. Accessed August 26, 2011. <http://www.Hawaii.edu/huikonohiki/facultyCarlos.html>.

University of Hawaii at Manoa. 2011b. *Kamakakuokalani center for Hawaiian Studies*. Accessed August 26, 2011. <http://www.catalog.Hawaii.edu/schoolscolleges/Hawaiian/kamakakuokalani.htm>.

University of Hawaii at Manoa: Department of Religion. 2011. *John Charlot*. Accessed August 11, 2011. <http://www.Hawaii.edu/religion/charlot.html>.

University of Hawaii at Manoa: Ethnic Studies Department. 2011. *Davianna McGregor*. Accessed August 13, 2011. <http://socialsciences.people.Hawaii.edu/faculty/?dept=es&faculty=davianna@Hawaii.edu>

University of Hawaii-West Oahu. 2011. *University of Hawaii-West Oahu 2005-2007 General Information and Catalog*. Accessed August 11, 2011. <http://westoahu.Hawaii.edu/pdfs/UHWOCatalog0507.pdf>

University of Hawaii System. 2011. *Obituary: UH Manoa Hawaiian studies professor George Terry Kanalu Young, 1954-2008*. Accessed September 20, 2011. <http://www.Hawaii.edu/news/article.php?aId=2471>

Van Dyke, Jon M. 2008. *Who owns the crown lands of Hawaii?* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Valeri, Valerio. 1985. *Kingship and sacrifice: ritual and society in ancient Hawaii*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Westervelt, William. 1913. "The Legend of Paa and Pili from Samoa." *Paradise of the Pacific*: 5-60.

Wikipedia. 2011a. *George Kanahale*. Accessed August 12, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Kanahale

Wikipedia. 2011b. *Haunani-Kay Trask*. Accessed August 31, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Haunani-Kay_Trask

Wikipedia. 2011c. *Herb Kawainui Kane*. Accessed August 10, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herb_Kawainui_Kane

Wikipedia. 2011d. *Hokulea*. Accessed August 26, 2011.
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hokulea>

Wikipedia. 2011e. *Irving Goldman*. Accessed August 10, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Irving_Goldman

Wikipedia. 2011f. *Lilikala Kameeleihiwa*. Accessed September 16, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lilikala_Kame%27eleihiwa

Wikipedia. 2011g. *Mary Kawena Pukui*. Accessed August 31, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mary_Kawena_Pukui

Wikipedia. 2011h. *Ross Cordy*. Accessed September 16, 2011.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ross_Cordy

Wilkes, Charles. 1845. *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842*. Vol. 4. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard.

Young, Kanalu G. Terry. 1998. *Rethinking the native Hawaiian past*. New York: Garland Publishing.