Mary Kawena Pukui explained this ‘ōlelo no‘eau to mean “parents should be cared for, for when they are gone, there are none to replace them.” To Hawaiians, Mākua Valley in Wai‘anae represents our parents; Mākua is a kinolau or physical body form of the parents of all Hawaiians. This chapter identifies Mākua as a particularly sacred place, or wahi pana, the protection of Mākua remains as of vital import to Native Hawaiians as the protection and caring for our human parents. The first part of this chapter looks at the ecocolonization of Mākua valley; the second half of this chapter looks at the impacts of ecocolonization on mākua (parents) and Hawaiian families. This chapter emphasizes the familial relationship between Hawaiians and the land by drawing parallels between how the separation from the people from their kūpuna `āina (ancestral land) is akin to separating the Hawaiian family unit.
The army occupation of this valley and the resulting destruction of it stands as one of the best representative examples of American ecocolonization of Native land and natural resources. The occupation and desecration of Mākua is both a physical and spiritual offense against the residing indigenous people of this land. Mākua provides the best example of the conflict between Wai‘anae as a pu‘uhonua and the western coveting of these places. Nowhere in Wai‘anae is the effort to identify our sacred places more vocal; nowhere is the neglect of this voice more apparent.

Nā Mo‘olelo o Mākua: The Native Histories of Mākua

Mākua’s rich history extends back as many as thirty-five generations, as early as the 8th century. All of the Wai‘anae region is renowned for its chiefs and military history, as explained in the previous chapter.

In addition to its distinguished pre-contact history regarding its rulers or ali‘i, Mākua houses a rich spiritual history that reflects its deep significance to the Hawaiian people. Even today, as one stands in the valley, hō‘ailona appear regularly to those who help mālama Mākua. Whether in the form of clouds and timely winds (called makani, a Hawaiian word also meaning ghost or spirit), or images that appear in the mountains or valley floor, signs or hō‘ailona serve as telling reminders of the powerful spirituality of Mākua.

Before beginning to describe some of the kapu or sacred figures that blessed the valley with their presences in the valley, one must first understand the role of spirituality in the Hawaiian culture. Like with most indigenous cultures, Hawaiians bother little to distinguish between empirical or observable knowledge and spiritual knowledge. What was spiritual was just as, if not more, real than what was empirical. And as such,
moʻolelo or traditional stories, often are comprised of both empirical and spiritual elements. Therefore, while some may discount the most fantastic elements of Hawaiian stories as discountable legends, these stories more likely represent real accounts of events that transpired and were simply preserved in narrative forms that reflect the epistemology or knowledge system of pre-contact Hawaiians.

Knowledge is sacred to Hawaiians. Unlike the western world that believes anything can be learned, Hawaiians understood that knowledge was a gift, for with knowledge came great responsibility. Those who speak for Hawaiians should have `ike because they will know how to pass on this knowledge. One element critical to this knowledge is localized experience.

Our land speaks to us, through its health and through its wounds. As kamaʻāina and hoaʻāina, being on the `āina, engaging with her and experiencing all she shared with us is essential to the process of becoming knowledgeable. Our experiences are our most important forms of education. Through experiences we learn. Once we experience, we must communicate in native ways. We must speak through traditional mediums so we may engender the experiences of others.

In The Other Side of Silence, Urvashi Butalia speaks courageously and candidly about history and memory. In her study of the Partition she observes of her methodology:

Oral history is methodological tool that many feminist historians have found enormously empowering. Looking at women’s narratives and testimonies, and placing them alongside, or indeed against, the official discourses of history, has offered feminist historians a new and different way of looking at history. How does ‘history’ look when seen through the eyes of women? How does it evolve, in narratives and testimonies, when women talk to women?
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This project developed straight from this reasoning. How does history (and place) look through the eyes of Hawaiians? How does it evolve, in narrative and testimonies (and in legends and mele), when Hawaiians speak with each other? Does ancient Wai`anae exist outside the memories of her Native residents? Who is she in their language? Who is she in long passed tongues?

It is necessary to speak loudly against objectification, isolation, over-simplification, and degradation. I find great solace in the writings of other women who resist silence, such as Gloria Anzaldúa who writes:

There is a rebel in me – the Shadow-Beast. It is a part of me that refuses to take orders from outside authorities. It refuses to take orders from my conscious will, it threatens the sovereignty of my rulership. It is that part of me that hates constraints of any kind, even those self-imposed. At the least hint of limitation on my time or space by others, it kicks out with both feet. Bolts.4

Those in academia are obligated to lead this rebellion. We are obligated to ourselves, our students, our people. In our shows of resistance, we empower others to do the same. To awaken their Shadow-Beasts. To let them roam free.

Hence, in part, my decision to use the term “ecocolonization” to define what occurs here. As discussed later, many will find the term problematic. I turn to a section from Daisy Hernandex and Bushra Rehman’s Colonize This! Young Women of Color on Today’s Feminisms as an analogy of how I made my decision:

After many late night talks, we chose the title of Cristina Tzintzún’s essay for this book in order to acknowledge how the stories of women and colonization are intimately tied. But when we first sat down to write this introduction and looked in the dictionary, we found that colonize means “to create a settlement.” It sounds so simple and peaceful. We rewrote the definition. To colonize is “to strip a people of their culture, language, land, family structure, who they are as a person and as a people.” Ironically, the dictionary helped us better articulate the meaning of this book. It reminded us that it’s important for women of color to write. We can’t have someone else defining our lives or our feminisms.5
Indigenous people cannot have someone else defining our lives or our native identities. It is our obligation to articulate the sufferings we witness and experience. It is our obligation to rewrite the discourses that oppress us. It is our right to define things as we see them and feel them.

We have been ravaged by ecocolonization…

Wai`anae is a pu`uhonua…

I cannot fully explain all the things I know; Mākua is a particularly appropriate place about which to have this discussion considering its spirituality. Perhaps it is the knowing of my own Shadow-Beasts, one built of mo`okū`auhau and a lifetime of wonderful experiences. I know only that there are unsettled murmurs lying just beneath my consciousness. And on rare and blessed occasion, there is clarity. It comes only from letting go. As Nainoa Thompson has explained:

“This was one of the more powerful experiences I’ve had on the canoe – one of those special moments when you step out of the bounds of your normal – outside your normal existence into another place,”…

“When you go into the doldrums, that area near the equator called the max cloud line, it’s the cloudiest place on earth. You are blind as a navigator – you can’t see heavenly bodies.” …

“Mau said, very profound, I’ll never forget this: ‘Don’t look with your eyes, look inside.’ He said, this is how you stand, this is how you feel the canoe as the waves pass through. To read the ocean waves, that’s hard. That’s when you step from science to art.”

“I just feared the doldrums. I didn’t know how in the world I was going to get through this band of clouds, because I didn’t have the skill to navigate without seeing the starts and the sun. I come from science and math; I had overtrained in studying the stars and celestial stuff. I didn’t have the time to study the waves with Mau. I just didn’t have time.” …

“And I wasn’t mature enough to tell the crew: I don’t know. So I faked it and hit it, and I was trying to read the ocean waves in all this rain and in all this changing
wind. I was a wreck. I was pacing around. I was getting very intense, looking for things you couldn’t see.”

“Mau was with me, but I couldn’t talk to him. That was the agreement. I knew if he had to step in, it would have taken away from his success as a teacher. If I succeeded in navigation, he succeeded as a teacher. It would be his honor, if, when he sailed with me, he would never have to say anything to me, and I know that, I never wanted him to have to correct me.”

“It was getting very intense and I was extremely tired. I was so exhausted, I turned to the rain and I locked my elbows on the rail and tried to get rest standing up. In doing that, in all this rain and all this could, I felt this really warm sensation and my mind got very clear. And I could feel the moon. I knew the moon was up, but I didn’t know where it was because I couldn’t see it. But somehow I could tell the direction.”

“In the fatigue, my best guess is that you let go. Like Mau says: ‘Don’t look with your eyes. Let that go. Look inside to find the answers.’ At that point, when I leaned on my elbows, I was really giving up. And in giving up, it was like letting go, and letting go allowed this other experience.”

“I turned to Buddy [the steersman] and I said: ‘Go this way.’ A lot of confidence, not knowing why. I know, but I didn’t know how I knew. We kept sailing and sailing and I could track the moon in my mind.”

“Then there was like a gift – a hole opened up in the sky and the moon was right there.”

Thompson’s experience reflects a transcendental knowing that some Hawaiians embrace. This knowing extends beyond our actions and into the very natures of who we are.

Therefore, when we deny our “mo`okū`auhau consciousness,” we deny more than an understanding of our history and culture, we deny ourselves. We deny ourselves life as Hawaiians. And the struggles we assume must not to force academia; they must be for ourselves. When we become conscious of our whakapapa, when we seek `ike, we discover our Native tongue – anything becomes possible. I can compare it only to a passage from Anne Howe’s Shell Shaker:

When it happens for the first time, it’s like discovering you’ve been speaking with a borrowed tongue. You think the words are yours but, in fact, they’re someone
else’s. Long before humans learned to clothe their feelings in words, love was a rhythm that two people shared. Once in sync, it was not ever necessary to ever speak of it. Rarely do Indians say “love” to a partner they way whites do. It is a rhythm they feel continuously, unto death.

Discovering one’s Native self is like this – it is the discovery of a rhythm that runs through each of us. Hawaiian academics today speak of our culture when we should be practicing our culture. We should aim to speak not to these colonized discourses, but to each other. Native knowledge is not found in a university classroom, it is found on our land and in our communities. Hawaiians knew that learning came through practice: maka hana ka `ike. Learning required work. It was only through doing work that one truly learned.

Being in Mākua enables this surrender of our selves to the spirits that reside there. They soar through the wind of the valley. They whisper in your ear. They fill your senses. The kūpuna caretakers of Mākua fight to protect this place and the knowledges it contains. Mākua is sacred because of its history and because of the spirits that still reside there. It is a kapu, sacred place. Its knowledge, too, is kapu, as was all Hawaiian knowledge.

`Ike is not noa. For years, Hawaiian culture was based upon the kapu system. Kapu has come to mean “taboo,” but this is a grossly over-simplified translation. Kapu rather referred to the aspects of life that were sacred, not necessarily “taboo” or forbidden. Kapu is therefore best understood for the purposes of this project in comparison to the term “noa.”

Noa generally means free. To make something noa is to release one’s hold on it; to free it; to let go of it. Therefore, Hawaiian learning revolved around the idea of the
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kapu, because knowledge was not noa. ʻIke is not noa. No one was entitled to knowledge or information. Knowledge was earned. Knowledge was sacred.

This western dominance of the researcher (or learner, as it is) conflicts with Native views of knowledge. Within indigenous knowledge systems, the learner is entirely subordinate. And in a Hawaiian methodology, it should still be treated as such. This is the fundamental fatal flaw of western methodologies – western researchers believe that all knowledge is obtainable and tangible. Far worse is that underlying presumption that everyone can or should be able to learn anything. Western academic refused to believe that there should be limits to knowledge.

Within the western framework, visualized above, the research process begins with the researcher. It is he or she who dominates the entire process by controlling a recognized and accepted methodology in which 1) a topic is selected, 2) a hypothesis or
Chapter Three

theory is developed, 3) a research method is designed, 4) data is collected, 5) the data is analyzed and the project written up. What if we could change this?

Here, instead of waiting until Step 4 (data collection) to engage with our subjects, we engage with our subjects from the outset and allow them to guide the project, making the subject and knowledge itself dominant in the research process. What if we allowed topics to choose us? Ethnohistory and ethnographic studies allow for this. And it is a more appropriate way to study Native people. Instead of working within such a Euro-centric research methodology, by simply engaging with the people and their history without plan, agenda, or expectation, we are utilizing a learning method (because researchers are really only glorified learners) more consistent with traditional pedagogies.

In many ways, *The Polynesian Family System of Ka-`u* comes very close to achieving this. The Introduction to the Seventh Printing includes this information:

Mrs. Pukui’s mother, Mrs. Wiggan, whose Hawaiian name was Paahana, was a full Hawaiian of the old school and has spent most of her life in the Ka`u district.
She was well aware of the steady losses to Hawaiian history and lore as the older folk died, and she was happy to share whatever she knew with those she could trust to preserve her knowledge. As a means of forestalling malicious gossip, or Hawaiian resistance to the overcurious haoles, Mrs. Wiggan adopted into her family both Dr. and Mrs. Handy. When word of this act passed along the Hawaiian grapevine, the expedition’s path was made easy where it would otherwise have been difficult. Many blood relatives of Kawena Pukui, especially those of the Ka‘u and Hilo districts, became very willing informants. However, an elderly aunt of Mrs. Pukui named Keli‘ihue, who lived in Ka‘u, was most reluctant to give out any information, until one night, we are told, an ancestor appeared before her in a dream and sternly ordered her to tell all she knew. In fact it is the recollections and experiences of the two elderly Hawaiians Paahana and Keli‘ihue that comprise most of the unique material that appears in *The Polynesian Family System in Ka-`u, Hawai`i*.8

We see here how this seminal text would not have been possible 1) without Pukui’s blood ties to Ka‘u and 2) without the intervention of ancestral spirits. We even see how the kūpuna are reluctant to share knowledge or share knowledge only with “those she could trust to preserve her knowledge.” This hints at the importance of knowledge within traditional Hawaiian culture.

Knowledge, mana’o or `ike, are parts of the self. When we ask someone to share knowledge, we are asking for part of one’s self. Within Native traditions, knowledge is as real as blood or flesh. Therefore, when Hawaiians shared or transmitted knowledge, it was understood that what was being taught was sacred. With knowledge came kuleana, knowledge came with responsibilities. Therefore, the knowledge given to someone marked their maturity as well as their intellectual capacity. In traditional society, the teacher (in this case our subject) determined when the student (in this case our researcher) was suitable to carry the responsibilities that came with receiving certain knowledge. This is also why we say `ike is not noa. Knowledge comes with certain kapu. Certain knowledge, like the burial sites of our kūpuna,9 were not supposed to be known by everyone, because those without the maturity to receive the information or the
willingness to assume the responsibilities that come with the information could very easily misuse the information they receive. Hence, an example of Hawaiian pedagogy is presented to illustrate the process through which one accumulated knowledge in pre-contact Hawai‘i.

Mākua is an appropriate place to discuss how modern research can evolve to incorporate traditional knowledges, because in 1977, renowned anthropologist Marion Kelly would lead a study on Mākua for the Bishop Museum that collected extensive interviews and documents on Mākua that served as one of the first studies to respectfully include the spiritual history of a place. Kelly’s study, which contributed largely to this chapter, now serves as a vital repository for the cultural and social history of Mākua. In her study, she places strong emphasis upon folklore and spiritual knowledges.

References of this second and spiritual form of knowledge or being can be commonly found in certain parts of our language, specifically, in concepts like ‘ike pāpālua, or second sight or knowledge. Mary Kawena Pukui defines this term as “To see double; to have the gift of second sight and commune with the spirits; supernatural knowledge.”10 This references the idea that knowledge or understanding for Hawaiians came in part from a spiritual realm or from ākua, the gods. Another similar concept is kino pāpālua, or second form. Pukui explains this term: “to have a dual form, as the demigod Kama-pua’a, who could change from man to hog.”11 Mākua served as home to a similar figure, the mo‘o of Mākua.

In heavy rains, the mo‘o come down the stream from Ko‘iahi to meet her boyfriend, the shark from Kāneana Cave. When the stream flows strong, it breaks through the sand beach and flows into the sea. The mo‘o goes into the sea and goes on the big rock next to the blow hole at the Wai‘anae end of the beach. The rock is called Pōhaku-kū-la‘i-la‘i. On this rock, she would turn herself into a beautiful princess and call to him. The shark would come out of Kāneana Cave
through the undersea channel and swim out to the blow-hole. He would then turn into a man, and he and the princess would make love. When they were ready they would go to live in the stream. And when the water is green the mo`o is in the stream. When it is clear she is not. No swimming is allowed when the mo`o is in the stream.\textsuperscript{12}

Another important part of Mākuʻa was the cave, known to local residents as “Kaneana Cave.” One woman recollects: “And my father was there to oversee when they opened the cave. And my father said, ‘His human form of [Kaneana] is still up on that hill, and he watches for you when you go to the beach to go swimming, or to try and catch fish. He can change himself to a shark and come and get you and bring you in that cave and eat you.’\textsuperscript{13} Mākuʻa remains particularly alive with traditions that speak to the natural resource management of the area. Yet, mo`olelo were also used to teach proper behavior.

A resident recollects about the lessons she learned at the cave in Mākuʻa.

The entrance of that cave is out by the long reef they call Papaloa. And she has an opening underneath. If you go way out to the end, and you just stand like that, you will see a big opening. And he enters through there, and he can have anyone that treats him mean. That is where he takes them, down below. If you ever entered that cave, you will see the water. Down below, there’s a pool. We were made to crawl into that cave, and we didn’t want to go. Just to teach us a lesson we went. And when we went, and the time he took his captives all in there, and then he killed them, the blood. And it [the cave] is a beautiful thing. And the only thing that got me scared was the sharks (sic) head. It was a big sharks (sic) head right on the stone. I don’t know if ______. [Dad said,] “Pretty soon you’ll be one of them, lady, because of your big mouth.” I have a bad temper, and in that cave I kept my mouth shut. Now you crawl out. That is how he gets out and changes into a man. Lot of the old folks and the children named him if we disobeyed. We were not as fussy then. No, no, we do it, we do it.\textsuperscript{14}

The lessons present in traditional folklore also contained social values and community norms. The loss of myth and folklore meant that traditional lessons about the family and community were being lost. Compare this to the American stories about Santa Claus.

Children are taught that Santa has a list of children who are “naughty” or “nice.”
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Children accordingly behave in order to be on Santa’s “nice” list. Story-telling and cultural narratives speak to history, contemporary norms, resource management, essentially every aspect of life. When those narratives are silenced, entire histories can be effectively wiped away.

Extinguishing histories serves foreign interests. If claims of indigenous rights come from the historical use of space, clearly foreigners who seek to control and occupy space once inhabited by Native people would be well served to silence their oral histories, usually the only way by which histories of Native people’s are preserved. As concerned over indigenous rights grows globally, particularly identified by the passage of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The Declaration contains extensive provisions, beginning with Article 25, about the use of Native lands, even stating: “Military activities shall not take place in the lands or territories of indigenous peoples, unless justified by a significant threat to relevant public interest or otherwise freely agreed with or requested by the indigenous peoples concerned.” By silencing the thriving history of Mākua, the military strengthens their ability to maintain control over it.

Seizing Mākua: A History of Military Occupation

The Leeward Coast of the island of O‘ahu is to this day one of the most polluted and uninhabitable sites in Hawai‘i. Unlike Kaho‘olawe, which houses no towns or large human populations, the Leeward Coast is home to most of Hawaiians in Hawai‘i.

On the Leeward Coast lies Mākua Valley. According to Earthjustice, a leading environmental advocacy group: “Mākua Valley on O‘ahu has been described by biologists as probably the greatest biological treasure in Hawai‘i. The valley is home to
Ho`i Hou iā Papahānaumoku

45 federally listed plant and animal species, as well as hundreds of acres of designated critical habitat. However, a decades-long history of live-fire training and fires has left the endangered species barely clinging to survival."\(^{16}\) Despite years of struggle to protect Mākua, the military presence continues.

The entire western end of Wai`anae, where Mākua valley lies, bears tremendous cultural and historical significance to the Kānaka ʻŌiwi. For example, Wai`anae ends at Ka`ena Point. Ka`ena Point is described as “the place from which souls departed from this earth.”\(^{17}\)

Yet, the cultural significance of these areas was completely ignored during the military buildup that occurred in the early 20\(^{th}\) century. After the illegal overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, the American military wasted no time using the provisions of the Organic Act discussed in the previous chapter to seize large areas of lands. The seizure of Mākua began in the 1920s.

In 1929, Governor Judd issued Executive Order No. 351 “for sites for Fortifications to be under the control and management of the War Department of the United States of America, including such necessary right-of-ways thereto across any adjoining Government Lands.”\(^{18}\) According to the community stories, the military would begin placing howitzers on these tracts of land, next to kuleana land awards. The placement of these howitzers on the area begs the question: why? World War II had not yet begun, so there was no reason to believe a foregoing threat was imminent. Further, howitzers are land weapons. The answer is horrific. Guns were used by militia to control the Native Hawaiians in the area. They were used against Hawaiians on Kaua`i after the overthrow, as recounted in newspapers accounts.\(^{19}\) The use of military weapons in
Mākua would evolve from a protective measure to control the Native population in an area otherwise far from military sites to a means of environmental devastation.

Prior to the seizure of Mākua, hoaʻāina like Sam Andrews and Lincoln McLandless used the land in Mākua for plantations and ranching. Andrews and McLandless’ exhaustive use of land reflected colonial farming practices common throughout New England in the 18th and 19th centuries. Colonial farmers would regularly occupy native lands, and “in
the process of clearing, colonial farmers treated their land as a resource to be mined until it was exhausted, rather than one to be conserved for less interest but more perennial use. Therefore, Mākua exemplified a clear pattern of ecocolonization that would repeat itself throughout the entire territory. First, depopulation would result in decreased land use by native residents. Then the conversion to a land ownership regime would allow for hoa`āina to purchase large tracts of land. These hoa`āina or foreign-born resident land owners would put lands into surplus agriculture or ranching by using intensive natural resource management practice which decreased natural land productivity. Finally, the Organic Act allowed the President or Governor to seize these lands for the military. This allowed the state to give America-friendly land owners compensation while providing the military land damaged by excessive agricultural and pastoral use. The military then freely uses the land for weapons testing, resulting in the complete destruction of natural resources and cultural sites.

Wai`anae residents are currently fighting the continued use of Mākua for weapons testing. Earthjustice was able to negotiate a settlement between Mālama Mākua and the military. In summarizing the settlement agreement, Earthjustice explains:

To address Mālama Mākua’s concerns regarding the use of weapons that have a history of causing fires at MMR, such as mortars and rockets (both identified by the Army as posing a “medium” fire risk), the agreement restricts use of such weapons to times when the official “burn index,” or fire danger rating, is in the “green” zone, defined as conditions presenting a “low” fire risk, in which “[w]eather conditions [are] favorable for all authorized munitions.” The military may use “low” risk weapons, such as rifles and other small arms, as long as the burn index remains in the “green” or “yellow” (“medium” risk) zone. Other terms of the settlement include:

- MMR’s range control personnel will provide burn index calculations every 15 minutes (as opposed to the usual one-hour intervals) while using “medium” risk weapons. All training with these weapons must stop if range control cannot obtain a positive “green” burn index reading.
• All training will stop if either a fire is observed or a mortar or rocket lands outside the firebreak road, and may not resume until safe conditions are confirmed. If a fire starts outside the firebreak road, training will cease altogether pending further consultation with the Service.
• All units training at Mākua will implement various firefighting measures, such as providing two firefighting helicopters on-site (instead of the one usually provided) and a firefighting vehicle, and dedicating 20 soldiers as firefighting personnel, in addition to the federal firefighters already present. The training units will also place clearly visible markers at the limits of the zone of fire to reduce the risk of misfires.
• No prescribed burns will take place pending completion of the consultation.22

While the settlement limits the long-term impacts the military has on the environment, the military nonetheless retained control of the land.

According to the military statements, 2100 acres were burned by Army fires in the valley.23
Yet, the military refuses to acknowledge its impact. *Sites of O’ahu* notes some of the important cultural sites that have been destroyed in Mākua.

**Kumuakuopio Heiau**  
(Destroyed)

Site 178. The site is on the mountain side of the present church and is known by the native though nothing remains of the heiau except a sand platform 120 by 100 feet that is about 20 feet higher than any of the surrounding land. Two piles of 1 foot stones are left near the center. The rest of the stones were used in building of rock fences….\(^{24}\)

**Fishing Shrine**  
(Destroyed)

Site 179. The Mākua ko’a has more the appearance of a small heiau or house site than of a fishing shrine. It is known and pointed out by the old fisherman in the region. It stands in the center of the sandy beach and, during the time of heavy seas, it is said to be the only part of the beach that is not covered with water. The shrine is a rectangle approximately 55 by 35 feet in extent with fairly well-preserved north and east walls. In the northeast corner, a platform 20 by 4 feet projects some 2 feet our and above the other walls. The north wall is built of water worn stones from 2 to 3 feet high, and inside, the sand is flush with the wall and slopes up to a central portion that is 3 feet higher. The south wall, parallel with the sea, and the west wall have been obliterated. Coral lies about the site. That the shrine is still regarded with respect is evidence by a bottled offering partially secreted in the wall.\(^{25}\)

A survey of Hawaiian sources, like remains of heiau or the oral histories of the people of the region leave little doubt that Mākua remains a place of historical and cultural significance for Kānaka Maoli.

We also know Mākua thrived, with a fish from the coast to feed its villagers. One resident recalls:

> You know the stone wall above the cave? The cave is here, and there’s a stonewall right alongside the road here. We children were told that. My grandpa is haole. He came home one night feeling good, and he heard this voice, I’ll say it in Hawaiian. “Analū, Analū, hele `oe mai, e kiʻi mai iʻau. Mai, mai. Ae, he analū.” “Maʻa nei-nei.” “Lohe `oe kuʻu leo.” “A maʻa nei.” He followed the voice. He went right us about the middle of the cave, and he found a little doll. Before he found her, she said, “maia nei-
The woman explains that the doll was Hina, and she was calling to her grandfather. She (the doll) explains that if he took the doll home, the land would never be without fish.

She continues on to explain:

Now that we are Christians and everything, I still believe in that, because form the time I was a little girl, certain times of the year the fish does not stay out where they have to go on canoes. The fish comes in to the shore, right where the breakers are. And the school is so big that there’s a head fisherman to call everyone to come, and they lay out their nets and then all you do is call all the people and he choses (sic) the divers, I was one once. They make you go dive to unloosen the nets underneath. If you don’t loosen the net, and they can’t pull it up, then the head fisherman tries to hit you on the head with an oar and you go down in the water to loosen the net. From the children to adults, you always go home with fish – moi, oi’o (sic), `opelu, akule – all the small fishes that cost so much money.27

This demonstrates that despite its remote location, its agricultural and aquacultural diversity provided for the people of the area. Kelly’s study revealed how much of a thriving community Mākua was, and we know today that military activities over the last 100 years caused extensive devastation on the valley. Yet, incredulously, the military concludes about its presence:

Finding of No Significant Impact

Name of the Action: Routine Training at Mākua Military Reservation and PFC Piliilā‘au Range Complex

The proposed action is to conduct company-level, maneuver, combined arms live fire exercise (CALFEX) training at the Company Combined Arms Assault Course (CCAAC) at PFC Piliilā‘au Range Complex, Mākua Military Reservation (Mākua), O‘ahu, Hawai‘i. This Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) is based on information contained in the Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Routine Training at Mākua Military Reservation and PFC Piliilā‘au Range Complex (SEA), dated 11 May 2001, and that document is incorporated by reference.
Factors considered in determining that no environmental impact statement is required:

The SEA analyzes impacts of the proposed action on the affected environment and also looks at the cumulative impacts of the proposed action. Based on the mitigation measures to be undertaken by the Army and the restrictions on the proposed training, the SEA concludes that there will be no significant impacts to the affected environment. The SEA examines the following areas in detail:

Land Use

Mākua is located on the northwest side of the Island of O‘ahu on the Wai‘anae Coast. The "Wai‘anae Sustainable Communities Plan" identifies a long-range plan for Mākua to be preserved as agriculture/open space and preservation. It also recognizes the importance of the continued use of Mākua by the military for the foreseeable future due to its importance for training and the overall economy of the State of Hawai‘i and the City and County of Honolulu. There would be no change to Mākua land use or the Wai‘anae District and surrounding land use as a result of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would have no significant impact on land use.

Socio-economic environment and environmental justice

The Proposed Action would result in minimal changes, if any, to population, housing, economy, employment or income figures, the use of facilities and services, or recreational opportunities. There would be no impact to rural settings or traditional practices of the Wai‘anae community. The impact of the proposed action to the socioeconomic aspects of the surrounding community is not significant. The Wai‘anae community has a large minority and low-income population. Because of its proximity to Mākua, this population will be affected by the proposed action more than any other human population in Hawai‘i. The proposed action would not result in any disproportionately high and adverse human health effects or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. The impact to this population is not significant.

Cultural resources

Mākua contains a number of cultural resources. These include archaeological sites and historic resources, as well as places associated with community values, religious practices, spirituality, Hawaiian gathering rights and cultural uses of the natural environment. Some of these sites had been damaged in the past by more extensive military training. Under the proposed action both the size of the units
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trained and the training area will be reduced. This reduction will protect cultural
resources from damage during training exercises. Protective measures include, but
are not limited to managing cultural resources in place as exclusion areas,
establishing physical barriers, data recovery, and modification of maneuver
corridors and target arrays. There will also be site monitoring and additional
surveys. These steps and other mitigation measures have been embodied in a
programmatic agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer and the
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Because of all of these steps, the
impact of the proposed action on historic property will not be significant.

* * *

Cumulative Impacts

The SEA concluded that the incremental impact of the action on Mākua, when
added to the impact of past actions at Mākua is not significant. The impact of the
proposed action, taken together with other present uses in the affected area is not
significant. Reasonably foreseeable future actions are not expected to have a
significant impact on the environment. Any additional or new uses of Mākua will
be subject to additional analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Conclusions:

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment has evaluated all data concerning
the effects of the Proposed Action on land use, soils and geology, vegetation,
wildlife and endangered species, air quality and the noise environment,
transportation and socioeconomics, and other topics. In every case, the impacts
were found to be less than significant. Based on the SEA, it has been determined
that the implementation of the proposed action will have no significant direct,
indirect, or cumulative impacts on the quality of the natural or human
environment. Because no significant impacts will result from implementation of
the proposed action, an environmental impact statement is not required and will
not be prepared. This decision is a final agency action for purposes of the
Administrative Procedure Act.28

Mākua has been devastated by military action. Over 2000 acres burned out of control.
Unique species were wiped from existence as a direct result of the military activity in
Mākua. Native Hawaiians, who resided in that valley, do not have access to their family
land. And yet, the military somehow finds that its actions are without significant impact.

Further, Hawaiians of that region, whose histories and culture tie directly to
Mākua Valley are continuously denied free access to the area. Rather, the military
Hoʻi Hou iā Papahānaumoku

routinely allows non-Hawaiian interns regular access to the area. One public example of this is available on the Mākuʻa Valley Environmental Impact Statement site. An article is posted which reads:

Toward the end of my internship and in a stark contrast to the dry valley at Mākuʻa, I was suddenly exposed to what I’m told is the "wettest place on Oʻahu", the Koʻolau summit, which is part of the Army's Kawaii Training Area. It was hairy getting up there because the weather is always unpredictable. It can be bright and sunny everywhere else on the island but these mountains will still be in the clouds. When we arrived, I felt like I had entered a perpetual wind-rain zone, and for the next 24 hours that I was there it remained the same. Our project was to clear a 3-km long fenceline for a fenced enclosure near the summit of the Koʻolau Mountain range. The fence’s purpose is to keep out pigs, which are very destructive to the natural landscape. Using machetes, handsaws, and weedwackers, we were able to make fast work of the brush and trees that would stand in the way of the fence. Obviously, we tried to minimize the damage that we did to the area by working along the already existing trail and staying away from any species that cannot re-root and grow back easily. For example, we cleared a lot of ‘Uki plants which are lightly rooted in the ground and have very thick, long leaves. We simply rolled the whole plant over and put it on the side of the trail where it would re-root in no time. Joby pointed out some endangered plants that thrive in the chilly, wet environment of the Koʻolau's. It's tragic that these plants are rare or endangered, and we hope that they will make a comeback once the pigs are controlled. Humans will continue to have a minor impact since this area is difficult to access even by helicopter.29

There are multiple problems with this statement. First, it illustrates the military’s willingness to allow non-native individuals into places restricted to native people, even those who have been long stewards of the land. Community groups have fought to get more access to Mākuʻa. Mālama Mākuʻa “hopes to eventually have more access to the valley to identify, restore and maintain sites important to Hawaiians.”30 Yet, the military readily gives non-Hawaiians with no tie to the valley access and the opportunity to work in Mākuʻa. This insults our sense of kuleana. Mākuʻa is our ‘āina.
Second, the adamant refusal to understand how the military’s control and presence over an area remains a devastating environmental influence reflected in her observation: "Humans will continue to have a minor impact since this area is difficult to access even by helicopter." Yet, the 2100 acres destroyed by Army fires emphasize that direct and repeat human contact is not necessary in order to cause devastation to an area. Further, this sports a complete ignorance of the Hawaiian ahupua‘a system, which requires environmental health throughout the entirety of the system for the system to function properly. To assume that human impact within Mākua Valley can be contained by the delineation of military activity, by relegating military exercises to specific areas of land, is to continue to ignore the sustainability ideologies of the Native Hawaiian people that recognize holistic approaches to the environment.

The continued military presence on the Wai‘anae Coast impacts the persistence of dispossession and displacement among the Hawaiian people of that region. The military
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has always been a factor in why Native Hawaiians have been removed and are continually denied access to their homeland. From the initial property interests of the military in Hawai`i in the 19th century, through the current battles between community groups and the military, no single force has been more colonial in its assault on the Native people than the U.S. military.

Hawai`i is certainly not alone in this matter. As editor of the California Environment Report William J. Kelly writes:

Environmental contamination from defense hardware manufacturing dots the U.S. landscape. While much of the contamination occurred before Congress enacted landmark environmental statutes, the pollution continued after those laws were passed.

The sites range from high profile Superfund cleanup projects, such as the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, 10 miles from downtown Denver, where bombs containing the nerve agent sarin were found buried, to less well known sites, such as Ordnance Products, Inc., in North East, Maryland, where the company made grenades for the Vietnam War and buried the waste, including solvents, acids and fuses.32

While the impact of military-based environmental devastation hurts everyone, Native people have been particularly hurt by military activity. This results from the combination of the military’s activities as both a source of environmental destruction and cultural destruction. Return to the basic premise of ecocolonization: you cannot discuss the colonization of land without similarly acknowledging the colonization of the indigenous people of that land. You cannot separate the land from its people. As such, any injury caused to land results in a like injury to the people, the Native stewards, of that land. Therefore, when the U.S. military takes over and subsequently destroys land, they are also taking over and destroying the Native people of that land. They destroy their culture, their food base, and their traditions.
Examples of this have been witnessed across the United States. University of Alaska professor Nelta Edwards notes of the environmental contamination near the Alaskan Inupiat community: “Traditional food acquisition activities remain paramount for the people of Point Hope despite the influence of Western culture introduced by European whalers, traders, and missionaries. These activities signify much more than just survival or even merely a way of life. Alaska Native people consider them inextricable from belief systems and self-identity.”\textsuperscript{33} Similarly, Native Hawaiian people, like most Native groups, consider the ability to live on and from the land “inextricable from belief systems and self-identity.”

Therefore, the military’s contribution to dispossession exists in the physical seizure of land from the Native people. Particularly in Mākua, where Native people were removed so the Army could use the land for training, the military’s use of land contributed to the devastation in Wai‘anae. The military’s irresponsible activities also contribute to the health problems of the region, as recently the area became aware of military ammunition dumping in the waters off Wai‘anae. The military refuses to disclose what was dumped or how much, but there is little doubt that the contamination of the waters in the area have had severe health impacts for those who use those waters regularly.

Further, the military’s continued assault on the land results in spiritual and cultural trauma for the indigenous people whose very identities are inseparably tied to that land. Kama‘āina who look at the land and its features do not see landmarks but stories of their family and childhood. Watching the destruction of that land and those features is akin to watching family assaulted.
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“ʻO ka makua ke koʻo o ka hale e paʻa ai”
To Peter Yuh Napa Coordinator
Directorate of Public Works, U.S. Army Hawaii
Schiffelt Barracks, Hawaii 96857-5031

Sir, Nanaop is hereby provided in Commentary regarding your Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment for Routine Training at Makua Military Reservation Hawaii.

Your SEA is inadequate and unacceptable (Hewa) because it severely restricts public involvement, further withholds, and disregards with obvious design and intent, information about hazardous contamination of the air, water, and soil on traditional and customary religious sites and practices.

The SEA does not address the health and welfare of this community when you transport hazardous materials through our towns, pass our schools therein putting at extreme risk, our children and grandchildren.

Shame on you, enough already, stop go home before you “accidentally” kill our children in the name of national defense.

I strongly urge and demand a full EIS, with full community input, contd
ALBERT POWELL [Department of Land and Natural Resource, State of Hawai‘i]: We’re going to ask you to remove yourself and your belongings back beyond the perimeter, which is either out on the beach or beyond this inner road.

We’re going to remove these shelters. And if you do not comply, those that are still in the area will be arrested.

KAWEHI KANUI GILL: As compared to the early ‘70’s, the ‘80’s is a waking up period where people are getting involved, not just standing on the side and watching. They’ve been watching since the ‘70’s. In the ‘80’s they’re going to get involved.

SAM MAHI‘AI IS ARRESTED.

VOICES: Be careful with him! All right, uncle! Love you, uncle!

APPLAUSE

ROCKY NAE‘OLE IS ARRESTED

ELAINE KELI‘IHELEHUA IS ARRESTED

MOANIKEALA AKAKA: Shame, taking Hawaiian grandmothers like this off the land.

STELLA PIHANA IS ARRESTED
IRENE “TINY” NIAU IS ARRESTED

VOICES: All right, Tiny!

EMMA ALANA: This is what we’re fighting for.

APPLAUSE

“‘O ka makua ke ko‘o o ka hale e pa’a ai.” The parent (makua) is the support that holds the household together. In 1983, the Department of Land and Natural Resources forcibly removed the last Hawaiian tenants from Mākua Valley. Stewards of the valley whose ancestral ties to that ʻāina dated back thousands of years.

During the eviction, sentiments about the importance of Mākua Valley as a symbol of the Hawaiian people appeared again and again. Uncle Pōkā Laenui stated during the evictions:

Well, we’re coming back home, home to Mākua, notwithstanding what the state says that it’s not our home. We are residents of Mākua and we just came home.

What we are saying is that it should be consistent with its history, with its lifestyle. The history of Mākua, of the makai side of Mākua, is that it has always been a fishing village. In fact, as some of the signs to verify this, just before we started our march back to Mākua, we found an ʻulumaika stone. And these, I think, is hōʻailona, it’s signs of what Mākua wants us to do, to begin that reconstruction of Mākua.

And the way I look at it too is that, it is to begin the reconstruction of the nation of Hawaiʻi.

Yet, the Mākua evictions and the resistance to them were about so much more than a single incident. The forced removable of Hawaiians from Mākua Valley marked a direct assault on the Hawaiian way of life. As Aunty Hoʻoipo DeCambra explained: “…that we bring to the hearts and minds of everyone who will see this as a symbol of our love for the ʻāina, for our love for the history of being Hawaiian, for the love that we have for all people to have the right to have a home, to have a base to raise their children, to have the
right to food, to life and happiness. Give us the power, ‘o Ke Akua, to show to the world that we love and we are bringing a message, a message that we have a right to live in harmony with the ‘āina.” For Hawaiians, Mākua represented the relationship all Hawaiians had to their homeland. Mākua is our parent. And no good child allows their parent to be harmed.

We know from the Land Commission Awards that at least twelve families claimed lands in the valley. While the political and legal consequences of the land commission awards remains a topic of debate with Hawaiian academic circles today, this text concerns itself primarily with their cultural importance. Native Hawaiian families were on these lands; they cared for them; they possessed cultural rights to their usage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Land Commission Award Number</th>
<th>Royal Patent Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haunouli</td>
<td>Iloewaa</td>
<td>9705</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>14.931</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haunouli</td>
<td>Kalama</td>
<td>236-K</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>3.136</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaawa</td>
<td>Kuli</td>
<td>9709</td>
<td>5464</td>
<td>14.967</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalena</td>
<td>Kuwaa for Manua</td>
<td>9054</td>
<td>3634</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamakaakuholu</td>
<td>Napuupaa</td>
<td>6123</td>
<td>3554</td>
<td>8.889</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaohai</td>
<td>Kahueai</td>
<td>9052</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaolekeia</td>
<td>Kauhi</td>
<td>9706</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihanau</td>
<td>Kauhi</td>
<td>9706</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kihanau</td>
<td>Puiwa</td>
<td>9706</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>6.336</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koiahi</td>
<td>Kauhi</td>
<td>9076</td>
<td>1076</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koiahi</td>
<td>Pulu</td>
<td>9078</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Awardee</th>
<th>Land Commission Award Number</th>
<th>Royal Patent Number</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parcels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kulaelawa</td>
<td>Keolohua</td>
<td>9053</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>12.922</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanui</td>
<td>Pulu</td>
<td>9078</td>
<td>1075</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. Military currently occupies Māku'a Valley. Like many of the lands under military control, the military began to seize Māku'a in the early 20th century during the territorial era. After the overthrow of the kingdom, the American government spent the early part of the 20th century seizing lands for economic and military purposes.

The military openly acknowledges that prior to military occupation, Māku'a thrived under native stewardship. An archaeological study of the valley identifies numerous significant sites, of which the military states:

The types of sites identified in historic and archaeological records indicate Māku'a represents a typical ahupua'a settlement. Settlements along the coast were focused around fishing and gathering of marine resources, and settlements in inland areas were focused on agriculture. Land Commission Awards (granted in the mid-19th century) indicate that lands had been passed down since the early 18th century, and attest to the long history of agricultural use of Māku'a. Early nineteenth-century visits by Levi Chamberlain and Reverend John S. Emerson documented extensive use of Māku'a by native peoples. By the mid-19th century, the area of Māku'a had been taken over by Euro-Americans for cattle ranching.38

Table 4-8: Known archaeological sites at Māku'a Military Reservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Kumuakuopio Heiau*</td>
<td>McAllister 1933</td>
<td>4536</td>
<td>Stone Walls and Well</td>
<td>Eble et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Fishing Shrine*</td>
<td>McAllister 1933</td>
<td>4537</td>
<td>Complex of 14 Stone Walls</td>
<td>Eble et al 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Kaahhihi Heiau*</td>
<td>McAllister 1933</td>
<td>4538</td>
<td>Enclosure &amp; C-Shape</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Heiau Ukanipo</td>
<td>McAllister 1933</td>
<td>4539</td>
<td>Small Retaining Wall</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Swimming Pool*</td>
<td>McAllister 1933</td>
<td>4540</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9518</td>
<td>Mākua Trail</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4514</td>
<td>Kuleana Plots</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9520</td>
<td>Stone Walls and Enclosure</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4542</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9521</td>
<td>Terraces</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4543</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9522</td>
<td>Terraces and Walls</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4544</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9523</td>
<td>Occupation Complex</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4545</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9524</td>
<td>Occupation Complex</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4546</td>
<td>Enclosure/Platform</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9525</td>
<td>Stacked Stone Wall</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>4547</td>
<td>Agricultural Complex</td>
<td>Eble \textit{et al} 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9532</td>
<td>Subsurface Deposit</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Williams and Patolo 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9533</td>
<td>Large Platform</td>
<td>Rosendahl 1977</td>
<td>5589</td>
<td>Agricultural/Habitation Site</td>
<td>Williams and Patolo 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4627</td>
<td>Agricultural Complex</td>
<td>Carlson \textit{et al} 1993</td>
<td>5775</td>
<td>Complex of 72 features in vicinity of Ukanipo Heiau</td>
<td>Clehorn, \textit{et.al.} 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4630</td>
<td>Habitation Site</td>
<td>Carlson \textit{et al} 1993</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>Complex of 111 features in vicinity of Ukanipo Heiau</td>
<td>Clehorn, \textit{et.al.} 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5778</td>
<td>Complex of 10 features in vicinity of Ukanipo Heiau</td>
<td>Clehorn, \textit{et.al.} 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Destroyed

Source: US Army-Hawai‘i Directorate of Public Words and US Army 25th ID(L) and USAH, 2000
The 1998 Cultural Resource Management Plan Report – O‘ahu Training and Area, Island of O‘ahu, Hawai‘i provided a preliminary evaluation of the significance of identified archeological sites at Mākua. One site, Ukanipo Heiau, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The remaining sites, with the exception of two heiau, the fishing shrine and a swimming pool, were noted in the report as having potential for archeological resources. The two heiau, shrine, and the pool described in a 1933 survey were reported to have been destroyed; efforts to locate them are ongoing. Although the potential of the remaining sites has yet to be fully investigated, these sites may contain sufficient archeological information to qualify for the National Register under Criterion D. In addition, yet unidentified cultural resources may also be present.

The removal of the village residents from Mākua represents the many ways in which Hawaiian people were removed from their land and resources. It is not far-fetched to relate the separation of people from their land to the separation of Native people from their families. They are interrelated. One Wai‘anae woman reflects:

Even today, Hawaiians suffer from a separating sickness of another kind [than lepersy] – a separating him from his land. It seems like he doesn’t have the unity, but I see a kind of building up of groups of people, small groups of people wanting to go back and work the land, wanting to find out where the “mana” is, the spiritual power that will hold them together. How you separate people is when you begin to take away some of the things that mean very much to them. ... Now big corporations come, big-money people come in and say, “Hey, wait a minute, now, you’ve been hogging this land, and you’ve been hogging the water. We want some of it; we want you to turn off some and let us have some of that. We’re going to build these big condominiums and these big townhouses.” I’m not talking about this from hearsay. I’ve seen these things happen.
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When we look at the connections between Hawaiians and their land and natural resources, these are more than just metaphors. They are microcosms of Hawaiian living. Mākua represents more than just the loss of a sacred place; it represents the loss of sacred family units.

Most people do not equate the militarization of land with the destruction of the family unit, but there is a relationship between military aggression against Hawaiians and strain upon the Hawaiian family structure. Mākua is a physical place that has been devastated by the military, but Mākua is also a symbol of the Hawaiian family. Largely, the strain the military places upon the family results from the forced removal of families from their one hānau (ancestral lands), but there have also been specific cases in which military actions targeted Hawaiians. The sad story of Koʻolau and Piʻilani illustrated a specific case where the military used its force to attempt to tear apart a Hawaiian family. In this case, the mākua (parents) refused to allow their family to be torn apart.

Aloha Wale: A History of Native Dispossession

The removal of Hawaiians from their land was common and devastating after the overthrow. Many of the seizures and disposessions, particularly by force, were predicated by the case of Koʻolau and Piʻilani on Kauaʻi. Kaluaikoʻolau and Piʻilani found themselves threatened by the effects of colonization. Foreign laws regarding maʻi hoʻokaʻawale terrorized Koʻolau and his family. In 1892, Koʻolau and his son, Kaleimanu, were diagnosed with maʻi hoʻokaʻawale, also known as Hansen’s disease. Little was known about the origins of maʻi hoʻokaʻawale at this time so those afflicted with the disease were sent away to be quarantined from the rest of society until their
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deaths. After the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani, Piki laws denied those with ma‘i ho‘oka‘awale with the ability to take kōkua to Kalawao with them. Not wanting to be separated from his wife, Ko‘olau, shot and killed the Deputy Sheriff sent to take him to Kalawao, a place also known by the Native people as ka luakūpapau kanu ola, or the grave where one is buried alive.

After shooting the sheriff, Ko‘olau, Pi‘ilani and Kaleimanu fled from their home into Kalalau Valley, where they lived off the land. The Piki, in response, sent a militia into Kalalau Valley to hunt down Ko‘olau. The Piki militia never found Ko‘olau and his family. The three lived off the land in Kalalau for a number of years as the disease slowly progressed in both Kaleimanu and Ko‘olau.

The disease would first claim Kaleimanu. Shortly thereafter, it also claimed Ko‘olau. Pi‘ilani would bury both her son and her husband in Kalalau Valley. After mourning her excruciating loss alone in the valley, she returned to Kekaha, where the remainder of her family still lived. A journalist would eventually write the beautiful, however sad, tale of Ko‘olau as told by his wife Pi‘ilani.

Before fleeing to Kalalau, Ko‘olau tries to send Pi‘ilani away. Of this, Pi‘ilani recalls:

He mau ‘ōlelo walania kūhohonu loa kēia a ku‘u kani, a he mau hua‘ōlelo a‘o nō i piha me nā mana‘o maika‘i a kū i ke aloha ‘oia‘i’o nō māua me ke keiki a māua, akā, ua lilo wale nō ia mau ‘ōlelo a pau i mea kāpae a noʻonoʻo ‘ole ‘ia e koʻu luna’ikehala, no ka mea, ua hoʻoholo ‘ia koʻu manaʻo a ua paʻa, ‘aʻole loa e hiki i ka māmā o kekahi mea honua ke hoʻololi a hiki i ka hopena, a ua hōʻike aku au i ia mea o kuʻu kāne me ka hoʻohiki paʻa loa no ka manawa hope loa, ma koʻu pane ‘ana aku pēnei:

“Ma lalo iho o nā ao kaʻalewa o nā Lani Kiʻekiʻe a i mua o ke Akua Mana Loa, ke lawe nei au i kaʻu hoʻopaʻa a ke hoʻohiki paʻa loa nei, ‘aʻole loa au e ‘ae aku i kou manaʻo, ‘aʻole loa hoʻi e hoʻokō i kēia kauoha āu, a ‘aʻole loa hoʻi au e haʻalele i ka ukali ‘ana ma hope e kou meheu a hiki i ka wā a ke make e hoʻokaʻawale ai iā
Piʻilani’s commitment to her husband, even when that commitment ensured hardship illustrates how colonization very early on attempted to tear apart the family unit. Like Piʻilani and Koʻolau, Native families today are forced to choose hardship in order to keep their families together. Therefore, acclamation into colonized Hawaiʻi often requires indigenous Hawaiians to choose between the relinquishing of basic Native values, like ‘ohana, or the arduous life of “houselessness” – which appears to be among the last places where Native people can retain their Native values.

The dismembering of ‘ohana serves as a mechanism for obliterating the indigenous culture. While the family unit commonly serves an important economic and social role in most cultures, in the Hawaiian culture, the role of ‘ohana was so central to Kānaka Maoli identity that the attack upon the institution of the ‘ohana was an attack upon Kānaka Maoli identity itself.

Research into the traditional Hawaiian lifestyle reveals the ‘ohana to not only play a central social role in the Kānaka Maoli identity, but ‘ohana served an essential role within the maintenance of the entire community. The famed study The Polynesian Family System in Kaʻū, Hawaiʻi reveals:

The fundamental unit in the social organization of the Hawaiians of Kaʻū was the dispersed community of ‘ohana, or relatives of blood, marriage and adoption, living some inland and some near the sea but concentrated geographically in and tied by ancestry, birth and sentiment to a particular locality which was termed the ‘āina.

* * *

Between households within the ‘ohana there was constant sharing and exchange of foods and of utilitarian articles and also of services, not in barter but as voluntary (through decidedly obligatory) giving. ‘Ohana living inland (ko kula uka), raising taro, bananas, wauke (for tapa, or barkcloth, making) and olonā (for its fiber), and needing gourds, coconuts and marine foods, would take a gift to
some ‘ohana living near the short (ko kula kai) and in return would receive fish or whatever was needed. … In other words, it was the ‘ohana that constituted the community within which the economic life moved.  

Therefore, it must be emphasized that the ‘ohana represented a larger system of communal living upon which life (through the sharing of resources) depended.

Hawaiian Sense of Community

Like many non-Western societies, Kānaka Maoli viewed community differently that Westerns. Their entire society depended upon the function of the community. In the words of civil rights activist Howard Thurman:

The working definition of community is the experience of wholeness, of completeness, of inner togetherness, of integration, and wherever this is experienced, at whatever level of life, at that particular level there is community. We point out last week that the individual human being experiences in his organism this definition of community. As if the organism, all the parts, had committed to the memory a sense of the whole, a social sense which is the overtone of the biological inner-continuity. Now this is the heritage. It is this that is the essential and necessitous equipment of the little child, of the baby when the baby is born, if all is well.  

Foreigners systemically dismantled this sense of wholeness within the Hawaiian Islands over the course of the last 250 years.
This early drawing illustrates the community living system in the early 1800s. In this system, women and men still occupied separate living spaces. Keeping families together was of the utmost importance to Hawaiians, but not only the immediate family as defined by Western terms, but the extended family more consistent with the kauhale living system utilizing throughout pre-contact Hawai‘i. The kauhale system allowed for greater social and community support for all individuals. This allowed the family to effectively parcel out responsibilities in a manner that allowed everyone to use their time and resources well.

The kauhale system received a devastating blow when foreign diseases began to ravage their way throughout the islands after being brought from distant shores by merchants and whalers. The kauhale system depended on a healthy population and regular repopulation of that living community. When foreign diseases led to rampant
death and infertility, the system began to crumble within a single generation of initial contact. The impact of foreign contact was that devastating on the Native people.

Ma‘i Ho‘oka‘awale

Perhaps the best example of the devastating impact disease had on Hawaiian families and the Hawaiian family structure was ma‘i ho‘oka‘awale, the separating sickness.

It is unclear exactly how many Native Hawaiians were impacted by leprosy, but it seemed that nearly every Hawaiian family knew or was related to someone impacted. Countless children were taken from their families. As one Kalaupapa resident recalls: “Like the other patients, they caught me at school. It was on the Big Island. I was twelve then. I cried like the dickens for my mother and for my family. But the Board of Health didn’t waste no time in those days. They sent me to Honolulu, to Kalihi Receiving Station, real fast. They then sent me to Kalaupapa. That’s where they sent most of us. Most came to die.”44 The bounty offered to those who turned in someone with leprosy only ensured that more families would be torn apart.

The fear generated by health officials led Hawaiian families to reject their own family members. Many were like Ko‘olau and Pi‘ilani, who fought to stay together. One researcher explains: “There is evidence early Hawaiians feared the Board of Health and mandatory isolation at Kalaupapa more than the actual affects of the disease of leprosy. Often, friends and family readily hid infected persons within households, rather than surrender them to a life of banishment at Kalaupapa.”45 Yet, as health officials convinced many residents to turn their own family members into the Department of Health.
The disease therefore did more than just impact individuals, it devastated the family units. One Kanaka woman explains: “I hate to tell you this, my family ho’oka’i (rejected) me. All of my relatives ho’oka’i me. They were sad and disappointed in me for getting this sickness, and after I got it they did not want me anymore. That’s what the ma’i Pākē does. It ho’oka’i you from your loved ones. The name of leprosy is a fearful thing, they fear this disease. That’s why they ho’oka’i me (separated me).”46

Even those whose families refused to give them up often gave themselves up, as the disease forced many who suffered from it into hiding. Another Hawaiian woman explains:

My mother did not want me to go to Kalihi Hospital. She knew more about the sickness than I did. Maybe she knew I would not be cured. So, she suggested I not show myself to anybody. She said, “Go hide. Hide inside the house. When someone comes to the house, run out the back door into the bushes on the mountain side.” And I did that for three months. I went into hiding and the Health Department inspector did not find me. But, I had a husband and two children. There was so much crying over me, and I began to tire of the hiding life. I thought, I will try the cure. Maybe in three months I will get well. After all, the doctor promised. So, I left for Honolulu. My family told our neighbors I was going to visit relatives.47

At the time of the interview, this woman had been at Kalaupapa forty-six years.

The illnesses that sicken the Native Hawaiian community today are not unlike leprosy in that they tear apart families. Whether they are health conditions, like diabetes, or social ills, like houselessness or substance abuse, the western responses by the state that focus on the individual and not family or community continue to ho’oka’awale. They separate us.

Conclusion
Chapter Three

Understanding how specific incidents or problems are interrelated within a community illustrates how solutions must be multifaceted. The history of leprosy is not simply about the etiology of the illness, but it is also about the cultural and historical context of the illness. Similarly, homelessness is not simply about being poor or without shelter, but it also being without family or about the strain it places upon the extended family.

Homelessness, particularly in communities like Wai‘anae, where many of the residents are also family members, strains the resources of the entire region because families are forced to deal with economic difficulties of the extended family. This will often have a cumulative effect on the extended family. The ahupua’a land maintenance relied upon large extended family units for support and labor, as illustrated through the idea behind the kauhale system. Therefore, when foreign disease began to impact the number of family members available to maintain the land and family community, the entire kauhale structure began to erode. When the living system depends upon the health of the extended family, any illness, whether it is physical or social, will negatively impact their entire community.

Therefore, until social problems begin to create opportunities which allow for the extended family unit to redevelop and function, illness will continue to devastate the entire Native Hawaiian community. The extended family and the kauhale system created the foundation of the community in traditional Hawaiian living systems; the extended family unit came first. It is only in modern times that we prioritize the individual above the family or community. We believe that the individual must be cured first. But through the healing of the family and the community, individuals will heal. Part of the
problem with western solutions is that they try to rehabilitate individuals without understanding that individuals need healthy communities or families to return to. As long as families and communities remain dysfunctional, individuals will not be healthy.
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Anyone who wants to know the human psyche will learn next to nothing from experimental psychology. He would be better advised to abandon exact science, put away his scholar’s gown, bid farewell to his study, and wander with a human heart through the world. There in the horrors of prisons, lunatic asylums and hospitals, in drab suburban pubs, in brothels and gambling-hells, in the salons of the elegant, the Stock Exchanges, socialist meetings, churches, revivalist gatherings and ecstatic sects, through love and hate, through the experience of passion in every form in his own body, he would reap richer stores of knowledge than text-books a foot thick could give him, and he will know how to doctor the sick with a real knowledge of the human soul.

Carl Jung

Kumuhea was an evil demigod, a son of Kū, known for ruining the health of his human wife. “Kumuhea kupu ‘ino” is our ‘ōlelo no‘eau for things destructive to health.