

person, and instances occurred where all the moos which composed an ili, were possessed by one individual.

Every feudatory was bound to his particular land-owner, after the same manner as the chief or land-owner was bound to the king; and thus a feudal connexion was established between the king and his lowest subject, by which tie the society or clan was held together.

The king and chiefs having power even to depriving a chief not only of his rank, but also of his possessions, had complete control over the whole, and had them firmly bound to their purposes.

This was the only system of government known to the Hawaiians, and even the older chiefs cannot be persuaded that authority or government can be successfully maintained by any other means. Their argument is, "If they cannot take the people's lands away from them, what will they care for their authority?"

But, what appears extraordinary, this bond was more often severed by the superiors than by their vassals, notwithstanding the landlord had not only a right to require military service, to tax his particular tenants at pleasure, and demand other things, among which might be daily labour in any or every kind of employment, so that a labourer seldom received on an average more than one-third of the value of his work, while the different chiefs pocketed the rest. But this was not all; even this portion of one-third was not secure, for they had no line of demarcation by which the tenant could separate the profits of his labour from the property of his chief; and if he by any chance was industrious, and brought his farm into a good state of cultivation, he was at once marked out as a subject for taxation. No tenant, in short, could call any thing he had his own. Favouritism, jealousy, and fickleness of character were so general, that no landholder could consider himself sure of the fruits of his own exertions, and therefore would make no improvements, and even ridiculed the idea of attempting them.

These exactions came so heavily at times from particular chiefs, that the landholders found it necessary, in order to avoid starvation, to hold lands at the same time under different chiefs, so that their chance might be greater of retaining a portion, and that the necessities of one of them could not entirely sweep away the whole.

All that restrained a chief in demanding taxes or from dispossessing his tenants was a certain sense of propriety, which forbade the ejection of the actual cultivator of the land, notwithstanding the changes which might take place above him, so that those possessing the moos were seldom disturbed. Self-interest must have pointed out this course to the chiefs, and it not only prevented distress throughout the different islands, but mitigated the evils of the frequent changes that were