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ABSTRACT

Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo (Aboriginal Hawaiian descendants) have a deep and abiding love and respect for their iwi kūpuna (ancestral remains). In this thesis, I explore the attitudes and perceptions of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island and more specifically Hōkūli‘a development community located in Kailua-Kona. I interviewed 20 nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who are connected to the burial issues concerning iwi kūpuna. They represent lineal descendants, cultural descendants, and ‘Ōiwi archaeologists. Through the coding, five major themes were identified: identity through place and ancestors; kuleana (responsibility) and kāhea (calling); preservation in place; knowledge for advocacy; and self-determination and decision making. An innovative educational module provided the stimulus for kūkākūkā (discussion) on how non-destructive skeletal examinations can produce osteobiographies, or another story, of the lives of the iwi kūpuna. This module was instrumental in understanding the changing lens of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo empowerment in protecting and preserving the iwi kūpuna. In this thesis, I demonstrate that the iwi kūpuna have a significant role in edifying ‘Ōiwi (Aboriginal Hawaiian) ancestry as well as the ‘Ōiwi current cultural identity. I demonstrate this by highlighting the central significance of mo‘olelo (stories) in the ‘Ōiwi culture, and specifically how osteobiographies are a contemporary form of mo‘olelo. Ka po‘e kahiko (the people of old) of Hawai‘i were ha‘i mo‘olelo (storytellers). Oli (chant), hula (dance), and mo‘okū‘auhau (genealogy) are traditional methods of storytelling. In this way mo‘olelo transcend time and space, linking each succeeding generation to the ones before as well as those yet unborn, an unbroken chain of continuity of the ‘Ōiwi culture. Osteobiographies can be added to the canon of knowledge passed from generation to generation. The most significant finding is that nā ‘Ōiwi mamo in this research project were not opposed to learning the stories of
their iwi kūpuna under certain conditions and have it become a part of the historical and cultural canon of nā ʻŌiwi mamo.
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PREFACE

My father recently gave me a picture of when I was about five or six years old. I am standing in front of a maroon colored, 1969 Ford Mustang. The Mustang is parked in front of the burial site of my Japanese great-grandparents. This photo has been a reminder to me of when I started this journey. My childhood memories revolve around family, both the living and the dead. These memories are stories which I carry with me much like how Anakala (uncle) Curtis of Hōkūliʻa describes how he carries his ancestors on his vertebra. Symbolically, this represents all those who came before us and we carry their genetic memories on our vertebra. I, too, feel the weight of responsibilities to preserve all the stories of the iwi kūpuna as a cultural resource.

I have perhaps lived and breathed through the moʻolelo of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and their kūpuna (ancestors). In the ‘Ōiwi way of thinking, collective cultural memory tells us our iwi kūpuna live in a different existence but still influence our thoughts and actions. These influences, experiences, dreams, and hōʻailona (signs) become ribbons of fibers or words of a moʻolelo. Then, these ribbons are rolled on the thigh to create cordage or a moʻolelo. This cordage then is transformed into something of greater value, like ‘upena (fishing net) which can feed a community. Moʻolelo then, has the transformative power to feed the community by strengthening their cultural heritage of the past, present and the future.

A distinctive nā ‘Ōiwi mamo epistemology is the creation chant the Kumulipo. This chant is a chiefly genealogical chant which details the various periods of life formation within this sphere of Hawai‘i. It chronicles the stillborn death of Hāloa, who is buried in the ground from which the kalo (taro plant) arises. A second child is born and lives, and bears the name Hāloa. This Hāloa becomes the progenitor of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. This is a symbiotic relationship, a familial relationship for the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. The beauty rests in its interpretation.
The stillborn Hāloa breathes life into the land and becomes kalo. Kalo then becomes the staple food for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. The second Hāloa becomes the caretaker of the kalo and the cycle begins again. It is cyclical and reciprocal and represents how Hawaiians view life. We are the land and the land is in us.

The ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian language) is being used more frequently throughout the state of Hawai‘i. I have therefore, chosen to not italicize the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i words. The definitions for the proper ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i diacritical marks are used throughout the thesis. The ‘okina or glottal stop is considered part of the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i alphabet. The kahakō is a macron and emphasizes the length of the vowel. Any errors in the use of the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i are my own. There are a few older quotations which have misspelled the ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i; those have been kept in that manner as the original author intended.
Keaka Lui and her parents Haleola and Joseph have been my mentors, for over 10 years, in all things ʻŌiwi. It is with great pleasure that I share a portion of her moʻolelo of becoming a protector of iwi kūpuna. This is Keaka’s moʻolelo of her being a caretaker of her iwi kūpuna:

My family and I (Keaka Lui) have been involved with burial issues since 2009. We are State recognized lineal and cultural descendants throughout Hawai‘i Island. For many years, I have been actively engaged in my kuleana (responsibility) to mālama (care for; protect) the burial places of my immediate family members. It was my tūtū wahine (grandmother), Margaret Pelekane, who taught me their names and their burial places so, I could keep their moʻokūʻauhau (genealogy) alive in my head.

One of my first mentors was Aunty Ruby McDonald, she played a vital role in molding me into the person I am today. She employed me as an aid in the Kailua-Kona Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), allowing me to use my skills as a genealogist to help the Hawaiian community members. Through working at OHA, I met Analu Josephides, who was the Hawai‘i Island Burial Specialist at that time. Analu asked me to come and intern at his office. Analu groomed and taught me how to set-up and conduct Hawai‘i Island Burial Council (HIBC) meetings, how to fill out descendancy claims, and many other aspects of his job. He also introduced me a few of the Cultural Resource Management (CRM) firms he worked with on burial issues. Many of those archaeologists became my friends, colleagues, and employers. It was during this time that I became aware of the importance to mālama the burial places of all iwi kūpuna. Analu was not only my mentor, he became a trusted friend to my family. No other Burial Specialist has ever embarked on a venture as Analu did with me, literally teaching me all aspects of how to mālama the iwi kūpuna. Analu had a mantra which I continue to use today: “It
is not about us, it is about the iwi kūpuna.” The rest is history, I continue to speak on behalf of those who can no longer speak for themselves. Those who have gone beyond the veil in the spirit but whose physical marrow is left to provide nourishment to our ʻāina.

I want to share a special experience I had while caring for an iwi kūpuna. It was in the month of October 2010, a local surfer, Walter Gay noticed something unusual in the sand. As he continued to watch the wash of the waves on the shore, a human skull was soon revealed, an iwi kūpuna. Many were called, various state agencies, and nā ʻŌiwi mamo of the area. They gathered together at the Kona Bali Kai condominiums on Aliʻi Drive and they made a temporary burial for the iwi kupuna out of large rocks to prevent further erosion.

Further research on the land, where iwi kūpuna was found, revealed it once belonged to my ancestor, namely Leleo Kinimaka. He was the son of Chief Kinimaka, who was the hanai mākua (adopted parent) of King David Kalakaua. Kinimaka is an ancestor of my mother through her father, Solomon Kaʻelemakule. Consequently, my mother and I filled out a descendancy claim for this area and for the kuleana to mālama iwi kūpuna.

Dr. Alan Haun of Haun & Associates offered their services pro bono to disinter iwi kūpuna. At a meeting with the stakeholders, the lineal descendants, the area kūpuna, Dr. Haun, and two of his archeologists, Juliana and Solomon Kailihiwai, a time and date was set to witness and participate in the disinterment of iwi kūpuna.

The day came, we all gathered together near the shore, a tent was set-up to keep prying eyes from watching this event. We started with a pule (prayer) followed by a kūkākūkā (discussion) on what excavation method was going to be used to pedestal and extract the iwi kūpuna as intact as possible.
There was a window of about one to two hours before high tide would make the extraction difficult. Quickly and accurately, Juliana and Solomon removed iwi kūpuna within an hours’ time. Iwi kūpuna had been buried in the fetal position, his legs brought up to his head and the arms wrapped around the legs. It was amazing that iwi kūpuna was still in that position for over a half century. Upon completion of this disinterment, iwi kūpuna was separated into two lauhala (*Pandanus*) baskets. One with the poʻo (head, cranium) which was given to me and the remaining iwi (bones) in another basket given to another nā ʻŌiwi mamo. We solemnly traveled to my home, where we offered pule and pikai (purifying ritual) ceremony was performed by Analu on those present. Aunty Shirley Keakealani, her hohona (daughter-in-law) Nana, my parents, Haleola and Raymond Lui and I were witnesses of the day’s events.

In the following week, I removed iwi kūpuna from the baskets, unwrapped the iwi kūpuna from the wet muslin, and laid out iwi kūpuna to dry in the shade of the garage. Everything I do for iwi kūpuna is done with prayers for direction and assistance from the ancestors and from Akua (God). I began the tedious work of sifting the sand to remove all the bone fragments. My mother and I tended to this kuleana with the utmost care and attention. The large bones were placed on the cleaned muslin and the smaller bones on the top until all were removed from the sand. I then, made a bundle with iwi kūpuna inside, mimicking the burials of long ago. The poʻo, the head, was wrapped separately. These bundles would be placed in a vertical lauhala basket, with the body on the bottom and the head resting on top of the body. The lauhala basket with iwi kūpuna was placed in a quiet spot in our home. There it would wait until a year later when the State Historic Preservation Department (SHPD) would finally recognize and approve our curation plan to reinter iwi kūpuna.
In November of 2011, we were finally able to reinter iwi kūpuna at a family cemetery here in Kailua-Kona. I called and invited the nā ʻŌiwi mamo of this iwi kūpuna to let them know the time and date of the reinterment. Preparation for the reinterment began in the day light hours. The cemetery was cleaned, the burial pit dug, dirt fill was prepared, and the area secured and made private with tarps and tents.

The participating descendants arrived at our home in the latter part of the evening. At 10 p.m., we gathered around iwi kūpuna to tie the bundles with kaula (rope) made of coconut husk. We performed oli (chant) and pule during the preparation process; then, headed to the gravesite. The area was blessed by my father, Raymond Lui, to ensure no negative forces would disturb us during the reinterment as well as for protection from prying eyes. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo believe that the night has eyes and ears not only spiritually but also physically, so we need to pule for protection.

The bundles were placed in the ti-leaf lined lua (pit) as we were watching from the tent it started to drizzle. At that moment, when the muslin bundle containing the poʻo was placed in the pit, a peal of thunder and a flash of lightning broke the darkened sky…. Surely, this was a hōʻailona (sign) that this was a special person. Perhaps, this hōʻailona was from the ancestors acknowledging that they were pleased. We stood in silence. After a few moments, I did an ancient oli speaking to iwi kūpuna of our happy time together also, that the only gift I had to bestow at our departing was the gift of my leo (voice). Yes, the leo is a gift cherished by the iwi kūpuna which they can take with them into the next life, therefore, when I need assistance, my leo will be the way iwi kūpuna will recognize me and come to assist me in doing good things, like writing this reminiscence of this special reinterment. Our night ended with a pikai ceremony and another ancient oli to make noa (free) for all present. A final pule to Akua and it was pau.
My hope is this moʻolelo will be used in a pono (correct, just) manner. Hopefully, others will learn from this moʻolelo and employ some of my teachings in the future, for I, too will one-day pass into history. I pay homage to those who have been my teachers and mentors, my tūtū, Margaret Pelekane, my parents, Joseph and Haleola Lui, my cousin, Jimmy Medeiros, Analu Josephides, Ruby McDonald and my ancestors.

Mahalo, to Tamara Halliwell and her desire to take on this rather sensitive topic. A topic which certainly needs rejuvenation, a second look to ensure that our ancestors’ marrow will not be forgotten and lost in our ever-changing world.

I am grateful to Keaka Lui for being my cultural advisor, as well as my hanai (adopted) sister. It is because of her that I have become intimately acquainted with the Hawaiʻi Island Burials Program. It is through her eyes and stories in which I have come to recognize my kuleana to my ancestors, as well to all the iwi kūpuna who call to me for protection.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Iwi o kuʻu iwi Bone of my bones
Koko o kuʻu koko Blood of my blood
Pili ka moʻo Our stories are one
A mau loa Forever and ever (Baldauf and Akutagawa 2013:15)

In the 1970s throughout many parts of the world there was an Indigenous movement that sought to revitalize and revalidate ancient cultural traditions in a modern, contemporary society. What galvanized some of the Indigenous American tribes was the wholesale collection of their ancestral remains for public and private collections and museums. The Western collection of ancestral remains began in the 18th and 19th centuries, often as a part or consequence of colonialism. This precipitated grass roots organizations throughout the United States to protest and seek redress. By the 1990s state and federal laws were adopted and codified bringing the Native American Indian tribes, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo (Hawaiian people) organizations, and Indigenous Alaskan tribal communities to the table for consultation to become the rightful stewards of their cultural heritage (Rose et al. 1996). Regrettably, in Hawaiʻi during this time, the relationships between the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, archaeologists, developers, and the government had reached new heights of distrust and antagonism (Cachola-Abad and Ayau 1999; Kawelu 2014). This led to a complete ban on the identification of any skeletal material found, including basic and superficially gained information such as sex, age, or general health profile. In other cultures, information gleaned from skeletal material is considered an important part of their ancestry and recorded history.

In the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo society, my thesis community’s priority is to protect the ancient burial traditions and spaces. In Hawaiʻi nearly all the osteological work pre-Native American Indian Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) has remained
fundamentally non-collaborative, even if there are instances of cultural sensitivity. Presently to maintain protocols of culturally sensitivity toward iwi kūpuna, physical examination is conducted on rare occasions and photographs of the iwi kūpuna are strictly prohibited (Hawai‘i Administrative Rules (HAR) §13-300), thus, ensuring the most respectful behavior around and for the exposed iwi kūpuna. This priority has become instinctive and explosive for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to exercise their rights of self-determination as the rightful stewards of their stolen past. Consequently, collaboration and negotiation with archaeologists, land owners, and land developers have led to restoration and access to familial and community ancestral lands. This acknowledgment of the past has reinvigorated the present cultural identity of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and ensured its availability for future generations, therefore, iwi kūpuna are the ties that bind.

My community transcends the specific place of Hōkūli‘a to involve nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who have made an investment with their iwi kūpuna and live on Hawai‘i Island. My ‘Ōiwi kūpuna (Aboriginal Hawaiian ancestors) and I are a part of this community which also includes the iwi kūpuna and 16 nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, who are recognized by the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council (HIBC) and State Historic Preservation Department (SHPD) as either lineal or cultural descendants of Hōkūli‘a and other land areas of Hawai‘i Island, as well as four nā ‘Ōiwi mamo archaeologists. A few key nā ‘Ōiwi mamo from this group were my collaborators, and they were especially helpful in identifying and introducing me to the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hōkūli‘a. The foundational knowledge and appropriate protocols for disinterment and reinterment of iwi kūpuna have come from my community advisor and hanai sister, Keaka Lui and her parents.

Investment in iwi kūpuna may include the sacred responsibility of disinterment and reinterment of the iwi kūpuna and the moepū (associated funerary objects). The protocols for doing so are determined by the family and their traditions. For example, one special reinterment
occurred in the late hours of the evening in the summer of 2016. We gathered at the home of one of the descendants. Pule (prayer) was offered to open the way and protect those involved in the process of preparing the bones of a male child for burial. As the bones were being wrapped in kapa (cloth made from wauke), we reverently chanted “Ke lei maila o Ka‘ula i ke kai e” (Ka‘ula island is bewreathed in the ocean) repeatedly until the bones were wrapped and placed in a lauhala (*Pandanus leaf*) basket. We then traveled to the new burial site. This ten-year old male child was rescued from a beach cave impacted by the high surf. His new home was to share a burial site with a tūtū kāne (grandfather) near the ocean. At the burial site, we performed an oli (chant) as he was put back to sleep. We ended the night with pule and a pikai (cleansing ritual). A mixture of water, olena (turmeric oil) and salt from the wahi pana (storied place) of Kalaemanō (North Kona, in Ka‘ūpūlehu) was sprinkled on the participants as an oli was sung, as a means of purification for working with the dead. It was a tender moment one I will treasure for a life time.

In this thesis, I demonstrate that the iwi kūpuna have a significant role in edifying their nā ‘Ōiwi mamo ancestry as well as their current cultural identity. Through preserving the iwi kūpuna and their mo‘olelo, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo build an infinite, reciprocal relationship between the past, present, and future of their cultural heritage. I look to the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island to be the trunk of an ‘ōhi‘a lehua (flowering evergreen or *Metrosideros polymorpha*, endemic to Hawai‘i) tree between the past and the future. Imagine that the ‘ōhi‘a lehua roots extend far beyond what the eyes can see. The roots are iwi kūpuna who hold the ‘ike kūpuna (ancestral knowledge) which forms the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo identity. The trunk of the lehua represents the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo communities of Hawai‘i Island and what they are doing now to preserve their iwi kūpuna. The liko (leaf bud) and the flowers represent the future possibilities
for iwi kūpuna to continue to teach and edify the keiki (children). Spanning the imagery of the ‘ōhia lehua roots to the buds, this thesis emphasizes five aspects of how the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island demonstrate the importance of their iwi kūpuna: identity through place and ancestors; kuleana (responsibility) and kāhea (calling); preservation in place; knowledge for advocacy; and self-determination and decision making.

Kūkākūkā is a nā ‘Ōiwi mamo methodology of data collection. Kūkākūkā is relationship building through the informality of talking story with the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo which leads to an open sharing of ideas. Therefore, kūkākūkā, ethnographic interviews and the introduction of osteobiographies are the main methodologies for this thesis. For this reason, an informative educational module was inserted in the interview dialogue to determine the attitudes and perceptions of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo stakeholders toward non-destructive skeletal analysis and osteobiographies. These osteobiographies are the stories found in the bones which can help to better understand the stresses, diseases, and other impacts of a mortal life on the bones. As previously mentioned, skeletal analysis is done on rare occasions. I would like to share some of the potential benefits to nā ‘Ōiwi mamo communities. The moʻolelo about the iwi kūpuna and their lifeways as shared by the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo provides a continuity of culture. Peering into the future, osteobiographies have the potential to help the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to better understand their ancient lifeways as well as the impact of Western colonization on their culture.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Many Indigenous communities describe skeletal analysis as “scientific colonialism” (Nicholas and Hollowell 2007). Consequently, obtaining any information from skeletal remains has been problematic and controversial in the United States, and especially in Hawai‘i. Indigenous communities argue that scientific interpretation devalues cultural identity. Kakaliouras (2012:214) illustrates the socio-political and socio-cultural identity associated with the scientific colonialism of iwi with this statement, “...repatriable can embody ancestors, but they also give material evidence to the destruction, dispossession, and scientific objectification of their culture and heritages.” Skeletal remains occupy a contested space between indigenous communities, archaeologists, and physical anthropologists. This contested space is about who should control the iwi kūpuna and the acquired information from doing skeletal analysis. In a multi-faceted deconstruction of the debate regarding skeletal material from the perspective of the various stakeholders, including that of the descendants’, Kakaliourus (2012:217) confirms the power of the bones by saying, “human remains are powerful-powerful manifestations of wrongfully disturbed ancestors in the present, and powerful tools for interpreting the past.”

Today, physical anthropologists and nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are striving to explore, collaboratively the benefits of skeletal analysis to cultural heritage. In this thesis, I examine nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island’s receptivity to the potential the iwi kūpuna have to contributing to their cultural heritage.

Since the 1970s there has been a global movement to revitalize traditional cultural practices in a contemporary society. This cultural movement has its foundation in the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo remembering their ethnic identities to empower and build capacity among their communities. This has led to looking at the past colonialist habits of archaeologists digging up
indigenous ancestral remains and then warehousing them for study as an extinct culture and museum curiosities (Lippert 2006). Mōkapu, O‘ahu Island and Honokahua, Maui Island are two sites in the State of Hawai‘i that represent the debacles of the past. These archaeological debacles have led to the formation and activation of indigenous grass-roots organizations which forced state and federal governments to draft and pass laws, such as NAGPRA, a federal repatriation law and Chapter 6E-43, Hawai‘i state law for burial protections, to return and limit studies on ancestral skeletal remains. Skeletal analyses have benefitted many Indigenous communities but the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo believe it to be disrespectful to their iwi kūpuna.

Non-destructive skeletal analysis has led physical anthropologists to make and test hypotheses of past lifeways which can be seen in the bones (Rose et al 1996; Jones and Harris 1998; Weiss 2006; Kakaliourus 2012). For example, teeth can provide a better understanding of the diet of the ancient peoples by looking at wear patterns on the chewing surfaces (Pietrusewsky et al 1991). Teeth and their wear patterns are just one type of osteobiography to be shared that can lead to a better understanding of the ancient ancestors and their survival.

The most positive outcome of the laws and regulations concerning the treatment of unmarked burials is in recognizing the value of consultation with Indigenous communities. The objective is to preserve and protect the community’s cultural resources of the past for the present and future generations. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community of Hōkūli‘a are working hard to preserve and protect the iwi kūpuna as their cultural resource.

Cultural Renaissance

Since the 1970s, the Hawaiian renaissance has been the vehicle by which to gain cultural recognition, self-determination, and access to traditional lands of an ancient peoples (Kanahele 1979; Darrah 2010). The renaissance has continued into modernity as the movement for sovereignty and independence
for the Hawaiian people. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo continue to define and redefine their identity in this modern world through the adaptations of ancient practices. The traditional practices concerning death and burials have been retrofitted to accommodate reburials of iwi kūpuna. In ancient times, death and the consequent burial of a family member was full of ritual, secrecy, and protocols to ensure their transition to the ao ‘āumakua (spirit world or heaven) realm (Kamakau 1964:49-51). Death and burial represent the precious cycle of reciprocity. As the earth provided sustenance and care for the living, the dead now enrich the earth with the spiritual energy contained within their bones. It exists in all forms of life and within our interaction with those life energies. Nihipali (2002:4) continues this frame of thought with this reminder, “Thus we carry with us and are the sum of our ancestral members who collectively gave us life. This relationship gives rise to a profound duty to care for and protect our kupuna. This interdependency is not defeated by death of the physical body, but continues between the living and the dead.” This profound duty extends to include land stewardship as instructed by Kanahele (1986:208) in this quote:

To be truly consistent with traditional Hawaiian thought, no one really owned the land in the past... The relationship was the other way around: a person belonged to the land. We are but stewards of the ‘āina and kai (land and sea), trusted to take care of these islands on behalf of the gods, our ancestors, ourselves, and our children.

Colonization in varying degrees has nullified the authenticity of indigenous knowledge construction and related action. James Riding In (1996:173), of the Pawnee nation describes how colonization has created a chasm between the ancestors and their descendants through this statement,

The theft of our ancestors happened through a process of colonization done in the names of Manifest Destiny and the rights of discovery. Europeans claimed that they had preemptive rights not only to our lands and resources, but to our dead as well.
Skeletal remains are part of the changing ways in which cultures are validating their place at the discussion table. This truth, the responsibility of speaking for their kindred dead, has changed the Indigenous community’s perspective from reactionary to proactive; they are now agents who act rather than being acted upon. This changing praxis is a direct result of the cultural renaissance grass-roots movement. There are many examples in Hawai‘i’s history of the disrespectful removal and curation of ancestral remains. Two of these events, Mōkapu, and Honokahua, shaped and influenced how the ‘Ōiwi mamo would respond to outsiders interfering in the preservation and protection of their ancestral remains. Beginning in 1915 Mōkapu, O‘ahu became the largest single pre-contact burial site where archaeological excavations eventually yielded over 1,172 iwi kūpuna. Sadly, for close to 100 years these iwi kūpuna have been curated at the Bishop Museum. In the late 1980s, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo-led reinterment of hundreds of burials from Honokahua, Maui represents how the grassroots movement can effect change in policy and stop the desecration of ancient unmarked burial cemeteries.

*Mōkapu Peninsula, O‘ahu*

The Mōkapu Peninsula is situated on Kāne‘ohe Bay, on the windward side of O‘ahu. There are remnants of two ancient village sites as well as a heiau, a fishpond, and agricultural complex. These sacred sites represent the cultural heritage of ka po‘e kahiko (the ‘Ōiwi of pre-contact era) who once resided there. Mōkapu has an expansive sand dune site on the northern side of the Peninsula which was used to bury the dead during the pre-contact days of the ka po‘e kahiko. The first reported recovery of skeletal remains discovered in Mōkapu was in 1915. A local fisherman had seen some bones sticking out of the sand, and turned them over to the Bishop Museum. Between the years of 1938-1957, The Bishop Museum and the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa authorized the extensive excavation of iwi kūpuna at Mōkapu. Approximately
1,150 ancestral remains were disinterred and curated at the Bishop Museum. By 1992 Mōkapu had become the largest area from which skeletal remains had been disinterred on O‘ahu, numbering 1582 pre-contact iwi kūpuna from the sand dunes (Ayau, 1996). The Mōkapu iwi kūpuna were curated in the Bishop Museum until the enactment of NAGPRA. All federal agencies were forced into compliance with NAGPRA. The Marine Corps base, which occupies the lands of Mōkapu, complied by having the Bishop Museum complete an inventory of all ancestral remains, and their objects recovered from said area (Ayau 1996; Collins et al 1994). Dr. Charles E. Snow was responsible for the most comprehensive osteological examinations of the skeletal remains of Mōkapu, completed in the 1960s. Some of the contributions of Dr. Snow’s examinations included detailed observations of tooth variations, mandible variations, and the pathologies in the bones (Pietrusewsky 2006; Snow 1974). During a HIBC meeting, Punahele Lerma had this to say about the ever-growing numbers of displaced ancestral remains of Mōkapu, “If there is anything Native Hawaiians will come to know its eviction. They evict us when we’re alive, they evict us when we’re dead. We are never safe. Our responsibility is to protect our sense of place” (Ayau 1996:1). The majority of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo wanted the immediate reburial of the remains. Five nā ‘Ōiwi mamo wanted to have DNA testing done to show familial affiliation of the remains. Currently, there are preliminary plans for the reinterment of the skeletal remains on the Peninsula in the near future.

*Honokahua, Maui*

This second cataclysmic event marks a growing disconnect between tourist based development and Hawaiian cultural heritage. The Kapalua Land Company in December 1986 was issued a Special Management Area permit to build a luxury hotel in Honokahua, from the Maui Planning Commission. Hui Alanui o Makena, a Maui grass roots organization, made
repeated attempts to sway the commission to rethink their decision because Honokahua was a significant, rich cultural site and the Hui felt the area and the burials needed to be protected. Kawelu (2007:91) states, “The Planning Commission placed conditions on the developer’s permit, instead of revoking it, which required the landowner/developer to enter into negotiations with the Hui and Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) to mitigate the effects of the development on the known burial site.” Mitigation measures, adopted by the Hui, OHA, the land developers, and the State of Hawaiʻi, included the disinterment, the temporary curation, the study of the iwi kūpuna, and the reinterment of the iwi in a secure location (Bolante 2007; Kawelu 2007).

Although all parties knew burials existed at Honokahua, none knew the extent of burials which would later be excavated. By late fall of 1987, more than 800 skeletal remains were excavated out of the sand dunes. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo from all over the state came to Honokahua seeking redress for the iwi kūpuna being excavated from the sand dunes, and the protests stretched to the State Capitol with a twenty-four-hour vigil. Governor Waihee, the first ʻŌiwi governor in the state of Hawaiʻi, stopped the construction and the following day a settlement was reached which included the ancestral remains being returned to the land of Honokahua after the hotel was relocated away from the burial site. The final count of excavated iwi kūpuna were over 1,100, and each was reinterred with their associated moepū in a reverent night ceremony.

Honokahua was instrumental in the creation of legislative changes to State Statues for the protection of unmarked burials. Amendments to Chapter 6E, HRS provided protections to unmarked burial sites equal to those provided for modern cemeteries. In addition, the new law established the Burial Sites Program and Island Burial Councils (IBC) as part of the SHPD, to protect, regulate, and care for the iwi kūpuna found in unmarked burials (Gaylord 2005; Greer 2012; Kawelu 2007).
Enactment of Laws

In the US, legislation attempted to redress the social injustice issues relating to the appropriation of skeletal remains, associated patrimony and other significant cultural items curated into laboratories, private and public museums, and collections. Australia, Canada, and New Zealand have adopted similar legislations and policies which curtail the mass excavations of Indigenous remains. In the US, the federal law is called NAGPRA and Hawai‘i state law is entitled Chapter 6E.

In Iowa 1971, during an archaeological reconnaissance 28 human remains were found, of which 26 European-American remains were reburied. The Native American Indian remains of a mother and an infant were instead transported to the local museum to be studied and displayed to the public (Rose et al. 1996; Pearson 2000; Ousley et al. 2005; Steeves 2015). This one act propelled the Native American Indian tribes to fight for the protection of their ancestral remains. The Native American Indian tribes spent the next 20 years lobbying, protesting, and fighting for Federal and State legislation to stop the desecration and disrespect of their ancestral remains (Jones and Harris 1998; Rose et al. 1996).

NAGPRA passed in 1990. One component of the law was consultation (demanded by indigenous leaders who worked with the federal government to draft appropriate legislation) with federally recognized Native American Indian tribes, Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHO), Native Alaskans, and other recognized indigenous communities in any federal undertaking concerning skeletal remains (Rose, et al. 1996; Jones and Harris 1998; Keiley 2010; Greer 2012). The addition of NHO into NAGPRA was a direct result of Hawai‘i Senator Daniel Inouye, who at the time was the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs (Greer 2012:40). Halealoha Ayau, a lawyer working for Senator Inouye during for formation of NAGPRA, was
key to the addition of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo into the law. Two specific NHO’s, Hui Mālama I Nā Kupuna O Hawai‘i Nei (Hui Mālama) and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs were named as federally recognized NHOs within the law. Hui Mālama was created from the acts of the defilement of iwi kūpuna at Honokahua, Maui. Hui Mālama represented nā ‘Ōiwi mamo for over twenty years, for the purposes of repatriating iwi kūpuna held in private and public museums and collections in the United States and throughout the world. OHA is a State agency whose main responsibility is to care for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and their cultural resources (Baldauf and Akutagawa 2013).

NAGPRA gives these communities negotiating and self-determination powers, or at least the access to those powers. As Edward Halealoha Ayau (1992:216) comments:

NAGPRA recognizes the cultural right of living ... Native American Indians to speak on behalf of their ancestors and to determine proper treatment of ancestral remains. Such recognition is a basic human right, the exercise of which is a long-standing attribute of native sovereignty and self-determination.

This is just one opinion on the value of NAGPRA. Some scientists argue NAGPRA restricts their access to skeletal material once it has been reburied, thus losing the possibility of using advancing technologies to answer an expanded range of research questions. Weiss (2006:9) states, “NAGPRA and other repatriation laws obstruct the process of scientific endeavors; thereby, creating an ethical dilemma for scientists.” There is no easy answer for either side, collaboration is the key to making this work for both indigenous cultures and scientists. One example of collaboration is between the Hopi and the archaeologists: The Hopi believe collaborating with the archaeologist is beneficial to their communities in recording the ancient sites and to sharing their cultural stories of place and people to the outside world. Hopi
collaborator, Micah Loma’omvaya states: “There is much to share, but we want to participate in this process and not just do it in the name of Science” (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2006:158).

Chapter 6E, HRS establishes legal processes (HRS 6E-43 and §6E-43.5) to protect and preserve historic Native Hawaiian burials and burial protocols and to regulate the formation of the Island Burial Councils (IBC) their advisory role for the iwi kupuna, whether previously identified or as an inadvertent discovery, and their burial sites (Gaylord 2005; Russo 2011). The intent of the law is clear as I quote from HRS § 6E-1:

…policy to preserve, restore, and maintain historic and cultural property in a spirit of stewardship and trusteeship for further generations, and to conduct activities and programs in a manner consistent with the preservation and enhancement of historic and cultural property.

The State created a state agency called State Historic Preservation Department (SHPD, by which to administer Chapter 6E. SHPD is a division under Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR). SHPD has two procedures through which they care for iwi kūpuna, depending on whether such historic burials are inadvertent discoveries or previously identified. Previously identified refers to ancestral burials discovered during the archaeological inventory survey or identified through oral or written histories. Inadvertent discoveries refer to unanticipated finds of ancestral remains because of ground disturbance or erosion (HAR §13-300-2). In short, the discovery of a single burial or multiple burials older than fifty years old will fall under the purview of the SHPD, and if such burials are iwi kūpuna, the Island Burial Council’s (IBCs), the land owners, and recognized lineal and cultural nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are mandatory parties to any decisions. The law states that either a determination of preservation in
place or relocation shall be agreed upon through a mitigation plan, or burial treatment plan
(BTP), as it is commonly called.

Act 306, passed in 1990, amended Chapter 6E by establishing the five IBCs which cover
the five counties in the state, to determine the disposition of previously identified Native
Hawaiian burials. The IBCs are public commissions staffed by SHPD and composed in part by
nominees proposed by OHA. The Act is specifically intended to protect unmarked burial sites
throughout the Hawaiian Islands by stating:

…areas with a concentration of skeletal remains, or prehistoric or historic
burials associated with important individuals and events, or areas that are
within a context of historic properties, or have known lineal descendants,
shall receive greater consideration for preservation in place…. native
Hawaiian traditional prehistoric and unmarked burials are especially
vulnerable and often not afforded the protection of law which assures
dignity and freedom from unnecessary disturbance (Act 306, Sess. Laws

In theory, Act 306 seemed as if it would end all further arguments on the protections of
unmarked Hawaiian burial sites. Although the laws are in place, many feel they do not
adequately provide all the necessary protections sought by nā ‘Ōiwi mamo in Hawai‘i, as
demonstrated in this quote by Moses Haia, a lawyer for Native Hawaiian Legal Corp (Greer
2008:74):

The spirit of the law is clear, protect and preserve historic properties
because they are so important and integral to the honor, dignity, and
culture of a people. The letter of the law allows the spirit of the law to be
manipulated through interpretation/misinterpretation and the attempt to
make sense of culture through a Western lens.

The Western lens focuses on the commodification of the land, therefore, the significance
of cultural sites and iwi kūpuna have no relationship to their goal of land development. State
laws like HAR§13-300 guarantee nā ʻŌiwi mamo voices will be heard in protecting their iwi kūpuna.

HAR§13-300 was formulated to ensure the statutes are followed and enforced. HAR §13-300 outline rules describing how all stakeholders will participate in the protection of iwi kūpuna. The definitions of all the terminology as well as how the law will be enforced are dictated through this document. Consultation with recognized lineal and/or cultural descendants is a must. Prior approval from said descendants is needed before performing any skeletal analysis. Non-destructive skeletal analysis is preferred over biochemical analysis, like DNA and radio carbon dating. All recognized burial sites will be protected in perpetuity.

Benefits of Skeletal Analysis

NAGPRA has hindered the work of physical anthropologists who have traditionally worked with skeletal remains to gain information about the health and life history of individuals and populations. Advancing technologies permit physical anthropologists more latitude in their ability to gather and interpret data collected through osteological examinations (Jones and Harris 1998; Landau and Steele 1996; Watkins and Muller 2015). It is sometimes noted that physical anthropologists have not always viewed skeletal remains as ancestors, but merely objects which are manipulated to understand the lifeways of humans through looking at patterns of change in health, nutrition, disease, and life expectancy (Jones and Harris 1998). Pietrusewsky (1989:1) reiterates, “Human remains represent an important and substantive part of the archaeological record which, when properly studied, yield valuable information on the biology, health, and culture of an ancient people.” Pietrusewsky et al. (2014) continues to study skeletal remains of ancient Oceanic cultures, expanding the narratives on the impact of the environment on health and disease. As indigenous people increasingly voice their rights, a burden is placed upon the
physical anthropologist is to find ways to atone for the mistakes or the historical wrongs of acquiring Native American Indian remains without consent (Riding In 1996; Jones and Harris 1998), which lead to the excavation and removal of thousands of skeletal remains from their homes. Osteology is beneficial for helping indigenous communities gain federal recognition and to learn about pre-historic health and lifeways. The following examples demonstrate how scientific research can benefit the indigenous communities. Unless expressly stated, standard osteological methods of non-destructive analyses were adhered to in the measuring and recording of the cranial and infracranial skeletal remains (Landau and Steele 1996; Heathcote et al. 2012).

Ubelaker et al. (1989:251) has used non-destructive skeletal examinations to assess ancient populations by examining the physical appearance of the bones. The individual’s height, bone structure, and the peculiarities in the shape of bones can lead to identifying populations through bone traits. When further analyzed through computer programs, these observations can be used to test hypotheses on migration, population origins and trade routes. The use of historical narratives and archival documents can be combined with analyses of a skeletal assemblage to corroborate analytical findings and create a more holistic view of the researched community.

Watkins and Muller (2015) have taken a unique approach to skeletal analysis. Their focus was to apply the original skeletal analyses, or osteobiographies, to answer questions of social justice issues through examining historical literature as well as medical and dental information to construct and understand the lifeways and diaspora of enslaved Africans. Heathcote et al. (2012) credits Frank Saul for creating the word “osteobiography.” It describes “the recognizable changes to the skeleton that reflect on an individual’s life history” (Heathcote et al. 2012:132). Osteobiography focuses on the biological, social, cultural, and historic interactions which can reveal stories in the bones. This research paved the way for a more thorough examination of
osteobiographies and the social and biological experiences which provide a more holistic and humanistic look at skeletal remains as part of the African diaspora story. Some of the information gleaned through this research explored “individual experiences of health and disease in the larger context of social issues, and conceptualizing the relationships between the past and present communities” (Heathcote et al. 2012:49). Trauma in the bones, such as fractures and dislocations, appears to be related to high incidence of violence. Other research has made comparisons between the poor Africans in the city and the residential, suburban Africans and the difference in their mortality when they have access to health services and support (Watkins and Muller 2015). In this instance those in the residential areas had a higher mortality rate. Osteobiographies and historical narratives thus produce usable information which can affect the lives of contemporary society through looking to the past.

McGowan and LaRoche (1996) believe that chemical analyses has the potential of generating large amounts of data such as genetic markers, dating, bone histology and pathology, mortality, and dietary, nutritional, and environmental stresses. “Often these diseases and stressors manifest on the bone. Osteomyelitis, periosteal manifestation of localized and systematic infections and pathological lesions, for example are among the external indicators of these diseases and stresses” (McGowan and LaRoche 1996:116). Although DNA analysis is invasive, it also has the potential of positively identifying direct ancestry to the skeletal remains which can be beneficial to addressing land claims in countries such as South Africa.

Landau and Steele (1996) demonstrate how bones can be an important part of telling the story of everyday work activities through the shape and form of bones in the body. They describe how muscle development can be seen in the bones and how it can lead to inferences of associated activity. For example, in their research they looked at the muscle attachments in the
long bones. The results indicated the muscles were large thus increasing the stress at the joints. “An example of this is seen in the overdeveloped attachment site of the muscle in the lower arm and arthritis in the elbow joint that is related to spear throwing and slinging and pitching” (Landau and Steele 1996:215).

The state of Hawai‘i has had its share of skeletal analyses which have been performed on various skeletal assemblages since the early 1900s. Although the following examples were done without the collaboration of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, the research provided a better understanding of the prehistoric health, nutrition, and demography of the ka po‘e kahiko community. Snow (1974) observed an unusually high number of healed fractures and broken bones in the Mōkapu skeletal assemblage, indicating the skill of the kahuna in the setting and healing of bones. The use of these osteobiographies present a partial history of skeletal analyses produced in the State of Hawai‘i. I see this as a baseline in which to change the old paradigms of scientific priority for the new paradigms of cultural relativism. I recognize that these analyses used both non-destructive and destructive methodologies, the latter of which I am not advocating. Yet these analyses can also be used as a guide in understanding how the non-destructive elements of research also added to the academic canon of prehistoric lifeways. These analyses have increased the knowledge about the ka po‘e kahiko which have helped to treat contemporary health issues still prevalent in the present nā ‘Ōiwi mamo communities. For example, Henry G. Chappel (1927) examined ‘Ōiwi mamo crania and mandibles in 1920. His thorough examinations produced a wealth of information on Hawaiian mandibles. His descriptions detailed cultural modifications, developmental issues, and diseases in the teeth. Chappel used this information to outline patterns in dental disease to the ka po‘e kahiko diets (Pietrusewsky 2012:599).
Charles E. Snow conducted a comprehensive study of the 1,171 remains from Mōkapu which were housed at the Bishop Museum. Snow was looking at the dental and bone pathologies found in the skeletal remains. He is most known for his work on cranial deformations and identifying the rocker jaw. It is a prevalent trait in ʻŌiwi mandibles. Snow was detailed oriented in describing the pathological conditions he saw in the iwi kūpuna. For example, Snow points to the muscularity of the long bones of both sexes are attributed to their lifestyle. Additionally, Snow discovered indicators of osteoarthritis, healed fractures, and broken bones all of which add to the osteobiographies of the ʻŌiwi of Mōkapu (Snow 1974). He was meticulous in recording the vital statistics (age, sex, height, etc.) of the iwi kūpuna. His recorded analyses of the Mōkapu nā iwi kūpuna are invaluable in the continuing osteological work by physical anthropology students in Hawaii (Pietrusewsky 2012:602).

The Mōkapu osteological analyses have led to understanding the variations in the Hawaiian skeletal collection. Another feature of Snow’s work is the addition of Hawaiian historical authors lending their knowledge to corroborate his analyses with ancient traditional practices. For example, Snow had described cranial modifications in the collection and Dr. Mary Kawena Pukui contributed a report describing how ka poʻe kahiko modified a child’s cranium (Snow 1974).

In 1986 Sara Collins analyzed the Keōpu, North Kona, Hawaiʻi Island, skeletal population, looking at their diet and nutritional status. The results of her study conclusively determined the cultural and genetic continuity within the burials that was indicative of over 450 years of familial use of the burial site in Keōpu. In addition to studying the skeletal remains she also examined the ethnographic history which corroborated her paleopathological and paleodemographical stories in the bones (Collins 1992:194). Just like the Watkins and Mullers
example, the combination of ethnographic literature with the osteobiographies have the potential of increasing our knowledge about the ka poʻe kahiko and their intergenerational family relationships, their diets, and their livelihood.

June Cleghorn examined how skeletal material can lead to a better understanding of sociopolitical mortuary practices of ka poʻe kahiko. Cleghorn’s analysis is based on the archival data from the West Hawaii Island assemblages, which total five areas. She was looking to see if the moepū found within a burial context could signify political rank. Her conclusion revealed that the ultimate value of the present analysis is in the realization that, “contrary to common a priori assumptions, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo burials do not directly reflect the sociopolitical complexity which characterized the society within which those deceased individuals once lived” (Cleghorn 1987:189). Cleghorn discusses one exception, a female aliʻi buried with “terrestrial symbols of rank, such as lei nihoa palaoa (whale tooth pendant).” Therefore, Cleghorn recognized the difference between male chiefly burials, hidden in secret, versus female chiefly burials having moepū of rank.

Pietrusewsky (1989:2) further elucidates in his paper some of the contributions to a better understanding of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo population which were made through the study of bones. There were high mortality rates among infants and children and on average adults lived to thirty years of age. The study of cranial deformations and dental diseases in ancient populations have benefitted the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo society through preventive health measures to prolong and increase their quality of life.

After examining a skeletal assemblage from Kailua-Kona, Pietrusewsky and Douglas (1992:258) concluded a few things from the study of iwi kūpuna from a historic, unmarked burial cemetery. There were traits and abnormalities in the bones which suggested they were part
of an extended family of at least three generations. Some of the more common shared traits among this assemblage include: “tooth baps, long and narrow faces, wide suprascapular notches, the presence of a third trochanter” and the proximity of their burials (Pietrusewsky and Douglas 1992:257). As demonstrated through the various examples, the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community can learn many important facets of their ancestors through their bone, the relevance of which can help the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo better protect their iwi kūpuna.

Collaboration and Negotiation

Despite the knowledge that skeletal analyses of iwi kupuna afford the academic and the Indigenous communities, the Indigenous communities recognize an imbalance in power, where their iwi kūpuna have been constantly mistreated (Ferguson 1996; Jones and Harris 1998; Kakaliourus 2012; Landau and Steele 1996). For the archaeologist and physical anthropologist, their paternalistic, authoritative voice usually holds the monopoly on the interpretive power of what is culturally relevant to each community in which they study (Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson 2004). The historic praxis of archaeology has at times ignored the value of the Indigenous communities. However, working partnerships between archaeologists and the Indigenous communities are continually challenging the old norms of practices.

The iwi kūpuna are a constant reminder of the values and traditions which have been an inheritance and a rallying cry to protect the remnants of an ancient culture striving for continual validation by modern-day Indigenous communities. Skeletal examinations must benefit the Indigenous communities in which they serve. Ferguson (1996:73) advocates for collaboration between archaeologists, physical anthropologists, and Indigenous communities by stating: “Truth is multiversal rather than universal, and one person’s truth does not invalidate another’s truth.”
The field of anthropology is a culture with its own theories and practices and change must be made to incorporate indigenous worldviews which expound on their versions of the osteobiographies of the ancestral remains. Negotiation and collaboration are done with communities in deciding how science will benefit the Indigenous communities. I have chosen examples from New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, U.S. Native American Indian tribes, and the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to show how they are managing their heritage.

In New Zealand, each Māori tribe decides the best course of action for their affiliated remains. One such tribe has determined skeletal examinations are permissible, with the understanding that they have the right to edit all “culturally sensitive information before publication” (Jones and Harris 1998:255). Because each Māori tribe is distinct they want definite proof they are reburying their ancestor. This is where skeletal analysis is wanted and approved to show tribal affiliation.

Aboriginal Australians have made concessions with archaeologists concerning the possible study of one of the oldest Aboriginal Australian’s skeletal remains. She was given the moniker of Lady Mungo because she was discovered in the Lake Mungo region. Her age, according to radiocarbon dating, dates back over 20,000 years. The Aboriginal descendant community she derived from collaborated with archaeologists for future study of her skeletal remains. She continues her long sleep in a locked vault or ‘keeping place’ at the Mungo National Park exhibition center. The vault has double locks and the keys are controlled by the Aboriginal Australian descendant community and the archaeologist (Cantwell 2000:101).

The Mapungubwe Tribe of South Africa, in a post-apartheid era, are searching for identity through connection with their ancestral remains. Archaeologists and physical anthropologists assisted in re-identifying human remains of the Mapungubwe as Black Africans
and not European. This discovery helped determine and solidify the memory and identity of their precolonial state and cultural continuity (Schoeman and Pikirayi 2011:398). The Government of South Africa is attempting to restore ancestral lands to the indigenous South Africans. To facilitate the claims, DNA was used from burials on certain land bases with descendants filing the claim to show affiliation thus legitimizing claims (Lambert-Pennington 2007).

For the Californian Chumash, skeletal examinations are permissible, through a special underground ossuary (room or container). “There the remains of their ancestors could be kept and, if need be, studied respectfully by physical anthropologists, under Chumash supervision” (Thomas 2000:216). The Californian Chumash are working with physical anthropologists to produce osteobiographies to understand more fully their ancestors’ lifeways.

Interestingly, the Blackfeet tribe of Montana wanted their direct lineal ancestors to be reburied on their land. To rebury enemies of their tribe would be disrespectful. Consequently, DNA testing must prove positive in making lineal links between skeletal remains and living descendants (Guilliford 2000). In this case, 15 skulls were positively identified as Blackfeet by the Smithsonian Institute and returned and repatriated in Montana.

In Colorado, the Southern Ute tribe decided to give permission for comprehensive analysis and radiocarbon dating. They did confirm skeletal remains as those of a man “between the ages of thirty-five and forty when he died 8,000 years ago,” (Guilliford 2000:133). The Southern Utes also gave permission for “casts, x-rays, and photographs of the remains” (ibid.) for research after reburial. The Southern Utes are recognizing how skeletal analysis can benefit their tribe.
Ancient DNA (aDNA) increases the likely probability to link through biological evidence of descendants/ancestor relationships which can be utilized to advance or reject land claims based on Indigenous rights. The Western Mohegan tribe has used genetic testing to advance their claims of lineal descendancy from Mohegan ancestors to receive state and federal recognitions (Kaestle and Horsbough 2002). State and federal recognition would give the Western Mohegan tribe the legal right to receive economic benefits denied them.

The Hopi tribes have been actively engaged in deciding what kind of skeletal analysis would be most beneficial for their community. One example of collaboration between archaeologists and the Hopi was for four months of access for non-destructive analysis of disarticulated remains which showed signs of perimortem (near or at the time of death) modification of tribal members. The Hopi desired to find out genetic affiliation to make sure ancestral Hopi were being reburied (Dongoske 2009). The Hopi have allowed high quality color and black and white photographs and dentition casts to be made to facilitate analysis of skeletal remains, which led to information on age, gender, and pathological conditions (Dongoske 2009:295).

In Hawai`i there have been occasions where permission was granted to perform osteological examinations on disinterred burials. Although Honokahua was discussed earlier in this section, I felt the remarks made by Dr. Pietrusewsky were more pertinent here, because of the respect in which he attended to the examinations and his gratitude expressed to the iwi kūpuna and their nā `Ōiwi mamo. I believe that Dr. Pietrusewsky tried his best to be culturally sensitive to the Hui Alanui o Makena and other nā `Ōiwi mamo, during his skeletal examinations. The last sentence shows his respect for the descendants and their feeling toward
their ancestors as well as his respect for the ancestors whose bones he was analyzing. In regards, to the Honokahua ʻiwi kūpuna, Dr. Pietrusewsky (1991: iii) says:

> We would like to thank members of the *Hui Alanui o Makena*, and others of the Hawaiian community who were faced with many emotional conflicts concerning the disinterment of the ʻ*iwi* of the kūpuna at Honokahua burial site. By attempting to understand the value of the analysis of the skeletal remains to Hawaiians living today and in the future, they were able to begin to resolve some of these conflicts and provide assistance in the work that was done.

> With deepest respect, we thank the kupuna of long ago, who have permitted us to learn so much about them from their ʻ*iwi*.

On the island of Oʻahu permission was obtained for skeletal analysis on burials in the Mānoa area. These ʻiwi kūpuna were uncovered during trenching activities. Sex, age (at time of death), and aspects of morphology indicate that the fourteen individuals of this sample were lineally related, concluding that the disinterred ʻiwi were part of a family cemetery (Douglas 1991). The age at death indicates that most were middle aged and died of natural causes. The dental pathology indicated good health among this burial population. The prevalence of some cranial and mandibular non-metric traits suggests the ʻiwi kūpuna were lineally related (Douglas 1991:22-24)

Another interesting skeletal analysis was begun on a skeletal assemblage from the Sam’s club/Wal-Mart project site in Honolulu, Oʻahu County. Osteological evidence showed correlation of burials to the small pox epidemic of 1853 as documented by Titchenal (2003). Signs indicating the small pox epidemic would be the absence of coffins, inclusion of dog burials, and compacted human burials within shallow pits. “A date of 1845-1870 for burial-related artifacts supports the hypothesis that the burials resulted from the 1853 epidemic” (McElroy 2010:24).
While physical anthropologists in other parts of the world such as Australia, South Africa, and among the Hopi tribes have formed collaborative relationships with the indigenous communities from which come the ancestral remains, in Hawai‘i nearly all the osteological work pre-NAGPRA has remained fundamentally non-collaborative, even if there are instances of cultural sensitivity. This is key to understanding the cultural construct of Indigenous communities and their counterparts- the archaeologists and physical anthropologists. Policy and laws have sought to mitigate the growing tensions resulting from the disrespectful treatment of the indigenous communities, their cultural heritage, and their right to be the stewards of their past. It is slowly changing to benefit both unique cultural societies.

Hōkūli‘a, Kailua-Kona, Hawai‘i

Through the years, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo have learned how best to protect and preserve their iwi kūpuna on their ancestral lands. The ancestral lands of Hōkūli‘a are no different. Hōkūli‘a is much like Mōkapu and Honokahua, a place where iwi kūpuna have been impacted through the actions of humans. Here, the personal experiences of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hōkūli‘a have demonstrated their commitments to preserve the iwi kūpuna and their cultural sites.

Lyle Anderson and Japan Airlines along with their partners, also known as 1250 Oceanside, first purchased Hōkūli‘a in the late 1980s. Development has continued in the Hawaiian Islands at a persistent pace, especially in the more tourist dominated areas like West Hawai‘i or more specifically Kailua-Kona, Hawai‘i Island. Hōkūli‘a encompasses North and South Kona lands on the west side of Hawai‘i Island and is the largest, luxury development on the island, with over, acres. The project area boasts many culturally significant sites, from religious sites, house sites, trails, and burial sites such as Pu‘u Ohau, the burial site of the High Chiefess Kamae‘okalani, the grandmother of Queen Lili‘uokalani and King David Kalakaua.
Puʻu Ohau is also significant because it is the ancient landmark divider between North and South Kona. Legal issues forced 1250 Oceanside and partners to file for bankruptcy. Pope and Walton purchased Hōkūliʻa in 2013 (1250 Oceanside, LLC, Hokuliʻa.com). There are many reasons why I chose Hōkūliʻa as the primary land base community for this thesis. One, it boasts many pre-contact cultural sites such as house sites, religious sites, and ancient and historic trails; two, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are actively engaged to preserve their iwi kūpuna; and three, I, too have an ancestor who lived upon the lands of Hōkūliʻa.

Environmentalists and cultural advocates challenged 1250 Oceanside Partners in Judge Ibarra’s court. Allegations included violations of the Clean Water Act, the statutory rights in the preservation of the traditional cultural practices, and improper land use (Darrah 2010; Gaylord 2005; Kawelu 2007; Kelly and Kelly 1999). The judge found the County of Hawaiʻi and the developer had intentionally joined forces to avoid Land Use Commission (LUC) involvement subverting the legal process by using agriculturally zoned lands in the building of a luxury residential complex (Gaylord 2005; Dayton 2007; Darrah 2010; Kawelu 2007). In 2003 Judge Ibarra found for the plaintiffs, ordering all grading activities to cease until the mitigation requirements were met by the plaintiffs. Mitigation included protection of cultural features impacted by development and creation of a burial treatment plan (BTP) for the wrongly excavated/disinterred iwi kūpuna. The ruling was eventually vacated in 2006, by an out of court settlement between the parties (Kawelu 2007; Darrah 2010). One possible consequence of the vacated ruling could be the past protection of Puʻu Ohau. It is the known burial spot of the High Chiefess, Kamaeʻokalani, and was the benchmark for building eight million-dollar homes. One of the problems with Hōkūliʻa was their decision to hire various archaeological firms to do piecemeal archaeology. Although, there were many archaeological sites and artifacts recorded,
the burials were largely ignored. In fact, there are allegations of burials being removed without authorization, stored in beer boxes in an outdoor closet in the garage of a rented home of a Cultural Resource Management (CRM) firm (Medeiros, 2016 pers. comm.). There are other allegations of misconduct by inexperienced, newly graduated mainland archaeologists, who were not familiar with the local customs and traditions, and who were inexperienced in the process of handling inadvertent finds and moving skeletal material to other areas in Hōkūliʻa.

Hōkūliʻa set precedent for court battles to save traditional cultural properties and burials. It continued the engaged advocacy of nā ʻŌiwi mamo for their iwi kūpuna to be protected and preserved within the cultural landscape and incorporated into the development process. It also put the SHPD on notice to do their jobs by enforcing the statutes and laws pertaining to protection of unmarked burial sites within a development project (Gaylord 2005; Kawelu 2007).

In 2015, nā ʻŌiwi mamo of Hōkūliʻa were protesting the dishonorable treatment of burial sites from spraying herbicides to ground dredging. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo became the driving force in protecting their cultural resources. LeeAnn Leslie, organizer and lineal descendant had this to say: “it’s not just about bones or about consultations. It’s about conduct. There are burial sites which have been under tarps for thirteen years” (Yager 2015). In the West Hawaiʻi newspaper article by Yager (2015), Conrad Gomes is quoted as saying, “I’m here to protect their rights and their descendants.” Gomes was hired by 1250 Oceanside partners as a cultural liaison to protect the rights of the community and the development. In addition, Yager (2015) reported that new burials were inadvertently discovered by Alan Haun and associates during an Archaeological Inventory Survey (AIS) in July 2015. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo have continued to advocate for the protection and preservation of their iwi kūpuna in the Hōkūliʻa development area for over twenty years. Hōkūliʻa nā ʻŌiwi mamo have a strong presence in honoring their iwi kūpuna by taking
care of them. They are among many nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who are advocating for the best protections available by law to preserve the cultural heritage of iwi kūpuna. Consequently, collaboration with other stakeholders enable the iwi kūpuna to tell many moʻolelo of their mortal lives through looking at their iwi.

Although there were many examples exemplifying the benefits of skeletal analysis and collaborative work throughout many parts of the world, Hawaiʻi continues to be on the periphery. Osteological analysis has continued to be viewed as destructive and fundamentally non-collaborative among contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Another gap in the literature is discussing the benefits of osteobiographies and their interpretive power on understanding how social, economic, cultural, and political stresses can leave their mark on bones. Being able to use osteobiographies would provide the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo opportunities to interpret how the stresses and diseases which stemmed from colonialism impacted their lives, which is seen in the bones, therefore, there is opportunity for capacity building among the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo in adding osteobiographies to the literary canon of cultural history. Currently, the contemporary literature does not accurately demonstrate how the iwi kūpuna strengthens the culture of the modern-day nā ‘Ōiwi mamo.

One of the questions I explore is how osteobiographies can benefit the modern ‘Ōiwi mamo community? I am also looking at how the iwi kūpuna perpetuates the cultural identity of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Lastly, I want to be able to bridge the gap between the cultural and scientific lens of preserving and protecting the iwi kūpuna.

While reflecting on this chapter, I can see a paradigm shift in power slowly occurring over time. It is still a work in progress for archaeologist, physical anthropologists, land owners, and developers to change their mindsets to incorporate more indigenous knowledge into their
projects. Teaching nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to produce osteobiographies would allow them to interpret skeletal analyses in a cultural lens which best reflects their cultural values and lifeways. Yet, there continues to be a lack of academic literature discussing the importance of the iwi kūpuna as a cultural resource which needs protection and preservation. This thesis and its legacy of stories of iwi kūpuna and their nā ‘Ōiwi mamo can become an important academic addition to the contemporary narratives of nā ‘Ōiwi.
CHAPTER THREE: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND METHODOLOGY

Indigenous scholars look to their life experiences as means by which to inform how their research can affect change in their community. I am no different than my contemporary peers, I see my life experiences informing me on how and why I am doing this thesis research. It is an amalgamation of academic and cultural knowledge pushing me forward. Recently, I had the privilege of caring for the iwi of a recent inadvertent discovery, impacted by the winter waves on the Kailua-Kona coast. Most of the skeletal material had been recovered with fragments of bone located in the sand surrounding the iwi. I had the opportunity to help with the recovery of bone fragments. It touched my soul and I felt this spiritual bonding with the iwi kūpuna. So, while continuing to search for more bone fragments, I kept thinking about what stories the bones could tell.

I have spent a lifetime it seems, forging myself through experiences that have taught me the importance of connections to space and people. I am of mixed ancestry. I am ‘Ōiwi and Chinese through my mother and Japanese, Scottish, and English through my father. My formative years were spent in Kalihi, O‘ahu Island and Kailua-Kona, and North Kohala, both on Hawai‘i Island. I was Japanese first, and ‘Ōiwi second until we moved to my mother’s home town of North Kohala. At age eight, I became ‘Ōiwi because of my tūtū’s, aunties, uncles, cousins, and living in Honomakau, North Kohala. I was becoming who I am today. At age 14 we moved. I soon became lost in a sea of uncharted waters, but I always knew I would return home someday. I lived on the Continental United States for over 30 years with occasional forays back to Hawai‘i to visit family and to reground myself to my home and my identity. Ironically, it was the death of my maternal uncle that brought me home for good. I accompanied my mother to his funeral and was quickly surrounded by family. Heady memories of childhood antics quickly
filled my soul. In the wind, I could hear my ancestors calling me home. So, when we left Hawai‘i after the funeral, I knew it was time to come home and eight months later, I came home!

In 2012, I became a non-traditional college student, seeking a Baccalaureate degree in Anthropology. Through my undergraduate experience, I learned that I love looking at and learning about the stories the bones could tell me. Osteology opened a whole new world for me, one in which I wanted to learn more. I signed up for a field school in Odorheiu, Secuiesc, Harghita, Transylvania County, Romania for Medieval Funerary Excavations. For three weeks, I was a bone-digger. I learned how to excavate and remove bones from the earth. The irony was obvious that as an outsider, I am digging up bones in someone else’s backyard, where this same practice occurs in Hawai‘i and is looked upon as disrespectful and damaging to the souls of the iwi kūpuna and nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. There is a large ethnic Hungarian population in the county of Transylvania, Romania. Hungarians have lived in the county of Transylvania over 1,000 years. Politics born from war has isolated Hungarian communities within Romania in these modern times (Veres 2014). Despite the modern politicking between the Romanians and the Hungarians, the ethnic identities of the Hungarians are directly related to the bones that are found in prehistoric church sites within Odorheiu. The excavations have been eye-opening, profound, and culturally relevant for the Hungarians living within Romania. The Hungarians do not view iwi kūpuna in the same manner as nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Both, the Hungarians and the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo love and respect their iwi kūpuna, yet culturally the iwi are treated in different manners. Hungarians accept the knowledge of these iwi as validating their long history in Romania and celebrate their ethnic identity both of which are found in the bones. Yet, they choose to place their bones inside an ossuary, for culturally they believe the spirit has left the bones. It was a surreal experience as I felt as if my hands were being guided as I excavated the bones of the
Hungarians. The Hungarian descendant community are invited to the excavation site and encouraged to ask questions. They are taught stories of their ancestors and their histories through their ancestral bones, or through the osteobiographies. When I asked the archaeologist Nyárdi, Zsolt (2014, pers. comm.) how it made him feel to find their ancestral dead, he would reply, “We always knew they were here,” thus, reinforcing their identity as Hungarians living in the middle of Romania. Hungarians and nā ʻŌiwi mamo share the knowledge that the iwi kūpuna provides both of us with our cultural identities.

As a physical anthropologist, I want to learn the osteobiographies of the iwi kūpuna which are inscribed in their bones. In being able to interpret the stories through osteobiographies nā ʻŌiwi mamo add another layer of importance and sacredness to learning from the iwi kūpuna. I am cognizant of my responsibility to be the representative of the nā ʻŌiwi mamo in ethically sharing their stories of their journey in protecting the rights of their iwi kūpuna. I echo the sentiments shared by Indigenous author Lori Lambert (2014:286) who states, “Indigenous peoples have the responsibility and right to restore, revitalize, use, develop, and transmit to future generations…knowledge…heritage and visions.”

ʻŌiwi Epistemology

Some may ask, why tackle research from an Indigenous perspective? Linda Tuhiwai Smith, an Indigenous scholar, argues “The West claims ownership of our ways of knowing…and simultaneously rejects the people who created the knowledge and denies them opportunity to be creators of their own cultures” (1991:1). Epistemology is a way of knowing that is steeped in cultural tradition and seeks balance with our environment both internally and externally or physically, spiritually, and mentally (Smith 1999; Absolom and Willet 2005; Kovach 2009). It is
essential to understand ʻŌiwi epistemology because it speaks to knowledge construction. It is directly related to how Indigenous Standpoint Theory will inform research.

Manu Meyer in her seminal work on ʻŌiwi epistemology (1998), gathered and interpreted contemporary narratives from ʻŌiwi kūpuna (Indigenous Hawaiian elders) and formulated seven key experiential facets of ʻŌiwi epistemology. Meyer (1998; 2008; 2013a; 2013b; 2014) describes these seven facets as the interrelationships between self and cultural ideology, which include spirituality, ʻāina, socio-cultural interactions, interpersonal communication, usefulness to community, and fusing thoughts, emotions, and actions. Meyer has taken these seven elements and refined them into a trilogy of the mind, body, and spirit. She states, “the body represents the physical, external, and touchable experiences; the mind represents the internal, conceptual, and subjective experiences; and the spirits represents the intangible, metaphysical, and cultural experiences. The spirit is independent of religious beliefs, for the spirit transcends time and space” (2013:96-97).

Meyer’s trilogy resonates with Tūtū Pukui’s “triple piko concept” (1972a:182-183,187-188; 1972b), in which the individual in old Hawai‘i viewed himself or herself as a link between his long line of forebears (the spiritual) and his descendants (the physical), even those yet unborn (the mind). Three areas of this body were thought most intimately concerned with this bond: the posterior fontanel, genital regions, and umbilicus and umbilical cord.

These three elements of epistemology are in fact a single interconnected concept of reality. ʻŌiwi cultural values have developed through observation and interaction with their environment. Their environment became their sibling, their family, and their teachers. Language plays an integral part in epistemology because it helps to frame our cultural reality. Kovach
states, “Without language to affirm our knowledge daily, it is easy to lose cultural memory” (2009:168).

Cultural memory stems from our collective ancestral past, and those ancestors gave meaning to their experiences through language as part of my cultural ways of knowing. Keaka taught me three ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i words which capture the essence of Meyer’s and Tūtū Pukui’s conceptualization of epistemology. These words are maka‘ala (vigilant, watchful), akahele (to ponder, reflect), and makawalulu (balance, interdependence). These words reflect daily choices of how we transform epistemology into pono (correct, proper) actions. It is a collective consciousness and a transformative power that is expressed through individual experiences, choices, and knowledge construction which guide the individual. This epistemological framework guides how nā ‘Ōiwi mamo mālama (care, preserve, protect) their iwi kūpuna.

Death of the body is but a transformation or a return to the ‘āina (land, that which feeds), therefore, the kuleana is two-fold, mālama the iwi kūpuna and the ‘āina, to which kanaka have a symbiotic relationship. My interpretation is reaffirmed by Tūtū Pukui’s statement that, “Everything related to this individual is within the matrix of ‘ohana: an individual alone is unthinkable, in the context of Hawaiian relationship” (Handy et al. 1972:75). The mo‘olelo in all its forms of oli, hula (dance), mele (song), and ha‘i mo‘olelo are to remind nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of their iwi kūpuna, their ties to this time and space, and their need to preserve the mo‘olelo for their children and grandchildren.

Theoretical Framework

The purpose of this research is to understand the dynamics between nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and their iwi kūpuna. Theory is how to explain and predict the phenomenon of the research. A theory
outlines an orderly way of comprehending events, actions and/or circumstances (Huffer and Qalo 2004). Regarding this research, it is to guide the interpretation of a cultural phenomenon in ways which return meaning to nā ʻŌiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island. Historically, much of the discipline of anthropology has been characterized by non-native scholars generating theory or developing theoretical perspectives about Indigenous peoples. Many Indigenous scholars would claim that their knowledge both produces and is based on theory. For example, long distance canoe voyaging rests on theories of how the stars move across the night sky and how stars flow across the ocean, and that environmental knowledge is reinforced through successfully finding land. Franz Boas’ work was based on a theoretical approach of collaboration with George Hunt, a native Kwakwaka’wakw, with whom he had a working partnership and friendship with for over forty years (Boas and Hunt 1895; Wilner 2015). Theory has typically derived from a Western, hegemonic relationship looking from the outside in, to interpret meaning of an experience. Theory gathers the information into an explanatory model of behavior allowing interpretation to provide meaning and validation. Indigenous Standpoint Theory (IST) will act as a guide to understand the inequities of power and knowledge construction.

*Indigenous Standpoint Theory (IST)*

Standpoint theory originated to fill the gaps in theory relating to women’s constructions of knowledge. Specifically, Feminist Standpoint Theory (FST) originated in North America, at a crossroads of the transformation of the “intersections between Marxism and feminism, and in turn their joint impact on positivism, together with the effects of postmodernism” (Ardill 2013:325). Subsequently, IST was developed in Australia to give voice to the Aboriginal First Peoples’ of Australia. According to Ardill (2013), Marxism and feminism shared the notion of unequal power relationships questioning who constructs the knowledge and how it is framed in
research. If, as Ardill (2013) suggests, the standpoint or viewpoint comes from the oppressed and/or the marginalized, then their knowledge is reflected in their narratives and research. It explains the necessity of shifting paradigms of who controls the power to create knowledge. For example, the Torres Straits First Aboriginal Peoples’ are seeking sovereignty, self-determination, and recognition from the dominating Euro-centric government of non-native Australians. The Australian government asserts that sovereignty exists for all Australians, yet, they do not acknowledge the standpoint of the Torres Straits community, which seeks sovereignty independent of the colonialist establishment. The Australian government believes they have the right to speak for the Torres Straits community, when they cannot. Until the Australian government can acknowledge the differing standpoints of the indigenous Australian community, there will be no paradigm shift in who constructs knowledge and controls the political power which sovereignty entails (Ardill 2013).

Indigenous Standpoint Theory (IST) comes to fruition while looking at FST’s portrayal of the power relationships and who constructs the knowledge. For example, Nakata (2007:11) states,

Since the early 1990s, I have investigated possibilities with standpoint theory and an Indigenous standpoint as a theoretical position that might be useful – something from the everyday and not from some grand narrative.

Nakata (2007:9) builds on this reflection by acknowledging the existence of a “cultural interface, a contested space between two knowledge systems. Things are not clearly black or white, Indigenous or Western.” It is in the intersection where power relationships and knowledge construction are recognized, negotiated, and where a paradigm shift occurs. Rouse (2005:19) speaks of Foucault’s concept of knowledge and power as a “dynamic relationship” which
changes in various interactions with society as individuals and as a collective population. Power is domineering and proletariat in class struggles. Yet, as truth or knowledge is constructed from the standpoint of the marginalized, power then changes its form from domination to enlightenment for change. So, in a sense, power and knowledge are two halves of one whole that can change the discourse of colonization, class struggles, and sovereignty. IST, at its core, is this very concept of power relations and its effect on the community at large. For example, the developers of Hōkūli‘a set out to convince nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community that it would honor and protect the culture, add necessary infrastructure (such as a bypass road), and partner with business communities to increase their capacity to provide services, especially for Kona Community Hospital (Darrah 2010). Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are making changes within the Western colonial system by acquiring the skill to beat Westerners at their own games through lawsuits which is shifting the power inequities to benefit the marginalized. IST provides the conceptual framework in which to recognize the imbalance of power between colonized and colonizers; and to obtain social justice, self-determination and sovereignty which empowers the individual and community, which was evident in Hōkūli‘a.

IST has multidisciplinary uses. According to Chinn (2011:227), IST seeks to understand science as a sociocultural endeavor by examining how culture, values, and power shape scientific inquiry and scientific knowledge, “…by knowing/negotiating/bridging cultural differences, towards the goal of expanding ways of knowing, understanding, and living responsibly within a multiscience/multicultural world.” Chinn (2011) advocates for a foundation of localized knowledge coupled with working collaborative partnerships with scientists and Indigenous community groups to mālama and accept kuleana in environmental spaces.
Agrawal (1995) builds a similar argument to Chinn’s (2011), by emphasizing the importance of localized, indigenous knowledge to a community and perhaps globally for the benefit of the marginalized. Despite the much-deserved recognition of IST, there must also be some recognition that Western scientific knowledge has, in some cases, benefitted marginalized communities throughout the world. Agrawal argues for more collaboration between the local communities and scientists to develop strategies which best fit communities. All applicable knowledge has value and should be integrated to best sustain local environments threatened by development, natural forces, or modernity.

IST has tenets of Marxist political economy embedded in its conceptualization which speaks to Western capitalism disrupting cultural continuity in a community. This leads to commodification of resources which on Hawai‘i Island benefits the land owners and their vision of a cultural landscape (Wilk and Cligget 2007). The focus is on the inequities of the social and political power within the dichotomy of Western culture and nā ʻŌiwi mamo culture (Earle and Spriggs 2015). Land is a precious commodity to nā ʻŌiwi mamo communities as well as land developers, but for very different and distinct reasons. Sam ʻOhu Gon III states (2014:1), “Any formula for land use that replaces huge native diversity for a single thing be it cows, pineapples, or tourists will ultimately destroy the foundations upon which our lives and identity depend.” Ekolu Lindsay (2012:1) echoes the same sentiment by reminding nā ʻŌiwi mamo when the sites of our iwi kūpuna are destroyed, that our identity as nā ʻŌiwi mamo is being destroyed as well. It is this contested space of ancestral lands, which are being redefined as a Western commodity, where the power inequities are being manifested. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo through the state and federal laws can impact the power relationships and work with land owners to preserve their iwi kūpuna in situ. Although this shift in power has produced inequities that are evident throughout many nā
ʻŌiwi mamo communities throughout the state of Hawaiʻi, it is still a fight to protect the sacred spaces of the iwi kūpuna.

The contested space of Hōkūliʻa reveals how place-based knowledge encourages active participation of the Indigenous community to save and protect at least some of their valued resources, such as the ancient Ala Loa trail system. Hōkūliʻa incorporated this cultural feature into a modern landscape by preserving part of it within the modern confines of the 16th fairway of the golf course. Using Global Positioning System (GPS) technology, each stone was recorded and removed until after the completion of the 16th fairway; at which time, each stone was restored to its original setting via the GPS technology thereby showing how negotiation and collaboration can bridge knowledge gaps (Hōkūliʻa Site Visit 08/04/2016). Collaboration and negotiation made this modern cultural landscape a reality on the lands of Hōkūliʻa.

To build and sustain learning capacity among indigenous communities, educators are incorporating IST to help bridge learning gaps (Choy and Woodstock 2007; Milne, et al. 2016). By understanding the standpoint of education from indigenous perspectives, educators can facilitate a learning environment that “supports strategies of success” (Milne et al. 2016:388). Understanding cultural values determines what approach will work the best to empower students by using their own cultural knowledge to succeed outside of their cultural domain. Again, it is focusing on the cultural interface, where knowledge transects and transforms for the benefit of the marginalized. As Nakata (2013:302) explains the cultural interface is the place where the Indigenous descendants can gather information from many sources and apply that knowledge to enhance their life. I believe this is how nā ʻŌiwi mamo remain culturally relevant in a contemporary society. Modern nā ʻŌiwi mamo scholars are changing the way in which they see their world, using ʻike kūpuna with modern technological advances to carry our cultural
traditions throughout the world. Hōkūleʻa and Hikianalia are a perfect example of new and old, restoring knowledge of long distance voyaging and incorporating advancing technology, working together to advance nā ʻŌiwi mamo culture. IST provides the opportunities for descendant communities to become relevant in a Western society. Indigenous communities throughout the world are sharing their traditional practices with each other and challenging the Western ideologies of the meaning of success. IST looks at the inequalities that exist, and focuses on partnerships with various stakeholders to effect change. Collaboration is the key to success.

*Indigenous Methodology*

Cultural heritage management is looking at the ways in which indigenous communities are preserving and protecting their cultures. Indigenous methodologies incorporate cultural practices, rituals, and interactions, ethics, and identities, which represent the expanded tool-kit of the indigenous researcher. These tools guide the researcher to design projects, activities and research paradigms which are focused on strengthening and benefitting the community at large (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2001; Kovach 2009; Oliveria and Wright 2015; Smith 1999; Thalman 2000). Indigenous peoples are becoming actively engaged in highlighting and protecting the uniqueness of their home communities within the academic dialogue. The balance of the existing interrelationships, between community members and their environment corroborates the inherent value of this methodology to indigenous researchers. Research provides the opportunity to learn about indigenous paradigms, such as knowledge manufacturing, methods, and reciprocity (Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2001; Thalman 2000; Kovach 2009). As Sandoval et al. (2016:21) point out, “We become part of the process that constructs new understandings and deconstructs existing standards.” Indigenous researchers are changing the
way in which academics and scholars are engaging with and promoting participant phenomena, a changing lens from colonization to emancipation of the mind. This reminds the researcher to focus on how research will benefit the community at large, to provide healing, social justice, and perpetuation of cultural beliefs which leads to empowerment. In doing research in this manner, it allows indigenous researchers to speak to indigenous stakeholders with the goal of “creating authentic knowledge” (Vaioleti 2006:23) to provide indigenous solutions to indigenous concerns. The use of culturally appropriate methodologies changes the focus from etic to emic. Indigenous researchers are opening the doors of Western scholarship to be inclusive and find avenues in which to incorporate native ways of knowing and doing.

Oliveria and Wright, in their book *Kanaka ʻŌiwi Methodologies: Moʻolelo and Metaphor*, express a uniform methodological structure:

Research protocols, positionality, and the importance of ʻike kūpuna (ancestral knowledge), ʻāina (land, that which feeds), and kuleana (responsibility, authority, privilege, burden) …. the collection illustrated the inherent duality of Kanaka ʻŌiwi research methodologies that seek to simultaneously dismantle old paradigms and build new ones shaped by Kanaka ʻŌiwi epistemologies (2015:x-xi).

The research paradigms are changing, diversifying, and creating opportunities for ʻŌiwi scholars, such as myself, to “think about, approach, practice, and articulate research” (Oliveria and Wright 2015 :2). As illustrated above, ʻŌiwi methodologies are based on local epistemology. Tūtū Pukui reminds all “There are many references to the supernatural or mystic occurrences…Hawaiian life and thought cannot be understood without knowing about them” (Pukui, Haertig, and Lee 1972a: ix). Knowledge is experienced, and it is gathered from all sources. ʻŌiwi kupuna Kekuni Blaisdell reiterates the Hawaiian epistemology in this way:

…to Kanaka Maoli, everything is living. Not only that, but its conscious. It also communicates. It receives messages and it sends outs out messages.
Everything is alive—the reflections, the shadows, the sound, the wind, the splash of the waves on the beaches. Everything is alive. And everything is communicating with us. All we need to do is open the receptors (1999:107).

‘Ōiwi methodologies incorporate dreams, visions, metaphysical communication, hō‘ailona (signs), kaona (deep reflection), feelings, as well as stories, and experiences of those who are engaged in the research. The intersection of these indigenous methods produces synergistic, dynamic, intertwined threads of knowledge which are shared through the mo‘olelo of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo (Vaioleti 2006). Metaphors provide a deeper understanding of a concept by engaging our senses, which transports the researcher into pondering the application of the shared experience. For example, Mehana Vaughn uses the metaphor of a lei representing a specific place. She states, “[A] Lei offers a way to see and know a landscape because each lei is unique to the place where it is made” (2015:42). Similarly, I remember the stories of my mother as she reflected on the hala lei her father always wore on election days. The significance of the lei is the memory it invokes of her mother making the lei and her father wearing it, therefore, the hala lei for my mother symbolizes the relationship of her parents. Metaphors can evoke memories which tie us to the relationships which exist in the memory.

The imagery of the olonā is intriguing as it relates to this research. Pukui and Elbert (1986:286) list two definitions: one, is for the endemic plant (*Touchardia latifolia*), which is used to make cordage; two, it is the word for muscle ligaments or tendons. Olonā cordage is highly prized for its durability and resistance to water (Summer 1990). Olonā patches were a kuleana responsibility, much like taro patches, which continued through the family line (Summer 1990; Kamehameha Schools 1994:27; Labiste and Hegerberg 2013). Women and men harvest and prepare the olonā for making cordage. The steps include stripping the bark, soaking the bark
in water, stripping the bark into ribbons, curing the ribbons in the sun, and then rolling them on the thighs into cordage. The cordage is then used for fishing nets, fishing lines, mending, and making frameworks for ti-leaf raincoats, feather capes, and helmets. It is also used to tie off the umbilical cord of a new born baby.

The cordage represents two important facets of this thesis: 1) the family kuleana to prepare the body of a loved one for burial and subsequent care after burial; and 2) the symbolism inherent in ribbons which are used to make the cordage. I see each ribbon as the moʻolelo which has been shared by the nā ʻŌiwi mamo. As each ribbon is added and then rolled to create the cordage, the ribbon is transformed and its value increases, therefore, it ties back to IST being formulated through indigenous knowledge production. This knowledge has the potential to change the current power dynamics to favor indigenous points of view. Consequently, the value of the olonā cordage increases as it is transformed into ʻupena (fishing nets) to feed families. Olonā cordage was passed down as a family kuleana, its utility increases its value, and it becomes cultural heritage. So, too, can moʻolelo feed families by empowering their rights to self-determination in decision making.

Just as important as the symbolism of the lei and the olonā cordage is the cultural symbolism of the ʻōhia lehua tree. Its imagery spans from the roots to the buds representing the past, present, and future generations of nā ʻŌiwi mamo or the triple piko concept of Meyer (2008) and Pukui (1972). It also provides the imagery for the key themes in this thesis. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo are reconnecting with the land of their iwi kūpuna, and recognizing the importance of the imagery found in everything around them. Hōkūliʻa is a cultural landscape where the past is incorporated into the present. It reminds us of the interdependent relationship with people and their environment.
Protocols for the land of Hōkūliʻa are important to the success of this project. It was upon this cultural landscape the iwi kūpuna lived, breathed, and died. As the ‘Ōiwi mamo speak of their ancestors, the landscape is embedded within the story. “The very word āina brings forth deep emotion evolved from ancestral times when people lived in nature as an integral part of it” (Harden 1999:13). I had the privilege of being invited to the lands of Hōkūliʻa to talk story with Kaleo, the cultural liaison. It was in the early part of August 2016. It was a beautiful, sunny day. I was excited to hear the moʻolelo of the Hōkūliʻa kūpuna. Kaleo introduced me to the iwi kūpuna by showing me their burial spaces, heiau, trails, and their environment. I could feel the love they had for these lands. As I was leaving Hōkūliʻa, I listened to a voicemail from Keaka reminding me to do my cultural protocols on the land. Auwē, no hoʻi e! (Alas, Oh, no!) I had forgotten to ask permission of the land and the people to enter their sacred space for learning and instruction.

I felt I had just committed a huge hewa (wrong, offense) at Hōkūliʻa. It was as if I had been scolded and sent to bed without supper. I felt as if the land and its iwi kūpuna were telling me that my research and I were not welcomed on their homelands. I wondered how I was going to correct this hewa. Reflecting on my predicament, Anakala Hanale’s name came to mind. Anakala Hanale had worked at Hōkūliʻa in the early days. I contacted Anakala and explained to him my predicament. Anakala and I spoke of his experiences with the land and its ancestral spirits and advised me to fast and pule for three days, and wait for the hōʻailona. In the early morning hours of the third day I had a dream. I was whisked away to Hōkūliʻa by my maternal ancestors; some of whom I recognized. I was part of a family group of 10 to 15 ancestors, who chanted as we waited for the arrival of the kahuna and his apprentice. We were allowed access and chanted until we reached a heiau. At the heiau was the aliʻi and his people. My great, great,
great-grandfather, David Keliʻipunui Kanehailua, presented my moʻokūʻauhau as well as introduced my research project. With a nod of acceptance from the aliʻi to the kahuna, I was now absolved from my hewa and would be able to continue my research. Food was laid to share with my family and all who were present. I was told to go home and sleep. After this dream, I decided to fulfill the hōʻailona of my dreams.

Kaleo Kualiʻi, the cultural liaison of Hōkūliʻa granted permission for the traditional cultural protocols on the land. Kaleo was the physical representation of the land and the iwi kūpuna who reside on the property. Kaleo transported our group, Keaka, her mother Haleola, and myself to a preservation site over-looking Puʻu Ohau near the ocean. Haleola, Keaka (my hanai mother and sister), and myself performed the rituals. First, we performed an oli, to ask for permission to enter the land with my moʻokūʻauhau, and research project. Second, we presented leis to drape around a preserved house site. I danced one hula and then Keaka presented an oli as her offering to the land. To seal my commitment, my kuleana to the land and to the iwi kūpuna, and to the descendants, I created a sensory bond with a handful of earth to seal the physical to the spiritual. Accordingly, Kaleo accepted our offering and he opened the door for my research to begin in the traditional ʻŌiwi way. Through this cultural protocol, I was creating an interdependent, respectful bond between research, the land of Hōkūliʻa, the iwi kūpuna who sleep on the land, and the nā ʻŌiwi mamo who speak in behalf of their kindred dead.

Qualitative Methodology

Methodology is the process by which researchers, based on their research design, and informed through theory, will collect, analyze, organize, and interpret data (Bernard 2011). A significant aspect of heritage management involves working with the community to develop recommendations that fall under the framework of applied anthropology. Qualitative and
quantitative methodologies are integral to applied anthropology. Ervin (2005) suggests that applied anthropologists have honed their skill set to be applicable for data collection. Genz et al. (2009) in working with the Marshallese navigation community used both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to gain a better understanding of Marshallese wave navigation. Becoming a Marshallese navigator is culturally situated with practical experiences and with intangible knowledge such as “stories, legends, songs, and chants of navigation” (Genz et al. 2009:236). Manu Meyer (1998) developed her Ōiwi epistemology from qualitative research based on kūkākūkā with Ōiwi nā kupuna. Likewise, Kathy Kawelu (2007) explored two sides (the professional archaeologists and nā Ōiwi mamo) of the sociopolitical history of archaeology in Hawai‘i. Kawelu (2007:220) states, “The relationship between native Hawaiians and archaeologists are complex manifestations of the various participants’ perspectives regarding issues and events involved in the practice of Hawaiian archaeology.” Each of these researchers successfully applied specific methodologies to fit their research thus showing that methodology must fit the community and their needs to record and preserve their cultural heritage.

As an applied anthropologist, I have chosen to use qualitative data collection because this technique is most appropriate for my research about the nā Ōiwi mamo community and how they approach the various burial issues. However, not only does qualitative data provide the best approach to applied research, but it can also add validity and compassion to applied anthropology’s collected stories and experience (Ervin 2005). Other disciplines recognize the importance of qualitative research and are applying the principles to fit their research paradigm. Sociologist Michael Quinn Patton (1980:22) perfectly describes the importance of qualitative research and what the results can provide to the discipline and community:
Qualitative data consists of *detailed descriptions*, events, people, interactions, and observed behaviors; *direct quotations* from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts; and excerpts or entire passages from documents, correspondence, records, and case histories…

Qualitative research methodologies encompass a holistic approach, beyond the statistics, which is reflexive, charismatic, and captivating to the three-way relationship (Cresswell 2003; Quanchi 2004; Ervin 2005; Charmaz 2006; Bernard 2011; Corbin and Strauss 2015), researcher, participant, and audience. Qualitative research looks at the stories that are shared and the meaning that is encapsulated in the telling of the story (Smith 1999; Kovach 2009). Million (2011:317) states, “It is a discourse of multiplex voices and multiple ways of knowing that intersect wherein the experiential and theoretical always informs each other.” Despite the vast amount of generated data in qualitative research and the rigor of analysis, it is often, nonetheless, described as a *soft science* by detractors (Denzen and Lincoln 2013:3); unwilling to acknowledge its appeal to a wider audience. Denizen and Lincoln (2013:6) state, “These practices transform the world, they turn the *word* into a series of representations…to interpret phenomena in terms of the meaning people bring to them.” Through qualitative methodology, I come to this research with a learned set of skills and tools that provide a unique advantage in working with a community of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. I chose to use GT as an appropriate way to analyze the interviews that allows for the emergence of key themes, and these are the focus of my thesis.

*Grounded Theory (GT)*

Grounded Theory (GT) was developed to “construct theory grounded in data” (Corbin and Strauss 2015:1). Data is the driving force for theory construction, and is primarily and inductive process; not the opposite [deductive]. It is the continual examination of the data during and after collection, generating codes, leading to categories and themes which produces theory.
According to Glaser and Strauss (Mills et al. 2006) post-positivism considers the researcher and his community as interdependent. The researcher is entangled in the interest of the topic and the way in which the community is engaged in the topic, subjective views versus objective views. Post-positivism was the foundation of Glaser and Strauss’ paradigm framework in the development of GT theory in the late 1960s (Ralph et al 2015:1). Through their work as co-researchers at University of California, San Francisco, in the establishment of a new nursing program, they formulated grounded theory based on their knowledge of sociology and qualitative research methodology. Their primary impetus stressed the importance of theory building, or in other words, coming up with a generalization or argument which equals a thesis from data collection (Corbin and Strauss 2015, Engward and Davis 2015). Strauss, of the duo Corbin and Straus, in 1987 personalized grounded theory and based it on these two key principles: “theory is constructed throughout the data collection process and analysis and data collection are interrelated” (Corbin and Strauss 2015:7). In other words, theory does not drive research, it is the outcome of research, Strauss and Corbin (1990:10) stress “pragmatism with a constructivist vent” of GT. Constructivist means a collaborative partnership exists where co-development of research outcomes becomes the goal. For my research purposes, GT provides a foundation on which IST focuses on who is providing the data. Their coding paradigm is primarily looking at and explaining the relationships located within the data. GT is reflexive, energetic, and relevant. It parallels the “contextual awareness and moment formation” (Ralph et al 2015:3) in the data collection and analysis of the research. It is an active and engaging process.

As a dynamic process, GT evolves to fit the needs of the researcher with the same goals of using data to generate theory. Creating new theory, and learning to use theory as a tool to integrate the results in a cohesive unit representing the community from whence it came. GT
answers to societal burdens, transitional periods, and adjusts to fit the various situations as they happen (Ralph et al 2015:5). The primary emphasis is situated in analysis and coding, providing the stimulus for generating theory to explain the phenomenon being examined. It is a continual comparative analysis. GT breaks down the data into manageable pieces creating a code which represents a concept. These concepts are collated creating a theme and these emerging themes coalesce to produce a core theme (Corbin and Strauss 2015, El Hussein et al. 2015) it is also an art form (Corbin and Strauss 2015), which engages the researcher with “intuitive appeal”, and nurtures creativity and “facilitates conceptualization” (EL Hussein et al. 2015:4). GT permits researcher transparency, self-reflexive engagement with the research community and accepting the outcomes as credible and applicable theory in explaining phenomenon (Engward and Davis 2015). GT highlights the three-way relationship in the research namely, the researcher, the community, and the research agenda.

Data Collection

Nā Ōiwi mamo for this research were primarily cultural and lineal descendants of Hōkūliʻa, Kailua-Kona, Hawaiʻi Island. Burial issues are located throughout Hawaiʻi Island, therefore, I felt it was appropriate to include nā ‘Ōiwi mamo from other districts of Hawaiʻi Island to corroborate and add to the stories of the Hōkūliʻa nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Hōkūliʻa represents a community of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who have been engaged in a twenty-year battle to rebury all the iwi impacted through development on this property. Most of the collaborative work with the community was done through partnership with my hanai sister Keaka. We discussed various burial issues and the importance of involving nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community members in the process. In the spring of 2016, I was fortunate to have two undergraduate interns, Robynn Namnama and Nicole Garcia. Robynn, Nicole, Keaka, and I formulated the interview guide and
standardized the cultural protocols for this project. Keaka has actively advocated for and
protected iwi kūpuna for over ten years; she was instrumental in helping our group to formulate
questions and ensure that our operating procedures were based on nā ‘Ōiwi mamo cultural
practices.

Part of data collection involved making connections with nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who shared the
moʻolelo of their iwi kūpuna with me. I had many chance encounters or hōʻailona (signs) that led
to conversations and invitations to become involved in this project. Attending HIBC meetings
allowed me to hear the voices of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, who I did not know, advocating for the
preservation of their iwi kūpuna in place. Another hōʻailona which was clear to me, was that they
had come to speak for iwi kūpuna in other Kona lands, but they were also lineal descendants of
Hōkūliʻa. Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo were friends, relatives and associates of Keaka, who spoke on my
behalf and received permission to introduce me to them.

As I spoke about my research to friends in the Kona area, I was blessed when they spoke
of being descendants of Hōkūliʻa, and before I knew it, I had 10 nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hōkūliʻa who
were SHPD and HIBC recognized lineal and cultural descendants. An additional two mamo are
professional ‘Ōiwi archaeologists who are familiar with the iwi kūpuna of Hōkūliʻa (Table 1). I
attribute my success in locating nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to my dream as well as to Keaka for being my
advocate with nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. In total Keaka, Robynn, Nicole and I kūkākūkā with 20 nā ‘Ōiwi
mamo for this thesis project. Keaka participated in three of the kūkākūkā. Her calm strength and
support allowed for a free flowing kūkākūkā of moʻolelo about the relationship between the iwi
kūpuna and nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Robynn, Nicole and I went kūkākūkā with eight ‘Ōiwi mamo who
reside on Hawaiʻi Island. Six of the eight are recognized lineal descendants in various districts on
Hawai‘i Island; the seventh is an ‘Ōiwi archaeologist; and the eighth mamo is a cultural descendant of Hawai‘i Island. I did the remaining nine nā ‘Ōiwi mamo kūkākūkā for this thesis.

Table 1
Summary of Nā ‘Ōiwi Mamo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kahuna Iwi</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Māhea</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Curtis</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Keaka</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Haleolea</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mele</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kulani</td>
<td>RLDB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Raymond</td>
<td>RCDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Kaleo</td>
<td>RCDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kila</td>
<td>RCDH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pōhaku Nui</td>
<td>OAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pa‘a Pōhaku</td>
<td>OAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Hele Wāwae</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Keanae</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Honaunau</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Kaiʻu</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kahio</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Makamae</td>
<td>RLDHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pa‘a ʻĀina</td>
<td>OAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mālama ʻĀina</td>
<td>OAH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To protect and respect the identity of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo story-tellers, I have chosen to provide those who wish to remain anonymous with a pseudonym.

Definitions of lineal and cultural descendants according to (HAR§13-300-2) are as follows:

“Lineal descendant” means a claimant who has established...direct or collateral genealogical connections to certain Hawaiian skeletal remains. Cultural descendant” means a claimant recognized as being the same
ethnicity and establishing genealogical connections to Native Hawaiian ancestors who once resided or are buried or both in the same ahupua’a or district in which the remains are located or originated from.”

The intent of the interview guide for this research was to create an open kūkākūkā and to develop a better understanding of the relationship between nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and iwi kūpuna. Kūkākūkā as an ‘Ōiwi methodology allowed us to immerse ourselves in the ‘Ōiwi cultural protocols. I felt adhering to the ‘Ōiwi cultural protocols showed our respect for the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, as well as their iwi kūpuna and to the sacredness of the topic we were discussing. Each kūkākūkā started with our group presenting makana, self-introductions, and moku’auhau. It was a discussion with the emphasis placed on the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo mana’o. We would then kūkākūkā on the hō‘ailona and reasonings behind their mana’o, which always came back to traditional cultural values represented in a modern context. We traditionally collect mo‘olelo of our ancestors so that they can be preserved and shared with others. The kūkākūkā facilitated the building of trusting relationships between nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and our group. Another important aspect included the venue of the kūkākūkā. I let nā ‘Ōiwi mamo choose the venue. The venues varied in location, most were in a private room at the University of Hawai‘i at Hilo; one venue was on-site at Hōkūli‘a, a few were in the homes of the mamo, a couple were at a local eatery. One of the most memorable kūkākūkā happened while walking on the ancestral lands of Kalaemanō with one of the lineal descendants of Hōkūli‘a. With an oli, we invited our beloved ancestors to come and join us on a walk through this cultural landscape. We spoke in hushed whispers, which were carried by the wind, of the stories of those who had once resided at Kalaemanō and their lives. I heard mystical stories of a shark who shapeshifted into a man; and, of gendered pōhaku (stones) who had witnessed the birth of countless babies.
In conjunction with the data collection, we performed cultural and research protocols. These are protocols part of the process of ‘Ōiwi methodologies. Two different protocols were performed, one for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and one for the land of Hōkūli‘a. The makana (gifts) were specially designed for the individual in which I was speaking with on that day. For the most part, the makana contained pre-contact and post-contact nā ‘Ōiwi mamo foods such as poi, sweet potatoes, dried fish or canned salmon and sardines, along with fruit and vegetables in season, as well as honey. On a few occasions, I purchased food to share during the kūkākūkā time. I felt this was an integral part of the interview for relationship building and for reciprocity. On a more intimate level, this is how I was raised. You never go empty-handed to any function and you always honor the interrelationships which exist between people, regardless of ethnicity. A brief introduction which included genealogy and locating of self to my wahi pana was included as protocol. The research protocols were approved through the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). We explained to the participants that there were no direct benefits for their participation. Furthermore, we cautioned that they might feel uncomfortable with some of the subjects addressed in the interviews nā ‘Ōiwi mamo were informed that if, at any time, they felt uncomfortable or no longer wished to participate they were welcome to end the kūkākūkā session. Also, I informed the mamo that I would be tape-recording our kūkākūkā. In addition, I would be providing them with a typed, transcribed copy of the kūkākūkā and provide them with editorial prerogative.

An informative educational module provided the stimulus for discussion on how non-destructive skeletal examinations can add other stories to the lives of the iwi kūpuna. This module was instrumental in understanding the changing lens of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo empowerment in protecting and preserving the iwi kūpuna. Most of the ‘Ōiwi mamo did not have any background
in osteology so were unaware of the vital information the iwi hold. To get a more tempered view of iwi, I purposely embedded within the interview guide an informative discussion module which focused on the stories that bones can tell through non-destructive examinations. I proceeded with a few general questions about relationships to their iwi kūpuna and to the lands of Hōkūliʻa. Question 4 and 5 spark the discussion on stories the bones can share with us. This section of the interview guide was created and discussed among Keaka, Robynn, Nicole, and myself as a good place to introduce the topic of skeletal analysis. This allowed us the opportunity to kūkākūkā on their manaʻo and our individual manaʻo on skeletal analysis. What we learned is nā ʻŌiwi mamo possessed some knowledge on the topic. We were then able to share what we learned from looking at the iwi.

4. How would you feel about learning another story of the iwi kūpuna through looking at their bones?

Each nā ʻŌiwi mamo had a different reaction to this question. I shared some of my experiences of the stories I learned through looking at the bones of the iwi kūpuna. I learned their approximate ages and sex by looking at the size of their bones. I learned if they were ʻŌiwi by the disposition of their bodies. I could see if there were old injuries by the healed bone fractures. With this information, I can add another story to the life of the kūpuna.

5. Do you think this is an important way to learn about your kūpuna? Why or why not?

Question 5 allowed the discussion to be more personalized to each nā ʻŌiwi mamo and how they felt this information would empower their rights to protect and preserve their iwi kūpuna.
In a brief explanation, the basic personal details of an iwi are presented such as age range, sex, whether, if female, she birthed a child, the presence of healed injuries, and the effects that infectious diseases and nutrition have had on the bones. There are also characteristics in the bones which show cultural affinity, like a rocker jaw, parietal bossing, and presence of a metopic suture. Other possible stories in the bones could tell of a skill possessed by the ancestors through looking at the size of the bones and where the muscles attached to those bones. For example, canoe paddlers will have larger arm bones. In some burial spaces, warriors were seen with the spear tips still within the remains which is a clear indicator of how the warrior died, thus adding the informative discussion module opened the possibility of learning the stories which can be seen in the bones *in situ*. It also allowed the introduction of a valuable methodological tool, osteobiographies accompanied with oral narratives which can be used to gain more information about our ka poʻe kahiko. We also discussed the opportunities for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to become physical anthropologists, or at least well-versed in osteology, so nā ‘Ōiwi mamo could be the ones to do the skeletal examinations. It was a collaborative effort in discussing cultural protocols and benefits of osteobiographies for the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community.

Data Analysis

Nicole and Robynn each transcribed four of the tape-recordings while I did the remaining 16 tape-recorded kūkākūkā sessions. Robynn, Nicole and I transcribed every word shared in the kūkākūkā. Thus, our voices have become part of the recorded stories. The kūkākūkā would be incomplete if we did not join our voices to the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Yet, it is their manaʻo that I focused on when analyzing and coding all the transcriptions and creating themes through an in-depth, rigorous coding process. I chose to not use any computer programs. I manually coded all
20 interviews using GT methodology to provide the framework in which to discover codes and thereby, larger themes. Saldana (2013:3) defines what a code is in this way, “A code…is most often a word, or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute.” The initial creation of codes was through the questions in the interview guide. Within each question of the interview guide, I looked for the repetition of words or sentences within the transcriptions. These codes were then placed in separate piles on a large rectangular table, thereby, creating a system which outlined the various codes which were then organized into themes. Then within each theme I read and reread each moʻolelo making sure that they were organized into the correct theme. This is a circular process involving the questions, methods, and analysis of the interviews to understand the collected data. Finally, I discovered five main themes which will be highlighted in Chapter Four. Through the coding, five major themes were identified: 1) identity through place and ancestors; 2) kuleana (responsibility) and kāhea (calling); 3) preservation in place; 4) knowledge for advocacy; and 5) self-determination and decision making. One of the most important outcomes of this thesis is learning that nā ‘Ōiwi mamo interviewed for this project are not opposed to skeletal analysis to create osteobiographies.
CHAPTER FOUR: NĀ MOʻOLELO ‘O NĀ ‘ŌIWI MAMO

Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are haʻi moʻolelo, storytellers, keepers of moʻokuʻāuhau for each generation. Each haʻi moʻolelo comes with their individual experiences which has become gained knowledge about iwi kūpuna (see Table 1 for list of participants). The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and I were creating a forum to share how they have become the caretakers and voices for their iwi kupuna. We are nā ‘Ōiwi mamo talking to other nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. As such, may I honor their moʻolelo and their iwi kūpuna for whom they speak. Anakala Curtis, RLDH, shares the symbolism of the human vertebra as our interdependent link to the ancestors:

I believe very strongly, that every vertebra that we have represents a generation of ancestors and we carry these ancestors with us. This is the symbolism of it. I don’t carry their iwi, but each of those(vertebra) are symbolic of those generations. It’s vital from my perspective that I not only respect all those generations, for they have provided for and made it possible for us to be here today…. There is a lot more to do than just saving some old bones, it must do with customs and traditions (Anakala Curtis, RLDH).

The symbolism of the vertebra connects us physically and spiritually to our moʻokuʻāuhau. Physically, it reconnects the mamo to their ancestral landscape. While spiritually it is a symbolic reminder that as ‘Ōiwi our foundational knowledge or ‘ike kupuna is inherited from our sociocultural traditional practices, rituals, and customs. Consequently, as the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo build their capacity to understand the ‘ike kupuna they become more adept at knowing how to mālama their cultural resources. The following moʻolelo speaks specifically to cultural memory embedded in the landscape. It speaks of relationships to the past with our ancestors, to the present with ourselves, and to the future with her children. It is a shared experience between myself and the Kulani, RLDH. We walk through time and space at Kalaemanō, Kaʻūpūlehu, North Kona, Hawaiʻi Island, we are learning from the ‘āina kūpuna (ancestors of the land):
We sit in awe, the feeling of their presence is real, very much as real as this table we sit on or the wind that blows through our hair, the kūpuna have arrived for the “interview.” A deep breath, is acknowledgement that kūpuna are with us, the conversation continues…I am convinced that kūpuna have heard us and soon enough we act upon another directive that seems to have come from the ancients, although not voiced, it is heard. I am in my element! A familiarity envelops me, I am maʻa, used to this place, as I rightfully should be. It is here that grandpa was born, great grandma was born, it is no wonder that I am maʻa with this landscape, Kaʻūpūlehu. It is inevitable, I become the orator. I speak occurrences of the past, stories and sites, hills and their names, the tradition of oration continues with me. I have a responsibility to my place, a responsibility to those from whom I descend, a responsibility to the present and to a time and people yet to come. I am grounded and centered, here within the lands that have raised generations before me. I do my best to convey to Tami my connection to this beach where the sacred act of birth happened, that hill in the distant upland where I grew up, or the winds of Hualālai, the mountain of Kona in the calm. I share of why I am connected to this place, why I feel the way I do about this place, how we perpetuate the teachings of our kūpuna from this place, all this and more are uttered. The messages I speak are my truths, it is of the iwi kūpuna that remain among the landscape we look out to, the house sites, the poho paʻakai (salt basins), all that our eyes peer at are a part of my DNA, a part of my tapestry.

And so, the story is told…and so the story continues! Aloha no.

The iwi kūpuna have come to share their moʻolelo through the voices of their nā ʻŌiwi mamo. Here is beginning of how iwi kūpuna have become the most important cultural resource of the contemporary ʻŌiwi society. A reminder here of how the ribbons of moʻolelo shared throughout this section of the thesis, is reminiscent of ribbons of olonā fibers which will be rolled together to create cordage. The created cordage then becomes transformed into items of value, such as ʻupena (fishing nets), raincoats, or chiefly status symbols, such as kahili (standard bearer), capes, and headdresses, therefore, the same principle can be applied to moʻolelo as cordage which changes the existing power relationships from colonial dominated to nā ʻŌiwi mamo cultural relevant.

There are five themes or ribbons: one, identity through place and ancestors; two, kuleana and kāhea; three, preserving iwi in the land; four, knowledge for advocacy; and five, self-
determination in decision making. Identity through place and ancestors provides descendants with a cultural foundation leading to solidifying their identities. It also provides the basic understanding of how the dead are kanu (planted in the ground) and their expectation of remaining where they are planted. Being engaged with the iwi begins at this point of entry. Two relationships are highlighted, place and people. In speaking of the ancestors, their burial spaces are an integral part of protecting and preserving the iwi. The second theme examines the meaning of two words, kuleana and kāhea. The nā ʻŌiwi mamo are defining the meaning each word has in the act of advocating for the iwi kūpuna. The third is the importance of preserving iwi in the land. The fourth is the knowledge for advocacy and its effects on the nā ʻŌiwi mamo. Knowledge for advocacy examines how knowledge enhances the effectiveness of the descendants who protect the iwi kūpuna. The final theme represents self-determination in decision making. Empowering the descendants through how the bones tell their moʻolelo or osteobiographies, the respectful treatment of the iwi kūpuna, and conditional acceptance of how iwi kūpuna can speak.

Although, not expressly stated in the moʻolelo, there was a feeling of camaraderie in our kūkākūkā; we shared many private encounters of how iwi kūpuna communicated through hōʻailona, dreams, or visions which guided their actions and their moʻolelo. Before each of the kūkākūkā, I offered a private pule and asked the ancestors to come and join our gathering, therefore, I expected to feel their presence and hear their moʻolelo through the voices of their nā ʻŌiwi mamo. During the kūkākūkā, our shared experiences became one in purpose, the kuleana to mālama the iwi kūpuna. I saw what they saw, I felt what they felt, and most importantly I connected with their iwi kūpuna, and I will cherish the expanded knowledge I gained through these kūkākūkā.
Identity Through Place and Ancestors

Affinity to place and people are key components to the cultural identity of the nā Ōiwi mamo. Sense of place and people attaches memory and feeling creating a space within one’s heart where culture is perpetuated. It is also a reminder of the symbiotic relationship which the iwi kūpuna had with their āina which the nā Ōiwi mamo are striving to re-establish in modernity.

Sense of Place

ʻĀina translates into “that which feeds.” There is a reciprocal relationship between Ōiwi mamo and the āina, very much reminiscent of the Kumulipo chant. The first Hāloa is planted in the ground and becomes the taro plant. The second Hāloa is the first Ōiwi and he cares for the kalo and kalo feeds the man. Land provides the necessities and nā Ōiwi mamo provide the care and sustenance of the land becoming a mutually beneficial partnership. The nā Ōiwi mamo have a deep sense of belonging to a place for it is in their hearts and calls to them (Wilcox and Maly 2015). These wahi pana (storied places) are usually the places where generations of ancestors have lived, labored, and died. Makamae, a RLDHI feels a special attachment to her ancestral lands of Waipiʻo. Maly, in an interview with Leslie Wilcox (2015) speaks of cultural identity tied to place. Maly says, “let the spirit of the place touch” become enveloped in the feeling it invokes in your naʻau (gut), sit and listen to nature and you can get a feel of the place and then you are connected. Her ʻiewe (umbilical cord) was planted in Waipiʻo. McGregor (2007:49) refers to Waipiʻo as “one of four cultural kipuka” (centers of spiritual power), which brings the nā Ōiwi mamo back to the land as their source of culture and spirituality. Waipiʻo becomes the surrogate mother of this child. She feels the emotional pull of the land calling her home, much
like the love of a mother. Unconsciously, Makamae has shared about the hō‘ailona of seeing signs which beckoning her home to Waipi‘o. As the ‘āina has cared and provided for her life, education and being, she seeks the reciprocal relationship of maintaining the productivity of her ‘āina. The continuation of the cultural cycle is seen through her connection with Waipi‘o as she states,

My wahi pana is Waipi‘o, you know, my piko ‘iewe (umbilical cord) is all in that valley. I miss it a lot...It is just kind of ‘eha (sore), you know. Lately, a lot of things just been popping up of Waipi‘o. I get a little emotional, too when I talk about it. But...something is calling me to return shortly...definitely calling. My sister and I were brought up, that no matter where we go we always return to our source to give back because that’s our kuleana as Kānaka Hawai‘i. (Makamae, RLDHI)

Pa‘a Pōhaku is a local archaeologist who is invested in Hawai‘i burial issues. Her professional archaeologist lens has opened her understanding of sense of place in Kailua-Kona. She identifies with the physical geography of Kekahawai‘ole o Kona (waterless lands of Kona) and the social construct of the ancient ‘Ōiwi. Pa‘a Pōhaku’s connection to place and people is strengthened as she walks the land of the kūpuna. She reflects on their survival and lives as seen through the archaeological record. It is in these lands which she has developed an understanding of the people who lived there through these words:

I’m pretty much connected to Kona, especially North Kona, Kekahawai‘ole o Kona. I’ve had the opportunity to walk this landscape and to feel how the people of North Kona, in this waterless place of Kona. How people had to basically live and to survive and how the archaeology was able to show they were able to survive the conditions of this place. (Pa‘a Pōhaku, ‘Ōiwi Archaeologist Hōkūli‘a (OAH))
In this sharing, family brings one back to center remembering that without the ancestors we would not be here in Hawaii. Here we see how Anakē (aunty) Haleola, RLDH, is linking family to land and extends the feeling in her quote:

Kona…where my parents, my grandparents, my ‘ohana come from…I feel attached to them and the land (Anakē Haleola, RLDH).

Pōhaku Nui, a cultural practitioner and archaeologist, shares that his heart belongs to Hawaiʻi. There is no other place which makes him feel at home than walking and being on any landscape of this state. He projects joy and wonderment at knowing he can be anywhere on the islands. His first love is Maui Island and his second love is the mountains he calls home:

All of it! Where do I really feel at home when I’m walking around and stuff…Maui. I feel at home on the mountains. It’s really, anywhere, as long as I’m in Hawaiʻi. (Pōhaku Nui, OAH)

Kahio, a lineal descendant of Hawaiʻi is demonstrating through this quotation, her desire to keep cultural tradition alive through the land and her parents who made it their home:

I would have loved to have buried my parents in my backyard, we’ve lived in this house my whole life. This was their first home purchase. I would have loved to put them there, you know. (Kahio, RLDHI)

*Sense of Identity through the Ancestors*

As strongly as cultural identity is embedded in the landscape, it is also deeply linked to the lives of the ancestors. Iwi kūpuna are the connection between ‘āina and nā ʻŌiwi mamo. Traditional burial practices continued with each designated family member who cared for the ancestors and their burial spaces. Although, it is not explicitly stated these moʻolelo have spiritual undertones which speak to communication of some form with these kūpuna. Whether they have had visions, felt the touch of a hand through wind, or felt their joy in their hearts each
experience tied them to their ancestors. I am reminded how each mamo was accompanied by their ancestors to our kūkākūkā, their presence was tangible and welcoming.

Kaleo, a RCDH, is constantly on the landscape of Hōkūli‘a. In Kaleo’s mantra, the three-way relationship is described through walking the land, seeking direction from the kūpuna, and acknowledging their presence:

My pule is what can I do to protect you (to iwi kūpuna) … Each day when I walk the ʻāina- I ask the kūpuna, “what needs to be done?” I never want to impose on anybody. All I can do is my duty to serve. This is their house. We are the guests. They help us grow and heal as we continue this journey. (Kaleo, RCDH)

Honaunau (RLDHI) describes the overwhelming desire to do her part in protecting and preserving the iwi kūpuna. It is especially more poignant for her because she was unable to cultivate a relationship with her ancestors while alive. A reminder of her interconnectedness with her ancestors is felt through her words:

I wasn’t raised by my Hawaiian family. I’ve had this major heart bend… I missed my ancestors because I wasn’t raised with them… so I feel this compulsion to be with them in that way, to serve the kūpuna by caring for them that way because I didn’t get to be with them when growing up. (Honaunau, RLDHI)

Similarly, Mālama ‘Āina, an OAHI and Kila (RLDHI) are reminded to not forget those who have come before with these expressions of identity:

You never forget where you come from that’s our roots. (Mālama ‘Āina, OAHI)

Without them, I wouldn’t be here now. (Kila, RLDHI)
In some cases, the discovered remains may not be of Hawaiian ancestry but the responsibility to preserve the iwi kūpuna remains the same as stated by Paʻa ‘Āina, an OAH:

Cause those are our ancestors and even if you’re not Hawaiian, that’s somebody’s family member. (Pa'a ‘Āina, OAH)

Anakala Raymond (RCDH) describes the importance of building “a rapport” with the iwi kūpuna. Rapport is the spiritual connection, having a conversation with the iwi kūpuna. Feeling their answers in their naʻau and then doing what is pono for the iwi kūpuna. Again, it is looking at the relationship which exist between the nā ʻŌiwi mamo and the iwi kūpuna. Look beyond the words and listen for the feelings which are portrayed as he says:

You have to be able to have that rapport with the iwi, you know, you have that special feeling that this set of bones once was alive, that it may be dead, but its spirit is still alive and, so we need to make sure that we respect the iwi as if it were a live person, because at one time it was. (Anakala Raymond, RCDH)

Anakē Haleola (RLDH) is reiterating the same focus of remembering the life of those whose bones have been kanu (planted, buried) in the earth. Anakē demonstrates her spiritual connection through acknowledging the wants of the iwi kūpuna which is to be cared by their nā ʻŌiwi mamo as expressed through her words:

To me they were important people, they were loved by their families. They loved each other, helped each other. To me it’s important that I carry on the love between me being alive and them being iwi. I really love, love them…They were loved on this earth and they left and, so we carry on. If we find them, we take care of them, and we bury them again…If the iwi wants us to continue taking care of them, we’ll continue taking care of them. (Anakē Haleola, RLDH)
Although the conversation continues to be centered on the relationship between nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and iwi kūpuna, there is an outlier to this conversation. The following manaʻo provided by Keaka (RLDH), who speaks of the concern she feels for the iwi kūpuna being disrupted in their long sleep. Likewise, it is reminiscent of a similar conversation with a child who is disoriented from being awoken from a deep sleep. The parent would gently explain to the disoriented child what is happening to alleviate the feelings of confusion and distress. Keaka is setting the tone for her role as caretaker and guardian of the iwi kūpuna with comforting reassurance:

…You gotta pule…to whatever Akua you feel connected to and then asking the ancestors also to be with you while you are doing that(disinterment) and I like to talk to the iwi kūpuna…saying I going to take care of them and put them in a save place. (Keaka, RLDH)

Keaka understands her role as a protector for the iwi kūpuna which involves finding them a new home when the former home becomes uninhabitable. Finding new homes for iwi kūpuna are problematic for a variety of reasons. The main reason being an available space close to where they were disinterred from. In this example, Keaka is speaking to an iwi kūpuna, who is being reburied in a large cave; because of its location and because burials already exist within its interior. Keaka is explaining to the iwi kūpuna why he/she is being put into the cave with this explanation:

I think if the cave is big enough, I don’t see anything wrong, they lived as ‘ohana before, they all knew each other…maybe, it could be like a nice reunion, you know all the iwi together and they can you know, talk story wherever they may be. My iwi next to yours, yah. I knew you or I knew your momma, they may be talking story. That’s just how I feel. (Keaka, RLDH)

Hele Wāwae (RLDHI) shows through his words the symbiotic relationship which he feels as he walks the land of his ancestors. He is the living embodiment of his ancestors and carries on
their work by restoring the landscape. He is saving the endemic plants; through ensuring their survival, his identity is cultivated through restoration of a cultural landscape. Hawaiian identity is explained in his words as he states:

When someone said, “how do you practice our culture?”, I could not answer that question. When I started to understand my kūpuna, I started to understand why I am so interested in growing Hawaiian plants, in stewarding property, in reforestation, and taking care of lands. I came to realize, that is my cultural identity. That is how I practice my culture, because that is what our kūpuna did, they mālama, you know, they mālama the land, and secured the resources for the future and that helps me to build my relationship with my ‘ohana that are here today. (Hele Wāwae, RLDHI)

A living, breathing contemporary ‘Ōiwi culture is based on two important aspects, connections to land and people. How these connections are fostered is individual and paramount to why these nā ‘Ōiwi mamo take on the responsibility of becoming guardians for the iwi kūpuna. As Hele Wāwae (RLDHI) so clearly validates, understanding leads to knowledge which guides action. Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo have shared their very personal experiences which have undertones of dreams, visions, spiritual communications, and reflection on the lives of their iwi kūpuna. Consequently, I then, am building intangible connections with the mamo and their ancestors.

Kuleana and Kāhea

The second set of ribbons to be rolled into cordage is the theme of kuleana and kāhea. Each of those words have a specific meaning which requires action by those who advocate for the dead. The following example demonstrates the power of reciprocity. Reciprocity is the underlying nuance which kuleana and kāhea embody as an expected action. Reciprocity is embedded in every action of an ‘Ōiwi mamo when being a guardian for iwi kūpuna. Reciprocity
is never depleting your source as Kahuna Iwi, a RLDH, explains through the importance of a fishing ko’a (fishing spot). In this short excerpt, the cycle of reciprocity is demonstrated and explain as Kahuna Iwi states:

The fisherman cares for his ko’a, he feeds the fish, nourishes the babies, those fish then feed the families. (Kahuna Iwi, RLDH)

**Kuleana**

Kuleana has a variety of meanings, it is irrespective of time and space, and it is in constant demand of attention. As I reflect on the shared mana’o, I am reminded that kuleana comes from genetic memory or through the mo’okū‘auhau from generation to generation. If, ‘āina is portrayed as grandmother, then our iwi kupuna, can be seen as our kaiku‘ana (older sibling), and the mamo (the younger sibling). Each of these entities becomes interdependent and builds a reciprocal relationship with each other. Kahio considers kuleana to be ‘pressure-filled’ because it demands constancy of action. When thinking about kuleana, Kahio was reminded of her uncle and his children always caring for the land. For her uncle and his children, it is inherited, and they continue the family stewardship. They travel from out of state to honor their kuleana commitment. It is a responsibility to be a steward of the land and physically take care of the burial grounds and its adjacent spaces she says:

Kuleana, that’s a hard one; that’s very pressure-filled…if you are born with that kuleana in your family already…they carried that kuleana…they all go down and clean the burial grounds, and pull the weed, fix the rock walls if its broken. (Kahio, RLDHI)

Keaka speaks from experience, caring for iwi kūpuna takes precedence over every other aspect in your life. Sacrifice is required and expected Keaka elucidates its importance as a “high calling”, demanding attention sometimes twenty-four hours a day. It is not to be entered in
lightly. Keaka’s mantra continues to be “It’s all about the iwi kūpuna,” this mantra is the kuleana as illustrated in these words:

Are they willing to carry that kuleana? I’m going to say it’s a high calling, it’s a big kuleana that you gotta take care of…it’s gotta be something that they want to do beside their own careers. (Keaka, RLDH)

Kuleana not only involves physical caretaking the iwi but also advocating to protect them. Kahuna Iwi points out his pathway to protecting the iwi is to become their advocate. The pathway is full of painful roadblocks. Accepting the kuleana is implied in his description as he says:

Because on the trail is full of thorns, glass, sharp things, painful things are on this trail for advocate for iwi. (Kahuna Iwi, RLDH)

Anakala Raymond believes all nā ‘Ōiwi mamo should share in the responsibility of advocating for the iwi kūpuna. Anakala Raymond is stressing the importance of taking care of what is in your back yard. He admonishes all to do something and do not expect others to carry the burden of your family’s ancestral remains. He reiterates his position by stating:

I think kuleana falls to all of us Hawaiians. I think wherever iwi is found, if it’s in our area we need to get involved…not just say that’s somebody else’s kuleana. (Anakala Raymond, RCDH)

Makamae explicitly states her opinion on why it is everyone’s kuleana to give back by protecting the iwi kūpuna using these words:

Our kūpuna have done so much for us to be where we are today. They sacrificed, they got ʻāina, they raised their children…it continues from generation to generation. It’s our kuleana, you know, that we take care of them. (Makamae, RLDHI)
Through the shared manaʻo kuleana means responsibility, burden, and/or action, it comes with the feeling of giving back to those of the past by taking care of the present. It is expected to be a lifelong commitment, perhaps continuing with each succeeding generation.

**Kāhea**

Another action word which exemplifies the contextual framework of reciprocity is kāhea. It impels the listener to answer the call, which changes the direction of the listener’s life. He/She becomes an active participant in protecting cultural heritage Kaleo, RCDH defines kāhea as a feeling and drive inside of you to make some event happen. He states:

> …the call, how it comes, it comes in many forms, hōʻailona, the signs, the feeling, the dreams, when you’re drawn to something very strongly and can’t explain what it is. You have this feeling and drive inside of you and you need to be there and after getting there you realize you’re supposed to be here because of all the things that have come before you and all the things that you have done. (Kaleo, RCDH)

During the kūkākūkā, Kahio and I were discussing the difference between a kuleana and a kāhea. We were trying to decide which of the two words best described the engaged action of advocating for the iwi kūpuna within our purview. She hears a call, receives that call, a feeling which as Kaleo describes as a “drive to act.” Kahio in her response emphasizes the difference between the two words, then recognize kāhea is more applicable to her circumstances by saying:

> …I feel the call more often than I feel the kuleana, so I think there’s a difference between the two because my haole, political science upbringing wants to make it all my business, it’s all my kuleana to do this; but really my Hawaiian side is much more in the hearing it, hearing the call to come and do this. (Kahio, RLDHI)

Anakala Curtiss is sharing another version of hearing and answering a call. Anakala Curtiss was part of a tour of preservation sites at Hōkūliʻa. As the group was walking through a
site, bones were being discovered at every turn. I have heard many stories of descendants who
happened upon ancestral remains and accepted the call to become their protectors. This is
hōʻailona and through the signs, Anakala Curtiss knows the ancestors wanted him to be their
caretaker and responds with these words:

   It was like they were crying to us, they just started popping up, you know,
   baby’s knee cap, part of a skull, a jawbone with teeth…Braddah said, “you
   know they only going to speak to the ones that they know gonna listen”!
   So, he said, “they gonna talk to you.” (Anakala Curtis, RLDH)

Kāhea is also represented as an important aspect to Hawaiian cultural protocols. First,
you ask permission to come into the land. Keaka has taught me to offer an oli to the land as a
makana and to ask permission to enter. An oli introduces who you are and your purpose for the
visit. The caretakers of the land will come out to acknowledge you and your gift of your oli. To
accept your gift, the caretakers oli a welcoming chant in behalf of the iwi kūpuna the ‘āina, and
themselves. Kahuna Iwi states:

   …have to ask permission of all the spirit there, first. Aunty and Uncle see
   my mama them at the bottom of Puʻuohau, (seeking permission to enter),
   but we kāhea because that’s our tradition to kāhea before we come into the
   ‘āina. Mama them kāhea to Aunty them (first oli to Aunty is to ask for
   permission to come into the land). Aunty kāhea to the land (Aunty’s
   protocol then is to oli granting permission for us to enter and
   simultaneously telling the ancestors who has come to
   visit), telling
   everybody that’s my ‘ohana…coming over here to see us. (Kahuna Iwi,
   RLDH)

Kuleana and kāhea are two very similar action words, both are reciprocal in nature and
internalized by the ‘Ōiwi mamo who protect the ancestral remains. These two words are driving
force between conceptualization and actualization of thoughts. Kuleana and kāhea are the
reflections of a deep, impactful, privilege of love.
The Importance of Preservation in Place

The third set of olonā ribbons are the importance of preserving iwi in the landscape. There are two aspects which will be discussed in this section. One, is the importance of preservation in place of the iwi. When this subject was discussed, there was unanimous agreement among the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, that is their iwi kūpuna resting place and should not be disturbed at all costs. Yet, there are occasions when the burial space is compromised and the iwi kūpuna must be relocated to another area. Relocating iwi kūpuna leads to understanding the second aspect of this section, which is the cultural landscape. Familiarizing oneself to the landscape will help determine the next best place to reburry the iwi kūpuna.

Preservation in Place

In the days of old, makaʻāinana (people of the land) designated their burial space. The survivors honored this last request. Sacred ceremonies were performed, and the pitiful tones of wailing and mournful tears accompanied the dead into the next realm. The absolute best preservation and protection of iwi kūpuna is to remain in their sacred burial space.

Keanae, a RLDHI, eloquently reminded me that the iwi had left their footprints on the land through blood and bones. They should remain in their homes with this thought:

Their blood is in the land…they are a physical memory of identity, who we are as a people and where we came from. They’re that tangible element in terms of an intangible culture, they link the two. (Keanae, RLDHI)

Kaiʻu uses the words sense of place and sense of belonging to show the importance of the ancestors preferred burial spot in the ʻāina as she says:

Culturally they’re put where they belong, where they felt home was to them…it’s a sense of place, a sense of belonging. (Kaiʻu RLDHI)

Likewise, Kaleo reiterates the autonomy of the deceased in choosing their burial site because of the connection or relationship with the ʻāina by saying:

They were placed there for a reason, they had a special connection to that ʻāina. (Kaleo, RCDH)

Kahuna Iwi’s manaʻo (thoughts) teaches of the cultural importance of placing iwi kūpuna in the ʻāina. It is a reminder that in life the land feeds and nourishes the ʻŌiwi mamo. In death, the iwi kūpuna nourishes the ʻāina and is a symbiotic relationship, he states:

When you hala (die), your iwi will go back into that ʻāina and…you feed that place…it’s about always being part of the symbiotic relationship with ʻāina. (Kahuna Iwi, RLDH)

Preservation in place is a symbiotic relationship between nā ʻŌiwi mamo and ʻāina. It is the sacred, chosen repositories of the bones of a loved one sent to the next realm in loving ceremonies. It is a tangible presence(bones) of the intangible nature of nā ʻŌiwi mamo culture. It is their home which it gives the living and the dead a sense of belonging and place.

*The Cultural Landscape*

This subtheme relates to what is impacting the burial space of an inadvertent discovery of an iwi kūpuna. There are circumstances when a burial left in place would be disrespectful and cause emotional and mental distress for the iwi kūpuna and their nā ʻŌiwi mamo. Such cases would include modern-day culverts, houses, and roads cutting through the grave. For these reasons, it is important to understand the landscape in which the burial is found. Can the iwi kūpuna be reburied close to his original home? If not, then where would be the next best space?

Nā ʻŌiwi mamo discuss many aspects of the cultural landscape and their effect on the iwi
kūpuna. Herb Kane (1999:210), an nā ʻŌiwi mamo artist, tells of how he spent two days and nights in a heiau before he received his answer on how to paint the heiau. The nā ʻŌiwi mamo walk the impact sites to provide the best advocacy for the iwi kūpuna in those sites as will be evident in their moʻolelo.

Keaka cautions others on the fine line which exists when preserving iwi and their burial spots. Nature is destructive and occasionally robs the dead of their homes:

Preserve in place that, that’s where they belong but you can’t always preserve in place. There is a fine line…like natural elements impacting the site. (Keaka, RLDH)

Anakala Curtiss puts it into perspective by suggesting that right next to a road is not the best resting place for iwi kūpuna. The roadway in question is Kuakini Highway and it reburial space is near Mazda dealership. The entirety of the landscape should provide a quiet place for the iwi kūpuna as he states:

Yes, it’s pololei (correct, right), we left ‘em place, we did but they are suffering every second, with the noise, and the exhaust fumes and everything else. Why, why would we do this…if a decision is made and not by us that this road is going to be built and then they are going to impact the iwi and yes, of course, I want them moved to a quiet place. (Anakala Curtiss, RLDH)

Pōhaku Nui points to the displacement of nā ʻŌiwi mamo from their ancestral lands causes them to believe preservation in place is the best option but sometimes it is not so easy. She says:

Everybody’s been displaced off land and so everybody wants to save our past. Preservation in place is good, when it doesn’t have to be pristine, but it still should be a safe and relaxing place. (Pōhaku Nui, OAH)
Being a protector of iwi kūpuna is looking at the cultural and environmental landscape. The next best place is the one closest to the original burial. An unsafe landscape dictates the prudency in providing a safe secondary burial area which is the next best alternative.

One important feature of protecting and preserving burials is the burial and the land becomes a cultural preservation site. It is saved in perpetuity per the state laws. Essentially, there is a restoration of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo sovereign land. Keaka teaches the importance of saving burials. When an iwi kūpuna is preserved, the land becomes sovereign land, it is protected from development in perpetuity as stated in HRS 13-300. It is protected in perpetuity for the iwi in which it houses she explains it with these words:

Preserving iwi... Already the law says the land around it is going to be protected…they want 100-foot boundary or preservation around the burial or twenty-foot buffer-at least that much of the land around the kūpuna iwi. (Keaka, RLDH)

Preserving burial spaces restore sovereign land which will be protected through time immemorial. As a protector, a flexible, reflexive stance is important for the well-being of the iwi kūpuna and the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo.

Knowledge for Advocacy

The fourth set of olonā ribbons looks how knowledge benefits nā ‘Ōiwi mamo in advocating and protecting the resource of iwi kūpuna. Consider the process to make olonā, it is laborious and time consuming. The plants are cut, stripped, dried, and bleached in the sun. This process was learned by watching others and following some standard procedures. In this manner, the olonā cordage became highly prized commodity for its strength and various uses (Kamehameha Schools 1994; Labiste and Hegerberg 2013; Summer 1990). The investment of labor increases the value of both the act of protecting and preserving the dead and their spaces as
is the investment required to make onā cordage. This is the benefit of knowledge for the nā Ōiwi mamo who are protecting their iwi kūpuna.

**Knowledge is Power**

IST focuses on who constructs knowledge and how it is used to change the power dynamics which exist in preserving the iwi kūpuna. Foucault (1980) is credited for expanding the understanding of the relationship dynamics of knowledge and power. As stated earlier, knowledge and truth which comes from the marginalized creates a shift in power which then benefits the marginalized (Rouse 2005). How the individual acquires, uses, articulates knowledge then becomes vehicle by which to transport said knowledge to others. There are many rules associated with burials. It can quickly become overwhelming and frustrating to be an advocate for burials. This journey to protect them is arduous and full of thorns and obstacles. It requires understanding of the stakeholders as well as the process.

Hele Wāwae is recalling a time when his inexperience in advocating for iwi kūpuna became a learning curve. He did not understand the procedures, the rules, and the process of going to a burial council meeting. He soon learned; that land owners hire experts who manipulate situations to their advantage. Knowledge is power he says in this excerpt:

> It’s so confusing and then they use those rules against you, so if you don’t know the rules, you don’t know what to say. A lot of these consultants that developers hire are experts and they know how to manipulate situations, so I think knowledge is power. (Hele Wāwae, RLDHI)

Kahuna Iwi cautions the first-time descendants, who are unfamiliar with the process to seek for help in this work. It is demanding and frustrating, especially when the doors to success are closed as he states in this paragraph:
…learn from the same book, on how to advocate. Possible ways to advocate, ways to be successful…I’ve seen plenty families come over the years trying to do their kuleana, dropped off after because they weren’t able to do that calling. (Kahuna Iwi, RLDH)

Although Kaiʻu is advocating for help from non-ʻŌiwi, she is doing it from an nā ʻŌiwi mamo standpoint. There are non-ʻŌiwi who have adopted the ʻŌiwi values and are sensitive to their plight. These non-ʻŌiwi have helped the nā ʻŌiwi mamo to learn how to use the laws to best advocate for preservation of iwi kūpuna:

…our voices might not be heard as much…we need to put somebody they are going listen to and sometimes these people who are non-Hawaiians can advocate better for us…they know our ways…not going to give a disrespectful decision. (Kaiʻu, RLDHI)

Nā ʻŌiwi mamo’s first instinct is to trust in the honesty and integrity of all people. Yet, as pointed out, nā ʻŌiwi mamo are overwhelmed in the political arena of preservation. The lack of knowledge in this arena puts them at a disadvantage. Seasoned lineal descendants have learned from their mistakes, so it is imperative to understand how the process of advocating for iwi kūpuna is done.

The Benefits of a Degree

Contemporary nā ʻŌiwi mamo live in two worlds, traditional and modern. These worlds are colliding, and it is up to the nā ʻŌiwi mamo to decide how best to mold these binaries into one cohesive unit which can generate solutions based on the best available modes of knowledge.

Kahio shares how her perspective on the importance of embedding culture in every day dialogue to implant significant cultural memory:

Teaching them their history, where they came from, who lived where, who did what. What your connection is back to that…so when you talk about it
at that means that is important and so your children pick-up on that…if you’re always talking about your kūpuna, your grandparents, your history, then that’s what they find important. (Kahio, RLDHI)

Kaiʻu is an advocate for higher education. She believes a post-secondary degree validates the native authority. Experts consulting one with another is part of her sharing:

…It is important for us to go and get further education, so we can be the ones, we the experts, we consult with one another…if that’s what we have to do, than that’s what we have to do and really that is actually growing a community of native authority. (Kaiʻu, RLDHI)

Kaiʻu and Kahio demonstrate the need for education. Cultural and academic education validates our knowledge to both communities Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians. Authority is assumed through knowledge gained and used while advocating for the protection of iwi kūpuna and their sacred spaces. Combing traditional knowledge with modern academic scholarship is important in the mitigation of contemporary issues like burials. Chinn (2011:229) echoes this sentiment with one of her own regarding ecological sustainability by stating: “In fact, Indigenous Hawaiian knowledge and values and community-based interest in sustainability support science education that integrates Indigenous ethics, environmental inquiry, and action to protect and restore social-ecosystems”. Hui Mālama is one example of integrating traditional knowledge with contemporary law to repatriate our heritage and bring the bones and artifacts home.

Teaching the Next Generation

The continuity of culture is dependent on teaching the next generation to take over the responsibility of protecting and preserving iwi. Modern-day practitioners are assuming the
mantle of kahuna, incorporating traditional cultural practices with contemporary cultural practices for the continuity of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo culture. Through the sharing of mana’o, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are training, teaching, and preparing the youth to participate in the process of advocating for iwi kūpuna.

Māhea outlines the process involved in teaching the youth about the kuleana of being a protector of the iwi. One of the steps is looking for lineal family members to continue the work started from their family. This process is culturally intense with ceremonies and protocols:

…It’s a process. We work with select lineal family members and they’re in our training. Myself and several kūpuna are training them so they can go and carry on that kuleana…an example. We fly them Mauna Ala for a sense of their kuleana, what it entails, then we will teach them certain chants…based on reactions and poise, we’ll make recommendations to go to the next step and each step along the way. Show them how to wrap, how to look at a place, and how, maybe how to set the bone, how to kanu and that’s the process. (Māhea, RLDH)

Anakala Raymond wants the youth to become familiar with the articulation and sight of bones. He recommends starting with plastic casts, create understanding, and lessen fear of the bones:

…the first thing to do is have a set of iwis (plastic cast) to look at. Lay it out and let them look at it, let them feel it. Their first reaction will be “Eeee”, probably run away. We need to get the young people involved in seeing iwi and getting involved in recovery of iwi. (Anakala Raymond, RCDH)

Part of the education includes understanding the importance of the cultural landscape. As previously mentioned, it is more than just a single burial. Sometimes the burial exists within a larger landscape of connected sites. It is important to become familiar with both a pre-contact site and post-contact site in determining how the burial fits in the context. In this way, instead of just a burial, a site can be preserved. The way in which the mamo connect with a cultural landscape is familiar to their sense of identity but it is much more than a connection. It is being
able to see the archaeological record in the land. It is learning to understand why a kupuna wished to be within a certain land area. These lessons only come to those who are on the land and see the signs of industry and live.

Pa’ā Pōhaku, an ‘Ōiwi archaeologist points out that for some descendants the only way to save a prehistoric site, such as heiau, house platforms, or agricultural fields is to find burials on the landscape. Yet, she posits sometimes in saving the prehistoric features you can also save the undiscovered burials in the site. She urges descendants to be open minded with these words:

I’ve seen a lot of individuals bypass arch sites and then go straight to burials… and they think that’s the only important cultural site out there and it’s the only card that you have in saving the place is the burial and that’s not true. You can have um other beautiful sites out there that are just as important that we could use in preserving places. (Pa’ā Pōhaku, OAH)

Māhea is considering the embedded cultural memory associated with a landscape. He sees all around him some of the same features which existed anciently, namely the clouds and the forest. Māhea knows he is walking the same paths, in different times:

…its inseparable because you get kūpuna all over the place…bigger picture is the same forest, with the same ‘ao(clouds)…the same lava that my tūtū them walked. Now I come along, and I walk the very same place, different time…I’m always mindful of that…it’s also alive. (Māhea, RLDH)

Pōhaku Nui’s views the cultural landscape through an ‘Ōiwi mamo lens as interconnected and whole. Integrity of place should be preserved per his words:

cultural landscape is basically the landscape itself, but especially the way Hawaiians look at it; everything is connected…. not sectioned off…everything is connected…and should be preserved to keep the integrity of the place. (Pōhaku Nui, OAH)
Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo want to change the dialogue in the negotiations of preserving cultural heritage on large developments and with large land owners. This change requires cooperation and understanding from those who are commodifying the land for huge capital gains. This capitalistic idealism is very foreign to the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Changing attitudes takes consistent effort and it begins with the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo being engaged in the decision-making process of protecting cultural heritage.

Anakala Curtiss is adamant in declaring the correct way in which to view burials and cultural sites within a development. No more discussion, do the right thing and thank Akua (god) for the blessing of having burials on the property you steward. These iwi kūpuna were buried there, they are regenerating the land with mana of their bones and thus making the land more valuable as he states:

…we not going down this road, we’re going to do this, that’s it, period, lawa(enough) it’s over. This iwi is going to be pili pa‘a (remain, connected to the land) in this site right here, because that is where they were put. It’s their ‘āina. Oh, and by the way, please give you’re thanks to akua for this blessing that has been left on your property, “your ‘āina”, you don’t own it you just have kuleana over it. (Anakala Curtiss, RLDH)

In summary, there were very strong opinions on the importance of education. Unfamiliarity with state laws and procedures can increase the stress of being an advocate for the iwi kūpuna. Navigating these waters can be treacherous and often a guiding hand is needed. Kai‘u and Kahio point out the benefits of cultural and academic education to validate knowledge and become an expert within the community. Preserving a cultural landscape is understanding the holistic relationship between the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and ‘āina, with or without the burials. Lastly, teach outsiders nā ‘Ōiwi mamo way of thinking so they can traverse this same trail.

Self-Determination and Decision Making
This journey has focused on changing the lens of how nā ‘Ōiwi mamo advocate, preserve, protect, and manage their cultural heritage of iwi kūpuna. The final set of olonā ribbons represent the changing lens. These fibers look at how the bones tell their stories; the respectful treatment of the iwi kūpuna; and conditional acceptance of managing the cultural heritage of iwi.

*How the Bones Tell Their Moʻolelo*

To be haʻi moʻolelo you must be invited to the table. The tools of negotiation and cooperation have changed the dialogue. The first step in changing the lens is changing the tools in the tool box. Creating harmonious discussions which lead to better understanding of what can be learned from the stories of the bones. Kaleo extols the modern tools which nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are coming to the discussion table with in the following excerpt:

> Going from pounding tables to now sitting across the table discussing what needs to be done. Our tools today are our leo, our voices, our ʻike, our visions and knowledge of what we learn. (Kaleo, RCDH)

The quotes were taken from the discussion on the benefits of doing non-destructive skeletal examinations. This directly relates to the educational discussion module on the story bones can tell us. The consensus was the decision should rest with the lineal family members. Just as a parent decides for a child, so do nā ‘Ōiwi mamo for their iwi kūpuna, who cannot speak for themselves. Kaiʻu wants to make sure it is a family member making those decisions as she states:

> a direct lineal descendant should be a part of the decision making. (Kaiʻu, RLDHI)

Kaleo gently reminds one of the order of protocol which has been established by the State of Hawaiʻi for the protection of the iwi; descendants are at the frontlines:
It’s the descendants who always take the lead. The State is there to ensure that their laws, both state and federal are followed, or enforced, they are the enforcement. (Kaleo, RCDH)

Hele Wāwae is urging nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to be the driving force of advocacy, to become the pace setter and not the follower:

I think descendants must put themselves more forward for their kūpuna, they can’t always rely on the State, SHPD to do everything. (Hele Wāwae, RLDHI)

Reviewing the passages in this section leads to one conclusion; self-determination empowers nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Consulting with nā ‘Ōiwi mamo is expected behavior. The advocates are the voices of the iwi kūpuna and expect cooperation and negotiation. The lens is changing with technology and distancing nā ‘Ōiwi mamo from the disrespectful behavior and treatment on inadvertent discoveries of iwi kūpuna.

Let the Bones Tell Their Moʻolelo

All the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo believe their iwi kūpuna have stories to share. Osteobiographies can add to the moʻolelo of the iwi kūpuna. It has the possibility of strengthening the relationship between mamo and kūpuna. Osteobiographies of the skeletal remains could be shared and the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo would be able to pass these moʻolelo to the future generations of the ʻohana

Paʻa ‘Āina, is an ‘Ōiwi archaeologist is familiar with issues surrounding the discovery of iwi kūpuna on a work site. She is very specific on her protocol of action, which is look, learn, and return the iwi kūpuna to its original state of burial if it will be preserved in place with these words:
I don’t think that iwi should be unnecessarily subjected to examination. If you’re gonna preserve in place, then look at it. But it’s not important to me to excavate a burial that will be preserved in place. (Pa‘a ʻĀina OAHI)

Again, a similar theme presents itself through this quote by Keanae, “Descendants have the right to choose to learn from their ancestors.” The protocol remains to do no harm to the iwi kūpuna. These are the words Keanae has also chosen:

I think it’s a good idea if there is a way to do a non-destructive analysis on iwi that are in the process of being dis-interred or removed to be placed elsewhere, I think that people should have the right to be able to do this kind of analysis and learn from their own people. I don’t think, on the contrary, that outside agents should have the same right. I think if a people want to learn about their own people, I think that sounds pretty fair. (Keanae, RLDHI)

Mālama ʻĀina uses the protocol of explaining to the iwi kūpuna the value of learning their osteobiography. He engages with the iwi kūpuna in asserting their value to modern nā ʻŌiwi mamo through learning the story contained within the iwi kūpuna with these words:

We’re giving them that sense of “hey, you’re not here anymore but your bones are still telling a story for the future.” We must take care of them no matter what…Because the more we can find out, the more we’ll feel inside ourselves like, oh, we just found out something we didn’t know about our people just by looking at the bones. I guess that gives a resurgent of pride inside of us again. (Mālama ʻĀina, OAHI)

Anakala Raymond shared his story of looking at the bones of ka poʻe kahiko. The size and breadth of the thigh bone made Anakala Raymond want to know more about the story of the bones:

…the first time I saw a thigh bone and I looked at the size of it and I tried to imagine how big that person must have been? How tall was he/she? Was it a male, was it a female? Just the thickness of it. The archaeologist who was there estimated the height to be about 8 feet. I said, “What?”
…By the thigh bone and the rest of the bones they had recovered, we estimate his height to be about 8 feet, this was an old Hawaiian burial site. (Anakala Raymond, RCDH)

Pōhaku Nui shares the value of examining the discovered skeletal material especially if it is the bones are going to be disinterred. He explains what can be learned through looking at a mass burial of warriors in this passage:

I’m not against examination of remains especially if they’re being disinterred, because there is so much to learn, so much to learn…Waikiki…a mass grave, it looked like warriors who had fallen. They still had all those death wounds still on them, like broken arms…shattered heads. (Pōhaku Nui, OAH)

Kila surmises if an educated guess can be determined through non-destructive analysis, every opportunity to learn the story of some discovered warriors can only lead to a better understanding of past societal behaviors. He states this way:

So, if we can make better educated guesses without being invasive and keeping that to a limit. I think it will help us move forward in getting better information and better data…So we don’t have to be digging all over here and disturb anything, it’s lawā, enough already. (Kila, RLDHI)

Honaunau has the final say with these words:

But to me, as a Hawaiian, I rather be the one looking at my own people. (Honaunau, RLDHI)

To summarize the content of the bones telling a mo’olelo, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are acknowledging there is a mo’olelo contained within the bones. There is a mo’olelo of the life of the individual within the bones, and a part of that mo’olelo can be gleaned through non-destructive analysis, through the method of osteobiography. Relocating the bones makes the
reality of cursory examinations more palatable, because the remains have to be removed and relocated. A small window exists where non-destructive skeletal analysis can be done without undue duress on the iwi.

The Respectful Treatment of Iwi Kūpuna

The following examples represent the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who are protecting the dignity of the iwi kūpuna. The past disrespectful behaviors of curious Westerners make nā ‘Ōiwi mamo cautious about the motives of learning the stories through the bones of their ancestors.

Kaiʻu is adamant that the iwi kūpuna not become a science project in a lab in this short sentence:

I wouldn’t want them to keep them as a scientific project and in a lab.
(Kaiʻu, RLDHI)

Kaleo wants the iwi kūpuna to receive the same love and care as if they were alive and in a doctor’s office with no unnecessary poking and prodding which could hurt the iwi kūpuna. His sentiments are shared in the following quotation:

to poke and prod them would be the same as to poke and prod them if they were alive today and that’s what I don’t agree to. (Kaleo, RCDH)

Māhea is explaining the cultural protocol of the reasons for wanting to look. The reason must be more than just curiosity. As he demonstrates his knowledge of looking for the possible stresses and traumas of the iwi kūpuna within this passage he states:

But to me, as a Hawaiian, I rather be the one looking at my own people.
(Māhea, RLDH)

Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are sensitive to the mistreatment and mismanagement of their ancestral remains. Very specifically, Kaiʻu does not want the iwi kūpuna to be disrespected. Again, there
is the implied cultural tradition, bones have mana, to disrespect them in death is akin to
disrespecting them in life. Māhea puts forth a caution to think about why there is a need to
examine the remains? I believe there is an interest in learning the osteobiographies in the iwi
kūpuna. This thesis is opening the door to discussing how non-destructive skeletal analysis can
inform the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo society about the lifeways of their iwi kūpuna.

**Conditional Acceptance**

The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo want to be involved in the decision-making process. When looking
at the feasibility of performing non-destructive skeletal analysis, it needs to be done in a
respectful, culturally integrated fashion. In the next passage, Pōhaku Nui wants examinations to
be performed in the field for expediency and he states:

I think anything that can be done at the field, should be done as they are
taking them out of the ground and then they go back into the ground.
(Pōhaku Nui, OAH)

Likewise, Māhea know advancing technology has become portable wants the lab to come to the
site. This is the preferred method reading through his quote with these words:

The advancing technology is kinda bringing the lab on site instead of
taking them away and to me that would be my choice. (Māhea, RLDH)

Kila prefers examinations be done on site for expediency and to learn about the osteobiographies
of the iwi kūpuna is during the process of removal and reburial. He explains in his words:

…in the process of being moved or something. I would say I would be OK
with it…in the process of being moved to make observation…learn what
can. (Kila, RLDHI)
As seen in the previous section nā ʻŌiwi mamo had certain caveats attached to the non-destructive examinations of the iwi kūpuna. In this section, the caveats are further explained through the manaʻo of the nā ʻŌiwi mamo. In the next passage, Kahuna Iwi is vehement in declaring a non-ʻŌiwi should never be in possession of the iwi kūpuna in these words:

…they should never be touching our iwi, they should never hold our iwi in their possession in any circumstances. (Māhea, RLDH)

Keanae, like Māhea, believes nā ʻŌiwi mamo should be the interpreter of the stories as illustrated here:

…I don’t think outside agents should have that same right. So basically, I believe a Hawaiian can do these kinds of non-destructive analysis. (Keanae, RLDHI)

Mālama ʻĀina adds to the discussion by posing the question of ‘Who would you rather have on the front lines?’ He points to education being the key for becoming the interpreter of the story in the bones. He eloquently provides reason to become an osteologist, which is to interpret the story with cultural accuracy saying it in this manner:

As Hawaiians, I would personally say I would rather us do em than people outside coming in and doing em. Who would you rather have on the front lines? Us as a people trying to educate ourselves, learning more about our history through our ancestor’s bones. Or would you rather have an outsider coming in and doing it and us never finding out anything. Let us use our own judgement on this. Let us have it pertain to ourselves and our ancestry. (Mālama ʻĀina, OAHI)

Nā ʻŌiwi mamo who were interviewed believe they are best equipped to interpret the stories of the iwi kūpuna. Education is the key and learning osteology, bioarchaeology, and pathology enables nā ʻŌiwi mamo to use culture and science in a respectful, reciprocal manner.
Education in the sciences will create job opportunities which combine cultural and academic knowledge and ultimately benefitting nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community at large.

I learned nā ‘Ōiwi mamo were not opposed to skeletal examinations if the lineal descendants could make that decision. We also discussed the opportunities for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to become physical anthropologist, or at least well-versed in osteology, so the mamo could be the ones to do the skeletal examinations. It was a collaborative effort in discussing cultural protocols and benefits of osteobiographies for the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo community.

*Dispossession from Land*

This is the heart-rending truth for those whose sole purpose is to restore what has been taken, which is land. Dispossession from land is one of the main reasons for having to fight so hard to keep iwi kūpuna from being extracted from their home. Connection to land is what grounds nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to home; a feeling of belonging. It is a reminder saving iwi kūpuna saves land. The iwi kūpuna should be the driving force in all decisions.

Anakala Raymond makes it clear the iwi is the priority:

> The first priority should be the iwi, it’s all about the iwi. (Anakala Raymond, RCDH)

Keaka points out there can be dissension among the descendant families which causes delays in the reburial process. She urges all nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to remember iwi kūpuna must come first. It is not about the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, it is about the iwi kūpuna she says:

> …I think it comes down to all the descendants coming together and making that decision, not about them, but about kūpuna iwi, it’s not about us. When it comes down to it, it’s not about us, yah! (Keaka, RLDH)
Paʻa Pōhaku shows through her experience the cohesive thoughts and energies of the descendants accomplish much good. She points out communication is key and remembering iwi kūpuna are the priority as she states:

I’ve seen in cases where the descendants have come together, and they’ve worked… and it wasn’t about who has the most say in this and that, it was all in the interest of the iwi kūpuna and um they were able to decide quickly because they communicated well, and you know so it made the process go a lot quicker. (Paʻa Pōhaku, OAH)

The ultimate goal is to work together with a single initiative, iwi kūpuna. This is a reciprocal act as we have seen through the varied responses of kūkākukā. These haʻi moʻolelo have shared their voices…which tend to converge on a like-minded goal. Sometimes descendants need to be reminded of their kuleana to the iwi kūpuna in their protection and all that entails. Hele Wāwae is clear and concise in how to advocate in these words:

You should have your morals straight and realize that I’m here to talk for those who can’t speak for themselves. It’s not about me. …they were here hundreds or thousands of years before us. (Hele Wāwae, RLDH)

This moʻolelo, in the late 1990s, captures the experience of Kahuna Iwi, RLDH who is trying to protect an iwi kūpuna. It is a story of a thirteen-year-old girl, who died in the pre-contact era. Her skull was being used as a plaything, on one of the local beaches in the Kona area. A report was made to SHPD and the burials specialist, about a bunch of tourist playing with a skull. These tourists were using the skull as a soccer ball during the day, kicking it around in the sand and at night, lit candles on her head to practice voodoo. A lineal descendant was asked to be the advocate and protector of this young girls’ skull. The following is his story of trying to reinter the skull. It was good intentions by one descendant but dissension among the others.
The State said, “brah, you wanna come pick this skull up and try to get em back where belong so no need to spend ten years in the process.” I said, “yes, I am coming right now.” I know the people of that area, we can do this, this our ‘ohana (speaking of the iwi)

I went down there and the family closest to the iwi live right there, get one ana (cave) in the back of their house, untouched that the iwi could go in with another iwi, very safe place. But they no like, the wife’s Christian, won’t accept that iwi in there (cave) and anywhere in their possession or near them or anything! This is a little girl’s skull, she’s 13 years old. I have this kuleana; I personally worry about em. So, I kept the iwi here (his house), looking for a place to rebury her.

I went to meet with the descendants of the National Park, cause I wanna go put em in the cave like we did…then own family blocks me (of the National Park). The descendants decided, she not from here, we no wanna put em in there (cave) I was like, “Wow, I gotta deal with this some more.” It was really disappointing to me cause all these years I was doing this and now they come out of the woodwork only to block. Block letting this thirteen-year old have a dry cave to rest in, was just hurting me.

I went to the meetings and I got shut down for two years. Finally, I called a meeting. Cause eventually if you listen they (iwi kūpuna) tell you what to do…Oh, I got it! I call the meeting and this time I take her skull with me. I put her on the podium; I stand up there with her and look at all the families…. I say, “ok ‘ohana I brought the iwi kūpuna today. I want you to
say your name, your Hawaiian name, and I want you to tell her that you not going to accept her to rest in that cave.”

“Later on, how you know when we go to the other side, that her ʻohana, no own all the good places over there. You going to need one place and you wish that you did differently here, now. So, I am giving you the opportunity, not for tell me no, I am giving you the opportunity for tell this your very self, tell her your name. So, they know who you are that is telling them no. Nobody can talk. Finally, after two years they when shut up and just let me do it. (Kahuna Iwi, RLDH)

It is not a perfect process, but descendants can perfect the process as they work to perpetuate cultural continuity. Contact with a Western power has changed the cultural dynamics, rituals, and traditions of ka poʻe kahiko. Yet, within these results, there is change and progress and most importantly empowerment in adapting Western concepts of negotiation, self-determination, sovereignty, and cultural resurgence. These are added to the cultural toolbox of nā ʻŌiwi mamo in how they become advocates of the iwi kūpuna. As each iwi kūpuna is preserved there is healing between descendant, ancestors and the ʻāina. These discussions were based on solutions to a contemporary, western political economy driven problem.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The motivation for this thesis came after years of being peripherally involved with the Hawai‘i Island Burial Council (HIBC). I watched, listened, and participated with those who were actively involved in advocating for and protecting their iwi kūpuna. The recent past mistreatment of the iwi kūpuna has made the nā ʻŌiwi mamo fierce guardians intent on protecting their iwi kūpuna and their associated spaces, artifacts, and lifeways, therefore, nā ʻŌiwi mamo have maintained a strong sense of kuleana, with familial responsibility, for their iwi kūpuna including a kapu, or restriction, against any skeletal analysis. Culturally, the nā ʻŌiwi mamo believe their beloved kūpuna reside in a spiritual realm with the ability to communicate, therefore, nā ʻŌiwi mamo are culturally sensitive to ancient traditional practices, the spiritual guidance from their kūpuna, and in protecting these resources for the benefit of the next generation. I believe skeletal analyses have the potential to add another story of the iwi kūpuna.

Historically, the ancestral remains of chiefs and commoners have been taken from these Hawaiian Islands, placed in glass boxes, and displayed in museums and private collections throughout the world as remnants of an extinct culture (Lippert 2006). Punahaele Lerma reminds the nā ʻŌiwi mamo of the effect of colonization with her quote, “If there is anything Native Hawaiians will come to know its eviction. They evict us when we’re alive, they evict us when we’re dead. We are never safe. Our responsibility is to protect our sense of place” (Ayau 1996:1). Punahaele’s poignant feelings are an extension of those shared by Maria Pearson in 1971 Iowa. Maria Pearson, who championed her ancestral remains in Iowa, stated, “give me back my people’s bones…and quit digging them up.” (Pearson 2000:131). Colonialism in all its forms has stolen the identity of many Indigenous communities through the misappropriation of their lands, their traditions, and most especially their iwi kūpuna. Kakaliourus (2015) calls this tug-of-war; a
contested space, a space in which the various stakeholders (the archaeologists, the State, the land
developers, and nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are vying for control of the ‘āina. Each stakeholder has a unique
culture and their goals represent their values. This tug-of-war reached its zenith in the 1970s, at
which time nā ‘Ōiwi mamo joined the global movement to regain ownership of their culture.
This renaissance was the beginning of becoming proactive in the fight to regain power and
control over the interpretation and the revitalization of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo culture. I am struck by
the weight of the responsibility which rests with the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to protect and
save their iwi kūpuna as a cultural resource. Edward Halealoha Ayau, one of the grass roots
activists of Honokahua, also served as a lawyer working for then Hawai‘i Senator Daniel Inouye.
Ayau was instrumental in adding the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo into the Federal and State laws. These laws
acknowledge the rights of all living indigenous communities to speak and act in behalf of their
iwi kūpuna for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo provides social justice, the freedom of self-determination, and
recognizes the importance of an ancient culture which continues to flourish in modernity. Yet,
development continues to threaten the iwi kūpuna and their burial space. The commodification of
the land has displaced both the dead and the living, therefore, it behooves the Indigenous mamo,
globally, to preserve their iwi kūpuna in place to the extent possible. For it is the symbiotic
relationship between ‘āina and nā ‘Ōiwi mamo which has produced and enhanced the
contemporary use of traditional and adapted cultural practices. The keen observation skills, as
well as everyday living and working on the ‘āina has provided the foundation of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo
culture. The basis of which is expressed through the language, the food, and the architecture of
the ancient ones which we seek to emulate in modernity. The kuleana to protect and preserve the
iwi kūpuna in their burial spaces, on their ancestral lands, and their cultural identity continues
with each succeeding generation of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Consequently, sharing of our moʻokūʻauhau
during the kūkākūkā was an unspoken necessity to cultural identity and building relationships with each other. Moʻokūʻauhau links us to a shared history. Hele Wāwae shared that his connection to his kūpuna becomes stronger as he imitates their lifeways. He says, “that is how I practice my culture, by doing what they did”. Along the same lines, Māhea, RLDH is reminded that when he is walking on ancient landscape, he is seeing the same clouds, the same mountains, breathing the same air, and working the same ‘āina as his kūpuna. That connection with the ‘āina strengthens his connection to his kūpuna and impels him to protect both resources. I am also reminded of the of the intimate relationship between iwi kūpuna and ‘āina. As ʻŌiwi kānaka are fed and nourished by the land in mortality; in death, their iwi nourishes and feed the ‘āina, therefore, a remnant of our kūpuna remains in the modern landscape which surrounds the nā ʻŌiwi mamo.

Their blood is in the land…they are a physical memory of identity, who we are as a people and where we came from. They’re that tangible element in terms of an intangible culture, they link the two. (Keanae, RLDHI)

Iwi kūpuna are more than just bones, they are the footprint of the ka poʻe kahiko landscape. The tangible links are the contemporary archaeological record of their lives: the agricultural fields; the temples; the tools; and the house platforms.

This symbiotic relationship between ‘āina and iwi kūpuna is a cultural tradition shared by the Koori of Australia and the Mapungubwe of South Africa. The contemporary Koori are tasked with reburying their ancestral remains being returned from various public and private collections. The Koori descendants felt it was important that they be reburied within the ancestral landscape because they believe the spirits are restless without their bones, the land does not produce food because the bones are not in the land, and it is their cultural tradition. The Mapungubwe
descendants were using skeletal analysis to establish their claims to ancestral lands for they believe the land is the heart of the cultural lives. With the help of physical anthropologists, the Mapungubwe were able to prove their existence on the land by re-identifying skeletal remains as their ancestors and not White Europeans, as previously identified.

The shifting power relationships is one of the positive outcomes of the global cultural renaissance movement of the 1970s. This movement propelled the Indigenous communities to regain their self-determination to remain culturally relevant. Not only relevant, but a powerhouse to change who has control to interpret and preserve their cultural heritage. Hawai‘i Island Burial Council meetings provide a platform for lineal and cultural descendants to speak in behalf of their kindred dead. At the core of the HIBC is how to preserve the iwi kūpuna. The land owners and developers have had the advantage of employing local archaeological firms to represent their interests, while nā ‘Ōiwi mamo have often been ill-equipped to challenge the knowledge and voices of the archaeologists and their clients. Yet, time and experience are leveling the playing field for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, by increasing the power of their voices and utilizing their knowledge of the laws, cultural traditions, and the landscape to negotiate with land-owning developers. Also, these tools benefit the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo at HIBC meetings.

As the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo become familiarized with the process within SHPD, the creativity in which they work within the laws allows them to see the bigger picture. Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are educating themselves by asking for site visits and by determining how the ancient footprints can be incorporated into the modern landscape. For example, in the lands of Hōkūli‘a, the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo working with the land developers incorporated sections of the ancient Alahele trail into the golf course. The preserved trail was thus a compromise which benefitted both sides and for me was a poignant symbol of how a shift in power to nā ‘Ōiwi mamo helped to protect, in situ, a
significant footprint of cultural heritage. As Kai‘u, RLDHI reiterates with her words, “…It is important for us to…be the ones, we the experts, we consult with one another… and really that is actually growing a community of native authority.” Consequently, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo are challenging the old norms through active participation at HIBC meetings thereby, shifting the power relationships.

Similarly, the Māori of New Zealand are challenging the old paradigms of who controls the interpretive knowledge of skeletal analysis. Some Māori tribal communities do allow skeletal analyses of their ancestral dead but retain editorial control of the published results. One controversial scientific discovery alluded that a common gene, labeled as the warrior gene, was the cause of Māori aggressiveness. Consequently, being Māori was interpreted as a genetic disease which offended the Māori community, therefore, editorial control ensures the protection of their cultural identity and heritage.

Since the advent of colonization, the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo have been increasingly displaced from ancestral lands. Additionally, commodification of the ‘āina has increased its value to the Westerners, thus, changing the cultural landscape to fit the Western ideal of success and wealth. Development is the main reason for the contemporary burial issue of disinterment and reburials of iwi kūpuna. Consequently, traditional burial practices have been modernized and incorporated for the purposes of disinterment and reinterment. One thing is certain, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo strongly advocate for preservation in place of iwi kūpuna. Cultural tradition presupposes iwi kupuna directed their family on where to be buried; to remain in situ in perpetuity. Although there were instances in the past when iwi kūpuna were disinterred, it was a rarity, therefore, the actual protocols and practices are not widely known or currently used by the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. It is safe to surmise that disinterment protocols are adaptations of known mortuary traditions. Discoveries
made on private or public lands, an active development site, or on the shoreline due to impact through natural erosion may each be treated differently. Yet, one thing is certain the protocols are adapted to ensure the iwi kūpuna are returned to the ʻāina.

One familial burial tradition is to keep the body of the deceased in their home until their burial. The interval was a time for family and friends to honor the life of the deceased. An adaptation to this familial practice is the excavation of iwi kūpuna and the subsequent temporary housing in the home of nā ʻŌiwi mamo. Each family has its own burial tradition which is safeguarded and passed down into each succeeding generation. So, therefore, variations are expected. It has become a new practice to have a lineal mamo present when the iwi kūpuna is being removed from their burial space. Nā ʻŌiwi mamo can decide to have the iwi kūpuna housed in their home until reburial. It is a sacred responsibility. Here, iwi kūpuna is with family, who are preparing iwi kūpuna for their new burial space. It provides a safe, interim space and retains an aspect of tradition in caring for the dead. Finding a new home for a displaced iwi kūpuna is of utmost importance to the nā ʻŌiwi mamo. It is not an easy task and sometimes it requires creativity. Yet, I believe all reburials have a singular focus - ensuring the iwi kūpuna is returned to the ʻāina. Reburial spaces are only limited by availability of space in each location. I have witnessed reburials in small and large caves, in a burial space belonging to relatives, and even within a central location of a development site. The point being it was decided by nā ʻŌiwi mamo and in each reburial, there were new, adapted, and traditional burial practices performed.

Each Indigenous descendant community chooses the best disposition for the iwi kūpuna. There are two examples of adapted burial spaces which accommodated both the nā ʻŌiwi mamo and physical anthropologist communities; the Aboriginal Australians of the Lake Mungo region and the Chumash of the California (Cantwell 2000; Thomas 2000). Lady Mungo, a 20,000-year
old Aboriginal Australian was placed in extraordinary vault requiring two keys (Cantwell 2000). One key for the Aboriginal Australian descendants and one key for the physical anthropologist who, with permission and a key can continue to learn from Lady Mungo. The Chumash have decided to create an ossuary as a reburial sepulcher for their ancestral remains. The physical anthropologists have the opportunity, with permission from the Chumash, to examine the skeletal remains. Although these adapted reburial traditions vary greatly from nā Ōiwi mamo point of view, it is culturally relevant for the Aboriginal Australians of the Lake Mungo region and the California Chumash.

A living, breathing, culturally advancing nā Ōiwi mamo are determining how best to mitigate the contemporary burial issues, according to the knowledge of the past. Living a contemporary lifestyle also allows nā Ōiwi mamo to adopt new traditions if they are of value to the perpetuation and advancement of their culture. Peering into the future, I believe osteobiographies have the potential to increase our knowledge of the ancient lifestyles of the kupuna. This is an opportunity to learn another story from the kūpuna through their iwi and it would be even more poignant and relevant if nā Ōiwi mamo were the osteologist performing the skeletal examinations.

In the last few years, nā Ōiwi mamo communities have been adopting wahi pana, the storied places of their iwi kūpuna, with the goal to preserve the cultural heritage contained on the landscape. In recognizing the dynamic relationship between power and knowledge, the nā Ōiwi mamo are forming working, collaborative partnerships with archaeologists. This mutually beneficial relationship has one goal: to interpret the moʻolelo found in the archaeological features in the landscape. These partnerships are providing opportunities for communities to be
actively involved in the recovery, the protection, and the interpretation of the cultural resources in the wahi pana which include ancient burial sites

Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson (2006) have built successful working relationships with the Hopi Indians. Colwell-Chanthaphonh and Ferguson are conscious of the Hopi belief in their ancestors purposefully leaving behind remnants of their existence for their descendants to find. In this way, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo can honor their ancestors’ existence and perpetuate their cultural significance in the land. Bearing this in mind, it can be considered purposeful intention by the iwi kūpuna to be found by their nā ‘Ōiwi mamo. Anakala Curtis remembers walking through Hōkūli‘a on a site visit and the iwi kūpuna was showing him were his/her bones were located. He said, “the bones were popping out of the ground speaking to him” --in other words, “purposeful intention,” so that the iwi kūpuna would be found and protected. I have experienced purposeful intention throughout the last two years of thesis research. One example is based on the five to six seemingly random, chance encounters with nā ‘Ōiwi mamo at HIBC meetings, UHH field school, and at Mauna Kea State Park. All of whom were SHPD recognized descendants from Hōkūli‘a and other ahupua‘a on Hawai‘i Island. They were part of the working, collaborative partnerships I formed while working on my thesis.

Working partnerships have been beneficial for many Indigenous communities. The Western Mohegan tribe worked collaboratively with physical anthropologists to establish genetic links with other Mohegans for the purpose of obtaining State and Federal recognition. Establishing State and Federal recognition will help Western Mohegans to re-establish claims to ancestral lands. Likewise, the Mapungubwe established working partnerships with physical anthropologists to help them to reclaim ancestral lands through re-identifying ancestral remains
from White Europeans to Mapungubwe ancestors. Land establishes a link to the past, it proves existence and cultural value.

Oral histories are the moʻolelo of the past which help to guide, direct, and inspire the contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo in traditional cultural practices. These moʻolelo are a direct link to our ancestral lifeways. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo believe they are competent to perform skeletal examinations. It is expected that nā ‘Ōiwi mamo conduct the analysis in a manner consistent with cultural sensitivities and protocols. Osteobiographies provide another link to the lives of the kupuna as illustrated by Mālama ‘Āina, who states, “We’re giving them that sense of hey, you’re not here anymore but your bones are still telling a story for the future.” further points out this knowledge comes directly from the iwi kūpuna and provides two advantages: a resurgence of cultural pride and osteological experience. Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo felt skeletal analyses is permissible in the interim between disinterment and reinterment. During that period, the preferred place to do analysis is in the field at their burial space, rather than in a laboratory facility. The iwi kūpuna should not be treated as a science project, and absolutely no photographs of the iwi should be taken. Each of these preferences, when exercised, can generate osteobiographies. In contrast, the Southern Utes gave the physical anthropologists permission to take “high quality photographs, x-rays, and plaster casts” of an 8,000-year old ancestor to continue their research after his reburial (Guilliford 1996:133). Likewise, the Hopi gave permission for photographs and dental casts of ancestral remains to be studied after their reburial. The Hopi learned how they died, as well as the age, and the sex of their ancestors. Although, the skeletal analyses were done by non-Indigenous peoples, the information was shared, and both were edified by the knowledge. Also, this new skill provides the means whereby, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo can be the experts who perform skeletal examinations on their iwi kūpuna, thereby, becoming the power brokers of
osteobiographies as cultural knowledge. This allows nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to retain their ownership of
the intellectual property rights of the osteobiographies of iwi kūpuna as a cultural heritage
resource.

Indigenous Standpoint Theory (IST) focuses on who constructs knowledge and how that
knowledge is used to change the power dynamics which exist in preserving iwi kūpuna,
therefore, the relationship dynamics of knowledge and power in this struggle to create and
interpret the osteobiographies of the iwi kūpuna. Osteology can become a valuable tool for
interpreting ancient lifeways of the ‘Ōiwi. Basic osteology skills allow me to correctly age and
sex an individual, recognize changes, and identify those changes in the iwi. I can become a story
teller of the iwi kūpuna. It strengthens my cultural bonds to the ‘āina and its people. It is
becoming part of my kuleana to share the osteobiographies of my kūpuna.

Consequently, nā ‘Ōiwi mamo can utilize the previously recorded skeletal examinations
of the iwi kūpuna to produce culturally relevant osteobiographies which can further inform the
nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of the ancient lifeways. Take for example June Cleghorn’s Masters thesis, on the
sociopolitical mortuary practices of the ka poʻe kahiko, she used archival data from five skeletal
assemblages from West Hawaiʻi Island. As an nā ‘Ōiwi mamo scholar, she was interested in
learning if moepū would signify the sociopolitical rank of the iwi kūpuna. Cleghorn created her
osteobiography from the archival work of physical anthropologists, thus, pointing out the value
of archived skeletal analyses which can be interpreted in culturally relevant way to added to the
canon of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo knowledge.

Likewise, Dr. Michael Pietrusewsky and his osteology cohorts, recognized the
Honokahua nā ‘Ōiwi mamo and their iwi kūpuna for the privilege of being able to examine them
(the iwi kūpuna) during such an emotionally-charged conflict. Dr. Pietrusewsky believed that as
nā ʻŌiwi mamo were trying to understand the benefits of skeletal analysis, it eased some of the
guilt of what was happening to the ancient burial site at Honokahua. I believe the nā ʻŌiwi mamo
were comforted by being allowed into the lab as their iwi were being examined. For while in the
lab, the living and the dead were comforted by each other’s presence. Dr. Pietrusewsky’s
archived documents present a Western viewpoint of what can be learned from the iwi kūpuna.
Consider then the value of archived documentation which can be utilized in creating information
which is of value to nā ʻŌiwi mamo. In 1961, Bowen used the skeletal assemblages from
Mōkapu to compile documentation of the various ways in which bodies were buried. This
remains the only document which discusses the disposition of bodies in the precontact era
mortuary practices. It could do with a contemporary update, and provide useful information on
variety as well colonial impact on mortuary practices.

As evidenced through the discussion, there are a variety of ways in which skeletal
analysis can be used to create osteobiographies. These osteobiographies provide additional
moʻolelo to the lives of the iwi kūpuna. Osteobiography is a tool in the toolbox of knowledge
construction. It involves being able to respectfully connect with the iwi kūpuna, and learn
another moʻolelo from what is found in their bones. These moʻolelo can also point to significant
changes in history, such as the impact of colonialism and introduced diseases to the diet and
nutrition. As family members accept their kuleana to mālama their iwi kūpuna opportunities will
arise to learn the osteobiography of their ancestors. With each new discovery of the iwi kūpuna
in the ʻāina, nā ʻŌiwi mamo see that their cultural heritage validates the footprint left by their
ancestors, giving their nā ʻŌiwi mamo permission to use their knowledge to perpetuate their
culture. “It is within these intersections of cultural and natural resources, traditional and
contemporary knowledge, and past and present that nā ʻŌiwi mamo are constructing a
framework to protect, preserve, and manage what they value in their communities” (Evans 2013:38). Or as Mills and Kawelu (2013) point out, it is the indigenous communities which determine the significance of a resource for its contemporary value.

One unspoken theme embedded in the words and actions of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo is the ever-expanding relationship each contemporary nā ‘Ōiwi mamo is developing with their ancestral iwi kūpuna. They have come to recognize the hōʻailona which appear to them as they are working with the iwi kūpuna. The more I participate in protecting and preserving the iwi kūpuna, the more I gain a deeper and stronger understanding of their lives. Like many of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo, I see the kūpuna, as I walk on their landscapes, I hear their voices in the winds, and I feel their tears in the rains. Their stories are worth sharing with the children, so they too, can carry our cultural tradition into the future.

Although the findings were significant there were limitations to the scope and sample size of the research parameters. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo represented equal numbers of males and females and there was variation in the age range, it was representative of the manaʻo of 20 nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who live on Hawaiʻi Island. Consequently, program- imposed time limitations only allowed for a small sample size in which to conduct, disseminate, and report on my findings. I realized I was just scratching the surface of the manaʻo of nā ‘Ōiwi mamo on the possibility of conducting skeletal analysis of their iwi kūpuna to enhance their knowledge of their ancestors. This research project is indicative perhaps, of a change of perception toward the benefits of skeletal analysis and in developing culturally centered osteobiographies as demonstrated through the manaʻo of the Hawaiʻi Island nā ‘Ōiwi mamo.
CHAPTER SIX: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of this research project had two recommendations: one, to preserve their iwi kūpuna *in situ*; and two, create a handbook for nā ‘Ōiwi mamo on burial issues and HIBC protocols. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo were adamant for *in situ* preservation of iwi kūpuna, because that is where they were kanu. It is no different in modernity, we choose our burial disposition and expect not to be disinterred from that space. Nā ‘Ōiwi mamo recognize that gravesites may be impacted by development or erosion of the landscape. If so, then nā ‘Ōiwi mamo should be the ones to decide on a new disposition for the iwi kūpuna.

The second recommendation of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo is to work together to develop a handbook for those who want to mālama their iwi kūpuna. Many of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo felt intimidated and unprepared at their first HIBC meeting. These feelings of inadequacies often caused nā ‘Ōiwi mamo to leave and not fulfill their kuleana as lineal descendants. To help the newly recognized lineal and cultural descendants to be successful, the more seasoned nā ‘Ōiwi mamo felt it was necessary to have a standard handbook which would discuss some of the responsibilities and expectations in being an advocate for iwi kūpuna. Some of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo offered to include their contact information, so they could be consultants. Consequently, this will be the next small collaborative project with the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo of Hawai‘i Island.

In conclusion, the majority of the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo who participated in this thesis project agreed that they were not opposed to non-destructive skeletal analyses being done on iwi kūpuna. The nā ‘Ōiwi mamo felt as along as lineal descendants were consulted, and skeletal analyses was done in a culturally sensitive manner, and pono, then learning the osteobiography of the iwi kūpuna would be beneficial to their history.
I have learned the importance of moʻolelo. Moʻolelo in the form of moʻokūʻauhau, connects us to our ancestors. I know their names, I have heard their stories and they are alive in me. It is a reminder that I do not travel this road alone. I carry their DNA and their memories are embedded in my memories. Contemporary haʻi moʻolelo are my umbilical cord to the present. The contemporary nā ʻŌiwi mamo of this project and I have shared our moʻolelo. We have transformed our dreams, our hōʻailona, our visions, and our knowledge into something tangible and physical. Our combined moʻolelo has been added to the contemporary canon of knowledge and our identities are written on our naʻau. We now are the carriers of the past and the present, therefore, the responsibility of this mākua (parent) generation of nā ʻŌiwi mamo is to teach our collective stories to the next generation. The moʻolelo is transformative, regenerative, and empowering for it contains the keys of knowledge. If the stories are told, the ʻŌiwi culture will never be lost, it will continue to be transformed with each succeeding generation.

In conclusion, I wanted to share this very personal experience of Kai Markell (2015 pers. comm.) while he was preparing iwi kūpuna to be reinterred in a cave in South Kona, Hawaiʻi Island. The weaving of words and visuals capture the essence of what those engaged in the work of protecting and preserving their familial iwi kūpuna encounter during the reburial process. These are precious experience of building relationships with the iwi kūpuna.

In the late 1990s he was called to assist in reinterring several hundred iwi kūpuna to a cave site at Puʻuhonua o Honaunau National Park. These ancestral remains had been temporarily curated in cardboard boxes within the cave, for a few decades. It was time to prepare these iwi kūpuna to return to their new home in a cave at Puʻuhonua o Honaunau. Over the next few days, the iwi kupuna were prepared for reburial in the traditional way of wrapping in kapa or muslin and placed within a ʻeke (basket).
One special iwi kupuna, caught his attention bringing his emotions to the surface. He tenderly shares his experience with these words:

“I remember working so fast and steadily that my mind began to wander as my hands went to work automatically, almost without aforethought. It wasn’t until I opened one box containing very small toddler’s remains. I remember looking down and seeing a small pair of brown leather shoes down by his feet bones. I erupted into tears as I thought of my own newborn son, and the unfathomable loss of a young child so young.

I tenderly and methodically took each of his little bones and arranged them carefully to put him back together the best I could. I then put his shoes on the bottom of the bundle before wrapping and tying him up…”

Many questions were asked and pondered as they wrapped the iwi? What were their struggles, their fears, their loves, their experiences, and their deaths? These questions increased the responsibility of the work which was being done for the iwi.

The day arrived to place these iwi kūpuna into their new home the cave. It was a labor of love as each bundle was passed from hand to hand until they were laid within the cave. Kai is overwhelmed with feeling and begins to sob uncontrollably. He relates those feelings as he states, “Then seemingly out of nowhere, the most intense emotions entered my body and I couldn’t help but erupt into sobbing. The emotion was so intense that I couldn’t stop crying, and I tried to suppress the sounds in that quiet cave which only made it worse…..”

Many years and reburials later, Kai has an epiphany which transports him back to the cave and his intense feelings. I end his story with his words as he comes to understand the power of enduring love as he states:

…. And it wasn’t until many years later, after working on the reburials of hundreds of other kūpuna, that I realized something very profound. I had always wondered where the intense sadness and grief came from, that touched my na’au (gut) that final day in the cave…Where and who was it coming from? I often thought about it…
It was then that I realized that the emotions I was feeling wasn’t sadness and grief. It was Love. A Love unlike the Love we feel and express here on Earth. A love filled with unconditional gratitude, from the deceased…

To lovingly take care of these beautiful ancestors. To acknowledge the shared humanity of the lives of the people that these bones represented. To acknowledge the lives of each other, the living….

And I know when it comes time for me to pass on, I look forward to the Loving Embrace, of one little Beautiful Hawaiian boy. A loving embrace that I have already felt once. In a dark cave. That caused me to sob. A Beautiful little Hawaiian boy with little brown leather shoes…

Poignant feelings such as these are universal to the nā ‘Ōiwi mamo as they speak on behalf of their kindred dead, and as they protect and preserve the vestiges of their mortality.
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APPENDICES:

APPENDIX A: Glossary of ʻŌlelo Hawai‘i

All words below are from ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi (Hawaiian language). I have included the meanings which are relevant to their use in this thesis. All definitions are from Pukui and Elbert’s 1986 Hawaiian Dictionary.

Pronunciation key:
Consonants are like English
‘okina (‘), like the sound between the oh’s in the English oh-oh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels unstressed</th>
<th>Vowels stressed (hold somewhat longer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a like in above</td>
<td>ā like in far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e like in bet</td>
<td>ē like pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i like in city</td>
<td>ī like in see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o like in sole</td>
<td>ō like in sole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u like in moon</td>
<td>ū like moon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hawaiian Word</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʻāina</td>
<td>that which feeds, or land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akahele</td>
<td>to ponder, reflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akua</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anakala</td>
<td>uncle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anakē</td>
<td>aunty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘ao</td>
<td>cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eha</td>
<td>hurt, sore, in pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘eke</td>
<td>bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haʻi moʻolelo</td>
<td>storyteller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hala</td>
<td>to die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hanai mākua</td>
<td>adoptive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heiāu</td>
<td>religious temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hōʻailona</td>
<td>signs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hohona</td>
<td>daughter-in-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui Mālama o Nā Iwi Kūpuna</td>
<td>NHO of NAGPRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hula  dance performed by people of Hawai‘i
ʻike kūpuna  ancestral knowledge
iwi  bones
iwi kūpuna  ancestral bones
kahakō  macron
kāhea  calling
kai  sea, ocean
Kalaemanō  place name in the lands of Ka‘ūpūlehu
kalo  taro plant, Colocasia esculenta
ka poʻe kahiko  the people of old
kanu  to plant, to bury
kaona  hidden meaning, deep reflection
kapa  cloth made from wauke
kapu  restricted
kaula  rope
Ka‘ūpūlehu  wahi pana in North Kona
keiki  child
kipuka  center of spiritual power
koʻa  fishing ground
kūkākūkā  discussions, talk-story
kuleana  responsibility, burden
Kumulipo  a creation story
kupuna  single grandparent, ancestor
kūpuna  more than one grandparent or ancestor
kuʻu kūpuna  my ancestors
lauhala  Pandanus plant
leo  voice
liko  leaf bud of ʻōhia lehua tree
lua  pit, hole
makaʻāinana  the eyes of the land or the common people
makaʻala  vigilant, watchful
makana  gift
mālama  care, preserve, protect
makawalu  balance, interdependent
manaʻo  song
Mauna Ala  Royal burial grounds, Mausoleum
mele  song
moepū
moʻokūʻauhau
moʻolelo
naʻau
nā iwi kūpuna
nā ʻŌiwi mamo
nā ʻŌiwi mamo
noa
ʻohana
ʻōhia lehua
ʻŌiwi
ʻokina
ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi
ʻōlena
oli
olonā
piko ʻiewe
pīkai
pili paʻa
pōhaku
poho paʻakai
pololei
poʻo
pule
tūtū
tūtū kāne
tūtū wahine
ʻupena
wahi pana

associated funerary objects
genealogy
stories
guts, of the heart or mind
ancestral bones (plural)
descendants
Native Hawaiian descendants
freed of taboo
family
Hawaiʻi endemic tree Metrosideros polymorpha
Native Hawaiian
glottal stop
Hawaiian language
turmeric Curcuma domestica plant
chant
wood shrub Touchardia latifolia endemic to Hawaiʻi; cordage
umbilical cord
to purify with sea water or fresh salted water
remain connected to a place
rock, stone
salt basins
correct, accurate
head
prayer
grandparent
grandfather
grandmother
fishing net
storied places, significant places
APPENDIX B: Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aDNA</td>
<td>ancient DeoxyriboNucleic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIS</td>
<td>Archaeological Inventory Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTP</td>
<td>Burial Treatment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLNR</td>
<td>Department of Land and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNA</td>
<td>DeoxyriboNucleic Acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>Global Positioning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GT</td>
<td>Grounded Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAR</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Administrative Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIBC</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Island Burial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>Hawai‘i Revised Statutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui Mālama</td>
<td>Hui Mālama o Nā Iwi Kūpuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBC</td>
<td>Island Burial Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IST</td>
<td>Indigenous Standpoint Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUC</td>
<td>Land Use Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHO</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHA</td>
<td>Office of Hawaiian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAH</td>
<td>‘Ōiwi Archaeologist of Hōkūli‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAHII</td>
<td>‘Ōiwi Archaeologist of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIBC</td>
<td>O‘ahu Burial Island Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCDH</td>
<td>Recognized Cultural Descendant of Hōkūli‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLDH</td>
<td>Recognized Lineal Descendant of Hōkūli‘a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLDHI</td>
<td>Recognized Lineal Descendants of Hawai‘i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPD</td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: Interview Guide

1. Share with us your family traditions of death and burials?
2. Why is it important to you to mālama iwi kūpuna?
3. How would you feel about learning another story of the kupuna through looking at iwi?
4. What is your connection to the land of Hōkūliʻa?
5. When/ Why did you become involved protecting iwi kūpuna?
6. Why is it important to preserve iwi in place?
7. When does it become important to disinter iwi and reinter them in a different place?
8. Whose responsibility is it to make sure re-interment of iwi happens in a timely manner?
9. What has your experience been like working with the various key players in the burial issues?
10. How would you feel about learning the story of the iwi kūpuna through looking at their bones? The parameters of this question were, as iwi were being disinterred and relocated for whatever reason.

   a. Let me share what can be learned just by looking, non-destructive. We can learn the sex of the kūpuna and age at death. With females, we can see if they have had babies. You can see what kind of work they did by the size of their bones, if there is arthritis, an indicator of over working the muscles. In the teeth, health of the individual can be seen. There are many more clues to the life of the kūpuna in their iwi.

11. Do you think this is an important way to learn about your kūpuna? Why or why not?
12. How do you teach the young ones to mālama iwi kūpuna?
My name is Tamara Halliwell. I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Hilo in the Department of Anthropology. As part of the requirements for earning my graduate degree, I am doing a research project. The purpose of my project is to collect oral histories of cultural practices and traditions of iwi kūpuna in Hōkūliʻa, South Kona, Hawaiʻi. I am asking you to participate because you are a Lineal or Cultural descendant of the area or have an interest in preservation of iwi kūpuna.

**Activities and Time Commitment:** If you participate in this project, I will meet with you for an interview at a location and time convenient for you. The interview will consist of open ended questions. It will take 45 minutes to an hour. I may have an assistant to help take notes. You will be one of about 15 people whom I will interview for this study.

**Benefits and Risks:** There will be no direct benefit to you for participating in this interview. The results of this project may help other Hawaiian communities who are involved with iwi kūpuna. If you do become stressed or uncomfortable, you can skip the question or take a break. You can also stop the interview, or you can withdraw from the project altogether.
**Privacy and Confidentiality:** You will be given copies of all notes, transcriptions, audio-taped interviews, and video-recorded interviews in which you are involved. I will keep all information in a safe place at the UHH for possible use in the future. Only my University of Hawaii advisor and I will have access to the information. The University of Hawaii Human Studies Program has the right to review research records for this study. You will have the right to edit or remove any written or visual information about you. At your request, I will not use any other personal identifying information that can identify you. I will protect your privacy and confidentiality to the extent allowed by law.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your participation in this project is completely voluntary. You may stop participating at any time. If you stop being in the study, there will be no penalty or loss to you.

**Questions:** If you have any questions about this study, please call or email me at (808) 756-6442 or ht7@hawaii.edu You may also contact my adviser, Dr. Lynn Morrison, at (808) 932-7263 or lmorriso@hawaii.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the UH Human Studies Program at (808) 956-5007 or uhirb@hawaii.edu.

If you agree to participate in this project, please sign and date this signature page and return it to:

Tamara Halliwell.

Please keep the section above for your records.

If you consent to be in this project, please sign the signature section below and return it to

Tamara Halliwell.
Signature(s) for Consent:

I give permission to join the research project entitled *Oral History of Cultural Practices and Traditions of Iwi Kūpuna in Hōkūli‘a, South Kona, Hawaii*

Please initial next to either “Yes” or “No” to the following:

_____ Yes  _____ No  I consent to be audio-recorded for the interview portion of this research.

_____ Yes  _____ No  I consent to being video-recorded for the interview portion of this research.

_____ Yes  _____ No  I give permission to allow the investigator to use my real name to be used for the publication of this research.

**Name of Participant (Print):** ___________________________________________________

**Participant’s Signature:** __________________________________________

**Signature of the Person Obtaining Consent:** ________________________________

**Date:** ____________________________