



University of Hawaii at Manoa

Department of Anthropology
Porteus Hall 346 • 2424 Maile Way
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

October 15, 1985

Dr. R. Hommon
Department of the Navy
Pacific Division
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860-7300

Dear Dr. Hommon:

Please find enclosed my review of D.T.P. Keene's "Kaho'olawe Island, Hawaii Ethnic Significance Overview". Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this document. I would be pleased to receive a copy of the Final Report when it is available. If you have any questions regarding my review please contact me at 948-7310 or 948-8415.

Sincerely,


Matthew Spriggs
Assistant Professor

MS:en

Enclosure

REVIEW OF D.T.P. KEENE "KAHO'OLAWA ISLAND,
HAWAII ETHNIC SIGNIFICANCE OVERVIEW"

By Matthew Spriggs, Assistant Professor
University of Hawaii at Manoa

October 1985

In some ways the timing of the report is unfortunate as several major publications which bear on questions addressed by Keene have just been published or are nearing completion. Recently published, generally at about the same time or just after Keene submitted his report, are:

1. J. Linnekin: "Children of the Land", concerning the Hawaiian community of Keanae, Maui. This represents an expansion of Linnekin's 1980 doctoral thesis which is referred to on page 26 of Keene (but not included in the bibliography on page 109).
2. V. Valeri: "Kingship and Sacrifice in the Hawaiian Islands". A major study of aspects of Hawaiian religion, including the different types of heiau.
3. M. Sahlins: "Islands of History". Several papers on aspects of Hawaiian history, social structure.
4. Pat Kirch: "Feathered Gods and Fishhooks: An Introduction to Hawaiian Archaeology and Prehistory". The major synthesis of Hawaiian archaeological findings.

In addition, nearing completion is the study by Paul Rosendahl Inc., Kaho'olawe Excavations 1982-83 which will represent a major rewriting of Kaho'olawe's prehistory in terms of dating and interpretation. Several personal communications from Matthew Spriggs are given in Keene's text which relate to this research.

While it is clearly not Keene's fault that these references were unavailable at time of submission of his report they all represent significant studies which need to be considered prior to submission of the final report as they have the potential to alter considerably interpretations of the Pre-Contact Hawaiian Culture (Valeri, Sahlins, Kirch), Hawaiian Culture Today (Linnekin), and especially questions of Kaho'olawe's history and archaeology (Rosendahl) which relate significantly to the questions of ethnic significance. Much of Rosendahl's report is complete including Spriggs' study of environmental change and I would recommend that the Navy ask Paul Rosendahl Inc. that draft copies of the completed parts of Rosendahl's report be made available immediately to Dr. Keene so that these important findings can be integrated with his report.

My specific comments on the report follow:

Page 1-2. Reference to Kirch's new book would change and clarify some of the questions of origins and chronology. See also interview with Kirch in the Star-Bulletin where he now suggests settlement by OAD on the basis of recent archaeological findings. "...by A.D. 1400-1500 the most marginal areas...were

occupied"--it would be better to say by A.D. 1600 (see Hommon 1983). Reference to Kaho'olawe population decline will be challenged by results of Rosendahl's study. Page 1-2 reference to 6th century A.D. irrigation has since been challenged by Steven Athen's ~~report~~ report to Bishop Museum on Hanalei Valley. It might be better to suggest that although irrigation was most probably practiced by the earliest settlers (lo'i has cognates in other East Polynesian languages such as Rapa), the most elaborate systems come later.

Page 8-10 (see also pp. 96-97). This section on religion should reference and discuss Valeri's new book.

Page 12-13. Question of human-induced environmental change and its effects. See M. Spriggs (1985) "Prehistoric human-induced landscape enhancement in the Pacific", in I. Farrington (ed.) Prehistoric Intensive Agriculture in the Tropics, for a different view which includes Hawaiian case studies.

Page 17, line 10. 1796 not 1896.

Page 18, 2nd paragraph. More recent population figures should be given than 1950; such figures are available (see Kanahale below).

Page 20, 3rd paragraph (also page 64, 3rd paragraph). These land statistics are misleading as large acreages are held by trusts which benefit Native Hawaiians such as Bishop Estate. Reference to G.S. Kanahale (1982) Current Facts and Figures About Hawaiians pages 4 to 6 is needed.

Page 22, 3-7 lines from bottom of page. Reference should be made to a recent OHA survey of needs which is noted in the October issue of the OHA newspaper which considers the question of language, and also to recent pre-school projects which use the Hawaiian language.

Page 29, 4 lines up. Pre-contact plant species are treated extensively in various reports from Paul Rosendahl Inc.'s recent project.

Page 30-32. The results of Paul Rosendahl Inc.'s project will substantially alter the provisional model put forward by Hommon.

Page 31. "Furrowed at intervals" could refer to gulches which dissect the otherwise flat terrain rather than referring to erosion.

Page 39, 3rd paragraph. "A firm conclusion as to whether...await further analysis of archaeological data". This has been done as part of the Rosendahl project.

Page 40, end of 2nd paragraph. 1859 not 1889.

Page 64, 3rd line from bottom. I would suggest deleting "influential, if not"!

Page 66, line 4. "Collegiate--marxist element". This is a very journalistic phrase; some better identification of the "factions" mentioned here and generally in this section would be helpful to the serious historian. There is too much vagueness as to the issues leading to splits in the PKO, and this section pp. 65-67 seems too superficial a coverage.

Page 67, paragraph 5. Generally "resource person" as used in the Hawaiian movement also implies non-Hawaiian ancestry.

Page 70-71. Very little coverage is given on more recent PKO activities i.e. since 1980. This section could be expanded.

Page 72, paragraph 2. Ben Henderson has been Acting Administrator of OHA for the last several months.

Page 75 Surveys. One of the TV Channels in 1984 or 1985 held an "electronic town meeting" phone-in survey on whether Kaho'olawe should be used for military purposes. This should be mentioned.

Page 78, chiefly grave. Silva and others have missed the following reference to the Kaho'olawe chiefly grave:

"At another time he [Kalakaua] persuaded a very old man, the kahu of a puoa [cave] on Kaho'olawe, to show him the entrance. The old man knew that he should die as soon as he parted with the secret, but he was old and weary of life and proud to die for his king. Kalakaua was very eager, but the kahu then told him that the man who opened it would die too. Not being weary of life, the king came to me and begged me to go and open the puoa for him. I asked if he was anxious to kill me: and he answered (in the general belief of his people) that the predicted fate had power only over Hawaiians. We went so far as to make an agreement as to the partition of the things that might be found, but the king's departure for the coast of California, where he died, put an end to the adventure, and the old kahu soon after died also."

--W. Brigham (1906) p. 174. "Old Hawaiian Carvings". Bishop Museum.

Page 81, line 4. "and probably lowered the water table". What evidence is there for this statement?

Page 85, line 6. 1090 change to 1980.

Page 88, paragraph 2. I would dispute Neller's assertion. If sites have been destroyed by bombing there might be no traces left and as no complete survey was done prior to military use we don't know (and presumably have no way of telling) how much damage and how many sites were destroyed by military activity. It is quite possible that lagged scatters of artifacts representing destroyed sites could mark sites destroyed by bombing where the soil matrix of the site was subsequently eroded away. In such a case we can't know the exact cause of the erosion of a site which is no longer there!

Page 90 Kamohio. The cave is indicated on an old map of Kaho'olawe (Doc. 1126) which is presumably of late 19th date and is reproduced in the MRNF.

Page 94 Ahupu. These dates may need revision in the light of the Rosendahl project.

Page 96 Hakioawa. These dates may need revision in the light of the Rosendahl project.

Page 97, top of page. Hale mua does occur in early Hawaiian references however. The archaeological remains are entirely consistent with Site 358's interpretation as a men's house--a structure more impressive than the usual

residential structure and containing food remains and evidence of tool manufacture. Other structures of this kind in Hawaii have been interpreted in this way by archaeologists such as Kirch and Spriggs.

Page 97, paragraph 4. Although not much reported in the literature, nucleated settlements are quite common in areas concentrating on dryland agriculture such as Lana'i, SW Molokai, Puna, Ka'u, and parts of Kohala on Hawaii Island etc. Hakioawa's uniqueness in this respect has been overstressed by previous writers.

Page 99. Questions of visitor impact to sites and site alterations by religionists are of concern to archaeologists and have the potential to become a major point of conflict in the future. This question certainly needs to be addressed. Statements from PKO and other religionists concerning their attitudes to and futures plans for alteration of archaeological sites on the island should be collected as this relates to ethnic significance. The solution which should be considered is for funds to be sought for archaeological salvage in areas being impacted such as Hakioawa, Moaulaiki so that clearance can be given for "construction" activities just as would be required if any other impacts were leading to deterioration of the historic resources. Archaeological excavation prior to halau construction etc. should be required. Discussion of this issue is all too brief in Dr. Keene's report.

Page 101, paragraph 4. "It is also desirable...decisions regarding the cultural resources of Kaho'olawe". This may be so but is nowhere discussed in the text. Have other Hawaiian organizations ever shown any sustained and serious interest in the cultural resources of the Island? Information given in the text suggests not.

Bibliography. Linnekin 1980 and Kahaulelio 1902 are not referenced.

Documentary Sources Appendix. This appears to include only references post 1970, whereas several important pre-1970 references were missed by Carol Silva in her 1983 report. Is it intended to revise Silva's report for the pre-1970 period? In 1983 I gave to H.D. Tuggle, then the Navy archaeologist, a list of newspaper articles on Kaho'olawe, mainly from the 1950s and 1960s I believe, which Silva had not included. In addition as part of my own research I have come across several other important references to the Island which should be noted. One of them is the quotation from Brigham 1906 already referred to in this review. Others include references from the Wilkes Expedition (the Geology and Hydrography volumes), Remy's translation of Sheldon Dibbles Mo'olelo Hawaii, (1862), Brigham's 1868 book on Volcanoes, Malo's (1951) reference to Kaho'olawe agriculture, and J.N. Cobb's 1902 and 1905 reports on the Commercial Fisheries of the Hawaiian Islands. Kahaulelio (1902) was also missed by Silva. In more recent references, Evangeline Funk's M.A. and 1982 paper on Touchardia (Archaeology in Oceania 17(1) p. 16) and Harold St. John's paper in Pacific Science (1969) on Hawaiian species of Gouannia contain important information. The files of the Malacology section of Bishop Museum should also be checked for information on the several collecting expeditions to the island which took place in the early part of this century. Efforts to obtain copies of A. Remy's diary (if still in existence) for his botanical expedition to the island in the early 1850s should be undertaken. It is probably in the French Museum of Natural History which published extracts from it in the late 19th century pertaining to Molokai and Hawaii.

Conclusion

Keene's report is generally well-prepared and a useful document. It suffers from its timing given the newly-available major studies of past and modern Native Hawaiian culture which have just appeared, or are just about to appear. In some areas its treatment appears too brief, particularly PKO history since 1980 and the question of alteration/impact to historic sites by PKO members. The treatment of culturally significant sites on other islands (p. 58-9) was planned to be "succinct" but it is too short to say anything significant about what Native Hawaiians might feel today about such sites, a question of relevance to the Kaho'olawe case.

I strongly suggest that reviews of Dr. Keene's previous study be appended to this report (as well as reviews of the current report). Dr. Keene refers frequently to these reviews and some would appear to include substantial new information on and interpretations of Kaho'olawe's ethnic significance and history. I am thinking in particular of Aluli et al (1983), Barrere (1983) and Perkins (1983) although there may have been other substantive reviews.

Again, I would suggest that Dr. Keene be given an opportunity to integrate the newly-published studies into his report and that all efforts be made to obtain access for him to the reports of Paul Rosendahl Inc.'s archaeological project. The Documentary sources appendix (or Silva's 1983 report) also needs to be made more comprehensive.

Matthew Spragg