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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) is in response to a request from T. S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologists, Inc. for the Līnā'i City Expansion project in the ahupua'a of Kamoku, and moku of Kona, Island of Līnā'i. This study is part of a larger study that includes an Archaeology Inventory Survey in compliance with federal and state requirements to identify and evaluate possible cultural impacts to cultural resources, cultural practices and access to resources and/or practices in advance of construction activities.

The purpose of a CIA is to gather information about traditional cultural practices, ethnic cultural practices and pre-historic and historic cultural resources that may be affected by the implementation of this project or undertaking in accordance with the State of Hawaii Environmental Council Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (Adopted on November 19, 1997) [Appendix B]. The level of effort for this CIA included ethnographic research (4-5 oral histories) of people who are connected to these lands in various ways and an archival cultural/historical background review of the literature (including reports by T.S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologists Inc., Kumu Pono and internet research).

The archival research was conducted from July through August 2016; the ethnographic research in August-September 2016 and the cultural-historical background report write-up in September-October 2016.

This report is organized into five parts or chapters. Chapter 1 describes the project area in terms of location in the context of ahupua’a (land division), moku ‘āina (district) and mokupuni (island), as well as a generalized description of the natural environment (e.g. geology, flora and fauna) and built environment (e.g. any current structural features). Chapter 2 explains the methods and constraints of this study. Chapter 3 summarizes a review of the historical and traditional (cultural) literature in the context of the Līnā'i of Kamoku. Chapter 4 presents the ethnographic analysis based on the supporting raw ethnographic data (oral history transcripts) as it pertains to land, water and cultural resources and use in the project area and vicinity. It also includes background data about the ethnographic consultants. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of this study based on supporting data from Chapters 1 through 4 and presents a cultural impact assessment and recommendations.

Archival research in the Cultural and Historical Background Review (Chapter 3) and ethnographic research (Ethnographic Data Review and Analysis) (Chapter 4) produces the data utilized to identify and describe the cultural resources, practices and beliefs located within the potentially affected area in the Summary of Findings. There were no identified cultural resources or practices connected to the project area. Therefore, it is determined by the CIA results that the suggested actions will not create any cultural impacts.
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INTRODUCTION

At the request of T. S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologists Inc., a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) of the Lī‘i‘nī City Expansion Project lands in the ahupua’a of Kamoku and moku of Kona, island of Lī‘i‘nī was conducted in two periods: the archival research from July through August 2016; the ethnographic research in August-September 2016 and the cultural-historical background report write-up in September-October 2016. This CIA is in compliance with federal and state requirements to identify and evaluate possible cultural impacts in advance of construction activities. Act 50 SLH 2000 (HB 28 H.D.1) [Appendix A] as it amends the State of Hawai‘i Environmental Impact Statement law [Chapter 343, HRS] includes “effects on the cultural practices of the community and State. [It] also amends the definition of ‘significant effect’ to include adverse /effects on cultural practices.”

The purpose of a CIA is to gather information about traditional cultural practices, ethnic cultural practices and pre-historic and historic cultural resources that may be affected by the implementation of this project or undertaking in accordance with the State of Hawai‘i Environmental Council Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (Adopted on November 19, 1997) [Appendix B]. The level of effort for this CIA included ethnographic research (4-5 oral histories) of people who are connected to these lands in various ways and an archival cultural/historical background review of the literature (including reports by T.S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologists Inc., Kumu Pono and internet research).

This report is organized into five parts or chapters. Chapter 1 describes the project area in terms of location in the context of ahupua’a (land division), moku/lī‘īna (district) and mokupuni (island), as well as a generalized description of the natural environment (e.g. geology, flora and fauna) and built environment (e.g. any current structural features). Chapter 2 explains the methods and constraints of this study. Chapter 3 summarizes a review of the historical and traditional (cultural) literature in the context of the general history of Hawai‘i, the island of Lī‘i‘nī and local histories of the ahupua’a of Kamoku. Chapter 4 presents the ethnographic analysis based on the supporting raw ethnographic data (oral history transcripts) as it pertains to land, water and cultural resources and use in the project area and vicinity. It also includes background data about the ethnographic consultants. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings of this study based on supporting data from Chapters 1 through 4 and presents a cultural impact assessment and recommendations.

SCOPE OF WORK (SOW)

The CIA scope-of-work (SOW) was based on the Environmental Council Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts (1997) and focuses on three cultural resource areas (traditional, historical and ethnographic), conducted on two levels: archival research (literature/document review) and ethnographic data (oral history).

1. conduct historical and other culturally related documentary research;
2. identify individuals with knowledge of the types of cultural resources, practices and beliefs found within the broad geographical area, e.g., district or ahupua’a, or with knowledge of the area potentially affected by the proposed action e.g. past/current oral histories;
3. identify and describe the cultural resources, practices and beliefs located within the potentially affected area; and
4. assess the impact of the proposed action on the cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified.

Traditional resources research entails a review of Hawaiian mo‘olelo (stories, legends or oral histories) of late 19th and early 20th century ethnographic works. Historic research focuses on the literature compiled.
The project area is located in the Ahupua’a of Kamoku, Moku of Kona on the Island of Lāna‘i.

Geology. Lāna‘i, also known as Na-na‘i (Pukui et al. 1974:128), is the sixth largest island of the eight major islands. It is of Maui County, along with Molokai and Kaho‘olawe. Lāna‘i is 13 ⅜ miles long, 13 miles wide, with an area of 140 square miles. Lāna‘i is a single dome-shaped shield volcano with its highest elevation of 3,379 feet at Hālāwai Hale (Maly & Maly 2007:3). The volcano last erupted 1.3 million years ago, and Pūlaiwai Basin is all that remains of the caldera (Juvik & Juvik 1998:13).

The name of the island may be literally translated as “day of conquest” – Lā meaning “day” and Na‘i meaning “conquest.” Through the tradition of the chief Kauiulāluu, Lāna‘i was named on the day that the young chief vanquished the evil ghosts from the island. An early missionary dictionary translates the island’s name as “hump,” but this translation does not fit in with traditional knowledge of the meaning or pronounciation of the name (Maly & Dye 2016: 6).

Lāna‘i City, has a population of 3,514 according to December 2015 Census (TC 2016) and Captain James King of Cook’s expedition gives the earliest written description of Lāna‘i:

“The country to the south is high and craggy; but the other parts of the island had a better aspect and appeared to be well inhabited. We were told it produced very few plantains, and bread-fruit trees; but that it abounds in roots such as yams, sweet potatoes, and tarow [taro]” (King 1785,115 in Morgan 1996:211).

Flora. In Hawai‘i a Natural History, Carlquist divides each island into six regions: Coast, Dry Forest, Wet Forest, Epiphytic Vegetation, Bog and Alpine. Within the 0-500’ elevation the only native tree is the hala (Pandanus odoratissimus). Humans have introduced other coastal trees in this zone (Carlquist 1980:267).

The Dry Forest Region has suffered the most impact by man. This is the area the early Polynesians modified extensively in slash and burn cultivation to expand their subsistence level, intensifying food production with complex irrigated agricultural systems of various crops (Kirch 1985:237). The early Polynesian settlers introduced all of the food or crop plants. The following crop plants were noted in Māhele Claims in the mid-1840s (Lanaichc.org):
Ipu (gourds) Six claimants listed ipu as a cultivated crop.
Kalo, ‘ai (taro) At least twenty-nine claimants listed kalo or ‘ai as a cultivated crop.
Kī (ti leaves) One claimant listed kī as a cultivated crop.
Kū (sugarcane) Four claimants listed kū as a cultivated crop.
Koa (Cordia) One claimant listed a grove of koa trees as a cultivated crop.
Ma‘u (banana) Three claimants listed ma‘u as a cultivated crop.
Niu (coconut) One claimant listed a grove of niu as a cultivated crop.
Pulu (cotton or the fiber of the native tree fern) One claimant listed pulu as a cultivated crop. Pulu in traditional times was the down of the native hāpu‘u (tree fern); in historical times, it was also the name of cotton. Being that the claim in which pulu was cited was situated in Ka‘a‘a Hāpu‘a, it is assumed that the term refers to introduced cotton.
Uala (sweet potatoes) Native claimants cited at least fifty two land areas (kula, mahina, lilīkīpūi, pānākī, moʻo and ʻili) as ‘ula growing sites. With additional claims for mahakea at kula pō’ō for fallow land.
Wauke (paper mulberry) One claimant listed wauke as a cultivated crop.

Some of the Dry Forest vegetation that may have been affected by early Hawaiian cultivation practices are the naio (Myoporum sandwicense), wiliwili (Erythrina sandwicense), ohe (Reynoldsia sandwicense), ‘ilialoha (Santalum sp), ʻohia (Metrosideros sp), koa (Acacia koa), as well as several species of shrubs, vines and ground cover (Carlquist 1980: 275-300).

Lāna‘i’s ecosystem evolved in the absence of man and most other mammals, giving rise to cloud forest zones, which gave life to the land, and made the island hospitable to people when they settled Lāna‘i perhaps as long as 1,000 years ago. There were two primary forest-watershed zones, the major watershed of Lāna‘i Hale at the highest peak of Pālawai and Kealia Aupuni Ahupua‘a, and what has historically been called the Kāne‘pua forest zone of Ka‘a Hāpu‘a. Untouched for countless centuries, the forest systems of Lāna‘i evolved the unique ability to capture droplets of water, which in turn percolated through the ground to create water sources that were spread from mountain to shore across the island. While these precious forest regions have been radically altered by man’s activities and feral animals, evidence of the region’s water-producing capabilities are still visible on the landscape and in traditional accounts and historic literature (Maly & Dye 2016:6-7).

The following are excerpts from A Botanizing Trip to Lāna‘i in 1870 ‘Reminiscences of an Amateur Collector’ By J.M. Lydgate (In the Hawaiian Annual for the year 1921) (Maly & Maly 2007:79-81):

Lāna‘i, even in those days, had been pretty well denuded of its forest cover; only on the summit of the island ridge was there a somewhat moth-eaten mantle on the left, and only on the slopes of the higher ravines and the steep hill sides was that mantle really intact and undisturbed. It was to those limited remnants that we devoted our attention (Lydgate 1921 In Maly & Maly 2007:80).

Another interesting plant which we found in the chaparral region lower down was a small tree Gardenia – Gardenia Brighamii. The more common Hawaiian gardenia is a forest tree, rather sparse in flowering. This smaller one, growing in the open, flowered profusely, and filled the air with its delightful fragrance.

Botanically speaking, Lāna‘i was at one time a very interesting island, with a rich and somewhat peculiar flora, confined to a very small area. It was well that we visited it when we did and were able to make a thorough an examination, for after our visit it remained unexplored for many years, while the ravages of cattle, sheep and goats, as well as forest diseases, hastened the decadence of the indigenous forest, so that a good many things that we found there were gone for good when someone else tried to get them (Lydgate 1921 In Maly & Maly 2007:81).

To the north of Lāna‘i City lies the Kānepu‘u Preserve, habitat of several native dry forest species. It is maintained by volunteers who continue to clear the alien species and allowing the native dry forest collections to thrive.

Photos 3-5 Kānepu‘u Preserve Signs.

Photos 6 - 11. Native species in the Preserve include tama, olopua, alahe‘e, na‘u and ʻilialoha.

The following are observations of George Munro, resident manager of Lāna‘i’s Ranch 1911-1930 (2006:11):

The ancient Lāna‘i Hawaiians must have cultivated a good deal of land before the Great Māhele, as there are signs of cultivation and habitation both on the grassy country and on the eroding land on the northwest end of the island where there are no kūlana. In some places where they were available, stones were used to mark off tilled ground and roads, and these are now the only signs that the land had been occupied. On the eroding lands, sometimes demuded of land down to hardpan, there can be seen cooking ovens with the charcoal still mixed with the stones. Over the hard surface there is a larger quantity of smaller stones, probably cooking stones that had broken up too small to be usable for that purpose. They were so numerous in some places that we raked them up and carted them to Kō‘ele for use in making concrete. The land had been under cultivation for a long time, and this evidently was the reason that its soil had blown away. Yams, sweet potatoes, and taro were probably grown on these lands under a system of dry-land cultivation as long as the soil lasted. These localities were rich fields for the collection of old Hawaiian artifacts; most of my collection was obtained there. When plantation work was started, and excavations for roads and ditches had been freshly made on grass lands, sections of cooking ovens were exposed, the stones in position where they had been embedded well under the surface of the soil.
The 'i'iwi is still a fairly common bird, also the amakihi, the olomao and apapane can be seen flying singly or in small groups across the gulches; the amakihi comes down to the Koele garden and seeks honey from the flowering plants; the sweet song of the olomao’s various calls are constant in some locations and the inquisitive little ualabahio works up close to the trail with its cheery little “chip chip” as the traveler passes (Munro 1930 In Maly & Maly 2007:84).

Fauna. Terrestrial fauna in pre-colonized Hawai‘i consisted of only one endemic mammal, the hoary bat (Lasiurus cinereus), thousands of endemic insects, and about 100 species of endemic birds such as the Hawaiian honeyeeyer (Drepanididae spp) (Berger, 1972:7, Kärch, 1985:28). Early Polynesian introduced animals included the Southeast Asian pig (Sus scrofa), jungle fowl (Gallus gallus), dog (Canisdae), and the Polynesian rat (Rattus exulans). Mammals on Lī‘i‘a‘i today include both the feral and domestic pig, various breeds of cattle, horses, dogs, cats, the mongoose (Herpestes auropunctatus), first introduced in 1883 (Berger, 1972:9), and the axis deer (chetal or spotted deer) (A. a. axis). Marine life in Lī‘i‘a‘i’s waters includes a variety of mollusk, seaweed, sea urchins, octopus, turtles, dolphins, stingray, whales and a variety of fish.

Native and introduced species were found in the dry forest in and outside of Kānepe‘au Preserve:

The following excerpts from Bird Life on Lanai By G.C. Munro (1930) and published in The Friend (1944) [In Maly & Maly 2007:82-84], give a good summary of the types of birds and other fauna on the island:

The plover (kolea) and the turnstone (akekeke) frequent the uplands in large flocks in the winter and with the aid of the much-abused mynah on several occasions saved the cattle from food shortage by devouring the army worm in its peridval invasions. Both of these waters should be taken under the protecting arm of the law. The owl (puuoo), though not in large numbers, is to be seen over the plains country, where its nest with round, white eggs or young of various sizes will sometimes be met with in a hollow in the grass. The number of mice lying dead around the nest is evidence of the usefulness of the bird. … The rock pigeon though present does not increase into large flocks, as on some of the other islands. The common Singapore dove is abundant everywhere,…

A small Australian quail is becoming common, running like rats in the grass or rising in quick flight and dropping down a short distance away into the cover. Wild chicken were brought from Kanai and are in limited numbers along the forest edge. It is doubtful if they will survive the increase of population. It is to be hoped that something can be done to preserve the original wild Hawaiian chicken. Lanai has long been famous for its pheasant shooting. It is one the pretty sights of the island to see these birds walk confidently off the road in front of an approaching car…. The Mexican wild turkey mixed nicely with the original bronze bird that roamed the hills. The Mexicans liked the level cactus-covered country, now rapidly becoming pineapple fields. Semi-wild turkeys have a small chance of survival in thickly populated districts. All the larger gallinaceous birds will adopt a pineapple diet and eventually be condemned….

The ‘i‘iwi, one of the most beautiful of the native birds and forty years ago one of the most common on some of the larger islands, has disappeared in late years from Lī‘i‘a‘i. The ‘apapane is still a fairly common bird, also the ‘amakahī, the ‘o‘o comes next and the ‘olomāo and ‘ualabahio. All of these with the exception of the ‘i‘iwi, were in sufficient numbers twenty years ago to keep up the species and every encouragement has been given them since. The ‘apapane can be seen flying singly or in groups across the gulches; the ‘amakahī comes down to the Koele garden and seeks honey from the flowering plants; the sweet song of the ‘o‘o can be heard in the valleys; the ‘olomāo’s various calls are constant in some locations and the inquisitive little ‘ualabahio works up close to the trail with its cheery little “chip chip” as the traveler passes (Munro 1930 In Maly & Maly 2007:84).

Of the other imported birds the mynah. Linnet, skylark, ricebird and sparrow are present on the island…. It was interesting a short time ago to watch the mynah following two tractors dragging a heavy chain between them to stir up the drying cactus…. A continuous stream of birds were landing just behind the chain…cockroaches and other insects were disturbed by the chain and furnished them a feast (Munro 1930 In Maly & Maly 2007:83). Photo 16. Today the introduced egrets follow the tractor cutting grass.

The following excerpt is from Lī‘i‘a‘i’s Culture & Heritage Center (lanaichc.org) Land Title 3:


The following excerpts by George Munro (1930) were published in The Friend (Sept 1930:193) as The Goat Menace of “g47”g407”g81”g68”g181”g76 Lanai (1930) [In Maly & Maly 2007:84-85].

For more than a hundred years goats have roamed the hills of all the islands of our group. No one can ever estimate the amount of damage inflicted by these pests upon our pastures and forests. In many localities they have ruined the native woods and turned into barren wastes what should still be good forest cover.…

Lanai…has suffered badly from goats. The splendid forest area in the center of Lanai was encroached upon by hundreds of the destructive goats. In 1908 there were about 10,000 of these animals on the island. Not content with staying on the lowlands, they entered the dry forest lands of Kaa and did harm to the old native trees. For years they could be found in all parts of Lanai, but constant warfare resulted in the slaughter of thousands of the pests. It was a real task to get them out of the cliffs of Maunalei and Nahoku, Kahawaiwai, and Naio, but at last that part of Lī‘i‘a‘i has been freed of goats, and it is thought that only a few animals remain in the western pa‘i‘i region of the island (Munro 1930 In Maly & Maly 2007:84-85).
METHODS

The Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) consisted of three phases: (1) cultural and historical archival literature review; (2) ethnographic survey (oral history interview), analysis of ethnographic data (past and current oral histories) and (3) report writing. The research, ethnographic analysis and report writing were done July to September 2016.

Personnel. The personnel consisted of the author (ethnographer) who has a master’s degree in Anthropology, with a graduate curriculum background in the archaeology track as well as anthropology theory, cultural resource management, ethnographic research methods, and public archaeology; an undergraduate curriculum background that included Hawaiian History, Hawaiian Language, Hawaiian Archaeology, Pacific Islands Religion, Pacific Islands Archaeology, Cultural Anthropology, as well as a core archaeology track, Geology, and Tropical Plant Botany; and ethnographic field experience that includes over 400 interviews to date.

Level of Effort. The level of effort for this study included an archival research literature review and an ethnographic survey and analysis [5 current oral histories].

Theoretical Approach. This CIA is loosely based on Grounded Theory, a qualitative research approach in which “raw data” [transcripts and literature] are analyzed for concepts, categories and propositions. Categories were pre-selected as part of the overall research design. However, it is not always the case that these research categories are supported in the data. Categories were generated by forming general groupings such as “Land Resources and Use,” “Water Resources and Use,” and “Cultural Resources and Use.” Conceptual labels or codes are generated by topic indicators [i.e., flora, fauna]. In the Grounded Theory approach, theories about the social process are developed from the data analysis and interpretation process (Haig 1995; Pandit 1996). This step was not part of this cultural impact assessment as the research sample was too small.

Archival Research. The archival research entailed reviewing previous works by Kepa Maly and reviewing other primary and secondary works and collections from various libraries and the internet.

Consultant Selection (Oral Histories). The selection of the ethnographic consultant was based on the following criteria:

- Had/have Ties to Project Location(s)
- Known Hawaiian Cultural Resource Person
- Known Hawaiian Traditional Practitioner
- Referred By Līnāi‘i Culture and Heritage Center staff

Interview Processes. The formal interview process included a brief oral overview of the study. Then the ethnographic consultant was provided with a consent or ‘agreement to participate’ form to review and sign [Appendix C]. An ethnographic research instrument [Appendix D] was designed to facilitate the interview; a semi-structured and open-ended method of questioning based on the person’s response (‘talk-story’ style). Each interview was conducted at the convenience (date, place and time) of each consultant (after August 8th at the request of the Primary Client). The interview was conducted using a digital recorder. The interviewees were allowed to choose where they wanted to have their interview conducted. Two chose to meet at the Līnāi‘i Culture and Heritage Center; one asked to meet in the Park; one chose his home; and one asked for a telephone interview. Notes were also taken, but more attention was given to listening intently to the consultant. A makana or gift was given to each consultant in keeping with traditional reciprocal protocol.

Transcribing-Editing Process. The taped interview was transcribed by a hired transcriber. After the interviews were transcribed, each transcript was edited and corrected by the principal investigator before mailing. Each ethnographic consultant was sent a mahalo letter that explained the transcript review process, along with hard copies of the interview transcripts, Release of Information forms, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of a signed release form and a copy of the revised transcripts. This process allows each consultant to make corrections (i.e., spelling of names, places), as well as have a chance to delete any part of the information or to make any stipulations if desired. The consultants were also informed of the two-week time limit for their review and return of revised transcripts and signed release forms after which it will be assumed that the raw data can be selectively used.

Ethnographic Analysis Process. The analysis process followed a more traditional method, as a qualitative analysis software program (i.e., TALLY) was not necessary. Each interview was considered a separate file, and the last name was used to identify the consultant. Each transcript was electronically coded for research thematic indicators or categories (e.g., personal information; land, water, marine resources and use; site information-traditional and/or historical; and anecdotal stories). For the purpose of this CIA, it was also not necessary to go beyond the first level of content and thematic analysis, as this was a more focused study. However, sub-themes or sub-categories were developed from the content or threads of each interview [e.g., plantation, ranching or fishing].

Summary of Findings and Cultural Impact Assessment. The Summary of Findings section is based on both archival and ethnographic data: Summary of Significant People and Events (e.g. Legendary Entities, Ali‘i Nui), Summary of Historic People and Events, and Significant Practices Pre-Contact and Post-Contact. This section also includes ‘Environmental Council Guidelines Criteria in Relation to Project Lands’ and the Cultural Impact Assessment and recommendations or mitigation if any are made.

Report. The report includes the description of the project area; the explanation of methods; a review of the historical and traditional (cultural) literature; the ethnographic analysis; summary of findings and cultural impact assessment.

Site Visit. Site visits were made by the principal investigator including one with an ethnographic consultant.

Ethnographic Research Constraints. While most of the ethnographic research went very well, there were a few glitches: (1) one of the ethnographic consultants was not able to have a face-to-face interview but requested a telephone interview which proved to be less than desired as it was difficult to hear or catch everything; (2) after the transcripts were sent to each person, two interviewees could not return their revised transcripts in the two weeks requested and asked for an extension – they later sent in revisions; and (3) one revised transcript was returned with hand-written corrections, which was difficult to decipher, but he later mailed another hand-corrected original that was clearer.
CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND REVIEW

The Cultural and Historical Background Review entailed a review of previous reports that included primary and secondary source literature. Examples of primary source material include maps, Land Court records, newspaper articles, genealogies, oral histories and other studies. Secondary source material included translations of 19th and 20th century ethnographic works, historical texts, indexes, archaeological reports, internet research and Hawaiian language resources (i.e., proverbs, place names and Hawaiian language dictionary). A review of selected archival material is presented in this section.

Chronology of Human Impact, Settlement and Development in Greater Hawai‘i and the Island of Lā‘i‘i – an overview.

Colonization Period. First voyager dating is scanty at best, however, based on early site dates from Bellows, O‘ahu and Ka Lae/South Point, Hawai‘i, Kirch (1985) estimated that the Colonization Period of the Hawaiian Islands by Polynesians from the south, was somewhere between AD 300-600 [this has been recently refuted with a new estimated settlement period beginning ca 1100AD (SAA 2013)]. A couple of mo’olele about Hawai‘i Loa the navigator, have the islands being settled much earlier than this. It is believed that the first Polynesian voyagers to Hawai‘i followed the flight paths of migratory birds, and navigated by the stars. A voyage of migration would have included sixty to a hundred persons who could exist for weeks on a large canoe, which may have been a hundred feet in length (Day 1992:3). This feat was “remarkable in that it was done in canoes carved with tools of stone, bone, and coral; lashed with handmade fiber; and navigated without instruments” (Teruia 1995: vii). The earliest date for Lā‘i‘i according to legend, was about 1400 A.D. (Lana‘ice.org).

Reconstructing the cultural sequence for the ahupua’a of Kamoku and other places in Lā‘i‘i and Hawai‘i during the colonization period would involve the “founder effect” and time necessary to adjust and adapt to a new environment. The colonizers were not able to bring all of the gene pool or crop plants from their homeland, so their new culture consisted of what survived the journey, what was remembered and what could be applied to the new environment (Kirch 1985:285-6). Although early Hawai‘i‘ans were farmers and felt spiritually tied to the ‘āina (land) in many ways (Waters, n.d.), when they first arrived they had to modify both their subsistence practices and the land. Faunal remains analyses indicate that early Hawaiian subsistence depended on fishing, gathering, bird hunting [extinct fossil remains, see Olson and James, 1982], as it took time to clear the forests, plant their crop cultivars, breed their animals, and construct suitable living quarters. Creation chants such as the Kaulula‘au depict a very deep philosophical bond with the land and nature and “the respectable person was bound affectionately to the land by which he was sustained” (Charlott 1983:45, 55). Ancient sites of various ko‘a (fishing and bird shrines) also imply a spiritual respect for their sustenance.

As the founding groups grew, they fissioned into subgroups anthropologists refer to as ‘ramages, with the senior male of the original ramele as chief of the conical clan, although hierarchical ranking was not just relegated through the patrilineal line of descent (Kirch 1985:31). Bellwood refers to these groups as tribal and related by blood (Bellwood 1978:31). Chiefly ranking probably did not occur until late in the Developmental Period.

Developmental Period. According to Fornander (1969) certain practices were universal Polynesian customs which the Polynesian-Hawai‘i‘ans brought from their homeland; such as the major gods Kāne, Kū, Kanaloa and Lono; the kapu system of law and order; pa‘ihonua (place of refuge); ‘aumalu (ancestral guardian) concept; and the concept of mana (supernatural or divine power) (Fornander 1969:61, 113,118,127-8). The early culture evolved as the population grew, and many of the changes were related to significant socio-economic changes. The evidence indicates that the “ancestral pattern of corporate descent groups” were still in place (Kirch 1985:302-3). However, this was changing as well.

During the Developmental Period, changes occurred bringing about a uniquely Hawaiian culture, documented by the material culture found in archaeological sites. The adze (ko‘i) evolved from the typical Polynesian variations of plano-convex, trapezoidal and reverse-triangular cross section to a very standard Hawaiian quadrangular-tanged adze. A few areas in Hawai‘i produced high quality basalt for adze production. Mauna Kea on the island of Hawai‘i was a well-known adze quarry of very high quality basalt. Other areas included Maunaloa, West Molokai, Kapa‘a Quarry in windward O‘ahu, Kaho‘olawe and Honolua-Honokōhau and Haleakalā on Maui. The two-piece fish hook and the octopus lure breadloaf sinker are also Hawaiian inventions of this period, as are the ‘ulu maika‘i stones and the lei noho palaoa (whale-tooth adornment). The latter was a status item worn by those of high rank, indicating a trend toward greater stratification (Kirch 1985:184,204,306).

Expansion Period. The Expansion Period is significant in that most of the “ecologically favorable zones,” the windward and coastal areas of all major islands, were now settled, and the more marginal leeward areas were being developed. This was also the period of the greatest population growth, the development of large irrigation field system projects, and dryland farming. The uniquely Hawaiian invention, the loko or fishpond aquaculture, was developed in the fifteenth century or the later half of this period (Kirch 1985: 303).

Between the 12th to 13th centuries another migration to Hawai‘i brought the “priest” Pa‘ao and a ruling chief, Pilikoa, from central Polynesia (some say Tahiti, others say Samoa). This created a major shift in “religion” and socio-political patterns. Pa‘ao brought with him the Kū practice of human sacrifice, used in monumental luakini heiau or war temples. Pilikoa started a line of ali‘i nui that would continue through the Kamehameha “dynasty.” The evolution of the luakini heiau is difficult to place archaeologically, and although the arrival of Pa‘ao may have been a real event the uniqueness and complexity of heiau were most likely a local [Hawai‘ian] development (Kolb 1989:3).

Lā‘i‘i’s history becomes more visible in the literature during this period with mo‘olele of Kaululaʻau who was banished to Lā‘iʻi by his father Kaka‘alaneo for destroying his prized breadfruit trees in Lahaina, Maui. Kaka‘alaneo co ruled Maui domain (Molokai, Lā‘i‘i, Kaho‘olawe) with his brother Kāka‘e. The brothers were part of the dynasty of Maui kings. Kaulula‘au made the island of Lā‘i‘i habitable by defeating the harmful entities said to reside there. He became the first known ali‘i of Lā‘i‘i. Monumental heiau building flourished in this Period, as “religion” became more complex and embedded in a socio-political climate of territorial competition between related ali‘i. Monumental architecture such as heiau “played a key role as visual markers of chiefly dominance” (Kirch 1990:206). Emory found that there were eleven large heiau on Lā‘i‘i. None of these were along the coast and two on the uplands (Munro 2006:12-13).

During the last 200 years of the Expansion Period, the concept of ahupua‘a was established, as well as class stratification, territorial groupings, powerful chiefs and “mōʻi” or king (Kirch 1985:303-6). The ali‘i and the maka‘āinana (those who looked after the land) were not confined to the boundaries of the ahupua‘a. Not only did the ma ka i‘i (ocean direction) and ma oka (mountain direction) people share seafood and produce by lighting a fire when there was a need, they also shared with their neighbor ahupua‘a o‘ahu (Hono-ko-hou 1974:14, 15). The ahupua‘a was further divided into smaller sections such as the ili, mo‘o ‘āina, panihi ‘āina, kihiki, kī’e, hoku one and kūkū (Hommon 1976:15; Pogue 1978:10). The chiefs of these land units gave their allegiance to a territorial chief (ali‘i nui or mō‘i – king). One of the most famous ali‘i nui during this period was Pi‘ilani (ca. Late 1500s to Early 1600s) whose ancestors made Hāna, Maui their home. As a ruler, Pi‘ilani spent time at both Hāna and Lele or Lāhainā. He was well
known for his peaceful rule of Maui, Moloka'i and Lāna'i. While he ruled there were no wars between chiefdoms and island polities. Several mele, 'olelo no'eau, and mo'olelo mention that Maui, Moloka'i and Lāna'i and all the bays of West Maui that begin with 'Hono' were in the realm of Pi'ilani.

Mo'olelo about events that took place in the early to mid 1600s revealed that many of the battles of this period were relatively quickly contained by the opposing ali'i. These stories also illustrate the ongoing inter-relationships between the people of the various islands. In the History of Kīālīi, the exploits of Kīālīi (great-great grandson of Kāhikīhēhua, ali'i nui of O'ahu) take him to every island and he eventually unites all the islands "from Hawai'i to Ni'ihau" (Fornander 1917:v⅔, part II, pg96). Kīālīi lived in the time of Maui ali'i nui Kamalalawalu and Kauhiokalani, sons of Kihaʻa-Pi'ilani by each of his two wives [Kumaka and Koleamoku] and Kauhiakama, son of Kamalalawalu (Kamakau 1992:56; McKenzie 1986).

Proto-Historic Period. The Proto-Historic Period appears to be marked with both intensification and stress. However, it was during this period that the Royal Kolowalu Statute or Kīālīi’s Law was enforced. Kīālīi’s Kūnia’aeks Kūkiekālaunokukalani lived for a very long time, was said to sometimes have supernatural powers, and was the first to “unite” all the islands. This ali'i nui of O'ahu died at Ka'ū in 1809 in AD 1730, supposedly at the age of one hundred and seventy five (Kamakau 1992:369).

It (Kīālīi’s Law) was strict, unvarying and always just. It was for the care and preservation of life; it was for the aged men and women to lie down in the road with safety; it was to help the husbandmen and the fishermen; to entertain (morally) strangers, and feed the hungry with food. If a man says, “I am hungry for food,” feed (him) with food, last he hunger and claims his rights by swearing the Kolowalu law by his mouth, whereby that food becomes free, so that the owner thereof cannot withhold it; it is forfeited by law. It is better to compensate… A transgressor, or one who is about to die, is, under the application of this law exonerated of his death or other penalty….(Fornander 1917:v⅔, part II, pg 432).

Many wars took place during this time between intra-island chiefdoms and inter-island kingdoms; the majority of these ali'i nui were related in various ways. In 1736, Maui ali'i nui Kealalike died. He chose his n'api'i'o son Kamehameha-nui to be his heir; although Kauhi-'aimoku-a-Kama was the oldest son, his mother was of a slightly lower rank than Kamehameha-nui’s mother [his parents are ⅔ siblings], making Kauhi whose parents were first cousins slightly lower rank than his younger half-brother, Kamehameha-nui. Kamehameha-nui was the full brother of Kalola, Kaheliki, and Ku-hoʻoihe-i-pahu. In 1737 and 1738 Kauhi-'aimoku-a-Kama (Kauhi), oldest son of Ke-kau-like rebelled against his younger brother, Kamehameha-nui. Many of the warriors of Kamehameha-nui were slaughtered. This prompted Kamehameha-nui to flee to his uncle, Hawai'i Island ali'i nui Alapa'i-nui-a-kaua (Alapa'i), who took him to Hawai'i Island where they spent a year preparing for war. Alapa'i-nui was the half-brother of Kamehameha-nui’s mother (Kamakau 1992:73-74).

When Kauhi heard that Alapa'i was heading back to Maui, Kauhi enlisted the help of his uncle, Pele-i-o-holani. Kauhi's ali'i nui was also ruling chief of O'ahu and the son of Kīālīi; Pele-i-o-holani was also the first cousin of Alapa'i and said to be the father of Ke'eaumoku (McKenzie 1980:23). Alapa'i attacked Maui (1738), drying up the streams of Ka'aua, Ka'ahā and Kahoma near Lahaina Luna, destroying the taro patches. His men kept guard over the streams of Olowalu, Ukumehame, Wailuku and "Honokawai" (sic). "When Pele-i-o-holani heard that Alapa'i was in Lāhainā he gathered all his forces at Honokahau and at Honolua. At Honokawai (sic) an engagement took place between the two armies, and the forces of Alapa'i were slaughtered and fled to Keawawa." Pele-i-o-holani had 640 men to Alapa'i's 8,440. However, the cousins once again came face to face in Pu'ūenē and decided to come once more for peace between the families. Kamehameha-nui ruled Maui in peace; Pele-i-o-holani retired to Moloka'i for a while, and Alapa'i went back to rule Hawai'i Island (Kamakau 1992:74). Kauhi, nephew of Pele-i-o-holani reportedly ruled east Maui before being killed in Ka'ūpō.

The inter-relatedness of these chiefs are further expanded upon by Kamakau (1992:75)

Between 1775 and 1779 fighting continued between Kalaniʻōpuʻu, son of Kalanimiʻamamao [whom the Kumulipo was composed for] and his brother-in-law, Kaheliki. In 1775 Kalaniʻōpuʻu and his Hāna forces raided and severely destroyed the neighboring Kaupō district, before continuing several more raids on Moloka'i, Lāna'i, Kahoʻolawe and parts of West Maui. It was at the battle of Kalaeokaʻilio that Kamehameha, nephew and favorite warrior of Kalaniʻōpuʻu, was first recognized as a great warrior and given the name of Pāiʻea (hard-shelled crab) by the Maui chiefs and warriors (Kamakau 1992:84).

In 1776 Kalaniʻōpuʻu was forced to sue for peace and sent his young son Kālani-kau-i-ke-aouli Kalōi to Kamehameha, the high chief of O‘ahu, and Kamehameha retired to Moloka'i for a while, and Alapa'i returned to Maui. Pele-i-o-holani became chief of O'ahu again then went back to Maui to wage many battles from 1778 to 1779 (Kamakau 1992:88). In 1777 when very young, Kaʻīhauʻumana’s parents took Kaʻīhauʻumana and their whole family to Hawai’i to get away from the war between the Kalaniʻōpuʻu and Kaheliki (Silverman, 1987:iii, 5:6; Kamakau, 1992:319).

In January 1778 Cook landed in Waimāne, Kaua‘i and the culture of old Hawai‘i began its spiraling change (see Day 1992). Cook left Hawai‘i for several months and returned later in 1779. Kalaniʻōpuʻu was fighting Kaheliki’s forces in Wailua, Maui on November 19, 1778 while Kahekili visited Clerke on his return trip to the islands. Kalaniʻōpuʻu visited Cook on the Resolution, while Kaheliki visited Clerke on the Discovery (Keykendall and Day 1976:16).

The following depicts the power struggles of the ali'i of Hawai‘i and Maui (Bucy & Asso 1989:191-193):

Five generations after Kaulula‘au there is mention in the History of Kūi‘īi (Fornander 1918-1970:v:422) that Lānā‘i's chiefs wanted to be independent from Kamalalawalu, King of Maui. This documentation confirms an early subordinate relationship between Lanai and Maui. As a tributary of Maui, Lānā‘i was pulled into the struggle for power between Kalaniʻōpuʻu, ruler of Hawai‘i Island and Kaheliki, ruler of Maui. After an unsuccessful attempt at trying to acquire Maui, Kalaniʻōpuʻu’s and his forces raided and pillaged the islands of Kohala, Hawa‘i and Lanai. The battle that ensued on Lānā‘i was described by native historian Kamakau (1961:90-91):

The War of Ka-moku-hi (1778)
was that when the chiefs and soldiers fled thither, their water supply was cut off and they were all
hungered. The whole island of Lanai was ravaged by the forces of Ka-laniʻipuʻu. At Paumalu, at
Kaena close to the forest, and at Kaʻōia was the place called Kamokuele scarred by war markings
of old. A certain captive who was being led to Ka-laniʻipuʻu with his hands tied, as he neared a
cliff asked to have the cords loosen, pretending he was in pain. Since they were so close to the
cliff the men felt no fear of his escaping, but no sooner were his hands released than he leaped over
the precipice. His (His) name was Kini and he was famous for his skill in leaping cliffs. He had
leaped down the rough cliff of Kauaʻomoku at Ioao and Ohoaloh, and it was this skill in leaping
down cliffs that saved his life in the battle on Lanai. During Ka-laniʻipuʻuʻu’s occupancy of Lanai, the
food ran out, and the men had to eat the root of a wild plant called kapala. This had a loosening
effect upon the bowels when eaten in quantity. The war is therefore called The-land-of-loose-bowels
(Ka-moku-hi) and it is a war still talked of among the descendants on Lanai.

When Ellis visited the island (Ellis, 1971:9) 45 years after this battle, he estimated the
population to be 2,000, which is not far from the pre-contact maximum estimate that Emory
gives of 3,000.

During the Battle of Ka-moku-hi a forty-two-year-old Kamehameha I fought alongside his
Uncle Kalaniʻipuʻu. After the death of Kalaniʻipuʻu, Kamehameha eventually conquered and
ruled the entire island chain, including Lānaʻi. Lānaʻi, like all the other islands, was subject
to the rules and taxation of Kamehameha I, the ruling King, who did spend some of his time in
residency at Kaunolu.

[NOTE: According to Kenneth Emory’s research in Munro (2006:10): “The campaign was called
kamoku hi after the effect of eating heavily of this root (kapala) which grew on the Kamoku lands.”]

When Cook sailed into Kealakekua Bay on January 17, 1779, Kalaniʻipuʻu was still fighting Kahelikil on
Maui. At this time Kanoe, younger brother of Kahelikil was the ruling chief of Kaʻi; Ka-bahana, nephew
of Kahelikil was the ruling chief of Oʻahu and Molokaʻi; Kahelikil of western Maui, Lānaʻi and Ka hoʻolawe; and Kalaniʻipuʻu of Hawaiʻi Island and Hāna (Kamakau, 1992:248-86, 92, 97-98). On
January 25th Kalaniʻopuʻu visited Cook again at Kealakekua Bay, presenting him with several feathers
cloaks. By February Cook’s scheme to kidnap Kalaniʻopuʻu as a hostage were thwarted and Cook was
killed following a skirmish over a stolen cutter (Kuykendall and Day 1976:18).

When the King George passed Lānaʻi on May 10, 1786, seven years after Captain Cook, when the
Hope did likewise on October 9, 1791, and when Vancouver sailed by on May 7, 1792, some canoes
came out to the ships, but they had nothing in the way of foodstuff to barter. Menzies, Vancouver’s
surgeon, noted the absence of ‘hamlets or plantations’ and judged the island to be ‘very thinly
inhabited’ (Munro 2006:12-13).

By 1790 Kamehameha I had gained enough control of the island of Hawai‘i that he could leave to join the
war parties on Maui. After several battles along the East Maui coast, Kamehameha’s force reached
Wailuku where the “great battle” took place. This would be the beginning of the end of independent ruling
chiefs because of the inequity of battle strategy, Kamehameha had brought a cannon from the Eleonora
along with her captain, Isaac Davis, and crewmember John Young, now his aikane panuhele (favorites)
and advisors (Kamakau 1992:147-148) [Day, 1992:24 says that Isaac Davis was the lone survivor of the
Fair American].

Demographic trends during the Proto-Historic Period indicate a population reduction in some areas, yet
show increases in others, with relatively little change in material culture. However, there was a continued
trend in craft and status material, intensification of agriculture, all (chief/land managers) controlled
aquaculture, upland residential sites, and oral records that were rich in information. Kū worship, luakini heiau, and the kapu (restriction or regulation) system were at their peak, although western influence was
already altering the cultural fabric of the islands (Kirch 1985:308; Kent 1983:15). By 1794 at least eleven
foreigners were living on the island of Hawai‘i, including American, English, Irish, Portuguese, Genoese,
and Chinese (Day 1992:23-25) [may have been connected to the sandalwood trade]. When Kamehameha I
conquered O‘ahu and Maui in 1795 (with western advice and technology), subsequently unifying the Island
Kingdom (Kent 1983:16), it marked the end of the Proto-Historic Period.

Early Historic Period

Kamehameha I conquered Maui in 1795, he went to Moloka‘i where the sacred women of Maui
(Kalolo Pupuaka and her daughters Kalanikaua‘ikilokalaniakia and Keku‘iapowia Līhā and her daughter
Kalanikauka‘ia‘alanoe), were in hiding. Kamehameha took Keku‘iapowia Līhā and Kalanikauka‘ia‘alanoe
and brought them back to his palace in Honolulu. This further increased the demand for the sandalwood
industry was thriving to the point where the subsistence levels declined, as farmers and fishermen spent
most of their time logging, causing famine to set in (Kent 1983:17-20).

On October 1819, Protestant missionaries set sail from Boston to Hawaii‘i. Earlier that year, on May 8,
1819, Kamehameha I died. Following his death, his son and heir Liholiho banished the kapu system at
the advice of his queen mother Keʻōpūolani and queen regent Kaʻahumanu [the queens were second cousins]
(Kamakau, 1992:210, 222). The missionaries arrived in Kailua-Kona on March 30, 1820, to a markedly
changed culture; one with a “religious” void, and a growing appetite for western products. They quickly
established missions on all of the islands (Day 1992:25).

As shown by their many heiau, kapu, and their readiness to adopt new faiths, the natives of Lānaʻi had
strong religious inclinations. According to Reverend William Ellis, who passed Lānaʻi on a
schooner July 1, 1825, they had a number of idols. Two were “large stone images representing the
deities, who were believed to preside over the sea and were worshipped chiefly by fishermen
(Munro 2006:12-13).

Following a chaotic internal overthrow of the established Hawaiian religion in 1819,
Hawaiians on all islands turned to Christianity. Although a newly converted Queen
Kaahumanu visited Lanai in 1829 (Bingham 1855:375) and tried to influence the Hawaiians to
turn to Christianity, it wasn’t until 1835, according to the records, that protestant evangelization occurred on Lanai. By 1837 there were three permanent church-affiliated schools
to educate the children of Lanai (Napoka In Bucy & Asso 1989:193).

In 1802 Wong Chun arrived on a sandal wood trading ship from China and resided on Lānaʻi for a short
time. He is said to be the first person to process sugar in the Hawaiian Islands (Kepa 2016). Years later in
1828 two Chinese merchants established the Hungtai sugar works at Wailuku. Many of the earliest Chinese
residents in Hawai‘i were knowledgeable in sugar production (the tong soo or sugar masters), and
established successful plantations on Maui and Hawai‘i (Speakman 2001:90). In 1836 the first sugar
plantation was established on Kaua‘i (Kent 1983:23, 29). During this period, “between one hundred and
two hundred foreigners lived among the Islands... (Day 1992:25). Hardly a ship touched without leaving a
deserter or two behind.... A white man automatically ranked as a chief, although he could not own land in
fee simple or build a permanent house...[and] they took Hawaiian wives” (Day 1992:25). In the 1830’s
other industries such as whaling, and merchandising crept into Hawai‘i.
In the 1840s a political act of the Hawaiian Kingdom government would change forever the land tenure system in Hawai‘i and have far-reaching effects. The historic land transformation process was an evolution of concepts brought about by fear, growing concerns of takawainui, and western influence regarding land possession. King Kamehameha III, in his mid-thirties, was persuaded by his kuhina mai and other advisors to take a course that would assure personal rights to land. One-third of all lands in the kingdom would be retained by the king; another one-third would go to ali‘i (chiefs/konohiki) as designated by the king; and the last one-third would be set aside for the maka’ainana or the people who looked after the land. In 1846 Kamehameha III appointed a Board of Commissioners, commonly known as the Land Commissioners, to confirm or reject all claims to land arising previously to the 10th day of December, AD 1845. Notices were frequently posted in The Polynesian (Moffat and Fitzpatrick, 1995). However, the Legislature did not acknowledge this act until June 7, 1848 (Chinen 1958:16; Moffat and Fitzpatrick 1995:48-49), known today as The Great Milieu.

At that time, lands on Lanai were divided between lands claimed by Kaukauaulani (40,665 acres), which were known as the Crown Lands, and the lands to be claimed by the chiefs and people (48,640 acres), which were called the Government Lands. The total land area of Lanai was then 89,305 acres, which included thirteen ahupua‘a or traditional land divisions. In 1921 when Emory conducted his Lanai research, only 208.25 acres of land remained in native Hawaiian ownership (Napoca In Bucy & Asso 1989:194).

The 1840s also heralded other changes as well. The Hawaiian government, with the aid of the missionaries, encouraged the sugar industry as well as other enterprises such as coffee, cotton, rice, potatos, and silk worms (Speckman 2001:93). psu. goats skins, fungus, wheat, other vegetables, sugar syrup and molasses (Macleman 1995:35). The constitutional monarchy was established during this period and in a speech to the legislature in 1847 Kamehameha III promoted the agricultural industry:

I recommend to your most serious consideration, to devise means to promote the agriculture of the islands, and profitable industry.... What my native subjects are greatly in want of, to become farmers, is capital, with which to buy cattle, fence in the land and cultivate it properly (In Macleman 1995:34).

Disease had a devastating affect on the population and the landscape, killing ali‘i and maka‘ainana alike; measles epidemics in 1848 and 1849, were followed by the horrendous smallpox epidemic in 1853. John Papa ‘I‘i in Fragments of Hawaiian History (1984) talks about the impact of this disease and as kaha or guardian of several young ali‘i, he had to take several of them off of O‘ahu island. They just kept sailing from island to island and usually were not allowed to land as O‘ahu was thought to be the source of the smallpox.

In 1850, the Kingdom government passed laws allowing foreigners to purchase fee simple lands (Speckman 2001:91), many were retired whaling captains or merchants. (Macleman 1995:48, 52). By 1858 at least 2,119 foreigners lived in Hawai‘i. Many were merchants who traded with whalers, while the missionaries lived in various locations throughout the islands. “Foreigners engaged in agricultural pursuits with the idea of reaping a profit from the land, in contrast with the Hawai‘ians, who carried on...subsistence agriculture” (Coulter 1931/1971:11).

In 1851 Mormons arrived on Lāna‘i according to Munro (2006:25):

In September 1851, Elder Francis Hammon went to Lāna‘i and organized a branch of the church at Manele Landing where there were Hawai‘ians living at the time. The Hawai‘ians took him for a horseback ride up the hillside to the rim of the Pālaiwai Basin with which he was greatly impressed as a suitable site for a Mormon colony.... On July 26, 1854 it was decided to proceed with the Mormon colony...a party of church members went to Lāna‘i to start the settlement. They selected a site for the city on the east side of the basin on a plate, about 50 feet above its lowest part. They called this the City of Joseph, and the lower part that it overlooked the Valley of Ephraim.... The Mormons went to work digging for water, building grass houses, and preparing land for crops. Lāna‘i is tricky for ordinary crops. They may have had good ones to start with, and then a series of dry years and consequent crop failures. This and the lack of water were discouraging, and they were on a lookout for more favorable location when the elders were recalled to Utah on account of trouble with the U.S. government.

The Mormons apparently had made no land transaction on Lāna‘i and acquired no holdings there. Walter Murray Gibson went to Lāna‘i near the end of 1861. He took charge of the Mormon colony but branched out from the teachings of the Mormons, and this was practically the end of it as a Mormon settlement. Gibson acquired land in his own name, and because he refused to turn it over to the Church, the Mormons communicated him in 1864 and some of the colonists left Lāna‘i.

According to Munro (2006:27) the Lāna‘i Ranch started about 1865:

The Lāna‘i Ranch was started by Walter Murray Gibson in about 1865 after the Mormon colony on the island had dispersed. Before Gibson went to Lāna‘i, Hawai‘ians had herded goats there, but it was he who consolidated most of the lands into one large sheep ranch.... In 1870 he persuaded twenty-two men with two women and six children to come from the United States to Lāna‘i ‘to ce, grains and other products upon a cooperative plan.’ These people were ‘independent immigrants’ paying their own passage...they evidently arrived during Lāna‘i’s dry years and found conditions very different from what they were led to believe. They were soon discouraged, abandoned the project and left the island....

Gibson eventually decided that grazing was more profitable than agriculture on Lāna‘i. Goats were herded for their skins and sheep for their wool. Angora goats were imported to improve the weight of the skins and merino sheep to add fineness to the wool. With the lush natural vegetation, the sheep thrived and increased in number. On January 5, 1867, Gibson made a census report to the Education Office and gave the number of sheep as 10,000 and of goats 18,000.

Territorial History (AD 1900-1949). This period saw Native Hawaiians running for Congress (Daws 1974 297); and much of the lands being sold in fee simple. Lāna‘i Ranch was deteriorating after owner Walter Murray Gibson left Lāna‘i for O‘ahu to dabble in politics. George Munro first visited Lāna‘i in 1902 as the ranch purchase was being negotiated for Mr. Charles Gay; Mr. Alika Dowsett was manager of the ranch and living at Kē‘ele. The ranch was in disrepair with evidence of severe drought (Munro 2006:28, 29). Shortly after this visit Gay gained possession of the island except for some kula‘ena lands and made considerable improvements. However, the financial strain proved too great and the lands reverted to Mr. W. G. Irwin in 1909 as the Lāna‘i Company (Munro 2006:31). It wasn’t until 1911 when George Munro was asked to come and manage Lāna‘i Ranch because of his previous experience working for Francis Gay for seven years on Kauai and Alfred W. Carter for three years as Molokai’s Ranch manager (Munro 2006:32). With the help of Henry Gibson, son of Walter Murray Gibson, Munro searched the forests for scattered goats and pigs and at this time collected plants, land snails and studied the birds. Lāna‘i was soon for sale again. This time several people with pineapple interests came to visit. In 1917 Harry and Frank Baldwin bought the island for $600,000. The Lāna‘i Ranch improved and changed from sheep to cattle stock; the Lāna‘i Company did well with their pineapple, but after five years the Baldwins decided to sell the island to the Hawaiian Pineapple Company (James D. Dole) for $1,500,000. This marked years of conflict between the profitable cattle industry and the land hungry pineapple industry on Lāna‘i (Munro 2006:33).

Modern History (Post AD 1950), Post World War II brought about an influx of people and industries to Hawai‘i, allowing the tourism, offshore enterprises and military to flourish. Along with the rise of the
tourism industry, and competing sugar markets abroad, the sugar companies saw a sharpening decline in business (the Sugar Acts of 1934 and 1937, and IL&NH Strike of 1946 didn’t help). The 1950s and 1960s were the bleakest years for the sugar industry and it was becoming apparent that the sugar industry was beyond salvage (Kent 1983:107-108). More changes were soon to take place on the landscapes of Hawai‘i.

On Lī‘ā‘ī, a decision was made in 1950 to discontinue Lī‘ā‘ī Ranch operations and dispose of the stock; 44,000 acres of ’fair grazing country’ was now wasteland (Manro 2006:35).

**Traditional Literature**

The ethnographic works of the late 19th and early 20th century contribute a wealth of information that comprise the traditional literature - the mo‘olelo, oli, and mele - as well as glimpses into snippets of time, and a part of the Hawaiian culture relatively forgotten. The genealogies were handed down by oral tradition and later recorded for posterity, not only give a glimpse into the depth of the Hawaiian culture of old, they provide a permanent record of the links of notable Hawaiian family lines. The mo‘olelo or legends allow ka po‘e kāhiko, the people of old, the kupuna or ancestor, to come alive, as their personalities, loves, and struggles are revealed. The oli (chants) and the mele (songs) not only give clues about the past, special people, and wahi pana or legendary places, they substantiate the magnitude of the language skills of na kupuna kāhiko (the people of old). Several excerpts of the mo‘olelo and mele have already been used as references or chronology markers in the ‘Overview of Human Impact, Settlement and Socio-economic Development’ above. The following sections give a little more detail and explanation of the traditional literature.

Genealogies. Po‘e kā‘auhau or genealogy kahuna were very important people in the days of old. They not only kept the genealogical histories of chiefs “but of kahunas, seers, land experts, diviners, and the ancestry of commoners and slaves… an expert genealogist was a favorite with a chief” (Kamakau 1992:242). During the time of ‘Umi genealogies became kapu to commoners, which is why there “were few who understood the art; but some genealogists survived to the time of Kamehameha I and even down to the arrival of the missionaries” (ibid).

Surviving genealogies illustrate that the ruling families of each island were interrelated quite extensively. The chiefs of O‘ahu, Kaua‘i, Hawai‘i, Maui, Moloka‘i and Lāna‘i had one common ancestry. Families branched out, but conjoined several times in succeeding generations. O‘ahu and Hawai‘i’s chiefs were linked as are Hawai‘i’s and Maui chiefs, and Hawai‘i’s chiefs were linked to Kaua‘i’s chiefs (Kamakau, 1991:101; McKenzie, 1983:xxvi). Not only were the chiefs or ali‘i related to each other, they were also related to the commoners. In Ruling Chiefs, Kamakau states that “there is no country person who did not have a chiefly ancestor” Kamakau (1992:4).

Malo (1971) wrote about the connection between the maka‘ainana and the chiefs; “Commoners and ali‘i were all descended from the same ancestor, Wākea and Papa” (Malo, 1971:52). This is evident in the genealogies. Genealogies were very important to the chiefs, while the genealogies not only indicated rank, they ascertained a link to the gods. The following excerpt explains the idea and importance of rank and the role of genealogies:

Position in old Hawai‘i, both social and political, depended in the first instance upon rank, and rank upon blood descent—hence the importance of genealogy as proof of high ancestry. Grades of rank were distinguished and divine honors paid to those chiefs alone who could show such an accumulation of inherited sacredness as to class with the gods among men... a child inherited from both parents.... The stories of usurping chiefs show how a successful inferior might seek inter-marriage with a chiefly of rank in order that his heir might be in a better position to succeed his parent as ruling chief... a virgin wife must be taken in order to be sure of child’s paternity—hence the careful guarding of a hibehorn girl’s virginity (Beckwith1990: 11).

One could defend and/or prove their rank by knowing or having one’s genealogist recite one’s genealogy. “To the Hawaiians, genealogies were the indispensable proof of personal status. Chiefs traced their genealogies through the main lines of ‘Ulu, Nana‘ulu, and Pili, which all converged at Wäkea and Papa (Barrere, 1969:24). Two well-known genealogy chants are the Kumuhonua and the Kumulipo.

Kumuhonua. The Kumuhonua, first published by Fornander in 1878, in *The Polynesian Race Vol. I* was based on information from Kamakau and Kepelino. Kumuhonua, the man, was of the Nana‘ulu line, and the older brother of Olopana and Moikeha (McKenzie 1986:14-15). However, the birth chant Kumuhonua has been a subject of controversy as noted in following Preface by Kenneth P. Emory in Barrere (1969):

We have become painfully aware that the Kumuhonua ‘legends’ are not ancient Hawaiian legends, nor is the genealogy which accompanies them a totally authentic genealogy…. In his second volume (1880) when he relates events from the period of the arrival in Hawai‘i of migrant chiefs from Tahiti to the time of Kamehameha, in these writings he is dealing with relatively untapped, authentic Hawaiian traditions and genealogies…. We must ever be on guard against the effects of this impact in what was recorded subsequently about the pre-contact period…. The world of the Polynesian began to be transformed overnight by Western influence” (Barrere, 1969:i).

Barrere (1969) explains that some of the Kumuhonua legends were recorded by Kamakau and Kepelino between the years 1865 and 1869, however, the ‘genealogy’ of the Kumuhonua, published by Fornander, was given to him “to provide credibility to the legends…this ‘genealogy’ [was] constructed from previously existing genealogies—the *Ololo (Kumuhonua)* and the *Paliku (Hulihonua)* which are found in the Kumulipo chant (see Beckwith 1951:230-234) and interpolations of their own invention” (Barrere, 1969:1).

Kumulipo. A better example is the famous Creation Chant The Kumulipo. Feher (1969) had several notable Hawaiian scholars write passages in his *Kumulipo: Hawaiian Hymn of Creation-Visual Perspectives by Joseph Feher*. In the Introduction Momi Naughton states “The Kumulipo belongs to a category of sacred chants known as pule ho‘ola‘a ali‘i, ’prayer to sanctify the chief,’ which was recited to honor a new-born chief (Feher, 1969:1). In her passage, Edith McKenzie states:

>“The Kumulipo is a historical genealogical chant that was composed by the court historians of King Keaweikahiali‘iokamoku of the island of Hawai‘i about 1700 AD in honor of his first born son Ka-lani-nui-‘I-a-mamo. This important chant honors his birth and shows the genealogical descent of both the ali‘i (chiefs) and the maka‘ainana (commoners) from the gods, in particular Wīkea…” (Feher, 1969:1).

The Kumulipo was an *inoa* or name chant for Ka-lani-nui-‘I-a-mamo, first born son of Keawe, who later became the father of Kalāpua‘u [Kalani`ipuu], ruling chief of Hawai‘i (Beckwith, 1990:9). However, Johnson comments that “Malo remarks that the Kumulipo is important to both ali‘i (chiefs) and maka‘ainana (commoners) groups. It is also a means by which Polynesians as a whole may corroborate lineal ties to the Hawaiian people…” (Feher, 1969:2).

Napoka (In Bucy & Asso 1989:185) expands on this in relation to Lī‘ā‘ī:

>Genealogical chants, such as the Kumulipo, trace the descent of mankind from the gods, Wākea and Papa, the personifications of sky and earth. These early chants explain the creation of the islands of Hawai‘i as well as the creation of the gods and thus eventually mankind. The birth of the island of Lī‘ā‘ī has been recorded by several surviving traditions. Most common of these traditions was chanted by Pakui, a historian during the time of Kamehameha I (Fornander B16-1914/12). According to this chant, after the birth of Maui...
Island, Papa returned to Kahiki and Wäke'a took Ka'ululawaihine for his wife. From this union Lānii was found and adopted by a chief from Kahiki (Fornander 1916:19:IV:2), while another recounts how Lānii grew from a piece of coral thrown into the ocean by the famous fisherman Kapuhi'suana (Fornander 1916:19:IV:20). All of these versions of creation are ancient traditions acceptable to native Hawai’ians.

**Hawaiian Genealogies.** In 1983 Edith McKenzie completed the first volume of *Hawaiian Genealogies*, translated from genealogy articles in 19th century Hawaiian newspapers; these articles were in response to a call to preserve the Hawaiian heritage. Some of McKenzie’s genealogies were from feature articles published in Hawaiian newspapers such as *Ka Nui o Nā Mana* and *Ka Nui o Kauai* in the late 19th century and early 20th century. The information was also in Maho’s (1838) *Hawaiian History*, and in *Hawaiian Races* (Book I) (McKenzie, 1883:1).

The following excerpt is from Kamakau’s article in *Ka Nui o Kuokoa* October 7, 1865, and was translated by McKenzie (1986). It illustrates some of the mid-19th century sentiment regarding genealogies:

> To the commoners, a genealogy was of no value because their parents forbade (sic) it lest comparisons should occur and country children be born and rise up as chiefs. Therefore, the children of the commoners were not taught beyond father, mother, and perhaps grandparents…. To us, the people of this time, there is no value of this thing of a chiefly lineage; we have no great interest in it. But in our thoughts it is of great value. We have entered into discussion of it; the chiefs valued the chiefs and ancestors; and we also value our knowledge of it. Because it was forbidden to the commoners, they were not to know this. However, due to the rise of wisdom and skill of the children of the commoners, therefore, all of the ranking privileges were no longer restricted; it was only lifted. What remains of the ancestors is something of interest (McKenzie 1986:18-19).

Using thirty years to account for one generation, McKenzie determined that Wäke’a was born in AD 190; Uma-a-Liloa in 1450; Keawekahiniiiloikamoku in 1650, Kaluhaikukapuapaikalani Keaou in 1710; and Kamehameha I in 1740 (McKenzie, 1983:12). Volume Two of *Hawaiian Genealogies* was published in 1986 and consists of information extracted from genealogical lists published in thirteen newspapers from 1858 to 1920. It complements genealogies found in other works, such as Fornander’s (1880) *An Account of the Polynesian Race…*, and David Maho’s *Hawaiian Antiquities* (McKenzie, 1986:v).

Maui Royal Genealogy. The following is an annotated genealogy of the Maui Royal Line extracted from several works. They illustrate the various family connections with all the island kingdoms or royal lines including Lānii’s. The Maui ali’i nui ruled over Lānii’s until Kamehameha I. The ruling chiefs of the various islands come from combinations of genealogies or branches. Most of the people in the Table below are in a loose chronological order, however, the multiple unions of a particular person is not necessarily in a chronological order, as much of that information was not provided in most cases. Table 1 below illustrates how interconnected the royal lines were based on the works of McKenzie (1983, 1986); Kamakau (1992); Forndener (1969); Peleisholohi (2012); MauiCulture (MC, 2013); and Wikipedia-Maui Kings (2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kings</th>
<th>Wahine</th>
<th>Keiki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td>Hina-ahu-ala</td>
<td>Kahnii (Nu‘uLi'olii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waha’ole</td>
<td>Kahinauluakaihale</td>
<td>Laka (Kaua’i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laka-wa</td>
<td>Hikaiwaiwai</td>
<td>Lii‘ui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakuanu‘u (Kauai ruling chief)</td>
<td>Kapokukukanu</td>
<td>Kale籟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kahinauluakaihale</td>
<td>Kauiauluakaihale</td>
<td>Kamea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pohaku</td>
<td>Hauhekalua'enui</td>
<td>Painalua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Annotated Genealogy of Maui Royal Line [Many diacriticals were not used].
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Kapohauola was also wife of Ehu, who was son of Hawai‘i Mo‘i Kuaiwa, whose father was Kalamaunu and Kamanawa. (Kapohauola was married to Ehu, and Ehu was the son of Hawai‘i Mo‘i Kuaiwa, whose father was Kalamaunu and Kamanawa.)

Kekai-kulaokekuananu (w) Kauhiakama
Kalanikaumakaowakea (Maui king)

(Kapohauola was also wife of Ehu, who was son of Hawai‘i Mo‘i Kuaiwa, whose father was Kalamaunu and Kamanawa)
Dibble, Dr. John Rae, Kamakau, Naihe, S.N. Hakuole [Haleole], Kepelino, and Remy. The An Account of the Polynesian Race: Its Origin and Migrations and the Ancient History of the Hawaiian People to the Times of Kamehameha I. Formander’s collection remains the most important single source of Hawaiian legends (Leib and Day 1979:9–13).

In June 1865 Kamakau began publishing in Ko Nuiapa Kookoa articles on traditions and legends. His series of articles dealing with Hawaiian history, particularly from the late eighteenth century on, and especially of Kamehameha, appeared weekly in the same publication in October 1866. When the newspaper ceased in 1869, this series continued in Ke Au Oolou for nine months. Kamakau then wrote a series on ancient Hawaiian religion, customs, and legendary history in Ke Au Oolou until February 1871. All of his writings were in Hawaiian (Leib and Day 1979:8, 9).

Very little work was done in translating Hawaiian mythology into English until late in the nineteenth century. It wasn’t until 1888, a hundred years after the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands, that the first book in English dealing exclusively with Hawaiian mythology was printed: The Legends and Myths of Hawai’i by King Kalākaua. However, it was more likely authored by former United States Minister to the Hawaiian Islands, R.M. Daggett (Leib and Day 1979:7).

Thrum is one of the most frequently cited authorities on Hawaiian lore. He was born in Australia in 1842 and arrived in Honolulu in 1853. In 1875 he began publication of the Hawaiian Almanac and Annual, later known as The Hawaiian Annual or Thrum’s Annual, which appeared yearly under his editorship until his death in 1932. Thrum’s contribution is as editor, compiler, and publisher of translations, not translator. By providing in his Annual a place for the publication of such material, and perhaps by persuading authors to provide him with translations, he was instrumental in much legendary matter appearing in printed form. Thrum wrote or rewrote a large portion of his own material (Leib and Day 1979:17).

Thrum’s first book Hawaiian Folk Tales was published in 1907 and consisted largely of tales that had previously been published in Thrums’s Annual. Only 35 of the 260 pages were translated by Thrum, the rest were credited to Rev. A.O. Forbes, Rev. C.M. Hyde, William Ellis, Mrs. E. N. Haley, Mrs. E.M. Nakaula, Walter M. Gibson, Joseph M. Poepoe, and M.K. Nakaula. His second book More Hawaiian Folk Tales, published in 1923 was similar. A number of translations were from Hawaiian language newspapers of half a century earlier, often with no translator cited. Translators credited were A.F. Knudson, Henry M. Lyman, W. D. Westervelt, J.H. Holway and Laaliada Webbe. Some of the chapters were reprinted or abridged from the Bishop Museum translations of the Formander Collection, of which Thrum was editor. His greatest work, Formander’s Collection of Hawaiian Antiquities and Folklore, was published by Bishop Museum in 1909. The original editor was W. D. Alexander. The work was completed under his supervision. However, he died in 1913 and Thrum was appointed to complete the production. Beckwith credits John Wise with the original translation of that work. In 1920 or 1921 Thrum completed another work “Ancient Hawaiian Mythology” which was never published (Leib and Day 1979:18-19).

A great resurgence of interest in Hawaiian folklore began in the early twentieth century, in part caused by the annexation to the United States. People on the mainland wanted to know more about ‘their new island possessions.’ The funds of the Bureau of American Ethnology were made available for Hawaiian studies i.e., Emerson’s Unwritten Literature and Beckwith’s Lautianakai. The most important twentieth-century translators of Hawaiian legends have been N.B. Emerson, Thomas G. Thrum, William D. Westervelt, William Hyde Rice, Laura C. S. Greene, Martha Warren Beckwith, and Mary Kavena Wiggins Pukui. Emerson’s extensive notes were a major contribution to Hawaiian scholarship. Most of them explain the meanings of Hawaiian words. In many, Emerson alludes to legends, giving a number of them briefly and relating a few in some detail. Some of these probably do not exist anywhere else in print (Leib and Day 1979:14).

History of Moʻoʻeʻlo Collecting. According to Leib and Day (1979) a substantial number of legends were collected and written in Hawaiian during the century following Cook’s arrival in Hawai‘i. A few accounts of the mythology were printed in the journals of missionaries and travelers, and a few of the legends were printed in languages other than English. The following synopses are excerpts from the works of Leib and Day’s (1979) and give an overview of the first collectors and compilers of Hawaiian myths and legends.

About 1836 a movement was started under the influence of Reverend Sheldon Dibble, to write down in Hawaiian some of the material dealing with the native legendary history, customs, and other lore. Results of the research were published at the Lahainaluna press in 1838. A partial translation made by Rev. Reshen Tinker was issued serially in 1839 and 1840—the first four installments appearing in The Hawaiian Spectator and the last four in The Polynesian. In 1841 the Royal Hawaiian Historical Society was formed at Lahainaluna. Some of their research and the earlier Ke Moolelo Hawai‘i were incorporated into Dibble’s History of the Sandwich Islands (1843). After his death in 1843 his work was carried on principally by two of his outstanding native pupils, David Malo and Samuel M. Kamakau. Malo wrote his own Moolelo Hawai‘i about 1840 at the request of Rev. Lorrin Andrews, which was later translated by Emerson as Hawaiian Antiquities. In 1858 the Rev. John F. Pogue of Lahainaluna printed a third Moolelo Hawai‘i, based on the 1838 history, but including additional material. Kamakau did not print any of his material for thirty years (Leib and Day 1979:7, 8, 9).

The increase in the amount of Hawaiian lore appearing in the native press in the 1860’s and thereafter was at least in part the result of an organized effort to collect and preserve such material. At Kamakau’s instigation a Hawaiian society was formed in 1863 to collect material for publication in the native press at the time, and also to aid Formander’s research. Formander was the greatest collector of Hawaiian lore. He credits as sources, several natives whom he sent on tours of the Hawaiian Islands to collect all available Hawaiian lore, as well as Kalakaua, Lorrin Andrews, Malo, 25
Moʻolelo of Aliʻi nui of Maui, From the legends or moʻolelo collected by Fornander, Kamakau, and others, we can get a glimpse into the lives of some of these people listed in the genealogies. To reproduce any legend completely would take too long, therefore only excerpts [paraphrases] are given. The Aliʻi Nui of Maui were said to rule over Lānaʻi, especially noted from the time of Kakaʻalaneo. However, some of his ancestors are referenced below.

Hua was from Lahaina, Maui. This is not the Hua whose heiau was Apahua in Wainēʻe next to Puako; this is the Hua, son of Kapaʻumanu (Pohukaina) whose heiau was Leukalo, near to Kapaʻana. Hauainakulaʻalii was born at Kewalo in Honolulu (Kamakau, 1991:103). Huaʻa-Pohukaina also known as Hua-a-Kapuuʻilau was born at Lahaina who built heiau of Homuaʻula and Kuawalu at Kaʻuiki…includes a chant. He was a war-loving chief. He lived at Wananalua in Hāna…Paua-Hua was born, also Pauui-ke-anaia, at Waiʻane, Huaʻs son—he ruled Ohikiolo to Keawaula on Oahu…Hua-Pau also known as Hua-nui-ka-laʻlaʻa was born at Kewalo. He was known as a chief. His government was called he aupunet laʻa, a peaceful government. He was chief of Honolulu and Waikiki (Kamakau, 1991:148, 149; see also Sterling, 1998:133).

Hanalaʻaniu and Hanalaʻaiki. According to legends, two of Huaʻs descendants, Hanalaʻaniu and Hanalaʻaiki, became the progenitors of the Hawaiʻi and Maui lines. These were two children of Hikawaiimi (w) and Palena-a-Haho. They were born in Kahinihiniula in Mokae, Hāmona, Hāna and certain districts of Maui were named after these children. The following excerpt is from Kamakau (1991).

Poaumakua, chief of Koʻolau and Mokapu was the son of Hua-nui. He married his sister Mano-kapiliiana and they had a son Haho who was born in Waiʻalua, Oahu. Haho's child was Palena-a-Haho…Palena-a-Haho was born on the hill of Kaʻuiki [sic], in Hāna, Maui at the site Hananakuhe; he ruled and died on Oʻahu…his grave is Kauh-o-Palena in Kaʻilii, Oʻahu…Palena-a-Haho who with Hi-ka-wai-nui had the twins Hanalaʻaniu and Hanalaʻaiki who were born at Kahinihiniula, at Mokae, Hamoa, [Hāna] and a certain aloha ulua land was named after these boys. The twins were progenitors of Hāna people…and because of their good deeds…their descendants gave the land their name. This was after the division of the island into the four parts of ahuwai, 'okana and makaʻainana— at the time when the island was divided by Kalaihaohia during the reign of Kakaʻalaneo…Hanalaʻaniu was the ancestral chief for those of Hawaiʻi and Hanalaʻaiki for those of Maui…. [However] there is a dispute among the genealogies really belonged to Maui…In the division and separation of the Maui and certain districts of Maui genealogies, the line of succession of Maui chiefs was made clear. It can be found in the genealogy of Hanalaʻiki to the time of Kakekili by turning to the ancient traditions of deeply revered persons. Here are made plain the places in which the chiefs were born, their deeds, and places in which their corpses were laid (Kamakau 1991:101, 150-152).

Beckwith’s (1970) version is as follows:

Hanalaʻaniu and Hanalaʻaiki. Maui chief Haho, son of Poaumakua and grandson of Hua-nui-kaʻlaʻa [Haho was grandfather of the twins], was the traditional founder of the aha oʻi or ranking body of chiefs whom were distinguished by the use of the sacred cord called ahu. They cultivated a metaphorical form of speech to conceal their words from the uninitiated…Between the periods of Maui and Piilani, that is, between Moaʻaʻa’s time and that of Umi of Maui, the twins were born at Kahinihini in Mokae, Hāmona [sons of Palena, son of Haho]. ‘Little and big sacred one of Hāna’ called Hanala-laʻaniu and Hanala-laʻaiki, from who respectively the chiefs of Hawaiʻi and Maui are descended. From Kaha and his wife Kolua they are descended the great Kaupa families of Koʻo and Kuai. From them, Kahekili’s wife Kaowahine, mother of Kanapiküpu, the last ruling chief of Maui, and of a daughter, Kaillikuaha, who became the wife of the Maui chief Uemuehe Huluiki and mother of Liihio, beloved wife of Koki of sandalwood fame (Beckwith, 1970:387, 389).

The following synopses consists of excerpts from Fornander’s (1880) An Account of the Polynesian Race: Its Origins and Migrations, and give an overview of the various aliʻi nui (ruling chiefs) of Maui, which Fornander refers to as “Moʻo.”

Independent Moʻo. Among the Maui chiefs from the close of the migratory period, say La‘amaikahiki to Piilani, the contemporary of Umi and his father Līloa, not many names arrest the attention of the antiquarian student. The position of ‘Moi’ of Maui appears to have descended in the line of Haho, the son of Poaumakua-a-Hauainakulaʻalii, though, judging from the tenor of the legends, East Maui, comprising the districts of Koʻolau, Hāna, Kipahulu, and Kaupō, was at times under independent Mois [sic]. The legends mention six by name, from Eleio to Hoolae, the latter of whom was contemporary with Piilani, and whose daughter [Koleamoku] married Piilani’s son, Kiha-a-Piilani. Their allegiance to the West Maui Mois was always precarious, even in later times (Fornander, 1880).

Kamalo-o-hua and ‘Ohana. While Kamaloshoua ruled over the greater part of Maui, a chief who was doubtless a near relation, and who was called Wakahana, ruled over the windward side of the island and resided at Wailuku. During his time tradition records that a vessel called “Mamala” arrived at Wailuku. The captain’s name is said to have been Kalihi-kī-Mumu, and the names of the other people on board are given in the tradition as Neleike, Malaeaa, Haukoua, and Hika. These latter comprised both men and women, and it is said that Neleike became the wife of Wakahana and the mother of his son Alo-o-i-ia, and that they became the progenitors of a light-colored family, “poʻe ‘ohana Kekea;” they were white people, with bright, shining eyes, “Kanaka Keokeo, a ua alohilohi na muka” (Fornander 1880:80).

After the reign and times of Kamaloshoua nothing worthy of note has been recorded of the Maui chiefs until we arrive at the time of Kakae and Kakaalaneo, the sons of Kaulaheanokamoku I [Kaulahea I], three generations after Kamaloohua…. Kakae’s brother, Kakaalaneo, appears, from the tenor of the legends, to have ruled jointly with Kakae over the islands of Maui and Līlīa. He was renowned for his thrift and energy. The brothers kept their court at Lāhaina, which at the time still preserved its ancient name of Lele, and tradition has gratefully remembered him (Kakaʻalaneo) as the one who planted the breadfruit trees in Lāhainā, for which the place in after times became so famous (Fornander 1880:80).

The following excerpt is according to Kepa Maly in Maly & Dye (2016:7): The earliest traditional lore of Lānai describes the arrival of the gods Kāne, Kanaloa, and their younger god-siblings and companions to the southern shores of the island. Later accounts describe the visit of the goddess Pele and members of her family to the windward region of Lānaʻi. Subsequent narratives describe the arrival of foreigners to Lānaʻi by evil spirits and the difficulties that the early human settlers encountered in attempts to safely colonize the island. Another tradition relates that in the early 1400s, a young chief by the name of Kauhulauʻu traveled around Lānaʻi vanquishing the evil ghosts/spirits of the island, making it safe for people to live on Lānai, and is the source of the island’s name (Lānaʻi a Kauhulauʻu).

Kakaʻalaneo was a grand uncle of Piilani. The following synopses about Kakaʻalaneo and Kulanalao are excerpts from Beckwith (1970). There appears to be a time-conflict with the arrival of the light-skinned foreigners. Fornander (1880) indicates they arrived during Kamaaloshoua’s reign, while Beckwith indicates the foreigners arrived four generations later during the time Kakaʻalaneo. Kakaʻalaneo. Many legends mention the name of Kakaʻalaneo (Kikaaʻalaneo, Kaʻalaneo), who lived in the Lāhainā district on the hill Kealā’s [Black Rock of Sheraton Maui]. He also owned fishponds in the Hāna district on the opposite end of the island and planted a famous breadfruit grove in Lāhainā. His wife was the Molokaʻi chiefess whom Eleio found for him and who brought him the first feather cape ever seen on Maui, and by whom he had the mischievous son Kauhulauʻu [great-uncle of Piilani] who killed off the bad spirits [Eʻepa] on Lānaʻi. In his day Lāhainā was called Lele. According to tradition, a group of strangers (huole) who later played an active part in court life and whose names were (according to Kamakau), kept in
memory as late as Captain Cook’s day, arrived on Maui in Kaka’alanoe’s time. Kukalanaoa and Kaekae (also Kaka’alaneo) were the leaders of this group. The “last allusion” in this legend is a pun about chief Ilohe of O’ahu who abducted the pretty chiefess of Maui, Kelea (sister of Pi’ilani’s father), while she was out surfing and carried her away to O’ahu in the uplands of Lihue. She later deserted him for his cousin Kalamakua of Tawa, by whom she became mother of the high chiefess Ilohe-lohe-lohe (The drooping pandanus vine), who became the wife of her Maui cousin Pi’ilani. All these names appear in the chant linked with the coming of Kukalanaoa, together with the names of a wife and son of Kaka’alanoe (Beckwith, 1970:384-385).

Legend of Kukalanaoa. The strangers land first at Ke’ei in South Kona and then come on to Waihe’e, Maui, they point to the uplands ‘far, far above where our parents dwell’ and show that they are familiar with bananas, breadfruit, mountain apple, and candlenut trees. The two leaders became Kaka’alanoe’s property. There is no place closed to them. They married chiefesses and some of their descendants are living today. Kani-ka-wa and Kani-ka-wa they are called, “perhaps because their speech was as unintelligible as that of the lala birds that live in the hill” (Beckwith, 1970:386). Pi’ilani and some of his family are mentioned in the following mele of this mo’olele:

Puka mai o Kukalanaoa, Kukalanaoa
O na haole iluna o Halakaipo, O’ahu mai nei Kukalanaoa,
Kapana hoole mai Kahiki, Kukalanaoa
Puka mai nei Kukalanaoa, Kukalanaoa
Me ke lew o kik Kaka’alaneo, Kukalanaoa
O Kanaula is, o Kaikaliwaina, Kanaula (the wife), Kaliwaina (the son),
O Kelea, o Kalamakua, Kelea (the wife), Kalamakua (the husband),
O Pi’ilani is, o La’ielohe-lohe, Pi’ilani (the wife), La’ielohe-lohe (the wife).

According to Fornander (1880), Kaekae was the son of Kauaheleau-kamoku I, and the brother of Kaka’alanoe with whom he co-ruled Maui. He was also the father of Kehekilihimaunahumun I and Kualauheau-kamoku II, grandfather of Kawaoakahele and Keleanuinohon’ama’api’api and great-grandfather of Pi’ilani of Hana and Lahainalani. The following excerpts from Fornander (1880) reveal some of their history.

Kakae, Kahekili I, and Kawaoakahele. Kakae’s son was Kahekili I, who is known to have had two children, a son named Kawao Kahele [Pi’ilani’s father], who succeeded him as Mo’o of Maui, and a daughter named Keleanuinohon’ama’api’api [Pi’ilani’s wife’s mother], who was successively the wife of Lo-Lale, son of Kalona-iki, and of Kalomakua, son of Kalona-nui, of the O’ahu Maewke line.

From the time of Maui, third from Haho and contemporary with La’amaikahiki, to the time of Kahele I [father of Kahekili and Kaaka’alanoe] there must have been troublous times on Maui, and much social and dynastic convulsions, to judge from the confusion and interlopers occurring on the royal genealogy of this period. I have shown it to be nearly historically certain that the O’ahu and Maui Paumakaus were contemporary, and it will be seen in the sequel that it is absolutely certain that Kawaoakahele [Pi’ilani’s father] on the Paumaka-Halo line was contemporary with Kalamakua, Pi’ilile’ole and Lo-Lale on the Maewke line of O’ahu chiefs, as well as on the O’ahu Paumaka line through La’ali’a-La’a; and yet the Maui royal genealogy, as recited at the court of Kahele I II at the close of the last century, counts thirteen generations between Mauiolu and Kawaoakahele [Pi’ilani’s father], whereas the Maewke and Oahu Paumaka genealogies count only seven from La’amaikahiki to Keleanuinohon’ama’api’api [Pi’ilani’s wife’s mother], the sister of Kawaoakahele [Pi’ilani’s father] (Fornander 1880:78-79).

Kawaoakahele. During the reign of Kawaoakahele [Pi’ilani’s father], the son of Kahekili I, and grandson of Kakae, the island of Maui appears to have been prosperous and tranquil. No wars with neighboring islands or revolts of turbulent chieflains at home have left their impress on the traditional record. Kawaoakahele’s wife was Kepala, whose pedigree is not remembered, but who was probably some Maui chiefess [she was a sacred O’ahu chiefess of Lihue]. Kawaoakahele was succeeded as Mo’o of Maui by his son Pi’ilani, who, through his good and wise government, and through his connection with the reigning chief families of O’ahu and Hawai’i, brought Maui up to a political consideration in the group which it never had enjoyed before, and which it retained until the conquest by Kamameha I consolidated the whole group under one rule (Fornander 1880:83, 87).

There are several legends of Keleanuinohon’ama’api’api [Kelea], the sister of Kawaoakahele, aunt of Pi’ilani, and mother of La’ielohe-lohe, Pi’ilani’s wife. Her story is one of intrigue, and romance, but also allegorizes the life and privileges of ali’i nui women. It further illustrates the interrelationships between the ali’i nui of the various islands. The following mo’olelo is extracted from Fornander’s (1880) “Story of Keleanuinohonanoapi’api.”

The Story of Kelea. The Story of Keleanuinohonanoapi’api, sister of Kawaoakahele, begins in Hana. The men of Chief Lo-Lale of Lihue, Oahu [now Scholfield] were searching for a wife for him…. They went first to Molokai, then to Lina’a, then sailed for Hana intending to go to Hawai’i. While at Hana they heard that Kawaoakahele, the Mo’o of Maui was stopping with his court and his chiefs at Hamakua-Poko, regulating the affairs of the country, and enjoying the cool breezes of that district, and the pleasures of surf-bathing, and that with him was his sister Kelea, the most beautiful woman on Maui, and the most accomplished surf-swimmer.

They thought of a plan to win her confidence by going surfing with her, and challenging her to a race. On her third time out, they captured her, and took her into a waiting canoe to O’ahu. They took her to Chief Lo-Lale of Lihue, O’ahu, son of O’ahu Moi Kalona-iiki, and brother of heir-apparent Piliwale. “And as she did not commit suicide, it may be inferred that she became reconciled to her lot and accepted him as her husband. And as no invasion of Oahu was ever attempted by Kawaokaohele, or vengeance exacted…. Though the legend says nothing about it, that the affair was diplomatically settled to the satisfaction of all parties.”

Kelea and Lo-Lale had three children: Kahili-a-Lale, (who later married Kohiapa [Kohiapa], sister of Kukanikono, Mo’o of O’ahu after her father Piliwale’s death, Luliuwaine, and Lulikane. After several years and three children she informed Lo-Lale that she was leaving him, as was her privilege due to her rank. He reluctantly gave her his consent, but his grief was preserved in a chant. While traveling around O’ahu, Kelea met Kalama, chief of Hailawa, son of Kalona-nui and cousin of Lo-Lale. They marry and have a daughter La’ielohe-lohe, who in her youth was betrothed to her cousin Pi’ilani, son of Kelea’s brother Kawaoakahele (Fornander 1880:83-87, 90-91).

Hawaiian Legends/Lina’a. There are 75 legends or mo’olelo that reference Lina’a in Hawaiian Legends Index Vol III (HSPLS 1989:1042-1048); too numerous to list.

Mele and Oli

Aside from the mo’olelo, legends or stories of these famous and infamous ali’i, the chants and songs also give glimpses into the lives of the ancient ones. This research has revealed that there are literally thousands of mele and oli that have been recorded and/or written over the last 170 years. There are several indexes of songs and chants in the Hawaiian Collections at the University of Hawai’i Hamilton Library (i.e., Hone 1990; Stillman 1988; 1990; 1993; 1995: 1996). Unfortunately, they just give the first line as titles, and it would probably take several months to go through each mele and oli. Pukui explained that it was common,
for chants not to have a title, as it was the composer’s role to create the mele, which was then given away. When formal titles were not specified, the first line of verse served as the title (Pukui, 1995:xvii).

The Hawaiian word mele included all forms of poetical composition and sometimes overlap oli or chant, the lyric utterance (Emerson, 1997: 254). In regards to Hawaiian poetry or mele, “they had no exact word for a abstract a term as our ‘poetry.’” The English equivalent to the Hawaiian mele means a song. All meles were “sung, or rather chanted, or cantillated. This is equally true of all early poetry of whatever race…. The mele is interwoven in Hawaiian culture with the hula and the kauo—that is, poetry is interwoven with the dance and with mythology…. Haiku mele, is one who arranges words into songs (Plewes, 1981:176).

Pukui (1995) classifies chants into three groups: (1) chants for the gods (pule); (2) chants for the ali`, descendants of the gods; and (3) chants of activities that involved serious things. In Pukui’s (1995) Na Mele We`lo she points out that some oli are non-dance chants, but many of the mele and oli were expressed in dance or hula (Pukui, 1995:xvii). Emerson explains that the hula was a religious service, in which poetry, music, pantomime, and the dance lent themselves, under the forms of dramatic art, to the refreshment of men’s minds. Its view of life was idyllic and it gave itself to the celebration of those mythical times when gods and goddesses moved on the earth as men and women and when men and women were as gods (Emerson, 1997:11, 12). Helen Cadwell quotes Alexander, but does not name the publication, as classifying meles into 4 divisions: (1) religious chants, prayers, and prophesies; (2) noa, or name songs, composed at the birth of a chief in his honor; recounting the heroic deeds of his ancestors; (3) kami kau, the dirges or laments for the dead; and (4) ipo, or love songs which includes topical mele of a more secular character, now surpassing the others in number, and have survived in better condition “on the lips of the country folk (Roberts, 1967:67, 72).

The following is from Napoka (In Bucy & Asso 1989:188-189).

With no system of writing, traditional Hawaiian society relied on oral chants to pass their cultural memory from one generation to another. A traditional chant that was chanted and danced on the island of Lāna`i (Kukaniloko 1902) is a good record of early life on Lāna`i as told by a native Hawai`ian:

A Kaohai, lae, lae A Kamaikī lae, lae A kau uhu ka`i lae, lae Hooahaehae lae, lae Hiu a lilo lae, lae O ke Ake ono le, lae O ka Lau Li lae, lae Penu kai on lae, lae O ka Uhu ula lae, lae Kau ka miko lae, lae Uala Kawelo lae, lae Kahī pupu lae, lae Poi Lehua lae, lae O Mauanalei lae, lae

This is an excerpt of a longer chant that, when recited, chronicles life on early Lāna`i. The ahupua`a of Kaohai mentioned in the first line is a renowned fishing ground for the uhu fish. Lāna`i was famous throughout the Hawaiian Islands for its uhu fishing. Other legendary fishing places on Lāna`i were the cliffs of Kohala famous for the malolo flying fish, Polihua for turtle catching and Pu`upepe for oio fishing….

This chant celebrates the delicious foods as well as the legends and places of Lāna`i. If all the verses were included for this chant, the “kaona,” or word meanings hidden in symbolism, would provide another level of interpretation for the same chant. This level of meaning celebrates procreation and a variety of other human emotions. The author of this chant has compressed a tremendous amount of information into a deceivingly short number of words that, when understood, reveal many aspects of traditional Hawaiian existence on Lāna`i.

**ʻOlelo No`eau and Place Names**

**ʻOlelo No`eau.** ʻOlelo no`eau or proverbial/traditional sayings usually had several layers of meanings. They reflected the wisdom, observations, poetry and humor of old Hawai`i. Some of them referenced people, events or places. The following “ʻolelo no`eau were compiled by Mary Kawena Pukui between 1910 and 1960 with both translations and an explanation of their meaning (Williamson, et al. in Pukui, 1983:vii), which are often more kaona (hidden or double meaning) than obvious.

**ʻOlelo No`eau Makua ana`i i ka mauna a pae kupapa`u i Lāna`i.**

Translation: May probably die at sea and his corpse wash ashore on Lāna`i.

Meaning: Refer to a person on a very hazardous venture (p 229 #2103).

**ʻOlelo No`eau I puni `a `oe o Lāna`i a `i `ike `ole ia Lāna`i a Ka`ula me Lāna`i.**

Translation: If you have gone around Lāna`i and have not seen Lāna`i Ka`ula and Lāna`i Hale, you have not seen all of Lāna`i.

Meaning: None given (p 137 #1258).

**ʻOlelo No`eau He weke, he `i a pahu。“**

Translation: It is a weke, the fish that produces nightmares.

Meaning: The head of the weke fish is said to contain something that produces nightmares. The nearer to Lāna`i the fish is caught, the worse the effects of the nightmares. Pahu was the chief of evil beings (akua) who peopled the island of Lāna`i. When Kaulula`au, son of Kahakuloa, ruler of Maui, was a boy, he was banished to Lāna`i because of his mischief. By trickery, he rid the island of evil beings, and the spirit of Pahulu fled to the sea and entered a fish. From that time on, nightmares have been called pahu, and a person who has had a nightmare is said to have been under the influence of Pahu (p 105 #982).

**ʻOlelo No`eau Ke ku no a Maui; ke ki`ei no a Lāna`i; ka moe no a Moloka`i; ka noho no a O`ahu.**

Translation: Maui stands; Lāna`i peers in; Moloka`i sleeps; O`ahu sits.

This is an excerpt of a longer chant that, when recited, chronicles life on early Lāna`i. The ahupua`a of Kahakuloa mentioned in the first line is a renowned fishing ground for the uhu fish. Lāna`i was famous throughout the Hawaiian Islands for its uhu fishing. Other legendary fishing places on Lāna`i were the cliffs of Kohala famous for the malolo flying fish, Polihua for turtle catching and Pu`upepe for oio fishing….

Meaning: Said of people who stand about, look on, go to sleep and sit around, but do not lend a hand with work (p 189 #1763).

**ʻOlelo No`eau Lāna`i i Ka`ula`a`u.**

Translation: Lāna`i of Kahaku`a.

Meaning: Said in admiration of Lāna`i, Kahaku`a`u was a Maui chief banished to Lāna`i by his father for destroying his breadfruit grove. By trickery Kahaku`a`u destroyed the island’s evil spirits and became its ruler (p 210 #1943).

**ʻOlelo No`eau Niihi Moloka`i `i, poahi Lāna`i.**

This is an excerpt of a longer chant that, when recited, chronicles life on early Lāna`i. The ahupua`a of Kaihule mentioned in the first line is a renowned fishing ground for the uhu fish. Lāna`i was famous throughout the Hawaiian Islands for its uhu fishing. Other legendary fishing places on Lāna`i were the cliffs of Kohala famous for the malolo flying fish, Polihua for turtle catching and Pu`upepe for oio fishing….

Meaning: Said in admiration of Lāna`i, Kahaku`a`u was a Maui chief banished to Lāna`i by his father for destroying his breadfruit grove. By trickery Kahaku`a`u destroyed the island’s evil spirits and became its ruler (p 210 #1943).
Translation: Moloka‘i revolves, Hawai‘i sways.

Meaning: Description of the revolving of the hips and the swaying movements in hula (p. 252 #2315).

Place Names. Hawai‘ians of old generally named everything: from winds and mountains, to rocks, canoes, taro patches, fishing stations, and “the tiniest spots where miraculous or interesting events are believed to have taken place” (Elbert in Pukui et al., 1974a). They all represented a story, some known only locally, while others became legendary. The following section is from Malo & Dye (2016:22-23) with additions from Lī‘i in Kamoku & Lī‘i in Kamoku (Lanaichc.org) website:

In addition to the ahupua‘a name, several place names survived the passing of time in Kamoku. The site numbers listed are from Emory’s 1924 archaeological inventory survey on Lī‘a‘i’s [13].

Anapuka Arch (Site 175). A rocky point with an arch.

Anuōkua Arch 1 & 2 Lī‘i in Kamoku (Lanaichc.org)

Hōkūdiao Morning Star (Site 84). A level land below Lī‘a‘i City.

Hulupu‘u‘unin Translation uncertain (Site 78). A level land area below Hōkūdiao.

Iwī‘ele No bones, or no boundary wall (Site 87). Named for a native tenant who lived on the land below Kō‘ele, in the early to mid-1800s; ‘lī in Kamoku (Lanaichc.org).

ʻIli o Lono The land section of Lono, site of an ancient heiau of the agricultural class, near the former house site of Papahā, and boundary point between Kalu‘u and Kamoku Ahupua‘a’s (Boundary Commission records). Point where the mauka-makai trail crosses out of Kalu‘u into Kamoku (Site 25). Now covered by the airport. Alternate spelling: Ka ʻili o Lono, Ili‘olono.

Kaihōle ‘Aloha banana tree (Site 89). An area above Kō‘ele, where bananas were grown formerly. A favored region of Lī‘a‘i, where enough water could be found to tend cultivated crops.

Kalama‘ikī The little torch (Site 71).

Kalamanii The big torch (Site 72).

Kamoku The district or cut off section. One of thirteen ahupua‘a’s that make up the island of Lī‘a‘i (Boundary Commission records).

Ku ‘a‘akū Interpretive, the brave or upright one. A small valley that joins Kapano Gulch on inland side of Pūhehulua, Kamoku Ahupua‘a’s (Site 81) (Boundary Commission records).

Koe The sand (Site 69).

Ko‘ele To peer, peep (Site 70). A small bay.

Kīhāmānini‘ia To sneeze and shudder (Site 85). Formerly a place associated with priestly lines, reportedly a training area of warriors. A hill with the ruins of a Protestant church and school house (construction started in 1840). Also the site of an old cemetery. Alternate spelling: Kihāmānini‘ie.

Kō‘ele Black or darkness drawn down (Site 88). Said to be named for the heavy, moisture laden clouds which would come down the mountain gulches. These clouds and fog were so thick that one could not see but a few feet in front of one’sself. Site of the former Kō‘ele Ranch—headquarters of the Lī‘a‘i Ranch from 1870 to 1971.

Ku-ʻa-nā-ʻipu Interpretive, upright gourds, a section of land between Pu‘u Nānā Hawai‘i’s ‘Ili o Lono, near the Kalu‘u and Kamoku boundary (Boundary Commission records).

Kulelehu also known as Kulelehu—a ʻili in Kamoku (Lanaichc.org)

Lālākōoa Kōa (Acacia koa) tree branch (Site 83). Formerly a forested area and, in the early 1900s, site of the Charles Gay family home.

Makaili‘ili ‘Ili in Kamoku (anai‘o.chg)

Maka-pā‘ia Enclosed point (Site 82). Overlooking Kapano Gulch.

Maloa ‘Ili in Kamoku (Lanaichc.org)

Naupaka The Scavullo plant (Site 67). A small perched valley.

Nininiwai Pouring water (Site 86). Formerly one of the important agricultural areas of old Lī‘a‘i natives. Later, the location where the first pineapples were planted on Lī‘a‘i.

Paliannono Literally, Cliff of Mano. A gulch that forms a boundary between Kamoku and Kā‘a‘a

Pāo Owl. An ‘ili of land in Kamoku Ahupua‘a’s, near the boundary with Kalu‘u.

Pālehu-loa To broil (cook) for a long time (Site 80). Hill and bank that forms a northern wall of Pālava‘a Crater, near the Kalu‘u-Kamoku boundary. Not far from Keli‘i-hanau‘ui’s house (Boundary Commission records).

Pu‘u Ka‘a Kansa tree hill (Site 74). A boundary point between Kalu‘u and Kamoku Ahupua‘a’s.

Pu‘ukōoa Koa tree hill (Site 76). A low hill on the flat lands below Hulupu‘u‘unia.

Pu‘unānāwahā‘i Hill from which to look to Hawai‘i (Site 77), a high prominence in Kamoku Ahupua‘a’s close to the boundary with Kalu‘u (Boundary Commission records).

Pu‘unēnē Goose hill.

Early Historic References

History of Land Divisions. It was during the time of Kaka‘alaneo of Maui that the division of lands is said to have taken place under a ‘ili named Kalaihaohi‘a. He portioned out the island into districts, sub-divisions, and smaller divisions, each ruled over by an agent appointed by the landlord of the next larger division, and the whole under control of the ruling chief over the whole island or whatever part of it was his to govern (Beechick, 1970:383).

Each island was divided into moku or districts that were controlled by an ali‘i ‘ai moku (Mo‘ifat and Kirkpatrick, 1995:24-25). The island of Lī‘a‘i was divided into thirteen sub-districts (James 2001:150) or okano (Alexander 1891). Within each of the moku on each island, the land was further divided into ahupua‘a and controlled by land managers or konohiki.

In name, as explained by Mr. Lyons, “is derived from the Aha or altar, which was erected at the point where the boundary of the land was intersected by the main road alalua, which encircled each of the islands. Upon this altar, at the annual progress of the aka or ‘iho makahiki (i.e. year god), Lenonakau, was deposited the tax paid by the land whose boundary it marked, and also an image of a hog, pua‘a, carved out of kukui wood and stained with red ochre” (Alexander 1891). The boundaries of the ahupua‘a were delineated by natural features such as shoreline, ridges, streams and peaks, usually from the mountain to the sea, and ranged in size from less than ten acres to 180,000 acres (Mo‘ifat and Fitzpatrick, 1995:24-29, see also Chinen 1958:3).

Each ahupua‘a was often divided and sub-divided several times over (i.e., ʻili, kuleana, mo‘o, ponaku, kō‘ele, kihāpua), answerable to the ali‘i where the lesser division was located. However the ‘ili kāpono or the ‘ili kai was “completely independent of the ahupua‘a in which it was situated...his tributes were paid directly to the king himself” (Chinen 1958:4). Rights to lands were mutable or revocable; a ruling chief or any “distributor” of lands could change these rights if displeased, or as favors—usually after a victorious battle, and after the death of the ali‘iuni (Chinen 1958:5).

The Great Māhele, Land Commission Awards, Royal Patents and Grants. During the period between 1839 to 1855, several legislative acts transformed the centuries-old Hawaiian traditions of ali‘i mai land stewardship to the western practice of fee simple or private land ownership. Kamemeha III formalized the division of lands among himself and 245 of the highest-ranking ali‘i and konohiki between January 27 to March 7, 1848. He acknowledged the rights of these individuals to various land divisions in what came to be known as the Buke Māhele or ‘sharing book’ or The Great Māhele.
This historic land transformation process was an evolution of concepts brought about by fear, growing concerns of takeovers, and western influence regarding land possession. King Kamehameha III, in his mid-thirties, was persuaded by his ali’i and other advisors to take a course that would assure personal rights to land. In 1846 he appointed a Board of Commissioners, commonly known as the Land Commission, to “confirm or reject all claims to land arising previously to the 10th day of December, AD 1845.” Notices were frequently posted in the Polynesian. The legislature did not acknowledge this act until June 7, 1848 (Chinen 1958:16; Moffat and Fitzpatrick, 1995:48-49).

In the first stage King Kamehameha III [Kasikeaouli] divided up his lands among the highest ranking ali’i (chiefs), konohiki (land managers), and favored haole (foreigners) (Chinen 1958:7-14; Moffat and Fitzpatrick, 1995:11, 17). The land for the people was designated Government Lands: “from time to time portions…were sold as a means of obtaining revenue to meet the increasing costs of the Government.” People who purchased these lands were issued documents called “Grants” or “Royal Patent Grants,” which differed from the Royal Patents issued upon Land Commission Awards (Chinen 1974:25-29). All these lands were “subject to the rights of native tenants” who were cultivating the land (Act of 1850) referred to as Kuleana Lands. They were independent of the ahupua’a or i‘ili kupono within which they were situated and were free of commutation fees. However, if there were no heirs, the lands reverted back to the owner of the ahupua’a or i‘ili kupono where they were located (Chinen 1974:29-30).

In all Awards of whole Ahupua’a(s) and ‘Ili(s) the rights of Tenants are expressly reserved, “Koa na Kuleana o Kanaka.” Besides, the Act of August 6th, 1850, confirmed and amended July 11th, 1851, protects the common people in the enjoyment of the right to take wood, thatch, ki leaf, etc., from the lands on which they live, for their own private use, but not to sell for profit. They are also guaranteed the right to water and the right of way, but not the right of pasturage on the land of the konohiki. (Hawaiian Reports, Vol. 2, p. 87; and Vol. V., p. 133.) These rights are embodied in Section 1477 of the Civil Code. Furthermore, every bona fide resident on a land has the right to fish in the sea appurtenant to the land, and to sell the fish caught by him. (Hawaiian Reports, Vol. VI., p. 334 In Alexander 1891). It may be observed here that Kuleana(s) in default of heirs “revert to the owner of the Ahupua’a or Ili at which the escheated Kuleana formed a part,” by a law passed July 6th, 1866 (Alexander 1891).

“The Māhele did not actually convey title to the various ali’i and konohiki; it essentially gave them the right to claim the lands assigned to them. They were required to present formal claims to the Land Commission and pay a commutation fee, which could be accomplished by surrendering a portion of the land to the government.” The government could later sell these lands to the public. Upon payment of the commutation fee, the Minister of Interior issued a Royal Patent to the chief or konohiki. In 1892 the legislature authorized the Minister of Interior to issue Royal Patents to all konohiki or to their heirs or assigns where the konohiki had failed to receive awards for their lands from the Land Commission. The Act further stipulated “that these Royal Patents were to be issued on surveys approved by the Surveyor General of the kingdom…” (Chinen 1958:24; Moffat and Fitzpatrick 1995:41-43; Alexander 1891).

Kamoku Government Lands: 8,291 acres on the west side from near Nānāhōna to Kaumālapu‘u bounded by Ka‘a on the north and Kalulu on the south (Munro 2006:19).

Kamoku Māhele Awards (Lanaiche.org) Kamoku was considered Crown Lands in the Record of Boundary Commission (1877).

Kamoku Royal Patents: Between 1855 to 1867, thirteen (13) grant applications, covering 735.93 acres, were surveyed and patented to fourteen individuals (13 natives and one foreigner) on the island of Lāna‘i (Lanaiche.org).

Royal Patent No. 4800
Pali (Konohiki)
Kamoku, Lāna‘i
Book 19:473-474

Kamoku Land Commission Awards (LCA) (from Lanaiche.org):

Helu 10630  Pali (Konohiki)
Kamoku
Native Register 6:526

Lanai Feb. 5th, 1848
Aloha to you Kaauwai, J. Ii and Armstrong, Commissioners who Quiet Land Claims. Here are my thoughts to you, that you will look upon my land claim. Here are the lands which the King gave me on Lanai. Auhea gave them to me. I am a Konohiki of the King, the lord of the land. That is what he said to me.

Here is this claim of mine. We spoke with Auhea, about my being the tax collector, that when the reign of the King in the Government was finished, then my position would end. That is what we spoke of. But the Government would not consider my claim if my work should be at fault.

Here is this responsibility of mine, a responsibility of prayer [as an overseer of the Lanai Church] from Ricord and Huapili. Richards is my overseer. I have attended this work for 13 years. That is what I took care of. Now Baldwin tends to the work, and I am under Baldwin.

School overseer is another responsibility of mine, gotten from those people who had it. That is it. The decision to approve or deny it, is now up to you as you decide.

Helu 10630  Pali (Konohiki)
Kamoku
Native Testimony 13:259

Lanai. July 10, 1851.
Poupou, Sworn. I know his parcels of land in the Ahupuaa of Makaliilii, Kulelelua, Iwiole and the 2 Aumoku on Lanai. They are combined into one, being several moku mauu (grass bounded by Ka‘a on the north and Kalulu on the south (Munro 2006:19).


He received his land from M. Keakaulelo in the year 1839, and has resided there peaceably to this time. No one has objected, and he is the Overseer of these lands.

Keawe, Sworn. All the words above are true. My knowledge is the same.

Pali, Sworn. The reason for my thinking of joining them together as one, is he cause there are many places of mine which are cultivated here and there, and where are built houses. I go from one place to another to cultivate, as announced in the Elele [newspaper]. Therefore I’ve
joined my places together. It is as the witnesses have stated above. My claims for the other places are ended.

**Helu 10630**

Pali

**Kamoku**

Foreign Testimony 15:40

Jany. 17th, 1853.

Resolved, that the Land Commission be and is hereby authorized to award fee simple titles to Pali (Claim No. 10,630), Kalaihoa (No. 3719 B) and Malulu (No. 6846) as surveyed by Asa, containing respectively 11 1/10 & 90 Acres.

By order of Privy Council (Sig.) Lorrin Andrews, Secretary.

**Helu 10630**

Pali (Konohiki)

Kamoku

Mähele Award Book 7:222

There in the ili of Kaumalapau, Mooloa, Makaliiili, Kalelelua and 2 Aumoku, in the Ahupuaa of Kamoku, Island of Lanai. One Parcel.

Beginning at the Western corner and running… [metes and bounds] … 112 Acres, 1 Rood, 23 Rods...

---

**Helu 2686** (see also Helu 367)

Oleloa (w.)

Kaumalapau at Kamoku

Native Register Volume 6:15

Lahaina. January 8th, 1848.

Greetings to you John II and Kaauwai, and the Commissioners who quiet claims.

I hereby tell you of my several land claims from the King. Here are the names of my lands: Puunau in Lahaina; Kalama II [Kona]; Kaumalapau [Lanai]; and Kanoni [Kau]. I have five lands, and my residency is from the King. Therefore, I provide before you, my document to you, that you, the Commissioners who quiet claims may see. Here also is my lot at Puunau, and I give to you my document, Kolopapela Kaau [wai] and Richards to quiet by your hands. Aloha to you with peace.

Done by me, Oleloa, Widow.

**Helu 6833**

Kauai

Kahului & Kamoku

Native Testimony 13:272-273

Pali (Konohiki), Sworn. I know his Parcels of land at Kahului, Lanai. 3 Parcels of land in the ili below.

---

Parcels 1. 1 moku mauu (grass land/pasture section) in the ili of “Ahupau.”


Parcel 3. The boundaries are thus. Mauka and all about, land of Konohiki.

He received these Parcels of land from his parents in the year 1840, and his parents received them from Daniel L. He has resided there peaceably to this time. No one has objected...

Kaauwai, Sworn. All the words above are true. My knowledge is the same.

**Helu 8556 Kauawaeaina**

Maunalei, Kamoku and Kalulu Native Testimony 13:265

Kaauwai, Sworn. I know his parcels of land on Lanai. They are in the ili and Ahupuaa below. 3 parcels.

Parcel 1. 3 loi kalo (taro pond fields) in the ili of Ainaiki, Maunalei Ahupuaa.

Parcel 2. 1 moku mauu (grass land/pasture section), in the ili of Kapano uka, Kalulu Ahupuaa.

Parcel 3. 1 Pauku land in the ili of Pueo, Kamoku Ahupuaa.

Par. 1. The boundaries are thus. Mauka, my land. Kaena and all about, land of Konohiki. Par. 2. The boundaries are thus. Mauka, and all about, land of Konohiki.

Par. 3. The boundaries are thus. Mauka and all about, land of Konohiki.

He received Parcel 1 from Kaawaia in the year 1844. Par. 2 from his parents in the time of Kamehameha II. Par. 3 from his parents in the time of Kamehameha I. He has resided there peaceably to this time. No one has objected.

I. Kaliliaumoku, Sworn. All the words above are correct. My understanding is exactly like that as spoken by Kaauwai.

**Helu 8556 Kauawaeaina Kalulu and Kamoku**

Mähele Award Book 7:212

There in the Ahupuaa of Kalulu & Kamoku, Lanai.

Parcel 2. There in the ili of Kapano... [metes and bounds] ... 1Acre, 0 Roods, 35 Rods.

Parcel 3. There in the ili of Pueo... [metes and bounds] ... 38 Acres, 2 Roods, 12 Rods.

**Lânai Land Grants**

More than half the applications made by native tenants of Lânai'ī for kuleana (personal property rights) were rejected by the Land Commission (see the Mähele ‘Āina on Lânai’ī). This problem was recognized while the Mähele was being undertaken, and Kamehameha III implemented the program
that allowed native and foreign residents to apply for grants of land—in fee-simple interest—which were held in the Government Land Inventory.

Most of the native claimants had also applied for land as a part of the Māhele 'Āina—some grantees received awards, others did not. The land came from the Crown and Government inventory of lands in four ali`i (Lanaichc.org).

Palapala Sila Nui Helu 3029
Nahuina & Keliihue

Parcel 2. In the ili of Kaumalapau, in the Ahupuaa of Kamoku.

Beginning at the Northeastern corner of this parcel and running to the:

North 52 ¾ º West 415 links along Government;
North 44º West 2144 links along Malulu; South 32 ½ º West 4664 links along Malulu;
South 43º East 2320 links along Government; North 29º East 2540 links along the Ili of Pueo; North 43º East 2200 links along the Ili of Pueo; To the corner of commencement.

Containing 103 58/100 Acres.

[John Richardson]
Waikapu.
Nov. 1855. [Maly, translator]

Bureau of Conveyance Documents/Kamoku, Lāna`i

January 26, 1875
Ahsee & Akuna; to Walter M. Gibson; Bill of Sale
Conveying sheep pasturing on Ahupuaa of Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 41, pages 194-195

January 26, 1875
Ahsee; to Walter M. Gibson, Assignment of Lease
Conveying Government Lease on Ahupuaa of Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 41, pages 195-196

July 5, 1875
William L. Moeohaua, Minister of Interior; to Walter M. Gibson; Lease
Covering the Ahupuaa of Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 43, pages 255-258

January 1, 1878
John O. Dominis, Agent, Crown Lands Estate; to Walter M. Gibson; Lease
(Terms of 20 years)
Covering the Ahupuaa of Kamoku and Kalulu
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 52, pages 475-478

June 13, 1879
M. Makalaha, Guardian of Kauikai an underage minor; to Walter M. Gibson; Lease
Covering Lands in Kamoku, Kalulu and Kaunolu
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 59 pages 499-500

December 19, 1890
Commissioners of Crown Lands; to F.H. Hayselden Lease No. 167

25 Year Lease on the Ahupuaa of Kamoku and Paomai, Lanai
Carried over from Leasehold Agreements dated Sept. 30, 1874 & Jan. 1, 1878.
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 128, pages 276-279

January 24, 1891
Fred. H. Hayselden; to Bishop & Co. Additional Security
Covering the Crown Lands of Kamoku and Paomai
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 121, pages 329-330

June 5, 1896
Kamala, Kaimuwai & Mele; to Kahalau and Kumu; Deed
Conveying a portion of the land in Land Commission Award No. 6833 at Kamoku and Kalulu
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 158, pages 451-452

November 1, 1899
Kanai; to S. Kaahoolahalahale; Deed
Conveying undivided interest in Royal Patent Grant No. 3029 of Nahuina and Keliihue at Kalulu (and Kamoku)
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 203, pages 33-34

November 21, 1899
Kekahai; to Kahuamakapulani; to Kahalau and Kumu; Deed
Conveying undivided interest in RP Grant No. 3029 of Nahuina and Keliihue at Kalulu (and Kamoku)
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 203, pages 34-35

September 12, 1902
F.H. Hayselden; to J.F. Colburn Assignment of Lease
Transferring lease of Crown Lands of Kamoku and Paomai (terms: 1890 to termination of lease)
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 240, pages 159-160

May 15, 1903
Estate of Walter Murray Gibson; to Charles Gay; Agreement
Agreement pertaining to the Crown lands of Kamoku and Paomai
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 245, pages 346-348

September 18, 1913
Ida Weedon (widow); to Lanai Company, Limited; Deed
Conveying half Royal Patent Grant No. 3029, to Nahuina & Keliihue, in Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 378, pages 391-392

March 15, 1920
Ida Weedon (widow); to Lanai Company, Limited; Deed
Conveying half Royal Patent Grant No. 3029, to Nahuina & Keliihue, in Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 550, pages 133-137

(See release of mortgage in Liber 689, page 33)

June 10, 1924
Elikapeka Kauhai (widow); to Henry Peters; Deed
Conveying the parcels of lands and the Improvements thereon at Lalakoa to Bishop & Co.
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 729, pages 411-412

June 12, 1924
Henry Peters, & wife, Sarah Peters; to Marmoon M. Mageon; Deed
Conveying Royal Patent Grant No. 3029, at Kalulu and Kamoku
Bureau of Conveyances – Liber 720, pages 427-428
Missionary Influences in Lāna'i.

From the time they landed in Hawai'i in 1820, the missionaries had a profound effect on the people and culture here. They quickly connected with the ali'i who later provided them with lands to build their mission stations and churches. They soon had mission stations in most rural areas including isolated Lāna'i. The following excerpts are from Napoka (In Bucy & Asso 1989:195).

By 1875 Gibson had control, either through lease or direct ownership, of nine-tenths of Lāna'i's lands. This was the first time since the occupation of Lāna'i by humans that power was consolidated this way. In the traditional system, land managers, or konohiki, existed for all ahupua'a land divisions of which Lāna'i had thirteen. These konohiki were subject to control by the ruling chiefs. Because of the poor rural nature of Lāna'i, the ruling chief probably had very little to do with Lāna'i's other than occasional fishing trips and collecting yearly tribute.

In 1874, Gibson's daughter Talula married Frederick Hayselden. Talula and her husband eventually moved permanently to Lāna'i, where Fred took over as proprietor of ranch operations, which were shifted from the Pālālai Basin to Kāele in 1874. Kāele remained the center for Lāna'i ranching activities on Lāna'i until the closing of the Lāna'i Ranch in 1951.

By 1898, there were 50,000 sheep and only 174 people on the island involved with a struggle for autonomy on Lāna'i between himself and the Elders of the Mormon Church. Land that Gibson purchased on Lāna'i was purchased in his name and he was excommunicated. After Gibson's dismissal from the church, most of the Mormons on Lāna'i moved to Laie, Oahu to start a new center for Mormon operations. A Mormon temple was eventually built in Laie, which is now the center for Mormon activities in the Pacific.

The Ranching Era on Lāna'i. The following is from Napoka (In Bucy & Asso. 1989:195-197):

By 1865 the Mormon colony had disappeared from the island, but Gibson remained, and during this time he established the Lāna'i Ranch. Deciding that grazing was more profitable than agriculture, he began to consolidate most of the lands into one large sheep ranch. Although Hawaiians had herded goats prior to Gibson's arrival, Gibson was the first to launch a large scale business venture using goats and sheep. In January 3, 1867, census report he counted the sheep population to be 10,000 and the goats 18,000.

The introduction of free grazing livestock in large numbers took its toll on Lanai. Within a brief period of time the entire dryland forest area, with a few exceptions in the Kanepu'u area, was decimated. Initially, there was an abundant land cover of grasses, especially the native pill grass that supplied the goats and sheep with their needs. During frequent drought periods the free-roaming animals would cluster on the eastern slopes of Lāna'i where there was available water. The large numbers of livestock grazing in this area eventually denuded the land and gave it the desert-like appearance that it has today.

In 1876, Gibson realized that Lāna'i was being denuded at a "fearful rate." (Advertiser:9/10/1946). One of Gibson's nephews, Mr. Moorehead, started planting Bermuda grass over all the northwestern end of the island to reclaim barren land. But, over the next 35 years, Lāna'i was primarily left to ravaging herds of sheep and goats.

In 1878 a manager's house for the Hayseldens was built at Kāele where the first two Japanese men and two women to carry on daily activities (Thurston:1886:30). Hawaiians were usually employed just for shearing. Although this house was destroyed, one of the two pineys still stands to mark this site today.

In January 1888, he died in San Francisco, leaving all of his interest in the island of Lāna'i to his daughter, Talula, and his husband, Frederick Hayselden. In 1880, Gibson's house in the Pālālai Basin was still standing (Gay, Lawrence, K.: 865:8). This area was later cleared and plowed for the cultivation of pineapples.

During Hayselden's period (1888-1902) on Lāna'i, Kōʻeʻe became a permanent sheep ranch center for Lāna'i. By 1898, there were 50,000 sheep and only 174 people on the island (Tabrah:1976:79). Attempts were made to control the rampant erosion on the island by planting thousands of acres of Bermuda grass. The eucalyptus and Norfolk pine at Kōʻeʻe were also planted at this time. Water reservoirs at Kōʻeʻe and Kāholelani Gulch were also built.
Past Oral Histories.

Since the time of Emory's expedition [1921], only one attempt was made to collect the oral traditions of Lāna'i - a survey conducted by the Bishop Museum in 1963. At the present time there are 13 hours of indexed, but not transcribed, interviews in the sound archives at the Bishop Museum. When these recordings are transcribed and made accessible to the public they could add to our understanding of the early traditional history of Lāna'i. These recordings may provide critical information since most of Lāna'i's knowledgeable informants have passed away. Today, we have a sketchy and incomplete picture of the pre-contact occupation of Lāna'i's (Nāpapa In Bucy & Ass. 1989:184).

Lāna'i Ranch: The People of Kō'ele and Keomuku Center for Oral History-UHM (2010)

In 1861 the approximately 600 native Hawaiians living on Lāna'i were joined by Walter Murray Gibson and other followers of the Mormon Church who arrived to start a settlement on land they had purchased. Three years later, Gibson was excommunicated for allegedly misusing church funds and he consolidated 26,000 acres of land to form Lāna'i's Sheep Ranch.

After Gibson's death in 1888, the ranch was turned over to his daughter and son-in-law, Talula and Frederick Hayselden. Charles Gay purchased the properties in 1902. He subsequently sold all but 600 acres of his lands in 1910 to a hui (association) of businessmen who formed Lāna'i Ranch Company.

These interviews contain detailed descriptions of the day-to-day work and lifestyles of cowboys, their spouses and children, and other Lāna'i Ranch residents.

“I came over here, I learn cowboy. I work with the cowboys. The cowboys, most, they talk Hawaiian. Then I learn from them.” —Ernest Richardson

Documented are agricultural activities, ranging from Charles Gay’s pioneering attempts to grow pineapples commercially prior to the purchase of Lāna'i by Hawaiian Pineapple Company in 1922, to the cultivation of watermelons by Keomuku families for shipment and sale to Maui, to the planting of pumpkins and sweet potatoes for home use.

Interviewees talk about fishing and hunting which enabled Lāna'i's native Hawaiians to maintain a near-subsistence lifestyle.

“The reef, coming more shallow. Way back, those days, we used to go down there, the water was kind of deep, way up, you know. . . So get big kind fish, small kind. Way up on shore, eh . . . You just go and they throw (nets). Almost everyone take home for eat, you know, just for the house only, and for down there.” —William Kwon, Sr.

The lives and accomplishments of former ranch managers Charles Gay, George Munro, and Ernest Vredenberg, and the changes each brought about in the lives of ranch workers and residents are also recalled. Interviewees remember when Munro, who took over in 1911, sent cowboys to plant hundreds of Norfolk Island pine trees to improve the ground-water supply. The trees are now Lāna'i's landmarks.

“I was always a bit in awe of Mr. Munro even though I liked him and I would say he was a kind man, but he could be strict. One day I was naughty and broke off the top of a Norfolk pine so I had to go and apologize to him and that was very difficult. Because it seems that if you break off the top of Norfolk pine, it stunts the tree, the growth of the tree.” —Jean Adams

Interviewees look back on Hawaiian Pineapple Company’s purchase of Lāna'i and the subsequent establishment of its pineapple plantation. Ranch residents, particularly women and students, found jobs in the pineapple fields and worked alongside newly hired Japanese and Filipinos from other islands.

“But about 1950, when they closed, there’s only two more families up there . . . The only two was working was (Ernest Keliikuli) and my dad (Ernest Richardson). The rest of them all already started to work for the company—truck driver—into the pineapple. They phased into the pineapple company.” —Charlotte Holsumback

In 1961 Castle & Cooke, Inc. acquired 100 percent direct ownership of Hawaiian Pineapple Company. Castle & Cooke’s recent construction of a luxury hotel on the former site of Lāna'i Ranch generates bittersweet reactions from interviewees. Some see this as a positive step toward diversifying the island’s one-dimensional pineapple economy. Others view it as a threat to the island’s environment and its close-knit society characterized by unlocked doors and friendly greetings.

“That’s all we can hope for is the best. I hope our island is not exploited, too, you know. . . I think of her as a person, I don’t think of her as an island. If you take care of them, they take care of you. And that’s how Lāna'i has been to me. She’s always been there for us when we really needed her.” —Elaine Kaopuiki
Previous Archaeological Surveys and Other Studies.


Except for recent research at Kalaehi (Graves: 1987:UH Field School) and Manele-Hulopoe (Kaschko and Athens:1987) the only major archaeological survey of the island was conducted over a six month period in 1912 by Kenneth Emory, who was employed by the Bishop Museum. Emory’s inventory was field checked and updated for the State Historic Preservation Office by Rob Hommon in 1974. Except for Niihau, Lāna’i is probably the least studied Hawaiian island from the perspective of archaeology. Future research will no doubt shed more light on life on pre-contact Lāna’i.

The wide variety of artifacts found on Lāna’i reflect a culture almost identical to that which existed on the other Hawaiian islands. This traditional society lacked metallurgy as well as pottery. All implements for living were made from wood, coral, bone, or volcanic stone. The stone alignments and structures which are the most visible prehistoric remnants on Lāna’i today were the foundations of structures in the Hawaiian village. Houses made of grasses fastened to a wooden framework stood on these platforms.


According to James (2001:150-161), there are many ancient sites on the island (twenty-three petroglyph sites, more than ten large heiau, numerous small shrines or ko‘a, house and burial sites, several fishpond ruins and ancient trails), but only a few are accessible. He briefly describes one ancient village, one shrine, some petroglyph sites, a cultural landscape, and a fishpond in his book. None of the sites are in the Kamoku project area. However, two miles southeast of Lāna‘i City on the lower slopes of Lāna‘ihale, on the edge of the Pālāwai Basin are the Luahiwa (sacred black pit) Petroglyphs – 400 images carved on twenty boulders; and a rain heiau. The site is on the boundary between Kealaniapenu and Kealilikapu ahupua‘a. Hawai‘itans once grew sweet potatoes in the Pālāwai Basin, but in the early twentieth century it was the largest pineapple plantation in the world. The petroglyphs here depict the most variety on the island from ancient triangular figures to some post-contact images.

A few miles south of Lāna‘i City lies the ancient village of Kaunolū, a once-active fishing settlement abandoned over a hundred years ago. It was made famous in early historic times as a favorite recreation location for Kamehameha I. Archaeological surveys conducted in 1921 and 1991 recorded 86 house platforms, 35 rock shelters, 30 detached enclosures, a canoe house, a fishing shrine and several petroglyphs including the legendary birdman images [boulders at Kukui Point have many more of these birdman images].
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ETHNOGRAPHIC DATA AND ANALYSIS

The Ethnographic Survey (oral history interview) is an essential part of the Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) because the ethnographic data helps in the process of determining if an undertaking or development project will have an adverse impact on cultural properties and practices or access to cultural properties and practices. The following are initial selection criteria:

- Had/has Ties to Project Location(s)
- Known Hawaiian Cultural Resource Person
- Known Hawaiian Traditional Practitioner
- Referred By Other People

The consultants for this Cultural Impact Assessment were selected because they met the following criteria: (1) grew up, lives or lived in Līlā'i; (2) consultant is familiar with the history and mo'olelo of Līlā'i and/or Kamoku and vicinity; (3) consultant is a cultural practitioner of the area; or a resident of the area; or knows the history of the area. Copies of signed “Consent/Release” forms are provided [Appendix E and F].

In order to comply with the scope of work for this cultural impact assessment (CIA), the ethnographic survey was designed so that information from the ethnographic consultants would facilitate in determining if any cultural resources or practices or access to them would be impacted by the Līlā'i City Expansion project. To this end the following basic research categories or themes were incorporated into the ethnographic instrument: Consultant Background, Land Resources and Use, Water Resources and Use, Cultural Resources and Use; Anecdotal Stories and Project Concerns. Except for the 'Consultant Background' category, all the other research categories have sub-categories or sub-themes that were developed based on the ethnographic raw data (oral histories) or responses of the ethnographic consultants. These responses or clusters of information then become supporting evidence for any determinations made regarding impacts on cultural resources and/or practices including access.

Each person interviewed is asked to talk about their background; where they were born and raised, where they went to school and worked, and a little about their parents and grandparents. This category helps to establish their connection to the project area, their area and extent of expertise, and how they acquired their proficiency. In other words, how they meet the selection criteria. Ethnographic consultants either have family or personal ties to the project vicinity and/or are familiar with the history of the area.

There is always a danger of not allowing the consultant’s “voice” to be heard; of making interpretations that are not theirs; and of asking leading questions. To remedy this, the “talk story” method is used and allows for a dialogue to take place, thereby allowing the consultant to talk about a general topic in their own specific way, with their own specific words. All of the excerpts used are in the exact words of each consultant or paraphrased to insert words that are “understood” or to link sentences that were brought up as connected afterthoughts or related additions spoken elsewhere in the interview.

The following Table 2 is designed to provide a demographic view of the ethnographic consultants and how they met the selection criteria. The selected categories are name, year of birth, general ethnicity, connection to project area, where they were born and raised, where they currently live, and general area of expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Connection to Project Area</th>
<th>Birthplace Raised</th>
<th>Reside</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta de Jetley</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>Pt. Hawn</td>
<td>Historian/News</td>
<td>Moloka'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Her</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Work Cultural Practitioner</td>
<td>Kealaakea</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genji Miyamoto</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Work Water Expert Farmer</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Morita</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Pt. Hawn</td>
<td>DLNR-FW Historian</td>
<td>Moloka'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Osako</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Historian Archaeologist</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
<td>Līlā'i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consultant Backgrounds. The following “Consultant Background” section provides an overview of the ethnographic consultant, as well as information about their families, their relationship to Kamoku and/or Līlā'i. These vignettes are presented in alphabetical order of interviewee names.

Alberta (Morita) De Jetley. My name is Alberta de Jetley, maiden name is Morita, my family moved to Līlā'i in 1951 when my father, Richard Morita, was hired by the Territory of Hawai'i, Land and Natural Resources, and he became the Island's Game Warden in 1951. My mother was Anita Morita, she was a housewife, and when we came to Līlā'i, she, like all of the other ladies of that time and generation worked for the plantation as summer employment, as field laborers. I think she did it until she was around 60 years old.

I went to school at Līlā'i High and Elementary school and graduated in 1963. After I graduated from high school I moved to O'ahu I went to University of Hawai'i for the semester and was asked to leave after the semester because I never went to class. I was too busy riding horses, gallivanting around in Mānoa Valley, where the supermarkets are now. We had horses all up into that valley. After that semester I was asked to leave and never come back. I was living with an older sister who was working at St. Francis Hospital; I had to look for a job. I was offered a job, and to this day my biggest regret of my life - Elmer Carvalho was Speaker of the House at that time, and I was offered a job in his office as a runner. This was before fax machine and e-mails, as a runner, Legislative Aide, we delivered papers and we did the copies, you were a glorified errand girl. But at the same time, I was offered a job as a dental assistant and sister told me I had to take the job as a dental assistant because the Legislative session was only for a few months and I would be job-less. And to this day I've regretted the opportunity to work with Elmer Carvalho. He was an amazing man. I worked as a dental assistant for about six months, until I couldn't stand it anymore. I eventually ended up working in Waikākī and I used to like telling people I was a street walker, because I worked for a company that passed out travel brochures to all the travel agents. So, in addition to taking reservations in our office I got to walk up and down Kalākaua Avenue delivering pamphlets to all the different travel desks so I was a street walker and it was really fun. One of our accounts was Kaua'i Helicopters, that's where I first met Kingie Kimball (Richard King "Kingie" Kimball) who was the owner of the Halekūlani, his family. With Kaua'i Helicopters I went to Kaua'i and did the flying around on helicopters, I also went to Maui to look at the hotels that we represented there and one of the hotels was the Royal Lahaina Hotel and that's where I met my husband Tony (De Jetley), he was the General Manager, I went to work on the Big Island; I worked for a while at Mauna Kea, at the Naniloa Hotel at Hilo, and then I returned to O'ahu. When I lived on O'ahu I used to go horseback riding at Tongg Ranch in 'Ewa. Rudy Tongg owned the ranch and I used to go out and play cowboys with them and go out and ride Polo ponies. Through the Tongg connection, I went to work at Aloha Airlines, I was a ground hostess and Aloha Airlines; they were one of the major owners of Aloha Airlines. When I worked at Contact and met Kingie Kimball the first time, he had horses and I rode all over O'ahu because I was, in those days, a very experienced rider. People who had horses to exercise, they wanted company so they would call me and ask if I wanted to go riding. So I started going to Lā'i where the Kimball's had a weekend place and where they kept the horses, and I'd go riding with Kingie every Wednesday.
afternoon. He asked my boss if it was all right to go with him up to Lāna‘i to go riding. He was a fabulous man, really kind, very nice man. I did a lot, mainly connected through horses. We [Tony] both knew Kingie Kimball at different times, and it was Kingie who recommended Tony for the Hāna job and that’s how we ended up there...1968 until 1981. After Tony died, I moved to Lāna‘i because I had Hotel Lāna‘i there and worked there until 1984 when I sold my lease.

I have lived on the Big Island of Hawai‘i and also on Maui where I made my home from 1968 until 1996. Over the years I’ve come and gone from Lāna‘i, beginning in 1980 when I had the lease for Hotel Lāna‘i, I sold my lease in 1984 and returned to Maui, and then I returned to Lāna‘i in 1986 to work for David Murdock when he became majority owner of the island. In my capacity working for Mr. Murdock, I did a community newsletter to let Lana‘i people and former Lanaians know what was going on with the development of the hotel. The main perspective of the newsletter was trying to encourage people who had grown up here and lived here previously to return to Lāna‘i to work in the resort. In 1996 I returned to Lāna‘i full time, I worked at Lāna‘i High and Elementary School as the Parent Community Networking Coordinator, I later went to work for Castle and Cooke at Lāna‘i Pines Sporting Place. In 2001 I started my own business, an 18-acre farm. I continue to run that farm today; it’s called Alberts’ Farm, and now it’s only seven acres. In 2005 I started a community newspaper of which I am the publisher and editor, it’s called Lāna‘i Today and we are a community newsletter which is paid for by advertisers; I encourage community development and community enterprises.

[NOTE: Besides being a farmer on Lāna‘i and the island newspaper publisher, editor and columnist, Ms. De Jetley is also the author of Lana‘i (Images of America) (2015) and has been interviewed several times (You Tube.)]

Photo 18. Ms. De Jetley leading site visit to project area and vicinity.

Roberto “Bob” Hera. My name is Roberto Hera, I came to Lāna‘i in 1937, when I was a couple of years old with my parents and my brother from Kaakalekua-Kona, Hawai‘i on the S.S. Humauma. My dad came over to start a new life with the pineapple industry… Florentino, my father was very respected in the Community. I don’t know if you’ve heard of the Filipino Federation of America? My dad was the branch manager and that was one of the other reasons why he came here was to head the branch of the Filipino Federation of America. There are Filipinos that had to have their own moral concept and believed in the United States, they are one of the organizations that outsold everybody in war bonds and they handled golf tournaments for school scholarships, they were big time, all the big wig would come from O‘ahu.

Besides working for the company… so he was well respected; respected by the community and involved with community affairs. They were involved in the building of the senior citizen program here and my mom was the one that started the ukulele group that goes to the hospital every Wednesday. Albert Motria is in charge now and they go and entertain. That’s when my mom (Marceline) got her first ukulele when she came to the island and worked at L&M. She and her gang of ladies brought the ukulele group up there to entertain. Both [parents from the Philippines] naturalized. My father was from Cebu and the mother was from Pangasinan it was one of those marriages that was not [accepted], her father disowned her because she married a Visayan and in those times Japanese were very strict about intermarriage, Chinese was the same thing.

I grew up here, graduated from high school here (1954), and I left to go to college, University of Hawai‘i, on O‘ahu. Agriculture. I did not graduate; I left college and joined the Army. That was 1955. I enlisted and got into aviation and was a mechanic in the Army-Aviation section. I took my basics in Monterey, California, and from there Texas, Edward Gary Air Force Base in San Marcos, Texas. I went to school there to learn the mechanics of the air planes. When I graduated I went to Junction City, Kansas, home of the First Infantry Division… I was an aircraft engineer on the U-1A military transport. We were in the Air Section at Marshall Air Field. There, we started on one of the new phases in the Army, Tactical Transport Aviation Company where the Army purchased 21 planes from the De Havilland Company in Canada. We converted them into Army transports. When the Company was formed we moved our planes to Mobile, Alabama, where we put them on an aircraft carrier, the SS Tripoli and we spent fourteen days through the Gulf and the Atlantic Ocean to land up in Bremerhaven located at northern part of Germany. We flew missions out of Desheim. I had an opportunity to see the World’s Fair in Brussels, Belgium, where they first displayed the Russian Space, where my tour was up, I flew back to New York, to San Francisco, the back to Hawaii where I got discharged. In 1958 I got into the building aspects of the building growth on O‘ahu. I started as a warehouse boy at the first City Mill Company on Nimitz and I worked myself up to Division Manager and I saw the growth of and the start of the ‘58 building boom in O‘ahu… It was Kingie who recommended Tony for the H/g407na job and that’s how we ended up there…1968 until 1981. In mid ’65 I decided to go back home to Lāna‘i. I went through a training program as a manager trainee for the Company. After the training program my first assignment was an administrative assistant to the Personnel Manager. At that time it was Yoshi Nagamine. I was involved with bringing in the seasonal workers. We spent a lot of time doing that in that area; I was handling the cafeteria and most of the indoctrination. So I got to know a lot of the people that came in and out. One familiar figure was the kicker for the Denver Broncos, he was one of the UH kickers. Elam [Jason Elam]. He was one of the seasonal supervisors at the time he was here. Teams came from St. Louis, Waiauam, Hilo, and Kahuku. I replaced him as representative from the island of Lāna‘i to OHAT at the Native Hawaiian Historical Council for four years. My next assignment was with the Ag Engineering Department/Utilities Department as a job supervisor. I was one of those that were instrumental in putting up the log cabins at Dole Park. It was a familiar place but it’s removed now. They have senior citizen and employee housing, there’s no baseball park there anymore. My second assignment was going to the Utility Department as a Supervisor, and construction of the drip water irrigation system. During the summer I’d go on loan to the Harvesting Department. I ran the harbor at one time, and I did the supervision for the Trucking Department. So I’ve done all phases of the pineapple from ground up, one of the few people that knows the pineapple operation from the bottom up. I stayed with the Utilities Department; I ended up there as a Superintendent with the Agriculture Engineering Department until my retirement (1990).

My interest during those years was hunting and fishing. My spouse and I had seven children to raise so I had to do a lot of fishing and hunting to feed them. Besides hunting and fishing, I had a lot of outdoor activities, including raising horses. I grew up with the Kaupu‘iki family, so I knew something about the culture. I was involved with Uncle Sol in different areas. We were involved with the Na Ala Hele; I still am. I’ve been with them for twenty-six years now. I’ve been involved as a hunter and education instructor in the ‘90s with Albert Motria. I played an active role in the community. I was the president of the Jaycee, FTA, and Chairman of the Advisory Commission to The Planning Department. I’ve been in the Grants Commission, involved in all the politics. I represented the Republican Party on the side of the political spectrum over here. On the Lāna‘i Community Association - I was president for many years trying to keep the organization together. Every year I did think of retirement, you have to look for new directors. With the help of Tamo Mizutanga - he was really involved with the committee -he and I put the Community Association together and it’s still going strong.

When I retired in the early ‘90s, my interest in the native forest really developed, kind of far back with Uncle Sol. The opportunity came when the Company gave the easement to the Nature Conservancy and they were looking for someone to run it. I applied for that job and did that until 1994. I got a notice from the Company that Murdock was looking for someone; they wanted me to come back and trouble-shoot for the Facilities Department. I was familiar with some of the operations, because I was with the Utilities Department. I went back as a Facilities Director, I got through that and got everything in order and got the accounts paid. I didn’t want to stay back to commute to O‘ahu. I’ve said you have experience as a superintendent for the water facilities and we want you to train somebody because the guy was leaving. So I did, somebody from the mainland, it took me three years, after I found the guy I was going back to retirement. So after five years of being with Castle and Cooke, and the Murdock people, I retired.

In 2005, there were some problems with the Lāna‘i operation. They were laying everybody off and were going to operate from Maui. What’s going to happen to Kāne‘pū‘u? Uncle Sol and I were concerned about what would happen to Kāne‘pū‘u. That would put Kāne‘pū‘u on the back burner. So we talked it over with ‘Iki ‘Aina president Tom Lenchanko, and try to do it ourselves. We got a contract with them under the ‘Iki ‘Aina banner. Uncle Sol and I were the two guys that started it and from there we picked up people. We got a better contract and since then we’ve done so many things over there that we can call it a success in what we started. I call our gang the Kāne‘pū‘u Warriors. I had people, like Uncle Sol who is now gone, I have two other plantation people, Marcos Eckaron and Ambrose Amanico that are gone and retired from working there. I have new people now working out there, it’s mostly voluntary status because mostly the contract is low budget operation, but we are proud of what we’ve done. We raised money for...
expenses putting up fences, developed interpretive trails, one for Uncle Sol which is now open to the public. Our self-guided trail is open twenty-four seven, adjacent to Keahiakawelo. So we have the Preserve that is very accessible, and you are knowledgeable. There are a lot of people that are not aware of the native dryland forest. We have your own cultural treasure right here.

Genji Miyamoto. [NOTE: Unfortunately Mr. Miyamoto was not available for a face-to-face interview, but agreed to speak briefly on the telephone. However, due to technical difficulties the conversation was not recorded and notes were sparse because of other issues. The following are bullet points from the conversation]

- Father brought the family to Lāna‘i to work in the fields
- Genji became a Surveyor and Geneticist of pineapple
- Worked in the whole plantation...testing pineapple in 1940's-1950's
- Worked the Company until 70 years old.

On Lāna‘i I lived at various places. When we first moved here we lived in Caldwell Avenue, that was just temporary and later we moved to Kāʻele, that’s where the Lodge is located now. About that time the Ranch just closed down and the homes were available, the Division of Fish and Games got that area for the base yard and homes for their two employees, my father and William Kwon who was the neighbor, they both worked for Fish and Games. My father was a Game Warden in charge of all the fish and game on the island. He wasn’t the one that made the rules; he was the one that enforced them. My dad was a hunter too and I grew up hunting from about 12 years old, the minimum age then was 12 years old.

I went to Lāna‘i High School, so Kindergarten to 12 (graduated 1968), and after that UH Manoa. I was in the Agriculture Program, animal science, and animal technologies. After I graduated I came back to Lāna‘i in the Fall of ‘72. Lāna‘i was starting to get together a development plan, there were two companies. Lāna‘i Company, a part of Castle and Cooke, and I think the land side was Oceanic Properties, and they were responsible for the general plan for development. The other side doing the day to day maintenance of the island was Kāʻele Company, another subsidiary. Actually I worked on both sides. My first job when I came back was in a plant nursery and doing beach maintenance, Hulopo‘e Beach. Then later doing anything they had to do, eventually after that company folded up, I went to Dole for a year 1976 or so. In 1977 I got a position with Land and Natural Resources as a Conservation Officer; I retired about nine years ago from that position (2007). I have been Board President of Lāna‘i Culture & Heritage Center and a Board Member and Docent of LCHC for several years. [Photo 26. Albert checking out old Google maps of Lāna‘i City].

Warren Osako. I was born and raised in Lāna‘i City, 1946. I went to school here until eighth grade, and I went to Honolulu and attended Mid Pacific…my older brother went there too. My dad decided I should go there, at first I didn’t want to go. Pretty much after that I moved around a little bit, went to California for a short while to go to college and I didn’t like it, came back and started at UH (Anthropology major). Being that I bailed out of California I couldn’t ask my parents for assistance, so I had to work and go to school in-between so it took me kind of long…. I did not do much because at that time there were very few (archaeology) jobs… I was more into Archaeology when I was going to school. I did a couple of summer projects with some of the professors. I did one summer on the Big Island with Dave Tuggle and the next summer I worked Kaua’i with Patrick McCoy. I know some of the Bishop Museum people too. I kind of lost contact a little bit. When I actually got my degree it was pretty much Bishop Museum and by then I got married and grad school was out of the question. Anthropology and the Grad Department, the guys actually lived at the school.

I actually left for a while, was in the Army, and after I came back I started working for United Airlines, was almost a summer job and I’d go to school the rest of the year, pretty much minimum full time, twelve credits and off and on. (In the Army) I went to military language school in Monterey, but they put me in Korea, after training I spent two years in Korea until I got out of the Army. This was in the ‘60s. For making a living I worked at United Airlines as a flight attendant, mainly. That’s why it was almost like a summer job, got laid off and I went back to school and went back to work the next summer. When I actually finished I got a long layoff so I worked for them on the ground and went to school for the day, it was better because I had the GI Bill, that helped pay for expenses. I lived in Kona for about ten years and commuted, and I moved back to Lāna‘i’s and commuted, it got really hard commuting from here because of the airlines situation. When Island Air was a part of Aloha we had privileges and when it got sold there was a period of time we didn’t get flying privileges so I was paying full fare to commute.

My father was Yoshikazu Osako…he worked for the plantation, originally from the Big Island, that’s how they got workers; the pineapple plantation paid more than the sugar plantation. My father moved here, a couple of my uncles moved here, one on my father’s side and one on my mother’s side. My father developed a relationship with the haole managers, I remember when my dad passed away we still got Christmas cards from the mainland from retired haole managers. I guess the old days, the bank manager was with Bishop, now it’s First Hawaiian, and they had good
relations with him. The first time they (parents) went to the mainland they visited them; they had built some kind of relationship. I think he (my father) actually got a GED - high school diploma, he was the oldest son in his family so he had to go to work when he was fairly young to help the family. They came from Honoka’a, Paauhau, that part of the island. My mother was Mitsui Yamato Osako...she was from the same area; they were married before coming here. She was a housewife, but I remember she used to work for some of the other managers like housekeeping and eventually she worked at the post office. There were four of us, I wouldn’t consider that being large but getting close to.

I’m retired now, since 2004. Since then I’ve worked with them here [LCHC]...I’ve been on the Board for five or six years. And I worked on a couple of archeological projects with Cultural Surveys, actually worked with them a couple of weeks on Maui and got tired of living out of a suitcase.

Land Resources and Use. Land resources and use changes over time. Evidence of these changes is often documented in archival records. Cultural remains are also often evident on the landscape and/or beneath the surface and provide information regarding land resources and use. However, oral histories can give personal glimpses of how the land was utilized over time and where the resources are or may have been. The sub-categories below are developed based on the responses of people interviewed.

Lāna‘i Flora and Fauna

Did you get the Munro book too? That’s a good one. George Munro wrote “The story of Lanai,” the original is out of print already but it was privately published and it’s available for purchase, they sell it at the Four Season’s Gift Shop, everything looks the same except it’s slightly smaller. The original is beautiful, George Munro was the Ranch Manager for Lāna‘i, and he was the one that planted all these trees. Everything, the island was made, it had no vegetation. [Because of] goats and sheep. He was the one who started taking care of the land and started to reforest so all the trees you see on the mountains, it’s was all his work. His son and grandson took his field notes and compiled this book. The son and grandson are on O‘ahu, RM Towill Corporation, that’s them [De Jetley].

At that time [my father was Game Warden], the main ones were game birds, feral goats and deer. Later, in that period of the early 50s, mid 50s, Mouflon Sheep were introduced, which is right now more than huntable population. Also one introduction of that period was Pronghorn Antelope - those eventually died out. Axis deer, same one from Molokai, in fact the Lāna‘i herd came from Molokai originally [Morita].

Most common [game bird] was Chinese Ring-necked Pheasant, also the Blue Pheasant, it was rare. The two interbred so we called it a Hapa, it might have a faint ring. The Ring-necked has a nice white ring around the neck and the Hapa’s wouldn’t be as distinct, they have more of the blue coloring. The Blue Pheasant was prized for the feather lei, the hat leis. Another popular bird at that time was Chukkar Partridge, the doves, later the Gray Francolins, Rio Grande Turkeys, lot of them right around the City, and Erckel Francolin [Morita].

The Ranch was everything outside of the pineapple fields, prior to the pineapple plantation the whole island was the Ranch, they tried to fence off the forest area trying to protect the forest. The best grazing lands would become the [pineapple] plantation. The Piliwai Basin and the North West Basin, they took the best lands and the ranch was pushed out to the surrounding areas, which were not as good and eventually decided that losing money and not doing the land any good, they decided in the ’50s to close it down [Morita].
Just prior to Dole buying the island, was the Baldwin family, Frank and Harry Baldwin, just about 1921 when they sold to Dole. Gay was a little bit before, up until the early 1900s, 1906 or so. They lost their holdings, the major part of their holdings, in 1909. They still stayed until the '20s, with smaller portions. After Hawaiian Pine bought the major part of the island they still continued the Ranch for at least another thirty years, and the closed down about 1951. When Mr. Murdock bought into Lana‘i he started cattle again but eventually that too stopped [Morita].

They still have the stables up there, they still do rides. The whole island was a ranch, pretty huge about the largest in the state about 89,000 acres. They had corrals in all the different sections, I missed all of that. This is just before we came (looking at Kōʻele photo), this is circa 1951, maybe the following year we were in this area, and this was our playground. Used to camp right in this building, the milk shed and the blacksmith shop and these corrals were still up. This was the Richardson home; this was the school building, which was the one they moved down to 9th Street. At least fifteen homes, here’s the present, they kept the reservoir and this building again is one they moved. It was quite a Ranch [Morita].

We came in 1951, when I was growing up until 1963, the community was predominantly Oriental and over the years I've seen it go from predominantly Oriental to predominantly Filipino. I was a very close society. Everybody did the same thing, we were all supposed to be the same. How do I say it? Everybody did the same thing; if you were different you weren't really accepted [De Jetley].

So in those days as soon as you turned 15 you went to work in the pineapple fields. If you didn’t go to work in the pineapple fields when you became of age, you were considered a lazy good for nothing. So everybody went to work in the pineapple fields. On my 15 birthday, I went to the company office and signed up and the next day I was working with an old lady gang out in the field. For the summer help, they usually kept all the teenagers together with a luna, a field supervisor, usually somebody experienced with working with teenagers, and we basically did hoo-hana, which is pull weeds or later they put us into harvesting, so we went out and picked pineapple. Because I came in July 6th, which is in the middle of the season I had to go work with a group of old ladies until the following day when I was assigned to a teenage gang. Working in the pineapple fields was really boring and everybody was expected to do the same thing, you did what the luna told you to do and as long as you were living and breathing you weren’t expected to think, so it was very, very boring [De Jetley].

[Teenager’s Dream in Lana‘i] Get out of Dodge! Leave town, go to Honolulu [De Jetley].

We played, organized activities, Little League Baseball, Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts, hiking and camping, horses, we always had horses. As I got older I did more hunting, other sports, high school activities. One that I had in AG Program in school, caring for the animals after school hours, chickens I mostly had. We had FFA. That was a good part, I’m kind of sad, shortly after that they started to phase it out, which I think was a mistake, and now they are saying maybe we should have it again.

Well you guys had it before; the feeling at the time was college prep. It’s good to be more well-rounded, it handy skills to have and it was a great program. I think most of the schools had because we were so rural. Once year we would travel to the FFA convention, there was also travel for sports, basketball and baseball [Morita].

We were pretty busy; in summer time everybody of age would work the fields. The bulk of the summer labor was from outside, high school and anyone else that they could recruit. They [outsiders] were the enemy because when they come all the wahines [go for the] new guys. It was strict competition, mostly guys; if any females came it would be with family. I can’t remember any females coming, mostly high school boys coming as a group, a school. One of the schools that used to come was Kahuku, this would be a summer camp to start their training. There were fights, I didn’t. Anytime you have an influx of different groups coming there’s going to be friction [Morita].

There were several places where they would stay. I recall before they had a lot of dormitories built they stayed in school buildings. I remember that Kindergarten and First Grade Buildings, I remember they even built a bathroom for them. Later Dole started to build more dormitories around town, and they placed the boys in there. Around 1968 or so, they built where the Hale Kupuna building is and the apartments across the service station what was called the log cabin dormitories; they had the dorm and cafeteria. By then, they were recruiting in the mainland, I think the group was called YDE Enterprises, I think they were associated with the Mormon Church and they’d bring them in for the summer. Every now and then we have some come and visit the Center (Lana‘i’s Culture & Heritage Center), and their childhood working places [Morita].

(Growing up) I thought it was good; obviously I have a bond that’s why I came back. I think it’s different now; I think we didn’t have too much, I remember there were times our family didn’t have a car. You noticed if you drive around the old parts the streets are narrow, people didn’t have cars and a lot of them didn’t have a garage space, especially the older parts... plantation buildings were right down there so everybody just walked [Osako].
When I moved [back] here I was just shocked at these events where nobody had coolers and Hāna everybody sits on the wall with their [beer] coolers and here, you come to these big events nobody has coolers. But we do have crime. There’s gambling, and a lot of domestic violence [De Jetley].

In their planning commission, they did a community plan, when they started the plantation they were visionary, even though it was lower income they had parks in town, a basketball court, a little play area and now they are slowly disappearing, which I thought was good because they had open spaces here and there in town, which really you need. Where I live right on Lāna‘i Avenue, across from where those apartment buildings are and that whole area now which is the senior housing, County Hale Kupuna and supposedly low income rentals things. That used to be a park, that whole area used to be a park, they see money, granted that was the previous owners. I can see that they want those things in town, they start taking up the open spaces. When I was growing up that was where the baseball games were and all kinds of things like that, people don’t realize. When they started the Pop Warner thing, they said this is the first time they had football on Lāna‘i, they don’t know they had football before, they had barefoot football [Osako].

Culturally they have the resort area homes, it’s like a separation. Down Mānele and up Ke‘ele, it’s more high-end stuff and there is quite a bit of separation. And there are people that mingle but a lot of them are, you know in Hawai‘i we say high maka maka. So something like this tends to concentrate the low income people in one place and you know you starting to make more of a class structure. When I was growing up, up the hill was ‘Haole Camp’ starting right up here, above the hospital, because it was mostly the managers and stuff but as time went on, the local people [lived there too].

When we were kids that was ‘Haole Camp’ the group of luxury resort homeowners. That’s why they call it homeowners. I’m a homeowner too. There is a little bit of class kind of thing happening; I think. I don’t know if that’s Larry Ellison, it started with the previous owner. I don’t know if Larry Ellison feels something like that or whether he’s personally involved too much with what happens here. I had friends who were really sensitive about that [plantation ethnic separation], but I wasn’t, my parents were more open in a way, my father was a luna. Japanese custom, New Year’s they always made food and everybody came and had a drink and ate and all the haole managers came [Osako].

I live in town. Back in 1989, Mr. Murdock did this project, he had a 350 plantation houses that he owned. He wanted to see what would happen if he sold them to people, so he did a lottery where they selected between 12 and 17 families. You had to be renting the house, you couldn’t say I want that house or that house, you had to occupy the house and it had to be a company owned house. If you qualified and your name was drawn, you could buy your house. The houses were appraised for more than the market price so it gave people a cushion. As part of the sale if you had iron [corrugated] roof fencing, it had to be removed, you had to landscape your yard, and bring the building up to code, so the plumbing and electrical had to be fixed. You had to fix the post and piers under the house, tent for termites, and your house had to be painted. Because of the way it was structured, every time you finished a job you got to cash out, the funds were held in escrow for you as you completed it. You could do most of the work yourself, but you had to get a licensed plumber and electrician. That was the only thing that had to come out of pocket so that was great, I bought my house for $50,000.00 [De Jetley].

Project Area

It’s beyond the 9th Street extension. [pointing to a map] Coming down this way is the garden area, to about here. It looks like the subdivision would be above the garden area, here’s the power house and the gardens would probably be here, roughly. So the top North East and North section of the gardens is part of the proposed subdivision [Morita].

The main tree in the [project area] is Iron Wood trees, introduced. I don’t think there were any native trees in there. Other introduced weed in there is Christmas Berry, the grass was Cane Grass, I can’t recall any other trees. Oh there were kukui trees, I remember my father going to get some, it was next to the power house; he would get some to make inamona [Morita].

Photos 38-40. Ironwood trees, Kukui nut tree, Lāna‘i’s old Power Plant and deteriorating house in project area.

Some of those buildings were originally at Keomoku, I don’t know which ones, when they started the ranch then they moved them up. Had the old school building that was falling down they moved it down there and left it. Below [the Iron Woods], sort of about the level of where the old power plant was, right off the road, it’s all bushes and everything... falling down and they weren’t doing anything so people were taking the iron roofing and stuff. I guess sometimes they don’t see any value [Osako].

Pretty much that lower area [was pineapple fields], the other thing is the old power plant is in that area too. I guess as the town grew they decided to move it away. I always thought they could rehab the building and use it for something; the tendency is to let everything [deteriorate] [Osako].

[NOTE: The following photos are of LCHC photos and of Google maps.]

Photo 41. Historic aerial of pineapple fields and Lanai City. (From LCHC)

Photo 42. Google map of historic school, (arrow) Kukui tree (arrow) and Power House (arrow)

These two buildings, they are still down there but they were moved there. This was near the school and was used for Boy Scouts. They moved it when they did the parking lot and Rec Center; this building was the old school house. In this photograph it was the school, in that photograph I understand it was near the hotel, right about in here. Those days they moved buildings all over the place, later they moved it to this location and the John Richardson family lived there, when they built the hotel they moved it to where it is now and sadly it is beyond salvage. Yes [historic] - it’s right off 9th Street, you can hardly see it, it’s across the baseball field. This is kind of interesting to see what’s...
inside there, might be some gardens or shack. Grass has grown really thick in there now; this was thirteen years ago in 2003 (Looking at Google Earth image from 2003) [Morita].

The rest of this area is still vacant land, and some people had gardens in there. This is 9th Street extension, right in here is where the Quonset hut is, this is vacant hill side area. One gentleman over here, he was in the police department, Celedonio Asuncion, his house is right across the street, and he raised goats in a lot down here. Some of his fence might still be there, historic properties, right alongside the road just below the church, adjacent to the parking lot. Here’s the Power House, again vacant lot, some people had horses here, not many, maybe one or two [Morita].

[Below the vacant lot was] pineapple fields. Right about from this road, this is the old Power House and below is the pineapple fields. I cannot remember any of the families who may have had gardens in here, probably people from across the street. Like every other neighborhood with children, that’s the children’s playground too, kind of overgrown forested area. After you e-mailed me I went down there on a Sunday, just to go look around and try to remember what was down there and sure enough had kids in there, so I went there to talk story. They were hacking on the trees. “What you guys doing?” “We making a club house.” I was thinking that was great, many generations, that area, how many generations of kids playing there. I’m always happy to see that because today you always see kids playing computer games, kind of nice just to see them build a club house. I was thinking it’s going to be a subdivision soon and maybe one of those boys could have a chance to get a house in there [Morita].

But it’s been tough, because like some of the old houses, the theatre and three houses, they boarded them up and it got to a point where they didn’t do anything and it became too badly deteriorated to save. I keep reminding them that there are two down here and the company owns and one of them is boarded up now and no effort made to, those were some of the first houses built by the pineapple plantation [Osako].

Not [familiar] in detail but just in looking at the map of the [project] area, our DLNR office was right up in the corner next to the church. In fact we had two different offices; right where the Jehovah Witness Kingdom Hall is, is where my first office where I worked, that’s torn down now. That building was previously the Research and Experimental Office (for Dole), next to it was a Quonset hut type building, which we moved into, now that’s the present office [pointing to a map]. Its right here, it’s still there next to the church [Morita].

Below was semi-industrial, I think the gas company had storage there...had some other stuff where they are slowly going out of use. Down below was original pineapple field. This upper part, once you get past Fraser, then it slopes down pretty steeply. There’s not much there [Osako].

Photos 43-45. Previous pineapple fields now overgrown or in other use.

Community Gardens.

Did you see them? It’s bad, it’s really, really bad, and it’s a shambles. The majority of the people down there are raising cocks; fighting chickens is illegal. I said I’d take you down there, but everybody knows me. But if you drove down there by yourself, you’d get stink eye and you would have someone stopping you to say “What are you doing here?” “What are you looking for?” They need a real community garden where people are actually growing food for their families. They said they’d relocate it [De Jetley].

Photos 46-54. Selected photos of sections of Lanai City Community Gardens.

In talking with other people, had chicken fight in there too [near Ironwood tree area], cultural practice. I don’t remember chicken fights being in there but after I thought about it, they went hide right. They aren’t going to be out in the open and it was well hidden. Probably started off as a Filipino thing but a lot of ethnicities were attracted to it and it may have involved a wide range of cultures. And more recently, further down, there’s community gardens in here and there too, I understand there is chicken fights in there too [Morita].

Looks like most of this and then this much, these are all community gardens. It looks like some will be displaced, this one is vacant lot. This is the County Yard, outside of project district, County Sewage Treatment Plant [Morita].
Company Nursery

Outside the fields are organic gardens; 3-4 places. The hotel needs vegetables and herbs; I planted what they wanted 3-4 yrs [Miyamoto].

Area is good...I did garden and I built the Green House – Nursery [Miyamoto].

Photos 58-60. Company Nursery area built by Mr. Miyamoto.

Photo 61. 2003 Google Map showing Project Area: Company Nursery and Community Gardens.

Lāna‘i City Expansion Area

It’s a 150 unit project, it’s long overdue because we are in severe housing crunch. I know people who are living in garages with their families, I know of families with three generations with 9to 12 people living in one house. I know a family camping outside of town in the bushes, there was a family of three camping for six months, there were families camping down the beach. Now you can’t camp at Hulopoe Beach Park for extended periods. For a while we had people going down there and camp all through the summer but now you have to break camp and leave - there’re all kinds of rules down there. You can’t be homeless down there now, but we’ve had homeless families go down the other side and live. I think, overall, basically the project is, I’ve written about it for Lynn, is for 150 units. Lāna‘i City Builders will be the general contractor. They will install all of the infrastructure in one swoop, but they are going to build the houses in increments, 51% will be affordable, 49% will be market. At the community meeting we had people asking if we were going to just sell to anybody, market is market and they’ll sell to whoever shows up with money, you don’t ask where they are from, and there is no way you can say Lāna‘i residence come first. I don’t believe that there will be that many buyers for it, 51% will be affordable but with the chart that they were passing around, it’s 20% down and 8% closing. If you look at the numbers, it’s between $30k and $40k to get in and with the economy on Lāna‘i right now, I doubt if any of the families that really need it can get in. Pulama is going to rent the units they don’t sell and that will be a good thing. Maybe they’ll start talking about rent to own [De Jetley].

It’s difficult here because they(Lāna‘i people) have nothing in place, once in a while, they just did an appliance pick up, we had our old air conditioning unit out there and they didn’t pick it up. [We have a dump] but they don’t accept stuff like that, like say recycling, you pay 6¢ per container, you can get back 5¢ but they won’t take bottles because it’s a contractor that does it. Because of the weight they are not going to make money, the state still collects the money for the container but you’ll not get your money back because of the glass [Osako].
Water Resources and Use. The Hawaiian word for fresh water is wai; the Hawaiian word for wealth is waia. This is because of the value the ancient Hawaiians placed on fresh water, which was crucial for growing taro, the staple of the Hawaiian people using the 'a'ena or irrigation system. Fresh water was also crucial in the lifecycle of stream inhabitants such as the 'opae, as well as some of the marine life that depended on the benefits of brackish water areas. Fresh water was valuable in other ways such as natural springs or ponds. Two of the ethnographic consultants worked in the water department for the pineapple company.

Company Water

Drainage Water (Mr. Genji Miyamoto)
- They should collect the rain water that goes down to ‘Mississippi’ to sewage system
- Below Ball Park a diversion ditch….I proposed; now the water goes down from the school to ‘Mississippi’ then water goes down to the ocean
- Propose water to go to Pālīwai Basin, below Housing area; drainage to Pālīwai Basin would save water
- Should save the water to Pālīwai Basin
- Golf Course water goes to the ocean instead should divert water to Pālīwai Basin; they said it costs money can’t do it.

Marine Resources and Use. The sea can be a great resource to people with access to its bounty. While Kamoku Ahupua’a was from the ocean to the uplands the interviewees did not mention any marine resources and uses. The project area is in Kamoku uplands.

Cultural Resources and Use. This category represents traditional Hawaiian cultural resources and practices and other ethnic resources and practices. The traditional Hawaiian cultural resources and practices, includes the pre-contact era, as well as cultural practices after contact. Cultural Resources can be the traditional wahi pana or sacred places, any cultural gathering place, or the tangible remains of the ancient past. One of the most significant traditional Hawaiian cultural resources is the heiau or place of worship. Other places of great significance for all cultures are the burial places of loved ones, dwelling places of deities and habitation sites of ali`i nui. The interviewees had very little to say in regards to what they considered cultural places and practices. All of them indicated there were no traditional cultural sites; a couple mentioned “cultural practices” such as chicken fighting and gathering kukui nuts.

Cultural Sites/Practices.
Not that I know of, except that part of the community gardens but they said they are going to give them space somewhere else, they didn’t say [Osako].
I don’t know any stories related to this particular area [Morita].
Power Plant area… no cultural practices [Miyamoto].

Project Concerns/Comments/Recommendations. This sub-category was created because interviewees are free to comment on the project as well as the project area.

Sewage Treatment Plant

It’s not so much cultural sites, you’ve seen the map. Of course this was all Dole Pineapple Plantation property at one time. The sewage treatment plant is right here so the Kona Winds, you’ll probably going to get the smell and this corner here, that’s where they did the chemical mixing for the plantation. The ground has changed a little bit, but then a lot of the water flow was down here, down here was the catchment basin towards the highway, the drainage was over there. I don’t know how bad contamination is…. I’m sure they did [test] but I don’t know. Well you know Mililani had heptachlor in the water for a while and that was from pineapple field chemicals, and you see right out there that the pineapple doesn’t grow really good without the chemicals [Osako].

So I’m hearing resistance to that lot, they want the lot from the 65 acres that Mr. Murdock put aside that was given to the County. The County is saying that the infrastructure is going to be too expensive to put in, although they have money put aside to put in the infrastructure. The numbers don’t come out, there are not enough qualified buyers. Although this project is adjacent to the town, it’s downside is that it will back up to the sewer treatment plant. Personally, I don’t think the sewer treatment plant is that much of a problem but I’ve heard comments that it will smell, especially on Kona wind days. If you get in on the first section, building closer to this side, you are going to be fine. If you sit around and wait for the perfect lot, it’s never going to happen [De Jetley].

Project Financing
I don’t know if you got this, they handed this out [brochure], and they did say that this project is two years out and these figures won’t be relevant at that point, that’s the HUD figures. It’s difficult because if you look at the figures, it’s 20% down payment, especially if they are families, it will be hard for them to make the down payment. It’s just because when we grew up and our situation, my wife and I both saved but you see the kids now they are young, they are driving all kind new trucks and cars [Osako].

It’s difficult raising funds and stuff. I think, that’s the part, of course then they said that if low income doesn’t sell they can rent them, it was a bad comment for her to say, “what, you want housing or don’t you”, because they need housing for their employees [Osako].

Affordable Housing and Rentals
I don’t know, personally although the infrastructure cost are going to be lower for them there, there’s probably a better site. When you keep making a separation like that of rich and poor you create problems anyway. I can see their reasoning, because basically its 51% and 49%, you can say half and half, half market and half low income and that covers a lot of costs because of the low income they can’t sell for very much and whatever they can’t sell it becomes rental. The County land was given by the previous owner and it was all low income, I think that’s what they were saying, plus the infrastructure costs for doing it out there [Osako].

Project Infrastructure
Yes, this area they don’t have [infrastructure like water, electricity] but it’s so close to everything. Sewage is no problem because it’s all downhill to the sewage and electricity and water is very close, got water all around up here and electricity. I can see that infrastructure cost are way lower than any place else. Sewage is the biggest thing. I don’t think water or electricity. Sewage from any place else, especially if you have to pump it, it becomes a cost. So close, it’s not a big problem [Osako].

Historic Properties
The power plant. I’m hoping nobody will stand up in a meeting and say this is a historical building and we need to save it. Because that’s what happened with the Richardson house, on the day it was scheduled to be demolished there was a court order stopping it. Then they put it up and moved it down there and they’ve been sitting there ever since. Another building that was moved there was deemed historically significant. Who’s going to pay for that? Who is going to do it? [De Jetley]
These two buildings, they are still down there but they were moved there. This was near the school and was used for Boy Scouts. They moved it when they did the parking lot and Rec Center; this building was the old school house. In this photograph it was the school, in that photograph I understand it was near the hotel, right about in here. Those days they moved buildings all over the place, later they moved it to this location and the John Richardson family lived there, when they built the hotel they moved it to where it is now and sadly it is beyond salvage. Yes [historic] - its right off 9th Street, you can hardly see it, it’s across the baseball field. This is kind of interesting to see what’s inside there, might be some gardens or shack. Grass has grown really thick in there now; this was thirteen years ago in 2003 (Looking at Google Earth image from 2003) [Morita].

We’ve heard one person say the power house should be looked at because it is a historical building, you know it was an industrial building. Probably [built] during the ‘50s, maybe earlier. That was the company’s generators were [De Jetley].

Photos 65-66. Row of Cook Pine trees munska of the Community Gardens

Native-Polynesian-Introduced Flora

The *kukui* is rubbish, they grow like weeds here. I have a *kukui* nut tree on my farm that is less than eight years and its more than 50 feet tall because it’s been left in its natural state just to grow, so it’s over 50 feet. If you go down to Central, there’s *kukui* nut they planted as landscaping trees, there’s rubbish all over the ground, and nobody picks the nuts. I actually, from my *kukui* nut tree, I sell it to this company called Luffer and they make bath oil and lotion from it and package it for Four Seasons. They’re in California. I send up there and they do it and my name is on the label under the ingredients. It’s called Aina. They sell them in these little bottles, it’s really, really nice. It’s made exclusively for Four Seasons Resorts Lanai [De Jetley].

Batching Plant

I didn’t go to the meeting. I didn’t really take a good look at this map, I was concerned about one area but it’s not on the project district according to this, and its right here. This area was a batching plant for the plantation, batching fertilizer, any time you have chemicals I wonder what it does to the soil. I was just telling my wife, “would you want to live in this area knowing what we do?” What was that subdivision in the mainland, Love Canal, being built on toxic sites with residents with problems? This is the area and I’m glad it’s not in the development area. Here’s a great photograph of the area, the batching plant is this Quonset hut here, and these are outside of the project district. Right in here up to 9th Street and coming down here - here’s the power plant. This photograph is, I believe in the ‘50s [Morita].

CIA SUMMARIES and ASSESSMENT

This cultural impact assessment (CIA) is based on two guiding documents: Act 50 and Environmental Council Guidelines (1997) [see Appendices A & C]. H.B. NO. 2895 H.D.1 was passed by the 20th Legislature and approved by the Governor on April 26, 2000 as Act 50. The following excerpts illustrate the intent and mandates of this Act:

The legislature also finds that native Hawaiian culture plays a vital role in preserving and advancing the unique quality of life and the “aloha spirit” in Hawai’i. Articles IX and XII of the state constitution, other state laws, and the courts of the State impose on government agencies a duty to promote and protect cultural beliefs, practices, and resources of native Hawaiians as well as other ethnic groups.

Moreover, the past failure to require native Hawaiian cultural impact assessments has resulted in the loss and destruction of many important cultural resources and has interfered with the exercise of native Hawaiian culture. The legislature further finds that due consideration of the effects of human activities on native Hawaiian culture and the exercise thereof is necessary to ensure the continued existence, development, and exercise of native Hawaiian culture.

The purpose of this Act is to: (1) Require that environmental impact statements include the disclosure of the effects of a proposed action on the cultural practices of the community and State; and (2) Amend the definition of “significant effect” to include adverse effects on cultural practices.

Summary of Findings

The following summaries are based on the information presented in the previous sections: the traditional (cultural) and historical literature background review and the ethnographic data and analyses. References are not cited unless it is new information and not already cited in the text above. These summaries condense the information above, but also serve to focus on a few significant individuals and events in history in relation to the project lands of Kamoku. It will give a broad overview of land, water and cultural resources and uses in the general area, as they reflect cultural resources (properties) and practices and access to them, as well as share the concerns and recommendations of the interviewees.

Summary of Significant People and Events:

No legendary/mythical entities or ali`i nui were directly connected to the project area, but two post-contact konohiki were mentioned in the literature. No Contact or Historic people were directly connected to the project area, other than in relation to lands used in the brief Mormon colonizing period, the ranching era, and the pineapple industry.

Summary of Land and Cultural Resources and Use of Project Area:

Various resource use patterns are often physically evident as well as recounted in the literature. The physical evidence remains in the form of landmarks, stone ruins that are fortunate to have been preserved relatively intact and cultural material remains (surface and sub-surface). Clues regarding function and use can sometimes be extrapolated from the stories, songs, chants and ethno-historical observations that were also fortunately recorded or passed on; and the continuing cultural practices of today’s people of Kamoku.

Ancient Use: There is no current evidence of ancient use in the project area although it can be assumed that it was once part of the ancient ahupua`a system.
The following Figure 10. illustrates a typical pattern of an ancient Hawaiian lifestyle from the ocean to the mountains (Minerbi 1999, slightly modified by Mueller-Dombois 2012); however, not all activities were carried out in every ahupua’a – a lot depended on the environment and natural resources.

Post-Contact/Historic Land Use:

- The project area was once part of the Lānaʻi Ranch lands;
- The project area was taken over by the pineapple industry which ended in 1992;
- There was a defunct Power Plant which was previously operating in a section of the project area; the derelict structure is still there;
- The Company Nursery and Community Gardens will be relocated;
- A kukui tree in the project area may have been harvested by an interviewee’s father-there is an interest in preserving it;
- There are two ‘historic’ structures that were relocated to the project area, but are currently neglected and in disrepair surrounded by overgrown vegetation;
- A row of historic Cook pine trees were planted as wind break and now mauka of the Community Gardens-there is an interest in preserving them.

Cultural Impact Assessment

According to the Environmental Council Guidelines, the types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, religious and spiritual customs. The following actions were taken to meet the EC Guidelines Criteria for conducting this cultural impact assessment based on the SOW:

1) **conduct historical and other culturally related documentary research**;

Documentary research, particularly on identifying traditional and cultural uses of the area, was completed. Much of what is known about the traditional and cultural uses of the area comes from written records that tell of its prehistory (e.g., ‘mo‘olelo; and 19th century ethnographic works); the stories associated with early coastal and upland area uses by early Hawaiians; and scientific studies (i.e., archaeological, botanical, geological, and biological).

2) **identify individuals with knowledge of the types of cultural resources, practices and beliefs found within the broad geographical area, e.g., district or ahupua’a; or with knowledge of the area potentially affected by the proposed action (e.g., past/current oral histories)**;

The project lands have been in continual use since ancient times, however, not in exclusive kanaka maoli use since Contact. The interviewees were selected because of their use and knowledge of the project area.

3) **identify and describe the cultural resources, practices and beliefs located within the potentially affected area**;

Archival research in the Cultural and Historical Background Review and ethnographic research (Ethnographic Data Review and Analysis) produces the data utilized to identify and describe the cultural resources, practices and beliefs located within the potentially affected area in the Summary of Findings above. There were no identified cultural resources or practices connected to the project area.

4) **and assess the impact of the proposed action on the cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified**.

Since there were no cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified in or connected to the proposed project area, there will not be any cultural impact. However, the following recommendations are suggested:

- Save the row of Cook Pines;
- If possible save the kuku tree.
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APPENDIX A
Act 50 SLH 2000
A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS
[UNOFFICIAL VERSION]
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H.B. NO. 2895 H.D.1
TWENTIETH LEGISLATURE, 2000
STATE OF HAWAI‘I
A BILL FOR AN ACT RELATING TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENTS. BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I:

SECTION 1. The legislature finds that there is a need to clarify that the preparation of environmental assessments or environmental impact statements should identify and address effects on Hawai‘i’s culture, and traditional and customary rights.

The legislature also finds that native Hawaiian cultural impacts assessment has resulted in the loss and destruction of many important cultural resources and has interfered with the exercise of native Hawaiian culture. The legislature further finds that due consideration of the effects of human activities on native Hawaiian culture and the exercise thereof is necessary to ensure the continued existence, development, and exercise of native Hawaiian culture.

The purpose of this Act is to: (1) Require that environmental impact statements include the disclosure of the effects of a proposed action on the cultural practices of the community and State; and (2) Amend the definition of "significant effect" to include adverse effects on cultural practices.

SECTION 2. Section 343-2, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes, is amended by amending the definitions of "environmental impact statement" or "statement" and "significant effect", to read as follows:

"Environmental impact statement" or "statement" means an informational document prepared in compliance with the rules adopted under section 343-6 and which discloses the environmental effects of a proposed action, effects of a proposed action on the economic [and] welfare, social welfare, and cultural practices of the community and State, effects of the economic activities arising out of the proposed action, measures proposed to minimize adverse effects, and alternatives to the action and their environmental effects.

The initial statement filed for public review shall be referred to as the draft statement and shall be distinguished from the final statement which is the document that has incorporated the public's comments and the responses to those comments. The final statement is the document that shall be evaluated for acceptability by the respective accepting authority.

"Significant effect" means the sum of effects on the quality of the environment, including actions that irrevocably commit a natural resource, curtail the range of beneficial uses of the environment, are contrary to the State’s environmental policies or long-term environmental goals as established by law, or adversely affect the economic [or] welfare, social welfare[.], or cultural practices of the community and State.

SECTION 3. Statutory material to be repealed is bracketed. New statutory material is underscored.

SECTION 4. This Act shall take effect upon its approval.

Approved by the Governor as Act 50 on April 26, 2000

APPENDIX B
Guidelines for Assessing Cultural Impacts
Adopted by the Environmental Council, State of Hawai‘i November 19, 1997

I. INTRODUCTION

It is the policy of the State of Hawai‘i under Chapter 343, HRS, to alert decision makers, through the environmental assessment process, about significant environmental effects which may result from the implementation of certain actions. An environmental assessment of cultural impacts gathers information about cultural practices and cultural features that may be affected by actions subject to Chapter 343, and promotes responsible decision making.

Articles IX and XII of the State Constitution, other state laws, and the courts of the state require government agencies to promote and preserve cultural beliefs, practices, and resources of native Hawai‘ians and other ethnic groups. Chapter 343 also requires environmental assessment of cultural resources, in determining the significance of a proposed project.

The Environmental Council encourages preparers of environmental assessments and environmental impact statements to analyze the impact of a proposed action on cultural practices and features associated with the project area. The Council provides the following methodology and content protocol as guidance for any assessment of a project that may significantly affect cultural resources.

II. CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

Cultural impacts differ from other types of impacts assessed in environmental assessments or environmental impact statements. A cultural impact assessment includes information relating to the practices and beliefs of a particular cultural or ethnic group or groups.

Such information may be obtained through scoping, community meetings, ethnographic interviews and oral histories. Information provided by knowledgeable informants, including traditional cultural practitioners, can be applied to the analysis of cultural impacts in conjunction with information concerning cultural practices and features obtained through consultation and from documentary research.

In scoping the cultural portion of an environmental assessment, the geographical extent of the inquiry should, in most instances, be greater than the area over which the proposed action will take place. This is to ensure that cultural practices which may not occur within the boundaries of the project area, but which may nonetheless be affected, are included in the assessment. Thus, for example, a proposed action that may not physically alter gathering practices, but may affect access to gathering areas would be included in the assessment. An ahupua’a is usually the appropriate geographical unit to begin an assessment of cultural impacts of a proposed action, particularly if it includes all of the types of cultural practices and features being assessed. The types of cultural practices and beliefs subject to assessment may include subsistence, commercial, residential, agricultural, access-related, recreational, and religious and spiritual customs.

The types of cultural resources subject to assessment may include traditional cultural properties or other types of historic sites, both manmade and natural, including submerged cultural resources, which support such cultural practices and beliefs.
The Environmental Council recommends that preparers of assessments analyzing cultural impacts adopt the following protocol:

1. identify and consult with individuals and organizations with expertise concerning the types of cultural resources, practices and beliefs found within the broad geographical area, e.g., district or ahupua'a;
2. identify and consult with individuals and organizations with knowledge of the area potentially affected by the proposed action;
3. receive information from or conduct ethnographic interviews and oral histories with persons having knowledge of the potentially affected area;
4. conduct ethnographic, historical, anthropological, sociological, and other culturally related documentary research;
5. identify and describe the cultural resources, practices and beliefs located within the potentially affected area; and
6. assess the impact of the proposed action, alternatives to the proposed action, and mitigation measures, on the cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified.

Interviews and oral histories with knowledgeable individuals may be recorded, if consent is given, and field visits by preparers accompanied by informants are encouraged. Persons interviewed should be afforded an opportunity to review the record of the interview, and consent to publish the record should be obtained whenever possible. For example, the precise location of human burials are likely to be withheld from a cultural impact assessment, but it is important that the document identify the impact a project would have on the burials. At times an informant may provide information only on the condition that it remain in confidence. The wishes of the informant should be respected.

Primary source materials reviewed and analyzed may include, as appropriate: Māhele, land court, census and tax records, including testimonies; vital statistics records; family histories and genealogies; previously published or recorded ethnographic interviews and oral histories; community studies, old maps and photographs; and other archival documents, including correspondence, newspaper or almanac articles, and visitor journals. Secondary source materials such as historical, sociological, and anthropological texts, manuscripts, and similar materials, published and unpublished, should also be consulted. Other materials which should be examined include prior land use proposals, decisions, and rulings which pertain to the study area.

III. CULTURAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT CONTENTS

In addition to the content requirements for environmental assessments and environmental impact statements, which are set out in HAR §§ 11-200-10 and 16 through 18, the portion of the assessment concerning cultural impacts should address, but not necessarily be limited to, the following matters:

1. A discussion of the methods applied and results of consultation with individuals and organizations identified by the preparer as being familiar with cultural practices and features associated with the project area, including any constraints or limitations which might have affected the quality of the information obtained.
2. A description of methods adopted by the preparer to identify, locate, and select the persons interviewed, including a discussion of the level of effort undertaken.

3. Ethnographic and oral history interview procedures, including the circumstances under which the interviews were conducted, and any constraints or limitations which might have affected the quality of the information obtained.
4. Biographical information concerning the individuals and organizations consulted, their particular expertise, and their historical and genealogical relationship to the project area, as well as information concerning the persons submitting information or interviewed, their particular knowledge and cultural expertise, if any, and their historical and genealogical relationship to the project area.
5. A discussion concerning historical and cultural source materials consulted, the institutions and repositories searched, and the level of effort undertaken. This discussion should include, if appropriate, the particular perspective of the authors, any opposing views, and any other relevant constraints, limitations or biases.
6. A discussion concerning the cultural resources, practices and beliefs identified, and, for resources and practices, their location within the broad geographical area in which the proposed action is located, as well as their direct or indirect significance or connection to the project site.
7. A discussion concerning the nature of the cultural practices and beliefs, and the significance of the cultural resources within the project area, affected directly or indirectly by the proposed project.
8. An explanation of confidential information that has been withheld from public disclosure in the assessment.
9. A discussion concerning any conflicting information in regard to identified cultural resources, practices and beliefs.
10. An analysis of the potential effect of any proposed physical alteration on cultural resources, practices or beliefs; the potential of the proposed action to isolate cultural resources, practices or beliefs from their setting; and the potential of the proposed action to introduce elements which may alter the setting in which cultural practices take place.
11. A bibliography of references, and attached records of interviews which were allowed to be disclosed.

The inclusion of this information will help make environmental assessments and environmental impact statements complete and meet the requirements of Chapter 343, HRS. If you have any questions, please call 586-4185.
APPENDIX C

Agreement to Participate in Ethnographic Survey

Project Title: Lāna'i City Expansion CIA
by Pālama Lāna'i - Lāna'i City, Lāhaina District, Lāna'i

Interviewer: Maria “Kaimi” Orr, M.A.
Kaimipono Consulting Services, LLC
(808) 375-3317  kaimi@lava.net

You are being asked to participate in an ethnographic survey conducted by an independent interviewer from Kaimipono Consulting Services LLC (KCS) contracted by T.S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologist, Inc. to prepare a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) as part of an environmental compliance document prepared by them. The interviewer will explain the purpose of this CIA, the procedures to be used, the potential benefits and possible risks of participating. You may ask the interviewer any question(s) in order to help you to understand the process. If you then decide to participate, please sign on the second page of this form. You will be given a copy of this form.

I. Nature and Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this ethnographic survey is to gather information about the project area through interviews with individuals who are knowledgeable about the area and/or about the history of this area. The objective of this survey is to provide ethnographic data for the CIA report.

II. Explanation of Procedures
After you have voluntarily agreed to participate and have signed the consent page, the interviewer will record your interview and have it transcribed later. The interviewer may also need to take notes and/or ask you to spell or clarify terms or names that are unclear.

III. Discomforts and Risks
Foreseeable discomforts and/or risks may include, but are not limited to the following: having to talk loudly for the recorder; being recorded and/or interviewed; providing information that may be used in a report; knowing that the information you give may conflict with information from others; your uncompensated dedication of time; possible miscommunication or misunderstanding in the transcribing of information; loss of privacy; and worry that your comment(s) may not be understood in the same way you understand them. It is not possible to identify all potential risks.

IV. Benefits
This survey will give you the opportunity to express your thoughts/knowledge (mana'o), which will be listened to and shared; your knowledge may be instrumental in the preservation of significant historic information.

V. Confidentiality
Your rights of privacy, confidentiality and/or anonymity will be protected if you so desire. You may request, for example, that your name and/or sex not be mentioned in write-ups, such as field notes, on recorder, on files (disk or folders), drafts, reports, and future works.; or you may request that some of the information you provide remain “off-the-record.” In order to ensure protection of your privacy, confidentiality and/or anonymity, you should immediately advise the interviewer of your desires. The interviewer will ask you to specify the method of protection, and note it on this form below.

VI. Refusal/Withdrawal
You may, at any time during the interview process, chose to not participate any further and ask the interviewer to erase the interview. Please note that you will be given an opportunity to review your transcript, and to revise or delete any part of the interview.

VII. Waiver

Part I: Agreement to Participate
I, ________________________, understand that Maria “Kaimi” Orr, an independent interviewer contracted by T.S. Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologist, Inc. will be conducting oral history interviews with individuals knowledgeable about Lāna'i City Expansion development area. The oral history interviews are being conducted in order to collect information of the area.

I understand I will be provided the opportunity to review my interview to ensure that it accurately depicts what I meant to say. I also understand that if I don’t return the revised transcripts after two weeks from date of receipt, my signature below will indicate my release of information for the CIA report. I also understand that I will still have the opportunity to make revisions during the draft review process.

_____ I am willing to participate.

Signature Date
Print Name Phone
Address
ZipCode
Email Address

MAHALO NUI LOA!
Part II: Personal Release of Interview Records

I, _______________________, have been interviewed by Maria “Kaimi” Orr of Kaimipono Consulting Services LLC, an independent interviewer contracted by T.S. Dye & Colleagues Archaeologist, Inc. I have reviewed the transcripts of digital recordings of the interview and agree that said documentation is complete and accurate except for those matters specifically set forth below the heading “CLARIFICATION OR CORRECTIONS” below.

CLARIFICATION OR CORRECTIONS:

I further agree that Kaimipono Consulting Services LLC, T.S. Dye & Colleagues Archaeologist, Inc. and Pūlama Lāna‘i may use and release my identity and other interview information, both oral and written, for the purpose of using such information in a report to be made public, subject to my specific objections, to release as set forth below:

SPECIFIC CONDITIONS TO RELEASE OF INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT:

_________________________________________________ ____________________________
Email address

MAHALO NUI LOA!

APPENDIX D
Ethnographic Basic Research Instrument for Oral History Interviews

This research instrument includes basic information as well as research categories which will be asked in the form of open primary questions which allow the individual interviewed (Consultant) to answer in the manner he/she is most comfortable. Secondary or follow-up questions are asked based on what the Consultant has said and/or to clarify what was said. The idea is to have an interview based on a “talk-story” form of sharing information. Questions will NOT be asked in an interrogation style/method, NOR will they necessarily be asked in the order presented below. This research instrument is merely a guide for the investigator and simply reflects general categories of information sought in a semi-structured format. Questions will be asked more directly when necessary.

The Consultants were selected because they met one or more of the following criteria:

- Had/has Ties to Project Area/Vicinity
- Known Hawaiian Cultural Resource Person
- Known Hawaiian Traditional Practitioner
- Referred By Other Cultural Resource People
- Referred By Other People (e.g. Staff, Client)

[NOTE: This part of the interview, #1-4 is mutual sharing and rapport building. Most of the information for research categories “Consultant Background” and “Consultant Demographics” come from this section, but not exclusively.]

1. To start please tell me about yourself…Name? Where/When you were born and raised?

[This information can be addressed in a couple of ways. After the investigator first turns on the recorder, the following information will be recorded: Day/Date/Time/Place of Interview; Name of Consultant (if authorized by Consultant; Name of Investigator. Questions: Have you read the Agreement-To-Participate? Do you have any questions before we begin? Will you please sign the Consent Page. The investigator will explain again the purpose of the interview.

The investigator will then ask the Consultant to “Please tell me about yourself-- when/where were you born? Where did you grow up? Where did you go to school?” This general compound question allows the Consultant to share as much or as little as he/she wants without any pressure. Most of the information for #1 may already be known to the investigator.]

2. History: Your ‘ohana/family background; Hawaiian connection (if any)?

[Much of the information for questions #2, 3, and 4 usually comes from the answer to Question #1. If it does not, then these questions will be asked. The answers in this section usually establish how the Consultant meets the criteria; how the Consultant developed his/her information base, etc.]

3. Youth: Where lived? Grew up? [This may have been answered in #1]

4. Schooling? Where? When? [This may have been answered in #1]
5. Can you tell me what you know about the lands of Project Area? Kamoku?

[NOTE: Generally when people share information about a specific topic/place, they usually state where their information came from. If it isn’t volunteered, it is asked as a follow-up question(s). A map of the project area should be available to confirm that investigator and consultant are talking about the same place. Photos would also help if a field trip is not possible. The best scenario would be to be “on-site” at some part of the interview…although this is not always practical.]

6. What are your recollections and/or personal experiences of this area?

7. Do you know any stories/legends/songs/chants associated with these areas?

[NOTE: Possible follow-up questions:
  * How are you or your family connected to the project area?
  * What year(s) were you and/or your family associated with these lands?
  * What was this place/area called when you were growing up? When you were working here?
  * Can you describe what the area looked like—what kinds of natural and/or man made things?
  * To your knowledge what kind of activities took place in this location?
  * Do you know of any traditional gathering of plants, etc in the area?
  * Please describe any other land/water use? Resources?
  * What was the historic land use? Agriculture? Habitation? Dwellings? Ranching?
  * Have map ready for marking.
  * Do you know about any burials in the project area?
  * Do you know of any cultural sites in the project area or vicinity?

8. Is there anyone you know who can also tell me about the project area?

[NOTE: Usually in the course of the interview, Consultants suggest other people to interview.]

9. As soon as this interview is transcribed I will send you two sets. Please review your transcripts and make any corrections and/or additions, then sign both copies of the Release Forms thereby allowing the information to be used by the investigator, T.S.Dye & Colleagues, Archaeologists Inc. and Piliana Līkāhā. Then mail one set back in the enclosed stamped-addressed envelope. [If available email is also utilized]

10. If your revised transcript is not returned within two weeks of date of receipt, it will be assumed that you are in concurrence with the transcript material and your information will then be incorporated into CIA, EA or EIS draft reports. However, you can still make changes during the draft review process.

**MAHALO NUI LOA**
VI. Refusal/Withdrawal

You may, at any time during the interview process, chose to not participate any further and ask the interviewer to cease the interview. Please note that you will be given an opportunity to review your transcript and to revise or delete any part of the interview.

VII. Waiver

Part I: Agreement to Participate

I understand that Maria "Kami" Orr, an independent interviewer contracted by T.S. Day & Colleagues Archaeologists, Inc., will be conducting oral history interviews with individuals knowledgeable about Liloa’s City Expansion development area. The oral history interviews are being conducted in order to collect information of the area.

I understand that I will be provided the opportunity to review my interview to ensure that it accurately depicts what I meant to say. I also understand that if I don’t return the revised transcript after two weeks from date of receipt, my signature below will indicate my release of information for the CIA report. I also understand that I will still have the opportunity to make revisions during the draft review process.

________________________
I am willing to participate.

Date: 8/10/12

Signature: [Signature]

Print Name: (Sign)_deJetty

Address: P.O. Box 630601
Liloa, HI 96703

Email Address: liloa@todayyahoo.com

Email Address: liloa@todayahoo.com

MAHALO NUI LOA!
VII. Refusal/Withdrawal
You may, at any time during the interview process, choose not to participate any further and ask the interviewer to cease the interview. Please note that you will be given an opportunity to review your transcript, and to revise or delete any part of the interview.

VII. Waiver

Part I: Agreement to Participate

I, _____ [Name], understand that Marie "Kaeo" O'Keefe, an independent interviewer contracted by T.S. Dye & Colleagues Archaeologists, Inc. will be conducting oral history interviews with individuals knowledgeable about Lihue City Expansion development area. The oral history interviews are being conducted in order to collect information of the area.

I understand I will be provided the opportunity to review my interview to ensure that it accurately depicts what I meant to say. I also understand that if I don't return the revised transcript after two weeks from date of receipt, my signature below will indicate my release of information for the CCA report. I also understand that I will still have the opportunity to make revisions during the draft review process.

☐ I am willing to participate.

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ________

Print Name: __________________________ Phone: __________________________

Address: __________________________ Zip Code: ________

Email Address: __________________________

MAHALO NUI LOA!

Part II: Agreement to Participate

I, _____ [Name], understand that Marie "Kaeo" O'Keefe, an independent interviewer contracted by T.S. Dye & Colleagues Archaeologists, Inc. will be conducting oral history interviews with individuals knowledgeable about Lihue City Expansion development area. The oral history interviews are being conducted in order to collect information of the area.

I understand I will be provided the opportunity to review my interview to ensure that it accurately depicts what I meant to say. I also understand that if I don't return the revised transcript after two weeks from date of receipt, my signature below will indicate my release of information for the CCA report. I also understand that I will still have the opportunity to make revisions during the draft review process.

☐ I am willing to participate.

Signature: __________________________ Date: ________

Print Name: __________________________ Phone: __________________________

Address: __________________________ Zip Code: ________

Email Address: __________________________

MAHALO NUI LOA!
APPENDIX F
Release Statements

Email Release

Alberta Morita
August 23, 2016

Hi Mia,

Attached is the transcript with my revisions and notes/comments highlighted in blue. Deletions are strike-through and additions are underlined.

By this email, I give Mia Orr, Kaimipono Consulting Services LLC, T.S. Dye Associates and Pulama Lanai permission to use information from the interview conducted with me on August 10, 2016 at the Lanai Culture & Heritage Center, Lanai.

Aloha, Albert

wmosako@gmail.com
August 31, 2016

Warren Osako

I give Mia Orr, T.S. Dye Associates, and Pulama Lāna‘i permission to use the information in this transcript.

Kaimi I did a few minor changes in the transcript, mostly spelling. I’m not the most savvy computer person so I couldn’t get the changes to come out in blue. Sorry.

Verbal Release:

Alberta De Jetly
Roberto Hera