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Abstract

This case study examines how the management practices of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park affect Kānaka ʻŌiwi (also known as Native Hawaiians) and communities the park was created to serve. This National Historical Park was established in 1978 to provide a center for Kānaka ʻŌiwi and others to rejuvenate the Hawaiian culture by rehabilitating Kaloko-Honokōhau as a thriving cultural landscape. However, as of 2014, the Park Service has yet to achieve the goals set out by the United States Congress in 1978. The National Park staff struggles to rehabilitate Kaloko-Honokōhau in ways as deemed appropriate and desirable by Kānaka ʻŌiwi and non-Kānaka ʻŌiwi. I use documentary data and information from interviews to understand Kaloko-Honokōhau management history, policy, and practice. I give particular attention to the management of Kānaka ʻŌiwi cultural heritage and to how management practices and park policies create management challenges. I describe the shared goals of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and non-Kānaka ʻŌiwi and provide recommendations to re-align Park Service management practices with policy as a way to better fulfill the Congressional intentions.

Keywords: Cultural Heritage Management; Indigenous; Archaeology; National Park Service.
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<td>Makani</td>
<td>Wind</td>
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<td>Garden</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Mea‘ai</td>
<td>Food</td>
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<tr>
<td>Mea ola</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mea wahi hanāi holoholona</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mele</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mō‘īi</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moku</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo‘okū‘auhau</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo‘olelo</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo‘opuna</td>
<td>Grandchildren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na‘au</td>
<td>Gut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na‘auao</td>
<td>Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīele</td>
<td>Asking questions that are rude and intrusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīnau</td>
<td>Ask questions, ask for permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noho pa‘a</td>
<td>Permanent living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ohana</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ōku‘u</td>
<td>Cholera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Ōlelo</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli</td>
<td>Chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oli kāhea</td>
<td>A chant asking for permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oli komo  A chant granting permission

Pa‘akai moe  Salt beds

Uhi  Yam
‘Ulu  Breadfruit

Pā  Enclosure
Pa‘akai  Salt
Pā holoholona  Animal enclosure
Pā pōhaku  Stone wall
Pia  Arrowroot
Poho  Depressions in stone. Also, to be wasteful
Pule  Pray

Tūtū  Grandparent
Ua  Rain
‘Uala  Sweet potato
‘Upena  Net fishing

Wahi  Place
Wahi Pana.  Legendary Place
Wai  Water

Note: Translations derived from: Kelly (1971), Roy and Nahale (nd), Maly (2000), Maly and Maly (2002), and Wehewehe (2014). Some were also provided by Lenelle Underwood.
Preface

*Lei Honokōhau I ke aloha o nā hulu kūpuna*

Honokōhau is adorned with the love of the ancestors

*He hei kapu la’a loa kū l ka mana*

A sacred place standing ever strong in its power

*Kani ka leo o ka manu walo l ka ‘ili kai*

The call of the birds resounds on the ocean’s surface

*Wehe hou ke ala ho‘ina, ke ala o ka mau‘ili*

The path to center is reopened, a path of the spirit

*Pa‘a ka paepae o ka ao mālamalama*

The platform of enlightenment is restored

*Ho‘ōla Kaloko ‘āina o ka mālino*

Kaloko begins to heal, the land of peace

*Tūnou honua*

These words are uttered with the deepest honor.

*Haku ‘ia kēia mele e Hāwane Ríos ma ka lā 21 ʻoiulai 2014 no ka hoʻohanohano ʻana l ka wā puka kula ʻo Ruth “Luka” Aloua.*
Chapter 1. Place and Purpose

Aloha mai kākou, my name is Ruth-Rebeccalynne Tyana Lokelani Aloua, I am a Kanaka ʻŌiwi (Native Hawaiian), born in Wailuku on Maui, and raised in Kailua-Kona on Hawaiʻi Island. The moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy) of my father connects me to the islands of Tonga and that of my mother to the islands of Hawaiʻi. My moʻokūʻauhau binds me to these islands and allows me to identify my ancestral connection to them. Through my ancestors, I understand my place and purpose in this world. In this thesis, I “talk story” about how my moʻokūʻauhau has taught me about the kuleana (ancestral responsibility) that I have to ensure the well-being of my ancestral homelands and the people of Hawaiʻi (Au and Kawakami 1985:409). Throughout this thesis, I primarily use this talk story approach because it is an informal style of communication that is familiar and inviting to people from my home. Talk story is used in Hawaiʻi to share experiences, teach lessons, and perpetuate knowledge. In contrast, archaeological terms and other elements of the authorized heritage discourse used in academic and governmental contexts often exclude and alienate non-archaeologists. While commonly used by archaeologists and public land managers, words such as archaeological “features” and “profiles” are unfamiliar to most non-professionals. The conceptual basis from which these terms arise is rooted in an ideology foreign to the Hawaiian culture. I deal with this problem by utilizing Hawaiian terms and definitions whenever possible. Non-English words are italicized because the Hawaiian language is not an official language in British Columbia, Canada. It is only recognized as an official language in the State of Hawaiʻi.

The aim of this chapter is to briefly describe the authorization of foreign land management practices in Hawaiʻi. I first introduce my research objectives and discuss the purpose of my thesis. I then explore the definitions of heritage and describe elements that make up Kanaka ʻŌiwi cultural heritage. Next I describe how my research relates to indigenous archaeology and relationship building recommendations. My discussion leads to an overview of the changes that occurred after contact with foreigners in Hawaiʻi. I
summarize major events that transformed the Hawaiian culture, people, and land management in Hawai‘i. Finally, I introduce the case study site, Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park.

**Research Objectives and Outcomes**

Within National Parks located throughout the United States, indigenous peoples are known to have shared and differing viewpoints from others regarding the management of land, resources, and objects located within them (Echo-Hawk 2009:63). If conflicting land management values and ideas exist, they can create conflict between individuals and groups. However, if understood by managers, constructive resolutions can be created to reconcile differences (Ruppert 2009:51). The goal of mediating different viewpoints to build cohesion and understanding amongst a diverse group of individuals, which sometimes have shared, conflicting, and competing interests, was the theme of this study. The primary objective of my study was to understand the shared and diverging points of views regarding the management of *Kānaka ʻŌiwi* cultural heritage at a National Park in Hawai‘i, as determined by *Kānaka ʻŌiwi* and non-*Kānaka ʻŌiwi* (non-Native Hawaiians). I accomplished this task by conducting a case study on Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park in Kailua-Kona, Hawai‘i. Four research questions were used to guide my research:

1. How would *Kānaka ʻŌiwi* and non-*Kānaka ʻŌiwi* like the cultural heritage located at the National Park to be managed?

2. What are the shared and conflicting management preferences?

3. How do the documented management preferences conflict with and conform to Park Service policies? and

4. How can Park Service management practice be adjusted to better reflect the management preferences and mediate differences?

I addressed the first question by interviewing Park Service personnel and community representatives interested in and knowledgeable about Kaloko-Honokōhau management to
identify management preferences. I addressed the second question by using NVivo\(^1\) to analyze the interviews and identify the shared and conflicting management preferences of both groups. I then compared the two categories of information to the National Parks policies, to understand how the management preferences were supported by and conflicted with existing legislation and policy. Finally, I created suggestions that sought to harmonize relationships between Kānaka ʻŌiwi and Park Service personnel by using the converging and diverging thoughts to transform management practices.

In summary, this study aimed to:

- Understand the shared and conflicting management preferences of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and non-Kānaka ʻŌiwi regarding the stewardship of cultural heritage;
- Identify how the sentiments shared by the interviewees were supported by and conflicted with Park Service policies; and
- Provide recommendations to bring back friendly and broadly beneficial relations between Kānaka ʻŌiwi, Park Service personnel, and the Kaloko-Honokōhau landscape.

The result of this study offers Park Service personnel at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park suggestions to build unity between staff and community representatives. Conflict between National Park Service representatives and members of the Kailua-Kona community has existed since the 1990s (USDOI, NPS 1994:163-314). A core issue that has created conflict involves how Park Service management fulfills the National Park’s enabling legislation that seeks to interpret, preserve, and perpetuate the Hawaiian culture (Public Law 95-625, section a). These differing viewpoints have the potential to be understood and remedied. The intent of this thesis is thus to strengthen and bring back pleasant relations between individuals that have outstanding conflicts today. I hope that my initiative can facilitate conversations between Park Service staff and community representatives, so that

\(^1\)For software information, see: http://www.qsrinternational.com/products_nvivo.aspx?utm_source=NVivo+10+for+Mac.
individuals can work together and through their differences to mālama (serve) Kaloko-Honokōhau.

**Heritage of Kānaka ʻŌiwi**

“Heritage” is a term that is widely used to refer to “everything” that is inherited and includes people, objects, structures, images, practices, sentiments, customs, traditions, and more. While heritage refers to the inherited items that are both new and old, all heritage is constructed by individuals or groups of people that selected things that they decide is their heritage (Darvill 2008). Conceptions of heritage occur at various levels of society. For example, a family’s heritage can include a wedding ring that was passed through several generations. A nation’s heritage might include the country’s flag, a historic site or an object that represents the accomplishments and history of a large group of people. Within the United States, there are National Heritage Areas, which are recognized as nationally important landscapes significant to American citizens (National Park System Advisory Board 2006:2). David Harvey best describes heritage as:

> [h]eritage itself is not a thing and does not exist by itself…As a human condition therefore, it is omnipresent, interwoven within the power dynamics of any society and intimately bound up with identity construction at both communal and personal levels (2001:19).

Brian Graham (2002:1004) notes that the contents and meanings of heritage change through time and across space, and that heritage is not restricted to the study of the past or material objects. Instead, he explains that heritage embodies meanings that are defined in the present and linked to other aspects like memory and identity. Likewise, David Harvey (2001) argues that heritage is not limited to physical objects, but should be thought of as a “cultural process.” He discusses the history of heritage in terms of a history of power relations that works via the “heritage process.” Similarly, Laurajane Smith (2006:44-45) suggests that heritage includes tangible components like objects and places, in addition to intangible components like forms of “cultural process[es].” She describes these cultural
processes as acts that people engage in that work to remember, commemorate, communicate, and pass on knowledge and memories, and to assert and express identities, values, and meanings.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO 2014) defines “cultural heritage” as tangible objects that are movable, immovable, and underwater, and intangible elements like oral traditions, rituals, and performing arts. Although this term is inclusive to physical and non-physical forms of heritage, the act of dichotomizing the interrelationship between “tangible” and “intangible” elements of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi cultural heritage can be considered rude. This is because the two are interlinked and separation is inappropriate. Rather than thinking about heritage in its material and non-material forms, I encourage individuals to think of heritage as a way of living. Waking up to chant to the sun, mending a fishing net or offering prayers to sacred places is a way of life. Attempting to divorce physical items like the sun, fishing net, and sacred places from their non-physical counterparts, like chants, ancestral knowledge, and prayers, can have damaging effects. I use terms like “tangible” and “intangible” to discuss Kānaka ‘Ōiwi cultural heritage to help individuals unfamiliar with the Hawaiian culture to better comprehend the interrelationship between the physical and non-physical realm.

The cultural heritage of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi includes tangible objects and intangible aspects that contribute to the formation of our identify. Some forms of our heritage are unique to specific moku (districts) or ahupua‘a (land divisions), while others are shared among our people across the Hawaiian Islands. For example, our material heritage includes, but is not limited to, kahua hulikoeohana (cultural sites) like loko (ponds), kahua hale (house platforms), heiau (temples), loko i‘a (fishponds), hōlua (toboggan), ki‘i pōhaku (petroglyphs), māla (gardens), ahu (shrines), ala nui (roads), pa‘akai moe (salt beds), hālau (long houses), ko‘a (fishing shrines and grounds), and poho (depressions). Additionally, koehana (artifacts), and natural elements like the ‘āina (land), moana (sea), pōhaku (rocks), nahele (vegetation), manu (birds), i‘a (fish) and ua (rain) are also physical forms of heritage. Our intangible heritage includes the lewa (sky), makani (winds), mo‘olelo (oral and written traditions), mo‘okū‘auhau, mele (songs), oli (chants), hula (traditional dances), pule (prayers), ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (language), ‘ōlelo no‘eau (proverbs), and inoa (names). These are a few of the many forms of tangible and intangible heritage.
Authorized Heritage Discourse

My approach in this thesis views management at this National Park as a reflection and embodiment of what Laurajane Smith calls “authorized heritage discourse” (AHD). Smith describes the authorized heritage discourse as a dominant form of heritage discourse that is naturalized and institutionalized within agencies and by nations (2006:11). She explains that it:

focuses attention on aesthetically pleasing material objects, sites, places and/or landscapes that current generations ‘must’ care for, protect and revere so that they may be passed to nebulous future generations for their ‘education’, and to forge a sense of common identity based on the past [Smith 2006:11].

The discourse imposes ideas about what constitutes heritage and how it should be treated. Smith explains that the authorized heritage discourse is a “self-referential discourse” that establishes claims that create and recreate opportunities for authenticity (2006:11). Within the authorized discourse, the values and ideas that constitute heritage are often confined to the past and are not an accurate depiction of the diverse values and meanings that actually exist. Meanings that are given to heritage are unauthorized, obscured or removed from the discourse, and through this process the dominant heritage discourse is created, maintained, and reinforced (Smith 2006:30).

Smith explains that the discourse also creates positions of authority for experts like archaeologists that have received authorized training deemed legitimate by the discourse to analyze and care for heritage (2006:11). Underlying this issue of expertise are power imbalances that are created when individuals that lack the recognized skills or training are less sanctioned. As such, the authorized discourse legitimizes particular forms of experts that possess preferred expertise to speak on behalf of heritage matters. Together, the values, ideas, and experts that are created and validated by the authorized heritage discourse confine contested heritage concerns and negotiations to it. The authorized heritage discourse successfully reinforces and recreates opportunities for authenticity by referring to the values, ideas, and experts that the discourse created. Competing heritage values and ideas that are not recognized by the authorized heritage discourse are
demonstrated through contested cases over the management or interpretation of heritage (Smith 2006:11-12, 29-43).

I used the authorized heritage discourse as a framework to guide my research because I thought the strategy best suited my research objectives. I assumed that there were Park Service management practices that were implemented that conflicted with the management preferences of Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. Like the authorized heritage discourse discussed by Smith (2006), the National Park Service practices displaced Kānaka ‘Ōiwi ideas, values, and management preferences that were incompatible with those of the National Park Service. I thought that this approach would also allow me to explore the various dimensions of conflicts that may occur, including those dealing with cultural processes. Initially, I considered the National Park Service as the agency authorized to approve and implement cultural heritage management goals, practices, and priorities for the National Park. Individuals that worked for the agency represented authorized heritage officials. I considered non-Park Service staff as individuals representative of an unauthorized heritage discourse.

Indigenous Archaeology

My research is similar to indigenous archaeology, which is a form of archaeology that is practiced “with, for, and by Aboriginal peoples” (Nicholas 2001:31). I think that this and other forms of archaeology (e.g., community and public archaeology) are necessary because archaeologists study the material remains of the past. Quite often, the physical objects, structures, and items that archaeologists work with is the heritage of living peoples, who are commonly referred to as “indigenous” or “descendant” groups and communities. Archaeologists that embrace indigenous archaeology in their practice use various methods to better serve, respect, and respond to the desires, wishes, and demands of individuals who are considered indigenous or descendants.

Justin Richland (2011:104, 110) describes working with the Nakwatsvewat Institute (TNI), a non-profit organization with a mission to serve the Hopi tribe. He explains that through his work, he learned about four principles that included: 1) “Consult, don’t conclude,” 2) “Listen, don’t lecture,” 3) “Provide resources, not regulations,” and 4) “Follow the tempo, don’t try setting it.” Richland describes these principles as powerful tools, which grew out of
failures TNI learned, and are meant to build lasting relationships with the Hopi that are rooted in mutual trust and commitment. Likewise, Joe Watkins and T.J. Ferguson (2005: 1389-1392, 1395-1400) also provide seven tips and 20 good habits they created to help researchers prepare to work with indigenous communities. All of the suggestions that they provide can assist novice researchers with methods to adjust their practice, and to be more reflective of and respectful to non-Western cultures.

Although I never physically moved, reconstructed or excavated physical forms of heritage like *kahua hulikoehana* in this study, I did study material heritage through documents and by conducting interviews to understand management preferences. This research objective necessitated that I worked with current and past stewards because they developed a connection to the ancestral objects, structures, and places at Kaloko-Honokōhau. By working with people who had a bond to Kaloko-Honokōhau and the objects located within it, I more successfully fulfilled my research objectives because I spoke with individuals that were familiar with the stewardship of the area. My research sought to identify and document how people thought the cultural heritage at the National Park should be managed. I accomplished this task by interviewing those who were active in land management activities. Adjusting my practice to be more inviting to these stewards was not only required, but also purposeful because these people cared about this landscape. I sought to better engage past and present stewards in my research by asking for their feedback, being receptive of comments received, and changing my practices to demonstrate that I value their sentiments. Such practices are part of creating an archaeology that is truly Hawaiian (Nāleimailei and Mills 2007:6).

**The Ahupuaʻa Management System**

The *Kumulipo*, a creation chant, is a *moʻolelo* of how our people came to be. It explains that we are the descendants of Papahānaumoku, earth mother, and Wākea, sky father, and how we are related to other life forces (Kamakau 1964:25; Malo 1951:5-6). From the unification between Papahānaumoku and Wākea, Papahānaumoku gave birth to their eldest child, the island of Hawaiʻi (Beckwith 1972:305). The genealogical relationship that our people have to the ʻāina is central to mālama ʻāina or aloha ʻāina (care or love of the
land), a Hawaiian value that teaches us to serve and honour the ‘āina (our elder sibling) who in turn feeds and cares for us (Trask 1993:141). Many of our people today embrace this genealogical relationship, and in doing so, they recognize the ‘āina as a member of their ‘ohana (family) and care for it as they care for other members of their ‘ohana. The ‘āina is central to our spirituality, health, and well-being (Aluli and McGregor 2007:1-3).

Our traditional sea-to-mountain management system honoured and reinforced the genealogical relationship we have to the ‘āina. Kame‘elehiwa (1991:10, 26, 27) explains that in our culture, the ‘āina belongs to the akua (gods), its maker, and is an akua in and of itself. She explains that pre-1848, before the privatization of land, the ali‘i nui (ruling chiefs) oversaw the ‘āina and protected the maka‘āinana (people that attend the land). The ali‘i nui ensured that the ‘āina was kept fertile and that the akua were appeased. In return, the maka‘āinana worked the land, and fed, clothed, and provided tribute to the ali‘i nui and akua. In this way, the reciprocal relationship between the akua, ‘āina, ali‘i nui, and maka‘āinana was maintained. Life was woven together and kept in balance through the kapu system, the formal religious structure. It was either through wars or successions that ‘āina was gained or passed on to an heir (McGregor 2007:26).

A subdivision that existed in our traditional communal land tenure system is the ahupua‘a. An ahupua‘a is a wedge-shaped division of land that generally ran from the ‘āina makai (coastal region) up into the ‘āina mauka (upland region) (Kamakau 1976:6-8; Malo 1951:16-18) and varied in shape and size. The boundaries of an ahupua‘a were marked by natural features, such as ridges, outcroppings of rocks, trees, and water flows. An ideal ahupua‘a contained the necessary resources that people needed for survival and within them, there lived ‘ohana. As long as these families were loyal to the ruling chief, their land holdings, fishing privileges, and home sites were assured (Handy and Handy et al. 1981:323). These ‘ohana were not bound to an ahupua‘a or to an ali‘i, but had freedom to move from one place to another (Lam 1985:105). Those that lived in the ‘āina makai shared and exchanged goods with those in the ‘āina mauka and vice versa.

The ahupua‘a were overseen by a konohiki (the headman of the ahupua‘a) (Lucas 1995:57) that supervised ahupua‘a activities. The konohiki oversaw the maka‘āinana and the distribution of lands and resources, management and regulation of the resources,
production of goods, maintenance of waterways, fair usage of the ahupua’a, and the duty to ensure that necessary tributes were provided to the ali‘i (Malo 1951; McGregor 1996:6-7). This headman enforced kapu, the seasonal restrictions on land and sea resources, and understood the hydrology, biology, and geology of the landscape, and how to work with humans to manage their impacts (Andrade 2008:74, 75). Although the konohiki oversaw the maka‘āinana and was elected by, served, and represented the interests of the ali‘i, a despotic konohiki and higher ali‘i could be removed by the maka‘āinana (Chun 2011:254).

Our communal land management system allowed our people to not only practice, but live and embrace mālama ‘āina. However, after contact with Captain Cook in 1778, our sea-to-mountain management system slowly crumbled. Issues stemming from depopulation (Schmit 1968:18-22; Stanard 1989:50), the introduction of foreign diseases (Wilcox and Maly nd:8), the ‘aina (breaking of the kapu system) (Kuykendall 1938:66-67), Christian beliefs and values (Zwiep 1991:XV; Bingham 1841:60-61), and foreign advisers with government positions influenced the replacement of our communal land management system by private land tenure (Kame‘eleihiwa 1991:151-152,169-198). Although maka‘āinana created petitions in opposition to the privatization of land (Kame‘eleihiwa 1991:193-198), the Ka Māhele of 1848, the first of several major land acts, replaced our sea-to-mountain management system (Chinen 1958). The undivided, shared, proprietary interest that was traditionally held by the Mōī (king), all classes of chiefs and konohiki, and the maka‘āinana to all of the land in Hawai‘i were no longer recognized (Perkins 2006:99), even though they were secured by King Kamehameha III, Kauikaouli, in the Constitution of 1840 (Alexander 2006:191). The illegal overthrow and annexation of our government by the United States (DOI and DOJ 2000:8-11) and other land acts (MacKenzie 1991:8) further separated our people from our homelands and threatened our ability to maintain our kuleana to mālama ‘āina. The events discussed in this section are summarized in Appendix A.

**Case Study Site: Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park**

Kaloko-Honokōhau is a National Historical Park that is located on the western flank of Hualālai in Kailua-Kona on Hawai‘i Island (Figure 1). The National Park is situated along the coast and includes approximately 228 terrestrial ha and 241 marine ha. Within the
legislative boundaries there are a variety of candidate, threatened, and endangered species, and more than 230 archaeological sites (Bond and Gmirken 2003), which I refer to as ancestral structures. The enabling legislation states that this park was created:

> to provide a center for the preservation, interpretation, and perpetuation of traditional native Hawaiian activities, and culture, and to demonstrate historic land use patterns as well as provide needed resources for the education, enjoyment, and appreciation of such traditional native Hawaiian activities by local residents and visitors…[Public Law 95-625, section a].

Because this place was created to “preserve, interpret, and perpetuate” our culture, I thought that the Park Service management practices would reflect our culture. However, during my time as an employee of the National Park from August 2008 to August 2011, I learned that they were more reflective of Park Service standards. The National Park Service valued the academic training that archaeologists received and therefore considered them to be the legitimate caretakers of ancestral structures at Kaloko-Honokōhau. However, from my perspective, it was the kama‘āina (natives of the land) that should care for these places and objects. Though I cannot speak for all members of the Kailua-Kona community, I can say that individuals with whom I spoke while on duty also expressed desires for greater involvement by kama‘āina. Volunteers and visitors expressed this interest.

The experience I gained first while working at Kaloko-Honokōhau and later conducting my thesis research has given me insight into differences between National Park Service culture and Hawaiian culture. While on duty at the National Park, I learned how the legitimacy and authority assumed and imposed by Park Service representatives creates tensions with Kānaka Ōiwi. One incident I witnessed reveals how different conceptions of heritage can affect relationships and heritage itself. One day, while walking through the ‘Ai‘ōpio Loko ‘Ume‘iki (fish trap) at the National Historical Park, I observed a volunteer ranger aggressively approach a Kanaka Ōiwi who had ancestral connections to Honokōhau

---

2 The NPS defines a “native Hawaiian” as any individual who is a descendant of the aboriginal people who, prior to 1778, occupied and exercised sovereignty in the area that now constitutes the State of Hawaii” (NPS 2006:158).
Figure 1. Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park (National Park Service 2012).

while the individual conducted a cultural education activity in the hālau (long house). The volunteer ranger aggressively confronted the descendant by talking at them instead of respectfully to them. The voice of the volunteer quickly escalated to yelling. I think that this occurred because the Park Service representative did not understand how to communicate respectfully to the kamaʻāina. Despite this circumstance, at that moment I felt ashamed to be wearing the uniform of an agency that had been charged to help perpetuate a culture it had not learned to respect. The kamaʻāina once lived in the exact area of this confrontation. This was their wahi (place), their heritage. In our culture, I was taught that, as individuals not from Kaloko-Honokōhau, we are the guests, and the kamaʻāina are the hosts. Though I tried to
pacify the situation and urged the volunteer ranger to stop speaking, it was too late. The clash had occurred; the damage had been done. As is often the case, especially in contexts charged with colonial power relations, the presumed legitimacy and authority, in combination with ignorance of the local culture, had harmed relationships and created other unfortunate consequences.

Other experiences taught me about Park Service struggles to understand the Hawaiian culture. Creating space to celebrate one of our national holidays, Lā Hoʻihoʻi Ea (Restoration Day, July 31, 1983), was a challenge. I questioned this because if the National Historical Park observed United States holidays like the Fourth of July (Independence Day), then why was there not a Hawaiian holiday? These and similar questions led me to wonder why Kaloko-Honokōhau was not being used or cared for as it was by our ancestors. If this National Park was established to preserve, interpret, and perpetuate our culture, then why did the management not reflect all aspects of our culture in practice? Why was the area preserved as-is or rebuilt to its “original” form? This management approach limited use and interaction with Kaloko-Honokōhau. Although I thought that these protective measures were necessary, I think that we also need opportunities for people to engage with the ‘āina like our kūpuna (ancestors). The idea of returning ancestral structures to their “original” status can be detrimental because it implies that cultures are static.

The view that and treatment of Native peoples and their culture as “static” has been a tool used to assume control over non-Western peoples and aspects of their heritage. Bruce Trigger (1984:360) explains that there is a type of “colonialist archaeology” that was developed in countries where native peoples were “replaced or overwhelmed” by Europeans and their settlements. He states that, “[m]odern native peoples were seen as comparable only to the earliest most primitive phases of European development and as differentiated from Europeans by possessing no record of change [or static] and development and hence no history” (Trigger 1984:360, emphasis added). He explains that the consequences of colonialist archaeology has the power to denigrate native societies and peoples, justify the destruction of their cultures, and underestimate the true accomplishments of these peoples (Trigger 1984:360-363).
The static view of native peoples and their culture can have other detrimental consequences. Naomi Kipuri (2009:62) explains that the appropriation of indigenous spirituality “is generally done without respect and tends to reinforce a fixed and static colonial understanding of indigenous peoples, thereby denying them the dynamism of cultural growth.” This statement eloquently captures a major issue with views regarding unchanging cultures. That is, how can a culture grow if it is assumed to be a product that it is not? Or how can Native peoples create new traditions, when ideas about what is and is not “authentic” are imposed upon them? Paige Raibmon (2005) discusses similar issues regarding static views of cultures, by analyzing problems associated with “authenticity.” She explains that when Native peoples are viewed as a part of the past, this implies that they could never be modern and are thus “vanishing” (Raibmon 2005:7).

Within United States National Parks, the treatment of Indigenous peoples and their cultures as static is not new. Mary Ann King (2007:485) explains that the National Park Service “institutionalized notions of static, past-tense tribes and tribal cultures that threatened to displace its concern for living, dynamic and evolving tribes.” This idea facilitated the pursuit of creating an uninhabited wilderness at Yellowstone National Park in the mid-1800s. She explains that the restrictions the Park Service placed on traditional hunting and subsistence uses of the park’s lands and resources, and treatment of Native Americans as visitors rather than inhabitants, was a reflection of federal policies of removal, reservation, and allotment. Motivations to create a “wilderness” (Cronan 1995:6), one that separated elements from the natural and cultural world, contributed to the forced removal of Native peoples from their homelands. This occurred at America’s first National Parks like Yellowstone and Yosemite (Burnham 2000).

More than 100 years later, in 2014, the dichotomy between nature and culture continues to resonate in the management of United States National Parks. For local groups, descendant communities, and Native peoples, the imposition of this dichotomous worldview disrupts social relationships, the maintenance of cultural traditions and practices, and the ecology of places and landscapes. Consequently, this creates hostility, resistance, and tension between conservationists and local groups (West et al. 2006). At Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park, I thought that this separation between nature and humans created problems that threatened the ability for our people and others to mālama ‘āina. Rather than
allowing the culture to thrive, the landscape was being preserved as a museum. If this landscape was preserved exactly as-is, what role could our people have here? Caring for the land by interacting with it is a part of who we are; it is an essential part of our identity, an intrinsic aspect of our heritage. The concept of preserving this wahi pana (legendary place) without allowing for close and continuous interactions with the people who know, love, and depend upon it is a foreign concept and an imposition of an authorized heritage discourse. It is incompatible with many Hawaiian cultural values and with the legislated purpose of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park.

Despite these challenges, while on duty my co-workers Lily, Hana, and I brought our culture to the National Park. We did so by hosting cultural workshops and talk story events with kūpuna, and scheduling cultural activities. Although we tried our best to bring our culture to the workplace, it was not easy. Working within the confines of the Park Service bureaucracy hindered our ability to bring life to this place. The conversations and personal experiences I had while working at Kaloko-Honokōhau led me to graduate school. I felt compelled by my na‘au (gut) to learn how things at this National Historical Park could improve, so that our people and others could better work together to mālama Kaloko-Honokōhau. I resigned from my position in 2011 to depart on a huaka‘i (journey) to the graduate program in archaeology at Simon Fraser University to do this study aimed at understanding the situation at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park and how it could be improved.

The Unique “Case” at Kaloko-Honokōhau

When I entered graduate school in 2014, I did not know that the circumstance at this National Park could provide a case study, but soon realized it would be ideal. Robert Yin (2009:18) defines a case study as an empirical inquiry that investigates a real life phenomenon within the real life context that the “case” (or problem) takes place. He explains that researchers use case studies to understand a real life phenomenon in-depth, to provide a greater understanding about a prevalent or broadly relevant issue.

Kaloko-Honokōhau provides a unique case study because this National Park was created specifically to interpret, preserve, and perpetuate traditional Native Hawaiian
activities and culture (Public Law 95-625). A study of this park allows me to understand if and how an entity foreign to the Hawaiian culture can care for the spirit of a place. This is the only park that I am aware of where the National Park Service has been directed to provide traditional accommodations for our people, to rehabilitate ancestral structures and elements for traditional use, and to allow temporary live-in accommodations. Although Park Service personnel have policies to support rehabilitation of ancestral structures and landscapes for traditional use, they still struggle to do so. If this National Park has difficulties fulfilling a mandate to rehabilitate ancestral structures for traditional use, then other National Parks that manage the heritage of Indigenous peoples will undoubtedly struggle to do so in accord with indigenous management principles and goals.

The knowledge, experience, and perspective that I bring to this research also makes this a unique case study in Hawai‘i. I have been a member of the Kailua-Kona community for more than 20 years and am a Kanaka ‘Ōiwi that has ancestral connections to the Kona District. Although I am still learning, I understand more each day about how to work with my community to gain a better understanding of the people from this place and our culture. In comparison to an outside researcher, my familiarity with the people and the place allows me to more easily—and I hope successfully—engage and work with the people from my community. My employment at this National Park made me familiar with the management practices of the Park Service. From an anthropological vantage, I have both an “insider” and “outsider” understanding of the multiple perspectives that are necessary for this research to be academically rigorous, while also culturally appropriate and beneficial to the community and the National Park. I am well positioned to facilitate dialogue between Park Service personnel and community members.

Organization

The thesis chapters highlight and summarize the change that occurred broadly in Hawai‘i through time, and more specifically at Kaloko-Honokōhau. I focused on how kahua hulikoehana in the park area were cared for and used. These tangible forms of cultural heritage link my project to archaeology. I also integrated discussions that focused on intangible aspects of our culture. This was done to breath life into the project and provide a
fuller discussion that respectfully interprets Kaloko-Honokōhau. I chose to center my discussion on certain occasions because these provide a historical backdrop that sets a stage for the events that followed (e.g., the creation of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park). In this and other ways, I sought to provide greater temporal depth and understanding to conflict at the case study site to reveal the consequences for, and its potential influence on matters dealing with cultural heritage processes within the National Park Service and Kanaka ‘Ōiwi communities.

When I started writing this thesis, I found it difficult to determine a “moment in time” to anchor my study. I chose to use a personal writing approach by using my heritage to guide the thesis discussions. This was appropriate because this writing style allowed aspects of my identity and culture to flow freely. In Chapter 1, I introduce my moʻokūʻauhau and the purpose of my thesis. Both my genealogy and research intent are aspects central to my heritage. The intentional use of “talk story” as a tone of writing and the use of the Hawaiian language are also a part of my identity. As my friends and I say in Hawaiian Creole English, “eh, if you no can keep up, then you no stay local yet.” That is, if an individual has not learned the local slangs and the structure of sentences, then they will find it difficult to comprehend and maintain a discussion with those that have in Hawai‘i. Although I do not actually use Creole to write, I try to convey the equivalent meanings and use everyday language and words.

In Chapter 2, I discuss my research methods. I introduce the members of my family and community who taught me how to conduct my research. Without their involvement and guidance, I doubt that my research would have been successful. I also introduce the interviewees and explain how I conducted and analyzed the interviews and document analysis.

In Chapter 3, I focus on the case study site, Kaloko-Honokōhau, in greater detail. I provide a general overview of the area and knowledge that has been learned from people familiar with or from the area to describe how cultural sites and places have been used. I then use archaeological studies to explain how archaeologists think that the area was used and cared for. The end of this chapter describes changes that may have influenced the movement of people away from this landscape.
Chapter 4 discusses the events that occurred between the 1960s to the early 2000s. I explain the events that spurred the creation of the National Historical Park and describe the events, people, and plans that guided its development. I then summarize the institutional development that occurred after the National Park was established in 1978, up until 2014. I discuss some of the developments that have occurred since the National Park was established.

My research results are presented in Chapter 5. Here, I describe Park Service management practices as of 2014 with an emphasis on converging and conflicting methods and goals, as identified through the interviews I conducted. I compare my findings to Park Service policies to highlight how management preferences supported by policy can still conflict with Hawaiian management principles. I offer my thoughts on why the Park Service struggles to fulfill the goals espoused by the interviewees.

The concluding Chapter 6 provides direction for the future and specific recommendations for changes in Park management. I begin by describing the implications of my findings. I then summarize and relate the research findings to cultural heritage matters in Hawai'i.
Chapter 2. Methods and Materials

Why, I really love these places. Sacred places. I mean everywhere, this whole island, it can eat you up or it can take care of you, and the respect that you show it, you show to that place and the respect comes when you go and you seek out these people that live in the area and you ask permission and you sort of build a relationship. I mean you could not even know this guy from the next person down the road, but you can make a connection and that connection is the one that will carry you through. It is not for today, it carries you for your children’s relationship that they gonna remember you, what you do now.

–Lily Souza (July 10, 2013)

While I worked as a Park Service employee, Lily Souza, a co-worker and mentor, helped me understand the importance of involving community members in management at Kaloko-Honokōhau. We shared discussions that emphasized bringing people with an intimate connection to this wahi back to this place. The thoughts that we shared took place in various areas throughout Kaloko-Honokōhau. Our mauna (mountain), Hualālai, watched over us as the ‘Eka breeze carried our voices through this place that we both held near to our hearts. She lit a fire in my na’au that inspired me to work with community members that historically lived on, were familiar with, and developed a relationship to Kaloko-Honokōhau. The fire that burned within me influenced how I conducted my research.

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of my research methods and methodology. Chapter 2 is divided into the six phases by which my research unfolded. Phase 1 describes how the knowledge of my family history, cultural values that I learned throughout my life, and time that I devoted to self-reflection grounded my research. This phase provides readers with a glimpse into how I viewed my role in the research and the purpose for this project. Phase 2 touches upon how I received guidance and feedback from academic advisors, National Park Service personnel, and community representatives. I discuss challenges that I encountered and how they were overcome. Phase 3 summarizes
how I received approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics (ORE) and National Park Service to conduct my research. In this phase I gained feedback from non-Park Service personnel. I describe the strengths and weaknesses that influenced my methods. Phase 4 introduces the documents I gathered and how I conducted and transcribed interviews that I recorded with Park Service and community representatives. I analyzed knowledge gathered in documents and interviews using NVivo. I discuss each of these phases in greater detail below.

**Phase 1: Building My Foundation**

The first phase of the research necessitated that I increased my cultural understanding about how I could work with Park Service employees and community representatives. My tūtū (grandmother), Beverly Puanani Wagner, and pāpā (grandfather), John Kalanianoano Hoapili Wagner, taught me cultural values I practiced in my research. Two of my close friends and mentors, Lily Souza and Lolana Medeiros, also shared countless hours opening their hearts to me. I too opened my heart by sharing fragments of my personal life with these individuals. With Lily and Lolana, I found peace, compassion, and courage to proceed with my research. I refer to the knowledge that I learned from my elders and friends as the “Three Pillars of Light.” Each pillar represents a significant learning curve that I encountered during my research.

**Three Pillars of Light**

My Tūtū and Pāpā taught me about the first pillar of light, which is “self.” As a child, they fed my soul with their love, compassion, and discipline. Pāpā instilled Hawaiian cultural values like ho‘oka‘ana (to divide equally), hō‘ihi (respect), kūpono (upright), ‘ohana (family), ho‘olohe (to listen), and kāko‘o (support) in me. In my research, I sought to demonstrate ho‘oka‘ana by sharing information equally, hō‘ihi by responding to recommendations and guidance, kūpono by being honest, ho‘olohe by allowing individuals to share without interruption, kāko‘o by offering my skills in service to others, and the value of ‘ohana by inviting children, youth, and elders to meetings. Tūtū taught me the importance of ha‘aha‘a (humility), laulima (cooperation), pule (prayer), and ho‘omanawanui (patience). In my
research, I sought to demonstrate ha‘aha‘a by thanking individuals for sharing, aloha by being empathetic to people’s feelings, laulima by mediating conversations, pule by thanking the Great Spirit and ancestors for love, guidance, and clarity, and ho‘omanawanui by remaining patient.

The cultural values that I mentioned above have been integral to the success of my research. I integrated these cultural values into my practice because they provided me with a foundation to maintain spiritual, social, physical, and mental balance. By following the teachings of my kūpuna, I emitted proper thoughts and actions to myself and other life forces. If I failed to hold myself in an appropriate manner, I could have caused shame, health issues or other internal issues to my family and myself.

Lily Souza strengthened my understanding about aloha, the second pillar of light. She taught me that I needed to love all parts of myself to share the purest form of aloha with others. This meant that I greeted people without judgement and cast all feelings of anger, frustration, and worry aside. Having an open heart meant that I demonstrated peace, love, respect, and humility to other life forms. I learned how to have an open heart when I assisted her with community events and volunteer projects. I watched how she behaved, spoke to, and worked with community members. Through these observations, I learned how to open my heart to others. In my practice, I sought to mimic her in all ways because she connected to others in a respectful manner. People were drawn to the pureness and beauty of her spirit. She taught me how to bind my spirit closer to the spirit of others.

I gained an understanding about the third pillar of light, self-reflection, from my close friend, Lolana Medeiros. He taught me to ground myself in my family, culture, and homelands. This meant that I made an effort to learn about my heritage. By increasing my knowledge about my ancestors and homelands, I understood how to conduct my research in a manner that was appropriate to myself, ancestors, and other life forms. The comfort and confidence that I gained by working with Lolana helped me understand the kuleana that I accepted. He showed me how I could perform my role as a researcher and work with people in a meaningful manner. Our discussions reaffirmed my belief that time is sacred and should be respected, knowledge is a gift and the process of sharing knowledge is a sacred exchange, and informal interactions create and reinforce social bonds.
My elders and friends helped me build my kahua (foundation). My kahua strengthened as my research progressed into the next phase that required me to identify my research objectives.

Phase 2: Identifying Research Objectives

The second phase of my research required overcoming challenges to identify research questions and objectives. During this phase, I strengthened my kahua by working with Park Service personnel and community representatives. There were three groups of people that I wanted my research to benefit academics, members of the Kailua-Kona community, and the Park Service. I gave special attention to developing a project that would benefit them by speaking with members from these groups over the course of two years. These discussions taught me several lessons about conducting research with my own community, most especially the importance of listening, learning, and embodying the changes I hoped to see.

Research Challenges

Early on in my research, I learned about the importance of trust in projects that sought to involve community members. I became aware that there was a lack of trust between Park Service personnel and community representatives. Several community members felt that some of the Park Service personnel only paid them “lip-service” when they voiced their concerns regarding the management of the National Historical Park. Similarly, several Park Service employees felt that some community representatives did not understand and trust the constraints of National Park Service laws, policies, and practices. This disconnect created communication barriers that limited the level of trust that individuals had for one another. Without these trusting relationships, it was challenging for people to share their thoughts honestly with each other. If people could not talk about their feelings openly and honestly, I thought that it would be difficult to work together as a group in research pursuits.
I learned about other challenges with working in my hometown, Kailua-Kona. My position in this project, as both a member of the community and as a former Park Service employee, raised difficult questions and challenges. Given my former affiliation with the Park Service, I was never sure whether community members trusted me in my researcher role. Because my 'ohana has been a part of the Kona community for generations, I thought that my ancestors had already laid a blueprint for my kahua. I assumed that people who remembered my ancestors as untrustworthy would have distrusted me because of their actions. Generally, when I first meet others in Hawai‘i, people ask for the name of my family and which island we originate from. Such questions help me and the individual to trace our genealogies and identify points of connections. If our ancestors had encounters that were negative, then these interactions could have served to create undesirable preconceived ideas about who we were as individuals.

In terms of Park Service personnel, I was never sure if they trusted me either. I tried to create trusting relationships in conversations by introducing my mo‘okū‘auhau, stating the project purpose, and being honest about my intent and skills. Following through on promises was a must. For example, those who were a part of this project were informed that updates would be provided as the project progressed. Individuals were contacted via email or phone at least once every two months during and after interviews, or when they requested.

Cultural barriers were another challenge. Direct questioning can be considered offensive and rude in Hawai‘i. An individual can impose on another’s personal space by being nēle, asking constant questions that are seen as intrusive and rude, and maha‘oi, asking questions that are viewed as offensive and invasive (Ito 1985:304). These two behaviours conflicted with the need to ask questions to identify research questions and objectives. Asking an individual to share their thoughts regarding the management of the National Historical Park could be received as nēle or maha‘oi. An ‘ōlelo no‘eau that my ‘ohana taught me as a child was to nānā ka maka; ho‘olohe ka pepeiao; pa‘a ka waha — observe with the eyes; listen with the ears; and shut the mouth. Learning by remaining quiet and watching with my eyes, listening with my ears, and mimicking with my hands was essential. I was taught to refrain from asking questions and that individuals will share if they feel a need to.
As a member of the Kailua-Kona community and a former Park Service employee, I shared experiences with the community members and agency staff. This was advantageous because my experiences gave me insight into what might be considered appropriate or inappropriate methods to each group. Adjusting my practice to be inclusive and respectful of the individuals that took part in the research was possible. When I worked at the National Park, employees followed a chain of command based on a top-down decision-making process. Questions were directed to the Superintendent, then the division managers, and finally the employees. In contrast, community representatives operated as a family. In my perspective, generally the kūpuna are highly protected, treasured, and revered by the makua (parents’ generation) and the moʻopuna (grandchildren). I sought to build relationships with the families by contacting the moʻopuna or makua generation first to ask them how I could respectfully work with their elders. This was an integral first step in demonstrating respect to the families.

I also learned how it felt to be a researcher who wanted to “do the right thing and talk to everyone,” without actually really knowing who “everyone” was. The park lacked a formally recognized board that represented community interests. I had a difficult time identifying all of the families and individuals with potential interests or “stakes” in my research. Sharing my research was important because I wanted to identify and address issues and concerns before I conducted interviews. Families and individuals familiar with the area were intimately connected to Kaloko-Honokōhau. These connections were invaluable and could help me understand how my research could harm or benefit Kaloko-Honokōhau and their interests.

Solutions to Research Challenges

As I began my thesis research, I learned how to deal with the challenges. I asked tough questions of myself and others and sometimes engaged in uncomfortable conversations to identify sources of conflict between Park Service representatives and community members. Rather than viewing conflict as a barrier to my research, I decided that I would identify management preferences and challenges. Concerns about the lack of involvement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi in management and planning was a frustration for Park Service
personnel and community members. These conversations suggested that the lack of meaningful involvement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi in the National Park’s activities was an issue that my research could potentially address. Although I needed people to share their thoughts regarding these and other issues, some felt that their concerns had been overly discussed. Despite their hesitancy, I asked people to share thoughts and I reassured them that I would dedicate my time and effort to see that the issues were addressed.

I avoided being niʻele and mahaʻoi by following a rule that I created and made central to my practice—to ask questions not asked by other researchers. I accomplished this by conducting thorough background research. At least five studies describing the cultural traditions and practices associated with the area had already been conducted (Kelly 1971; Maly 2000; Maly and Maly 2002; Peterson and Orr 2005; Roy and Nahale n.d.). Asking questions about information available in these studies would be repetitive. To demonstrate that I took my work seriously, I sought to complement existing information about Kaloko-Honokōhau.

Beginning discussions by asking open-ended questions was a useful technique to stimulate conversations. This allowed individuals to share freely and without feeling pressed. My ability to read subtle behaviour strengthened by listening for what feelings, thoughts, and issues were conveyed in informal conversations. Park Service personnel and community representatives encountered management challenges that made it difficult to conduct community projects and host community events. By identifying this and other concerns, I created research questions that I thought would benefit the Park Service and community members.

I became more attuned to the thoughts and feelings that individuals expressed and responded to them by adjusting my practice. I developed terms and definitions recommended by interviewees. The interviewees corrected me when I used terms like “Native Hawaiian” because they thought it was disrespectful. They explained that the United States government imposed and used this term to describe and define who was legally recognized as a Native person from Hawaiʻi. These thoughts suggested that this term was rude and offensive. I used the term Kānaka ʻŌiwi instead, which was generally more appropriate to the interviewees. The term “descendant” has negative connotations because
of associations with United States government consultation processes. Instead I utilized terms like “ancestral connections, places, and objects.”

Finally, because there was no formal group established at the National Park that represented the interests of the community, I sought out individuals that I had established relationships with. This gave me a chance to learn about issues from those that cared about the management of Kaloko-Honokōhau. These individuals referred me to others that I made an honest effort to meet with when they had time available. Using this approach, I created the research objectives that I hoped would address the concerns of each group. The emergent goal of the project became understanding how Park Service practice could better comport with the enabling legislation and with Park Service and community preferences regarding the management of cultural heritage. The all-important next phase of my research was to identify methods to fulfill my objectives.

**Phase 3: Gaining Feedback and Guidance**

The third phase of the research involved identifying the research methods. During the two years I spent talking with Park Service personnel and community members, individuals emphasized the importance of using documents and talking to families from Kaloko-Honokōhau. This led me to conduct a document analysis and interviews. These methods were appropriate because they allowed me to fulfill the research objectives.

Park Service management documents provided opportunities to explore and analyze texts and images that recorded the park’s creation (Public Law 92-346; Public Law 95-625; Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974), institutional development (USDOI, NPS 1994), and archaeological significance (Cluff 1971; Cordy et al. 1991; Emory and Soehren 1971; Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006). Oral history reports were invaluable because they described the cultural traditions and practices associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau (Kelly 1971; Maly 2000; Maly and Maly 2002; Peterson and Orr 2005; Roy and Nahale n.d.). These documents are central to the fulfillment of the National Park’s enabling legislation (Public Law 95-625) because they discuss the historical uses and cultural significance of the area.
I spoke with people familiar with Kaloko-Honokōhau by conducting interviews. This is a familiar and low-intrusion research method that allows individuals to share freely and comfortably (Au 1980:95). My interview methods were modeled after Kūpuna talk story that commonly occurs at family dinners where sharing takes place. Because talk story is an informal conversation, I wanted my interviews to document sentiments without being intrusive. Talking story meant that interviewees and I talked casually about the research, their childhood, their life experiences, and other topics.

I explored the potential of conducting surveys to measure the level of satisfaction individuals had with park management. To this end, I created a 10-question survey to quantitatively assess how satisfied individuals were with Park Service management. After creating and testing this survey, however, it was not used because gaining descriptive information about the management of the National Park was limited. With my methods chosen, it was time to seek formal permission to conduct my research.

**Phase 4: Receiving Ethics Approval and the National Park Research Permit**

The fourth phase of the research involved seeking approval to conduct my research from the university and Park Service. I first prepared and submitted an ethics application to the Office of Research Ethics (ORE) at SFU. After the initial submission, the ORE requested minor revisions regarding anonymity and that I assure them my research would not be used for land claims. The university office was informed that the interviewees had an option to remain anonymous and my data would be used exclusively for educational purposes. After I completed the revisions and verified the educational nature of the research, I received approval to conduct interviews (Study Approval 2012s0330).

I applied to the National Park Service for a research permit to conduct my study. I worked with the Park Staff to address concerns and answer questions. I received a research
permit from the National Park Service to carry out my research (KAHO-SCI-0003\textsuperscript{3}). There were several conditions that I needed to follow to receive the permit. One required that I interview a maximum of 10 individuals that were Park Service employees because their ethics approval process was lengthy. Because of this restriction, I interviewed eight of their personnel. I met with Park Service personnel and community members that I had worked with to identify other issues and concerns. Although people did not share any concerns and demonstrated support for my research [at the time, in retrospect I think that I should have developed other means to receive feedback. In any case, with approvals in hand, I started actively pursuing the information I hoped would address my research questions.

**Phase 5: Gathering Knowledge**

The fifth phase of the research involved conducting interviews and a document analysis to address the aims of my research. My first research method consisted of conducting interviews with those who agreed to participate in my research. Interviewees decided if their interviews would be recorded with an audio recorder or by interview notes. I followed the directions that they provided and worked with each interviewee to finalize their transcriptions. The second research method consisted of gathering and analyzing documents to increase my knowledge about Kaloko-Honokōhau before and during National Park Service management. I collected documents relevant to two primary domains of knowledge: Hawaiian cultural traditions and practices associated with the area and the legislated creation and institutional development of the National Park. The strategies that I used to conduct both of these methods is discussed in this section.

\textsuperscript{3} The acronym “KAHO” is used by the Park Service to refer to the place name, “Kaloko-Honokōhau.” Although this term is appropriate to the Park Service, in the Hawaiian culture this can be considered disrespectful because the original name is altered. Therefore, I refrain from using the acronym in this thesis.
Interviews

Sampling

There were two sampling methods that I used to identify who to contact about my research. The first sampling method was *purposeful sampling*, a sampling strategy that selects individuals who share a particular set of attributes that relate to the topic being investigated (Stringer 2007:42-44). The attributes that unified the people that I sought to speak with was that I wanted to interview those who (a) cared about the management of Kaloko-Honokōhau and (b) had an active role in management-related activities. This meant that I needed to speak to National Park Service managers, National Park employees, and community representatives. Park Service managers are individuals with the authority to take actions and make decisions regarding impacts to the park’s resources and values (NPS 2006:158). National Park Service employees were those in non-managerial positions. Community representatives were advisory commissioners, park partners or volunteers.

Because I could not speak to all of the individuals from these groups, I instead interviewed between one and five representatives from each of the three groups. My goal in selecting people was to obtain a relevant range of experiences that best represented the case at the National Park (Mason 2002:124). As individuals more familiar with the management of the National Park than I, they would be better qualified to answer questions concerning how Park Service management practices could fulfill the National Park’s mandates.

The second sampling method reflected “snow ball sampling,” a technique that researchers use to identify who they should speak with using referrals (Stringer 2007:47). I first contacted friends and acquaintances who helped me identify others that I should speak with and so on. This was a useful method because members of the Kailua-Kona community directed me to people that I would otherwise have been unable to contact.

I gave explicit attention to sampling issues. Inadequate or non-representative sampling, and the use of non-probability-based sampling are three factors that lead to sampling errors, which in turn potentially leads to biased results. Nicholas Walliman (2006:75-83) suggests that researchers deal with these issues by (1) ensuring that they
understand who should be involved in a target group, (2) having adequate representation for each of them, and (3) avoiding using non-probability selection because it may misrepresent the research findings. Purposeful sampling gave me greater control over these issues because I had greater control over the level of effort used to recruit Park Service managers, Park Service employees, and community representatives. If a non-probability-based sampling method had been used, I could have risked creating a non-representative sample because some groups could not have had an equal chance of being selected for.

Martin Marshall (1996:522) explains that although quantitative researchers often utilize random sampling, this form of probability sampling may hamper qualitative research. Instead, he advises researchers to utilize a sampling strategy tailored to address specific research questions. According to this view, purposeful sampling should have helped select interviewees that could answer research questions. Robert Yin (2011:89) warns that forming a sampling strategy based on numerical rationales is often inappropriate in qualitative studies. Likewise, purposeful sampling should strengthen my research because rather than seeking to recruit a high number of interviewees, the sampling groups sought to recruit individuals from diverse backgrounds. Such sampling can serve to represent a wider array of sentiments and be equally as beneficial as high numbers of interviewees.

The first group of interviewees that were not as fully represented as I desired was individuals who had ancestral connections to Kaloko-Honokōhau. Although some kamaʻāina attended research presentations and were consulted throughout the research process, I did not get to speak to all of the families that have ancestral ties to this land. In the end, I was able to talk with five ʻohana about the project, and interview only two members of two ʻohana as interviewees. I did not include tourists who visit the National Park as an interviewee group because the research seeks to identify, document, and explore the sentiments of individuals closely familiar with and active in the management of the park. Although tourists are affected by management decisions and actions, they are not actively involved in park management. Other studies aimed at visitor experiences should include their sentiments. Their perspective is valuable and can help the Park Service strengthen interpretive activities.
Recruitment

Park Service employees and community representatives suggested that I share the research, receive feedback, and recruit interviewees by conducting presentations, preparing handouts, filming a short video, calling people, exchanging e-mails, and meeting with individuals in person. I conducted three presentations for Park Service staff, partners, and advisory commissioners in May and June 2013. At the start of these presentations, I first providing the audience with a personal introduction and stated my moʻokūʻauhau. I then described my educational background, shared some of my personal interests, introduced the purpose of the project, explained the research objectives, and discussed the research methods before opening the presentation for questions and comments. Audience members were given my contact information at the end of my presentation to ask questions, share concerns, and offer other comments privately. The three presentations followed this format.

I first presented to the park’s advisory commission, Na Hoa Pili O Kaloko-Honokōhau, on May 17, 2013, at the Kaloko fishpond picnic area. Twelve individuals attended my 25-minute presentation. Afterwards, I invited questions, comments, and concerns from the advisory commissioners. Several members shared thoughts that provided me with guidance, and the necessary endorsement to proceed with the research. In particular, the commission wanted me to know that:

1. The project was ideally a life-long project that would extend beyond my years in academia;
2. Hawaiian cultural values are full of meanings and expressions that are difficult to define, and therefore may be inappropriate to integrate into the project; and
3. I should review the oral history reports and the park’s management plans to familiarize myself with the area.

After conducting this presentation, I removed my objective to identify cultural values because an advisory commissioner thought that it was inappropriate. In other words, I refocused the interview questions to understand why people were unsatisfied with Park Service management practices, and how they could be improved. Although I initiated this change, I remained open to receiving insight about Hawaiian cultural values if the interviewees discussed them.
The second presentation was held for the park partners, Makani Hou O Kaloko-Honokōhau, on May 18, 2013, at the Kaloko fishpond picnic area. Five individuals attended the presentation; three of whom had also been present at the presentation for the advisory commission. My talk lasted 20 minutes and no questions were asked when the presentation ended.

My final presentation was held for the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park employees at their “monthly” all-staff meeting, on June 5, 2013, at the park’s headquarters. Approximately 30 individuals from all levels of management attended. My presentation lasted 20 minutes. When I finished presenting, audience members asked questions regarding:

1. The National Park Service research permit conditions;
2. The management division between natural and cultural resources by the National Park Service; and
3. Whether and how the management division between natural and cultural resources would be addressed and discussed in my research.

For the first and second topic, the group and I discussed the National Park Service research permit conditions, and thesis research terms and definitions together. Through this discussion, I thought that the audience members became more aware of the permit restrictions. For the third topic, I informed the group that my approach to the division between natural and cultural resources would remain undetermined until the interviews were conducted and guidance was obtained from the interviewees.

I also prepared a film that was 15 minutes in length and followed the presentation format. This video was sent via email to all of the individuals who expressed interest in the project in informal meetings, emails, phone calls or at a presentation. Individuals were informed that the “recruitment video” could be shared with others that might be interested in learning about or working on the project.

Two handouts were also prepared. The first (Appendix B) that I created was shared at the presentation I conducted for the advisory commission. It was one page and contained
four parts: a short introduction to the project; a description of how individuals could participate in the research and their role as interviewees; an explanation of how knowledge they share would be used; and my contact information. After presenting to the advisory commission, I better understood the types of information that individuals wanted and used comments to develop a second five-page handout (Appendix C). This contained a personal introduction and explained the gap I thought existed between park management policy and practice; my project purpose and methods; the voluntary nature of participation; and the value of having individuals participate. The handout summarized how information shared would be used and how individuals could participate; and people could contact me for further information. Hardcopies were distributed at the presentation for the park’s partners and the Park Service employees. I sent the handout to audience members at the first presentation via email.

I contacted 10 individuals via telephone and email solicitations. I began these discussions with a personal introduction, stated the purpose for my call or email, and then asked if they were interested in talking more at a later time. Quite often, several phone conversations or email exchanges took place before interviews were scheduled. Pre-interview phone and email conversations afforded individuals opportunities to ask questions regarding my personal background, interests, and ideas.

**End of Recruitment and Interviewee Background**

I tried to ensure that individuals could contact me with concerns before I actually started the research by creating a 30-day question-and-comment period, held from May 26 to June 24, 2013. Nine individuals contacted me during this period via email. Six requested clarifications regarding the National Park Service research permit conditions; the other three shared personal concerns and thoughts about park management practices. For these discussions, the individuals and I discussed all concerns and related matters until there were no remaining questions or comments. One individual who contacted me in early August requested to participate in the research. I included this person as an interviewee. I stopped recruiting interviewees when the question-and-comment period ended.
Of the 57 individuals that I invited to participate in the research, a total of 19 agreed to participate as interviewees. This included 14 who attended presentations and 5 who I contacted via email or phone. Table 1 provides a summary of the backgrounds for the 12 interviewees who agreed to share personal information. Information that could be used to identify the seven individuals who requested anonymity has been removed. I created alias names to refer to these persons.

Table 1. Interviewees who agreed to share their names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Kānaka ‘Oiwi</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben Saldua</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 13, 2013</td>
<td>NPS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Cachola</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 11, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Gillespie</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>July 18, 2013</td>
<td>NPS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Jokiel</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 18, 2013</td>
<td>NPS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall Ho’opai</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>August 29, 2013</td>
<td>NPS Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Souza</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>July 10, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mele Barton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>July 13, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokihana Keoho</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NPS Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Solien</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 13, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nainoa Perry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 11, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Paikuli-</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Recorded</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>NPS Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson Harp</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>July 03, 2013</td>
<td>Community Member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I worked with community members and Park Personnel to make the research aims and methods as appropriate as possible. I then structured, scheduled, and conducted the interviews.

**Interview Questions, Structure, and Schedule**

All of the interview questions pre-supposed that the interviewees were familiar with the management goals of the National Park (Table 2). Chances of recruiting people unfamiliar with this topic were minimal and all interviewees possessed and applied substantial knowledge about the National Park’s history and management.

Table 2. Interview questions.

- How satisfied are you with the park’s fulfillment of management goals?
- What are some of the challenges or barriers that limit the park’s ability to fulfill these goals?
- How can the park more successfully fulfill these goals?
Table 2. Interview questions (contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How satisfied are you with the involvement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and non-Kānaka ʻŌiwi in planning and management activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How satisfied are you with the involvement of the local community in planning and management activities?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I prepared for the interviews by referring to the teachings of my Tūtū to create an interview structure that I felt comfortable using in my research. As a child growing up in a home with my grandparents and other relatives, I learned how to show aloha to family and guests that visited our home. My grandmother, a hardworking woman who took care of the house and family, always had a pot of rice prepared or poi (mashed taro) available. Visiting guests would walk to the screen door and yell, “Hui!” My grandmother, upon hearing this call, would respond “Hui! Mai, mai. Come eat, come eat.” She would invite the guest into our home to sit, eat, and talk story. After hearing this response, the visiting guest would remove their slippers and enter.

I tried to create an atmosphere that followed this protocol in my research because I thought that it would encourage the interviewees to share freely. Rather than structuring the interviews in a rigid manner, I sought to allow aloha to be shared and exchanged by integrating food, family, music, and conversations into planned meetings. This interview process reflected the teachings of my ʻohana. I also treated the interviewees as a member of my family. They helped me decide how the interviews would be conducted and their knowledge would be shared. In turn, I respected their wishes by following their directions and let them lead the interview process. In some cases, not all of the questions I thought were important were thoroughly addressed; in others, I received knowledge and perspective beyond what I had hoped for or anticipated.

The interviewees identified a location, time, and date when their interview would be conducted. When I conducted interviews with those familiar with Hawaiian cultural ways of interacting, I prepared food and drinks to share. The interviews that I conducted at these individuals’ homes consisted of this and a small gift that could be shared by the interviewee and their ʻohana. Using this approach, I tried to create an environment that fostered love, sharing, and cooperation. Before interviews, I asked the interviewees for permission to record their thoughts using an audio recorder. When individuals approved, I recorded the
interviews; when they did not, I asked to take notes instead. The recorded interviews provided a fuller, more detailed description of what individuals shared, largely because they enabled me to use direct quotes. These recordings were also complemented by laughter, cries, chuckles, and the natural sounds of the ocean, wind, and waves. The notes that I wrote could not capture these elements. During these meetings, I ensured that the amount of time that individuals had to share was not restricted. I planned for us to meet for a minimum of three hours. These interviews generally lasted anywhere from an hour and a half to two hours. For these meetings, some individuals brought family members to join in and others coordinated a group interview with their friends. Structuring the interview in this manner helped encourage group discussions and sharing. These discussions flowed freely and were not rushed.

Interviews that I conducted with those unfamiliar with the Hawaiian culture did not include meals or gifts. During previous meetings, I learned that individuals unfamiliar with cultural exchange practices felt uncomfortable with sharing food and accepting gifts. Rather than creating a comfortable atmosphere for the interviewees, this traditional approach could thus actually make people uncomfortable. I therefore offered to meet for coffee or lunch at a later time instead. I planned to meet for a minimum of 30 minutes and a maximum of one hour. After observing and learning about the preferences and behaviours of some of the interviewees, I noticed that Park Service personnel approached the interviews with a business mentality. These individuals often managed their time according to rigid schedules. I asked the interview questions in chronological order. After all of the interview questions were asked and answered, I thanked the participant and the interview ended.

**Interview Transcriptions, Edits, and Records Release Processes**

After the interviews were conducted, recorded interviews were transcribed verbatim using Express Scribe, a digital transcription software. The notes were typed into a Microsoft Word document or written up. As soon as each transcription was prepared, it was immediately returned to the interviewee to review. I worked with each interviewee to finalize their transcriptions and notes. Those whose interviews were recorded reviewed their

---

transcriptions and deleted parts, rephrased statements or added thoughts to more accurately reflect their views. Most of the revisions were minor; the interviewee either deleted parts that were unclear, or changed or added parts for clarity. However, in two instances the revisions were major – the interviewee and I worked on two to three draft versions of the transcriptions together.

After transcriptions were reviewed and edited, the interviewees signed the records release forms to allow me to include their transcriptions in the research. Nine individuals consented to the use of their transcriptions in the research, seven of whom requested anonymity. Two interviewees requested that I contact them before sharing direct quotes. As per their instructions, I contacted them when I used direct quotes.

I worked with the other 10 interviewees to edit their interview notes. Parts were deleted, statements rephrased, and thoughts were added to more accurately reflect their views. As with the transcriptions, most revisions were minor; in one case, the revision was major and required that I work through three draft versions of the notes with the interviewee. After the interviewee reviewed their interview notes, they signed the records release forms. Seven of the interviewees were not interested in assisting Park Service in any way and requested that their thoughts not be included in the research. I found it difficult to hear that an important individual felt injured by Park Service management actions to the extent that they believed the damage could not be repaired; nonetheless, per their instructions, their interview was excluded from the research.

Document Analysis

*Identifying and Collecting Documents*

Throughout the research I collected documents that were pertinent to this case study. The first documents that I retrieved related to the creation, institutional development, and management of the National Park. This information was documented in legal documents, administrative records, and Park Service publications. Each of these written sources was central to my study because they described the creation and development of park management. The interviews directed me to other relevant literature that described the
cultural traditions and practices associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau. These sources were central to my research because they explained how people historically used, managed, and interacted with other life forces. Although I attempted to gather documents describing the National Park’s employment, funding, and the internship and training programs, privacy concerns and difficulties obtaining complete records led me to exclude these and other records relating to individuals and to focus on program-level information that was publicly available. I tried to deal with issues regarding the credibility, authenticity, representation, and meaning of these documentary sources by collecting all documents pertinent to the research objectives (Mogalakwe 2006:221). Table 3 lists the documents I used in this study.

The documents that I collected were first saved to Mendeley, a reference software, and then exported into NVivo, a qualitative data analysis software program. I collected pertinent documents from the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park library. I worked with park personnel to identify potential sources to include in the research. Once I reviewed the park’s collections and prepared a list of the reports that I was interested in, I filed a research request to access, copy, and utilize them in my study. A park administrator approved this request in 2013 (FY13-001). The next phase of the research involved interpreting the information that I gathered to fulfill my research objectives.

---

5 See www.mendeley.com to access this software.
6 See www.qsrinternational.com to access this software.
7 FY is a acronym for “fiscal year.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Histories and Ethno-Historical Reports</td>
<td>Kelly 1971; Maly 2000; Maly 2000; Maly and Maly 2002; Peterson and Orr 2005; Roy and Nahale n.d.</td>
<td>Oral histories; ethno-historical reports; historical maps and documents.</td>
<td>Documents traditional uses, cultural practices, and history.</td>
<td>Not all information is shared in these studies. In the Hawaiian culture, some forms of knowledge are protected and not shared. This helps to protect tangible and intangible cultural elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Documents</td>
<td>Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866; Public Law 92-346 and 95-625; USDOI, NPS 1994</td>
<td>Legislative records; Congressional reports; formal decisions; and Public Laws.</td>
<td>Documents historical creation of NHP.</td>
<td>Not all information was available online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Records</td>
<td>USDOI, NPS 2013</td>
<td>Superintendent’s Compendiums; employment and funding records; internship and training programs and number of individuals recruited; and meeting minutes for the advisory commission meetings.</td>
<td>Provides insight into the institutional development of the NHP.</td>
<td>Some records could not be disclosed or were incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Policies, Kaloko-Honokōhau NHP Management Documents, and Reports</td>
<td>Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974; USDOI, NPS 1994</td>
<td>NPS management polices; park management plans; and reports regarding natural and cultural resources.</td>
<td>Describes the management goals of the NHP and studies conducted.</td>
<td>Some of the management plans conflict.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 6: Meaning Making

The final phase of my research necessitated that I analyze the knowledge I gathered in interviews and documents. I conducted my analysis using NVivo to organize the information gathered in a systematic manner and assign codes to broad and narrow themes as they emerged from the texts. These codes were continually refined until I thought that I understood the knowledge that I gathered. The process that I followed to code the interviews and documents is discussed below.

Coding Interviews

I uploaded and analyzed the interview transcripts and discussion notes using NVivo. The purpose of the analysis was to be open to the information to identify current challenges and management preferences for the National Park (Simons 2009:124-126). I began the analysis by thoroughly reading each document three times to familiarize myself with the topics discussed, and assigned “pre-codes” (Saldana 2008:16-17) to significant and unique statements. During this process, I created “memos” (Strauss and Corbin 2008:110) that were written as short notes to document my analysis, thoughts, questions, and future directions.

After familiarizing myself with the transcripts, I conducted “open coding,” an initial coding process to disassemble the interviews (Benaquisto 2004:582-583) using “line-by-line analysis” (Strauss and Corbin 1998:119) to read each line and break down the interviews into small, manageable parts. This process allowed me to better understand the interviewees’ perspectives and interpretations in-depth (Warren and Karner 2010:218-221) and create “categories,” a higher order grouping that brings together “concepts,” the thoughts, ideas, and meanings (Strauss and Corbin 2008:102) that have been coded, which share similar qualities (Strauss and Corbin 1998:113). Instead of using preconceived codes that I developed independently without reading the interviews, I used the recurring concepts to form codes more organically. I coded discussions that referred to the physical structures and objects as “loko i’a, ala hele, and wai” first, and then recoded them into a category I
named “biophysical objects,” which shared a characteristic that referred to natural and cultural elements of Kaloko-Honokōhau. Creating and refining the codes and categories was an iterative process that involved sorting through the interviews, reflecting, analyzing, and organizing pertinent parts (Weingand 1993:25). Throughout the open coding process, I reorganized and recoded the interviews to get closer to the interviewees’ messages, the links among these messages and among interviewees, and their relevance to the research questions (Weitzman 2000:803-819). As each interview was analyzed and concepts were identified, blocks of texts were coded into categories that referenced the topics listed in Table 4.

### Table 4. Initial categories and their properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy barriers</td>
<td>Conditions and constraints referring to policy impediments and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>challenges to the realization of legislated mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>Activities describing or referring to interpretation of the park resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or the interpretation division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>References to interactions describing the relationship between the park,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel, and the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biophysical objects</td>
<td>Biophysical objects in the park like the fishponds, fish trap, heiau,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planters and water, fish, rain, plants, sky, mountains, ocean, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Spiritual experiences and elements of the Hawaiian culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditions</td>
<td>Cultural traditions and practices in the Hawaiian culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>Hiring practices, training and orientation programs, and park positions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because I did not think that I “saturated” or could no longer learn information from the interviews (Given 2008:196-197), I continued using line-by-line analysis to closely examine the interviews and refine the categories. The interviewees and others involved in the project trusted me with sharing their views as accurately as possible. I felt a sense of kuleana to follow my na‘au and continue coding the interviews. I created new categories to better group shared topics discussed by the interviewees (Charmaz 1996:39-40). I created a spreadsheet that summarized the categories, their properties that define them, and direct quotations. I used the spreadsheet to analyze and refine the categories. I began this process by examining their properties for similarities and dissimilarities. When a category property conflicted with another, items coded did not contain the characteristics required or two or more categories shared the same properties, I made note of these occurrences and
recoded the items into the appropriate category or created new categories that more accurately reflected the material. Statements referencing Park Service hiring, training, and orientation practices revolved around a core theme grouped under the category “Hiring.” I constantly analyzed the coded material to narrow them down by making constant comparisons between the properties within a single category and between multiple categories (Boeije 2002:393). I refined, recoded, and renamed the categories that had shared properties to break them down into more discrete groups (Table 5).

### Table 5. Second round of categories and their properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural traditions and practices</td>
<td>Legends, land and sea management, and agricultural, fishing, and social practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Spiritual experiences and elements of the Hawaiian culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biophysical</td>
<td>Natural and cultural elements located at Kaloko-Honokōhau.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relationships</td>
<td>Social relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary and seasonal hires</td>
<td>Temporary and seasonal positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring practices</td>
<td>NPS hiring practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Employee training and orientation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I analyzed the second round of codes that I created to identify their “axial codes,” a higher level of analysis used to explore relationships between the categories and their properties (Strauss and Corbin 1998:123-124). To stimulate my thoughts about potential relationships amongst the categories, I asked questions: What are the issues and challenges? How do the interviewees suggest these matters be dealt with? And what are other recurring topics that have been discussed? These questions allowed me to pull out the “subcategories” that highlighted differences between each category (Strauss and Corbin 1998:145). I identified four subcategories that described four landscape elements that are aspects of land management at Kaloko-Honokōhau (Table 6).

Table 6). The subcategories revealed that the axial codes referred to two forms of Park Service management. The first described concerns regarding current Park Service management and the second described preferences for a future form of management. Each of the landscape elements is interrelated and influence aspects of land management mentioned by the interviewees.
Table 6. Four subcategories that describe land management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcategory</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Landscape Elements</td>
<td>Cultural Traditions and Practices</td>
<td>Stories, land and sea management, and agricultural, fishing, and social practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Landscape Elements</td>
<td>Spirituality</td>
<td>Spiritual experiences and elements of the Hawaiian culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Landscape Elements</td>
<td>Human Relationships</td>
<td>Social relationships between people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporary and Seasonal Hires</td>
<td>Temporary and seasonal positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiring Practices</td>
<td>NPS hiring practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Training and orientation processes and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biophysical Landscape Elements</td>
<td>Biophysical Objects</td>
<td>Natural and cultural types of elements located at Kaloko-Honokohau.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final step of the coding process involved identifying the “selective code,” which meant that I integrated the concepts identified around a core category (Strauss and Corbin 1998:236). The strategy that I used to guide the research, authorized heritage discourse, assisted me with developing the selective code. Because this strategy presupposed that there were forms of heritage management authorized in the dominant discourse, and others which were construed by them, I concluded that the interviews described the current discourse of the National Park Service and a reauthorized heritage discourse of Kānaka ʻŌiwi. This second discourse described a management style that would allow the management preferences of the interviewees to have a more integral and active role in management. My interview results are discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. The document analysis necessitated that I conduct an analysis of documents that were pertinent to my research.

Coding Documents

I used “content analysis,” a technique that researchers use to “provide aggregate accounts or inferences from large bodies of data that reveal trends, patterns, and differences no longer obvious to the untrained individual” (Krippendorff 1989:404). More
simply, I analyzed documents to identify key information that was pertinent to my research questions. I conducted the content analysis by uploading and analyzing the documents that I gathered using NVivo. This qualitative software was used to systematically sort through, organize, and assign codes to information in the documents that I collected. Like the interview analysis, I used “open coding,” a first step in the coding process to disassemble the documents (Benaquisto 2004:582-583). Research questions were also formulated and used to guide the analysis as I read through each document using “line-by-line analysis” (Strauss and Corbin 1998:119), a process that obliged me to intimately familiarize myself with the text. I first assigned “pre-codes” (Saldana 2008:16-17) to significant and unique statements that I thought answered the questions that I asked. I created “memos” (Strauss and Corbin 2008:110) throughout this process to document my analysis, thoughts, questions, and future directions.

As I read and familiarized myself with the documents and answers that responded to my research questions, I created codes for thoughts, ideas, and meanings that shared similar qualities (Strauss and Corbin 1998:102, 113). I began creating “categories,” a higher order grouping that brought together the “concepts” as the analysis progressed. I analyzed one to three documents; I also read through the codes that I developed to begin developing the categories. This helped me refine previously created codes and categories. I continued this process until I thought that the data had been “saturated,” meaning no new knowledge could be learned because the codes and categories were sufficiently refined (Given 2008:196-197). This was the coding process that I used to analyze all of the documents that were gathered.

The first group of documents coded included two historical reports, four historical maps, an oral history report, a marine ethnography, and a study that included a narrative of oral testimonies. Because of my analytic focus on identifying and describing cultural traditions and practices associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau, I focused on information that described how structures in the park’s legislative boundaries were used before the National Park was established. I sought any information on management practices or arrangements, and social, cultural, and spiritual aspects associated with them. This information was used to describe cultural traditions and practices associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau. Much of this information is summarized in Chapter 3.
The second group of documents that I coded included legislative documents and National Park management reports, studies, and policies. The purpose of this analysis was to develop a chronology describing the creation and institutional development of the National Historical Park and guidelines for all aspects of management. Information gathered in this analysis was compared to the cultural traditions that I identified. Most of this information is summarized in Chapters 5 and 6.

Chapter Summary

The research phases described in this chapter were integral to the formation and completion of this study. The knowledge that I learned from friends and family in the first phase of my study helped me strengthen my understanding about my research purpose. Conversations with Park Service personnel and community members in the second and third phase allowed me to create research objectives and identify appropriate research methods. These discussions led me to the fourth phase that necessitated I receive approval to conduct my research. This then allowed me to gather documents and conduct interviews in the fifth phase. The sixth phase of the research required that I make meaning from the information that I gathered to identify management challenges, preferences, and recommendations.

Family members, Park Service personnel, and community representatives provided me with spiritual, social, and physical grounding throughout my research. I sought to maintain love, compassion, empathy, respect, and humility for the people I spoke with and places that I visited. These values provided me with a peaceful face to counter the waves of people, feelings, and conflicts I met throughout my research. The knowledge that I gained helped me understand how I could heal relationships at this National Park.
Chapter 3. Nurturing A River of Relationships

Like viewing the ocean floor through a glass bottom box, where panoramic details come to life, rocks do not remain rocks, artifacts do not remain artifacts, but rather, are put back into the hands of those who used them in their culture. By doing this, elements of cultural significance take on a broader, more meaningful scope.

–Roy and Nahale (n.d.:5)

To understand the cultural significance of Kaloko-Honokōhau, it is essential to have a thorough understanding of the rich cultural traditions and practices that are associated with the area. In this way, the landscape transforms into a wahi pana and history comes to life. Structures become more than objects and are instead places that take on a life of their own. Moʻolelo, which are both oral and written, recite the names of people, spiritual guardians, and deities that have associations with Kaloko-Honokōhau. These legends also describe how the area was used and cared for, as well as the events that occurred there. They provide our people with connections to our past because through the remembrance and transmission of these moʻolelo, the legacy of the Hawaiian culture lives. Our traditions, legends, and practices transform into a living and active culture. Each of these cultural elements is embodied in places, objects, and structures at Kaloko-Honokōhau.

The aim of this chapter is to bring our moʻolelo to life by highlighting cultural practices that are associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau. I begin by introducing the Kekaha Region surrounding the National Historical Park. I then discuss the sea-to-mountain exchange system as people who historically lived on or used the area described it. I highlight the cultural values that were embedded in everyday life, and explain how they worked to provide harmony in relationships and between life forces. I narrow the discussion to focus on how ancestral structures located near the coast were used and cared for. Next, I review some
key archaeological studies pertaining to how the area was first settled, used, controlled, and maintained. I close with a description of how and why people left the area.

The Kekaha Region

Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki are three *ahupua‘a* located in Kailua-Kona on the western flank of Hualālai on Hawai‘i Island (Figure 2). Of these, Kaloko is located farthest north and is bordered by Kohanaiki to the north, Ka‘ūpūlehu to the east, and Honokōhau Nui to the south. South of Honokōhau Nui lies Honokōhau Iki, which is bordered by Ka‘ūpūlehu to the east and Kealakehe to the south. All of these *ahupua‘a* are located in the Kona District in an area traditionally referred to as the Kekaha Region. Pukui et al. (1974:106) explains that the name “Kekaha” literally translates into “the place” and describes the dry environmental conditions. The Kekaha Region was once only inhabited by ghosts until the demigod Punia cleared it, making it safe for human habitation (Fornander 1998:294-300). Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki are three of 23 *ahupua‘a* located in the Kekaha Region (Maly 2000:6).

Annually, the Kekaha region receives 64 to 76 cm of rain. Water is of high value and is remembered in Hawaiian proverbs and legends. Kepā Maly (2000:6) notes that the Kekaha Region is “affectionately” referred to as “*Kekaha wai‘ole o nā Kona*” (Waterless Kekaha of the Kona District) by the people from these lands. This ʻōlelo no‘eau is a powerful name because it acknowledges the environmental conditions and also conveys the deep love and close bond that I and many others have for it. Eliza D. Maguire (1999), who published several legends tied to this region’s coast, emphasizes the importance of water.
Honoring the Relationship Between People and Life Forces

*Kamaʻāina* that historically lived at or are familiar with Kaloko-Honokōhau shared knowledge regarding living in the Kekaha region, caring for their *wahi*, and interacting with other families. The experiences that they shared describe how individuals lived with and sustainably used other life forces, nurtured relationships with other families, and used and cared for *kahua hulikoehana*. Each of these aspects was central to the sea-to-mountain exchange system. This system is described as a “cooperative” and “self-sufficient” economy and “self-contained” complex (Roy and Nahale n.d.:13) that fostered *mālama ʻāina* in all aspects of life. Families from the ʻāina *mauka* exchanged goods with those from the ʻāina *makai* and vice versa in existing and neighboring *ahupuaʻa*. It was a custom for families to visit their extended *ʻohana* and leave with gifts of vegetables and other staples (Roy and Nahale n.d.:16). The types of resources that people exchanged was influenced by where they lived in the *ahupuaʻa* and the types of goods that were readily available or could be gathered and grown (Peterson and Orr 2005:69). Caring for, maintaining the health of, and sharing the abundance of the ʻāina were responsibilities central to *mālama ʻāina*. Alena
Kamakakaokekua from North Kona shared one such kūpuna lesson that revolved around mālama:

There’s three things: Mālama o ka ‘āina. What does that mean to you? [Look after the land; it will take care of you.] That’s right! That’s the key. No haumea the ‘āina. No make the land dirty. Mālama ka ‘āina. Take care of the land. So what do you plant, that’s what will take care of you! So keep it clean. Now Mālama o ke kai. Take care of the ocean. Don’t throw rubbish in the ocean. Don’t throw plastic inside there and cans. And the fish or whatever get stuck with them. You keep the ocean clean, you going to eat clean fish. You haumea the ocean, that’s what you are going to get. The fish going to eat your rubbish and who will eat the fish? So you learn important things of the land and the ocean. To Mālama o ka ‘āina—care for the land and the land will care for you. Mālama o ke kai—care of the ocean, ocean will care for you. But the third one? Mālama o ke kino. Take care of your body; it’s the only one you get. Don’t put all that rubbish inside you. It’s going to make you sicker. The same way you care for the land, care for the ocean, care for yourself. ‘Cause if you keep the ocean clean, the land clean, keep yourself clean, you’re healthy, the land healthy and the ocean healthy. You learn from that (Peterson and Orr 2005:66).

This passage teaches us to mālama o ka ‘āina (care for the land and the land will care for you), mālama o ke kai (care for the ocean, ocean will care for you), and mālama o ke kino (care for your body). These lessons reinforce the reciprocal relationship that humans have to each other, the land, and the waters. This reciprocal relationship was reinforced, fostered, and embraced by other kūpuna.

Samuel Keanaaina (“Anakala Samuel”), who was born in Kalaoa, Hawai‘i, and Peter Keka (“Anakala Peter”), who was born in Waiki‘i, and Arthur Mahi (“Anakala Mahi”), who was born in Laupahoehoe, Hawai‘i, explain that in their time, you only took what you could eat and did not poho (waste) (Maly and Maly 2002:190, 278; Peterson and Orr 2005:49). By taking only what one needed, people maintained the health of the ‘āina, by encouraging elements of the land and sea to survive and thrive. When gathering goods from the ‘āina, to help care for it, ‘Anakala Peter said, “Whenever we get chance we planted it” (Maly and
Maly 2002:207). When plants were gathered, he gave back to the ‘āïna by planting in return. This practice of gathering food and giving back to the ‘āïna describes how to mālama ‘āïna.

‘Anakala Peter said that it was “everybody’s responsibility” to take care of the ‘āïna (Maly and Maly 2002:204-205) and that “the worst thing you could do, is litter” (Maly and Maly 2002:278). By picking up trash and ensuring that the land was kept clean, the land was healthier and better able to produce. He explained the importance of ho’oma’ema’e (cleaning and always taking care) to maintain kahua hulikoehana (Maly and Maly 2002:281). This too helped keep places clean from fallen vegetation. In contrast, when people ‘ānunu (took greedily) and hāpuku (took foolishly), they abused and depleted marine and terrestrial life. ‘Anakala Peter explained that these were practices that his Tūtū disliked. Instead, he said, “You only take what you going to eat, that’s why I tell my grandchildren, “Mālama those things because if you abuse ‘em the next generation not going to have” (Maly and Maly 2002:242). If people took more than they needed, the land would suffer because of one’s greed, and so would their family because there was no foresight.

The kama‘āïna from the area discussed ho‘okipa (hospitality). For example, Agnes Puakalehua Nihi-Harp (“‘Anakē Agnes”) and Violet Leimomi Nihi-Quiddaoen (“‘Anakē Violet”), who were born in O‘ahu, were taught to ho‘okipa by “tak[ing] care of the old people” (Maly and Maly 2002:30). Nīnau (asking for permission) was also a part of life. ‘Anakala Al Kaleio‘umiwai Simmons (“‘Anakala Al”), who was born in Hōkūmāhoe, Hilo, shared an experience telling how one would nīnau before they traveled the island. His Tūtū told him that in their time, to travel to another person’s place, the traveler would have to nīnau to do so:

“I asked him, Tūtū, why is that, ‘have to ask’? He turn around in his old age you know, he look at me and he tell me, “You like me just come your house and I root up your plants and I go home? You agree on that?”...I say, Oh, no!” He said, “Well, same thing!”...He tell me, “You know [sic] can just go!” Hawaiian culture you got to learn, you got to know Hawaiian culture (Maly 2000:111).

‘Anakala Al explained how those that practice lā‘au (medicinal healing) nīnau too:
Even the lā‘au today, they think oh yea, noni can heal you. Sure noni can, but that tree noni get one name, noni. You got to ask the tree….Hawaiians they no just go pick….Before the Hawaiians used to come to the gate over there, even the gate open they used to go, “Hui!”...“Pehea ka po’e o kēia hale?” They ask. “A, ‘o wai la kēla?” “Ae, hele mai ‘ai, come, come” (Maly 2000:111).

These are some of the examples he shared that described how and why one should nīnau. Asking for permission to fish from those who oversaw land was followed (Maly and Maly 2002:266). Pule (prayer) was a part of life. ‘Anakē Violet and ‘Anakē Agnes explained that before they approached the ocean, they aloha by praying first (Maly and Maly 2002:48).

To help care for life forces of the sea, kapu (seasonal restrictions and fishing designations) indicated where ‘ohana could fish and what types of fish could be gathered (Maly and Maly 2002:10). Kapu helped protect marine life and other items from being overused. Because the ‘ohana had an intimate knowledge of the land and sea, this helped protect places from being abused. However, when foreign land management systems, technologies, and ideologies were introduced, the amount of fish available was reduced (Maly 2000:123-124).

Hā‘awi (giving freely) is another value practiced. ‘Anakē Violet and ‘Anakē Agnes explained that their father exchanged goods with people, rather than paying for them with money (Maly and Maly 2002:33). ‘Anakala Al also said that families would exchange to “support one another” (Maly 2000:107). George Kinoulu “Kino” Kahananui Sr. (“‘Anakala George”), who was born in Hōlualoa, Hawai‘i, said that when fish was caught, they would share it with “everybody” (Maly and Maly 2002:104).

‘Anakala Peter also explained that sharing was important, and that when a person visits a neighbour, the host hā‘awi, and then the visitor will hā‘awi in return (Maly and Maly 2002:301, 208; Roy and Nahale n.d.:16). Individuals would travel the ala hele (trails) to exchange goods (Peterson and Orr 2005:52; Roy and Nahale n.d.:16). When ‘ohana needed food, they would light a fire to signal this need. Individuals would go to the source of the fire to share goods. ‘Ohana would also share supplemental food and materials with others (Roy and Nahale n.d.:24).
These are some of the life practices that were shared by *kūpuna* to nurture interrelationships between people, land, and other life forces. The *kūpuna* teachings, such as *mālama o ka ‘āina*, *mālama o ke kai*, and *mālama o ke kino* reinforce reciprocal relations between all living things and the sea-to-mountain exchange system, which relied upon healthy bodies, lands, and waters. The *kahua hulikoehana* that are located near the coast at Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki provide further insight into the lives of *kūpuna*.

**Kahua Hulikoehana**

There are a number of *kahua hulikoehana* like *heiau*, *pā pōhaku* (rock walls), *kahua* (platforms), *loko* (ponds), and other structures that are located in Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki. In early Hawai‘i, *kahua hulikoehana* like *kahua hale* (house platforms) were built without the use of mortar by dry stacking stones. After contact with Europeans, mortar began to be used to build and repair these and other types of *kahua hulikoehana*. People used and cared for these ancestral structures in different ways through time. These practices are documented and described in oral history, ethnography, and archaeology reports. In this section, I describe how *kahua hulikoehana* located along the coast in these three *ahu‘pua‘a* were used and cared for, as well as cultural traditions associated with these structures.

‘Aiʻōpio Loko ‘Ume‘iki (Fish Trap)

‘Aiʻōpio is a stone-walled structure, a *loko ‘ume‘iki* that is approximately 0.81 ha in size and circularly shaped. The east, south, and southwest boundaries of the *loko ‘ume‘iki* at Honokōhau Iki is made of stone and sand, while the open end of the shoreline is closed by a manmade seawall. Pu‘u‘oinoa Heiau (also known as Hale-o-Mano) is located near the southern end of the ‘Aiʻōpio Loko ‘Ume‘iki. Figure 3 shows the position of the fish trap, its stone walls, and the location of Pu‘u‘oinoa Heiau. Within the fish trap, there are four walled enclosures that may have been used to corral or hold fish (Green 1993:378). ‘Anakē Agnes recalled that at ‘Aiʻōpio there were “all kinds of fish” (Maly and Maly 2002:42). ‘Anakē Momi said that ‘Aiʻōpio “had awa, they had mullet and they had that red ‘ōpae” (Maly and Maly 2002:42). The five smaller ponds that surround Pu‘u‘oinoa Heiau were used to hold fish like *kumu*, *‘aholehole*, *hinalea*, and turtle for the *ali‘i nui* (Roy and Nahale n.d.:18).
Figure 3. Map of Pu'uoina Heiau (adapted from Emory and Soehren 1961:61).
Traditions of Kahuna (Priests) and Aliʻi

Like humans, the ʻāina also has a moʻokūʻauhau. This moʻokūʻauhau binds people to places and serves as a constant reminder of people who came before. At Kaloko-Honokōhau, oral traditions recount the names of high-ranking kahuna and aliʻi that first ruled the area. The association of these individuals to Kaloko-Honokōhau is respected and adds layers of sacredness and cultural significance. These rulers of various ranks oversaw the use and care of the land, water, plants, fish, and other life forces in Hawaiʻi.

Our oral traditions trace the kahuna hierarchy to Paʻao, who arrived from Kahiki and began his rule when he established a new line of ruling aliʻi. As a high-ranking kahuna, his second son, Pili, dwelt at Kahua and ruled Kohala and Kona. Pili appointed chiefs at Kawaihae, Honokōhau, and Palemano (a place in Keʻei) to protect the area from invasions from other district chiefs. Pili’s son, Onale, was next to oversee the area and appointed Makakilo, a warrior chief, to govern activities at Honokōhau. Makakilo lived and ruled from the base of Puʻuoina Heiau (Figure 4). Makakilo was known for his keen eyesight that helped him observe the movement of fish. He directed fishing activities using red and white flags, supervised fish distribution, and held fish in the ‘Aiʻōpio Loko ‘Ume‘iki for future distribution (Roy and Nahale n.d.:45-50).

The next person to assume rule was Mano, who lived on the second terrace of Puʻuoina Heiau, which was re-named Hale-o-Mano under his leadership. This chief ruled during the time of Kiha and Liloa. After Mano, Kaumanamana, the son of ʻEhunui Kaimalino, a ruler of all of Kona in the 15th century was next to rule. He lived on the third terrace of Puʻuoina Heiau and assumed rule under the high-ranking chief ʻUmi. Kanaka-leo-nui (man with the loud voice) was the next chief to oversee the area and lived in Keauhou, commuting to Honokōhau to administer activities from Ka Pōhaku O Kanaka-leo-nui (The Stone of Kanaka-leo-Nui), which is located on a bluff that overlooks ʻAimakapā Loko Iʻa. Subsequently, Kekaheulu oversaw the area under the rule of Alapaʻinui, and finally Kekuaokalani, under the rule of Kamehameha the first (Roy and Nahale n.d.:45-50; Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-16). Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006) provide a concise overview of kahuna and aliʻi hierarchy.
Rain and moisture that is captured in the uplands penetrates the soils, and then drains through the bedrock into the aquifer and is released at various points until it reaches the shore. In this process, water runs from the ‘āina mauka into the ‘āina makai feeding loko that are located near the coast. These loko, which range from 1 to 3-m in diameter, contain a mixture of fresh and salt water. There are at least 80 loko within Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki (Brock 1997).

Our ancestors excavated or modified these loko to gather drinking water for cooking and bathing, or to hold fish (Foote 2005; Maly and Maly 2002:202, 281). Strict kapu governed the use of the loko by designating some specifically for gathering drinking water for humans and animals, and others for washing dishes, clothes, and utensils. The drinking

Figure 4. Pu’uoina Heiau (Hale O Mano) (Photograph by R. Aloua in July 2012).

Loko (Ponds)
water that they gathered was referred to as “sweet water,” which was also used for “internal cleansing of the body” (Roy and Nahale n.d.:28).

**Ala Hele (Trails)**

There is a network of *ala hele* (Figure 5) that are located throughout Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki. Some of these trails are narrow passageways, which are 30 cm wide with water-worn stones that line the walkway or worn pāhohoe lava flats. Others are 1 m wide with curb stones. These trails were used by our *kūpuna* to travel and exchange food and materials (Roy and Nahale n.d.:23). Although historical maps often show few *ala hele*, 'Anakala Al explained that, “Every ahupua’a going down that person that owns he get his trail in the ahupua’a” (Maly 2000:127). 'Anakala Peter noted that there are *ala hele* marked with white coral to guide travelers at night (Maly and Maly 2002:274).

![Figure 5. An *ala hele* that connects Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki (Photograph by R. Aloua in July 2013).](image-url)
**Māla (Gardens)**

There are at least 79 māla (gardens) that are located within or near Kaloko (Renger 1970:26). At one time there were hundreds (Roy and Nahale n.d.:14). These structures range in size and shape, but are typically roundish or oval, and range from 1 to 4 m in diameter (Renger 1970:26). Figure 6 is a plan view of some of the māla that are located in Kaloko. The walls of these structures were built by stacking boulders and cobbles, at least two stones or more high, without the use of mortar. Because the area is dry and receives a limited amount of rain annually, these māla likely provided a limited source of agriculture.

![Plan view of the māla located in Kaloko](image)

**Figure 6.** Plan view of the māla located in Kaloko (adapted from Renger 1970:25).

Oral narratives and interviews indicate that these māla were used to grow plants like sweet potato, medicinal herbs, pumpkin, gourds, tobacco, and watermelon (Kelly 1971:2; Roy and Nahale n.d.:14). To provide moisture and ensure protection of the plant roots, the
husks of dried coconuts were immersed in fresh or brackish ponds until the color of the husks darkened to black. The husks were then placed around the roots of the plants to protect them from exposure to the sun and dehydration. This way of planting and mulching ensured favourable growing conditions. The stone walls would also provide crawling vines with support and shade in the afternoon heat (Roy and Nahale n.d.:14). ‘Anakē Agnes recalled tending to small agricultural plots in Kaloko, growing sweet potato and other plants (Maly and Maly 2002:13).

Kaloko Loko I’a (Fishpond)

Kaloko is a loko kuapā-type of fishpond that is separated from the ocean by a manmade sea wall (Wyban 1992:114). The Kaloko Loko I’a contains a: kuapā (sea wall), four secondary pā pōhaku (stone walls) near the southeast corner of the pond, and secondary ponds in the northwest, northeast, and southeast corner of the pond (Figure 7). The kuapā is approximately 228 m long and its construction consists of primarily dry stacked stones, a traditional Hawaiian rock wall building technique, and some portions with mortar that was applied following European contact. This fishpond covers approximately 4.45 ha and is one of the largest that remains in Hawai‘i (Renger 1970:5). There are two mākāhā (sluice gates) that were built near the north and south end of the kuapā (Roy and Nahale n.d.:27).

Elders from the area remember how this fishpond was used in their lifetime. ‘Anakala Val explains that in the 1930s-1940s:

the [fishpond] wall, it was high and there was two kahe [the main channel from the ocean into the pond for the screen], one on the Kailua side and one on the north side…At the kahe, there was a screen that separated the small fish from the big fish. They made it so that the ‘ama‘ama or whatever, baby awa would pass through either way, and that way they were able to not plant the fish in the pond because automatically, it will feed itself you know. And that’s the way…that’s reason, when they made the kahe, they made it in such a way, that the big fish wasn’t able to go out, but the small fish were able to go either way (Maly and Maly 2002:7).
Within the kahe, there were mākāhā that regulated water and the flow of fish. ‘Anakala Val stated that the mākāhā were prepared using:

ōhi’a, or later, from kiawe, nothing less than that….Could retain the salt and would last longer. But, you know, when they made those mākāhā out of ʻōhi’a and everything, everything was done green. Because when the ʻōhia’a is green, you can nail through. And in many instances they used wooden pegs (Maly and Maly 2002:7).

Figure 7.  Map of Kaloko Loko ʻi’a (Tracing of Renger 1970:6).

Located on the outskirts of the Kaloko Loko ʻi’a are kiʻo pua (small ponds) that were used to hold small fish. ‘Anakala John Hills Kaʻiliwai (“ʻAnakala John”), who was born in Lanihau, Hawai‘i, explained how fish entered:
the babies [small fish] going follow the stone….And then pretty soon you look they see one puka (hole) they going follow right inside….Because the big one no can chase them in the shallow water….So they going find one place. Once they get one house pau (finish) they going stay in that house (Maly and Maly 2002:129).

Cultural Traditions

The name “Kaloko” translates into “the pond” (Roy and Nahale n.d.:19). Mo’olelo state that the area was used by King Kamehameha’s armies for refreshment purposes. Those who lived in the villages located along the ‘aʻā and pāhoehoe fields would feed and house the warriors (Roy and Nahale n.d.:12-13). This loko i’a and the broader area is thought to contain the ilina (burials) of several high-ranking ali‘i, including Kamehameha the First (Kelly 1971:21-25; Roy and Nahale n.d.:39-45), which should be left in place (Peterson and Orr 2005:75). This area is kapu-kapu, “very sacred, to be respected,” and is revered by individuals familiar with the history of this place (Roy and Nahale n.d.:19). The Kaloko Loko I’a is also guarded by a moʻo (Roy and Nahale n.d.:20). This moʻo and the ilina are treated with the highest regard in our culture, and for that reason detailed descriptions of them are excluded from this study.

In early Hawai‘i, our ruling chiefs valued fishponds and oversaw harvests of them, within the constraints of the kapu system; distribution followed a particular order (Roy and Nahale n.d.:17-18, 22, 29). At Kaloko, the fish were for the ali‘i (Roy and Nahale n.d.:17). Normally, people were forbidden from catching the fish from this fishpond and could only catch fish during times of hardships or when abundant harvests were made (Roy and Nahale n.d.:38).

Some loko kuapā have a hale kia‘i (guard house) where the guardian for the fishpond resided (Wyban 1992:116). In the tale of Kamiki, it is said that when the Kaloko Loko I’a was ruled by Chief Ahauhale and his young brother Owela-a-Luʻukia, Kamiki was able to catch mullet without being spotted by Kūmakapuʻu (Maly 2000:27-29). It is said that Kūmakapuʻu was:
the guardian of the pond, the one who secures the abundance of the fish. He enforces the restrictions of the ponds and is the one that causes the numbers of fish to increase. It is he who ensures that the fingerlings (‘ua) are plentiful, and that the small holding ponds (ki‘o) and sluice gates (hā) are secure. He is not a man, but is a spirit. It is he who takes the offerings that are made, to the chiefess-deities of the fishpond ‘O'opu-po'owai-nui-a-niho, Ka-lama-i-nu'u-nui-a-noho, and Kiha-wahine-iki-a-nanea. They are the alii kapu Lono i'a (royal ones who keep the fish of Lono class restrictions) in that pond. And the small island in the middle of the fishpond, the fish-gourd (ipu-kai'a), is their royal compound (hālau alii), called "Pakolea."

At the times when people desire to journey and see the sites of the land, it is these goddesses who hide the fish in the ponds, so that it appears there are no fish. Now if the goddesses are gone, the water of the pond is green, but if they are present, the water is red, like the color of blood. In that way, it is known whether or not the goddesses are at their royal compound. When the water is no longer red, they have gone, and that is time that fish are caught in the mākāhā of the fishpond (Maly 2000:28-29).

**Caretakers and Overseers**

There were numerous individuals who oversaw and cared for this fishpond. In 1819, the loko i’a belonged to Hoapili, and was next held by the Kamehameha family from 1848 to the 1880s before passing through a series of owners until it was acquired by the Hu’ehu’e Ranch and the McGuire family in 1906. Within the last 142 years, there have been at least 26 caretakers and countless others that helped mālama this fishpond. Because many individuals cared for this pond, the mo‘olelo provide rich, detailed, and diverse descriptions of how this fishpond was handled and used.

From 1910 to the 1920s, the Mokuakai group cared for the fishpond. The son of a group member recalled helping to repair the kuapā. It is thought that the hui may have lived at the north boundary of the fishpond (Kelly 1971:30). In the years just prior to 1924, Ahuna cared for the fishpond. He lived at Kohanaiki (the ahupua’a north of Kaloko) and followed protocols before fishing from the pond; he prepared offerings that were given to the mo’o
and shared fish from his first catch with neighbors. The second catch was sold at the market. He was known for his generosity and good fortune (Kelly 1971:28-29).

The Simeona family were next to care for the loko i’a. They lived primarily at Honokōhau, but also at Kaloko when fish harvesting activities occurred. The family brought drinking water in 5-gallon buckets with them, and used the brackish water in the area for washing purposes. Simeona’s wife recalled that her husband prayed for the wall for protection in stormy nights, to prevent damage (Kelly 1971:30). Simeona Kanakamaika’i, who was a caretaker of this loko i’a, was a skilled man able to stand on the kuapā and identify areas where the fish congregated, including the types and number of fish that were present (Roy and Nahale n.d.:26).

William Keana’aina was next to oversee the fishpond in 1934 to 1940. His son, William Nu’uanu Keana’aina, Jr., worked the pond with him. William’s grandchild was born at the pond, and at the edge of the loko i’a there was a house used to store the fishing nets. There was also a 2.5 m high stilt home on the Kailua (south) side of the pond that belonged to Keawehawaiis. Cooking was done in a shelter next to the house that was surrounded by a stone wall, which included loko nearby for washing (Kelly 1971:32).

When repairs were conducted on the kuapā the wall would move further inland, towards the east. Young fish that ranged from 5 to 8 cm were transported from Kailua as live bait and released in the smaller pond near the Kohala (north) side of the fishpond. They were allowed to enter the fishpond when they grew to 15 cm to ensure that the pond was stocked with fish. Mullet was only caught seasonally, during Christmas and New Year’s, while other reef fish were fished for more often (Kelly 1971:32). Rather than entering the pond on foot, canoes were used to conduct fishing activities. Pali (possible brother-in-law of Joseph Kahananui, Sr.) and Bill and Alex Keana’aina harvested fish. Fishing nets were set in the pond shortly after dark because if the nets were laid during the day, the fish would see them and hide. If the fishing nets were used too often, the fish would hide and be difficult to trap. Fishers slapped the surface of the water to chase fish into the net (Kelly 1971:32). The numbers and lines added to Figure 8 demonstrate the placement and progression of fishnet laying. During net-laying activities:
People did not go into the pond. We had a canoe. Pali...was the captain of the canoe. Bill and Alex helped. The nets were put into the pond at dark because the fish, if they saw the net, would hide in the mud and could not be caught. They are smart. If you catch too often, the fish hide. When you bring the net and the fish out of the pond, the buyer might be right there to buy the fish, or you have to take the fish to Kailua (Kelly 1971:32).

Caught fish were loaded into kerosene cans and transported to Kailua on donkeys, who traveled the *ala loa*. The fish that were sold included milkfish and mullet.

![Diagram of Kaloko Loko I'a](image)

**Figure 8.** The method of fishnet laying in the Kaloko Loko I'a (Tracing of Kelly 1971:34).

Malaea Keanaaina Tolentino’s (“ʻAnakē Malaea”) brothers gathered *awa* and mullet from the *loko i'a*, packed them into kerosene cans, covered them with burlap bags, loaded them on the donkeys, and sent them to Kailua (Maly and Maly 2002:138). ʻAnakē Malaea described their fishing techniques:
We would go down the old trail from Kohaniki to Kaloko, to work on the pond when my grandpa leased it. I think the trail (makai) comes out basically where the gate that goes into the park is now. My oldest brothers would go lay net in the night, and then at three or four o’clock, they would go pick up the nets. They would set nets and pick them up from a little canoe with uncle Pali. Uncle Pali was the captain for them, he would direct my brothers Alec, William, and Sam, in how to lay the nets and collect the fish. He taught my brothers the history of the area, and how to care for the pond; what was kapu, and how to fish down there at Kaloko and Honokōhau...

My father also used to make imu (stone mounds) in the Kaloko Fishpond near the mākāhā. He’d do this one day, and the next morning when he got up, he would go throw the net, and in that way, he caught all the fish that had gone into the imu. My grandmother and I also used to go catch ‘ōpae in the pond. It was mostly the white ‘ōpae (kowea). Grandma made her own ka’e’e (scoop net) to catch the ‘ōpae. We used the ‘ōpae for bait, and they were also good to eat. Using the ‘ōpae, my grandma would go kā mākoi (pole fish) for po’opa’a, mamo and other fish like that along the shore. We caught the ‘ōpae right inside the pond. We would also gather limu, eat fish, whatever.

One of the things that I remember, is that my grandpa would always give fish to whoever passed by along the trail. He would aloha the people, call to them and give them fish. I thought he was kind of a hard man, but he always worked hard, and had a good heart, he always shared with others (Maly and Maly 2002:139).

From 1943 to 1961, Francis Foo was next to oversee the fishpond. He stocked the fishpond with approximately 40,000 young fish that were bought out of the ponds at Anaeho’omalu and took five years to reach 1 kilogram (market size). He bulldozed a jeep road that connected Kaloko to Kailua. Yearly, the kuapā would be damaged and the Keana’aina brothers assisted with repairs. At this time, mortar was used to repair sections of the kuapā (Kelly 1971:35).

‘Anakala Peter also recalled that to care for this fishpond, “[a] lot of people worked on it not just a few” (Maly and Maly 2002:248). He stated that individuals “[d]onated to the
resource” (Maly and Maly 2002:248) and that these individuals had an opportunity to eat fish from the loko i’a (Maly and Maly 2002:248). Tropical fishes and turtles were put into this pond, ‘Aimakapā Loko I’a, and other ponds to eat seaweed and help maintain the health of the fishpond (Maly and Maly 2002:248, 262). The turtles that were kept in the pond were not eaten because they were treated as pets, while those outside the pond were killed and consumed (Maly and Maly 2002:262).

Historically, it is known that the Kaloko fishpond was harvested seasonally, during holidays like Christmas Eve and New Year’s, and then generally at night because the fish were calmer. Fishes congregated in certain areas of the loko i’a (Roy and Nahale n.d.:26). The fish raised in this fishpond were said to be the best tasting (Roy and Nahale n.d.:37). Likewise, white eels were also placed in the loko i’a and fed until they were harvested for food (Roy and Nahale n.d.:25).

Ko’a (Fishing Grounds and Shrines)

Along this shoreline are ko’a that were used in ceremonies to make fish multiply (Wyban 1992:179). Each ahupua’a had their own ko’a that was used to feed certain types of fish (Peterson and Orr 2005:58). The ko’a range in both size and shape. Val K. Ako (‘‘Anakala Val”) explained how the ko’a that are located along the Kekaha coast were used, shared, and cared for:

We fished for ‘ōpelu out there on that ko’a. Even up ‘O’oma 1 and 2, there were two ko’a over there that we also used. And Akuiwa and I fished in that area. And in that particular area, none of the old ‘ōpelu fishermen were using that ko’a, so Akuiwa and I were using taro and flour. So we never intruded with other ko’a. Where other fishermen didn’t use the ko’a, we would use our bait, but we would let the other fishermen know what we were using for the bait, you know, what the chum was. So that they wouldn’t intrude, they could use the ko’a, but just had to use the same type of palu….It was a must to retain the ko’a, that even if we didn’t go out to fish. The old timers always went out with their pū’olo to feed the fish, to retain them…. [A] certain time, you would have to go out there at the certain time of the day, you see. And I know for a fact that it used to be 4:30 in the afternoon, I would be going out. So when
you fed that the group of fish, the next morning when you feed ‘em, they’re going to be there. But how you going….because when you go out to the ground, so you paipai [urge the fish up] you know, with your paddle and you hit the side of the canoe and automatically, the whole school will come (Maly and Maly 2002:8).

Other practices governed the use and care of the ko’a to ensure that fishing areas were not abused and that the fish were fed and trained to return (Maly and Maly 2002:8).

**Ka Wai O Kahinhini‘ula (The Waters of Kahinhini‘ula)**

There are a series of *ala hele* that lead to a brackish water *loko* that is located in the lava fields and is surrounded by 12 *ahu* (cairns). The largest *ahu* is 3 m tall and extends 4 to 5 m at its base, while the smallest is 1.5 m high and the diameter of its base is 2 m. The sides of the *ahu* are curved; and some parts have fallen. The pond itself, Ka Wai O Kahinhini‘ula, is a modified *loko* that is 4.5 by 6 m, and has a floor covered with finely crushed lava stones. Near the east end is an enclosure that may have been used by bathers and flat stone slabs in the larger pool (Emory and Soehren 1961:28-29).

Ka Wai O Kahinhini‘ula is considered “*kapu-kapu*” (forbidden) (Peterson and Orr 2005:55, 80). It is thought that Kahinhini‘ula was used for spiritual cleansings by *ali‘i* for bathing, including King Kamehameha the First (Hansen, quoted in Kelly 1971:48). Table 7 lists the names of high-ranking females thought to have bathed in this pond. In more recent times, this *loko* was used for rinsing purposes and by campers to bathe. However, rather than entering the pond to rinse their bodies like many do today, visitors retrieved water from the *loko* to prevent contamination (Maly and Maly 2002:291). People that enter the water wearing sunscreen cause pollution. ‘Anakē Agnes recalls that this place was used by the Queen to bathe and that when females have their menses, they are forbidden from entering (Maly and Maly 2002:44,155).
Table 7. Summary of use of Ka Wai O Kahinihini‘ula (Adapted from Tomonari Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kahuna/Royal Hierarchy</th>
<th>Used Ka Wai O Kahinihini‘ula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onale</td>
<td>Kahelekaimoana, Nanamoana (ali‘i wahine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiha and Līloa</td>
<td>Nu‘uhel (wife of Mano, kahuna chief of North Kona)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Līloa</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Umi</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly Keli‘iokoloa-Lono-i-ka-makahiki</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alapa‘inui</td>
<td>Kāpulu (wife of Kekaheulu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(break in information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamehameha</td>
<td>Manono (wife of Kekuaokalani)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Aimakapā Loko I’a (Fishpond)

‘Aimakapā is a natural inland fishpond that is also located in the ahupua‘a of Honokōhau Nui (Figure 9). This is a loko pu‘uone type of loko i’a that is separated from the ocean by a sand barrier. This loko i’a once covered approximately 12 ha. As of 2014, approximately 6 ha have been transformed into marshlands by encroaching wetland vegetation on the northern, eastern, and southern boundaries of the loko i’a. There are at least six smaller ponds that are located within this fishpond, in the rear east. Historically, this loko i’a contained an active mākāha at the northern section of the sand barrier (Green 1993:372-375). The large platform of stones built near the north mākāhā was a shrine for the kia‘i (Roy and Nahale n.d.:22). There may be a seawall in the bay that extends a distance of 762 m from ‘Ai‘ōpio Ume‘iki north to 244 m beyond ‘Aimakapā Loko I’a (Kelly 1971:18). This fishpond was built in an area where fresh water seeps into the pond and ocean waters thereby naturally attracting fish to enter and live in it (Kelly 1971:21).
In English, Ai-ma-ka-pa translates into “eat by the fence or border” (Kelly 1971:18; Roy and Nahale n.d.:18). Unlike the Kaloko Loko I’a, the fish from this fishpond could be caught by the makaʻāinana that were destitute. They could take and eat whatever fish they could catch with their hands (Roy and Nahale n.d.:18). There was a spring near this loko i’a used to gather drinking water (Roy and Nahale n.d.:35). The elders that historically used and lived in the area caught i’a (Maly 2000:72), ʻōpae (Maly and Maly 2002:41), and non-native types of kōloa (duck) (Maly and Maly 2002:327) from ‘Aimakapā and the surrounding loko for consumption. ‘Anakala Peter had memories of the holding pens:

They had individual families, you know, taking care of it….Everybody would have enough time to maintain….Not that just one person….It was almost like individual
holding pens. A family would put there and share among the people (Maly and Maly 2002:267).

‘Anakala Peter compared the holding pens in the fishpond near the east to ‘ohana ponds (Figure 9) that “everybody” helped care for (Maly and Maly 2002:267).

**Poho (Depressions) and Paʻakai Moe (Salt Beds)**

There are poho that are circularly shaped, and located along the pāhoehoe flats that are clustered and isolated. Some of these poho were used to make paʻakai (salt), a product that ‘Anakala Peter compared to “gold or money” (Maly and Maly 2002:246). ‘Anakala Al explained that our people looked for areas to prepare paʻakai where the ocean spray naturally gathered in poho, which filled with water, without draining into the ocean. He explained that families identified their poho. ‘Anakala Al said, “What my grandma do and she makes some kind of knot, because you got to mark your own salt hole. If nobody know, they take that salt” (Maly 2000:107-108). Paʻakai could also be made by pouring water into a poho to allow the salt water to set then evaporate. The surface was skimmed at intervals during drying time until collected for use (Roy and Nahale n.d.:24). Some “shallower poho” were also used as pans to dry fish and to prepare concoctions for stunning fish. These were also close to the shore, and are sometimes confused with others used to make paʻakai (Roy and Nahale n.d.:25).

Paʻakai moe are located near the coast. These are made of concrete and thus are likely historic structures built after European contact. There are two basins: (1) an upper basin that is about 11 by 30 m, and is where the salt water was pumped; (2) the second basin is about 11 by 15 m, and is located about 0.5 m below the first basin. From here, the salt water emptied into five smaller pans where the salt water would evaporate (Emory and Soehren 1961:18). Rally Greenwell, who was born in Honokōhau, and Patricia Greenwell, who was born in O‘ahu, recalled that near the coastline in areas like Kawaihae, Puako, Mahai‘ula, and other areas in North and South Kona, there were “big salt works” (Maly 2000:89). Like these larger salt works, the paʻakai moe at Honokōhau may have produced large amounts of salt.
Archaeological Interpretations

Generalized Settlement Pattern

Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006) provide a general settlement pattern for Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki. They document activities that occurred from the ‘āina makai to the ‘āina mauka region. Their general settlement pattern begins at sea level and moves upward to 701 m above sea level (asl). The authors suggest that near the coast, the two fishponds and the fish trap existed at the time of contact, and that the maka‘āinana and ali‘i lived near these structures. Evidence of maka‘āinana and ali‘i exists in the variety of housing platforms located in the area and in the gardens, burials, temples, petroglyphs, and toboggan slide. These structures extend inland approximately 9 m to 12 m asl, where there is at least one main coastal trail that connected to a network of trails. The Māmalahoa Trail, situated at about 12 to 15 m asl, was probably constructed between 1830 and 1840 (Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-9).

Moving upland, beginning about 122 m asl, Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006:C-9) suggest that there was a “barren zone,” which was absent of cultivation and permanent living areas. Trail markers, resting areas, and sometimes petroglyphs marked trails in this region. There are also caves located in this zone that may have been used for temporary camps and which often contain burials. Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006:C-9) further note that although there are no known temples in the area, ceremonial activities may have been conducted in this region. Some caves may also be “refuge caves” that were used for protection or for defence purposes. Prior to long-term cattle grazing, this area may have been occupied by native hardwood shrubs and trees like ʻūlei (Osteomeles anthyllidifolia), lama (Diospyros ferrea), uhiuhi (Caesalpina kavaiensis), and ‘ohe (Reynoldsia sandwicensis). A variety of plant taxa were identified from archaeological excavations (see Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-9-11), but it remains uncertain if they were local or transported to the area.

Farther upland, the lower edge of the upland agricultural zone occurs at about 121 to 152 m asl and contains stone mounds that are generally associated with the cultivation of sweet potatoes (Ipomoea batatas). This area is the “kula” zone of the Kona Field System,
which expanded from Kealakekua in South Kona to somewhat beyond Kailua-Kona in North Kona. This zone was developed in an area that maximized the plants’ exposure to rain and sunlight, while also protecting them from the winds. Sweet potato and paper mulberry (*Broussonetia papyrifera*) were grown from sea level to 150 m asl. Sweet potato, breadfruit (*Artocarpus altilis*), and paper mulberry were grown 150 to 300 m asl. Sweet potato, dry land kalo (*Colocasia esculenta*), *ti* (*Cordyline fruticosa*), and sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) were grown 300 to 750 m asl. Bananas (*Musa acuminata*) were grown 600 to 900 m asl (Kelly 1983:71-74). At its lowest edge, the field system receives approximately 635 mm of rain annually.

Continuing upland, at about 168 m asl, the agricultural areas become more formalized with highly structured walls that are associated with the Kona Field System. Here, individuals lived both temporarily and permanently. There are also ceremonial structures. At about 213 m asl, there are agricultural temples that may be associated with the Hawaiian deity Lono, which are located in the lower region of the Kona Field System. The field system may have extended to 671 to 701 m asl. Areas where individuals lived permanently and most densely occurred at about 244 to 610 m asl (Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-11-C12).

**Pre-Contact and Contact Settlement Pattern**

Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006:C-73-74) propose a model of the settlement associated with Kaloko-Honokōhau and suggest that the two fishponds at Kaloko and Honokōhau were in existence around roughly AD 1600. The upland settlement included agricultural and permanent living areas that contributed to the development of the *ahupua’a*. The two fishponds and the fish trap may have been focal points for the *ahupua’a*, and were distinguished from other resources located in the *ahupua’a*. There was some degree of integration between the coastal and upland settlement. When first settled, the area may have been a single land unit that was then divided into three parts (Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki).

---

8 These structures are not described by Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006).
‘Ai’ōpio Fishtrap and Pu‘uoina Heiau may have been ceremonial centers used to make offerings for the success of ‘Aimakapā Fishpond. Fish could have been held or caught in ‘Ai’ōpio Fishtrap and utilized for offerings. If correct, then these activities would have occurred during the Kamehameha Era, before Honokōhau was divided into two ahupua‘a—Honokōhau Nui and Honokōhau Iki. If this compound was created prior to the division of Kaloko and Honokōhau, then it may have been a ceremonial center for ‘Aimakapā and Kaloko Fishponds. Individuals may have lived near the northern and western edge of the lower a‘ā flow at Kaloko. Maka‘āinana lived in Honokōhau south of ‘Aimakapā, intensively using and modifying the area in the 19th century. Those that settled in the area oversaw the maintenance, production, and guardianship of the fishpond. Fish that was harvested from the fishpond were for the chiefs (Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006:C-75).

High-ranking chiefs and priests possibly lived east of the ‘Aimakapā Fishpond. These individuals may have conducted ceremonies for the fishpond and other sacred areas and activities. A chiefly residence may be located near Kaloko. Fishing shrines are located along the coast, residential shrines in male houses, and temples inland. There are also clusters of burials that will not be discussed to protect them from harm. The petroglyphs in Honokōhau Nui and Iki may describe events that occurred in the area. Because Hawaiian cultural traditions refer to Ka Wai O Kahinihin‘ula as a place used for ceremonial bathing, this area may be sacred (Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle 2006:C-75-77).

Fragmentation of the Hawaiian Cultural System

Though people lived in the area before 1778, maintaining cultural life ways without interruption, both the Ka Māhele of 1848 and the increase of foreign cash economies disrupted our way of living. Marion Kelly argues that:

Kaloko (mauka and makai) may have supported from 300 to 400 people at one time. Undoubtedly, the mahele and kuleana laws displaced people—took land away from them and forced them to go elsewhere, such as into the trade centers of Kailua and Kawaihae. The concentration of large landholdings by ranchers and the subsequent
fencing in of lands that were formerly accessible to residents served as an additional impetus to leave (Kelly 1971:12).

In this, Kelly suggests that the Ka Māhele of 1848 removed people from this wahi. Eventually, as landowners changed and the local economy became more heavily dependent on and influenced by the cash economy, life at Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki transformed. No longer could people rely on being loyal to an ali‘i for residence or exchanging goods to survive; people needed to sell goods to provide for their families. The self-sufficient economic system that relied on practices like ha‘āwi and makana of goods was slowly replaced; individuals transitioned to the modern practice of exchanging cash for fish. Peterson and Orr (2005:91) suggest that for ‘Anakala Val, this transition was “one of the most significant breaks from his sense of Hawaiianness.” Similarly, the authors also note that ‘Anakala Paka Harp regretted this change because it brought a “feeling [of] the loss of the sense of community practice” (Peterson and Orr 2005:91).

Substantial change occurred in 1941 when the United States entered World War II following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. The United States Government identified Hawai‘i as an essential strategic asset for protecting the West Coast of North America and launching attacks against Japan. The local effects of these developments included a relocation of families that lived here near the coast into the uplands (Maly and Maly 2002:271-271). Despite these and other changes, there were families that resided at Honokōhau into the mid-1990s (Green 1993:376).

Chapter Summary

The cultural traditions described in this chapter are only a few of the many that speak to the rich history of this wahi pana. The experiences and knowledge shared by kama‘āina and information contained in archaeological reports provide a glimpse into the history of Kaloko-Honokōhau. Through the experiences of elders, the Hawaiian cultural system that existed in the mid-1900s demonstrates that the families that lived in the area nurtured relationships between people, places, and other life forces. The practice of giving fish and sharing resources helped to sustain the sea-to-mountain exchange system. People shared
goods with their extended family and neighbours, while caring for the ‘āina by cleaning, maintaining, and giving back to the source.

The kahua hulikoehana located at Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki further supported the sea-to-mountain exchange system. Structures like the fishponds and fish trap were used to raise fish for consumption and exchange purposes. Within these ponds, people also gathered shrimp and caught non-native varieties of duck. Nearby gardens likely provided sweet potato and bait for fishing. Loko provided water for drinking, bathing, and washing purposes. Ceremonial areas such as the temples and fishpond outskirts were used as residences by high-ranking chiefs and priests, as well as places used to direct fishing activities. Salt was prepared in the depressions. Some of the shallower depressions were used to dry fish; others to mix bait and fish-stunning potions. The trails served as a lifeline across the landscape, providing people with a way to travel and share goods, give gifts, and visit family. These practices and traditions would play influential roles in the creation of management goals for Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park.
Chapter 4. Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park

[The advisory commission] dared to talk about spirit...if you look at other publications by the National Park, I don’t know if you would see a group of people trying to explain the spirit of a place. Trying to articulate that [the spirit of a place] to an audience who may not see things spiritually. A lot of it is physical. The grandeur, the big Yosemite or Bridal Falls...Grand Canyon...huge physical monuments...[This National Park] wasn’t that kind of wow factor...it was wow in a different way. Wow, [our kūpuna] could do this, [our kūpuna] saw this. That’s what we wanted to recreate. We wanted to recapture that spirit.

–Fred Cachola (July 11, 2013)

The statement above by ‘Anakala Fred refers to long-standing tensions between the Park Service and the surrounding community stemming from the creation and development of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. The aim of this chapter is to describe the creation and institutional development of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. I do this primarily through analyses of National Park Service planning and management documents, including legislative texts.

The chapter begins by introducing the first foundational study, which provided a blueprint for the conceptual design for the National Park. I then describe the management recommendations that were made in the report to demonstrate how the National Park was to be managed and the goals for all aspects of management. Next, I review the enabling legislation for the National Park, Public Law 95-625, and describe public sentiments regarding the development of the general management plan. I introduce three long-term goals contained within the plan and conclude by describing the management subzones that designate how areas in the National Park should be used.
The Spirit of Ka-loko-Hono-kō-hau

The United States Congress enacted Public Law 92-346 (Appendix D) in 1971. This act directed the Secretary of the Interior to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing the Honokōhau Settlement National Historical Landmark as a National Park. This act authorized the creation of the Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission (“advisory commission”) to assist the Department of Interior (DOI) with determining if the Honokōhau Settlement would become a National Park. The advisory commission was comprised of 15 members, 13 of whom were Kānaka ‘Ōiwi. Their final report, The Spirit of Ka-loko-Ho-no-kō-hau (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1994) (“Spirit Report”), provided management recommendations. The advisory commission brought the physical, cultural, human, guardian, and royal spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau to life through the medium of the written word. The commissioner’s report stated:

We [the advisory commissioners] take special pleasure in presenting this study, because perhaps for the first time, native Hawaiians have been able to tell their story and tell it in their own way (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974).

The Spirit Report is a powerful document that eloquently describes the significance of Kaloko-Honokōhau to Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and its value to the nation. The Spirit Report explained that we (Kānaka ‘Ōiwi) had survived and continued to embrace our culture, despite all that our people had endured since contact with foreigners. The advisory commissioners stated that:

Perhaps the spirit of Ka-loko, Hono-kō-hau has withered because the spirit of the Hawaiian people has withered; slowly eroded by the powerful forces of the west [sic], introduced almost two hundred years ago by profit-seeking merchants and overzealous missionaries; forces that devastated the Hawaiian population through epidemics, broke down the kapu system which provided the basic foundation for the Hawaiian culture and replaced the Hawaiian system of land tenure with one so totally foreign to the Hawaiians that within a matter of 50 years they found themselves practically landless in their own land.
The loss of their land and the disintegration of their culture has left the Hawaiian people virtually lifeless, without much of their identity. Their language and arts are perpetuated by only a diligent few, and except for major events, many Hawaiians know very little about their heritage. But perhaps the most tragic loss Hawaiians have suffered is the sensitivity and spiritual bond to each other which once brought the people of the Ka-loko, Hono-kō-hau settlement so close together (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:20).

With hopes of rebuilding the spirit of the Hawaiian people, the advisory commission determined that the Honokōhau National Historical Landmark should be preserved and made recommendations for the creation of a National Park (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:25).

**Management Recommendations**

In 1974, the advisory commission recommended that the National Park Service create Honokōhau National Historic Landmark as a National Park that would provide a place for the reorientation and perpetuation of Hawaiian activities, culture, and land use patterns. The advisory commission urged the government to set aside the area for the education, enjoyment, and appreciation by local residents and visitors (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:25). This National Park was to be developed as:

- a living museum of the Hawaiian culture. The facility would replicate, as nearly as possible, the prehistoric and phases of the historic Ka-loko Hono-kō-hau settlement. The cultural programs conducted within the park will be based on the actual life activities performed by Hawaiians (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:26).

In pursuit of the vision of a living museum, the advisory commissioners created plans for general management, preservation, interpretation, research, and Hawaiian management. The boundaries would include areas designated as a part of the Honokōhau National Historical Landmark and the adjacent waters. The National Park would be divided into land use zones created for: the preservation, stabilization, and restoration of historic features; the
demonstration of cultural activities; public swimming and other outdoor recreation; the education and training of Native Hawaiians in traditional cultural pursuits; the protection of sensitive sites and values through restrictions; watershed management; and offshore water and marine management (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:26).

The advisory commission saw clearly that the fishpond was the keystone feature in history, park planning, and community engagement: “The overall intent of the [preservation] program will be to make the fishpond and numerous surrounding sites, which were part of the fishpond culture, functional once again” (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:30). The advisory commission continued:

a long term plan will be designed to eradicate the exotic vegetation and animal life which now dominate the area. The park will then be replanted with native vegetation...which had functional uses and are still growing....In general...the park is based on the historic-cultural importance of the settlement rather than on individual archaeological or environmental features. When all these features are preserved and restored they will become what the Ka-loko, Hono-kō-hau settlement was – the Hawaiian culture as it was (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:34).

The Spirit Report recommended that the National Park Service: establish a water quality monitoring system; determine the role and use of sites and structures; preserve burial sites and maintain their privacy; protect the ecosystem from depreciation; and uphold ecological balance (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:28). The commission explained that the “primary interpretive theme will be the Hawaiian culture” (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:36). This primary theme was to be developed around subthemes of significance: the rejuvenation, perpetuation, and education of Hawaiian culture and activities; and the education of recreational activities in early Hawai‘i (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:37). Programs interpreting the Hawaiian culture would include “cultural demonstrations, educational activities, stabilization and restoration of sites, fishpond management, interpretive exhibits, and publications” (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:37). The stabilization and restoration program would be:
A major program...to analyze and determine which archaeological sites within the park should be restored, stabilized, or merely left alone. These determinations would be part of the overall interpretive concept that will complement the cultural demonstrations and assist in the educational program. For example, the restoration and operation of Ka-loko, and ‘Ai’makapā [F]ishponds as food producers would be a dominant cultural exhibit in the park. ‘Ai’makapā would also double as a wildlife sanctuary...(Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:41).

The advisory commission recommended that the National Park Service involve Hawaiians in all aspects of management and interpretation to maintain the dignity and character of the Hawaiian culture. A major aim was to provide opportunities for Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and visitors to study and perpetuate the Hawaiian culture, including live-in accommodations for cultural pursuits. The advisory commission urged cooperation with other state and county agencies and community organizations to develop a living cultural park (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:48).

The advisory commission’s commitments to revitalization of local cultures and ecologies are reflected in suggestions that the National Park be patterned after the ahupua’a management system. The advisory commission urged monitoring of the use of adjacent lands, cooperating with other agencies, protecting offshore reefs and waters from pollution, and maintaining air quality standards. Additional recommendations stated that “preservation and interpretation...[should] be managed, to the greatest extent possible, by native Hawaiians” and that Hawaiians be given “preferential treatment” for employment and training opportunities to transition from technical and support staff to managers and supervisors (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:49).

The recommendations in the Spirit Report are central elements in the presentation given to Congress by U.S. Senator Spark Matsunaga:

The intent of the Kaloko-Honokohau [sic] Park proposal is threefold. First, the proposal will restore, stabilize, and preserve the native Hawaiian historic sites which are located in the Kaloko-Honokohau [sic] area...which prior to the arrival of Capt.
James Cook in 1778, the first Caucasian to visit the Hawaiian Islands, was a thriving shoreline native Hawaiian fishing community....

The second intent of the Kaloko-Honokohau [sic] National Park proposal is to restore, stabilize, and preserve as a living museum vitally important remnants of the declining culture of the native Hawaiians through the development and preservation of the historic and archaeological sites in the area and the implementation of cultural programs in the park which would be designed to replicate significant traditional aspects of native Hawaiian culture....

The final specific intent of this new [N]ational [P]ark proposal is to provide a living demonstration to the rest of the world of how one, closely knit group of people, the native Hawaiians, lived for over 1,000 years before the arrival of the first white man in the island in 1778, in such total harmony with their land and environment that there was always enough food, shelter, clothing, sources of energy, and leisure time to meet their total needs (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866).

In keeping with the recommendations outlined in the Spirit Report, Senator Matsunaga explained that:

In view of the importance of accurately portraying the aspects of native Hawaiians culture which were associated with the Kaloko-Honokohau [sic] area, the park proposal strongly recommends that native Hawaiians be employed in every aspect of the park’s development and management to the maximum extent which is consistent with National Park Service Employment policies. In any event, it is the specific intent of this proposal that those individuals who are employed in the development and management of the Kaloko-Honokohau [sic] National Historical Park should be extremely knowledgeable of and sensitive to all aspects of traditional native Hawaiian culture (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866).

The dedication and effort of the advisory commission, Senator Matsunaga, and others who pushed for the creation of this park were successful. On November 10, 1978, United States Congress enacted Public Law 95-625 that authorized the establishment of
Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. This act states that this National Park was established to:

provide a center for the preservation, interpretation, and perpetuation of traditional native Hawaiian activities and culture, and to demonstrate historic land use patterns as well as to provide a needed resource for the education, enjoyment, and appreciation of such traditional native Hawaiian activities and culture by local residents and visitors…(Public Law 95-625, Section a).

Other authorizations that were created specifically for this National Park are included in the original legislation text (Appendix E).

In the 1980s, the National Park Service began acquiring the land for the National Historical Park and resolving boundary issues. Twelve years after the authorization of the enabling legislation, formal efforts to create the first general management plan commenced.

The Development of the General Management Plan

In December 1990, the National Park Service filed a Notice of Intent in the Federal Register announcing that an environmental impact statement for Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park would be prepared. The National Park Service initiated formal efforts to receive comments from the public that amounted to more than 900 responses. These comments were taken into consideration in drafting the general management plan. After creating the general management plan, the draft plan was released for public review in 1992 (Office of Environmental Quality Control 1992:11). The public was provided with 85 days to comment on the Draft General Management Plan (USDOI, NPS 1992) during which time, a total of 123 individuals attended three meetings held by the National Park Service, 56 individuals spoke at these meetings, and 81 letters were sent to the agency (USDOI, NPS 1994:156-161). The National Park Service reviewed the comments and grouped them into three broad themes: the future use of Honokōhau beach; permanent and legal residency for the Pai ‘ohana; and criticism that the document did not follow the Spirit Report. For the last issue, 20 members of the public and members of the Na Kokua Kaloko-
Honokōhau, a group that included members of the advisory commissioners, critiqued the plans for having been written by the National Park Service independently, without their participation (USDOI, NPS 1994:161-162). Nā Kokua O Kaloko-Honokōhau wrote:

After 18 years of patiently waiting for this proposal to become reality, we are very disappointed and seriously concerned because the 1992 “Draft General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement” (GMP) has lost the “spirit” of Kaloko Honōkohau and betrayed the trust and confidence of those visionary planners of 1974. The 1992 GMP is not the same story which we proudly presented at Washington, D.C., in 1974 (USDOI, NPS 1994:205).

Despite this complaint, Nā Kokua O Kaloko-Honokōhau maintained hope that the plans they proposed would be fulfilled:

We believe the draft GMP [general management plan] tried to fulfill the cultural restoration concepts that were so carefully nurtured in 1974...but have fallen far short of what was envisioned. However, in spite of the short-comings we believe that together, we can plan and implement programs that will restore the cultural integrity and “Spirit of Kaloko-Honōkohau” [USDOI, NPS 1994:206, emphasis in original].

After the public comments were reviewed and responded to, the National Park Service created a Final General Management Plan, and issued a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register initiating a 30-day (no action) period for the public to submit comments. During this period, no comments were received, and so the Record of Decision (ROD) was made in 1994 to initiate the proposed plan: “The National Park Service disputes the contention that the proposed action does not follow the 1974 Spirit of Ka-loko Hono-ko-hau” (ROD 1994:6). The Record of Decision provided details regarding the management of the park, verifying the development of a “live-in cultural education complex.” This would be a place where Kānaka ‘Ōiwi and others could:

immerse themselves in the Hawaiian culture without being unduly disturbed by others. Nearby, but outside the complex, traditional Hawaiian activities such as tending to fishponds, engaging in subsistence shoreline fishing, and subsistence
horticulture are to take place. Traditional use of Kaloko-Honokohau’s cultural sites and features by Hawaiians is to be an integral part of the operation of this national historical park [ROD 1994:2].

The Record of Decision justified initiating the proposed plans and gave management direction for the National Park. The Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park Final Environmental Impact Statement and General Management Plan (USDOI, NPS 1994) (“general management plan”) set long-term goals for the park.

**Long-Term Goals Identified in the General Management Plan**

Like the enabling legislation, the general management plan has a central role in the management and administration of Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park. In brief, the National Park Service Management Policies explained that the general management plan defines the: conditions to be achieved and maintained for natural and cultural resources; conditions for visitors to understand, enjoy, and appreciate the significant resources; kinds and levels of management activities, visitor uses, and development appropriate to maintain the desired conditions; and indicators and standards to maintain the desired conditions (NPS 2006:23). The general management plan for Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park recognized that the goals for this park were unique because the National Park Service needed to understand the spirit of Kaloko-Honokohau to fulfill its duties:

Kaloko-Honokohau’s general management plan must not only deal with customary resource management and visitor use matters, it must also attempt to convey a real sense of this very special place. When Congress authorized the park, it endorsed the concept of a place where Hawaiians and others could return to live, at least temporarily, in the manner of their forefathers, and to have the opportunity to learn by experiencing some of the cultural values of the past. Therefore, in the planning of needed visitor park facilities and in the future management and interpretation of park resources, we (the National Park Service and others involved in the development of this master plan) must be open to the “spirit” of Kaloko-Honokohau and allow it to
guide us. We must try to look at things as the Hawaiians would have and see not only what’s there physically, but what’s there spiritually (USDOI, NPS 1994:6).

Three of the goals of this National Park were to: (1) create a live-in cultural education complex; (2) allow the traditional use of cultural resources and rehabilitate the landscape to pre-contact Hawai‘i; and (3) interpret primarily the Hawaiian culture. Each goal is discussed below.

**Goal 1: Cultural Education Complex**

In keeping with the Spirit Report and the general management plan, the live-in cultural education complex was to be a:

setting for the practice and perpetuation of Hawaiian traditions; where the Hawaiian customs and traditions...can take place, be studied, and be entwined with the more tangible aspects of the culture; together forming a vignette of the total fabric of ancient Hawaiian life (USDOI, NPS 1994:33).

At this complex, our people would “come to teach others and learn more themselves about their [Hawaiian] customs and traditions” (USDOI, NPS 1994:33). Participants would learn, teach, and recreate aspects of life by those that lived at Kaloko-Honokōhau. Traditional activities such as fishing and other subsistence activities were to take place nearby, but outside of the compound. For this to occur, the general management plan stated:

An exception to the National Park Service Policy prohibiting use of actual cultural sites would need to be made to allow the traditional Hawaiian aquaculture to take place in the [F]ishponds. Another exception would be to allow the growing of traditional Hawaiian crops within existing rock wall enclosures located nearby and used for that purpose in the past (USDOI, NPS 1994:36).

Prior to initiating these activities, compliance with applicable federal laws need to be fulfilled. In January 2013, the *Kaloko-Honokōhau Cultural Center Environmental Assessment* was completed (USDOI, NPS 2013). These plans provided three alternatives for the
development of the cultural center. Below, I explain how resource management goals were designed to preserve, interpret, and perpetuate the Hawaiian culture.

**Goal 2: Rehabilitation of the Cultural Resources and Landscape**

Four major cultural resource management goals and associated strategies in the final general management plan aimed to: identify and inventory archaeological resources; identify and protect cultural resources important to Native Hawaiians; preserve and stabilize major archaeological resources; and restore and use selected cultural resources (USDOI, NPS 1994:40-44). To restore the cultural resources for traditional use(s), the general management plan directed Park Service personnel to:

Upgrade traditional use and cultural landscape data by working primarily with Hawaiians...[and to upgrade] existing oral history and ethnography by interviewing knowledgeable Hawaiians and other long-time residents of the area. Conduct specific research which would include working with knowledgeable individuals to determine how to go about re-establishing traditional Hawaiian aquaculture. Determine appropriate actions necessary to re-establish traditional Hawaiian horticulture in the park’s agricultural features. Work with knowledgeable Hawaiian individuals and organizations to determine, both physically and spiritually, which additional structures and features in the park are amenable to restoration. Determine the cost of restoring and maintaining any such features (USDOI, NPS 1994:44).

Because the cultural and natural resources are interrelated, the management strategies were also linked. The natural resource management goals called for the following: protection of anchialine pool resources; restoration and monitoring of endangered waterbird habitat; protection of sensitive species other than waterbirds; vegetation restoration and management; and identification and management of human impacts on marine resources. Each goal contributed to the objectives of preserving, interpreting, and perpetuating Hawaiian culture as it existed pre-contact and of rehabilitating the cultural landscape. To convey the significance of these cultural and natural resources, the visitor use and interpretation goals called for both to play a central role in visitation services.
Goal 3: Visitor Use and Interpretation

The “primary theme” for interpretation was the Hawaiian culture, and the basic goal of interpretive activities was to:

communicate the various aspects of the traditional Hawaiian way of life. To provide a glimpse of how the original residents of the park might have spent their time – their customs and practices, their spiritual beliefs. Interpretation will also focus on the important natural values of the park – its endangered water birds, anchialine ponds, and marine resources (USDOI, NPS 1994:53).

The general management plan stated that “[p]roviding the visitor with recreational opportunities for picnicking, fishing, snorkelling, diving, sunbathing, and hiking, however, is to be secondary to the Hawaiian cultural aspects of the park” (USDOI, NPS 1994:53). The interpretive activities were to occur in conjunction with other cultural activities, demonstrations, and educational opportunities at the live-in cultural education complex (USDOI, NPS 1994:54).

Management Subzones

To administer management goals, the general management plan identified and delineated five management use subzones for the National Historical Park (USDOI, NPS 1994:67). These subzones corresponded with the three management goals and identify how the National Park should be managed for desired resource conditions and visitor experiences. The general management plan described the appropriate uses and facilities that were necessary to support them (NPS 2006:24). The five management subzones for Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park are:

- **Historic Preservation Subzone (230 ha)** — park management is to focus on the preservation, protection, restoration, and interpretation of the cultural resources. Cultural resources in this area shall be preserved as-is or restored;

- **Natural Environment Subzone (214 ha)** — includes all of the offshore waters and coastal areas, and land taken up by anchialine ponds and
pools. Management shall emphasize the conservation of natural resources and permit environmentally compatible recreational activities;

- **Natural Environment/Historic Preservation Subzone (22 ha)** — ‘Aimakapā Fishpond and adjacent wetlands are to be an overlapping of the Historic Preservation Subzone and the Natural Environmental Subzone. The management of ‘Aimakapā will emphasize the natural resources. Kaloko shall focus on once again being a producing Hawaiian fishpond, and emphasis will be on the cultural resources;

- **Modern Development Subzone (4 ha)** — This area will be modified and developed for park facilities and visitor use; and

- **Traditional Development Subzone (1 ha)** — This area is for the live-in cultural education complex. It shall be low-key, Hawaiian in style and design, and will not significantly alter the setting. Here, participants can experience solitude and the “spiritual nature of these places” [USDOI, NPS 1994:65-68].

### Chapter Summary

In this chapter, I have described the creation of the National Park’s first foundational management plan in 1974, the Spirit Report. I have also summarized the management recommendations that were made by the advisory commissioners, and their efforts to provide the National Park Service with a conceptual design to create a National Park as a living museum. The suggestions that the advisory commissioners created emphasized the importance of rehabilitating and using the *kahua hulikoehana* and landscape. The advisory commissioners stressed the importance of the Hawaiian culture in the interpretation activities. Recommendations in the Spirit Report were used by Senator Matsunaga to pursue the creation of the National Park. The efforts of the senator and others contributed to the establishment of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park, which was created in 1978 to interpret, preserve, and perpetuate the Hawaiian culture. To help with the fulfillment of this three-fold task, the National Park Service created a general management plan to facilitate the development of the National Park. Within this management document, the Park Service created three long-term goals and five management subzones.

The goals of interpretation, preservation, and perpetuation of Hawaiian culture established the desired future. The general management plan described specific processes for integrating aspects of the Hawaiian culture into all dimensions of management, including
resource management, and visitor use and interpretation. The management plan prescribed the development of an education complex where Kānaka ʻŌiwi and visitors could engage in cultural pursuits. The five management subzones designated where this and other activities would occur. All of these management plans and goals were created to help create a place where Kānaka ʻŌiwi and others could come to experience the cultural values of our ancestors.
Chapter 5. Management Preferences and Challenges

It is difficult for the Park [Service] to successfully manage its resources and provide adequate interpretation, preservation, and perpetuation of a culture within the overarching NPS framework. The NPS framework is rule, policy, focused, and doesn't allow much flexibility in order for advance[d] interpretation, preservation, and perpetuation to occur. In addition, the NPS framework survives on making plans and setting goals, not accomplishing goals.

–Wiliwili (July 8, 2014)

The quotation by Wiliwili, an anonymous interviewee, broadly describes the interview analysis results that revealed gaps between Park Service management practice and policy. These challenges reflect issues that Park Service personnel have in fulfilling their legislation and management goals while maintaining positive community relations. The management challenges also make it difficult for the Park Service personnel to fulfill the management preferences of the interviewees. The purpose of this chapter is to share the key findings of my research that describe the management preferences of the interviewees and challenges encountered or created by Park Service management practice or National Park Service policies.

The first part of this chapter introduces the four management preferences that the interviewees have for cultural heritage at the National Historical Park. I then explore how these management preferences are supported by and conflict with Park Service policies, legislations, and management plans. Next, I introduce the management challenges and describe how they limit the fulfillment of the four management preferences. The second part of the chapter explains how the four management preferences are similar and different to the authorized heritage discourse embedded in Park Service practices and policies. I refer to documents analyzed to shed light on the subtle differences that I think separate an
authorized heritage discourse of Park Service management from a future reauthorized Kānaka ʻŌiwi heritage discourse.

Research Findings

Based on the interview results, there are four management preferences that the interviewees would like the Park Service to incorporate into the management of cultural heritage at Kaloko-Honokōhau. These relate to: rehabilitating the kahua hulikoehana, providing opportunities to reconnect with the ancestors and with the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau, and increasing the engagement of Kanaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in planning and management activities. This reauthorized Kānaka ʻŌiwi heritage discourse may be difficult to achieve because of challenges that reinforce the authorized heritage discourse of the National Park Service and work to de-legitimize a Kānaka ʻŌiwi heritage discourse.

Management Preference 1: Rehabilitate the Kahua Hulikoehana

The interview analysis indicates that the interviewees would like the kahua hulikoehana at the National Park to be rehabilitated for traditional use. Several of the interviewees emphasized the importance of reusing ancestral structures for food production. Structures like the māla should be rehabilitated to grow sweet potatoes and the loko iʻa to raise fish. Samson Harp (“Harp”) mentioned the importance of rehabilitating the loko iʻa, stating:

It [the loko iʻa] is a waste of a resource. The more that I learn [about the status of the loko iʻa] the more I question what can be done? These [fish]ponds should not be there just as a landscape [without use], it would be beneficial if it was there to be used as a place [to provide] meaʻai (food), it should be real.

Harp asked, “What needs to be done and what kinds of support can we receive to get this [fishpond] started?” He responded, “Right now, there aren’t any people living in the ahupuaʻa. We won’t have any time to generate the ponds in a time of need. It [the loko iʻa]
shouldn’t be a once upon a time thing, it [the loko i’a] should be much more.” Harp finished, “These places should more than a pretty picture.”

Likewise, Lily Souza (“Souza”) has similar thoughts regarding using the loko i’a to produce food:

I would like to see [the fishponds] become viable because it has been proven and it has been done. If [the Park Service] can bring in these same kind of people that are doing the work already, that are familiar with maintaining fishponds, that they bring the people in and teach the community especially or have the community and these sort of people continue the legacy. Pardon my pidgin, but I no like the word “expert.” I no like the word “expertise” because anybody can be an expert. So I just want to stress the fact that if they all work together and find that balance of productivity and just bring it alive. Bring it back because we need to be sustainable and that fishponds are a productive source of protein. It is something that is already existing here and it has been feeding the people for generations. Why mess around with something that has already been proven? You can always improve, but I think [our küpuna] had it down already (laughs). I think they [our küpuna] already had the formulas down, it was just a matter of observation. I know it’s been done. We need to move forward and get it done.

Ae’o, an anonymous interviewee, also talked about reusing the fishponds, saying, “[I would like to] see a thriving fishpond that is actively being managed, managed is a Western style word, but managed as an aquaculture unit that serves the population of people, so not a demonstration of an aquaculture farm.” Ae’o continued:

At ‘Aimakapā, similarly, a person would...see that [native bird habitat and aquaculture] can be kept in balance. That there is a thriving...coastal sea bird [population]...and...the ability to catch fish and feed people. Fish in general, aquaculture.

9 Pseudonym refers to anonymous interviewee.
At ‘Aiʻōpio, that’s a challenge because you got that harbor right next door and you can’t close the harbor now, they blew the wall out so it is beyond repair. So it’s been altered tremendously, however, I would again why not see that people are able to fish there and restore those walls. The coastal, the near shore coastal salt water walls and see that and be able to fish there or at least demonstrate in that case how fishing was practiced. You can catch small fish and raise them in a saltwater environment until they reach a size or number that can feed people and sustain a population. Those are three things that I would like to see here.

Auku’u, an anonymous interviewee, had thoughts to rehabilitate ancestral structures, such as the loko i’a, ko’a, māla, heiau, and kahua hale. In our interview, Auku’u explained that the kahua hulikoehana were built to be used; each have a purpose. The loko i’a were used to raise and catch fish for food or offerings. Fishing grounds were used to feed, train, and catch ‘opelu. The māla may have also been used to grow sweet potatoes or other dry land crops. Heiau served various purposes and were generally reserved for ceremonies or special activities. The kahua hale were used for hale pupupu (temporary) or noho pa’a (permanent) living. Auku’u’s thoughts were reinforced by Pua Kala and Noni, two interviewees who requested anonymity. These interviewees stated that rehabilitating kahua hulikoehana is an important basis for producing food, educating visitors, and perpetuating cultural practices.

**Supporting Policy**

The document analysis revealed that National Park Service policies support rehabilitating kahua hulikoehana for traditional use. The enabling legislation authorizes the Secretary to provide “traditional native Hawaiian accommodations” (Public Law 95-625, Section d, Part 1). This legislation may support rehabilitating kahua hulikoehana for traditional use because Hawaiian interviewees requested the use of ancestral structures. However, because the enabling legislation has not been used to advance management initiatives, the types of accommodations that the Secretary can allow are not fully known.

---

10 Because Auku’u requested that direct quotations be eliminated from the research, I summarized this individual’s comments.
The rehabilitation of kahua hulikoehana is supported by key documents like the general management plan, Record of Decision, Spirit Report, and legislative history. The general management plan (USDOI, NPS 1994:36) directs the Park Service to “allow traditional Hawaiian aquaculture to take place in the fishponds... [and to grow] traditional Hawaiian crops within existing rock wall enclosures.” The Record of Decision emphasizes the traditional use of kahua hulikoehana, stating that the “[t]raditional use of Kaloko-Honokohau’s cultural sites and features by Hawaiians is to be an integral part of the operation of this national historical park” (NPS, ROD 1994:2). The Spirit Report (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:41) and the statements provided by Senator Matsunaga (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866) support the traditional use of kahua hulikoehana. Although these management directives exist, they have not been fully realized. That is, none of the loko i’a or māla are functioning and the management practices necessary to bring them into active use are not in place. This non-rehabilitation of structures for traditional use creates an unfulfilled long-term management goal for the Park Service.

**Challenges**

Three management challenges noted by the interviewees make it difficult for the Park Service to rehabilitate the kahua hulikoehana for traditional use: unsustainable resource management practices; limited funding; and a lack of human resources. The interviewees explained how these challenges influenced park management practice.

Maiapilo, an anonymous interviewee, said, “[the Park Service] just spent 12 years and hundreds of thousands of dollars to put that wall [the Kaloko kuapā] back up and it needs to stay up.” Continuing, Maiapilo explained, “[the Park Service] gotta have people on the staff to deal with [management challenges], or partnerships, but it needs to be maintained. It cannot sit for eight months and be ignored, it cannot.” Maiapilo finished by stating:

I think that there are just recurring patterns of nonsense in the park that would be easily dealt with. [The Park Service] clear[s] vegetation and then [the Park Service doesn’t] back plant or out plant native stuff, and then [the Park Service doesn’t] have
the manpower to maintain the cleared areas so that it just grows back. This has happened many, many, many times and it is silly.

These statements by Maiapilo suggest that unsustainable resource management practices and the lack of human resources make it challenging for the Park Service to maintain completed work. These issues make it difficult for Park Service personnel to build on completed projects and rehabilitate the *kahua hulikoehana*.

Ae’o had concerns regarding how limited funding and human resources limit initiatives to rehabilitate the *loko i’a*:

[I am happy] that the focus is now going to ‘Aimakapā where it has really never been... However, I am concerned that [the Park Service doesn’t ignore] Kaloko the pond.... [A] huge effort was put towards building that pond wall. That pond wall, the whole purpose of it was to see... use and interpret a working fishpond where you know how much fish you have... how much you can take and what you cannot take... what belongs and doesn’t belong.... [F]rom my experience, where the current emphasis is will draw you away from completed or nearly completed projects because we have limited resources to maintain the stuff you did before, while trying to focus on upcoming or ongoing projects. Many of the fund sources are cyclic or one-time awards also which makes it difficult to adequately maintain the work [the Park Service has] done.

So [the Park Service is] happy [that they] built the [kuapā], but then [the Park Service] going turning [their] backs or [their] sides to [focus on] ‘Aimakapā which is great, wonderful, but let’s not forget about Kaloko. Let’s remember that there is a purpose for that wall, it’s not just to be a pile of stones. They want to be, that pile of stones is a functioning fish trap wall, so let’s make it a fishtrap wall. Let’s see if it will trap fish or cultivate fish.... [T]o be specific, I would be happy if we could continue doing the kind of work [intended] at ‘Aimakapā and work on the resource management...of Kaloko pond.... [F]ind out what is there, can it be sustainable, what would take for it to be sustainable for the values of Hawaiian people. What kind of fish do they want, what kind of fish, shrimp, everything else, what do they want it for,
can it be sustainable? I would like to know that…. Some of the challenges of what it takes to get funding to support natural resource efforts, it can always be better…. Of course funding and other things determine it.

Ae'o indicated that limited funds and human resources create challenges for Park Service managers to maintain and diversify the National Park’s resource management projects.

**Management Preference 2: Reconnect with the Ancestors**

The interview analysis indicates that the interviewees would like to reconnect with our ancestors by practicing cultural traditions. The interviewees suggested that by performing the traditions of our ancestors, the link between the past and present is enhanced. This thought reflects those of Harp, who said, “The ‘āina is a human resource. The land and ponds are a human resource.” He discussed the importance of traditions, stating that, “What matters is not the quantity of your Hawaiian blood, what matters is to carry on the traditions [of our kūpuna] that can be applied to better ourselves in this ever-changing world.” Harp concluded by comparing past and present food gathering methods, stating:

Very few of our people gather and hunt for their own food today, the new tradition is shipments. Hunt and gather in the place of Wal-Mart and Costco, again, because most of us don’t have any other options of feeding ourselves. We need to continue the traditions that have supported our people’s growth and independence. These traditions took care of hundreds of thousands of people plus. Today, the majority of us can’t take care of ourselves if things aren’t shipped here from afar.

He suggested that by practicing ancestral traditions, we can improve the health and well-being of our people and homelands:

It’s important to remember whose children we really are. It is simple, it’s nothing new…it’s not just trying to rely on new tricks [and technologies]. [We should] "hoʻi hou i ka piko" – return to what was, look back at our source. Our people were pragmatic
people. We got to take the best of yesterday and see how we can apply it today to function in a productive manner.

This statement indicates the importance of using cultural traditions to produce food. Harp compared and contrasted the practices of our ancestors to our subsistence practices. He introduced the statement, “ho’i hou i ka piko,” a term describing bringing our past into the present by using, learning, and allowing the knowledge of our kūpuna to guide us, so that we can provide for ourselves as our kūpuna once did.

‘Anakala Fred Cachola had similar thoughts:

'Anakala Fred described the importance of viewing, treating, and interacting with the landscape like our kūpuna. For our ancestors, the land, elements, and objects were gifts from Papahānaumoku and Wākea. Our kūpuna understood the environment and how to care for, use, and interact with the life forces that surrounded them. Today, we can regain this intimate understanding by using elements of the land and sea. By learning, relearning, and performing the practices of our ancestors, we can reconnect, enhance, and honour our genealogical relationship to the ‘āina.

**Supporting Policy**

The enabling legislation (Public Law 95-625, section a) for Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park directs the Park Service personnel to preserve, interpret, and perpetuate Hawaiian cultural activities and traditions. This is a widely interpreted policy that
supports the management preference to reconnect with the ancestors by performing cultural traditions. This policy states that the National Historical Park exists to “provide a center for the preservation, interpretation, and perpetuation of traditional Native Hawaiian activities and culture” (Public Law 95-625, section a). What this means and how this three-fold goal is accomplished is decided by the Park Service personnel. They decide how our culture will be preserved, interpreted, and perpetuated.

The general management plan called for the development of a cultural education complex (USDOI, NPS 1994:32-39). This center was to be “the setting for the practice and perpetuation of Hawaiian traditions; where the Hawaiian customs and traditions...can take place” (USDOI, NPS 1994:33). It was to be a place where “[living history demonstration[s] and other activities...are to take place at a replica Hawaiian village [the cultural center] proposed in the park” (USDOI, NPS 1994:54). The cultural live-in center should provide our people and others with a place to engage in cultural pursuits, to “recreate aspects of the life of those who lived at Kaloko-Honokōhau centuries ago...a place where ceremonial gatherings or meetings can take place on special occasions” (USDOI, NPS 1994:33). However, as of 2014, the cultural live-in center is not operational. Both policies support allowing people to reconnect with our kupuna by practicing their cultural traditions.

**Challenges**

Interviewees suggested that the Park Service personnel limit opportunities for people to reconnect with the ancestors in at least four ways: 1) altering cultural traditions; 2) utilizing traditional interpretive approaches; 3) lacking human resources and cultural knowledge; and 4) neglecting to prioritize cultural traditions. Each of these management challenges creates barriers that threaten the integration of Hawaiian cultural traditions into Park Service management practice.

In terms of altering cultural traditions, ‘Anakala Nainoa Perry explained that when the Park Service personnel adjust cultural traditions to “fit” the agency policies, this practice is disrespectful. He said, “[Cultural] traditions are important. It is what the [National] Park is here for, is to carry forward traditions.” ‘Anakala Nainoa Perry thought that, “The knowledge of the kupuna is shared with the park and the park, by saying that traditions like halau...
construction should be altered to NPS standards for safety reasons is disrespectful." He suggested, "Things should be done as close as possible to the way that it once was done. Our kūpuna knew what they were doing. The park documents say to reconstruct things as close as possible to before the arrival of Captain Cook." When shared customs are adjusted to conform to foreign viewpoints, this practice may be disrespectful.

The second challenge stems from using traditional National Park Service interpretive approaches. In reference to this challenge, Ranger Jon Jokiel thought that the National Park Service used interpretive approaches that limit engagement with the local community:

The National Park Service has a template of the way that they do things. Their main mission is to protect and to share with the American people our history and the way that you do that is through interpretive programs, educational programs, and it is a national system. I think that there has been a lot of difficulty here trying to fit that into Hawai‘i. Those kinds of things are important to engage visitors, to have interpretation, but sometimes that does not work here when working with Native people and the community that the brand of the flat hat and a ranger program is not entirely familiar here, especially with local kids….I think that we’ve had more success through engaging the community through cultural demonstrations, having community events, having a lot of food. Those have been extremely successful. We do not have a lot of locals show up for the 10 am geology walk….[However] I do not think that we reach as many people as we do with the community events. We are trying to fit people into a mold that does not really work. We have a system with the Park Service, a national system, it’s governmental. Focusing on for us, working on other things. I’d like us to become for educational, working with the schools, and developing the community relationships.

Jokiel noted that National Park Service interpretive methods may be better designed to attract, entertain, and educate non-Hawai‘i residents. These programs may not have interpretive components that allow Hawai‘i residents to reconnect and enhance connections to the ancestors.
The third challenge relates to the lack of human resources and cultural knowledge by Park Service staff. In regards to this issue, Maiapilo said:

The park could probably [host more cultural programs but] there is not enough staff, nor will there be in the near future, nor does the park hold all the cultural knowledge it takes to perpetuate these things...it will require working with partners to accomplish them. Working with partners requires good relationships with the community, which takes trust, and building and maintaining working relationships and demonstrating support and the humility to let the Hawaiian community lead the way.

I think every employee in the park, it should be a requirement that every employee have a basic respect for, if not, knowledge of Hawaiian cultural practices and Hawaiian culture. How to do that, I don’t know. But I think that it is a primary component of making the park successful. If you are going to have a cultural park, you have to have that. If you don’t respect the culture than how are you going to perpetuate it?...it would be great to see some time in the future that our park was a little gem of Hawaiian culture that was spreading its tentacles and helping people with partnerships. Helping people to perpetuate Hawaiian culture, it would be really great to see that. But you cannot do that without community, and you can’t do it if you don’t understand on some level and support and respect the culture.

Maiapilo suggested that because the Park Service lacks staff and the agency employees lack cultural knowledge, it is difficult for the National Park to practice Hawaiian customs and provide cultural educational opportunities. Without staff who are knowledgeable in Hawaiian cultural practices, it is challenging for the Park Service to fulfill the second management preference.

Souza thinks that the lack of cultural knowledge is an issue:

The National Park] might have people [community representatives] that are ready to go, right intentions [to help the culture], and then [these individuals] get this roadblock and this roadblock...we don’t understand the culture or they try to manage culture and it’s like you’re the host culture and yet they [National Park Service
representatives] are telling you things about your culture, how to do it, when to do it, and so this creates the tension. She finished, “That’s a barrier. Definite barrier.”

The fifth challenge describes issues with neglecting to prioritize cultural traditions. As Souza noted, “the first step I’d say to making this management realize that yes, we need to acknowledge the fact that protocol is important. This mission of the park came because of this group. What is this group’s intention versus what they need to do.” Frustrated, she asked, “Because they [the Park Service] own it? Because they [the Park Service] manage it?”

Management Preference 3: Interact with the Spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau

Interviewees would like opportunities to interact with the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau by using the area as our ancestors did. Interview results suggest that the “spirit” of a place has agency and the capacity to inspire people’s actions. Individuals that visit Kaloko-Honokōhau can experience the spirit by seeing, feeling, and immersing themselves in the physical environment. ‘Anakala Fred explained how he interacted with the spirit, stating that, “we [the advisory commissioners] saw the spirit, we [the advisory commissioners] felt the spirit…. [What] we did was we camped out over here.” He continued, “We said, ‘We gotta feel the place. We gotta feel the place.’ So we walked the trails, camped over here, slept over here. We were trying to immerse ourselves into not just the physical, but the spiritual.”

Souza shared thoughts about connecting to the spirit. She explained, “One day you gonna realize that one day you were tied into this area [Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, or Honokōhau Iki].” She asked, “You know what I’m saying? I can say that, yes, I do not come from this area, but, later on I am going to find out that hello? Somebody has. Yea, somebody and why is that so important? I don’t know.” Souza said, “But it draws me, and certain people, it draws them.” Referencing the spiritual elements of the Spirit Report, she said:

It’s the unwritten [in the Spirit Report]. There is so much unwritten in there that is hidden...that spirit. And who would understand the spirit? Unless you are a part of that...
spirit. It’s strong. To be called The Spirit Report because the spirit is like nothing really written, but it’s what you feel and what you feel compelled to do without being told.

Souza described the spirit as having the ability to call people to its service and reconnect them with the landscape, environment, and elements. In a sense, this is comparable to an elder who calls their youth to return home. People can feel and follow the spirit. This is important because it describes a sense of reawakening that occurs within people, which urges them to be responsible and steward the ‘āina.

**Supporting Policy**

The ability for people to engage in practices that allow interactions with the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau is generally described in Park Service policy. The Record of Decision states:

Kaloko-Honokōhau is a special place to many Hawaiians not only because of the many significant cultural sites and features found there going back to the time when it was a thriving Hawaiian settlement, but because, to Hawaiians, the place today still retains a spiritual quality. Therefore, in planning for the future use and development of Kaloko-Honokōhau, the National Park Service must deal with two important concerns: (1) the need for this national historical park to be a place where people, primarily Hawaiians, can come to recreate and practice the traditional Hawaiian ways in an atmosphere that evokes old Hawaii; and (2) the need for the national historical park to be a place where visitors can come to gain a better understanding of and appreciation for the traditional Hawaiian way of life (ROD 1994:4).

This statement calls for the National Park to be a place to “recreate and practice an atmosphere that evokes old Hawai‘i.” To create such a setting, the interviews suggest that our people should have opportunities to engage with the landscape as our kūpuna did.

The general management plan emphasizes and directs the Park Service to provide opportunities to experience the life practices of our elders:
The basic goal of interpretation at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park is to communicate the various aspects of the traditional Hawaiian way of life. To provide a glimpse of how the original residents of the park might have spent their time – their customs and practices, their spiritual beliefs (USDOI, NPS 1994:53-54).

This goal can be achieved if the Park Service provides people with daily opportunities to participate in and observe cultural traditions. The Park Service’s final general management plan lists topics that can be shared, including the Hawaiian language, land/sea ethic, fishpond culture, extended family system, ancient dances and chants, and crafts and religion (USDOI, NPS 1994:54).

The ability to engage in the practices of our kūpuna was an aspect of creating a “living museum,” a development called for by the legislative history (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866). Although a concise definition of a living museum was never provided, it was described by the advisory commissioners as a place where the Hawaiian culture could be practiced, lived, transformed, and perpetuated (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:38-40). Advisory commissioners recommended the Park Service provide opportunities to participate in, observe, and engage in cultural pursuits. The Spirit Report stated that “[t]he interpretation of Hawaiian culture can best be accomplished by maintaining an informal atmosphere where traditional Hawaiian activities can take place” (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:38). The advisory commissioners recommended that the Park Service interpret fishing activities and fishpond culture, land and sea food production, religious activities, canoe building, hula instruction, basket weaving, lau hala plaiting, wood carving, feather work, musical instruments, nut crafts, and the making of fishing materials and objects (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:38-40). Based on this information, it seems that there are policies that direct the Park Service to allow and provide people with a chance to engage with the landscape like our kūpuna. This is important because by performing these and other cultural activities, we can experience the lifestyle of our ancestors and become closer spiritually to them in the process.
**Challenges**

There are three management challenges that suggest why visitors have limited opportunities to interact with the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau: 1) restrictive rules; 2) enforcement of rules made by people unfamiliar with this National Park; and 3) lack of fulfillment of the advisory commission goals. These challenges seem to revolve around a core issue regarding the lack of interface between people and place. The interview findings suggest that these issues create undesirable outcomes that impact the National Park's atmosphere, park visitors, and the interviewees.

Challenges with the National Park’s restrictive rules were discussed by Jokiel, who suggested that the restrictive rules seem to limit interactions between the park users and Kaloko-Honokōhau:

> We [individual management divisions] have to work with other departments, [the Park Service has] compliance, so any time that you take [visitors] out in the park, you’ve got to [ensure they are] not harming the resources and going off trail. We [the Park Service] have a lot of rules, and they are meant to be there, they are good. We need to protect the resource. But, we also need to allow access to use the areas, to go out in the park and make it a park that is alive. It is not dead, it is not a museum, it is something that needs to be interactive.

As a consequence, this practice creates an atmosphere for the National Park that he compares to a “museum.” This type of management approach creates a divide between the National Park and its users. When this division is created, interaction is limited, and rather than living, the landscape is preserved as a moment in time.

Challenges regarding the restrictive rules were discussed by Ranger Janette Chiron (“Chiron”), who thought that the regulations limit the use and enjoyment of the park:

> I think right now we [the Park Service] are at the very highly restrictive phase of favoring the physical attributes of the cultural sites and the natural sites over the use, even the use and enjoyment or even the cultural practice for some people. So I think
that is an area in which we are abiding by the strict rules kind of determined or set forth by resource management.

She continued:

I think I hear talk of it eventually moving towards or being a living thing, but this is where the vision comes in, and where I think park management needs to be much louder in laying the groundwork now for what will happen. I think even in the short-term that the way we are managing it is keeping people away from it. So even to the point of having a wayside sign or infrastructure that puts people more on the edge of Kaloko fishpond. Even sitting and looking at it with maybe a little information, whereas now, the way we are managing it is really keeping people away. So really, looking to Kaloko, at least 50% of the time their interaction around Kaloko Fishpond will be like you can’t go past here, you can’t go there (chuckles). Feedback that we got from the advisory commission is that we are heavy on regulations and not very good at welcoming [people] or interpreting the resources.

Chiron’s sentiments described how the park regulations limit interaction between people and Kaloko-Honokōhau and create an atmosphere that is uninviting to park visitors.

In regards to the restrictive rules, Chiron noted how off-limit areas limit interactions between people and Kaloko-Honokōhau:

I think the biggest restriction that I’ve seen here is that people are only allowed to walk on the designated trail, they are not allowed to go off anywhere in the back country or anywhere off-trail except along the shoreline, they are allowed to go along the shoreline. They are not allowed to go to Queen’s Bath...the hōlua slide...and the reason being that they may disturb cultural sites...[and] natural resources that are there. See, so Queen’s Bath, it is an important cultural site, it is an important natural resource because of the anchialine pools so people can’t swim or bath or even go there. So that is identified.
Chiron explained how the restrictiveness of the park regulations protects resources from disturbance. Although this is a positive outcome, she noted that people are kept from experiencing the landscape:

The restrictive part might be that, and I have reached out to the advisory commission to ask them if there are certain things that are important to people to be able to do, whether it’s all people, or whether it’s just Native Hawaiians or cultural practitioners, are there things or places that people shouldn’t have access to and we can balance out the resource concerns whether it’s through education or mitigation or whatever because right now we have narrowed it down to...okay...we are concerned that people might trample stuff if they go off-trail, so, nobody can go off-trail. How do we open that so that people have the freedom to practice? You know this park, it may never be appropriate for every visitor to be able to go to Queen’s Bath, but maybe there are opportunities or times or certain user groups that should be allowed to go. You know one of the rangers had a contact with the family at Queen’s Bath over the weekend and the father identified that they are a local family, they have been going there for years, and that is a type of visitation that I would like for the park find a way to identify who is appropriate to go there and how can we let them go? Not saying that we let the resources be impaired, I’m not saying that we should allow impairment, but I’m saying how do we balance real cultural access with our mandate to preserve things.

Concerns regarding the park’s restrictive rules were expressed by Ranger Benjamin Saldua, who has spoken with community members frustrated by the regulations:

[currently the park rules say] no this, no that, no this, no that. Hey, why go to the park? I had friends that used to come down in [the 1980s] that used to go down close down by ‘Ai’ōpio and there is a small beach. A lot of people used to use that area before to go sunbathing, just a small area. But now you are not allowed to put your mats or things down. People ask me and say, “Why are they doing this?” I say, “I don’t know.” There is a difference and so they say, “Did they talk to the community about this?” I say, “Um, I don’t know. I don’t work there anymore.” But people have done it before for such a long time and when they come back, they can’t do it. You
know, a lot of people like to go there, to go along that point, and go on down and they go fishing. But now you cannot put nothing down along that area.

Challenges that arise when people who are unfamiliar with Kaloko-Honokōhau create rules were discussed by Harp, who thought that rules should be created specifically for this park:

The rules and regulations make it difficult. Everything is in a box, when really, it’s individual to the landscape. We need to work to smooth and develop what’s fit for this place. It’s not the same print for everything. What works in Washington no work here. The decisions from foreigners with no connection and understanding. They look at us [Kānaka ʻŌiwi] as museum pieces. We [Kānaka ʻŌiwi] should refuse to be once upon a time Kanaka. The quality of the [Kānaka ʻŌiwi] is most important. Cannot take by blood quantum. You either [Kānaka ʻŌiwi] or you not.

Harp emphasized the importance of having those who understand Kaloko-Honokōhau, the people, and Hawaiian culture create rules for management.

Challenges that are created by the Park Service personnel’s limited fulfillment of the Spirit Report management recommendations were discussed by Souza, who thought that their recommendations have yet to be fulfilled:

I am happy that the park took it [the area] over because at a time when it needed to be [protected], something had to be done or...[the] land [would be lost] to development. It was handed over to the park, so that is the good part. Where it starts to get kind of cloudy is when it actually was spelled out how the park should be run or managed or evolved into a management type of cultural park, then that’s where I feel there is a lot of room for improvement and I am very dissatisfied about the current management....I think they [the NHP] have the wrong people in there and maybe I need to be made clear as to how the park received this gift and I think it is a disservice to the people [the original advisory commissioners] that actually had that idea of allowing the park to achieve its full potential. How they [the original advisory commission] wanted the park this gift to be given to the people. So I think that the
management now is far from what the [the original advisory commission] intentions were. And I say *were* because yes, a lot of them died, but their spirit lingers and you can feel it when you read what they were envisioning. You know, most of them [have passed], but, it is not an excuse to not fulfill that mission...the *kuleana*...it can be more productive.

In terms of challenges with fulfilling the Spirit Report recommendations, Ae’o would like the Park Service to fulfill the vision of the advisory commissioners:

[what] concerns me is we have a rare opportunity here at Kaloko [Honokōhau NHP]. The people [the original advisory commissioners] that envisioned this place...put that spirit down on paper, and influenced Congress...the establishment of the park, [some advisory commissioners] are still alive. Not many of them, but those who directly had the vision and those who were supporters and sharers of that original vision [and] the spirit. So I really am concerned...that [the Park Service is] not doing everything [that they] can to...allow them the realization of their vision in their lifetime.

Issues regarding the lack of fulfillment of the advisory commissioner recommendations were discussed by Chiron, who thought that there were limited opportunities to experience the spirit:

I just feel like we manage [the National Park] in the traditional confines of the [National Park Service] that we have to do. I don’t think that the visitors here get more an approach and an experience. It’s more like we are a traditional recreational park and there are not that many opportunities for them to get the heart of the Spirit of Kaloko in a visit. A normal visitor is not getting much Spirit of Kaloko, I think.

I feel like we [the Park Service] have preserved some of the natural resources [and] cultural resources, but in the way that we manage the park and even some of the programs, I think that we are not embracing the enabling legislation. Like, there is not a lot of living culture happening, a lot of the interpretation is centered heavily around the visitors center which is kind of a false construct. I think that there is talk about how the natural resources and the cultural resources are woven together and are
one, but, I don’t think that we actually manage them to allow both the natural and the
cultural resources to be alive, to be utilized. I feel like we are still in the museum
mode as a very traditional...I think that we manage it as a very traditional park. So I
think that in terms of fulfilling the legislation there is that, so I think that it is missing
the heart and soul of that. Even with the cultural live-in-center, I don’t think that there
is enough spirit that is here in a way to influence people. I think that what we have
done, like the kuapā restoration, is good, but it is more like work and less like [spirit]
(laughs).

Chiron saw that the National Park is being managed as a recreational park that favours
activities like swimming and hiking over cultural use. This form of management limits
opportunities to experience the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau.

Management Preference 4: Engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi and Other Locals

The results of the interview analysis indicates that the interviewees would like the
Park Service to engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in planning and management
activities, including employment. The interviewees described why they think the engagement
of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and non-Kānaka ʻŌiwi is important.

The employment of Kānaka ʻŌiwi is important to Maiapilo because Kānaka ʻŌiwi
have cultural knowledge that can help the Park Service fulfill the enabling legislation:

It is important that Hawaiians are employed by the park. I think that if [the Park
Service] had...regulations that there was some kind of preference, I think that that
would be good. Right now, it seems kind of weird to me that there is only four
Hawaiians employed by the park. I think that's it and there is something wrong with
that. This park is different from other parks, and this is a part of the Park Service
culture and the regulations that are hard to deal with. It just doesn’t make any sense
for a seasonal position in interpretation, where you are talking about Hawaiian
culture, and you’re talking about the place, doesn’t it make more sense to hire
someone local who knows what they are talking about?
I think by default Hawaiian people have more knowledge on the subject instead of just hiring somebody off the street. Since seasons, since terms are short, it makes more sense for the learning curve to hire people that know what they are talking about (laughs).

Employing Kānaka ʻŌiwi is important to Wiliwili because the cultural knowledge that they carry can further National Park management goals. Wiliwili said, “when you have cultural people, Native Hawaiians working in a cultural park from their ancestors – from their end, the possibilities, they think outside the box.” Comparing the National Park Service to the Hawaiian culture, Wiliwili said:

They (Native Hawaiians) don’t think within the NPS, they think outside the box, and then they think, how can they accomplish the goals within the framework. They are not starting in the box...they are already outside looking at your box already.

The employment of Kānaka ʻŌiwi is important because the National Park is a Hawaiian cultural park. As such, Wiliwili thought that people from the host culture should be involved in park activities. Wiliwili said, “Well, I think that in Hawai’i...Kaloko-Honokōhau...should...hire Native Hawaiians....[T]he Park [Service] should employ native Hawaiians in cultural parks.” Wiliwili finished by stating:

Native Hawaiians should be employed in interpretative positions and in managerial positions. There are many Hawaiians that are qualified for upper management positions; however, the park has consistently hired Native Hawaiians for only enforcements positions and to man the desk. Enforcement and Interpretive Rangers are important as they interface with the community, but at the same time, the decision makers of what the interpreting needs to be needs to include Hawaiians.

In reference to the employment of Kānaka ʻŌiwi, Wiliwili thought that by employing people of Hawaiian ancestry, the Park Service can better create and establish trusting relationships with Hawaiian communities:
[The Park Service needs] to hire Native Hawaiians that become specialist in whatever they have. There is Native Hawaiian botanist, Native Hawaiian marine biologist, Native Hawaiian Superintendents...you can have some [foreigners] in there too….You know, we can be a family, but we just…the leader needs to be kind of transverse in both worlds…the Superintendent needs to know how to speak white and speak government…[T]hat is where you get, they have to be a more influential part, so people when they get that high they are kind of at their end [to retire]. Near the end of their career. So they just kind of take it easy….That is where the personality with who you hire comes into play too, because if you hire the wrong person - you going get bad results and you know it’s not something that you can just get rid of. I mean it starts with people who represent the system. If they have a bad personality and you gotta keep in mind that even the Superintendent, they are part of the system too. You can have a really good one, like, despite what some people think about this Superintendent, that Superintendent actually let the Park Service form a foundation here. That Superintendent let the Park Service in [with the Native Hawaiian community]. There are some things that happened along the way…the Superintendent was the start in building the relationship between the Park Service and the Native Hawaiian community.

Employing Kānaka Ōiwi at the National Park is important to Chiron because she thinks that our people should be managers involved in decision-making matters. She said, “When we [Park Service managers] sat as a management team around the table, we can say percentage wise we are doing okay, maybe about half our staff is Native Hawaiian, maybe a little less than that.” Chiron continued:

When you look at the management team, though, there are no Native Hawaiians. So that’s a hurdle. I think an individual asked, “What is this park doing to cultivate Native Hawaiians into the administrative management role?” I think that is a very good question ‘cause now it is one thing to say that, “Oh, our masons are” that’s good. In terms of making decisions, it needs to be...there should be more Hawaiians in management…I think in that aspect we are lagging.
The importance of employing Kānaka ʻŌiwi was described by ʻAnakala Fred, who thought that Kānaka ʻŌiwi have an ancestral connection to the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau:

We [the advisory commissioners] also recommended very strongly and the Parks began to say, “Okay. Okay, okay.” We needed staff. We needed people who could write, people who could understand what we were saying, people who could influence the physical…the structures, the facilities. People who could illustrate it, and so, we insisted on that they had to be Hawaiians…it’s that spirit that we wanted to capture.

The employment of Kānaka ʻŌiwi at Kaloko-Honokōhau is important to Pua Kala because the Park Service can financially support people through employment. Frustrated, Pua Kala asked, “Why [is the Park Service] hiring bird people to count birds? Why are people from the mainland being hired?” Continuing, Pua Kala elaborated, “As a park for Hawai‘i, you should help your own people. Your people that know the tides, the currents, and the fish. When they bring all these outside people, I get irritated and aggravated.”

Employing Kānaka ʻŌiwi at the National Park is valued by Souza, who thinks that our people can provide the Park Service with guidance on cultural matters. Souza said, “[The Park Service] don’t even have that glue. They need the glue.” She asked, “Where do you get this glue?” Continuing, she joked, “So, here they [the Park Service] are, chickens without heads now trying to do a cultural park when they ain’t got it. They don’t possess any of this.” She stressed this point, stating, “That’s not to say anybody who comes here cannot obtain it, it’s earned, it’s like you have to drink the bitter waters in order for you to understand and it’s sad because if we speak like this…it’s like okay, another angry Hawaiian.” She finished by saying:

We’re tired of being called “angry Hawaiians.” We don’t deserve it. We never asked for it to happen, but now, it’s like enough is enough. Yep, you need to possess that glue. If you know you don’t have it, by all means, please go out and find it. Find it. Okay (chuckles), you can change the question or what (laughs).
When the interviewees expressed preferences for the Park Service to engage the kamaʻāina, each gave justifications as to why they thought these people’s involvement at the National Park was important. Souza thought that the Park Service could demonstrate respect to the ‘āina by engaging kamaʻāina in park management and planning:

When I first worked there, I was wondering how in the world was I going get trained because I didn’t see anybody or talk to anybody that I felt was, I don’t want to say capable, but, there wasn’t anybody for me to talk to. So, on my own, what I did was I sought out these people [the kamaʻāina]. I had to know who lived here and who would understand. Who would want me to say what I have to say. So I started looking for them and I didn’t care if that wasn’t my job description or anything cause I was not from the area, and I respect every person’s place of residence so I actually went out and I did these things.

By working with kamaʻāina, Maiapilo explained that the Park Service can learn about how the personnel can better steward the area. Concerned, Maiapilo said, “there is a cemetery in the park that has not been well cared for and it is disturbing to see. It is not in good shape….” Maiapilo suggested, “I think [the Park Service needs to] partner with the families and see how they want to maintain and work with [the Park Service].” Maiapilo asked, “What is [the Park Service’s] responsibility to care for those places?” Finishing, Maiapilo emphasized the responsibilities of the park, stating, “[The Park Service is] entrusted with this land so…need to make sure that things are well cared for and people who are buried there are well cared for.”

Engaging kamaʻāina is important to Maiapilo because by working with people from the area, the Park Service will conduct a local practice of respecting people’s connection to places. Maiapilo explained, “the mission [of this National Historical Park] is to perpetuate Hawaiian culture…. [P]eople have connections to place. People belong to places. That’s what being a descendant [is]…is that you have the ties to that place….” Maiapilo continued, “The whole purpose of our purpose of…compliance…is to get people’s mana’o (thoughts) because their connection to place are very important.” Finishing, Maiapilo stated:
That is what is so beautiful about Hawaiian archaeology...there is so many living connections.... I love that about archaeology here. It’s very alive. There are people that are very connected to place and that is important. So if you are trying to have a park to perpetuate the living Hawaiian culture, then shouldn’t you be involving, consulting with, and listening to those people?

The benefits of engaging kama‘āina and other locals in park planning and management was discussed by Samson Harp, who thought that the Park Service could prevent creating negative relationships by working with these two groups. He said, “People who care should be here [at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park].” Harp asked, “If [people] no care, then why are [they] here?” He continued, “We need to take care [of this place] for future generations. If you take care you stay on land, if you no take care, you out.” Harp suggested that, “[the Park Service] should first check with lineal descendants if they can help or would like to be involved. Others come next. If they [lineal descendants] aren’t at least contacted and spoken with, it could cause a negative ripple in the future.”

The engagement of kama‘āina in National Park planning and management is valuable to Wiliwili because the Park Service can gain respect from outsiders, while also allowing families to fulfill their kuleana to care for their wahi:

Definitely [those with ancestral connections] should have...a role [at the National Historical Park]. The reason why, people’s family, not just no – at Kaloko-Honokōhau the park area...the boundaries of the now park area is around a place that is very special....Interpreting the sites within the park in the context of the ahupua‘a system will provide you with a lot of answers and the culture will gain more respect from outsiders.

Wiliwili continued:

The park should have descendants play a very huge role in the development and the management of the park. Particularly the management...because the [Park Service] is managing what came from these families. [People] can work for the park, and, to some that is okay. You work, you do your job, you go home...but people who are
descendants from that area, especially for like mine who are buried there...there is such a larger sense of responsibility and when you have, when you have people who are in tune with those kinds of resources, they give more. They are not just going to give you their time, they give you their sweat. The park becomes a part of their family, it’s the resources that is still a part of their family and knows...they know how it works down there. The park wants to find out how that area came to be, how it came to be is from the history of these families. And having them as a token or within the park...that just makes it, them more authentic. If you get what I’m trying to say.

The engagement of kamaʻaina and Kānaka ʻōiwi in planning and management is important to Wiliwili because by working with these people, the Park Service will provide a more holistic perpetuation of the Hawaiian culture. Wiliwili explained, “The Park perpetuates the Hawaiian culture by merely preserving the physical manifestation of a culture.” Wiliwili suggested, “Through in-depth interpretation, active preservation, involvement of the Hawaiian community and descendants, will result in a more holistic perpetuation of the Hawaiian culture.”

**Supporting Policy**

There are several policies that direct the Park Service to employ and work with Kānaka ʻōiwi to conduct Park Service activities. The enabling legislation—Public Law 95-625 (section 3)—contains a section discussing the preferential hiring of Hawaiians, stating that “[i]n carrying out the purposes of this section the Secretary is authorized and directed as appropriate to employ native Hawaiians.” The employment of Kānaka ʻōiwi was emphasized by Senator Matsunaga (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866):

In view of the importance of accurately portraying the aspects of native Hawaiians culture which were associated with the Kaloko-Honokohau area, the park proposal strongly recommends that native Hawaiians be employed in every aspect of the park’s development and management to the maximum extent which is consistent with National Park Service employment policies (Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866).
The Spirit Report contained an employment policy that stated “the preference in hiring and training [of Hawaiians] be viewed as a required activity rather than an optional one” (Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:59-62).

The final general management plan directed the Park Service personnel to work with Kānaka Ōiwi (USDOI, NPS 1994:43-44). This planning document directed the Park Service to work with “knowledgeable Hawaiian individuals and organizations to determine, both physically and spiritually,” which structures should be restored (USDOI, NPS 1994:44).

**Challenges**

The interview results suggest that there are four challenges that may create issues for the Park Service to employ Kānaka Ōiwi. The limited employment of Kānaka Ōiwi may be influenced by problems with the federal hiring process, bias of hiring officials, the lack of resources to sustain internships, and insufficient hiring guidelines for the employment of Native peoples. Other challenges are created by aggressive interactions and the lack of: involvement with Kānaka Ōiwi, fulfillment of promises, dedication to community relationships, community outreach and knowledge. These issues may create outcomes that challenge Park Service’s ability to work with Kānaka Ōiwi in planning and management activities, including employment.

Wiliwili, who thinks that the hiring system limits applicants to existing federal government employees, discussed challenges created by the federal hiring process. Wiliwili said, “If you [the Park Service] are limited by who you hire by sticking within the NPS or federal frame, then you are not getting the best [employees] that is out there. So they [the Park Service] are already, they are cutting their foot short already.” Wiliwili continued, “So when you talk about what kind of people that help, or what to do, it starts at the hiring phase. They [the Park Service] are always limiting the choices that they hav[e]…. Concluding, Wiliwili explained that:

[B]ecause [the Park Service] are in the framework of the NPS, when they hire positions for the park they have to choose within the federal family and then if they don’t find anyone then they can open it up to public. Most of the scholars are not a
part of the Federal System. Thus, they would get passed over for a current federal employee who can laterally be transferred into a position.

Here, Wiliwili explained that the hiring process creates challenges for the Park Service personnel to hire Kānaka ʻŌiwi.

Other challenges that are created by the hiring “preference” of Park Service managers were discussed by Wiliwili, who thinks that the bias of hiring officials influences employment practices. Wiliwili said, “The preference of the park managers, and the perspective of what they want in an employee [influences hiring].” Wiliwili asked, “Will the park hire someone to provide technical expertise or to be a “yes-man”?” Wiliwili continued, “The agency is its own entity that doesn’t have life. It’s the people that work for it that breathe life into it. So, if you constantly hire the wrong people you, you can’t expect to get glorious results.” Finishing, Wiliwili asked, “How can you make a ‘ono (delicious) beef stew with wrong ingredients?”

Issues with employment may be influenced by the lack of long-term internship and training programs. Wiliwili said:

I couldn’t quite understand why some park staff thought going into the native community to do outreach and to recruit Native Hawaiians to learn about a career with NPS, when there wasn’t a park support system to sustain the students from volunteer status to employment status.

Wiliwili asked, “Well what are you [the Park Service] offering them?” The interviewee continued, “You [the Park Service] are giving them hope and then turning around saying, ‘No more money, get away, get out of our face.’ It’s been happening surprisingly for many years.” Expressing frustration, Wiliwili finished by stating that:

It seems like each year, [the Park Service employees have] to try and convince the new generation, not my generation cause they already messed that one up, and the two before me. Now they gotta go try again with our keiki…It was mentioned that a non-Hawaiian was being hired in managerial positions because Hawaiian were not
“getting the job done.” They staffed [the National Park] with a new non-Hawaiian staff who are now leaving the park. People come, people go but what remains constant are the Native Hawaiians, the cultural sites, and their perpetuation of their culture through any means possible.

The Park Service hiring practices may be influenced by insufficient guidelines for the employment of Kānaka ʻŌiwi. Souza said, “I don’t wanna be complaining, but I was told…that they [the Park Service] are hiring Native Hawaiians. I questioned this, going back to the kahu (cultural advisor) and protocol.” Continuing, she explained, “I questioned who sits at that table to determine the hiring of a person….Right now there are no set guidelines to hire Native Hawaiian people and...preference is always given to the Veteran...which is fine.” She finished:

But, it’s sort of like everybody understands the original people...well I am saying everybody because I understand. But there are [personnel who] feel that they can give the job to someone...they prefer or are associated with….They have their biases. But there is no set ground rules as far as this hiring of Native people.

While speaking with Harp, issues regarding the lack of meaningful involvement with Kānaka ʻŌiwi in the National Park planning and management activities were discussed. He asked, “How much kanaka is there?” Harp continued, “Through their [the Park Service] government procedures, they check us off. They see us as a checklist. Check and move on.” Harp asked, “Do you see anyone on the actual ahupua‘a, living there [at Kaloko-Honokōhau]?” He suggested, “Got to find the things of today and yesterday. It can be reciprocal. See, people want to live there if they could, but they cannot. The land today does not feed us as it once fed our ancestors.”

Frustrations regarding the lack of meaningful involvement with Kānaka ʻŌiwi were discussed by Maiapilo, who said, “the elephant in the room is the relationship with the community, the Native Hawaiian community. It is a really, really, big elephant.” I jokingly replied, “it’s the elephant in the fishpond,” and we chuckled.
The lack of follow-through on promises made by Park Service employees may result in limited engagement with community members and mistrust. This subject was discussed by Wiliwili, who said, “[The d]escendants have heard the NPS offering the community certain things which they haven’t delivered… trying to get these deliverances from [the Park Service] they are not really seeing or thinking about other adverse affects…”

The lack of dedication that Park Service has to community relationships and community events may also create limited relationships with community members. Wiliwili discussed the importance of follow-through, which is essential to relationship building:

[The Park Service] needs to stop false advertisement to the Native people. I heard park staff say that they want to go in the high school and let Native Hawaiian students know that they can be employed by the park service and they should come down and be Junior Rangers. I thought… oh my goodness you need to just stay away and don’t even tell these kids that because… you can’t follow through with it. So, my mana’o is, don’t say something that you cannot follow through. You are just talking to get your way to pull your park up your ratings up and you really have no intent on following through on this. You really don’t have anything in the park to have these come to the park, be engaged in the park, and sustain them for five to seven years. Until they leave for college. You have nothing there for them like that. And until you start building something like that, don’t even try. I mean what is this for, like a 10-week program? Come on get a grip.

I think that the park should be like an essential hub to help. They should be having connections into the high school…middle school, but these connection…are only going to [happen] if you have people who are willing to go there and sustain these connections to see that one person from the third grade go all the way up to the park service as well. Not just… oh yea I [achieved this] and I’ll put it in my end of the year report of this is what we did. That to me is…impulse buying at the store. [The Park Service] need to link the park into the community. Not the white [haole or settler] community. It’s not all about them. They need to link it into the host cultural community.
Aggressive interactions may also ruin relations between Park Service employees and community members. Maiapilo shared a personal experience describing the consequences of harmful interactions, stating, “[the Park Service should not] come at people all aggressive and weird, authoritarian. It doesn’t work well and it’s not good for building relationships when you are like that.” Maiapilo continued:

I wasn’t involved, I wasn’t there when it happened, but several years ago when a descendant of the park was there doing an educational program, a cultural program, perpetuating Hawaiian culture, which is what [this NHP is] supposed to be doing, so theoretically [they, the Park Service would] support an activity like that. They [the descendants] were approached very aggressively by a seasonal law enforcement person and a volunteer ranger who got up in their face and were very aggressive with them and these were people, the descendants, that lived right there. I mean they know that place and it was over stupid parking stuff, which is how it had been, I mean, they were just doing what had been set up for them for quite some time. Parking within the park boundaries so that their elderly relatives could make it to the beach. They were basically verbally attacked...and that is not the way that you build relationships with community...It is disheartening and I think that the park reacts out of fear a lot of times.

The limited engagement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in planning and management may be influenced by Park Service managers, who have challenges with identifying the “community.” This issue was discussed by Chiron, who said, “I would think that the community (from my limited perspective)¹¹ that would have authority to speak about it would be families that have a connection to this land and to this area.” She continued,

I guess the biggest challenge the park has is how to identify [the community], and if the lineal descendants are not responding to the standard approach, is there any other way of getting their input or is it just a flawed model that they use. I don’t know.

Exploring the absence of knowledge regarding community, Ranger Chiron explained,

¹¹ Clarifications in the parenthesis were added by the interviewee.
Here’s the thing, you know the question, how well are we managing it? I feel that there is some sort of an empty space, like compared to Hōnaunau, we don’t have a strong local group saying that there are things that they wanna do or that they want to see people do. There is a disconnect from the community and I don’t know why. I haven’t been here long enough to know why. How come there is no community around here? But that’s where I think the management is open to hearing, but I think we don’t know where to look to get that input. So from the management team, I think that there is some willingness, some openness to hearing from the community but there is a sort of lack of knowledge, skills, people, and connections to hear it.

Discussion: Conceptions of Heritage

The first objective of my research was to identify the shared and conflicting goals of Park Service personnel and community representatives regarding the management of cultural heritage at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. The key findings of the research suggest that Park Service personnel and community representatives have four shared management preferences for cultural heritage at Kaloko-Honokōhau (Table 8), which seek to bring cultural traditions “alive” by making the three ahupua’a functional again. The interviewees had similar ideas about which structures in the National Park should be rehabilitated for use, how they would like to use the landscape for cultural and spiritual pursuits, and who should be involved in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Preference</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Supporting Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rehabilitate the Kahua Hulikoehana | Unsustainable resource management practices  
Lack of manpower  
Limited funding | Difficult to maintain completed projects  
Projects are not maintained and thus require constant attention  
Efforts to advance resource management practices are limited | (USDOI, NPS 1994:36)  
(NPS, ROD 1994:2).  
(Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission 1974:41),  
(Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866). |
| Reconnect with the Ancestors | Alter cultural traditions  
NPS traditional interpretive approaches  
Limited staff  
Lack of cultural knowledge  
Control by people unfamiliar with cultural traditions  
Park management values and priorities | Disrespectful  
Unfamiliar and uninviting to locals  
Limited opportunities to participate in cultural activities  
People disrespect the Hawaiian culture  
Creates tensions and limitations  
Integration or non-integration of traditions into Park Service practice | (Public Law 95-625, section a)  
| Interact with the Spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau | Restrictive rules  
Rules made by outsiders  
Park Service has yet to fully fulfill the Spirit Report goals  
Managed as a traditional park | Park is a “museum”  
Limited interaction with place  
Uninviting to park visitors  
Imposed rules unfit for place and people  
Protect the resources from disturbance  
Balance rules to protect and allow access  
Disappointment  
Lack of opportunities to experience the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau | (ROD 1994:4)  
(USDOI, NPS 1994:6, 53-54)  
(Cong. Rec. 1978, 865-866)  
Table 8. Summary of interview results (contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Preference</th>
<th>Discrepancy</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Supporting Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According to the interview results, *Kānaka ‘Ōiwi* and non-*Kānaka ‘Ōiwi* who are Park Service personnel and community representatives have shared goals for the management of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. Most or all interviewees are aware that there are Park Service policies that support their management preferences. The interview results suggest that interviewees categorized in the same interview group (e.g., National Park Service employees, managers, and non-employees) experienced similar challenges that they thought made it difficult for the National Park personnel to fulfill NPS long-term management goals. The Park Service managers discussed issues related to limited funding and human resources. These challenges made it difficult for the Park Service to diversify and enhance resource management and educational projects. Managers also expressed frustrations with Park Service policies and regulations. The Park Service employees and community representatives shared their concerns regarding the lack of support, follow-through, and commitment that they received from the Park Service managers. People from the latter two groups expressed frustrations with decisions and actions made by Park Service managers.

The management challenges highlight questionable management practices, especially those that impede or conflict with both legislative mandates and interviewees’
preferences. My research further suggests at least four landscape elements that need to be integrated into how the Park Service manages the National Park in order to accommodate how interviewees would like Kaloko-Honokōhau to be managed:

- **Spiritual landscape elements** – spirits includes those of deceased family members and Hawaiian chiefs, gods, spiritual guardians, and those of objects and land;
- **Biophysical landscape elements** – natural (e.g., wind, water, trees, plants, etc.) and ancestral (e.g., cultural sites and places, artifacts, etc.) aspects;
- **Social landscape elements** – the status and health of people and their relationship to other humans and to the land; and
- **Cultural landscape elements** – Hawaiian cultural customs and knowledge that has been transmitted to present-day peoples.

Each of these landscape elements can be conceptualized as necessary components of a management plan (Figure 10). In reference to the four landscape elements, there are four key differences that seems to create a disconnect between how the National Park is managed and how the interviewees want the area to be managed:

- Interactions that people have with Kaloko-Honokōhau to experience spiritual landscape elements;
- Opportunities that people have to steward, rehabilitate, access, and use biophysical landscape elements;
- Relationships that people have to each other and to the land that influences social landscape elements; and
- Cultural activities that people can participate in, listen to, and observe that contributes to perpetuating cultural landscape elements.

These management preferences can be used to understand how present Park Service management practices differ from what the interviewees would like for the National Park.
Figure 10. Conceptualization of the interview results.
Rehabilitating Kaloko-Honokōhau

The interviewees agreed that the loko i’a, loko ‘ume‘īki, māla, kahua hale, ko’a, and heiau should be rehabilitated for traditional use. These are the only kahua hulikoehana that the interviewees mentioned when they described preferences to bring structures at the National Park back to their functional status. Because these structures are not yet functional, this is seen as an unfulfilled management goal by the interviewees, and creates tension between the interviewees and National Park Service. The challenges shared by the interviewees suggest that there are issues that need to be overcome. To rehabilitate Kaloko-Honokōhau, it is essential that the Park Service understands which structures in the park would be best preserved and protected in place. These two values are compatible with Hawaiian land management values.

The National Park’s mandates (USDOI, NPS 1994:43) that seek to “preserve” kahua hulikoehana by preventing loss and harm to them (National Park Service 2006:158) is similar to the Hawaiian cultural value ho‘omalu (to protect), an aspect of mālama. Based on interviews conducted by Maly and Maly (2002:70), preservation and ho‘omalu should be applied to care for the ilina, which need to be protected in place to prevent disturbance to them. The interviews conducted by Maly and Maly (2002:271) suggest that the ilina may be best cared for by only tending to them to clean or to talk to ‘ohana. ‘Anakala Peter explained that he was taught to ho‘oma‘ema’e the ilina by maintaining them and placing fallen objects back in their place. He also stated that ‘ohana visited the ilina to “talk story” and give their aloha to kūpuna (Maly and Maly 2002:271).

Edward Ayau (2005) discussed the importance of leaving iwi kūpuna (ancestral remains) and moepū (funerary objects) in place, which he suggested should be reburied if disturbed. Dana Hall (2013:37) stated that the places where ilina were laid to rest is the “home” of our kūpuna. She noted that when they are left undisturbed, the preservation of ilina in place strengthens us (Kānaka ‘Ōiwi) as a people, and that by “[f]ulfilling this responsibility, we reaffirm who we are as a people – that we too have a place here, and it comes from the bones of our ancestors” (2010:196).
Although the Park Service protects the *kahua hulikoehana* by limiting use and access to them, the *loko i’a* and *māla* have not been rehabilitated for traditional use. Because the Park Service has not yet rehabilitated such structures in the National Park, this creates a gap in their practice. The inflexible preservation approach used by Park Service management limits opportunities to steward and access cultural structures. Creating solutions that allow the Park Service to allow access to and the rehabilitation of structures that protect the *kahua hulikoehana*, can help better fulfill both legislated mandates and interviewee management preferences.

**Reconnecting with the Ancestors**

Interviewees wanted more opportunities to reconnect with our *kūpuna* by practicing cultural traditions. By performing the customs of our ancestors, the link between the past and present is enhanced. In a sense, people today become connected to the ancestors by engaging in the cultural practices. The study results indicate that five management challenges limit opportunities for people to reconnect with the ancestors. Although the Park Service hosts community events, cultural workshops, and interpretive walks that communicate aspects of the Hawaiian culture, what is missing from their practice are cultural activities that are hosted on a daily basis. Because the Park Service does not provide daily opportunities for people to participate in, listen to, and observe cultural practices, this creates a gap in their practice.

Although the interviewees expressed a preference to reconnect with the ancestors by engaging in cultural activities like food production, they did not provide specific details about the types of cultural activities they would like to bring back. Because the interviewees did not discuss the traditional uses of Kaloko-Honokōhau, I referred to archaeological and ethnographic reports to identify the traditional uses of this *wahi pana*.

**Rehabilitating a Thriving Cultural Landscape**

Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006:C-131) summarized the Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park Geographic Information System database containing the archaeological sites that are located in the National Park’s legislative boundary, but did not
include all of the database entries. Their work consolidated existing archaeological investigations performed, providing a clearer idea about how this landscape was possibly used before and after contact with foreigners. This information plays a central role in rehabilitating Kaloko-Honokōhau for traditional use and as it existed in early Hawai‘i.

Using Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle’s summary (2006:C-132-158), I created a traditional use map (Figure 11), whose purpose was to demonstrate uses of the landscape by integrating archaeological data with local knowledge. I created this map using iDraw\(^\text{12}\), an illustration software, to digitally layer the archaeological reports. Figure 11’s icons map and indicate the general locations of structures located on the landscape and what types of activities are thought to have occurred in the area. The archaeological studies that I included in this map were conducted by Cluff (1971), Cordy et al. (1991), Emory and Soehren (1971) [including the first digital map layer], Reinecke (1930), and Renger (1971), including sites identified by Emmerson (1882) and Stokes (1991).\(^\text{13}\) Any descriptions that were noted on existing maps were translated into Hawaiian and included in the map that I created. Individual petroglyphs documented by Stasack and Stasack (2004a and 2004b) are not displayed because there are hundreds that would overwhelm the map if included. Instead, icons of petroglyphs indicate the known fields that exists, which includes more than one ki‘i pōhaku. The oral history reports that I included in this map were produced by Maly (2000) and Maly and Maly (2002). I mapped local knowledge associated with specific places, but did not map sensitive areas (burials) and removed a map scale to protect the wahi pana from disturbance. This map is not exhaustive and should be improved to better demonstrate personal and shared land and sea practices.

\(^{12}\) See for software information http://www.indeeo.com/idraw/

\(^{13}\) I did not include the findings of Walsh and Hammatt (1995) and sites identified by Durst and Glidden (1999) because a copy of their archaeological report was not available.
Lenelle Underwood, a kama‘aina from North Kona, provided guidance with creating appropriate terms and definitions.
The Kaloko ahupua‘a (Figure 12) was used for both temporary and long-term living. Most of these kahua hale are located adjacent to ala hele, loko or along the coastline; these areas also contain kahua. Ahu were also constructed adjacent to the ala hele. At least two upland trails lead to the eastern section of the Kaloko Loko I’a. Near this structure, there are kahua hale that may have been used by fishpond caretakers and leases, or used to house, care for, and repair canoes. The fishpond was used to gather ‘ōpae (shrimp) and to catch fish. Seasonal cross net fishing was used for large harvests, while imu (fish houses) built near the mākahā were used to catch reef fish more often. Ala hele are located near māla, and connect to a network of trails in the lava fields and a coastal trail running north to south. Near trails, there were hālau wa’a (canoe houses) and pā holoholona (animal enclosures). Coastal trails passed near or branched off leading to kīʻi pōhaku, poho, ko’a, and Ka Wai O Kahinihini‘ula, and connected Kaloko to Honokōhau Nui.

Figure 12. Kaloko Ahupua‘a (Section of Figure 11).
Honokōhau Nui, Honokōhau Iki, and Kealakehe (Figure 13) contain *kahua hale* and *loko* that appear to be located near the coastline, trails, fishpond, and fish trap. People collected ‘ōpae and caught fish and non-native ducks from ‘Aimakapā Loko l’a. Fish and ‘ōpae were caught in ‘Ai‘ōpio ‘Ume‘iki. Both of these structures have pāhoehoe flats that are located around them. Some of these smooth sections of lava have *poho* and *ki‘i pōhaku*. There are at least four *heiau* that are located in these *ahupua‘a*, along with several *ko‘a*. Fishers caught specific fishes in particular areas along the coast and canoes were landed in sandy areas and rock outcroppings.

Figure 13. Honokōhau Nui, Honokōhau Iki, and Kealakehe *ahupua‘a* (Section of Figure 11).
Interacting with the Spirit

The interview findings suggest that the interviewees prefer increased interactions with Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki. They would like opportunities to actively engage with the landscape and to experience the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau by performing the cultural activities that were conducted by our ancestors. There are several Park Service policies created for Kaloko-Honokōhau that support the initiative to create activities for people to observe, participate in, and immerse themselves in the customs and traditions of our ancestors. However, although legislation and planning documents called for these types of activities to occur, there are management challenges that make this difficult to happen. These issues seem to revolve around the lack of interface between people and place, through which people can experience the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau.

The notion that a place can have a “spirit” is not unique to Kaloko-Honokōhau. This view regarding how our people and other peoples, including the Park Service, conceptualize landscapes influences the management of National Parks. Holly Miller (2000:103-104) explains that when beliefs regarding how places should be used and cared for conflict, tensions between Park Service personnel, recreational visitors, and Native peoples arise. Walter Echo-Hawk (2009:63) discusses conflict that can occur when people relate to landscapes differently. He introduces the idea of a “primal” cosmology, in which the divide between people, places, plants, and animals is “thin” and everything has a spirit. This is very similar to the worldview of our people, which reinforces the genealogical relationship that our people have to the ‘āina (Aluli and McGregor 2007). The idea of what is considered appropriate when managing land and resources in the Hawaiian culture is best described by Richard Kekuni Blaisdell, John Keola Lake, and Healani Chang (2005:373): “[w]ellness is the constant interaction between all life forces...[w]hen there is proper interaction, things are pono or in harmony, and mana [divine power] maintains this balance.” These authors emphasize the importance of constant and proper interaction between people, place, objects, and elements in the Hawaiian culture.
Maintaining Harmony Between Life Forces

At Kaloko-Honokōhau, the Superintendent’s Compendium (USDOI, NPS 2013) lists regulations that are enforced at the National Park. These regulations determine the types of interaction that are allowed between people, Kaloko-Honokōhau, and other life forces. I analyzed the compendium (USDOI, NPS 2013) to identify what types of Hawaiian customs practiced at Kaloko-Honokōhau are currently prohibited. I included traditional uses discussed by kamaʻāina in Kelly (1971), Maly (2000), Maly and Maly (2002), and Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle (2006) to highlight practices that do not occur today. This analysis identifies the types of interactions that occurred between people and the landscape in the past, which are prohibited from being practiced today. I discovered that although Kaloko-Honokōhau was widely used in early Hawaiʻi, today, much of these activities no longer occur. Individuals do not live at Kaloko-Honokōhau either temporarily or permanently. Though our people were supposed to be provided with a live-in education complex, this has not yet happened. The fishponds and gardens have not been rehabilitated for traditional use. These and other unfulfilled long-term management goals limit interactions between people and place.

More specifically, the compendium (USDOI, NPS 2013) lists rules that regulate the use of the National Park. These regulations are similar to the kapu system because they are needed to regulate use in order to prevent overuse of the landscape and resources. The concept of protecting places is not foreign to our culture. However, the idea of highly restricted access and use that limits the perpetuation of cultural traditions is. In regards to the Kaloko Fishpond, individuals are only allowed to access the southern portion of the sea wall to fish from it by pole, and are not allowed to enter the fishpond. This means that they no longer catch ʻōpae for bait, build imu (fish traps) (Maly and Maly 2002:143), and lay nets (Maly and May 2002:146) for seasonal harvesting activities. Interestingly, these uses are prohibited to protect the cultural values; the compendium (USDOI, NPS 2013) states:

Use of throw net, lay net, fish trap or scoop net fishing, spear, and other collections are not allowed in Kaloko Fishpond because these methods requires [sic] entry into the water which is prohibited by 36 CFR 3.16 to protect the resources and cultural values of the pond (USDOI, NPS 2013:2).
As with the Kaloko Fishpond, ‘Aimakapā Fishpond—which was used to catch fish (Maly 2000:72; Maly and Maly 2002:327), ducks (Maly and Maly 2002:327), and shrimp (Maly and Maly 2002:41)—is “closed to all fishing” (USDOI, NPS 2013:2) to:

- prevent interference with breeding and foraging activities of the endangered Hawaiian coot, and to prevent disturbance of endangered Hawaiian stilts and migratory fowl (USDOI, NPS 2013:2).

Canoes are no longer allowed to enter the Kaloko Fishpond even though boats were used to fish from the pond for net-laying fishing (Kelly 1971:32). The park regulations state that non-motorized vessels are prohibited from entering the fishpond because they will interfere with the appreciation of traditional Hawaiian use:

Kaloko [F]ishpond is important habitat for the endangered Hawaiian stilt. Recreational use in either pond would interfere with the birds’ natural behaviors, including breeding, foraging, and loafing. Both ponds are important archaeological and cultural sites’ and vessels interfere with the interpretation and appreciation of traditional Hawaiian use of the fishponds (USDOI, NPS 2013:3).

Canoes are prohibited from entering the ‘Aimakapā Fishpond because:

Aimakapa [sic] [F]ishpond is an important wetland habitat for two federally protected endangered birds, the Hawaiian stilt and the Hawaiian coot, and for migratory waterfowl. Non-motorized vessels are prohibited to minimize disturbance to endangered birds per the Endangered Species Act and Migratory Bird Protection Act (USDOI, NPS 2013:3).

Individuals are only allowed to walk on the southern half of the Kaloko Fishpond because much of the area is closed as a “Stilt Foraging Area” to:

- protect the birds from human disturbance while they are foraging and loafing (resting). The Hawaiian stilt is listed as an endangered species under the Federal Endangered Species Act. Human activity such as fishing, walking and picnicking in
this area disturbs the birds, resulting in disruption to necessary foraging and loafing behaviors (USDOI, NPS 2013:11).

Both fishponds are no longer being used to raise fish. The ‘Ai’ōpio Fish Trap is also no longer traditionally used to catch fish (Maly and Maly 2002:42) or to demonstrate how they were caught, but instead is primarily used for recreational swimming.

In terms of the ponds, individuals are also prohibited from entering them, including Ka Wai O Kahinihīnī’ula because:

Anchialine pools are fragile ecosystems which support endemic species. Swimming is prohibited to prevent contamination from sunscreen, body oils or other materials and to prevent disturbance to animals. Anchialine pools are cultural and archaeological sites and entering them for swimming may damage historically significant features (USDOI, NPS 2013:3).

This pond was used for ceremonial (Tomonari-Tuggle and Tuggle:C-16) and non-ceremonial bathing purposes (Maly and Maly 2002:42). Visitors are restricted from traveling trails other than those authorized by the Park Service:

Archaeological sites and features in the park are comprised of dry-stack (no mortar) stone work, loose stone work, pits, soft-lava trails, or loose midden material that may be difficult for the untrained eye to see and which are easily disturbed or damaged by off-trail pedestrian use. Due to the arid environment many native plants within the Park are small and have thin, shallow root material that is easily damaged and/or dislodged when tread upon (USDOI, NPS 2013:2).

Although all of these rules are important because they protect some aspect of the cultural and natural resources, they do so to the point where the traditional uses authorized by Public Law 95-625 and the general management plan (USDOI, NPS 1994) are prohibited. The landscape is preserved as-is, rather than allowing interactions between people and place to occur. Because visitors are restricted to only viewing and visiting Kaloko-Honokōhau as passive users, people cannot experience the spirit by using the landscape like our kūpuna. Creating opportunities for people to interact with the wahi pana
like our kūpuna can help the Park Service better fulfill the management preferences of the interviewees.

**Nurturing Relationships**

The interviewees indicated that they would like the Park Service to engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi in planning and management activities, including employment. The document analysis revealed that there are Park Service policies that support the involvement of Kānaka ʻŌiwi in planning and management activities, including employment. However, management challenges that were discussed by the interviewees suggested that the Park Service struggles to engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi.

The interview findings and park policies suggest that relationships are important because without them, the Park Service will struggle to rehabilitate the landscape for traditional use and conduct other resource management tasks. This impacts Park Service management practice and policy because the management directives inform the agency to: 1) work with Kānaka ʻŌiwi to identify and protect the ancestral structures important to our people by working with the ʻohana that have ties to the area (USDOI, NPS 1994:2, 43); 2) update the National Park’s traditional use and cultural landscape data, and oral history and ethnographic information by working with knowledgeable Kānaka ʻŌiwi (USDOI, NPS 1994:43); and 3) work with knowledgeable Kānaka ʻŌiwi to determine physically and spiritually which ancestral structures will be restored (USDOI, NPS 1994:44). This lack of engagement makes it difficult for the Park Service to fulfill these management directives.

Although the Park Service can fulfill the National Park’s management goals by talking with the families, the interview results revealed that the interviewees would like the agency employees to engage with kamaʻāina, Kānaka ʻŌiwi, and other locals. Without their involvement in all aspects of management and employment, this management preference will remain unfulfilled. Creating opportunities for people to become engaged in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment, can help the Park Service to better fulfill the management preferences of the interviewees.
Chapter Summary

The interviews I conducted revealed that the interviewees would like the Park Service personnel to rehabilitate the *kahua koehana* at the National Park for use, provide opportunities to reconnect with the ancestors, open land use to enhance interactions with the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau, and engage with Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in management and planning activities, including employment. Park Service policies do support and comport with these management preferences but there are gaps between these policies and preferences on the one hand and actual management practice on the other. These management issues stem from both other Park Service policies and a prevailing Park Service preference for retaining control over all lands and resources as part of a national-scale authorized heritage discourse. The goals arising from interviewee preferences are: provide opportunities for people to steward, rehabilitate, access, and use biophysical landscape elements; create opportunities for visitors to participate in, listen to, and observe cultural practices on a daily basis; increase interactions that people have with Kaloko-Honokōhau to experience spiritual landscape elements; and engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment. Each of these goals deals with spiritual, cultural, biophysical, and social landscape elements.
Chapter 6. Recommendations and Conclusions

The health of our land and sea reflects the health of our people.

–Ruth-Rebeccalynne T L Aloua

The call that I received by the spirit of Kaloko-Honokōhau awakened the ancestral voices that stirred in my na’au. Through the time that I spent at this wahi, I felt my connection to the spirit strengthen. I reawakened my ancestral connection to this place by offering pule and ho’okupu (offerings) from the pāhoehoe at Ka Lae Malii (Maliu Point), singing songs to the honu and manu at ‘Ai’ōpio, walking the sandy shores of ‘Aimakapā, and speaking to the elements at Kaloko. As I spent time at Kaloko-Honokōhau, I felt the spirit guide my thoughts, actions, and words. I began to feel intense love, respect, and humility for this wahi. Tears of joy, love, and sadness often fell from my eyes when I stood on this āina. I felt that the spirit yearned for people that loved this place to return and bring the landscape to life once again. The dreams and visions that I received revealed the future for this wahi. The guidance I received from ancestral spirits and precious souls like Lily Souza, Mele Barton, Michelle Tomas, Mokihana Keoho, Nona Naboa, Kealoha Manakū, ‘Anakala Fred, ‘Anakala Paka Harp, and Lolana Medeiros inspired me to attend graduate school. These āina warriors who visited me in dreams and in-person inspired me to understand how our people could better mālama and share our aloha with this place. By reconnecting, enhancing, and nurturing the ancestral connection that our people have to this place, we could heal Kaloko-Honokōhau and ourselves.

My research has revealed that the interviewees have four management preferences for the management of cultural heritage at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park. These management preferences deal with social, cultural, spiritual, and biophysical landscape elements. Each of these elements describes a form of land management that is appropriate for Kaloko-Honokōhau. Sentiments shared by the interviewees provide insight
into how the Park Service personnel can create management practices in tune with the people that have connections to Kaloko-Honokōhau. These recommendations can be used to heal, nurture, and strengthen relationships between people, Kaloko-Honokōhau, and other life forces. In this concluding chapter, I share the six management recommendations offered by the individuals I interviewed. These recommendations are meant to help the Park Service create more effective and satisfying forms of management practices. I use quotations from the interviews to demonstrate my research findings. From this discussion, I describe how communities throughout Hawai‘i are connecting people to their ahupua‘a. I then conclude by briefly discussing how archaeology is used to serve communities and Hawaiian cultural practices and values are integrated into archaeological practice.

**Six Recommendations for More Effective and Satisfying Park Management**

My analyses of the interviews identified four management preferences for cultural heritage and four associated management goals for Kaloko-Honokōhau (Table 9). The management preferences reflect sentiments shared by the interviewees. They describe actions that the Park Service personnel can take to honour management approaches valued by the interviewees. This section takes the logical next step by identifying six recommendations to help the Park Service adjust their management practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Preference</th>
<th>Management Goal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1  | Rehabilitate the Kahua Hulikoehana | Provide opportunities for people to steward, rehabilitate, access, and use biophysical landscape elements. | • Designate a Konohiki  
• Create partnerships  |
| 2  | Reconnect with the Ancestors | Create opportunities for visitors to participate in, listen to, and observe cultural practices on a daily basis. | • Enhance cultural experiences |
Table 9. Summary of interview findings (contd).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Preference</th>
<th>Management Goal</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Management Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interact with the Spirit of Kaloko-Honokohau</td>
<td>Increase interactions that people have with Kaloko-Honokohau to experience spiritual</td>
<td>Create partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Engage Kanaka ‘Ōiwi and Other Locals</td>
<td>Engage people in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment by creating lasting relationships that people have to each other and to the land.</td>
<td>Hire a Kahu, Create internships, Practice the 6 rules of engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation 1: Designate a Konohiki

Harp recommended that the Park Service designate a konohiki to help rehabilitate Kaloko-Honokohau for traditional use:

Designate a konohiki. Someone familiar with the cultural resources, they can facilitate and be the konohiki and see over the development. Cannot get influence from someone else. We got to influence our own future. Hard to remove and put ourselves somewhere else. We need a konohiki to live in everyday and supervise. Someone to be a makua or ali`i, someone to make sure that we are being productive. Someone to ensure the icebox is full. There are three things the konohiki needs. The first is someone that is mākaukau, ready. Next is someone that is maui i luna and the second is maui i loko. Maui i luna is intellect, Maui i loko is emotion. Bring balance, pono. You see, you should carry these two lights to be productive. I think that’s a good start for someone to qualify for this kuleana.

He explained that a konohiki can facilitate the rehabilitation of the Kaloko-Honokohau for use. This contributes to the fulfillment of the goal to provide opportunities for people to steward, rehabilitate, access, and use biophysical landscape elements at Kaloko-Honokohau because this individual can supervise activities, monitor the use of resources, and bring people together.
Recommendation 2: Create Partnerships

Jokiel suggested that the Park Service create Partnerships to maintain and increase resource management projects at Kaloko-Honokōhau:

The park did a fantastic job rebuilding that wall [kuapā] and getting it to where it is today. In terms of maintaining it…I would like to see…a committed group of masons who are working on projects have it permanent funding not contract money. We have them for six months and then we don’t have them for six months. I think that it would be very important…the park did a fantastic job in rebuilding that physical structure, but, we have got to engage another group to really have that pond come alive because if it is just the wall, and that’s all that we do, that’s not enough.

There has got to be the community involved to restore that fishpond and to have them use it. I think it is there to be used not just for education, which we use it for today. I think there has got to be more. We see fishponds on other islands. There seems to be a movement now to restore those ponds and to use them and there is a pride involved in doing so. There is a lot of organizations now throughout the island that are doing that and we just need to bring some of that energy here, I think. This is a very important fishpond for the community. We have the kūpuna who has given us their input and they would like to see some things and I would like to see those things happen too. There is a lot of wonderful events that can happen there. Just to get a working fishpond and having people out there would be amazing. Right now, it’s built, and they fix it. We tell people to stay off. It’s not really alive yet and that’s another whole project I think. I don’t know if it is going to be Makani Hou or another group, I mean, they have enough on their plate right now. The park has enough. That is going to take more people, which the park is not going to do it by themselves. Again, that is going to be a partnership with other groups helping out.

It is also important to note that the interviewees explained what they consider to be “collaborative” and “partnership” practices. Table 10 provides a summary of the interview quotations and the practices that they mentioned, which described how the Park Service can create, strengthen, and develop relationships. These practices that they discussed can be
used to help the Park Service create partnerships and strengthen relationships. I combined the thoughts of the interviewees to create a definition for the term “partnership”:

A group of two or more individuals or organizations that: shares benefits and decision-making power; develops processes to resolve conflicts; encourages individuals to do their job to the best of their ability and to be respectful, humble, empathetic, honest, and cooperative; commits to creating a lasting relationship; supports each other by sharing resources; makes decisions that are beneficial to the group and families; and invests in relationships by being patient; provides healing when conflict occurs; and listens and responds to unmet needs.

Table 10. Summary of interview quotations referring to “partnerships” and “collaborative practices.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Example of Interviewee Quotation or Discussion Note</th>
<th>Practice Mentioned</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranger Benjamin Saldua</td>
<td>“[The Park Service needs] a strong management that can sit down with different local people. No matter if there was some hūhū (conflict) before, set a meeting and sit down. Forget about what’s in the past. Just sit down and see what we can do right now for the future. Cause that’s for future generations. You get people that are angry and cannot talk to people. Oh, I don’t like this person because of [whatever reason]. But…it doesn’t matter, they ['ohana from the area] were here, talk to them. What’s their problem? How can we resolve the problem instead of just getting angry at the person and what the person did. And that person would more or less bring it out, this is what happened, we did this and did this and you folks didn’t like what we did because there was no communication. There was no meetings. There was no consensus to what they really wanted so people started to just get mad at each other. I always tell myself forget the past, the past is done, you cannot bring the past back. Let’s look at now and move to the future because this is what we really need to. Move to the future. How the park’s can really be a park where it’s the peoples park but we manage and protect it.”</td>
<td>Resolve conflicts</td>
<td>Create and maintain relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[Park Service management] need to have really good input by the community then things can work. Both sides [the Park Service management and community] collaborate. Sit down and talk. No hūhū, no do this, no don’t do that. Get into a place when it’s a win-win situation. Good for the park and good for the local community, which people are all satisfied.”</td>
<td>Equal benefits</td>
<td>Satisfaction for members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee</td>
<td>Example of Interviewee Quotation or Discussion Note</td>
<td>Practice Mentioned</td>
<td>Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lily Souza</td>
<td>“Number one is…be respectful. Find out, you know, here I am…this is me…I’m entrusted with this responsibility and I have these qualities, but maybe what I need is a lot more humility. I need to work with whoever it is and not pull rank cause that’s what a uniform can sometimes do. You need to be comfortable in your own skin. You know, see the other person as an equal person to be treated with the same respect that I would want to be treated with. So, that’s the first step. That’s basic (laughs).”</td>
<td>Respect and humility</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[People] need to be productive and move forward. If you are stagnant, you know, and it ain’t working please try something else. Be totally respectful, be totally humble and no other purpose. No other purpose. Even though you got to feed your family, you can feed your family in a greedy way or you can feed your family for the generations to come so they can look back and say, “Wow, my so and so really understood their kuleana”. I realize I am a product of the original founders. I am experiencing their foresight, their spirit…their empowerment. You know that only comes as years go by. Maybe they don’t see it now, but, you know…no other purpose…but the purpose is to do the job and do the job well. To the best of your abilities.”</td>
<td>Respect, humility, and love</td>
<td>Create working relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiapilo</td>
<td>“[The Park Service] need to listen to the staff and the partners that are trying to make things happen and grow and go. Support the staff that are doing really good things, for instance, Hana in the Interpretation Department that puts on these amazing events with little to no support from the rest of the park. She does it for the love of the event and because it is the right thing to do, which is great, but she needs more support and more help.”</td>
<td>Listen, support, and help</td>
<td>Better achieve goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[The Park Service] need to invest in relationships with the Hawaiian community, and that means time, patience, maybe ho'oponopono, listening, and doing something with the information that's conveyed. They need to get the compliance done on the fishpond and get the fishpond going. That means having partnerships with the Hawaiian community because it is supposed to be co-managed…”</td>
<td>Time, patience, healing, and action</td>
<td>Develop relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. Summary of interview quotations referring to “partnerships” and “collaborative practices” (contd.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Example of Interviewee Quotation or Discussion Note</th>
<th>Practice Mentioned</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maiapilo</td>
<td>“Working with partners requires good relationships with the community which takes trust, and building and maintaining working relationships and demonstrating support and the humility to let the Hawaiian community lead the way.”</td>
<td>Trust, support, humility, and shared leadership</td>
<td>Build relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiliwili</td>
<td>“[The Park Service] haven’t figured it out yet – that they will only be as successful as the community allows them too. If ain’t got no community there, you [the Park Service] just the land owner of these pretty cool things, but you need to show that you are a part of the community. That’s what the NPS facade is, we are a part of the community…no, you are not.”</td>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>Become a part of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[The Park Service] need to invest (laughs). The Park [Service] doesn’t invest. They don’t invest in the community, which is why…they have tried to and the community has come, the community has trusted them, and then they [the Park Service] turn their back on them. They need to make a commitment and make an investment.”</td>
<td>Invest</td>
<td>Build relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranger Jon Jokiel</td>
<td>“I just think it is important to keep going…we can’t get discouraged by the setbacks even though we’re working in a governmental system which has its problems. I think, I work for the park and I am passionate about working for the park, I think the system that’s in place, a lot of those things we can overcome by working together and I think that we’ve shown that. Even when we talk about the difficulties, but I think that as a community, working amongst ourselves, we can overcome some of those difficulties. We can push the envelope and maybe make some big changes in the Park Service by doing something different and we might be causing some stress in the beginning, but if we show that it can work, I think that this park could be a model for the future. For other National Parks on how we do things here. I am just hopeful (chuckles), cautious, but hopeful.”</td>
<td>Cooperate and dedicate</td>
<td>Work through difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auku’u</td>
<td>Anonymity requested.</td>
<td>Cooperation, share goals and resources, family, empathy</td>
<td>Create, develop, and nurture relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 3: Enhance Cultural Experiences

Wiliwili suggested that the Park Service enhance cultural experiences for the visitors by diversifying interpretation to include the mountain regions of the *ahupua'a*:

[The Park Service] designate[d] [‘Aimakapā Fishpond] as a “bird land” sanctuary, that's not what it was. It was a fishpond. If you are going to create a bird land habitat, I would hope, and [the Park Service] haven’t done so yet is actually look at the cultural resources around it, and interpret that. Talk about that more. [The Park Service] haven’t done that either….Interpretation is limited to site function (i.e., this is a fishpond. The Hawaiians used it to raise fish to feed their family). Analysis of a site as a component of the wider *ahupua'a* system is lacking and necessary to understand Hawaiian culture and life.”

By expanding interpretive programs to include a wider perspective of *ahupua’a* land management, the Park Service personnel will provide a more holistic interpretation of the Hawaiian culture.

Chiron stated:

One thing is to have cultural practices or cultural activities that are authentic going on in places where visitors are. So like, actual harvests from Kaloko Fishpond, people doing things in the park that are actually relevant. That they are actually doing that aren’t for show if that’s possible, so a fish harvest seems like one of them. Even like carving, like Charlie Grace does at Hōnaunau, you know authentic activities that are actually happening. Kind of putting them in the way of visitors so that they have no choice but to encounter them. If you come to the park, even if you are just going to swim at ‘Aiʻōpio with nice waters, you encounter something happening. I think that’s part of it is putting those actual experiences in real accessible places, where it is not like someone reads it in the Kona web events and goes to do a 2 hour activity…. [visitors can] have the opportunity to talk story with someone if they come down to ‘Aiʻōpio or Kaloko. If…an elder or someone from the community that was here and
available to talk to people…I am sort of cherry-picking ideas from other people, but, putting people more into the resource like the canoe rides, so providing experiences for visitors but also providing opportunities for Hawaiians, and Native Hawaiians to share and even get paid for doing certain things like taking people on canoe rides or explaining what’s going on….or even something more along the lines of hearing stories…The kind of juke-box thing where you can hear stories on your cell phone, or in certain areas of the park like the Fred Cachola cell phone recording about Kaloko, you know you have a piece. But wouldn’t it be cool to have someone like Kalani talking about canoes at the canoe hale…I think those ideas and personal contacts would do a lot. I see people getting really enriched by an interaction with Charlie Grace, or with Mele, or with Hana doing weaving or something.

Chiron suggested that the Park Service provide opportunities for visitors to participate in and observe cultural demonstrations daily. She recommended that the Park Service host informal talk story sessions with kama`aina or provide visitors opportunities to listen to storytelling. These suggestions contribute to the management goal that seeks to provide opportunities for visitors to participate in, listen to, and observe cultural practices on a daily basis.

**Recommendation 4: Hire a Kahu (Cultural Advisor)**

Souza recommended that the Park Service hire a kahu to provide guidance with the hiring process and other matters. She said, “I would like to see a kahu be a part of that hiring process, so that the cultural aspect is still on the table. Always a reminder. Always that Ace card.” Souza asked, “You hear what I am saying?” Continuing, she elaborated:

Yes, so they [the kahu] are always there - it’s in your face. Because behind closed doors [the Park Service] gonna be making decisions for that moment and not longevity. [The Park Service] are going by the value of saying “We only have this much money to spend, so, we can spend it on lesser quality or on less versus someone who possesses what the park needs.” They have this indigenous knowledge or familiarity with what is going on, versus, oh instead of paying for one I can get by paying for two that’s not the right fit for the area. You know you just got to
go back to the foundation. How close can this person be to the original intent of the park? Use that as a guideline. I don’t see it any other way. But if I belong to the federal government, then maybe their guideline is something else and how close to the federal government lines do we want this person to be. But you know, this kahu should be a big part of this. Of all the decision-making that goes on in the park.

She continued:

I feel that the park should be doing these things because there is nobody that continues it and like I am no longer there. What I asked for when I left is that if there was somebody who could take that role and actually do histories, do oral histories and share these histories when they make decisions for the park. They can come back to these oral histories and you know, not everybody is going to agree, but at least they are there and they should take a look at it not just make a decision just because it is the easy way. It’s the cheapest way out. It seems the people exist for management’s convenience. You gotta look at the long-term affects on the next generation and the next generation, you know. And things might change, but, for this time period now you make these decisions and you make the best possible choices by doing your research. So anyway, kūpuna, I stress that. Kūpuna weren’t really involved in a sense only on paper.

The sentiments Souza shared suggests that a kahu can help the Park Service build trust with the Hawaiian community, conduct oral history projects, and better work with people that are connected to Kaloko-Honokōhau. This recommendation contributes to the fulfillment of the goal to engage people in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment, by creating lasting relationships between community members and Park Service personnel.

**Recommendation 5: Create Internships**

Chiron suggested that the Park Service create internships to recruit local youth as agency employees. She said, “I think there should be some internships…. [M]anagement paths that should be explored…to grow someone up through the organization to become a
manager or a leader, hopefully a leader (laughs).” The sentiments of Chiron are beneficial because if the Park Service can engage youth at a younger age, they may be better positioned to provide youth with experience to become future employees. By building experience as Park Service interns, youth can become more competitive when it comes to the selection of employees. This recommendation contributes to the fulfillment of the goal to engage people in Park Service management and planning activities, including employment.

**Recommendation 6: Practice the 6 Rules of Engagement**

I recommend that the Park Service dedicate themselves to creating trusting relationships with Kānaka ʻŌiwi and the broader community by embracing six rules of engagement that I developed based on personal experiences shared by the interviewees:

1. Avoid communicating aggressively;
2. Be honest about skills and intents;
3. Dedicate park resources and the efforts of Park Service personnel to sustaining relationships with the Hawaiian community;
4. Create park activities that link the National Park to the native and local community;
5. Identify shared goals; and
6. Fulfill promises and agreements that are made to the community.

Putting these rules into practice would ensure that the Park Service could learn about how to better engage ʻohana from the area and other Kānaka ʻŌiwi in park management and planning activities. This recommendation should also help the Park Service engage Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in management and planning activities, including employment.

**Reviving the Ahupuaʻa as a Thriving Body of Life**

The interviewees’ recommendations reflect a movement in Hawai‘i that seeks to integrate the roles, practices, and values of traditional ahupuaʻa management into contemporary resource management. David Blane and Christopher Chung (n.d.:292) explain that there are four goals of ahupuaʻa management: instill values that allow people to make the right choices for themselves and society; develop community-based efforts that involve ahupuaʻa tenants or people with localized knowledge in the decision-making process and who have a personal stake in their ahupuaʻa; create partnerships and involve
stakeholders who examine Western governmental and legal structures to integrate *ahupua’a* principles throughout; and perpetuate this practice from generation to generation. This definition broadly describes how communities in Hawai‘i are integrating aspects of *ahupua’a* management into contemporary practice by creating partnerships.

In 2006, the Hawai‘i Ocean and Coastal Council held meetings on Kaua‘i, Hawai‘i, Maui, Moloka‘i, Lana‘i, and O‘ahu. These meetings were held to gather information to revise and update the State of Hawai‘i’s Ocean Resources Management Plan. A theme that arose from these meetings was the importance of integrating *konohiki*-like positions and traditional *ahupua’a* management practices into contemporary management systems. These meetings identified three five-year goals for the management of Hawai‘i’s resources that sought to connect land and sea management practices, preserve our ocean heritage, and promote collaboration and stewardship (Hawaii Office of Planning 2006:1-3, 16-39, 67). These goals were fulfilled by creating a Watershed Atlas, hosting an interagency watershed meeting and climate change workshop, passing a climate change adaptation bill, forming a working group for policy and agency coordination, conducting strategic planning meetings for working groups, and creating a consolidated work plan (Hawai‘i Office of Planning 2013:1-7).

In 2012, the State of Hawai‘i authorized House Bill 2806 that established the Aha Moku Advisory Committee (“aha moku”). The aha moku advises the Department of Land and Natural Resource chairperson on issues related to integrating indigenous resource management practices with Western management practices in each *moku*, identifying indigenous practices for natural resource management, fostering understanding and practical use of Native Hawaiian resource knowledge, methodology, and expertise, sustaining the State’s marine, land, agricultural, and natural resources, and providing community education and fostering cultural awareness on aha moku system benefits. There are eight members who make up the aha moku and represent a Hawaiian Island (HB2806, section 2, part d).

Other organizations have implemented *ahupua’a* based management approaches and studies as well. For 20 years, the Waipā Foundation has managed 647 ha of the Waipā *ahupua’a* on Kaua‘i Island. This foundation maintains the “kuleana (responsibility) to establish and perpetuate a thriving ahupua’a as an example of healthy interdependent
relationships between people and earth’s natural resources” (Waipā 2014). In Kohala on Hawai‘i Island, the Kohala Institute of ‘Iole stewards 971 ha of land in North Kohala. This institute strives to “offer conditions for people to heal, renew, revive, and practice Right Relationship for the benefit of all” by “provid[ing] opportunities for people to reconnect with the land and universal values in order to cultivate transformation in ourselves, our communities and beyond” (Kohala Institute 2014).

The E Ala Pū Network embraces traditional Hawaiian resource management. This network’s mission is to “nurture community kuleana—both the responsibility and the privilege—for the ‘āina where they live in order to ensure the vitality of resources for use by present and future generations.” (KUA 2014). The E Ala Pū Network partners with Kua‘āina Ulu ‘Auamo (KUA). This organization:

empowers communities to improve their quality of life through caring for their bio
cultural (natural and cultural) heritage. Our vision is ‘āina momona — abundant and
healthy ecological systems in Hawai‘i that contribute to community well-being (KUA
2014).

KUA embraces a “bottoms-up” management approach that is inclusive of and driven by
communities. The organization strives to build local capacity for community-based initiatives,
nurture connective spaces for network growth, and promote fair and equitable partnerships
(KUA 2014). Numerous organizations on other islands have formed management goals
reflective of traditional ahupua‘a management (Hawai‘i Association of Watershed Partners

Throughout Hawai‘i, there are groups rehabilitating fishponds. In Hale‘iwa, O‘ahu, the
Mālama Loko Ea Foundation is restoring the Loko Ea Fishpond. This foundation hosts
community work days that provide community members with an opportunity to connect with
the fishpond (Mālama Loko Ea Foundation 2015). Paepae O He‘eia is a non-profit
organization that is rehabilitating the He‘eia Fishpond. The organization’s mission is to
“implement values and concepts from the model of a traditional fishpond to provide
intellectual, physical, and spiritual sustenance for [the] community” (Paepae O He‘eia 2013).
Hui Mālama Loko I‘a is a group that includes more than 38 fishponds and complexes and
over 100 fishpond owners, workers, supporters, and stakeholders. This group provides “an opportunity for practitioners to empower each other and leverage their skills, knowledge and resources related to restoration and management of loko i’a (traditional Hawaiian fishponds)” (Kua 2014). Like these ahupua’a rehabilitation activities, archaeology is a tool being used to reconnect people to physical and non-physical elements of the ahupua’a.

Creating Archaeological Practices that Serve Hawai‘i’s Communities

Archaeologists in Hawai‘i are reigniting and enhancing the bond between our people and the material and non-material legacy of our ancestors. There are a number of archaeology-centered or related projects that are using archaeology to better represent and serve the needs of Hawai‘i communities. Malia Kapuaonalani Evans (2013:36-38) introduces the idea of an “‘āina based approach” to cultural heritage management in Hawai‘i. This form of management views natural and cultural resources as inseparable. Such a view is reflective of the genealogical relationship that our people have to the ‘āina. This approach to archaeology is used to care for Kukuianiani Heiau in the ahupua’a of Waikane on O‘ahu. Keoni Fox, the heiau caretaker, members of the Waikane community, the Honolulu Department of Parks and Recreation’s Adopt-A-Park program, and the Ko‘olaupoko Hawaiian Civic Club collaborate to care for the heiau. Invasive plants are being removed from the structure and the surrounding area to rehabilitate the natural landscape. This initiative is improving the natural elements, cultural landscape, and social well-being of the community.

Kelly Lehuakeaopuna Uyeoka (2013:33-35) has developed and continues to coordinate and manage an internship program for Native Hawaiian undergraduate students. This internship program aims to provide CRM technical training and job skills in the laboratory and field; offer interns the necessary mentors, resources, and training to succeed in academic pursuits; provide interns with the opportunity to network with cultural resource professionals and cultural practitioners; and create a learning environment bridging the worldviews of science and culture, and encourage the interns to respect, appreciate, and utilize their cultural values, beliefs, and practices. Program facilitators encourage community involvement, provide technical training and research skills, disseminate research findings
with communities, and integrate Hawaiian cultural values, beliefs, and protocols into archaeological practices. Uyeoka’s efforts are increasing the number of Native Hawaiian archaeologists in Hawai'i and providing Native Hawaiians with the tools that they need to become cultural resource managers.

Kathleen Kawelu (2013:39-41) conducts community archaeology in Hilo, Hawai'i. This project was spearheaded by Don Pakele (“Uncle Don”), who sprang to action to protect the last heiau in Hilo town from destruction. Initially, the project collaborators included Uncle Don, members from the Native Hawaiian community, and the three archaeologists. Since creation, the group has grown to include other members of the community. The group aims to clear overgrown vegetation from the site and bring public awareness to the heiau through partnerships with educational institutions. Archaeological work focuses on continuing archival research, conducting interviews with knowledgeable community members, surveying of the surrounding areas, and mapping of the site.

Conclusion

The type of makeover that needs to occur at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park is most accurately summarized by Kawelu (2013:30) who states, “A true Hawaiian archaeology, one that incorporates Kānaka Ōiwi worldviews has the potential not only to preserve past life ways, but to perpetuate a living culture.” To help the Park Service move forward, how then can an archaeology be practiced that embraces and fosters Kānaka Ōiwi? Sean Nāleimailei and Lokelani Brandt (2013:31-32) answer this question by calling for the development of a “Native Hawaiian space” in archaeology and cultural resource management. Such a mission necessitates the protection of iwi kūpuna (ancestral remains), the integration of cultural protocols and culturally appropriate methods of study into archaeology, guidelines of practice set by our people, and the participation of Kānaka Ōiwi in these changes. Luckily, to initiate these alterations, the challenges associated with contract archaeology in Hawai'i (Cachola-Abad 2013:31-32) are minimal for this National Park because there are policies that support this transformation. Efforts to protect this wahi pana from destruction were overcome in 1978 when the area was declared a National Historical Park. However, although this landscape was protected from desecration, the
objective of creating an archaeology that is more reflective of, and appropriate to, our culture remains. On Hawai‘i Island, there are community groups that are actively involved in caring for their heritage (Kawelu 2013:39-41).

Today, there are Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals in Hawai‘i that call for the return of sovereignty to Hawai‘i (Sai 2004; Trask 2000). This movement and other topics regarding ideas of “power sharing” (Trask 2000:3) that threaten the traditional rights of Kānaka ʻŌiwi create tensions between our people, settlers, and the United States. The appropriation, exploitation, and commercialization of our culture by government and private agencies also intensify these matters (Lindsey 2004:113). Though these topics and the historical relationship between the United States and our people undoubtedly make partnerships challenging, the recommendations in this thesis provide this National Park with the ingredients that it needs to begin mending relationships and work towards rehabilitating a cultural landscape to its thriving state.

Beyond the geographic borders of Hawai‘i, there are others that encourage archaeologists to transform their archaeological practices to be inclusive, responsive, and respectful to indigenous peoples and their heritage (Atalay 2006:298; Marshall 2002:218; Silliman and Ferguson 2010-48-72). Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park has the potential to set a tone for archaeological practices in Hawai‘i by integrating the sentiments shared by the interviewees into their practice and implementing the recommendations. If the Park Service can create heritage management practices that are reflective of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other locals, they will be better positioned to fulfill legislative mandates with the support of the broader community. Park Service personnel and community representatives can work together to harmonize our relationship to Kaloko-Honokōhau, each other, and other life forces. Together, we can bring new life to Kaloko-Honokōhau by reconnecting, enhancing, and nurturing relationships between people, places, and all bodies of life to reauthorize a Kānaka ʻŌiwi heritage discourse at Kaloko-Honokōhau.
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## Appendix A. Timeline of Primary Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The NPS created a Final General Management Plan and issued a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register initiating a 30-day “no action” period for the public to submit comments. During this period, no comments were received, and so the Record of Decision (ROD) was made in 1994 to initiate the proposed plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>The NPS files a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register announcing the availability of the draft general management plan for public review in 1992. The public was provided with 85 days to comment on the DGMP, during which time, a total of 123 individuals attended three meetings held by the NPS, 56 individuals spoke at these meetings, and 81 letters were sent to the NPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>The NPS filed a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register announcing that an environmental impact statement for Kaloko-Honokōhau NHP would be prepared and conducts scoping sessions. Comments from the public were taken into consideration to form the draft general management plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 1978</td>
<td>Public Law 95-625 authorizes the creation of Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18, 1974</td>
<td>The Honokōhau Study Advisory Commissioners determine that it is feasible and desirable to establish the Honokōhau National Historical Landmark and adjacent waters as a national park unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Public Law 92-346 authorizes a study to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing the Honokōhau Settlement as a National Park unit. This act also authorized the creation of the Honokōhau Study Advisory Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>The makai portions of Kaloko, Honokōhau Nui, and Honokōhau Iki are declared a part of the “Honokōhau Settlement,” a National Historical Landmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Hawai‘i becomes a state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7, 1941</td>
<td>World War II begins. The martial laws enforced during the war push families from the makai into the mauka region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 12, 1898</td>
<td>Hawai‘i is annexed by the US. Approximately 1.8 million acres of land that was taken by the Republic of Hawai‘i, is ceded to the US without the consent of our people and government. Despite this event, Queen Lili‘uokalani, Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other nationalists of the Kingdom of Hawai‘i, maintain their loyalty through literature, art, and mele.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>30,000 of 40,000 Kānaka ʻŌiwi sign Kuʻē Petitions in opposition to the annexation of Hawai‘i by the US.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>President William McKinley replaces President Grover Cleveland. The threat of the annexation of Hawai‘i by the US culminates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Imprisonment and forced abdication of Queen Lili‘uokalani from her throne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>Provisional Government is re-established as the Republic of Hawai‘i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 1893</td>
<td>Committee of Safety (a group that represented American and European interests) overthrow the Kingdom of Hawai‘i and establish the Provisional Government. Queen Lili‘uokalani yields her authority to the US. Shortly after, President Grover Cleveland recognizes that these were acts of war, and concluded that the Kingdom of Hawai‘i should be restored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 1893</td>
<td>US Minister John L. Stevens and US naval representatives order US troops to invade Hawai‘i and intimidate the Kingdom of Hawai‘i and Her Highness, Queen Lili‘uokalani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 14, 1893</td>
<td>US Minister John L. Stevens and US citizens conspire to overthrow the Kingdom of Hawai‘i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>Population of Kānaka ʻŌiwi declines to 47,508.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Though maka‘āina sign petitions against the privatization of ʻāina, Ka Māhele, a major land act replaces the ahupuaʻa land and sea management system. As a result, maka‘āina receive only 1/3 (less than 1%) of all ʻāina in Hawai‘i. Massive displacement of our people from our homeland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>King Kamehameha III, Kauikeaouli, secures the vested rights of the Mōʻi, all classes of chiefs and konohiki, and the maka‘āina to ʻāina in Hawai‘i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>The first Christian missionaries sponsored by the ABCFM arrive in Hawai‘i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>The ʻaino, breaking of the kapu system, occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804</td>
<td>ʻŌkuʻu epidemic sweeps through the island. Approximately 175,000 individuals pass away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Captain Cook arrives in Hawai‘i. Population of Hawai‘i contains 200-800,000 Kānaka ʻŌiwi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumulipo</td>
<td>Creation of Kānaka ʻŌiwi and other life forces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing the Gap Between Management Policy and Management Practice at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park

What Gap??

The gap that I am referring to are the cultural values that helped establish the park. These cultural values have not been identified, defined, and institutionalized. It is important that the park understands what cultural values are important to native Hawaiians and other individuals when making management decisions. By understanding what the cultural values are, the park can make more informed decisions about potential affects to these values. You are invited to participate in a research project that seeks to identify cultural values that you think should guide management of the fishponds and fishtrap.

If you participate in the research your:
- Participation is voluntary
- Identity can remain anonymous

Your are asked to:
- Participate in two interviews in July – September
- You will be asked questions pertaining to:
  - How satisfied you are with the parks fulfillment of management goals.
  - Why the fishponds and fishtrap is important to you.
  - How the park can better manage the fishponds and fishtrap.
- Provide me with feedback on my interpretations to ensure that I accurately represent your shared sentiments.

Information I learn will be:
- Provided to you at the end of the study
- Shared with the park to provide management recommendations
- Included in my thesis

For more information contact Ruth Aloua at:
Closing the Gap Between Management Policy and Management Practice at Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park

Aloha, my name is Ruth-Rebecca Lynne Tyana Lokelani Aloua. I am a Native Hawaiian from the island of Hawai‘i. My family is the Ho‘omanawainui and Ka‘ana‘ana from Hawai‘i and the Hoapili and Wagner from Maui. I am a graduate student attending Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, Canada. I am conducting a project on Kaloko-Honokōhau National Historical Park to fulfill requirements for my master’s thesis. My project seeks to identify the cultural values that individuals think should guide the management of the cultural resources, like the fishponds and fishtrap. Below, I provide information on the research project and invite you to participate.

What Gap?
For the past year, I have conducted a literature review of management documents for the park. By conducting this review, I have learned that the park has not identified cultural values to guide management. Although documents like the *Spit of Kaloko Honokōhau* (1974) and the general management plan (National Park Service 1994) describe cultural values that should guide management; the cultural values are not clearly identified, defined, and institutionalized.

Hypothesis
I hypothesize that there is a gap between park management policy and park management practice. This gap occurs because the cultural values have not been clearly identified, defined, and institutionalized. I further hypothesize that the cultural values that are important to individuals that care about the management of the cultural resources at Kaloko-Honokōhau receive varied levels of attention by the park. While some cultural values may always be practiced, I think that, there are also cultural values that are rarely or never practiced. This affects how satisfied individuals are with the park’s fulfillment of management goals.

Project Purpose
To test my hypothesis, I have designed a research project that has four objectives. The objectives are to:

- Assess how satisfied individuals are with the fulfillment of management goals.
- Identify and define cultural values that individuals think should guide management of cultural resources.
- Assess how the park practices cultural values.
- Provide recommendations on how the park can respectfully integrate cultural values into practice.

Your Voluntary Participation
In the research I use satisfaction surveys, interviews, and performance surveys to fulfill the research objectives. For each of these, I invite individuals to share what they would like freely. It is important to me that the individuals who participate in the research are comfortable. Thus, for this...
reason, individuals that participate in the research decide:

- If their identities will remain anonymous or be publicly affiliated with the research.
- If they would like to conduct the interviews individually, as a group with friends, or with family.
- To answer or decline to answer questions.
- How I may use the information that is shared.

Methods

The satisfaction survey, interviews, and performance survey are three methods I use to fulfill the research objectives. If you participate in the research, you will be asked questions whose purpose is to: assess how satisfied you are with the park’s fulfillment of management goals, which cultural values you think should guide the management of cultural resources, how often cultural values are practiced by the park, and how the park can respectfully integrate the cultural values into practice. The type of questions I ask in the satisfaction survey, interviews, and performance survey are described in greater detail in the following section. These questions should be asked in two interviews.

Interview One:

In the first interview, you are asked to participate in the satisfaction survey (See Figure 1) and to describe cultural values that you think should guide the management of the cultural resources. The type of questions I ask are:

- Can you please describe what is important to you at Kaloko-Honokōhau.
- Why are the described aspects important to you?
- If you were the caretaker, how would you manage the important aspects?
- Why would you manage the aspects like so?
- What type of management practices would you avoid?
- Why would you avoid these type of management practices?
- Is there anything else that you would like to share that can help improve management of the cultural resources?

Interview Two:

After I identify and describe the cultural values that were shared in the first interview, I ask that you review my interpretations of these cultural values to ensure that my interpretations accurately represent your views. Once you review my interpretations, I ask that you assess how often cultural values are practiced by the park by describing them as either Always Practiced, Often Practiced, Sometimes Practiced, Rarely Practiced, Never Practiced, or Not Applicable. Lastly, I ask that you share recommendations on how the park can respectfully integrate the values into practice and share any remaining thoughts.
Please rank how satisfied you are with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Kaloko fishpond is used to preserve traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Kaloko fishpond is used to interpret traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Kaloko fishpond is used to perpetuate traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Aimakapa fishpond is used to preserve traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Aimakapa fishpond is used to interpret traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Aimakapa fishpond is used to perpetuate traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Ai'ōpio fishtrap is used to preserve traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Ai'ōpio fishtrap is used to interpret traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How 'Ai'ōpio fishtrap is used to perpetuate traditional Native Hawaiian aquaculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of Native Hawaiians in planning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of Native Hawaiians in management activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of the West Hawai'i community in planning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The involvement of the West Hawai'i community in management activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Sample of the satisfaction assessment.
Appendix D. Public Law 92-346

Public Law 92-346 - July 11, 1972

HONOKOHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL LANDMARK, HAWAII

The Congress finds the site of Honokohau National Historical Landmark in the State of Hawaii encompasses unique and nationally significant cultural, historical, and archeological resources and believes that it may be in the national interest for the United States to preserve and interpret those resources for the education and inspiration of present and future generations. The Congress further believes that it is appropriate that the preservation and interpretation at that site be managed and performed by native Hawaiians, to the extent practical, and that training opportunities be provided such persons in management and interpretation of those cultural, historical, and archeological resources.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall study the feasibility and desirability of establishing as a part of the national park system an area, not to exceed one thousand five hundred acres, comprising the site of Honokohau National Historic Landmark and adjacent waters.

(b) As a part of such study other interested Federal agencies, and State and local bodies and officials shall be consulted, and the study shall be coordinated with other applicable planning activities.

Sec. 3. The Secretary shall submit to the President and the Congress within one year after the effective date of this Act, a report of the findings resulting from the study. The report of the Secretary shall contain, but not be limited to, findings with respect to the historic, cultural, archeological, scenic, and natural values of the resources involved and recommendations for preservation and interpretation of those resources, including the role of native Hawaiians relative to the management and performance of that preservation and interpretation and the providing to them of training opportunities in such management and performance.

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Honokohau Study Advisory Commission. The Commission shall cease to exist at the time of submission of the Secretary's report to the President and the Congress.

(b) The Commission shall be composed of fifteen members, at least ten of whom shall be native Hawaiians, appointed by the Secretary, as follows:

(1) Two members, one of whom will be appointed from recommendations made by each of the United States Senators representing the State of Hawaii, respectively.
(2) Two members, one of whom will be appointed from recommendations made by each of the United States Representatives for the State of Hawaii, respectively.

(3) Five public members, who shall have knowledge and experience in one or more fields as they pertain to Hawaii, of history, ethnology, anthropology, culture, and folklore and including representatives of the Bishop Museum, the University of Hawaii, and organizations active in the State of Hawaii in the conservation of resources, to be appointed from recommendations made by the Governor of the State of Hawaii.

(4) Five members to be appointed from recommendations made by local organizations representing the native Hawaiian people; and

(5) One member to be appointed from recommendations made by the mayor of the county of Hawaii.

(c) The Secretary shall designate one member to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this Act on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(e) The Secretary or his designee shall consult with the Commission with respect to matters relating to the making of the study.

Sec. 5. During the period commencing with enactment of this Act and ending with submission of the Secretary's report to the President and the Congress and any necessary completion of congressional consideration of recommendations included in that report (1) no department or agency of the United States shall, without prior approval of the Secretary, assist by loan, grant, license, or otherwise in the implementation of any project which, in the determination of the Secretary, would unreasonably diminish the value of cultural, historical, archeological, scenic, or natural resources relating to lands or waters having potential to comprise the area referred to in section 2(a) of this Act and (2) the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall not, without prior approval of the Secretary, undertake or assist by license or otherwise the implementation of any project which, in the determination of the Secretary, would diminish the value of natural resources located within one-quarter mile of the lands and waters having potential to comprise that area.
Sec. 6. The term "native Hawaiian", as used in this Act, means any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to the year 1778.

Sec. 7. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000 to carry out the provisions of this Act.
Appendix E. Public Law 95-625

KALOKO-HONOKOHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Sec. 505. (a) In order to provide a center for the preservation, interpretation, and perpetuation of traditional native Hawaiian activities and culture, and to demonstrate historic land use patterns as well as to provide a needed resource for the education, enjoyment, and appreciation of such traditional native Hawaiian activities and culture by local residents and visitors, there is established the Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "park") in Hawaii comprising approximately one thousand three hundred acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Kaloko-Honokohau National Historical Park," numbered KHN-80,000, and dated May 1978, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) Except for any lands owned by the State of Hawaii or its subdivisions, which may be acquired only by donation, the Secretary is authorized to acquire the lands described above by donation, exchange, or purchase through the use of donated or appropriated funds, notwithstanding any prior restriction of law.

(c) The Secretary shall administer the park in accordance with this section and the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the national park system, including the Acts approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 461-467), and August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), and generally in accordance with the guidelines provided in the study report entitled "Kaloko-Honokohau" prepared by the Honokohau Study Advisory Commission and the National Park Service, May 1974, GPO 690-514.

(d)(1) In administering the park the Secretary may provide traditional native Hawaiian accommodations.

(2) The Secretary shall consult with and may enter into a cooperative management agreement with the State of Hawaii for the management of the submerged lands within the authorized park boundary, following the marine management policies of the State of Hawaii.

(3) Commercial, recreational, and subsistence fishing and shoreline food gathering activities as well as access to and from the Honokohau small boat harbor by motor boats and other water craft shall be permitted wherever such activities are not inconsistent with the purposes for which the park is established, subject to regulation by the Secretary.

(4) The Secretary shall consult with and may enter into agreements with other governmental entities and private landowners to establish adequate controls on air and water quality and the scenic and esthetic values of the surrounding land and water areas. In consulting with and entering into any such agreements, the Secretary shall to the maximum extent feasible utilize the traditional native Hawaiian Ahupua'a concept of land and water management.

(e) In carrying out the purposes of this section the Secretary is authorized and directed as appropriate to employ native Hawaiians.
For the purposes of this section, native Hawaiians are defined as any lineal descendants of the race inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands prior to the year 1778.

(f) (1) There is hereby established the Kaloko-Honokohau Na Hoa Pili O Kaloko-Honokohau (The Friends of Kaloko-Honokohau), an Advisory Commission for the park. The Commission shall be composed of nine members, appointed by the Secretary, at least five of whom shall be selected from nominations provided by native Hawaiian organizations. All members of the Commission shall be residents of the State of Hawaii, and at least six members shall be native Hawaiians. Members of the Commission shall be appointed for five-year terms except that initial appointment(s) shall consist of two members appointed for a term of five years, two for a term of four years, two for a term of three years, two for a term of two years, and one for a term of one year. No member may serve more than one term consecutively.

(2) The Secretary shall designate one member of the Commission to be Chairman. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled by appointment for the remainder of the term.

(3) Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation. The Secretary is authorized to pay the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under this section on vouchers signed by the Chairman.

(4) The Superintendent of the park, the National Park Service State Director, Hawaii, a person appointed by the Governor of Hawaii, and a person appointed by the mayor of the county of Hawaii, shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members of the Commission.

(5) The Commission shall advise the Director, National Park Service, with respect to the historical, archeological, cultural, and interpretive programs of the park. The Commission shall afford particular emphasis to the quality of traditional native Hawaiian culture demon-