

Book Reviews

Pi'o, An Enquiry into the Marriage of Brothers and Sisters and other Close Relatives in Old Hawai'i. By William H. Davenport. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1994. xii + 91 pp. Appendix. Bibliography. Index. \$26.50.

The preface to this study of "close consanguineal marriage" notes the historical record of brother-sister marriages from the time of contact (Captain James King, 1776–1780; Captain George Vancouver, 1792–1794), before the introduction of writing (1820) and the beginning of native Hawaiian commentaries on this subject by Lahainaluna Seminary scholars (David Malo, *Moolelo Hawaii*, 1836–1838, and Samuel M. Kamakau, whose works were published between 1961 and 1991), and previous analyses of the practice from various scholastic points of view, anthropological and sociological, between 1871 and 1950 (Louis Henry Morgan, Robert Briffault, Edward Westermarck, W. H. R. Rivers, Robert Lowie, George P. Murdock). "In addition," explains the author, "there were less sweeping interpretations of the pattern by distinguished scholars of Hawaiian culture, such as A. Fornander, M. W. Beckwith, M. K. Puku'i, E. S. C. Handy, and D. Barrere" (p. x).

"I undertook this study . . . because new historical data were becoming accessible; and perhaps because there seemed to be some fundamental discrepancies among the interpretations of often-cited comparative scholars" (p. x).

When I began this study certain obvious questions were uppermost in my mind. Just what kind of marital pattern was the *pi'o* marriage? Was it preferred or prescribed only under certain circumstances and what might these be? Who were the participants? How often did such marriages occur? . . . (p. x)

Our question, both as scholars and native Hawaiian descendants affected by these disclosures, since they derive from our legitimate or illegitimate past, depending on the perspective of the persons reexamining that record

The Hawaiian Journal of History, vol. 30 (1996)

and how much it fortifies disdain or curiosity, would be: does Davenport succeed in his stated objectives?

As though he had foreordained that expectancy, he leaves no one any doubt that he has exhausted the data:

So I conceived the idea of constructing a register of references to *pi'o* unions covering both *manuscripts and published works*. That register appears as an appendix to this essay. . . .

As of the moment of writing, the register lists 86 references to different close consanguineous marriages, most of which come from recorded genealogies . . . a very small fraction. . . . [I]t is realistic to assume that they actually were rare events and that Hawaiians perceived them as such. (p. xi; emphasis added)

On a very positive side, Davenport has made of his study a definite contribution because the data are quickly and conveniently made accessible, whereas formerly the subject entries would require the kind of organization that the author by his effort already offers to researchers. The simple provision of this organized information gives the essay its formidable value.

That is the quantitative assessment. Qualitatively, then, what is the commensurate value of the commentary derived from the data?

The opening division (or chapter), "Hawaiian Society: 1778-1824," exemplifies the dual translation of *ali'i* as politically "aristocrat" when a member of a social class or "chief" as of political office (see p. xii, paragraph 1). In relation to social classes in the hierarchical order, a particularly constant ethnological reminder is the emphasis placed on the distance between the "aristocrat" *ali'i* and the inferior or subjected commoner class (*maka'āinana*) and outcaste (*kauwā*) groups. In actuality, however, the *ali'i* are part of the extended family groupings (*'ohana*) or they were not "chief(s)" over people allowing that right to rule, as the political office comes with that relationship in different hierarchies of feudal warrior-chief responsibilities (as also noted) which required, on the part of the *ali'i*, certain kinds of unexempted performance expected in times of military crisis. Oftentimes the ethnological stereotype of the "aristocrat" minimalizes the membership of the *ali'i* within the *'ohana* system, if over it as political and social in leadership and ultimate feudal title, still of it as well in terms of kinship within the consanguineal definitions of blood-related kin groupings.

Another aspect forgotten or misunderstood, apparently, is the position of that chief within the hierarchy of descending authority to rule derived from the god(s) or patriarchal godhead, as from Ku, the highest-ranking among the gods themselves (Lono, Kane, and Kanaloa, in descending rank thereafter) within the context of divine descent from the godhead. The chief is of

kupua nature, meaning that the god himself is reborn into the chief and by which the chief receives the incarnate status, personality, and embodiment, both physically and spiritually, from the divinity itself, thus “son” of the “regal sky” (*lani ali'i*) and paramount chief (*lani ali'i*), as from that hierarchical dimension, the “sky” (*lani*) from which superiority of position status of rule abides and descends. The so-called sacred aspect of chiefly rank as a religious endorsement is that part of the culture which maintained that gods descend bodily into their sons, the chiefs, and genealogical declaration must be proven by observation and recorded. The chiefs, however, must not only prove by oratory of birth that status but also by valor, from the moment they are weaned from their mothers and put to the social test of obedience to instruction by qualified masters and by valor on the field of combat. From this responsibility they would have had no privilege to escape unless to bring an unwanted dishonor on their respective houses. That sons of gods and warrior-chiefs must give their lives in battle as the distinctive calling of their status and right to rule is seldom given the ethnological consideration it deserves.

From the above follows the resulting levels of subsidiary rank, taboo, and forms of distinctive marriage from the paramount and subsidiary chiefs within the several Island sovereignties of historical record. The record suffices as to the “how” rather than the “why” of such marriages that qualified the *ni'aup'i'o* from the *naha* ranks and their corresponding respect taboo: *kapu moe* (*ni'aup'i'o/pi'o*), *kapu noho* (*naha*), and *kapu wohi* (the taboo of “choice” [*wohi*], i.e., whereby the demand of the *kapu moe* may be waived to a lesser form of directed honors (i.e., sitting, rather than prostration). The discrepancies of definition per native historian accounts are tabulated for easy inspection and reference (pp. 29–30) in the chapter titled “Sacred Rank and Marriage Between Close Kin.” This is followed in the commentary by another clarification of terms denoting the “Lesser Ranks of the Ali'i” (chapter 7) so that categories so often confusing to students become more distinct, or once more, they are all in one place: the *papa*, *lokea*, *la'au ali'i/la'auli*, *kaukau ali'i*, *ali'i noanoa*, *ali'i maka'ainana*.

Treatment of the subject of improper incestuous unions, as of parent to child (and also grandparent to grandchild), is made in “Close Consanguineous Unions and the Incest Taboo,” in which two recorded father/daughter unions are part of the precontact genealogical record. As Davenport does report, however, the incestuous union of parent to child was not condoned by precontact Hawaiian mores, even among the chiefs, and the Wakea cosmogonic union with Ho'ohokukalani, as of Sky Father to the daughter of his mate, Earth-Mother Papa-hanau-moku, is a mystical explanation of the extraordinary origin of chiefs descending from an anomalous relationship between the cosmic and terrestrial principles. As Davenport points out in

earlier chapters, the permissible between-generations matings having *nī'auipi'o* status were between siblings of the parents and parents' children. It follows, then, that the definition of incest in Hawaiian taboos is that between parent/child (and grandparent/grandchild), although this is to be inferred from the accumulated genealogical and historical data.

Davenport writes, "After vanquishing Kiwala'o, Kamehameha I took one of Ka-lani-opu'u's former consorts, Kane-kapolei, as his own" (p. 43), perhaps to emphasize a political motive for the nephew/aunt *nī'auipi'o* result, with Kaoleioku as the offspring of rank from that acceptable union between generations, thus: "This is best seen as a political prize of the capture of the chieftainship. . . . He also took Ke-opu-o-lani, who was the vanquished Kiwala'o's daughter in order to secure his political successors . . ." (p. 43).

It should be pointed out that none of these results were to Kamehameha's actual advantage, since the dynastic successorship of Keōpūolani's heirs, Liholiho and Kauikeaouli, shifted the paramount sovereignty, or rather its power of prestige and lineal base, back to Maui (rather than Hawai'i). It is therefore necessary to provide here additional information by which to better judge or to assess Kamehameha's political motives from the standpoint of structured marriages.

It should be remembered that Kalani'ōpu'u vanquished Keaweopala, heir to Alapa'i's sovereignty over the island of Hawai'i, and when he had secured that position, Kalani'ōpu'u moved Kamehameha and Kamehameha's brother, Kalaimamahū, to his own court:

. . . When Kalaniopuu next arrived from Kau, it was to take Kamehameha away with him, perhaps because Kamehameha's mother had died. This was in accordance with Keoua's request before his death. When they left, they were accompanied by Kalaimamahu, son of Keoua and Kamakaeheikuli and half brother of Kamehameha. Upon their arrival in Kau, Kalaniopuu placed Kamehameha with his wife, the chiefess Kaneikapolei. . . .

Because his [Kamehameha's] physique was perfect and his features well formed and admirable, the women took a great fancy to him, as they did also to his younger brother Kalaimamahu. . . . This led to trouble with their uncle Kalaniopuu, for they were taken by Kaneikapolei, wife of Kalaniopuu. This happened twice, the first time with Kalaimamahu and the second time with Kamehameha. It was probably in this way that Kaoleioku was conceived." (John Papa Ii, *Fragments of Hawaiian History*, 1959, 6-7)

Davenport continues: "He [Kamehameha] also took Keopuolani, who was the vanquished Kiwala'o's daughter, and with her he had two sons, Liholiho and Kau-i-ke-aouli, and a daughter" (p. 43).

Kamehameha was a brother of Keku'iapo'iwa Liliha, the wife of Kiwala'o,

and Keōpūolani was Kīwala'ō's daughter by Kamehameha's sister. By returning the successorship to the line of Keōpūolani, Kamehameha was securing the successorship equally in favor of Kīwala'ō and through Kīwala'ō's own descendants.

Kamehameha was known to have preferred the line of Keli'imaika'i, his full brother, to succeed to the paramount sovereignty, or he at least regarded his own line and that of his brother Keli'imaika'i as potentially able to access the descent of sovereign power by succession:

Liholiho and Kekuaokalani [son of Keli'imaika'i] were both regarded as heirs to the kingdom, just as Kiwalao and Kamehameha had been in the days when Kalaniopuu was living. . . . (Ii, 1959, 140)

That Kamehameha declared Liholiho heir to the kingdom when this son was barely five years old, that is to say, when Liholiho had not yet given any indication by inclination or training that he would be a fit successor, also indicates the priority of succession which favored the rank of Keōpūolani which derived from Kīwala'ō and Keku'iapoiwa Liliha, rather than Kamehameha. Moreover, it also favored the lineage from the Maui kings (Kekaulike and his descendants) and speaks of another motive perhaps greater in the sincere regret of Kamehameha for the death of Kīwala'ō and wish to atone for the death of this son of Kalola, from whom Kamehameha wrested consent for the hand of Keōpūolani before Kalola died on Moloka'i.

Finally, it must be said that William Davenport has again lived up to his reputation as a rigorous scholar of Hawaiian culture, that in this work he has spared no small attention to the most pertinent of details in a complicated set of patterns in nearly two thousand years of Hawaiian genealogical tradition.

Rubellite K. Johnson
Retired Professor of Indo-European Languages
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

Volcano: A Memoir of Hawai'i. By Garrett Hongo. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995. 342 pp. \$24.00.

The poet, Garret Hongo, has written a memoir of the Volcano district of the Big Island where he was born—but did not grow up. Hongo's birth certificate identifies him as having been born at "29 Miles." His return to his local roots, twenty-nine miles from Hilo, led him to search out most of what we

read in the book. Since his memories are actually few, the book is more a discovery of the truth than a conventional memoir that recovers the truth.

Volcano is written with a dense texture. Concrete details, testifying to the broad interests and knowledge that inform this book, range from sublime poets and painters like Bashō and Van Gogh to the shining slime trails of lowly slugs and the flow temperature of molten lava. Hongo's imagination ranges from Dante's wood (the author is himself midway on the path of life) to the natural history of the volcano forest, particularly its flora and geology. The book is packed with miscellaneous, yet ultimately interesting, references. This method is reminiscent of something another poet, Wendell Berry, once said in conversation: that while in poetry he uses one manner, when writing prose he throws in everything he knows. Rather than being poetic prose, the style is more a poet's prose.

One of the most interesting stories is that of his Grandmother Yukiko, whom the author had thought dead. But, in getting together with his Hawai'i relatives to hear the family saga, he discovered that she was still alive. This fact is in itself startling enough, and the reader wonders if Hongo will ever get to meet her. The suspense is resolved after an interval, and Hongo finally does meet her, but she is an old woman who lets her husband do the talking. Apparently lost in a world of deafness or denial behavior, Yukiko does not even hear Hongo ask why she left his father forever. But there is a hint of the story's climax in the incongruous detail that this out-of-it antique reminds Hongo of Gloria Swanson in *Sunset Boulevard*.

After another interval, we come to the end of the story as the newly discovered grandmother, with a faultless sense of theatrical impact, waits backstage during her own eighty-fifth birthday party. Finally, she emerges like a fantastic butterfly, "dressed in rich brocades that trailed like a banner of clouds behind her. She wore a thick wig and an ornate headdress too, her face powdered white and her features lacquered in a classic red and black." Not everybody has a grandmother like that!

One section of the book is a true memoir that recounts the Los Angeles where Hongo was raised. This section features an awful moment when Hongo was beat up by fellow Japanese-American students for dating a haole girl. I found the Los Angeles he portrays to be repellent. Before long, however, the thought dawned that this abyss of belligerence and frustration is nothing less than the anti-Volcano itself, the life he fled to find his deeper roots.

Volcano creates interest and curiosity. Local people look at it and want to know more. The density of the prose style meant I had to read and think alternately. I did not find it to be a fast read. While I was carrying the book around to read in the pukas of my life, I was asked more than once such

questions as, "Should I read it?" Or, even more pointedly, "Should I buy it for my mother-in-law?" The answer is a definite "yes," particularly if you love your mother-in-law.

Henry B. Chapin
Professor of English
University of Hawai'i—West Oahu

A Dictionary of Hawaiian Legal Land-Terms. Compiled and edited by Paul F. Nahoa Lucas. Honolulu: Native Hawaiian Legal Corporation and the University of Hawai'i Committee for the Preservation and Study of Hawaiian Language, Art and Culture, 1996. xv + 177 pp. Maps. \$24.95

Western contact brought disease, invasive species, and foreigners with strange ideas to Hawai'i. Though rats, insects, noxious plants, and disease ravaged and continue to threaten the ecosystem that sustained precontact Hawaiians for nearly a millennium, perhaps it was the concept of private land ownership that most irreparably damaged Hawaiian society. Some Hawaiian scholars, mostly notably Lilikalā Kame'eleihiwa in her comprehensive treatise on the Mahele, believe this to be the single greatest tragedy suffered by native Hawaiians. As if Hawaiians didn't have enough problems with influenza, tuberculosis, venereal diseases, and mosquitoes, they now had to contend with greedy foreigners who used this bewildering and alien concept of land ownership, then unknown in Polynesia, to divide their lands and stake claim to them. Though Hawaiian as a written language was still in its infancy, Hawaiians were rapidly becoming able to comprehend new words introduced by the foreigners for familiar land forms and to make sense of numbers that now divided land into linear and cubic measurements. The final assault was the new legal system thrust upon them, causing the decline of both *mālama 'āina* (caring for the land) and the *ali'i/maka'āinana* stewardship land-tenure system that carried the Hawaiian people through countless generations.

The use of Hawaiian words and phrases created as a result of the move to private land-ownership was limited to legal documents, government circles, and courts of law. Though some terms did filter down to the general public and were recorded by Mary Kawena Puku'i, Thomas Thrum, and Lorrin Andrews, a number of land terms existed only on the word lists of individuals who translated land-conveyance documents. Paul F. Nahoa Lucas is to be

commended for using these sources to compile a compact volume of Hawaiian land terms and legal phrases accessible to all. Additional sources used by Lucas include the Hawaiian-language newspapers and the works of Nathaniel Emerson, E. S. Craighill Handy, S. M. Kamakau, and others.

Intended to provide the reader with “a general understanding of the words and phrases that were commonly used in Hawaiian land-conveyance documents,” this work is especially helpful to those who have a command of ‘ōlelo Hawai‘i (Hawaiian language). Lucas’s intent is “to familiarize the reader with various land documents written in Hawaiian during the nineteenth century,” but he cautions readers against using it as a document translation tool. Entries are arranged in alphabetical order. Each contains a definition rendered by a court of law as the primary source. If no court has rendered a legal definition of the entry, a secondary, nonlegal source is provided. If multiple definitions exist for a single entry, the one with the meaning more commonly used in the law comes first, followed by more obscure interpretation(s).

Entries are first listed as they originally appeared in primary source documents without the diacritical marks contained in almost all Hawaiian-language materials today. Concerned with correct pronunciation and spelling, Lucas follows the orthographic standards created by the “Recommendations and Comments on the ‘Ahaui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i 1978 Spelling Project” by Emily Hawkins and William H. “Pila” Wilson, later adopted by the ‘Ahaui ‘Ōlelo Hawai‘i. The entry is listed again, with ‘*okina* (glottal stops) and *kahakō* (macrons).

The dictionary has three valuable appendices. Lucas includes samples of legal documents in Appendix A, among them examples of Land Commission awards relating to declarations of held property, definitions of boundaries and enclosures, and a *palapala ho‘oko* (certificate of award). Other well-reproduced examples include a *palapala sila nui* (royal patent), copies of Mahele awards, deeds, leases, mortgages, bills of sale, adoption, wills, and probate documents, all with Hawaiian and English texts. Appendix B contains an alphabetical listing of nineteenth-century surveyors with Arthur C. Alexander’s 1920 commentary on the strengths and weaknesses of each; for example, William P. Alexander was “One of the most careful surveyors of that time,” Artemus Bishop “Had no conception of the value of accuracy,” John T. Gower was “A very careless surveyor,” and John Richardson “Must have used a very defective compass; his distances are good, while his bearings in most cases are quite unreliable.” Appendix C contains a conversion table of various measurements (e.g., square yards to square feet and acres, links to feet, etc.). Lastly, maps of each island are included that give the square miles of each and indicate the better known *ahupua‘a* of each island.

As a reference librarian and subject specialist in Hawaiiana who frequently fields land-conveyance document questions, I thank Lucas for contributing this valuable work to the people of Hawai'i. A required purchase for all public and private Hawaiian collections.

Kevin M. Roddy

Librarian, University of Hawai'i at Hilo

Darwin's Laboratory: Evolutionary Theory and Natural History in the Pacific. Edited by Roy M. MacLeod and Philip F. Rehbock. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994. 540 pp. \$45.00.

Two historians of biology, one from Sydney and the other from Hawai'i, have collected a set of extraordinarily rich new contributions dealing with the natural history of the Pacific Basin. The development of each topic quickly engages the reader and the detail is sumptuously documented throughout. As the title suggests, key essays deal with the effects of those nineteenth-century pioneers of evolutionary biology, Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace. Although working separately, both embraced descent with change as a fact and then followed by developing natural selection as the major process that engineers that change.

How did science reach these revolutionary generalizations that after nearly one hundred and fifty years remain central to all biology? This book, more than most collections of essays by separate authors, converges on a pivotal scientific view. These conclusions were reached in view of repeated observations, by scientist-explorers, of the intricate biogeographical and ecological puzzles posed by the rich and far-flung biota of the Pacific Basin.

The articles are deftly arranged in four sections, each of which emphasizes a pivotal aspect of biological exploration and its impact. The first five papers treat the Pacific as a site for research. Alison Kay deals directly with the core issue of biogeography, both of archipelagoes and oceanic islands. Following this are accounts of the evolution of cartography relating to the Pacific, the Darwin/Dana "coral reef episode" and the influential work of lesser-known but fascinating figures, such as the Rev. John Thomas Gulick of Hawai'i, and the strong continuing British involvement in the Pacific represented by Francis Maitland Balfour and his students.

In the second group, we have accounts of the networks of exchange of information that were built up after the publication of *On the Origin of Species*.

Using detailed geographical lists of the players, Janet Garber explores the extraordinary number and variety of persons corresponding with Darwin, from both the Pacific area and elsewhere. From Australia comes an accounting of that amazing botanical enterprise, "Dr. Schomburgk's garden" at Adelaide. Geographically, this essay is countered by a view from northwest America: the development of natural history and conchology by P. Brooks Randolph, based in Seattle.

The third section has four articles centering on human reactions in the face of evidence, from the islands and the Pacific rim, that man himself consists of naturally distributed endemic biological populations. Although communication was tenuous, missionaries, anthropologists, colonials, and natives all influenced one another's attitudes toward the new development of a biology of man. The Pacific area yielded rich material, indeed. A noted Darwin scholar, Janet Browne, who has just published the first volume of a continuing biography of Darwin (*Charles Darwin: Voyaging*, Knopf, 1995; see review by Stephen Jay Gould, *The New York Review of Books* 43.6: 10-14) contributes an intriguing study of the attitudes and interactions of Darwin and Captain Fitzroy aboard HMS *Beagle* during that famous globe-circling voyage in the 1830s.

Evolution as opposed to creation has caused, and indeed still causes, agonies and emotional mental battles involving religion and science. The essays in this book are oriented to scientific approaches and do not deal with this conflict. On the other hand, natural selection, as an engine of genetic change in populations, breeds other different, but deeply disturbing, conflicts. Thus, the final four essays approach what may be called "Social Darwinism," which essentially is an attempt, often misguided, to apply the perceived principles of natural selection to human society. Both Darwin and Wallace reflected a Victorian culture and attitudes that made the implicit assumption that the European was somehow a superior breed of men, especially with regard to aboriginal peoples. Racism and practices that enforced "manifest destiny" were not far behind, the proponents openly seeking support from science for repression of "the unfit." One essay reviews the relation of Maori and settler in New Zealand; another delineates the subtle varieties of these attitudes, and attempts to counter them, in different parts of the Pacific Basin. Barry Butcher, in his chilling essay on the extreme effects of these attitudes on the Australian aborigines, reminds us that the subtitle of *On the Origin of Species by Natural Selection* contains some poorly chosen words: namely, *The Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*.

Modern study of evolutionary process has produced data and theoretical formulations that greatly downgrade the importance of conflict between geographical races and groups as a legitimate form of natural selection.

Rather than competition between groups, it is the competition between *individuals within a group* that is the principal way that descent with genetic change occurs. Thus, the relatively greater reproductive capacity of genetically favored individuals *within the group* is the essence of Darwinian selection. In modern biology, this capacity is usually referred to as “darwinian fitness”; it is nothing more than the fact that some individuals leave more descendants than others and thus are able to quietly “inherit the earth.”

Despite the subtitle referred to above, and the gross misuse of intergroup selection by others, individual fitness was Darwin’s major theme in *Origin of Species*. The theory was developed to an even greater degree in *The Descent of Man*, where he advocated the idea of sexual selection as a companion process to natural selection.

Internecine strife involving human groups is a terrifying, continuing problem that our young species is facing as it has overpopulated the earth. On the optimistic side, such strife surely cannot be based on any deep genetic differences between us, since our species is now known to have an extraordinary basic genetic similarity that unites all peoples across the globe biologically. The problem is our susceptibility to form militant in-groups, a social disease unique to our species. It must be solved in a strictly human sociopolitical context. Basic biology cannot provide any simple solution except to show that racism can find no justification whatsoever in the science of evolutionary biology.

Hampton L. Carson
Professor Emeritus
Department of Genetics and Molecular Biology
John A. Burns School of Medicine
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

How “Natives” Think: About Captain Cook, For Example. By Marshall Sahlins. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. x + 318 pp. Bibliography. Index. \$24.95.

The controversy between Marshall Sahlins and Gananath Obeyesekere—regarding the degree to which Hawaiians equated Captain Cook with the *akua* Lono—brings to mind the Trojan Horse. The controversy involves esteemed figures—one from Chicago, the other from Princeton. Great collections of evidence are brought together to produce monuments of intellectual prowess—four books in all to date. And perhaps most important, the

controversy involves a lot more than one bargained for. Behind the obvious issue regarding Cook and Lono are critical ones for the doing of Hawaiian history (and history in Hawai'i): To what degree, for example, can we reach beyond present perspectives to provide a reasonable rendering of times past—specifically Hawaiian beliefs at Kealakekua Bay in 1779? Who seems best equipped to provide such renderings? How do we know the person is “right”?

In the beginning—that is to say, the 1980s—there was limited controversy. Two important books by Sahlins dominated the scene: *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities* (1981) and *Islands of History* (1985). They described changes in Hawaiian society during the early contact period and, more generally, enunciated a vision of how, in Sahlins's words, “the reproduction of a structure become[s] its transformation” (1981: 8). The events set in motion by Cook's visits to the Hawaiian Islands in 1778–1779 became a prominent example of Sahlins's thesis. He suggested Hawaiian efforts to cope with the anomalies of Cook's stay—by incorporating Cook, for instance, into their cultural order as a manifestation of the *akua* Lono—led over time to transformations in that order. In *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook* (1992), Obeyesekere challenged Sahlins's analysis. He suggested Hawaiians perceived Cook as a chief rather than as a manifestation of Lono. Cook's apotheosis, Obeyesekere stated, constituted an example of European mythmaking, something as a Sri Lankan, as one of the formerly colonially oppressed, he tended to be more sensitive to than many Western scholars (1992: 8–9, 21–22): “To put it bluntly, I doubt that the natives created their European god, the Europeans created him for them. This ‘European god’ is a myth of conquest, imperialism, and civilization” (1992: 3). Obeyesekere, moreover, repeatedly attacked Sahlins's scholarship: “There are virtually no instances in Sahlins's corpus,” he noted, for example, “where a source is critically examined [beyond two references regarding Ledyard] . . . information from any text is used as long as it fits the structuralist thesis” (1992: 67). The controversy thickened when a host of reviewers, instead of siding with Sahlins as Sahlins expected, praised Obeyesekere's book for its thoughtful scholarship. *The Apotheosis of Captain Cook*, in fact, won the Gottschalk prize for excellence in eighteenth-century studies.

The intensity of Obeyesekere's attack, and the positive reactions to it, demanded a response from Sahlins. *How “Natives” Think* is his reply. One reviewer calls it “a splendid war machine,” another “a work of refutation and revenge,” and the *New York Times* terms it “a forceful, learned, and persuasive counterattack.” It is divided into six chapters and seventeen appendices. There are details upon details to impress (and perhaps intimidate) the uninitiated.

The introduction considers Obeyesekere's self-positioning in postcolonial scholarship. "Presuming that as a native Sri Lankan he has a privileged insight into how Hawaiians thought," Sahlins writes, Obeyesekere seeks to "defend them against the imperialist myths that have . . . been inflicted on them" (1995: 1). But in this effort, Sahlins suggests, Obeyesekere actually negates Hawaiian cultural particularity—failing to recognize that Hawaiian conceptions of "god," for example, differed from Western conceptions.

Chapter one, the lengthiest of the chapters, details dynamics of the Makahiki celebration during Cook's 1778–79 visit. (Obeyesekere had specifically questioned Sahlins's analysis in this regard.) Two themes weave through the chapter. First, Sahlins analyzes various ploys Obeyesekere uses to argue his case, calling them such names as "hyper-ventriliquating" and "double-bind question begging." Second, given the ritual structures recorded in the British journals—such as the types and timing of fish traded by Hawaiians during Cook's circumnavigation of the Big Island—Sahlins stresses the Makahiki must not only have been operating during Cook's 1778–79 visit but in a manner parallel to that retrospectively described by Hawaiians (such as David Malo) for that period.

Chapter two deals with Cook's posthumous status as Lono among Hawaiians in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Sahlins describes how, in the process of reproducing the Makahiki festival following Cook's death, Hawaiians in fact altered it. Cook's (purported) bones, for example, were incorporated into Lono's circumambulation of the island.

In the third chapter, Sahlins criticizes Obeyesekere's interpretations of the Hawaiian data further, focusing particularly on (1) Obeyesekere's analysis of the rituals performed on Cook at the Hikiau shrine, (2) his claim of food scarcities at Kealakekua Bay (resulting from supplying British ships), and (3) his "invention" of Cook's postmortem *only* deification.

Chapter four comments on Obeyesekere's claim that humans use a trans-cultural "practical rationality" in decision-making. (Obeyesekere defined it as "the process whereby human beings reflectively assess the implications of a problem in terms of practical criteria," 1992: 19). Rationality is not a universal, Sahlins asserts, but rather is constructed in different ways by different cultures. Deciding Lono is associated with kona winds, for instance, draws into play cultural principles far more than universal, pragmatic ones.

The final chapter reflects on Obeyesekere's thesis and the seeming political agenda behind it. Sahlins asserts there is an absurdity to Obeyesekere's claim that he, a Sri Lankan, can understand Hawaiian beliefs in ways that Sahlins, a Westerner, cannot. Sahlins asserts the ultimate victims of Obeyesekere's argument are the Hawaiian people who lose a sense of their own history. Western definitions of divinity, he suggests, replace "their own view

of things, leaving them with a fictional history and a pidgin ethnography" (1995: 197-98).

At stake, ultimately, in the book, is the "doing" of history and the host of subtle complications this entails. Is Sahlins's citation upon citation, detail upon detail, accounting, for example, the best approach to writing history? How does one respond to Obeyesekere's assertions regarding text/context relations? How do we know whose assertions and accusations are "correct"? From systematically examining each book's arguments, from detailed checking of each book's citations, I can say this. In contrast to the deliberate, careful documentation of Sahlins's "*Natives*," Obeyesekere's *Apotheosis* contains much imprecise scholarship. He quotes statements out of context (e.g., 1992: 23), his central arguments contain important contradictions (e.g., 1992: 87, 126), he distorts Sahlins's perspectives (1992: 55), he mistakes Western patterns for Hawaiian ones (e.g., 1992: 61), and he misstates certain points of "fact" (if I might use that quaint phrase, e.g., 1992: 206n10, 1992: 44, 53, 64). Why did earlier reviewers not notice this? One can only assume fitting into current intellectual trends—as Obeyesekere does—and including a host of citations counts for a lot in academic life. Also at issue in the controversy is who can best speak for Hawaiians of old. Nineteenth-century Hawaiian retrospective accounts regarding Cook's visit (such as those by Malo and Samuel Kamakau) constitute key evidence in Sahlins's argument. Yet a number of indigenous scholars today feel Obeyesekere is basically correct, despite his imprecision, in attacking Sahlins. How do we bring all these indigenous and Western perspectives together to make sense of Cook and Lono? (Clearly there is no simple West/Rest divide here.) In these politicized times, what should our shared points of reference be for evaluating divergent assertions? Who might be deemed to speak most (or just more) credibly about the Hawaiian past? Why should we trust them? There is, then, a lot in the Sahlins-Obeyesekere controversy that deserves careful, thoughtful attention. *How "Natives" Think* is an excellent place to begin the thinking process.

Robert Borofsky
 Professor of Anthropology
 Hawaii Pacific University

Firsts and Almost Firsts in Hawai'i. Compiled by Robert C. Schmitt; edited by Ronn Ronck. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1995. xxii + 240 pp. \$15.95.

The study of history includes a number of fields that could be classified as marginalia. Stamp-collecting comes to mind. So too do the buying and selling of antique furniture, swapping old baseball cards, and preserving old buildings.

I have an uncle who obsesses over old garbage dumps or even mounds in the earth that *might* be old garbage dumps. He always carries a pick and a shovel in the trunk of his car, and he's never happier than when applying his tools, ever so delicately, to a garbage dump.

He collects old bottles. They fill his basement, porch, and garage. A decorative few have crept into his kitchen, living room, bedroom, and bath.

Former state statistician and *Hawaiian Journal of History* editorial board member Bob Schmitt collects firsts: The first Island residents; the first birds, beasts, insects, and anthropods in Hawai'i; the first automobiles, freeways, helicopters, lighthouses, neon signs, zippers, and copy machines in the Islands. And so on. Hundreds of firsts.

If you want to know when macadamia nuts were first cultivated in Hawai'i, read Schmitt (around 1881). If you want to know the proprietor of Hawai'i's first barber shop, go to Schmitt (William Johnston around 1836). If you want to know who applied the first anesthesia to whom, see Schmitt (Dr. Charles H. Wetmore to his wife Lucy in Hilo in 1850; he then extracted one of her teeth).

Whenever I visit my uncle, he shows me some of his more interesting bottles. After looking at a half dozen or so, I find my mind growing numb. A bottle, it seems to me, with only the date and the bottler, is just a bottle.

So too with firsts. I like my history in context and in narrative form. Lists of bottles, cards, missionary ancestors, or firsts do not enlighten me.

Still, in small doses, Schmitt's list of firsts makes pleasant reading; and any collection that includes the first zipper and the first marshmallows in the Islands has certainly covered the territory.

Firsts thus belongs in every reference library of Hawaiiana, on every Island coffee table, and in every Hawai'i bathroom.

Dan Boylan
 Professor of History
 University of Hawai'i—West O'ahu

Born and Raised in Waikiki. By Betty Dyer Sorenson. Santa Cruz, CA: Limu Press, 1995. 228 pp. Illustrated. Chronology. \$8.95.

This is an entertaining autobiography written in a light style but with historical applications. Betty Sorenson covers the principal events from her parents' arrival in Honolulu in the early 1900s to her own youth and adulthood in Hawai'i and marriage and family life in California. The unifying thread is the strong pull the Islands have exerted on her and her family.

Her father, John Michael Dyer, arrived from Ohio in 1910, "looking for new opportunities" (p. 2). Her mother, Mabel DeJarlais, came from California in 1913 at the age of twenty-nine "looking for the man of her dreams" and a job (p. 14). They met, were married at St. Augustine's Chapel in Waikiki in 1915, and joined what Bernhard Hormann ("The Caucasian Minority," *Social Process in Hawaii* 14 [1950]: 38–50) has called the period of formation of a small but definite middle class comprised of recent haole immigrants engaged in small businesses, the professions, and skilled labor. The father successfully developed Dyer's Gift Shop on Fort Street and made buying trips to the Orient.

Betty and her brother Jack grew up on Beach Walk road, one block from Waikiki Beach, in a single-family dwelling, when Waikiki in the 1920s and 1930s was a small neighborhood of cottages, two-story apartment houses, and boarding-type hotels. Wealthy tourists came out from the mainland to spend the winter at the Moana, Royal Hawaiian, or Halekulani hotels, some even bringing their own cars, drivers, and maids. The Dyers had a Japanese cleaning woman, and for holiday dinners, John Dyer dressed in a dinner jacket and black tie, Mabel Dyer in a long dinner gown and crystal beads and earrings (p. 4). Betty was delighted with her proximity to the Outrigger and Uluniu clubs and Sunday polo matches at Kapi'olani Park. The Dyer children attended Punahou School, and the family spent happy hours at their Moku'ia beach cottage. Betty reports on the Dole Derby when the planes landed at Wheeler Field in 1927, and on the beginning of commercial flight with the arrival of the Pan-American clipper in 1935.

So far, this is pretty much the scene one expects from the oligarchy's fellow travelers, or what Hormann identifies as a fledgling middle class's "insecurity in its position, and subject to status anxiety" ("The Caucasian Minority," p. 49). But a different dynamic brings us a larger picture. The family, devout Catholics, built the beach cottage themselves. The parents encouraged Betty to help out in her father's shop, marking and selling the merchandise. Betty writes that the streetcar stopped near their house:

In Waikiki we lived side-by-side with various businesses. Our service station, where we bought gas for twenty-five cents a gallon, was only one block away. The Piggly Wiggly grocery store was three blocks away. It had the first shopping carts in Honolulu. Dairyman's Ice Cream was next to the gro-

cery. Lau Yee Chai's . . . restaurant . . . was across the street from Dairyman's. I would often walk my dog Kam to Dairyman's and buy him an ice cream cone for a nickel (pp. 55–56).

Betty's life changed dramatically with the attack on Pearl Harbor. She departed from Honolulu on Christmas Day in 1941 and graduated from Stanford. She was determined to come home, which she did in 1944 as a postal censor. As many young women did, she met a serviceman whom she married—Jim Sorenson, a naval lieutenant and engineering officer. Photos show us family members in Hawai'i and, later, in California and also early scenes of Honolulu. Betty exhibits an openness and ability to learn from experience as when several of her five children attend the University of California at Berkeley in the 1960s during the Free Speech movement and her innate tolerance broadens. A defining point in her life is surgery for a brain tumor from which she recovers.

Another value to the book is that while the Dyers' lives may seem to have belonged to a bygone era, they also represent a continuum—the influx of mainland haoles searching for opportunities and a compatible lifestyle. This in-migration continues to the present and is a significant factor in Hawai'i's demographics, politics, small business enterprises, professional and educational patterns, and multicultural society.

Homesick for Hawai'i, on one return visit to see her aged mother and without consulting her husband, Betty buys a condominium at Mokulē'ia. Jim approves. They also are pleased when Dyer children marry the offspring of Betty's childhood friends, thus continuing the beloved Hawai'i connection.

Helen G. Chapin
Hawaii Pacific University

History of the Macadamia Nut Industry in Hawaii: From Bush Nut to Gourmet's Delight. By Sandra Wagner-Wright. Lewiston, New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995. iv + 265 pp. Appendices. Bibliography. Index.

History of the Macadamia Nut Industry in Hawaii by Sandra Wagner-Wright traces the introduction, promotion, and commercialization of the state's macadamia nut business. Hawaii's geographic isolation combined with the relatively late introduction of the nut gives clear parameters to Wagner-Wright's study, allowing her to analyze the evolution of the industry since its inception. In conducting her research, Wagner-Wright draws upon local

agricultural and economic records as well as interviews of surviving pioneers of the industry. Wagner-Wright describes the original entrepreneurs, the formation and capitalization of the corporations, diversification and marketing, and most importantly, the evolving technology necessary for an entirely new industry. Though her descriptions of the technological challenges and innovative solutions to planting, cultivating, harvesting, and processing are not the main focus of the study, they are perhaps the most interesting passages.

Wagner-Wright organizes her book along chronological lines. In part one, which covers the late nineteenth century to the 1940s, she traces the origins of the macadamia nut back to Australia. According to Wagner-Wright, William Purvis first introduced the tree to the island of Hawai'i in 1881. Robert and Edward Jordon introduced a slightly different type of macadamia to O'ahu in 1892. Progeny from these two sources began bearing in 1908, and by 1910 investors began to see the macadamia's commercial potential. While acknowledging that many small farmers produced macadamia nuts as a supplement to their other crops, Wagner-Wright focuses on the early development of commercial macadamia orchards by the Honokaa Sugar Company and the Hawaii Macadamia Nut Company, both of which were operated on the island of Hawai'i.

The U.S. government facilitated early efforts to promote commercial cultivation of macadamia nuts through the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station (HAES). Wagner-Wright explains that the government charged this agency with the task of promoting "Americanization of the new territory by encouraging crops that would produce small farms, eliminating the Asian labor force used on sugar plantations." According to Wagner-Wright, HAES deemed five varieties suitable for commercial production and actively promoted them by offering grafted trees to anyone interested in creating an orchard. The Sugar Act, passed by the U.S. Congress in 1935, bolstered this publicly subsidized system by diverting revenues to programs that encouraged crop diversification in Hawai'i.

In part two, Wagner-Wright details the postwar expansion of the nut industry. After years of government-funded research, the University of Hawaii Agriculture Department, in cooperation with the Hawaii Agriculture Extension Service, began actively promoting the expansion of macadamia nut production. Public officials cited various factors to support their argument that the macadamia nut business could invigorate Hawai'i's economy. The nut could be developed, they explained, at low cost and on land unsuitable for sugar and pineapple production. Encouraged by this positive assessment, Castle and Cooke embarked on an ambitious development plan, purchasing one thousand acres on the Big Island with an option on an additional three

thousand, all incorporated under the Royal Hawaiian Macadamia Nut label. Cooperation between the Royal Hawaiian Macadamia Nut Company and the HAES fueled industrial development. By 1973 Royal Hawaiian had more than 2,400 acres of productive macadamia nut orchards.

The success of Royal Hawaiian made the fledgling market competitive. The C. Brewer Company began developing macadamia nut orchards on Hawai'i in 1958. Aggressive and innovative strategies helped Brewer outproduce Royal Hawaiian in the 1960s, and in the 1970s the newer company purchased the older one (for \$8.3 million) and became, under the Mauna Loa label, the world's largest grower and processor of macadamia nuts. Meanwhile, small farmers, in their efforts to compete with this new industrial giant, formed a number of regional cooperatives which produced both for Mauna Loa and for several other processing firms that arose in the 1960s and early 1970s.

Part three begins with a discussion of the macadamia orchards of the Honomalino Agricultural Company. After faculty at the University of Hawaii Agriculture Department, in cooperation with large and small farms, established the Hawaiian Macadamia Producers Association, developers gained new insights into profit-making. By 1958 the Honomalino Company had begun to develop limited partnerships with mainland investors, including such famous people as Jimmy Stewart, Julie Andrews, and Jim Nabors. Using well-known names as a marketing tool helped Honomalino. In 1966, the company merged with the Honokaa Sugar Company to become the largest producer of macadamia nuts.

Though this book is an interesting case study of industrial development, it does have shortcomings. The book suffers from an oddly schizophrenic character: Wagner-Wright vacillates between a scholarly approach to history and a plaintiff, Chamber of Commerce-style promotional campaign. Even the scholarly approach, however, is unsatisfactory. As she narrates the evolution of the industry, Wagner-Wright offers too little analysis of the changing entrepreneurial strategies and industrial structures that characterize the economic setting. The book portrays the macadamia nut producers as a monolithic bloc, making little distinction between the different managerial and labor problems faced by independent farmers and large corporations. In short, there is little economic theory behind this study. One wishes that the author had placed the industry more squarely within the literature of business and labor history as well as within the context of the world economy. Furthermore, the book suffers from poor editing. The typographical errors and spacing problems in the text are, to be blunt, inexcusable. These defects, of course, are mostly the fault of the publisher.

Wagner-Wright's achievement is her careful documentation of the details of the evolution of the industry. The author has captured the multifaceted development with its many causal relations. As such, despite its problems, this study is valuable for its exploration of an important aspect of Hawaiian history and local economic development.

Brian L. Cassity
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa