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Executive Summary

OHA received its first landholding, Pahua Heiau, in 1988. Pahua sits on a small 1.15 acre parcel of land located in southeastern O‘ahu in a residential neighborhood of Maunalua (which is now known as Hawai‘i Kai).

This report seeks to explore the cultural and historical narratives of Pahua Heiau. It is hoped that this effort will renew a modern, collective understanding of Pahua as a wahi pana (storied place) and will guide stewardship practices within OHA.

Pahua remains a vital cultural and historical resource for Native Hawaiians and the broader community. The goal of this report is to make important ‘ike ‘āina (intimate and nuanced knowledge about a place) about Pahua Heiau more readily available to the public, and will hopefully inform future decisions about the site. OHA seeks to steward Pahua in a way that fulfills OHA’s kuleana to Native Hawaiians, honors Pahua as a wahi pana (storied, noted, legendary place), and actively involves the community in care of the site. In particular, Pahua represents an important opportunity to develop and implement strategies that are rooted in traditional Native Hawaiian cultural practices and informed by Native Hawaiian epistemologies in ways that cultivate meaningful, impactful, and long-term stewardship.
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Introduction

The Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) was established by an amendment to the Hawai‘i State Constitution in 1978. Charged with managing trust resources for the lāhui (Native Hawaiian nation, people), OHA is directed to use these resources to improve the social, economic, and political conditions of Native Hawaiians. However, OHA’s kuleana (reciprocal responsibility) extends far beyond a legal impetus or a statutory obligation; we are accountable to past, present, and future generations of Native Hawaiians.

A handful of landholdings, including Waimea Valley (O‘ahu) and Wao Kele O Puna (Hawai‘i Island) have allowed OHA to assume the important role of land manager as part of our trust responsibilities. The mission of OHA’s Land Management Division is to protect and preserve Hawai‘i lands and their cultural significance by attempting to bridge the ancient Native Hawaiian use of lands with future land use patterns, as well as to engage in advocacy for land use that is congruent with a Hawaiian sense of place (OHA Real Estate Mission, 2007).

OHA and Pahua Heiau

Pahua is one of the most significant sacred sites remaining in in Maunalua (now known as Hawai‘i Kai) on the southeastern shore of the island of O‘ahu. Consisting of stacked stone terraces arranged in a rectangular shape, Pahua is a heiau (temple or shrine, place of worship). It measures 68 by 40 feet (approximately 20 by 12 meters) and is set against the base of the ridge dividing the Kamilonui and Kamiloiiki Valleys. Archaeologists posit that Pahua was once an agricultural heiau, constructed between the fifteenth and eighteenth century. Although there are many theories surrounding its traditional usage and function, there is little doubt that Pahua was an important place to Native Hawaiians.

Originally held by the Bishop Estate, the fee simple title to the 1.15 acre land parcel of Pahua was transferred to OHA in 1988, on the condition that the whole of the property be preserved from development for historical, non-commercial purposes only. Pahua became OHA’s first landholding.

This report will explore historical narratives to gain a better understanding of Pahua as a wahi pana (noted place). A review of the archaeological and restoration work that was conducted on the heiau is also an important aspect of this report. In particular, this report includes cultural and historical information which may be a vital part of the development of cultural management strategies and long-term community stewardship at Pahua.
Report Frameworks and Methodologies

The relationship between Native Hawaiians and the ‘āina (land) played a significant role in guiding interaction with the environment and resources; as historian Davianna McGregor (2007) notes, “The land and nature, like members of the ‘ohana or extended family, were loved” (p. 5). Indeed, the relationship between the ‘āina and Native Hawaiians is genealogical in nature. On a fundamental level, moʻokūʻauhau (genealogies) established a definitive familial connection between Native Hawaiians and the ‘āina. Native Hawaiian historian Davida Malo (1951) noted that in the Puanue, Kumuhonua, as well as the Papa and Wākea genealogies, the Hawaiian Islands were birthed by the akua (gods), who were also the progenitors of the kānaka (Native Hawaiian people).

The importance of the land is also embedded in the Hawaiian language. For example, the word ‘āina can be translated as “that which feeds” or “that from which one eats” (Kameʻeleihiwa, 1992, p. 9). Hawaiian words used to describe people, such as kamaʻāina (native-born, native to an area; lit. a “child of the land”) and kuaʻāina (a person from the countryside; lit. “the backbone of the land”) demonstrate the close relationship between Native Hawaiians and the land. In common usage, the word kamaʻāina is employed in a variety of contexts to convey familiarity and acquaintance, but the expression demonstrates a specific land-based epistemology. The strong relationship to the land and level of ‘ike ‘āina (intimate and nuanced knowledge about a place) maintained by kamaʻāina personified an important frame of reference for other Native Hawaiian modes of familiarity and knowledge. These words reveal the centricity of land within Native Hawaiian worldview and cultural epistemologies.

Wahi Pana as a Framework for Management

There was an elevated level of reverence and importance associated with wahi pana. Wahi pana were considered to be noted, storied, and legendary places which were well-known and beloved in Native Hawaiian communities and across the paeʻāina (archipelago). Wahi pana are crucial to the perpetuation of cultural knowledge, particularly because an understanding of a place allows for greater understanding of an area’s function and significance in Hawaiian society (G. Kanaha, 1986).

Places such as heiau (places of worship), shrines, burial caves and graves, as well as “geographic features associated with deities and significant natural, cultural, spiritual, or historical phenomena or events” were considered to be wahi pana (McGregor, 2007, 291).
Places that were the subject of *moʻokūʻauhau*, *kaʻao* (legends), *moʻolelo* (historical narratives), *mele* (songs and chants), and other forms of traditional literature were also considered to be *wahi pana* (Hoʻomanawanui, 2008). Native Hawaiians maintained strong connections to these specific places, which was the result of living and working directly on the land. Individuals who were native to an area also carried unique ‘ike ʻāina that had been passed from one generation to the next (McGregor, 2007).

Native Hawaiian beliefs and practices relating to *wahi pana* represent a particularly appropriate framework for this report, and also provide a solid foundation for the development of stewardship strategies at Pahua.

**Pahua Heiau as a Wahi Pana**

When the archaeologist J. Gilbert McAllister (1933) first documented Pahua as a field site in the 1930s, the *heiau* had been abandoned for some time; he was unable to definitively ascertain its function and significance, either from previously published works or from interviews with kamaʻāina living in the area. According to noted Hawaiian language scholar Larry Kimura (1983), the loss or absence of *moʻolelo* connected to a place is often due to a disruption in the transmission of knowledge. This seems to be the case for Pahua; the diffusion of ‘ike ʻāina surrounding Pahua was likely affected by the social, political, and economic transformations in Hawaiian society over time. In particular, Maunalua has been the site of intensive urban residential development in the past fifty years.

Nonetheless, historical evidence suggests that Pahua Heiau was recognized as an important *wahi pana* at one time. This study seeks to explore the cultural and historical contexts of Pahua in an effort to regain a better understanding of the ‘ike ʻāina associated with the site in order to renew a modern, collective understanding of Pahua as a *wahi pana*.

**Historical Sources and Materials**

The extensive research conducted for this report included the incorporation of historical sources *ma ka ʻōlelo Hawaiʻi* (in the Hawaiian language). Original Hawaiian language material published in the *nūpepa* (Hawaiian language newspapers) which were written by prominent Native Hawaiian historians of the nineteenth century, such as J. K. Mokumaia, J. H. Kanepuu, Joseph Poepoe, John Papa Ii, Davida Malo, and Samuel Kamakau, were utilized to provide general background information on Hawaiian culture and history. These accounts also provide...
specific social commentary on issues facing the Native Hawaiian community. Translations of these materials completed by scholars like Mary Kawena Pukui, Nathaniel Emerson, Lahilahi Webb, Martha Beckwith, John Wise, and Abraham Fornander were also utilized. Research conducted for this report was necessarily constrained to an examination of written accounts of Pahua; although the author attempted to include diverse source material in this report, it should be noted that additional ‘ike may still exist in other written sources, oral histories, and specialized familial knowledge of the site.

Native Hawaiian moʻolelo and archaeological surveys of Pahua, as well as the surrounding areas in Maunalua, also provided important regional contexts for the site and illuminated the changing ways Pahua may have been understood over time in Hawaiian society; incorporation of these narratives in a discussion of Pahua aligns with traditional Native Hawaiian understandings of place.
Pahua Heiau

Pahua is one of dozens of recorded archaeological sites and one of four confirmed heiau sites in Maunalua (McAllister, 1933; Takemoto et al., 1975). The heiau sits near the end of the ridge dividing Kamilonui and Kamiloiki Valleys. Archaeologists estimate the heiau was constructed in either 1485–1665 CE or 1760–1795 CE (Davis, 1985c). After visiting the site in the early 1930s, archaeologist J. Gilbert McAllister (1933) noted, “The heiau is 68 by 40 feet in extent and is primarily a built-up rock terrace with several low division walls,” (p. 65). Commenting that it could be considered a smaller heiau, McAllister postulated that Pahua was likely an agricultural heiau “of the husbandry type”; a native informant had told him the name Pahua was associated with the heiau (p. 65). However, McAllister was unable to learn any other cultural or historical information about the site.

Significance of Heiau in Native Hawaiian Culture and Society

The antiquarian Thomas Thrum (1906) noted that the subject of heiau “is interwoven with the history, tradition, and legends of the people,” (p. 51). Indeed, heiau represent some of the most complex religious and political structures in traditional Native Hawaiian society, and were usually considered to be wahi pana (E. Kanahela, 1991). This section contains a general discussion of heiau and examines their function in Native Hawaiian society in order to gain a better understanding of the possible significance of Pahua.

Commonly understood to be a temple or shrine, heiau can consist of simple earthen terraces as well as elaborately constructed platforms. Heiau were set aside by Native Hawaiians for specific and often elevated forms of worship. McAllister (1933) noted that although many of his Native Hawaiian informants used the term loosely, there was a distinction between heiau and other shrines and places of worship. Anthropologist Valerio Valeri (1985) asserted that the term heiau “can sometimes refer to a simple natural object or to an element in a landscape where the god manifests himself and where sacrifices are offered to him,” (p. 173). Writing in the nineteenth century about traditional Native Hawaiian cultural practices and beliefs, the Native Hawaiian historian Samuel Kamakau (1976) described koʻa (fishing shrines) as a type of heiau.

An examination of the word heiau illuminates some aspects of the function and significance of these sites with particular consideration of Native Hawaiian epistemologies. The word hei was spoken and used in place of the word hai, which means “sacrifice”; au in this sense refers to a specific region or place. Therefore, one understanding associated with heiau/haiau is a place for sacrifices. Sacrifices could be offerings of prayer, crops, fish and other oceanic yields, as well as hu-
man lives. As discussed, archaeologists have postulated that Pahua was an agricultural heiau, suggesting that crops and other foodstuffs were used as sacrifices at the site.

The intended function of a heiau determined its location, methods of construction, the complexity of religious–political ceremonies that would performed, as well as the sacred nature of the site (Kamakau, 1976, pp. 129–144). Heiau represented different levels of social complexity and political power because of the inherent demands on natural resources and labor (G. Kanahele, 1986). Malo noted that while any ali’i (chief) was free to construct a variety of agricultural heiau and those dedicated to Lono, only an ali’i nui (high chief) was able to build luakini (sacrificial war temples) (1951). Native Hawaiian historian Kepelino (2007) observed:

Aole i like ke ano o na heiau o na aoao hoomana o ka wa kahiko. He heiau huīnahalike kekahī, a o ko Kane heiau ia. He heiau poepoe kekahī, he heiau kīi ia. O koa no hoi na heiau nui, a me ka hanohano: na na ‘īlii ia e hana.

Not all heiau belonging to the different branches of worship in old times were built alike. Some were square, as were Kane’s heiau; rounded heiau were built for images. Large heiau varied in the honor in which they were held: they were built by the chiefs. (pp. 58–59)

Furthermore, the function and type of heiau dictated the observation of different sets of ceremonies and kapu (regulations and restrictions) (Malo, 1951). For example, the number, stringency, and rarity of kapu and ceremony associated with a heiau reflected, protected, and enhanced the mana of the place; therefore, heiau used for elevated political and religious purposes were often associated with kapu that were strict in nature and rigorously observed.

Theories of the Use and Significance of Pahua Heiau

If Pahua was an agricultural heiau, it is likely that the kapu surrounding it were not exceedingly strict, and it is possible that low-ranking ali’i of the area may have constructed the site and worshiped there. Modern Native Hawaiian scholars and cultural practitioners have also postulated that the other meanings evoked in the word heiau illustrated the significance and function of heiau in Hawaiian society. The word hei can refer to the act of “netting or snaring” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). According to Kanahele et al. (2011), Native Hawaiians understood the movement of the universe and the earth in various layers, realms, planes, or foun-
dations; therefore, heiau were places that enabled Native Hawaiians to snare and pull down part of the lewa (atmospheric layer associated with the akua, or gods) to the realm of känaka.

Because heiau were places of significance, great care was taken in the processes surrounding their construction. Kuhikuhipu’uone (one who draws in the sand) made up a dedicated cadre of professionals who were involved in every aspect of heiau construction, including site selection, proposed layout and orientation, and management of the building process. Malo noted that kuhikuhipu’uone were “acquainted with the heiau which had been built from the most ancient times, from Hawaii to Kauai,” (1951, p. 161). According to Kamakau, these individuals were kahuna hulihonua (experts of studies concerning the earth) and “their knowledge was like that of the navigator who knows the latitude and longitude of each land, where the rocks are, the deep places and the shallow, where it is cold and where warm, and can tell without mistake the degrees, east or west, north or south,” (1992, p. 154).

While working on the restoration of Pahua in the late 1980s, the archaeologist Bertell Davis (1985b) noted,

The heiau sits high on the hillside above the far inland head of Kua-pa Pond, also known as Keahupua–o–Maunalua Fishpond... In former times one could look out from this vantage point over the broad plain surrounding the pond below and stretching eastward across the “saddle” behind Koko Crater to Kalama and Wāwāmalu beyond. (pp. 1–3)

As Davis observed, Pahua offered strategic views of the vastness of Maunalua, a location that was likely significant for Native Hawaiians, given the care that was given to the placement, orientation, and construction of heiau in ancient Hawaiian society.

The use of heiau was not always continuous, depending on its type and function. For example, use of an agricultural heiau may have mirrored planting seasons, while heiau dedicated to politics or war may have shifted in or out of ceremonial use which likely coincided with the ascension of an ali‘i and recognition of a new akua (Johnson, 1983, p. 232). Heiau that had been abandoned for long periods of time could also be reconditioned and put into use (Buck, 1957). However, regardless of whether a site was in use, the presence of a heiau in a particular wahi demonstrated the sacred nature of place. Heiau were built on places that were considered to be important; likewise, these places become consecrated and imbued with mana by the presence of the heiau, as well as the ceremonies and kapu
associated with it. Although Pahua was no longer actively used by the nineteenth century, it remains a wahi pana.

Inoa Wahi and Inoa ‘Āina: The Importance of Place Names

Inoa wahi or inoa ‘āina (place names) were significant in all aspects of Hawaiian culture and epistemology. In Hawaiian society, places were named regardless of their size, location, and environment (Bacchilega, 2007). As with personal names, place names could also honor significant individuals and events. Intimate knowledge of physical and spiritual characteristics of a place usually informed its naming, and place names often contained ancestral knowledge accumulated over generations (McGregor, 2007).

Descriptions of place and inoa wahi are ubiquitous and multifunctional in traditional literature (in both oral and more recently written mediums), purposefully deployed as devices to evoke emotions and to trigger collective and cultural historical memory (Bacchilega, 2007; Ho’omanawanui, 2008). Therefore, consideration of “Pahua” as an inoa wahi represents an important research methodology which may result in greater understanding of the site as a wahi pana; it may also contribute additional knowledge about the function and significance of Pahua Heiau. In particular, Hawaiian language words contain multiple allegorical meanings and were deliberately deployed in ways that allowed for varied interpretation, depending on the intent of the speaker and the context under which it was spoken (Kimura, 1983). A word could have different meanings depending on its segmentation, as well as its pronunciation (marked with diacriticals in modern Hawaiian language writings). The same was true for place names.

There is a degree of uncertainty in determining factors like date and origin that can complicate attempts to understand the most probable contexts and meanings of a place name, which were not static over time. Additionally, the perpetuation and passage of knowledge that was specific to a place, particularly pertaining to inoa wahi for certain communities, was largely interrupted by the deep societal transformations that occurred in Hawai‘i beginning in the late eighteenth century. For example, in an article that was published in the May 1, 1856 issue of Ka Hoku o ka Pakipika, J. H. Kanepuu wrote of the loss of population in Niu, Ku‘ili‘ou‘ou, Koko, Ke‘awawa, and other places in Maunalua during a ten-year period between 1852 and 1862, from more than 300 people to less than 150 people. Commenting on the general depopulation experienced by Native Hawaiians during the mid nineteenth century, Kanepuu also noted:

*Ua make ka nui o na kanaka, ua hele kekahi poe. No ka hookau-maha o na konohiki, no ka nele kekahi i kahi ole e kanu ai na wa-

Pahua Heiau
The majority of people have died, some have left. As for the burdening of the konohiki (land managers), it is because some do not have a place to plant in the sweet potato mounds of this place, which are overrun by animals. Many of those who remain just wander about aimlessly, seeking a means of livelihood elsewhere.

As suggested by Kanepuu, the rapid depopulation of Maunalua during the nineteenth century would complicate the transmission of ‘ike ‘āina pertaining to specific places, and was likely a significant factor in the loss of historical and cultural knowledge surrounding Pahua.

Pahua was the only name recorded for the heiau as given by a Native Hawaiian informant to McAllister in the early 1930s. Despite the possibility that Pahua was not the original or proper name for the site, limited historical evidence suggests that it was. For example, Pahua is also documented as a name for the area in nūpepa (Hawaiian language newspapers) during the early and mid-1800s. Reference to Pahua as a place is found in one of the first kanikau (chant of mourning) ever printed in the nūpepa. In the August 8, 1834 issue of Ka Lama Hawai‘i, David Malo used the phrase “noho anea kula wela la o Pahua,” (tarrying in the vibrating heat of the hot plains of Pahua) in a kanikau he composed for Queen Ka‘ahumanu; based on the context of the rest of the kanikau, which mentions important place names in a literary circuit of the island of O‘ahu, the line was clearly referring to the area in Maunalua as Pahua. The kanikau was reprinted in its entirety in the October 28, 1835 issue of Ke Kumu Hawai‘i and the April 29, 1857 issue of Ka Hae Hawai‘i, reflecting the fact that the area was still known as Pahua during the mid–1800s. Reference to the plains of Pahua is also found in a kanikau written for the ali‘i Abner Kahekili in the August 8, 1843 issue of Ka Nonanona. Articles in Ka Hae Hawai‘i and Ka Nupepa Kuokoa also continued to mention Pahua as a place name for the general area during the 1860s.

**Pahua as a Place Name**

Some academic study has been devoted to an analysis of the word Pahua. McAllister and other scholars have posited that Pahua may have been an agricultural heiau; the interpretation of the word pā–hua as “an enclosure of fruits” has been used as a support for this point. Indeed, the word hua not only has meanings associated with fruit, ovum, and seeds, but also with general fertility and fruitfulness (particularly as applied to a high agricultural yield; the verb hua means to sprout,
Archaeological work at Pahua has revealed that the heiau was built over smaller stone formations.

Pahua as a Reference to Drums

The word pahu can refer to a drum. Häwea and ‘Öpuku were two of the most famous and sacred drums in Hawaiian history, and were prominent in many important religious ceremonies on O‘ahu; the use of Häwea and ‘Öpuku has been recorded at Kūkaniloko, a birthing place of the ali‘i (McKinzie, 1986). Both drums were said to have strong ties to the Maunalua area. According to Kamakau (January 12, 1867), a man named Ha‘ikamālama from the Maunalua area heard a drum as the chief La‘amaikahiki and his retinue landed their canoes at Kawahao-kamanō in Waihaukalua. Pretending the people of O‘ahu were familiar with the pahu, Ha‘ikamālama was able to inspect the drum ‘Öpuku; it was from this encounter that Ha‘ikamālama learned to make pahu, which subsequently spread throughout Hawai‘i (Kamakau, January 12, 1867). It has been speculated that Häwea Heiau, which is located to the west of Pahua, once housed the sacred drum Häwea (McKinzie, 1986). Although it is not known whether there was an association between Häwea Heiau and Pahua, there is a possibility that Pahua was a heiau that once housed the sacred drum ‘Öpuku. Additionally, the word pahua can be understood as pahu–‘ā, meaning the fiery drum. The cultural association of fire with the kapu and status of high ranking ali‘i, as well as akua, may also be significant, considering the use of Häwea and ‘Öpuku in chiefly religious ceremonies and the description of Pahua as kula wela in the kanikau composed for the ali‘i Ka‘ahumanu and Abner Kahekili (Mckinzie, 1986; Malo, August 8, 1834; Ka Nonanona, August 8, 1843).

Pahua as a Reference to Ranching

One meaning of the word pahua is “down–trodden,” which can be used to describe grass that has been flattened (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). Although rare, this understanding of pahua correlates to the description of Pahua as a kula (plain) that is found in the kanikau (laments) printed in the nüpepa. Although pahua likely held meanings that evoked the concept of “a relatively flat expanse” that was particularly applied to land, it also held meanings that were strongly associated with cattle, cattle grazing, and cattle ranching. Cattle were introduced to Hawai‘i in the late 1700s, while the first written reference to Pahua appears in the nüpepa in 1834. Maunalua was also known for cattle in the 1880s. Other variations of pa-
hua also suggest a link to cattle; the meaning of the word pāhu‘a is similar to that of kipuka (a clearing, an oasis, a change in form) and especially refers to an area that is free of brush and vegetation, such as a pasture where it was easy to rope cows (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). The word pahu‘ā, (pahu, to push; ‘ā, to drive, as in cattle) also suggests a strong association with cattle (Pukui & Elbert, 1986).

**Pahua as a Reference to Water Characteristics**

Other findings may provide additional insight into the meanings of the name Pahua. The word pahu can convey a pushing or thrusting force or motion (as with a spear or javelin), while the word pahū can refer a bursting forth or an explosion (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). It is possible that the place name Pahua could have referred to a characteristic of the water in the area; for example, the place name Waipahu or Waipahū (O‘ahu) also suggests water pushing or busting forth. Prior to development and despite historical descriptions of the area as dry, portions of Maunalua were known for freshwater springs and marshy environs (Stump, 1981). In the course of the restoration of Pahua in the 1980s, archaeologist Bertell Davis found that the rear portion of one of the heiau platforms had once been saturated by ground water seeping from the cliff, as evidenced by the presence of a gleyed horizon (a layer of soil that is typical of pond or wetland conditions). Davis (1985b) noted:

> One can easily imagine from this, and from the frequent appearances of the many small seeps that still emerge after extended rains (even on the slopes of Koko Crater), that in former times the whole ridge line behind Pahua Heiau must have presented one spring after another. (p.11)

**Pahua as a Reference to Hula**

The word Pahua is also associated with a type of hula (dance), as well as with its dancers. Known as hula pahua, the dance was “a kind of fast hula that increases to a frenzy said to have been named originally for a mele ma‘i [genital chant] named Pahua (shoved),” (Pukui & Elbert, 1986). In the early 1900s, the ethnologist Nathaniel Emerson wrote that the hula pahua was a spear or stick dance and that it was “a dance of the classical times that has long been obsolete. Its last exhibition, so far as ascertained, was in the year 1846, on the island of O‘ahu,” (Emerson, 1998, p.183). In fact, Bartimus Puuaieke, one of the most famous early Native Hawaiian converts to Christianity, had been renown as an accomplished dancer of the hula pahua prior to his conversion (Ka Nonanona, January 9, 1844). The Reverend D. S. Kupahu wrote an article on various types of hula and ha‘a (a dance with bent knees) in the December 16, 1865 issue of Ka Nupepa Kuokoa, and described the hula pahua.
Hula pahua. O keia hula, he hula keia na ka poe kane, ina he umi a emi mai paha, a i ole ia, e oi aku ana paha, a me kekahi wahine hookahi. I ka manawa e hana ai o na kane, alaila, ku mai ka mea haa, oia hoi ka olapa imua o ka poe kane, a haa mai no i o a ia nei; a pela mau aku no e hana ai a pau na mele.

Spear Hula. This dance, it is a dance for males, perhaps ten or less, or if not, more perhaps, and a single female. When the men are performing, the one who is in the ha’ a position (with knees bent) will stand, the one who is a dancer in front of the men, and that person will bend here and there; and that is how the performance continues until the songs are finished. (p. 1)

Pahua as a Reference to Gods and People
It is also possible that Pahua had been named for particular people and akua. For example, Pahua was the name of one of eight famous warriors of the ‘Ewa and Waialua districts of O‘ahu during the reign of the ali‘i ‘aimoku (chief over a district or island) Kahahana in the late 1700s (Westervelt, March 30, 1906). These warriors were known for their bravery and deft skill while defending against the invading forces of Kahekili, the ali‘i ‘aimoku of Maui in 1783; instead of joining the Kahahana’s gathering forces in Nu‘uanu, the group traveled to ‘Äpuakēhau near Waikīkī to fight the Maui warriors alone. According to Kamakau (March 30, 1867): “E hiolo ana na pololu e like me na paka–ua, aka, aohe nae he wahi mea e poino o keia poe ahikanananana, aka o kela poe koa o Maui, ua pau i ka make,” (“The spears tumbled like raindrops, but there was not one indeed that could harm these fierce warriors, and it was those warriors of Maui who perished in death,”) (p.1). Although the O‘ahu forces were eventually defeated and a handful of the eight continued to fight against Kahekili, Kamakau does not mention Pahua again.

Kāne–i–ka–pahu’a and Kāne–kū–pahu’a were also the names of an important akua. In an interview with the anthropologist Edward Smith Craighill Handy, Pu‘uheana (an aunt of Mary Kawena Pukui) noted;

The owl–body (kino pueo) is the body that gives a person protection from any impending harm. Because of the sacredness of his name (the owl’s name) our forebears named him Kane–kū–pahu’a (Man–standing–at–the–forest–border), because his bird–body (kino–manu) had its place at the edge of the forest. (Handy, 1941 in Emory, 1942, pp. 200–207)

Kāne–i–ka–pahu’a is the name of the akua that is mentioned in a series of prayers
used in the worship of Kāne recounted by Robert Luahiwa (a Native Hawaiian man from Kaua‘i) to the scholar Theodore Kelsey. According to Luahiwa, Kāne–i–ka–pahu‘a was one of the akua invoked in the “Pule Oli i ka Nähele,” which was chanted when gathering plants for a heiau (Beckwith, 1970). According to Beckwith (1970), “The address to Kane–i–ka–pahu‘a (Kane the thruster) is said to be to Kane in the guise of an owl, which thrusts with wings and talons at the enemies of his worshippers in time of battle and turns aside their weapons,” (p. 52).

The references to Kāne–i–ka–pahu‘a and Kāne–kū–pahu‘a may be especially significant. The translation of the name Kane–kū–pahu‘a given by Pu‘uheana suggests that “forest border,” was one of the meanings associated with the word pāhu‘a; in this instance, the word hu‘a refers to a “rim, border or edge.” As noted by Luahiwa, Kāne–i–ka–pahu‘a was invoked in prayer as an akua associated with the nähele (forest, grove). In considering the probability of these associations with Pahua Heiau, it is important to note that the site is located on the bluff of a ridge between Kamilonui and Kamiloiki Valleys, which are areas that may have formerly been the site of significant milo (Thespesia populnea) forests (Davis, 1984). In fact, ka milo may be literally translated as “the milo tree,” while nui and iki refer to size of the land sections (large and small, respectively) (Maly & Wong, 1998). The former presence of milo forests in the area may be one of the reasons the heiau was named Pahua; it may even suggest a direct affiliation of the heiau with the akua Kāne–i–ka–pahu‘a/Kāne–kū–pahu‘a, who was known to take the form of an owl and stand at the edge of the forest.

Indeed, other mo‘olelo link the areas surrounding Maunalua to akua pueo (owl gods). According to the nineteenth century Native Hawaiian scholar Joseph M. Poeope (July 22, 1865) the owls of Hawai‘i, Lāna‘i, Maui, and Moloka‘i gathered at Kalapueo (near Makapu‘u) before waging war on the ali‘i ‘aimoku Kakūhihewa in order to save a man who was under the protection of the akua pueo.

The placement of Pahua near the easternmost end of the island of O‘ahu may also indicate an affiliation between the heiau and Kāne, since the east, the rising sun, and sunlight were all traditionally associated with Kāne (Handy & Pukui, 1972).

Although not all meanings associated with the word Pahua and its variations have been examined, the exploration of possible contexts and associations was an important aspect of research conducted for this report, and represents a new analysis in the scope of literature pertaining to this place. In particular, the recognition of the importance of Pahua as an inoa ‘āina and the mo‘olelo that are associated with it represents an attempt to utilize research methodologies that reflect a greater awareness of Hawaiian epistemologies in understanding the possible function and significance of Pahua Heiau to Native Hawaiians.
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Maunalua and the Surrounding Areas

When conducting a survey of the *heiau* on O’ahu in the early 1900s, Thrum (1906) noted that there was much less information about *heiau* in the *moku* (district) of Ko‘olaupoko than in other areas on the island; this assertion certainly seems to be true for Pahua Heiau.

However, historical and archaeological evidence suggests that Maunalua was an important area for Native Hawaiians. This section contains an examination of the *mo’olelo ʻāina* (stories of the land) and historical narratives connected to Maunalua, which will augment an understanding of cultural significance and also provide an enhanced regional context of Pahua in a way that emphasizes the relationships and linkages between *wahi pana* in Hawaiian society over time.

The name Maunalua (two mountains) is said to have been attributed to Ka Lae o Koko, also known as Kuamo‘okāne (today known as Koko Head), and Kohelepelepe (today known as Koko Crater). Traditionally, land divisions in Hawaiian society reflected shifting resource use and availability; it is likely that the areas which were considered to be part of Maunalua changed over time. Historical records suggest that Maunalua was alternately considered an *ahupua’a* (land division) and an *ʻili* (small land parcel) of Waimānalo or Honolulu (Maly & Wong, 1998). In the late 1700s, Maunalua was considered to be an *ʻili* of the *ahupua’a* of Waimānalo in the *moku* (district) of Ko‘olaupoko. In 1859, Maunalua was incorporated as an *ʻili* of Honolulu (Sterling & Summers, 1978). Although these boundaries may have changed over time, Maunalua was generally considered to include the *mauka* (inland) valleys of Kuli‘ou‘ou, Haha‘ione, Kamilonui, Kamiloiki and Kalama, as well as the coastal areas of Koko, Hanauma, Wāwāmalu and Kaiwi, which ran to Makapu‘u.

Today, the landscape and environment of Maunalua are predominantly that of a leeward coastal plain. The journals and observations of foreigners recorded in the late 1700s also characterize Maunalua as a dry and arid area. While in the midst of a voyage meant to determine the feasibility of augmenting the British maritime fur trade on the northwest coast of North America, the English explorers Nathan Portlock and George Dixon stopped in the Hawaiian Islands, anchored at Maunalua twice in 1786 (Portlock, 1789; Cartwright, 1922). Although Portlock (1789) remarked on the lack of abundant water and the relative scarcity of foodstuffs in Maunalua as compared to other areas in the Sandwich Islands where he had previously anchored, he also noted that the residents of the area were kind and brought coconuts, bananas, sugarcane, pigs, and other necessities to the crew.

Native Hawaiians settled and populated places in Maunalua; this may have oc-
Figure 1. The Island of O‘ahu and Maunalua. Hawaii Territory Survey, 1902. Source: Walter E. Wall.
curred between 1100 and 1400 CE (Maly & Wong, 1998). On a tour of O‘ahu taken in 1821, the English traveler Gilbert Mathison (1825) described a settlement in Maunalua, noting, “We soon passed a village mostly inhabited by fishermen and containing perhaps one hundred huts.” (p. 387). In an 1826 circuit of O‘ahu that was undertaken to assess the progress of English literacy among Native Hawaiians (and which was accompanied by the ali‘i nui Ka‘ahumanu), the American Protestant missionary Levi Chamberlain (1828) wrote of a village named Keawaawa of approximately 100 houses in Maunalua, noting that it was the last important settlement on the south side of the island.

Maunalua as a Place to Sustain Life

Indeed, despite having the appearance of an unforgiving and arid landscape to many foreign explorers, other historical accounts suggest that there was a ready availability of water and food in the area. These lands were known for marshy areas where there were coconut groves, water holes and springs (Stump, 1981). Other European and American explorers noted the growth of wauke (paper mulberry; Broussonetia papyrifera) in Maunalua. Native Hawaiians also grew kalo (taro; Colocasia esculenta) in the inner valleys of Maunalua, where there were also springs with freshwater food resources, such as ‘ōpae (shrimp) and i’a (fish) (Goss, April 23, 1962). The ocean at Maunalua was also well-known for the abundance and availability of fish; an article that appeared in the December 1918 issue of the Paradise of the Pacific noted, “The bay is skirted by extensive coral beaches, mud flats, and reefs. Since the earliest times it has been a famous fishing grounds for the Hawaiian fishermen who excelled in reef and inshore fishing,” (MacCaughey, December 1918). Hanauma and surrounding lands were known as a fishing and relaxation area for the ali‘i (Sterling and Summers, 1978), and Makapu‘u was famous for “ka uhu ka‘i,” travelling Parrotfish (Pukui, 1983, #1531). The shark ‘aumakua (ancestral god), ‘Ouha was also known to live in the waters of Koko (Westervelt, 1915). Into the early twentieth century, mullet were known to stop seasonally in Maunalua Bay on their way to Kahuku from Pu‘u’ula to spawn (Krauss, March 27, 1966).

Native Hawaiians worked to carefully manage resources in the area. Although most areas were too dry to support the extensive growth of wetland kalo as in other areas of O‘ahu, the inland coastal regions of Maunalua were known to be an intensive ‘uala (sweet potato) agricultural complex that supported the populations of Native Hawaiians in Maunalua and in other areas (Goss, 1962; McAllister, 1933). Handy et al. (1991) noted;

According to the last surviving Kama‘aina of Maunalua, sweet potatoes were grown in the small valleys, such as Kamilonui, as well as
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on the coastal plain. The plain below Kamilo‘iki and Kealakipapa [the narrow pass that ascends to the present-day Makapu‘u over-
look] was known as Ke–Kula–o–Kamauwai. This was the famous potato–planting place from which came the potatoes traded to ships that anchored off Haha’ione in whaling days. The village at this place, traces of which may still be seen, was called Wāwāma-
lu. (p.155)

Keahupua o Maunalua

Maunalua was also the site of a remarkably large loko i’a (fishpond) known as Keahupua o Maunalua (the shrine of the baby mullet) which was called Kuapā or Maunalua Pond in later years (Sterling & Summers, 1978). In 1821, Mathison described the pond, noting “here is a large salt–water lake... It was divided from the sea by a large embankment of sand, which on extraordinary occasions is probably overflowed by the tide,” (p. 386). Fishponds were considered a crucial element of traditional Native Hawaiian resource management, and the use of use of fishponds often went back centuries (Cobb, 1901).

Although O‘ahu was known for having more fishponds than any other island, the fishpond at Maunalua was rather unique because of its enormous size; in 1851, Keahupua o Maunalua was said to have covered 523 acres, and it stretched nearly two miles inland. It was believed to have been the largest fishpond ever constructed in Hawai‘i and possibly the Pacific (Thrum, 1906). It is thought that Keahupua o Maunalua, which was considered a loko kuapā (a type of pond named for the stone wall structures that were used in its construction), was created by blocking off part of a naturally existing arm of the bay (MacCaughey, December 1918). The brackish waters of the pond supported many varieties of fish and sea life, but Keahupua o Maunalua was especially known for the ‘ama‘ama (mullet) and awa (milkfish). Archaeologist William Kikuchi (July 23, 1974) postulated that fishponds were symbols of chiefly power because they required intensive labor to construct and maintain, which only chiefs could command. Historical narratives suggest that the fish of Keahupua o Maunalua may have been reserved for the ali‘i at times, though it was a common practice among the chiefs to redistribute resources among the maka‘āinana (Kamakau, 1991).

Despite the appearance of an inhospitable landscape, the resources of Maunalua supported significant populations of Native Hawaiians over time, suggesting that the area was an important component of Native Hawaiian society. For example, Kamehameha, the ali‘i nui who was famous for unifying the Hawaiian Islands through military conquest and diplomacy in the early 1800s, was known to have lived in Maunalua for a time. According to Kamakau, Kamehameha worked to
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restore parts of Keahupua o Maunalua in the early 1800s, at various fishponds and other worksites on O‘ahu in the early 1800s as part of a peaceful campaign to promote growth in the Islands (Kamakau, 1991). In a letter published in the July 31, 1865 issue of Ke Au Okoa, B. V. Kanaiku‘ihonoināmoku recounted famous areas favored as places of residence by the ali‘i and noted that Kamehameha had a large house at a place called Keawahili at Kawaihoa; Kamehameha was also said to have lived in the caves of Maunalua and in a village which remained in the area in the 1860s.

Figure 2. Excerpts from Ke Au Okoa about Maunalua. Top to bottom: The paper masthead and parts of the letter written by B. V. Kanaiku‘ihonoināmoku (July 31, 1865) about famous places of Oahu, including some discussion of Maunalua.
Moʻolelo ʻĀina of Maunalua

The cultural and historical significance of the area is reaffirmed by the presence of many moʻolelo connected to places and events in and around Maunalua. According to an interview given by the kupuna (elder) Almeida Goss (1962), Maunalua was one of the legendary places visited by Kāne and Kanaloa; these akua travelled around the islands creating springs and other sources of water. This place was named Kawaihoa (the water companion) as a testament to the water-bringing activities of the akua. It was in this area that their younger brother Kāneapua threw himself down in anguish after seeing Kāne and Kanaloa leaving without him, after he took too long fetching water for ʻawa (a drink made from the ʻawa [Piper methysticum] plant). His body became Kuamoʻokāneʻapua or Kuamoʻokāne (the backbone of Kāne; Handy et al. 1991, also records the name Moʻokua o Kaneʻapua), the cinder cone ridge dividing Hanauma from the area now known as Portlock on Maunalua Bay (Goss, 1962; Sterling and Summers, 1978; Mokumaia, March 4, 1921). Other moʻolelo suggest that Maunalua and its surrounding areas, such as Makapuʻu and Kaiwi, were culturally significant for navigators and fishermen. For example, in an oli said to have been chanted by Kuapākaʻa (the son of Pākaʻa, who was the famous attendant of the aliʻi Keawenuiaumi), all the winds of Oʻahu were named, starting and ending in Maunalua (Nakuina, 1990).

Maunalua and its surrounding areas were also visited by the akua wahine (goddess) Hiʻiakaikapiopele and her companion Wahineʻōmaʻo in their epic travels to fetch Pele’s lover, Lohiau. While approaching Makapuʻu from Molokaʻi, the men who were paddling the canoe bearing Hiʻiaka and her retinue were frightened after seeing a woman with many eyes, who was known as Makapuʻu; they fled from the canoe once landing (Maly & Wong, 1998). On another leg of their journey, Hiʻiaka and Wahineʻōmaʻo were welcomed by the akua wahine ʻIhiʻihilauākea and Kanonoʻula at Kuamoʻo o Kāne at Koko (Maly & Wong, 1998).

Maunalua is also mentioned in moʻolelo connected with Pele and her other sisters. When Pele was being pursued by the half–man, half–pig kupua (demigod), Kapokohelele (also known as Kapomaʻilele) detached her maʻi (sexual organ) from her body and flung it towards Koko. It left an imprint on a mountain at Maunalua, which was then called Kohelepelepe (vagina labia minor) and Puʻulepelepe (labia minor hill).

Unsurprisingly, many moʻolelo surround Keahupua o Maunalua. McAllister (1933) conversed with a Native Hawaiian woman named Makea Napahi, who noted that the fishpond was built by her great grandmother, the chiefess Mahoe, with the help of the menehune (a race of people known for their mysterious works).
A number of mo’o (water spirits) were associated with Keahupua o Maunalua. Mo’o were usually described as female ‘aumakua (Poepoe, n.d.). Mo’o were often associated with fishponds and were said to have reptilian features. According to Kamakau (1976),

They were the guardians who brought the blessing of abundance of fish, and of health to the body, and who warded off illness and preserved the welfare of the family and their friends... When the chiefs or their agents abused the poor and fatherless, the mo’o guardians took the fish away until the wrongdoers showed penitence and made restitution to their victims. (pp. 84–85)

A mo’o known as Luahine was said to have traveled from Keahupua o Maunalua to Pali Luahine in Mānoa (Sterling and Summers, 1978). The mo’o Laukupu was known to be the guardian and caretaker of Keahupua o Maunalua (Kamakau, 1976; McAllister, 1933).

Keahupua o Maunalua was strongly associated with Kā’elepulu in Kailua, O’ahu, which was known for being a favored fishpond and source of ‘o’opu (a type of go-by fish) of the ali’i ‘aimoku (chief of a district or island) Peleiöhölani in Kailua (Kanaiku’ihonoināmoku, July 31, 1865). Schools of ‘ama‘ama were said to have vanished from Keahupua o Maunalua while massive schools of awa would appear; the opposite was true for Kā’elepulu; many felt that there was a subterranean lava tube or tunnel connecting the two ponds (McAllister, 1933). The associations between Keahupua o Maunalua and Kā’elepulu were likely significant to Native Hawaiians, who may have understood these wahi pana to be linked in other ways.

The historical narratives included in this section are mo’olelo ‘āina about Maunalua and allow us to gain a better understanding of how Pahua Heiau may have fit into the historical and cultural landscapes of in Hawaiian society.
Pahua Heiau, with residential areas and Kohelepelepe (Koko Crater) in the background. Source: OHA, 2014.
Development and Urbanization in Maunalua

According to Davis (1985b), the lowland areas of Maunalua supported vast sweet potato gardens “to which, at least during the early post–contact years, an apparently sizeable population was devoted. Much of this population was also apparently resident in the neighborhood of Pahua Heiau,” (p. 1).

Yet, despite the presence of extensive sweet potato agriculture and the availability of resources from Keahupua o Maunalua, historical records indicate that occupation of certain villages in Maunalua was not always sustained or permanent, and that Maunalua likely had a shifting population. For example, Wāwāmalu is said to have been abandoned by the end of the 1840s, and whaling ships stopped frequenting Maunalua when an 1852 law required all whaling ships to anchor at Māmala in Honolulu (Takemoto, et al. 1975). As previously discussed, the dramatic loss of population in the Maunalua area was the result of massive death and migration. These population shifts are sometimes evident in the historical record; for example, although oral accounts suggest there was once a village in Haʻaʻione, a map drawn by William Webster in 1851 does not indicate the presence of a village, perhaps suggesting that the area was vacated before 1851.

As noted previously, archaeological estimates place the construction of the heiau between 1485—1665 CE or 1760—1795 CE. However, because of the difficulty of locating oral histories and other accounts for Pahua, scholars have had problems determining which aliʻi was responsible for building Pahua. Records of which aliʻi controlled Maunalua are also scarce, although Kamakau (1992) notes that during the reign of the Oʻahu aliʻi ʻaimoku Peleioholani (approximately 1737—1770) the aliʻi Kanahaokalani, the son of Kapiʻiohookalani defended Koko in a battle with the Hawaiʻi Island aliʻi Alapaʻi. Takemoto et. al. (1975) hypothesizes that Kanahaokalani was likely entrusted with the area.

General control over the lands of Maunalua is much easier to ascertain beginning in the 1800s. In the mid–nineteenth century, Maunalua was retained by Kamāmalu under Royal Patent Grant 4475 and Land Commission Award 7713 during the Māhele, which was a series of laws creating legal mechanisms for land privatization in Hawaiʻi initiated by King Kauikeaouli (Kamehameha III) beginning in the mid and late 1840s (Maly & Wong, 1998). In 1856, Kamāmalu leased all of Maunalua, except for Keahupua o Maunalua, to William Webster (a lawyer and land agent for the Kingdom), who held it until his death in 1864 (Dye, 2005; Takemoto et al., 1975). From 1864 to 1867, Maunalua was leased by Manuel Paiko and in 1867, Maunalua was leased to J. H. Kanepuu for a term of six years (Takemoto et al., 1975). Upon her death in 1866, Kamāmalu’s lands were passed to her father, Mataio Kekūanāoa. Upon his death in 1868, his lands passed to his daughter,
Ruth Ke’elikōlani. When Ke’elikōlani died in 1883, her extensive landholdings passed to her cousin, Bernice Pauahi Bishop, and Maunalua became a part of the Bishop Estate.

Unfortunately, the social, political, and economic transformations within Hawaiian society during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries would result in the increased loss of Native Hawaiian rights and access to natural resources in Maunalua. For example, Webster used much of the lands he held to ranch cattle. Fishing rights to Keahupua o Maunalua were also leased, and leaseholders often prohibited the free use of resources in the pond. For example, advertisements appeared in the nūpepa in the late 1800s warning people not to trespass and fish in the pond (Lee, January 9, 1894). Hunting was prohibited on ranch lands in Maunalua (Damon, 1905, October 7). And, when a cholera epidemic hit O’ahu in 1895 and again in 1900, all the fish from Keahupua o Maunalua were put under quarantine; fish and other seafood from the pond were prohibited for sale and consumption (Hawaiian Gazette, October 11, 1895; Hawaiian Star, January 3, 1900).

Over time, rice paddies, kukui (Aleurites moluccana) farms, coconut plantations, pigeon runs, apiaries, poultry farms, cattle ranching and other agro–commercial endeavors were initiated in Maunalua (MacCaughey, December, 1918). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, increasing numbers of Chinese and Portuguese immigrants moved to the area. In the 1960s, the areas immediately surrounding Pahua were occupied by pig farms and rural homesteads (Davis, 1985b).

Extensive residential and commercial development of Maunalua began in the 1970s. Henry J. Kaiser, an industrialist who had worked to build the Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams in the U.S., arrived in Hawai‘i in 1954 and began several development projects on O‘ahu. Kaiser envisioned a post–world war suburb that could house 75,000 people, a place in the islands where people from the U.S. could establish residence prior to statehood (Ali & Patrinos, 1995). With the permission of the landowners, Bishop Estate, Kaiser was able to initiate extensive residential development which would dramatically alter Maunalua in many ways; for example, large parts of Keahupua o Maunalua were dredged, farmers and other leaseholders in the area were forcibly removed, and Maunalua was renamed Hawai‘i Kai (the Kai was meant to be a subtle reference to Kaiser himself) (Ali & Patrinos, 1995). These projects transformed Maunalua into a place that was increasingly removed from associations with traditional Native Hawaiian culture and history (Trask, 1987).
Archaeological Study, Preservation and Restoration of Pahua
McAllister was the first archaeologist to record Pahua as an archaeological site. Other scholars and specialists would record observations at the site in the 1950s and 1960s, and brief accounts would appear in Sterling and Summers (1978). However, significant deterioration of Pahua occurred in the decades following the early part of the 1970s, much of it the result of the aggressive urban residential development in Maunalua. For example, stones from the site were used to make walls in residential landscaping and agricultural developments of the area. Erosion of the hillside buried parts of the site, and several trees disturbed the structural integrity of the heiau. Davis (1985b) notes that by 1980, “the structure had already been virtually reduced to an amorphous heap of rock,” (p. 3).

Figure 3. Archaeological drawing of Pahua Heiau from a bird’s eye view. Earl Neller Collection, Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Source: OHA, 2014.
Figure 4. Archaeological drawings of Pahua Heiau showing wall and terrace placement. Earl Neller Collection, Anthropology Department, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Source: OHA, 2014.
Modern restoration of Pahua Heiau has been the result of concerted community efforts. The first impetus for restoration came from the Hawai‘i Kai Lion’s Club, which cleared the site of vegetation in 1980. Four years later, on September 17, 1984, the Hawai‘i Kai Outdoor Circle identified Pahua for its 1984—1985 volunteer community service project. The goal of the project was to “clear the dense scrub overgrowth, restore the structure to its probable original form, and then landscape the property with Native Hawaiian plants, preserving a valuable cultural/historical resource for the benefit of the entire community,” (Davis, 1985a). The Circle invested over $25,000 to implement a phased restoration, landscaping, and maintenance plan for Pahua. Other financial contributions to the project were given by the Bishop Estate, Kaiser Development, the Outdoor Circle, Sandwich Isle Construction, the Tree People, and Waimea Falls Park (Hawaii Kai Sun Press, Feb. 21, 1985).

Restoration efforts engaged volunteers of diverse backgrounds, and included community members, tradesmen, and professionals. Students from Kamehameha Schools and the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, the Boy and Girl Scouts, volunteers from the Lions Club and National Job Corps, the Hawai‘i National Guard, as well as the community service work force from the O‘ahu Community Correctional Facility all contributed to these efforts (Davis, 1985b). The restoration process was overseen by Earl Neller, an archaeologist with the State of Hawai‘i Department of Historic Preservation, and Bertell Davis, an archaeologist with the Bishop Museum; Davis served as principal investigator in the project.

Restoration of the heiau was coordinated through the Bishop Museum Department of Anthropology. Archaeological excavations for the restoration of Pahua began in 1984. From 1984 to 1985, work was concentrated in the eastern half of the heiau, and was focused on identifying the extent of the walls and terraces. Workers cleared vegetation off the site from October to December of 1984. A research design and excavation plan were formulated using data that had been collected from archaeological mapping conducted by volunteer archaeology students from UH Mānoa. A number of excavations were completed by students from Ohio University, UH Mānoa students, and Bishop Museum staff during February and March of 1985 (Davis, 1985b). Two UH Mānoa archaeological field schools were also held at Pahua between 1985 and 1986.

Restoration of the terraces on the eastern half of the site, which were distinguished by complex construction, was completed by June 1985. Four large platforms and associated free-standing walls were rebuilt during this phase of the project. According to Davis, the reconstructed height of the walls was based on “the width of their foundations, the gradient of the floors on which they stood, and the height of the upper platform from which they extended,” which provided a reasonable
Although coral is commonly found in other kinds of coastal and inland archaeological sites, the amount of coral found in Pahua was more than what had been reported for other heiau located in coastal areas.

Archaeological work and restoration of the western half of Pahua was postponed until late 1985 and 1986 (Davis, 1985b). While the eastern platforms were filled and paved with basalt cobbles, most of the western platforms had primarily earthen floors. Several internal stone alignments believed to be the same rough terracing that had been identified in the area around the heiau were also found in the excavations of the western platform; these may have been a part of the extensive field system for sweet potato cultivation that was known to be in Maunalua, and the western terraces may have been built over existing agricultural structures. Excavations also uncovered a small detached platform with evidence of hearths, which suggest that it had been a house site, possibly for the kahu (caretaker) of the heiau (Davis, 1985c).

Overall, the excavations for the project revealed the heiau had an uphill-downhill width of 11 meters and length of 22 meters, “with a total accumulative height of roughly 5 meters from the lowest foundation to the highest floor,” (Davis, 1985b). Five dry stacked terraces and seven free standing walls were completed during the project.

Radiocarbon dating conducted on wet wood charcoal from a large fire pit adjacent to the heiau allowed archaeologists to determine that the hearth was used during 1485—1665 CE or 1760—1795 CE. Based on soil disturbance caused by the restoration efforts, archaeologists felt it was reasonable to infer that the eastern platforms of Pahua predate the use of the hearth. Therefore, the western platforms are thought to be older than the eastern platforms. Davis noted “the first of at least three major construction phases at Pahua likely dates at least as far back as the mid-sixteenth century,” (Davis, 1985b p. 19).

Only four pre-contact artifacts were found during excavations of the heiau, which Davis (1985b) notes is uncharacteristic for sites of Pahua’s size and age. Although few artifacts were found, the excavations revealed that a significant amount of coral was incorporated in the foundation and the walls of the heiau. Moreover, archaeologists found a very large coral limestone block built into the base of one of the heiau walls. A few other smaller examples of coral blocks were also found in other intact wall sections. Although coral is commonly found in other kinds of coastal and inland archaeological sites, according to Davis (1985b), “the amount of coral found in the rubble of Pahua Heiau appears to be considerably more than
what has been reported to date for other *heiau* located in coastal areas,” (pp. 14–15). Davis offered no theories on the significance of the large coral deposits at Pahua, although he noted that future archaeological research may illuminate the reasons for its incorporation in the *heiau*.

Other findings resulting from the work at Pahua have had broader scholarly implications. For example, following completion of the restoration project, Davis (1985b) concluded that “a crew of only ten reasonably experienced dry masons could have completed the entire structure in a month or less, working full-time,” (pg. 11). This finding challenged existing labor and time estimates for *heiau* that were smaller in size and less complex than Pahua. Although these findings did not challenge the theory that Pahua was primarily an agricultural *heiau* posited by McAllister in the 1930s, they gave archaeologists, scholars, and community members greater understanding of the historical and cultural significance of Pahua. That the reconstruction efforts were undertaken with the participation of a diverse set of volunteers allowed for a renewed sense of community and responsibility for this *wahi pana*.
Wahi Pana and ‘Ike ‘Āina in Stewardship of Pahua
Wahi Pana and ‘Ike ‘Āina in Stewardship of Pahua

One of the goals of this report was to renew an understanding of Pahua as a wahi pana within the broader community. In particular, a brief examination of heiau, an exploration of mo‘olelo about Pahua and Maunalua, an analysis of “Pahua” as a place name, and a review of findings resulting from archaeological study and restoration were some of the ways this report sought to enhance contemporary understandings of the cultural and historical significance of Pahua Heiau.

As noted previously, Native Hawaiians traditionally maintained strong connections to specific wahi pana that were shaped and also informed by unique ‘ike ‘āina. This intimate, nuanced knowledge of a place conveyed a sense of community responsibility among Hawaiians, and informed stewardship practices which maintained careful balance between people, resources, and the land. Appropriate, culturally–based stewardship of Pahua that is based on important Native Hawaiian concepts like ‘ike ‘āina and wahi pana could provide a strong example for land management strategies among OHA’s other landholdings and could also positively influence stewardship of other significant historical and cultural sites in Maunalua, such as Häwea Heiau, and throughout of Hawai‘i.

It is hoped that this report will foster the transmission of Native Hawaiian cultural and historical knowledge within the general community and to future generations in ways that will inspire long–term stewardship of Pahua Heiau as a wahi pana, a noted and celebrated place.
Historical Photographs of Maunalua and Pahua

This section of the report includes a selection of historical photographs of Maunalua. Many of these photographs provide an important look at parts of Maunalua prior to the extensive development of Hawai’i Kai in the 1950s, which included the dredging and infilling of parts of Ke Ahupua o Maunalua, the bulldozing and/or removal of sacred sites, as well as aggressive construction and urbanization throughout the area.

All photographs of Pahua Heiau included in this report were photographed during or after restoration work occurred in the 1980s, with the exception of the aerial photo of Kamiloiki and Kamilonui Valleys found on page 43. The more recent photos were taken by OHA staff members in 2014.
Top: Maunalua looking towards Kohelepelepe (Koko Crater) from Hanauma near Portlock, n.d.
Middle: Maunalua coastline and mudflats, near Niu Valley and Haha’ione (Paiko Lagoon).
Bottom: Elizabeth Kahanu Kalaniana’ole (right) with unknown companion in Maunalua with Koko Crater (Kohelepelepe) and Koko Head (Kuamo’okãne), 1900.

Sources: Hawai‘i State Archives Digital Collections.

Historical Photographs of Maunalua and Pahua
42
Historical Photographs of Maunalua and Pahua

The northern banks of Keahupua o Maunalua Fishpond (Kuapa), likely turned into duck ponds or rice fields. n.d.  
Source: Hawai‘i State Archives Digital Collections.

Left: Koko Crater (Kohelepelepe) and Koko Head (Kuamo‘okāne), 1915. Source: Hawai‘i State Archives Digital Collections. 
Top: Hanauma Bay, O’ahu, n.d.
Bottom Left: Makapu’u from Waimānalo Pali showing Archaeological Features. Historical Commission, 1923.
Bottom Right: Old road over pass between Waimānalo and Sandy Beach area, O’ahu. 1931.

Sources: Hawai’i State Archives Digital Collections.
Middle: Maunalua as seen from the Ka Iwi Coastline, 1959.
Bottom: The Kaiwi Coastline, n.d.

Sources: Hawai‘i State Archives Digital Collections.
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Top Left to Bottom Right: Restoration efforts at Pahua in the 1980s. Anthropology Department, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa. Source: OHA Files, 2014.

Historical Photographs of Maunalua and Pahua
Top: Pahua Heiau with the Kamiloiki and Kamilonui residential areas in the background.
Bottom: Pahua Heiau, Maunalua, O’ahu.

Sources: OHA, 2014.
Top: A view from the Northwestern corner of Pahua Heiau.  
Bottom: Pahua Heiau, Maunalua, O‘ahu.

Sources: OHA, 2014.
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