

# PROTECT KAHO'OLAWA 'OHANA



January 23, 1984

TO: David Tuggle, PhD.  
PACNAVFACENGCOM 09P3  
Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96860

FROM: E. Aluli, T. Dye, K. Fairbanks, and H. McEldowney

RE: Kaho'olawe Cultural Study Draft

ALOHA KAUA:

Thank you for meeting with us at the University of Hawaii on January 10. Present at the meeting were Nathan Napoka, Tom Keane, Keoni Fairbanks, Holley McEldowney, Rick Warshauer, Tom Dye and yourself. The purpose of this letter is to review what transpired at the meeting. If you disagree with anything in this letter, or feel that important points have been omitted, please address your concerns in writing to Keoni Fairbanks or Emmett Aluli.

The meeting opened with a pule led by Keoni Fairbanks in which those present expressed solidarity in working toward completion of adequate and accurate historical and cultural studies of Kaho'olawe.

At the onset, you related that no schedule has been set for completion of the Cultural Study, but that Tom Keane, author of the Cultural Study Draft will be responsible for the necessary revisions. Keane will most likely be awarded a contract to complete the revisions, but the details of that contract have yet to be worked out. Likewise, the Scope of Work has not been finalized and no decisions have been made as to which of the specific and general comments on the Cultural Study Draft offered by the 'Ohana, SHPO, and others will be incorporated into the Scope of Work. Your offer to circulate Leialoha Apo Perkins' comments on the Cultural Study Draft is gratefully accepted.

Tom Keane was given the opportunity to ask any questions or voice any concerns that he has about the comments on his Cultural Study Draft. He voiced concern over the negative tone of many of the comments, but had no questions about the content or meaning of the comments.

The next portion of the meeting was given over to a discussion of general points that may serve to guide the revision process and that should be incorporated in the Scope of Work. These general points may be summarized under three major headings: 1) Historical Perspective, 2) Ethnographic Overview, and 3) Social, Cultural, Political and Economic Context.

## HAWAII

11 Kou Lane  
Hilo, Hawaii 96720

P.O. Box 469  
Na'alehu, Hawaii 96772

P.O. Box 993  
Kailua, Kona, Hawaii 96743

P.O. Box 833  
Kapa'au, Hawaii

## MAUI

RR 1 Box 267  
Wailuku, Maui 96793

P.O. Box 254  
Hana, Maui 96713

## MOLOKAI

P.O. Box H  
Kaunakakai, Molokai 96748

## LANAI

P.O. Box 44  
Lana'i City, Lana'i 96763

## O'AHU

796 Isenberg Street #19-H  
Honolulu, O'ahu 96826

47-175 A Aha'olelo Road  
Kaneohe, O'ahu 96744

85-134 Old Plantation Road  
Waianae, O'ahu 96792

## KAUAI

P.O. Box 368  
Hanapepe, Kauai 96716

323 Kamokila Street  
Kapa'a, Kauai 96746

ALOHA 'AINA



Historical Perspective: The lack of an historical summary of the years 1970-1981 in Silva's Historical Study Draft was noted and sharply criticized as arbitrary and counterproductive, as it made it difficult to relate the Cultural Study Draft to any on-going historical processes. You accepted these criticisms and expressed your belief that there was every good reason to document this period. You noted that an 'information explosion' since 1970 would make an exhaustive treatment, such as that attempted by Silva, difficult, if not impossible to complete. It was generally agreed that a summary of the important events of this period would suffice, though Keane expressed reservations about having to decide what constitutes an important event. In response to this reservation, those present expressed a willingness to consult with Keane during his historical research to work out specific problems on interpretation.

Silva's summary section was criticized on several counts, the most important of which were its lack of alternative interpretations of the early historical accounts and its poor articulation with the aims of the Cultural Study Draft. It was agreed that documentation of the period 1970-1981, more thorough and scholarly consideration of the early historical sources, and a summary geared toward the more general aims of the Cultural Study would help to mitigate these criticisms.

Ethnographic Overview: Several criticisms of the Cultural Study Draft centered on what seemed to be Keane's lack of appreciation of Hawaiian ethnography, so it was suggested that Keane incorporate an overview of Hawaiian culture as a baseline against which both continuity and change could be assessed. You and Keane both asked which summaries on native culture other people at the meeting had found most helpful in their own work. The major works mentioned were those of Malo, Kamakau, Sahlins (unpublished), and Barrere. You offered to provide Keane with a copy of Barrere's work, and Dye and McEldowney offered to procure copies of Sahlins unpublished works. Dye has written to Sahlins requesting permission to copy these unpublished works, on file at the Bishop Museum. On receipt of permission, McEldowney will copy the papers and forward them to Keane.

All present agreed that a proper ethnographic overview should be included in the final Cultural Study.

Social, Cultural, Political, and Economic Context: The Cultural Study Draft was criticized for not relating values and beliefs about Kaho'olawe to social, cultural, political and economic events and processes. Keane expressed doubt that this could be done given the wide spectrum of values and beliefs currently held by the people of Hawaii. It was suggested that this problem could be overcome by focussing first upon those people who had devoted considerable time and effort to the issues raised by Kaho'olawe, and opposing these to views held by people who had chosen not to devote time and energy to these issues. It was generally agreed that completion of the Ethnographic overview and adoption of an historical perspective would aid in the solution of this problem. Others present at the meeting offered to consult with Keane should he have difficulties in relating values and beliefs to social, cultural, political and economic events and processes.



Some of the specific points raised at the meeting were: 1) the need for some sort of ethno-geography of the island, so that the cultural importance of the geographic position of various natural and cultural features could be assessed, and 2) discussion of the present and future role played by children in the exercise of native Hawaiian rights to Kaho'olawe. It was generally agreed that these specific points would be most easily addressed with reference to the ethnographic overview.

As at our previous meeting, the Theodoratus report was cited as a model for the Kaho'olawe Cultural Study. Deane raised the argument that such a study was not possible in Hawaii because: 1) Hawaiian culture was "discontinuous" as opposed to the continuity displayed by the American Indian cultures dealt with by Theodoratus, and 2) Summaries of Hawaiian culture are not as complete or as competent as Keoerber's overviews of American Indian cultures. The first argument was rejected as besides the point - Keane's job will be, in part, to identify aspects of both continuity and change in the Hawaiian culture. As noted above, several good summaries of Hawaiian culture at the time of European contact are extant and will be made available to Keane. Fairbanks offered to send Keane a copy of the Theodoratus report for his reference.

We look forward to meeting with you and your successor in the near future, and to helping in any way possible with completion of the Scope of Work and revisions made to the Cultural and Historical Studies Draft.

Mahalo for your time and your concern for the future of Kaho'olawe.

Sincerely,

Emmett Aluli

cc: Dr. Thomas King  
Mr. Louis Wall  
Mr. Nathan Napoka  
SHPO  
PKO membership