

NEWS from the PACIFIC



ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF HAWAII
c/o DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
BERNICE P. BISHOP MUSEUM • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96819

VOLUME XIX

1968-1969

This issue is presented to Dr. Leonard Mason, former President of the Anthropological Society of Hawaii and Chairman of the Department of Anthropology, University of Hawaii, on the occasion of his retirement in 1969 as Professor of Anthropology at the University of Hawaii.

What was past, as told here, was prologue to your years of service and accomplishment. And those years are prologue, we hope, to an equally fulfilling career for you elsewhere.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
IMPONDERABILIA FOR A HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY AT UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, 1922-1946 By Kathorine Luamala	1-32
VISITING ANTHROPOLOGISTS	33
MEETINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION	33-35
ARCHAEOLOGICAL ACTIVITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, 1967-1968	35-36
ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN HAWAII, 1968-1969 By T. Stell Newman	36-39
PACIFIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL RECORDS, A NEW SERIES FROM THE BISHOP MUSEUM	39

IMPONDERABILIA FOR A HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY AT

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII, 1922-1946

By KATHARINE LUOMALA

Introduction

Anthropological research and teaching began at University of Hawaii before there was a Department of Anthropology. Of five periods distinguishable in the history of anthropology at the University, the first two precede the formation of a department. The five periods, which overlap in time, are:

1. Starting about 1922 the period of volunteer teaching of anthropology at the University by Bishop Museum staff members.
2. The period from 1927 to 1937 when the Rockefeller Research Foundation financed a program of investigation on racial blending in the Hawaiian Islands.
3. The period from 1934 to 1942 that opened with the establishment of a Department of Anthropology and ended in 1942 with all anthropologists engaged in service in World War II.
4. The wartime period from 1942 to 1945 when anthropology was taught by the sociologists remaining of the joint department created in 1936.
5. The post-war period which ended in 1945 with the return of the first anthropologist and continues into the present.

The fifth period is so inclusive that future historians will divide it into several independent periods. This paper carries the history only into 1946 when the author joined the faculty. Sources of information have been the University of Hawaii Quarterly Bulletins (later named University of Hawaii Bulletin), some personal knowledge, information from Andrew W. Lin, and a letter to me, dated August 15, 1956, from Felix M. Keesing who kindly read and commented on my

"Preliminary Draft of the History of Anthropology of the University of Howaii," which I had probably written for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the University celebrated in 1957. To have woven in properly the anthropological connections between the University and Bishop Museum would have made a book. The reader will find Te Rangi Hiroo's An Introduction to Polynesian Anthropology (Bishop Mus. Bull. 187, 1945) useful in identifying what some of the anthropologists who were also on the University staff were doing at the Museum; the Museum Annual Reports also provide information. Publication data on articles and monographs by University anthropologists will be found in the U.H. Quarterly Bulletin.

By way of prologue, events of the year 1920 and the presence of a sister institution the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, must be mentioned. The long established program of anthropological and other research at the Museum bears upon the origin and development of anthropology at the University located across the town from it. Anthropologists, coming and going on fieldwork, came to the Museum while their ship lay over for the day or between ships. Some also come as temporary staff members to work on the collections or use the Museum as a base for Pacific fieldwork; others come as permanent members of the staff; and others came to Honolulu or met on the mainland to advise the Museum on plans for research. Anthropologists in Hawaii gained for this stimulating atmosphere. The year 1920 was momentous for both the Museum and the University. For the Museum it marked the start of its Bayard Dominick Expeditions of reconnaissance studies in Polynesia and of its affiliation with Yale University; both were to bring anthropologists temporarily or permanently to the University staff also, as an outcome of their Museum connection. For the educational institution in Manoa Valley 1920 was the year it changed from being the College of Hawaii to the University of Hawaii. And for both institutions the year 1920 was further signalled by the holding in Honolulu of the first Pacific Science Congress, under the auspices of the Pan-Pacific Union and with financial aid from the Territory of Hawaii and other sources.

At the Congress, anthropologists joined with geographers, geologists, zoologists, and botanists in what A.L. Kroeber called a "surprisingly successful" gathering; he declared that no scientific gathering in his experience "was characterized by so lively a spirit as this one" (American Anthropologist, Volume 23, 1921, p. 129). He was certain that the conference would surely spread interest in Hawaiian anthropology, and he listed the anthropological delegates as F. Wood-Jones, G. Fawke, C. Wissler, W.E. Safford, A.M. Tazzer, A.L. Kroeber, K. Kishinouye, and N. Yomasaki, and "of local students, or those for the time attached to the Bishop Museum, W. T. Brigham, J.F. G. Stokes, K. Emory, J.S. Emerson, T.G. Thrum, R.T. Aitken, L.R. Sullivan." Sometime during the same year Dr. Alés Hrdlicko visited Oahu and Hawaii on his way to lecture in the Far East, and wrote up some of his views on races in Hawaii.

A recent publication by George W. Stocking, Jr. illuminates the national and professional situation that led to this sudden and serious interest by American anthropologists in the Pacific. In a chapter called "The Scientific Reaction against Cultural Anthropology" in his book Race, Culture, and Evolution (New York, 1968), a study of the history of anthropology, Stocking discusses the indirect impact on American cultural anthropology of the burst of nativism in the United States after World War I which was climaxed in the legislation of 1923 to limit immigration on non-"Nordics." In the winter of 1918-19 there was strong criticism of American cultural anthropologists by those of their fellow scientists who did not understand, and if they did understand, did not agree with the anthropologists' view on race. To put it in another way, these critics did not understand the concept of culture held by Boas and other academically oriented anthropologists in the profession who agreed about "the fundamental significance of the historically conditioned variety of human cultures in the determination of human behavior" (Stocking, p. 296). To the anthropologists culture, not race, was the shaping factor in human behavior.

However, the profession reacted to the criticism that anthropologists in the United States had not only neglected the rest of the world to concentrate on American Indians but had also neglected biological anthropology "and specifically the problem of the differential makeup of the contemporary American population" (Stocking, p. 297). One response to the critics was for some anthropologists to gather first in Berkeley in 1918 and next in Honolulu in 1920 to discuss problems of the Pacific. In Honolulu the focus was on "Race relations in the Pacific." The Dominick expedition at the Museum, in which E.S.C. Handy, E.W. Gliffard, R. Linton, and others participated, had as an important research phase that of "race psychology."

Even a history of American anthropological research in the Pacific as it affected our local scientific institutions and scholars is too large a problem to deal with here. It is impossible, of course, to delve into the inter-disciplinary and intra-disciplinary feuds in American science and the national events which spurred or limited the development of anthropology in Hawaii. However, this introduction may serve to remind us of the Tarde-like concentric circles of influence that originated elsewhere and overlapped with the locally initiated waves to shape the course of anthropology at the University of Hawaii.

An anthropologist, then, at the start of the second decade of the 1900's was no novelty in Hawaii. However, with travel possible only by ship fewer came through the islands than now when, as one resident anthropologist remarked, he felt as if he were sitting on a rack in the middle of the ocean with anthropologists flying like gulls overhead back and forth in all directions around him. The solution was to take to the air and join in the flight.

The First Milestone

The first milestone in the history of anthropology at the University bears the name of Dr. E. S. Craighill Handy, who in 1922 taught its first course in anthropology. Handy had received

his Ph.D. in anthropology at Harvard two years before, and had joined the staff of Bishop Museum which was publishing his dissertation on Polynesian religion.

The elaborate label of the course, "Ethnology and Social History, with Reference to Polynesia," was probably deliberate, for the University had no department of anthropology, and, in fact, few colleges and universities anywhere in the United States taught any anthropology at all at that time. The course label was surely informative for the curious student.

Herodotus, as the Father of History--and some say of Anthropology too-- would have approved Dr. Handy's course being listed as History 22. Herodotus went from Miletus to Athens in search of an audience to whom he could lecture on his hobby of studying mankind and its peculiar ways. He carried on this hobby, it is claimed, during his travels on business. In Athens he is believed to have collected admission for lectures on his hobby, but Dr. Handy, who had come from Cambridge (Mass.) to Manoa Valley by way of Bishop Museum, was not paid for History 22. The President's Annual Report (U.H. Quarterly Bull., Vol. 2, 1923) states that the course was given without cost to the University through the cooperation of Bishop Museum and Dr. Handy's own interest and enthusiasm. In the matter of titles for himself, as well as in admission charges, Dr. Handy did not do as well as Herodotus, for he had only the nominal rank of Lecturer in Polynesian Anthropology.

Hondy also was listed as one of several faculty conducting an evening seminar one semester in 1926-27 on "Comparative Culture." With him were Romanzo Adams of Sociology, the department with which the course was affiliated, and representatives from Political Science, and from Japanese and Chinese Languages and History. In studying Oriental and Occidental cultures the faculty sought to investigate both similarities and differences and to drive home the point that "all lasting culture elements are valuable under the conditions of their origin and development" and to determine what features each culture might take from the other as valuable and useful.

In 1925 Dr. Handy's History 22 became History 279, "General Ethnology." That the phrase "and Social History" was dropped from the title makes it appear that the burgeoning Department of History no longer felt it necessary to explain, justify, or accord more than the scantiest identification of its alien foundling. The course was re-described as giving special attention to Polynesian culture (my italics). Both the use of the word "culture" and the new name of the course point toward a growing acceptance and acknowledgement of anthropology as a discipline distinct from history. Expressing perhaps more hope than assurance, the Department of History listed the course off and on until 1929 with the note that "a member of the Bishop Museum staff" would give it. The generous staff member, however, was away much of the time on field trips to other Polynesian islands farther south. Later, when the Rockefeller Foundation research program got under way, his course vanished from the catalog.

Dr. Handy's connection with the University did not cease entirely. In 1935 and 1936 he gave a course, "Nature Worship in Hawaii," at the Hawaii School of Religion, an affiliate of the University. In the summer of 1951 he taught "Ancient Hawaii" in the Department of Anthropology; and this time he received, I know, payment more substantial than the gratitude of his students and the University President.

The Second Milestone

The second important milestone in the development of anthropology at the University bears the name of the Rockefeller Foundation. While neither Dr. Handy's unpaid course nor the nearly quarter of a million dollars from the Foundation created a Department of Anthropology they helped to foster a favorable climate for its formation in 1934. In the years from 1922, when Dr. Handy first lectured, through 1937, when the Foundation grant ended, there were as many as five or six anthropologists listed each semester as faculty members. One of them

might give an occasional course in anthropology but most were on the staff, especially between 1927 and 1937, the duration of the Foundation grant, to carry out research on racial mixture in Hawaii.

The Rockefeller grant of \$215,000 brought several kinds of benefits to the University. Three to be discussed now are the establishment of a tradition of research, interdisciplinary cooperation in research, and specific results from the study of racial mixture. Other apparent benefits are, of course, the advantage taken of local and regional opportunities for research; the broad training of student participants who also gained from the regional and individual specializations of the staff; and the attempt to interpret the significance of the research for the improvement of social conditions. One can also see this wide-gauge approach in the later research supported by the Rosenwald Fund before the Second World War, and in the post-war programs.

Newcomers to the faculty tend to take for granted the emphasis on research and its sympathetic encouragement by the administration and the Board of Regents. Perhaps the taking-for-granted is the finest praise for those who established the tradition and those who fought to keep it during the Great Depression before World War II when it was gravely threatened. At that time reactionary leaders saw the future of the University only in terms of a freshwater college, locally the phrase was "cow college," a merely provincial institute, for rather low level training of local students for an A.B. degree. They did not credit the students with sufficient maturity even to refer to them as young men and women. They called them boys and girls, and deplored the plantation labor to be lost by educating them and nourishing undesirable and unattainable aspirations through education. These negative forces could only fight a delaying action. They could never have won in the end, for the University could not be simply

a kind of postgraduate high school devoted primarily to a vocationally slanted training. The crossroads position of the Hawaiian Islands in the Pacific Ocean would inevitably make a freshwater University a contradiction in terms. Location alone would help somewhat to counteract any tendency for either students or faculty in a territorially supported institution of higher learning to take a narrowly insular point of view. Furthermore, transportation facilities to all parts of the world were constantly improving in number and speed, and making the cross-roads position increasingly significant.

As important to the international perspective of the University as its location in connection with international travel were the increase in population, the rapid exploitation of the natural wealth, and the extensive economic development of the Territory. The immigrants, who come in the nineteenth century from around the Pacific and parts of the Atlantic to replace the nearly vanished Hawaiians, intermarried, regardless of race, culture, and origin, whether from Boston, Madeira, Hiroshima, Luzon, or Canton, and the small communities around them. All were prolific and ambitious for themselves and their children. No merely vocationally slanted training could prepare graduates of the University for leadership in whatever occupations and professions they chose to enter and wherever in the world they chose to live and work. Instead it was necessary that they have a liberal education of a quality which would not only compare favorably with that of many mainland colleges and universities but even surpass them in specialized programs.

A liberal education can be acquired only in an institution where the faculty, or those members of it who are so inclined, are encouraged to pursue learning far beyond the boundaries of what they teach to their students. And, of course, there can be no Graduate School, with its advanced education and training for research and teaching, if there is no faculty engaged in research. A University such as Hawaii in such a location and economic and demographic setting

can only go, as between up or down, up. The upward path has been, and will continue to be, rocky in trying to spread a budget to cover a phenomenal growth in attendance and an equally phenomenal expansion in services that match the development of the rest of the State which provides the money.

The Rockefeller grant for research brought more than fertile soil in which to root firmly a tradition of research. The second effect of the grant is still evident. This is in the comparative ease with which scientists in the State cooperate in inter-disciplinary and inter-institutional research. Because human beings are involved, strains occur, but the pattern and habit of cooperation are strong enough to moderate or overcome occasional personal or inter-institutional differences. Those anthropologists and other scientists who worked on the Rockefeller program had, despite some personal and inter-disciplinary factionalism, a headstart in learning teamwork in research, a value little recognized until World War II.

I recall, during the Second World War, American anthropologists in Washington D.C., critically weighing the merits and the shortcomings of themselves and their colleagues in wartime service. One of the things that most had been forced to learn, the group of critics remarked, was to work together on projects, and unfortunately they had had to learn it under the stress of war. The prima donna habit of work has always been, and still is, strong in anthropology. Perhaps it has grown out of the necessity, born of a formerly limited number of personnel in the science, shortage of funds, and difficulties of travel, to work alone in the field and later to write up alone the results of the solitary work. Another factor is that in the United States, unlike, say, among the British and the Dutch, there were not, until the Second World War, many anthropologically trained persons employed in either government or industry. There just were not many anthropologists at all and there were not enough jobs to go around. The few

positions in existence were almost exclusively in a few large universities, museums, or in the U.S. Bureau of American Ethnology. Now there are many positions and not enough anthropologists to fill them.

It took World War II for the American anthropologists to demonstrate the benefits of their disciplinary training and of their solo orientation in the way of independence, endurance, resourcefulness, and the ability to obtain and organize masses of seemingly unrelated material and to deal as trouble-shooters with unexpected situations. However, it also revealed their difficulties in learning to work in teams, to write up the results of their solo or team research in such a way that an administrator could and would read their reports, and, not last in importance, to demonstrate the contributions that anthropology can make to modern life.

In Hawaii before the Second World War several conditions fostered cooperative research and helped offset solo orientations. The Rackefeller program was one of these. While the scientists did not form one large team, their groups were somewhat closely coordinated. Physical anthropologists, sociologists, physiologists, psychologists, and scientists in other disciplines united in studying phases of a single subject, namely, the mental, physical, and cultural effects of racial blending in the Hawaiian Islands. Among those working on the sociological effects were Romonza C. Adams, Andrew W. Lind, E.B. Reuter, E.V. Stonequist, E.T. Thompson, and Clarence E. Glick. Biological aspects were studied by Frederic Wood-Jones, Harry L. Shapiro, and physiological by Corey D. Miller. Psychological aspects were studied by Stanley D. Parteus and his associates. Those scholars who came from outside the islands worked with each other, with the resident faculty of the University, and with the staff of Bishop Museum. The subject of racial blending in Hawaii on which all focused their investigation was certainly a logical and fortunate choice for establishing the University tradition of research and of cooperation between disciplines in both research and teaching.

The third benefit of the Rockefeller Foundation program was in the specific results of the study, and for the students at the University a fourth benefit was that during the ten years of the program many of the visiting scientists gave courses.

In 1927 Dr. Frederic Wood-Jones, renowned scholar in physical anthropology and comparative anatomy, came from the University of Adelaide in Australia, to spend three years at the University of Hawaii. A statement in the report of the President of the University of Hawaii in 1937 (U.H. Bull., Vol. 17, 1937-38) indicates only one facet of Dr. Wood-Jones' versatile interests:

"On the premise that science had not yet defined thoroughly what constitutes race of the human species, he devoted himself to a study of the Polynesians, especially the Hawaiians, in the expectation that the study would yield significant results because of the fact that the Polynesian progenitors of the present Hawaiian people migrated to these islands at least 700 years ago, perhaps as much as 1200 years ago, and have been in isolation for a very long period."

From 1927 to 1930, his period at the University, Dr. Wood-Jones published the results of his basic research relating to the standardization of measurements in physical anthropology and to the comparison of cranial architecture of man with that of the rest of the primates. For the Journal of Anatomy he wrote papers between 1929 and 1931 describing and comparing Tasmanian, Australian, and Hawaiian skulls. Of special local interest, among his many reports, is a description in the Journal of Mammalogy of the skull of an apparently native Hawaiian dog which he and Dr. Porteus had found in a Kauai burial cave. A study of embryological material obtained in Hawaii dealt with the appearance of a mid-dorsal hair whorl in four embryos, three being part-Hawaiian and one Japanese. Dr. Wood-Jones' major publications of this period are

Man's Place Among the Mammals (London, 1929), Measurements and Landmarks in Physical Anthropology (Bishop Museum Bull. 63, 1929), and with Stanley D. Porteus, The Matrix of the Mind (London, 1929).

Wood-Jones shared several mutual interests and research projects with Dr. Porteus of the Department of Psychology. For example, in 1928-29 they gave jointly an orientation course called "Science and Ourselves." Dr. Porteus, who was very active in the Rockefeller program, has summarized and discussed the publications and research of himself, Wood-Jones, and their associates in "Human Studies in Hawaii" (in Pacific Problems, ed., Charles E. Martin and N. B. Beck, U.H. Quarterly Bull., Vol. 12, No. 3, 1933). Dr. Porteus has many publications on racial psychology, as, for example, on Australian and African aborigines and on the racial groups now living in Hawaii. These studies as well as the Porteus Maze Test, an intelligence test applicable to nonliterate peoples, have made him very well known to anthropologists and psychologists everywhere, and inevitably have had a stimulating effect on the development of anthropology at the University.

The survey course which Wood-Jones and Porteus instituted survived and continued to appear in the University catalog. Usually, however, Professor H. Palmer, Department of Geology, was the lecturer. Anthropology is mentioned in the course descriptions as one of the phases of science to be discussed to give students "a broad view of the world we live in." The name shifted in 1930 to "The World We Live In" and by 1933 it had become prosaically entitled "Survey of Natural Sciences."

Dr. Wood-Jones' teaching at the University was not limited to that one semester of the survey course. In the summer of 1928 he taught Anthropology S250, "The Study of Man," a course in physical anthropology. Dr. Wood-Jones also supervised the research of Rufus Wood Leigh,

who already had a degree of D.D.S. from the University of Michigan, but wrote a Master of Arts thesis, the first in anthropology at the University, on "Dental Morphology and Pathology of Prehistoric Guam." The University, in other words, gave an advanced degree in a subject in which it had as yet no formal department. Although the degree was granted in 1930 the thesis was published in 1929 by the Bishop Museum (Memoir No. 11, No. 3), where the source materials used by Dr. Leigh were on deposit. Wood-Jones, by the way, also published an article on this same Guamanian dental material.

Dr. Wood-Jones, having resigned early in 1930, was succeeded as Research Professor of Physical Anthropology by Harry L. Shapiro, then Assistant Curator of Physical Anthropology at American Museum of Natural History. The research program greatly broadened in its anthropological and sociological scope and perspective. Six people were appointed in 1930 to work on physical anthropology and their names appeared on the University roster under Anthropology although no department existed. Dr. Shapiro, who began work in Honolulu in January, 1931, brought two research aides, both trained like himself at Harvard. They were William Lesso, A.B., Research Associate, and Frederick S. Hulse, M.A., as Research Assistant. Shapiro added in Hawaii two sociology students, Margaret Lam, A.B., as Research Assistant; and Jitsuichi Masuoka, A.B., as Clerical Assistant. Don Ling also served as a Clerical Assistant.

During the ten and a half years of the Rockefeller program, one after another of these people gradually left the project. Masuoka in 1931 finished his M.A. thesis in Sociology on "Race Attitudes of the Japanese in Hawaii; a Study in Social Distance"; and in 1932 Margaret Lam completed her thesis also in Sociology on "Six Generation of Race Mixture in Hawaii." Hulse whose part in the research had taken him to Japan, left to get his Ph.D. at Harvard in

1934 but returned the next year as Research Associate, and as Resident Instructor; the following year he resigned to go to the University of Washington. By 1933-34 only Lessa and Shapiro remained of the original six; and in the following year only Shapiro's name was on the roster and remained there until 1937-38 as part-time Research Specialist in Physical Anthropology. No record appears of his having taught a course while at the University.

The physical anthropologists found the islands a natural laboratory in which to investigate the behavior of physical traits in racial mixture and the effects of environment (climate, diet, health, working conditions, and many other factors) on certain physical traits which had generally been considered stable and unchanging under environmental influences. Professor Franz Boas, who pioneered the study of these phases, in 1894 had published the results of his comparison of American Indians with hybrids who were a mixture of American Indian and Caucasoid, to determine the effect of racial mixture on physical characteristics and growth. In 1911 he had published the results of his comparison of European immigrants in New York City, mainly Italians and Hebrews, with their direct descendants in that city. His purpose was to examine the effects of environment on physical type and development. Twenty years later in Hawaii under the Rockefeller grant Dr. Shapiro's team was to make the first large-scale investigation to test further Boas' hypotheses and conclusions.

The team, concentrating first on the matter of racial hybridization, singled out Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids to compare them with the parent groups, the Chinese (both in Hawaii and China) and the Hawaiians. Because the Chinese had been exposed to two different environments, China and Hawaii, interest emerged in the effect of environment on the migrant groups. The second phase of research was on the Japanese, who constituted a check group. Japanese immigrants were compared first with their children who had been born and reared in Hawaii

and then with members of the same families in Japan who had been reared in the same villages under the same conditions as those who had migrated to Hawaii. The latter aspect of the study gave the team a control on the physical characteristics of the immigrants. Comparison of the Japanese immigrants with their children revealed that the Hawaiian environment had produced modifications in the bodily traits of the children. Certain physical traits, formerly thought to be immune or relatively immune to environmental influence, had undergone significant changes within a single generation. The team measured more than three thousand individuals for just the Japanese phase of the research. Even without counting the number of individuals studied in the Chinese phase, the size of the project has not, so far as I know, been surpassed by any later research in physical anthropology although several studies in racial dynamics have been undertaken since the end of the Second World War.

Shapiro published several articles on the Japanese and Chinese-Hawaiian hybrids. The University Report for 1936-37 (U.H. Bull., Vol. 17, 1937-38) lists six titles in the course of surveying the many projects engaged in by the scholars on the Rockefeller program. Shapiro's major monograph was Migration and Environment. A Study of the Physical Characteristics of the Japanese Immigrants to Hawaii and the Effects of Environment on Their Descendants (London, 1939). Subsequently Dr. Leslie Spier studied the physical changes in the Japanese immigrants and their descendants on the West Coast of the United States. Hulse of Shapiro's team published an article on Japanese in Japan.

No major monograph on the Chinese resulted from the team research although the University Report for 1936-37 lists studies in process on Chinese-Hawaiian mixtures, on physical changes of the Chinese in Hawaii, on growth in children of various groups in Hawaii, and on physical characteristics of Hawaiians. Material collected included information on blood groups in a sampling of Hawaiian, Chinese, and Chinese-Hawaiians.

Indicative of the range of inter-disciplinary research under the Rockefeller grant is the study of basal metabolism in various races in Hawaii by Carey D. Miller of the University Department of Home Economics. Subsequently she extended her research to Samoa, and much later one of her students undertook a study of Japanese in Hawaii. Besides basal metabolism Professor Miller and her associates pioneered in the analysis of the nutritional value of staple Polynesian foods.

The several projects that occupied the sociologists included Glick's study of Chinese colonization in Hawaii and Lind's studies on Japanese in Kono and on ecological succession in Hawaii. Glick used his material for his Ph.D. dissertation. Two classic and definitive works in sociology which were outgrowths of this period were Lind's Island Community, published in 1938, and Adams' Interracial Marriage in Hawaii, published in 1937.

The year after the arrival of the Rockefeller team shows the number of anthropologists connected with the campus increasing. The University Directory of 1931 lists five members of the Rockefeller team (Masuoka was gone) and adds Dr. Peter H. Buck (Te Rangi Hiroa), who was already on the Bishop Museum staff as ethnologist but not yet as Director, and Dr. T. T. Waterman, cultural anthropologist, who had been transferred to the University staff from the Territorial Normal School where he had been teaching geography. None of the anthropologists engaged in lecturing that year, and of them only two, Buck and Hulse, ever did give a course at the University, and that was later after the Department of Anthropology had been established. Then Hulse, in the summer of 1936, taught "Race and Race Mixture," and Buck, in the summer of 1941, taught a course on Polynesia. The course "Race and Culture Contact in Hawaii" first given in the 1920's by Adams of Sociology continued to be given into the 1940's.

Until his death in 1951, Dr. Buck's name remained on the University faculty list because the custom was established of having the Director of Bishop Museum associated nominally

as Research Associate with the University and of having him give an occasional course at his convenience and pleasure. Thus Dr. Buck's successor as Director, Dr. Alexander Spoehr, also an anthropologist, became Research Associate in 1954 (he was listed as Professor in 1953) on the University faculty. In 1953 he conducted a graduate seminar on "Pacific Islands Research." In 1956, Dr. George Peter Murdock of Yale University conducted a graduate seminar focused on social organization, while at the same time he acted as Director of the Museum when Dr. Spoehr was teaching Oceanic cultures at Yale University. This exchange was one of the features of the Tri-Institutional Program of Pacific Research which was instituted by the University of Hawaii, Bishop Museum and Yale University in 1953.

However, in 1931, these courses were still in the future. After Wood-Jones' course in 1928 on "The Study of Man," an anthropology (unless Handy gave a course) was taught until the summer of 1933 when Charles T. Lorum, a visiting Professor of Education from Yale, lectured, in the School of Pacific and Oriental Affairs of the University, on social anthropology with special reference to Africa. During these early years, other departments gave courses on subjects which in other universities might perhaps be encompassed within a Department of Anthropology. Examples are the courses on racial psychology by Parteus and others in the Department of Psychology and those in the Department of Hawaiian Languages on native Hawaiian language, literature, arts, crafts, and religion, with some comparison with other Pacific islands. Teaching Hawaiian were Frederick W. Beckley, John Henry Wise, and the Reverend Henry Judd. Scientific linguistics and a social-science approach were, in the main, lacking as yet in Hawaiian studies.

The Third Milestone

The third important milestone in the history of anthropology at the University came in 1934, when, during the summer and fall, Dr. Felix M. Keesing began to shape a Department that was an

administrative, teaching, and a research unit. For information on this period I owe much to a letter to me from Dr. Keesing, written August 15, 1956, at Harvard, after his reading of my preliminary draft.

Between 1930 and 1934 Dr. Keesing had been working on a research project "Dependencies and Native Peoples of the Pacific," supported by grants from the international research organization of the Institute of Pacific Relations and from the Rockefeller Foundation. He had, from 1930 on, made Hawaii a base for his field trips, and had worked closely with University faculty members and others in Hawaii who were interested in the same Pacific problems as himself.

In the spring of 1934 when he was in London on a Rockefeller grant to do documentary research and to sit in on Malinowski's seminars, he received a message from David L. Crawford, President of the University of Hawaii, asking him to return to start a Department of Anthropology. It was Dr. Crawford's conviction, Keesing wrote me, that anthropology was an essential subject for the students of the University of Hawaii.

That summer in Hawaii Keesing lectured on "The Filipinos and His Cultural Trends" in the School of Pacific and Oriental Affairs at the University, and drew, as one might expect, upon his work in the Philippine Islands about which he had several publications. With Peng-Chung Chang, a visiting Professor of Education and Philosophy from Nankai University, he also conducted a seminar on "Education and Race." Denzel M. Carr, then Instructor in Romance Languages, taught "Cultural Trends in the Soviet Union," which, like the course on the Filipinos, was listed under Anthropology. The theme of the School, which for the summer of 1934 was under the leadership of Dr. Romanzo Adams and Dr. Andrew Lind, sociologists, was on race relations, and "the various problems, biological, economic, political, and cultural, which arise among peoples of divergent racial stock brought together in a common territory." That summer the School

sought to present "Research findings from different regions where race relations have been subjected to scientific study. . . ." Africa, Europe, Asia, and Oceania, including Hawaii, came within the purview of the courses and seminars. The Psychology Department had Dr. Oswald F. Black from the Union of South Africa give a course on "Racial Psychology."

In the fall of 1934, a Department of Anthropology appeared in the University catalog for the first time. Keesing, Buck, and Shapiro were listed but Keesing was the only staff member teaching. He gave a one-semester introductory course on cultural anthropology (200) both semesters, and followed a first-semester course on Polynesian culture as it was before European contact with a second-semester course on Polynesian culture change after European discovery (250-251). In the summer of 1935, Carr again lectured on the Soviet Union, but Keesing now taught "Peoples of Hawaii," a title which recalls that given by Adams to his pioneer brochure on the subject in the early 1920's. Keesing also conducted a seminar on the applications of anthropological knowledge and methods to contemporary education and other problems.

These three courses, like those taught in the regular session of 1934-35, the Department's first year, strongly emphasized how knowledge of the racial and cultural backgrounds of the people studied could be related to "the larger human story," to contemporary education, and to problems of modern adjustment. Interest in applying the knowledge of anthropology and other disciplines to contemporary problems of either autonomous or dependent peoples was rare in American universities at the time. In this respect the University of Hawaii may regard itself as a pioneer which was years in advance of the mainland institutions. In part, this reflects a continuation of the interest stimulated, though not created, in Hawaii by the earlier program of the Rockefeller Foundation that for ten and a half years investigated racial mixture in the islands. It was not until 1936, it will be recalled, that the classic "Memorandum on the Study of

Acculturation," drawn up by Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits, was published in the American Anthropologist (Vol. 37).

Two notable stimuli, one around 1934 and the other in 1936, gave further momentum to the new Department's emphasis on the application of anthropology to current problems. One was a Julius Rosenwald Fund grant in 1934; the other was the Seminar Conference on Education in Pacific Countries held in 1936 in Honolulu. The latter will be discussed first because it can be dealt with more briefly than the other which had extensive effects on the new Department for many years.

The Seminar Conference on Education, sponsored jointly by the University of Hawaii and Yale University with a \$10,000 grant from Carnegie Corporation, sought to determine what contributions anthropology, psychology, and other disciplines could make to the educator, administrator, and other practical workers. Attending the Conference were thirty local delegates and forty-three specialists from outside Hawaii. Among the latter were several anthropologists, the British being well represented, and also several administrators of British territories who had extensive practical experience and knowledge of the anthropology of their territories. On behalf of their respective sponsoring institutions, Keesing and Lorom acted as co-directors. The proceedings were published in summary by Keesing as Education in Pacific Countries (Shanghai, 1937); two volumes of the Papers and Addresses were published separately in 1936. Familiar names among the visitors include A.P. Elkin, N.B. Tindale, F.E. Williams, Gordon Brown, H.E. Maude, and Arthur I. Mayhew. The latter, Secretary of the Committee on Education in the British Colonial Office, led a seminar "Education in British Dependencies." Browsing one day on the ground floor of the newly opened Sinclair Library I came across a sizable phonograph record of a talk given at the Conference by F.E. Williams; what has become of it I do not know.

The interest in anthropology shown in the 1930's by other disciplines on the campus can perhaps be interpreted from the title of an article "Ethnology as the Basis for Education," written in 1935 by B.O. Wist of the Education Department.

The Rosenwald Fund of Chicago in 1934 granted the Department of Anthropology a total of \$24,000, which came in a lump sum, to develop a research program in anthropology. The President of the Fund, Edwin R. Embree, who was vitally interested in the Department's program, visited Hawaii from time to time, and one year gave the Commencement address at the University.

Keesing, in his letter of August 15, 1956, wrote that "we spent it the \$24,000 parsimoniously but I believe effectively." Studied were the Filipinos in Hawaii and in the Philippines, Guamanians; Hawaiians; Japanese; and the mingling of races in Hawaii.

"The Filipinos in Hawaii; economic and social conditions, 1906-1936," a Master's thesis in social anthropology, the first in the new Department, was completed in 1936 by Raman R. Cariaga with some Rosenwald support. Hulse returned for a year to work with Rosenwald aid on "Cultural Factors Influencing Growth Patterns of Japanese Immigrants," as demonstrated in the studies sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and to teach, the same summer as the Conference on Education, a course "Race and Race Mixture." John F. Embree, who had his A.B. from Hawaii, returned in 1937 as Research Associate with his Ph.D. from Chicago, and before beginning to teach finished his book Suye Mura (Chicago, 1939) and made an acculturation study, financed with Rosenwald aid, on a Japanese community in Kona, Hawaii. (The American Anthropological Association published it as Memoir No. 59). He discussed his plans at length with Lind of Sociology who, it will be recalled, had already done some work at Kona.

Of the studies on native Hawaiians made with Rosenwald support, there is Keesing's monograph on Hawaiian Homesteading on Molokai, a project in which the Territorial Government had a special interest; the results were published at the University in 1936. Keesing, a prolific writer and investigator, had many publications which appeared immediately before or during his affiliation with the University. His book South Seas in the Modern World (New York, 1941; rev. ed., 1945), which happened to appear just at the start of World War II, filled a definite need felt by many Federal agencies for orientation on contemporary conditions in the Pacific islands. Keesing was also associated with Rosenwald-supported projects studying long tenure in the Pacific dependencies, race mixture and status of people of mixed descent in certain Pacific areas, and with Stello M. Jones, a Research Assistant 1934-36, on economic acculturation of races in Hawaii.

Dr. Ernest Beaglehole of New Zealand, a Research Associate for about two years between 1935 and 1937, studied culture change among urban Hawaiians. The University published his Some Modern Hawaiians in 1937. Another New Zealander who like Beaglehole received Rosenwald aid was Harry Hawthorne; he had been a teacher in a Maori district; after a year or so at the University he went on to Yale for his Ph.D. in anthropology. His study on Maori acculturation later appeared as a Memoir of the American Anthropological Association.

About the same time that Dr. Beaglehole was in Hawaii, Edwin G. Burrows, a former City Editor on the Honolulu Advertiser, who had become interested in anthropology and later went on to get a Ph.D., became affiliated with the University as both a Research Associate and a part-time Lecturer. With Rosenwald's aid he collected data for his book Chinese and Japanese in Hawaii, published by the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1939.

In 1937-38, Laura M. Thompson surveyed native education in Guam, and the history, archeology, culture, and modern communities of that island. During 1938-40, after her return, she became Research Associate at the University. Her Guamanian work was jointly sponsored by the U.S. Naval Government of Guam and the University, with the latter drawing on funds from its Rosenwald grant. Three editions of Dr. Thompson's Guam and Its People have been published; the last edition, in 1947, was greatly expanded by material subsequently obtained. During 1940-41, having written up the Guamanian research done thus far, Dr. Thompson surveyed cross-cultural education for the Territory of Hawaii, and then went to the mainland to coordinate research on American Indian education.

Another important expenditure of the Rosenwald Fund was in physical anthropology. In 1938, Gordon T. Bowles, a Harvard-trained physical anthropologist, joined the Department faculty. With a light teaching load at first--or so, Keesing recalled--and with some subsidy from the Rosenwald grant Dr. Bowles worked on anthropometric data that he and Mrs. Bowles had just collected in India and Tibet. Some Rosenwald money later went to buy skeleton boxes and to equip an anthropometric laboratory for the use of Dr. Bowles' classes in physical anthropology and archeology. Located in Room 326 of the Social Science Building (later re-named Crawford Hall), the laboratory was dismantled during the Second World War when the courses were discontinued, and the room for a time served as an office for Graduate Assistants in anthropology and sociology. Some of the equipment was still being used in the mid-1950's by both the Department and the Museum. Of the damaged or worn-out instruments the Department during those later years replaced only a part due to lack of funds, although it had again begun to feel the need for more equipment and space for archeological and anthropometric research and instruction.

To have aided so many worthwhile projects the Rosenwald Fund money had obviously to be spread out very thin, but its beneficial effects to the Department, to the individuals specifically aided, and to research and instruction in anthropology continue to be reaped into the present. The grant, it should be emphasized, was given and apportioned during the Great Depression when positions in anthropology and grants for research were discouragingly scarce and were constantly being reduced in number and financial value. Most of the individuals, who were then just at the start of their careers, later became widely known and continued to produce important work in their fields.

The period from 1934 to 1941 was marked by more than the very active research program aided by the Rosenwald Fund. In 1936 the Departments of Anthropology and Sociology were combined, with Keesing acting as Chairman until his sabbatical leave in 1941 when Dr. Andrew W. Lind of Sociology succeeded him. A special feature which President Crawford had requested of the new combined department was a course "Introduction to the Study of Man." Not only was it the first rung in the academic ladder for many years in both sociology and anthropology, but it was also a requirement for a degree in the College of Arts and Sciences, and in the College of Education; and an elective in the College of Applied Sciences. Keesing taught the course until his sabbatical leave and resumed teaching it on his return. After the War the joint department returned, for the most part, to its previous system of separate introductory courses in anthropology and sociology.

With Embree and Bowles added to the faculty in anthropology in those pre-war years, the curriculum expanded rapidly to create a broad base of training for competence in more than subjects relating to the Pacific Island. The goal was to give students a well-rounded and disciplined training in every phase of anthropology. This training was intended to match that

given in the principal mainland universities teaching the subject and to add to it a specialized knowledge of the Pacific, including the Asiatic littoral. This continued to be the goal of the Department of Anthropology into the 1950's. By 1939 and 1940, the anthropological courses offered to juniors, seniors, and graduate students (culminating in an M.A.) numbered something like twenty-three, not counting the seminar, reading, and research courses. Then, as now, some of the courses were given only in alternate years. Most of these courses were still being given, with new added, in the early 1950's. Besides teaching in the regular, summer, and post sessions, Keesing, Bowles, and Embree also taught in the Adult Education Division.

They had other instructors to assist them in teaching. Burrows, as has already been noted, was a part-time lecturer while engaged in his research: Hondy taught twice in the School of Religion; Dr. John Reinecke was Instructor in Anthropology and Sociology from 1937-39; Kenneth P. Emory of Bishop Museum was Lecturer in 1938-39; Denzel Corr continued to give linguistic courses for the Department; and Peter Buck, as noted earlier, gave a Summer Session course in 1941. Graduate assistants included Brunhilde Kaufer (1936), Mory Turner (1938), and John De Young who came in 1939. The policy with regard to graduate students was to send the U.H. graduates to mainland institutions whenever possible and to take on graduate students from the mainland and overseas.

Keesing wrote to me with regard to library resources as follows: "From 1934 I made a deliberate attempt to build up the library not only in general anthropology but also Pacific island administration documentation. I don't know if it has been kept up at the time it was one of the best study centers in this respect in the U.S. for such documentation. We cooperated quite closely with Margaret Titcomb (Bishop Museum Librarian) so as to complement one another, and make sources mutually available."

Another development that Keesing described: "In later years we ran interesting weekly staff meetings in afternoons with Gordan, John, Denzel, Porteus, Lind, etc."

Undergraduate and graduate students benefited from associating with the transient anthropologists working in the Rosenwald program and with the specialized members of the regular teaching staff. Embree, for example, lectured on Japanese and Chinese village communities; a 1939 Post Session course "Modern America" reflected the growing interest of anthropologists in applying their knowledge and techniques to problems of modern industrial society. Bowles' courses on Asiatic ethnography drew on his nearly life long residence and knowledge of the Far East. His courses on archeology and physical anthropology initiated long-term research problems which are still active.

A local project which Bowles carried on weekends for two years with his archeology classes, his colleagues at the University and the Museum, and interested strong-backed but careful amateurs was the excavation of an old Hawaiian burial site at Mokapu, Oahu, which the Armed Forces later levelled for a flying field. Kenneth Emory was a co-director. John de Young, who had come from Beloit college to be Graduate Assistant, used the Mokapu skeletons to write his Master's thesis in 1941 on "Preliminary Measurements of the Hawaiian Crania with an Emphasis upon the Frontal Region." After the Second World War, Professor Charles Snow of the University of Kentucky worked with Dr. W. White of Tripler Hospital on these skeletons.

All artifacts and skeletons from the Mokapu site were sent by Keesing to Bishop Museum in accordance with a long standing agreement between the Museum and the University about the disposition of archeological materials. At least as early as 1922, an arrangement between the University and the Museum "provided that there shall be reciprocity in the use of

libraries, laboratories, collections, and other facilities of research. Graduate students registered in the University of Hawaii will be allowed to carry on investigations under the guidance of members of the Museum staff and work done in this way may be credited toward advanced degrees by the University. Advanced students will be allowed the use of the museum facilities when working under proper direction subject to such regulations as may be deemed expedient by the Director of the Museum" (U.H. Quarterly Bull. Vol. 6, 1927).

Another archeological project of one of Bowles' students was the excavation of a bluff shelter on Oahu at Kuliouou. It was discovered and worked mainly by John R. Porteus, a major in anthropology. Then in 1950, after World War II, Dr. Kenneth P. Emory's University class in archeology used it as a training site. It was eminently suited for this purpose because it had been continuously occupied for a long time by human beings who had displaced the sea birds who had first found this shelter. The first Carbon-14 date to be registered from the Pacific islands came from charcoal from a hearth at the earliest level of human occupation of this Kuliouou shelter. The date of 1004 A.D., plus or minus 180 years, was determined by Dr. W.F. Libby, University of Chicago Institute for Nuclear Studies. University students had the satisfaction of having participated in working on a site of historical significance in scientific research in Pacific anthropology. Subsequently Dr. Samuel F. Elbert with his students in Linguistics sought as part of their comparative research on Pacific glottochronology to determine whether their results correlated with this date.

Scientific linguistics had received impetus at the University before World War II under the direction of Denzel Carr whose two courses, "Languages of the World" and "Phonetics and Phanemics," listed under Anthropology were important in the training of the students. Besides doing some work on Hawaiian, he specialized on Asiatic languages, and in 1940-41

made an important field trip to Okinawa to study proto-Ryukyuan and its possible relations to proto-Japanese and proto-Indonesian. In the history of the Department of Anthropology he played a major role in firmly establishing linguistic study as essential to the training of an anthropologist; for a time after World War II until a separate Department of Linguistics was established this tradition provided at least psychological support and students for the linguistic specialists on the campus.

From the frequent references to the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, it is clear that the University and the Museum had very close relations though both are independent of each other in origin, administration, and finances. Before World War II, the split between "pure" and "applied" science and research was wide. However, in the Territory of Hawaii the anthropologists maintained a balance. Just as an understanding existed between the Museum and the University with regard to the disposition of archeological source material and student work at the Museum, so an informal understanding existed with regard to research in their mutual area of interest, the Pacific islands, particularly Polynesia. Studies in problems of native adjustment to modern conditions or "acculturation"--a very new term for the process like "applied anthropology"--were to be the particular concern of the University. Anthropologists working through the Bishop Museum would engage in reconnaissance studies of native culture as it was before western culture had completely altered the past beyond recognition. The same anthropologist might be affiliated with both institutions at one and the same time, or at different times. For the Museum he would be recording, analyzing, and reconstructing the pre-European culture of an archipelago, and for the University he would be describing present-day conditions as affected by western culture. In some instances, a

formal affiliation was achieved by the Museum naming a University anthropologist as an Honorary Research Associate on its staff and by the University naming a Bishop Museum anthropologist as Lecturer or by some other academic title.

Four anthropologists who held research fellowships given jointly by Bishop Museum and Yale University were also associated with the University of Hawaii. Ernest Beaglehole, who had worked in Pukapuka Island (Northern Cook Islands) on the Bishop-Yale fellowship and had come to Honolulu to prepare his material for publication, was Research Associate at the University to study cultural change on modern Hawaiians for which he had Rosenwald funds. Edwin G. Burrows, who had the Museum-Yale fellowship to study Uvean and Futunan ethnography, was also on the University staff for a time to do research on modern Hawaii, and part-time teaching. Laura Thompson, who had studied the Lou Islands under the Museum-Yale fellowship, was also a Research Associate to study modern Guam with Rosenwald funds. Katharine Luamala, who had worked the summer of 1934 with Martha Beckwith at the Museum and later returned to do research on mythology for two years on the Museum-Yale fellowship, joined the University faculty in 1946, and also continued as Honorary Research Associate at Bishop Museum. Bath Buck and Emory of the Museum staff taught at the University at times, as has been noted.

The division of labor between the two institutions before the Second World War has largely been obliterated because of the unified approach to problems of dependent peoples of the Pacific under TRIPP, the tri-institutional program of the University of Hawaii, Bishop Museum, and Yale University, initiated in 1953.

An informal outgrowth of Dr. Bowles' archeological classes led to an unexpected and memorably pleasant custom of an inter-institutional and inter-departmental weekly

luncheon at one of the restaurants at Kewalo Basin. For a couple of years before the end of 1941, Gordon Bowles, John de Young, and Jack Porteus spent Thursday at the Museum working on Mokapu bones, and would then go with some of the Museum staff, usually Emory, Titcomb, and myself, to Kewalo for lunch. Converging from the opposite end of town would be Keesing, Embree, and Corr. Other "regulars" were Burrows and Laura Thompson. Psychology was sometimes represented by Colin Herrick, Geology by Chester Wentworth, Botany by Harold St. Jahn, Oriental languages by Edward Schafer, and Geography by John W. Coulter. Then there were at times visitors, just going out on expeditions to the south Pacific or returning from them. As anyone, regardless of previous interests, becomes a scientist on marrying one, spouses were often present too, and our Kewalo table was often a very long and noisy one.

The Anthropological Society of Hawaii has always been closely linked with both the University and the Museum anthropologists. Joining them in the Society have been interested staff members in other fields, some staff members of Kamehameho Schools and the Honolulu Art Academy, and students. Townspeople without an academic affiliation but interested in anthropology have always taken a prominent part in the Society. The Society linked "Town and Gown," some speakers liked to point out, and especially too the University and the Museum. The meetings provided an opportunity to report on current research of members and visitors; Burrows in his preface to Hawaiian Americans acknowledges "valuable suggestions" from discussions at the Society meetings.

Although its composition changed from year to year, the group tended to be tightly knit and so congenial that a first-time non-anthropological visitor might easily feel an outsider at first. Usually meetings were held in private homes. Reverend Henry Judd, when

an officer, was so insistent on promptly beginning on the stroke of eight that even yet I feel the Society is falling apart if the President does not rise promptly at eight to introduce the speaker of the evening. Reverend Judd also saw to it that the formal speech and formal discussion ended by 9 P.M. to leave time for refreshments, informal discussion, and sociability. The time for the formal meeting to begin and end was one unenunciated rule. Another rule, which was enunciated, was also typical of the Society. T.T. Waterman, a founder, is reported to have said, "There is to be but one rule, and that is, that there are to be no rules." This happy thought, modified only during Reverend Judd's lifetime with regard to starting time, was later ignored. Now the "right" starting time is completely ignored, but there is a Constitution, the second, in fact, since World War II. John Embree drew up the first; someone else, or maybe it was a committee, drew up the second constitution. Probably few officers have ever read either constitution or even know that any exists. An informal news sheet started by Margaret Titcomb during the War, became a quarterly News from the Pacific which had a wide circulation, with many requests for copies, during its early years because for a time it was the only summary available of Pacific anthropological news.

The Fourth Milestone

December 7, 1941, came. Some anthropology continued to be taught. In the summer session of 1942 Keesing was to have given "Introductory Anthropology" and a course called "War Theatre of the Pacific," but he left in the spring to do war work. The catalog for 1942-43 reports that all members of Anthropology and Geography had been called to Government service and were irreplaceable. Sometimes it seemed to me that the best place to come across them was in the middle of the street at 14th and Pennsylvania, Washington,

D.C., and since it was wartime one did not ask but hoped to be told where they were coming from and where they were going. Bernhard J. Hormann, back at the ranch, taught both anthropology and sociology between 1942 and 1944; then J. Rodemaker joined him in 1944-45.

The Fifth Milestone

In 1945-46, John Embree returned as Associate Professor in Anthropology, and drew up plans for the future development of the discipline at the University. Kotharine Luomalo joined the faculty in the fall of 1946; Leonard Mason came in the spring of 1947 when Embree, who later resigned, went on leave. Emory, also released from wartime service, began teaching a course each semester, while he continued his major affiliation with the Museum. Saul Riesenbergs came in 1949. An interesting development for the anthropologists during this early postwar period was the appointment of Mrs. Willowdean Handy, ethnologist, as a member of the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii.

With these brief notes on the postwar revival of anthropology at the University of Hawaii I leave further historical reconstruction to a future anthropologist. My hope in this paper has been to give new students and faculty in anthropology some information about what went on here in their field before they arrived on campus. Perhaps they will come to appreciate the intellectual heritage left by these earlier scholars even as they play their own part in the history of anthropology at the University of Hawaii.

VISITING ANTHROPOLOGISTS

Dr. Roy Rappaport of the Department of Anthropology at the University of Michigan spent the academic year 1968-69 as a Senior Scholar with the Institute of Advanced Projects at the East-West Center. Dr. Rappaport was working on a new book on New Guinea and presented some of his material at the evening Anthropology Colloquium. He also participated in informal discussions with local anthropologists.

Dr. Norma McArthur of the Department of Demography of the School of Social Science at the Australian National University spent some time in Honolulu advising the East-West Center on the Population Studies Program, and talking informally with others on Oceanic demography.

Dr. Milton Barnett, formerly with the Agricultural Development Council in the Philippines and now with the Agricultural Development Council in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, spent this year as a Senior Specialist at the Institute of Advanced Projects of the East-West Center. Dr. Barnett will join the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawaii as a special affiliate faculty member.

Dr. Raymond Firth of the Department of Anthropology at the London School of Economics and Political Science spent the academic year 1968-69 in the Department of Anthropology of the University of Hawaii as the first holder of the Pacific Chair of Anthropology.

Dr. Douglas L. Oliver of the Department of Anthropology at Harvard University replaces Dr. Firth as the holder of the Pacific Chair of Anthropology. Dr. Oliver will retain his Harvard affiliation half-time and spend the other half of his time at the University of Hawaii.

Conferences

The Association of Social Anthropologists in Eastern Oceania held its second meeting at the University of California at Santa Cruz at the Institute for South Pacific Studies, in March 1969.

MEETINGS OF THE ASSOCIATION

The Association met six (6) times during the 1968-69 academic year for programs on five (5) different Pacific groups: The New Guinea Kurelu, Micronesians, Ainu of Northern Japan, Hawaiians in Kona, and Anthropologists at the University of Hawaii.

At the first meeting we watched an ethnographic film Dead Birds. It portrays the Kurelu people of the central New Guinea highlands and was made by the 1961 Harvard-Peabody Expedition headed by Robert Gardner. (Film is available at the main State of Hawaii Library.) Dave Eyde, a University of Hawaii anthropologist who has done field work in another area of New Guinea (Asmat), led the discussion. The film focuses on inter-tribal warfare and death rituals.

The second and third meetings were organized by the Micronesian Students' Club. The Associated Students of the University of Hawaii and our association joined in as sponsors. Topics

were Relocation of the Marshallese, Land Tenure and Use, Rights of the People, and Power of the Congress of Micronesia. Speakers included University of Hawaii Micronesian students Gregorio Calvo, Fransisco Uludong, and Toshio Nakayamo. Mr. Nakayama is also Representative to the Congress of Micronesia from Truk. Newspaper columnists Bob Krauss and Byron Baker and University of Hawaii anthropologists Leonord Mason and Steve Boggs also participated, along with William V. Vitorelli and David Sandbergan who have held offices in the Trust Territory Government and long defended the interests of Micronesians. Many others spoke from the floor. In the course of two evenings discussion the speakers documented many mistakes made by United States officials in appropriating land and moving peoples. Many of these mistakes were due to lack of appreciation of the vital and irreplaceable role of land in Micronesian societies. To Micronesians the possession of their homelands, owned and used for livelihood by family groups through a very complex system of inheritance, is essential to both the economy and social structure. Their way of life is changing rapidly and accommodating to Western contact; nevertheless people removed to new islands and given many compensation find that the new circumstances do not provide means for subsistence or a realistic income. They have come to realize there is sometimes no way back to the land when titles have become confused or the natural life destroyed by nuclear testing. Land is in short supply and is Micronesia's most vital possession. Peoples removed from or to Eniwetok, Kwajalein, Ebeye, Bikini, Rongerik, Kili, Ujelond, Majuro, and Eliib have suffered serious deprivation, and this has made an enormous impression on the Micronesian people. Some Micronesians are now at least as fearful of losing their land to the Americans as they are eager to increase their contact and participation in the outside world. The people most acutely aware of the linked possibilities of loss and opportunity offered by Americans are students who have been successful in the U.S. educational system. They come to receive college training in the U.S., particularly at the University of Hawaii, and while here learn their identity as Micronesians. Many Micronesian people still regard themselves only as belonging to a district or to the society of one tiny atoll. But some see Micronesia as a unified people, governed by the Congress of Micronesia, which should have the right to negotiate relations with its benefactors, particularly in the matter of land use. At present the United States has the absolute right to take land for its interests and needs under the Trusteeship Charter granted by the United Nations.

At our fourth meeting we had a unique opportunity to interview Mr. Ekashimotoku Miyamoto, Ainu Chief of Shiraoi District, Hokkaido, Japan. He had come on a vacation trip to Hawaii and was eager to share knowledge of his culture. He was dressed in his native costume, charming in manner, and he produced a kind of instant-fieldwork sensation for all of us. Miss Hirako Ikeda, Japanese folklorist at the University of Hawaii, did an outstanding job of interviewing, and even though Mr. Miyamoto spoke no English and few of us spoke Japanese, we received very full answers to questions. We learned about the bear ceremonies, important in the religion and in hunting. Tattooing of women was described and recommended for its cosmetic effect! Eleanore Williamson played a tape recording from which he then translated a tender Ainu lullaby and a rice-pounding song, long present but unrecognized in the Museum collection.

For our next meeting, Larry Kimura, a University of Hawaii graduate, spoke of his memories of a tiny village on the North Kona coast of the Big Island, where he stayed as a child with his grandparents. All of us present, and especially Kenneth Emory, were moved by the opportunity to hear a young person of Hawaiian descent reading excellent poetry he had written in his native language. Mr. Kimura's poem beautifully describes the legendary beliefs about Pele's visit which gave meaning to the rock formations in the sea near his grandparent's village. In addition we discussed how almost all activities went on outside the tiny houses. Being inside the house called for quiet respectful "parlor"

behavior. Many chores were done in a burst of group activity that made a routine job into fun. Several listeners were stimulated to describe their early memories of Hawaiian life which were very informative to the rest of us.

At our last meeting of the 1968-69 season Dr. Leonard Mason, retiring professor of Anthropology at the University of Hawaii, spoke to us about the history of the Anthropology Department there. Dr. Mason, although retiring early in his "late youth" to turn his full attention to secondary education in anthropology and to Micronesian problems, has an impressive length of service since 1947 at the University of Hawaii. Anthropology has developed into an independent department, enlarged, and developed its graduate program during his tenure. Many of his remarks were stimulated by notes from Kothorine Luomola's history of the earlier years of local anthropology which appears in this issue. Before the meeting members gathered at a dinner to honor Dr. Mason and to give an opportunity for sociable shop-talk.

Archaeological Activity at the University of Hawaii 1967-68

During the year 1967-68 there were 12 graduate students working in archaeology at the Manoa Campus in a program with three faculty members. Laboratory facilities have doubled in space since 1966, with accompanying improvement in equipment and library sources.

Mr. Donn Bayard, working under the auspices of the National Science Foundation, completed excavations at Ban Nadi, Khon Khaen, Thailand, and was writing up the material for his doctoral dissertation. Mrs. Yong-jin Choe completed a bibliography of recent North Korean archaeology for publication in Asian Perspectives. Mr. Chet Gorman was writing up his material from northern Thailand, a preliminary report of the discovery to domesticated plants from 6,000 B.C., which appeared in Science. Miss Daisy Lee worked on a Ford Foundation project testing magnetometers for surveying sites in Ireland during the summer of 1968. Mr. T. Stell Newman presented a paper on Hawaiian agriculture at the American Anthropological Association Meetings in Seattle in November, 1968. He also worked on computer applications with Dr. John Belshe of Kentron Hawaii using data from Lapakahi on the Big Island. Mr. Warren Peterson, with support from the National Science Foundation and the National Defense Education Act, worked in Cagayan Valley, Luzon, on Neolithic Sites. Mr. David Wu has completed a study of the Ch'u Culture, a Bronze Age Civilization of China, published in the East Asian Studies Occasional Papers, Volume 3, of the University of Hawaii. Mrs. Lorraine Wu has completed an annotated bibliography of archaeology in Taiwan (1948-1969) for publication in Asian Perspectives. Mr. Francis Ching, who graduated from the University of Hawaii in Anthropology in 1967 has become Staff Archaeologist of the Division of State Parks. Through his initiative, many projects have opened up field work opportunities for students.

Dr. Roger Green, who holds a part-time appointment with the University of Hawaii in addition to his appointment with the Bishop Museum, continued his research in Western Samoa under the Polynesian Culture History Program with auspices from the National Science Foundation. Dr. Wilhelm Solheim continued research on Thai pre-history in addition to editing Asian Perspectives. Dr. Richard Pearson was analyzing the material from the Bellows site on Oahu excavated in August, 1967, and continuing research on Korea, the Ryukyus, and Japan. He carried out field work on Cheju Island, Korea, during July, 1967.

Many people in the department were surveying and excavating here in Hawaii as described in the next article.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN HAWAII - 1968 - 1969

By T. Stell Newman

Last year I went through about two-hundred references in making an analysis of past trends in Hawaiian archaeology. When I sat down and began compiling this summary of work completed during 1968 and 1969, I was immediately struck with the tremendous lunge of Hawaiian archaeology within the last few years. Not only is the total number of archaeological projects increasing, but the quantity, quality, and control of the data are also increasing. With this is also coming improved project funding by State and National agencies, along with an increasing awareness of Hawaii's past and support of its study and protection by the general public.

I feel quite certain that more archaeological work has been done in Hawaii during the decade of the 1960's than was done in the previous sixty years combined. As an illustration of this, let me do what I was asked to do in this article and present a summary of what has been done in Hawaiian archaeology in the last two years:

1968

A site survey was conducted by Francis Ching and Paul Rosendahl for the Division of State Parks of the Honokohau to Keahole section of the proposed Kailua-Kowaihae Road on Hawaii Island. This two-man team spent about two weeks on the survey which involved the first intensive use of helicopters in Hawaiian site surveys.

Another site survey was conducted by Lloyd Soehren and Stell Newman for the Lieutenant Governor in the area above the pali behind Kealakekua Bay, Hawaii Island. This survey consisted of an initial week of airphoto analysis and the construction of an area map using photogrammetry, followed by three days in the field.

Dr. Richard Pearson led excavations at the Mission Houses in Honolulu and completed the first historical archaeology on Oahu. His crew consisted of approximately six volunteers and the work was conducted over about a four day period.

Ed Ladd conducted excavations on the Chief's housing complex and the holua slide at the City of Refuge National Historical Park, Honaunou, Hawaii Island. He also excavated and stabilized the village of Kaili'iili near the City of Refuge.

Salvage excavations were conducted for two days during May in the Honokohau-Keahole Point area of Hawaii Island by Francis Ching with a crew from the Hilo Campus of the University of Hawaii.

Ed Ladd led salvage excavations in the area of the Honokohau Small Boat Harbor with a crew of six for five days.

The Summer Field Schools in Archaeology from both the Manoa and Hilo campuses of the University of Hawaii cooperated in extensive excavations in the Lapakahi area of North Kohala, Hawaii Island during the summer. William Bonk directed the Hilo class and its field work, while Dr. Richard Pearson directed the Manoa class with Strell Newman in charge of the field work. Approximately seven man-years of field research were completed during the summer, making the Lapakahi Project the most intensive application of effort on any Hawaiian site.

A spectacular burial cave exploration involving helicopters, the Honolulu Fire Department, and a mountain-climbing archaeologist took place in July along the cliffs near the Waipio Valley, Hawaii Island. John Shipman, under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Emory and Francis Ching, rappelled down the face of the cliff to record the contents of the cave.

A major project began during the summer in Makaha Valley on Oahu under Dr. Roger Green. Field crews were led by Rob Hammon and Ed Ladd who spent a major portion of the summer making a very extensive site survey within the valley. Excavations were begun in the fall and continued during the winter and spring.

On weekends through the spring and summer, William Bonk and students from the Hilo campus excavated in the Honakohau area of North Kona, Hawaii Island.

Historical excavations were directed by Mike Seelye within the partially reconstructed Barracks on the grounds of Iolani Palace in Honolulu. Three days field work by a crew of about 12 resulted in the possible location King Kalakaua's cottage.

William Bonk returned in several weekends during the fall to the coastal fishing hamlet of Kaaie in the Lapakahi area of North Kohala to continue excavations started by his summer field school. His crew consisted of students from his classes at the Hilo campus.

An extensive site survey and salvage excavations were conducted over a two week period in the North Kona area of Hawaii Island by crews under the overall direction of Francis Ching. Debbie Cluff was in charge of a five-man crew doing site survey work and the salvage excavation of one cave in the Keahole Point Airport area. Tom Riley was in charge of another crew of four doing site survey work and salvage excavations along an extension of the proposed Kailua-Kawaihae Road.

Debbie Cluff completed an intensive description of Kupolopolo heiau on North Oahu during the winter.

In addition to these field projects, a major step in Hawaiian archaeology was taken by the formation of an ad hoc Archaeology Coordinating Committee composed of all the archaeologists in the state. This committee has been active in laying plans for a comprehensive state-wide survey of prehistoric and historic sites, in coordinating archaeological projects, and in reacting to development plans endangering important site areas.

1969

Paul Rosendahl and a crew of three made test excavations for about one week near the Mauna Kea Beach Hotel on Hawaii Island.

Stell Newman and Mike Seelye spent three days at the Kaaie fishing hamlet at Lapakahi, North Kohala, Hawaii Island doing problem solving excavations to follow up on the summer work in the area.

Dr. Richard Pearson and a crew of three made an intensive site survey of the Waiānupapa State Park near Hana, Maui over a five day period.

Ecological research was conducted at the Lapakahi agricultural area by Stell Newman and Ed Murabayashi, a soils specialist, using earth moving equipment. Later in the year, Newman returned with Don Kelso, a marine biologist, for quantitative research on the marine environment offshore from Koaie.

Dr. Pearson returned with another volunteer crew to excavate a basement in the Mission House complex at Hanalei.

Work has continued throughout 1969 on the Mokaha Valley Project under Dr. Roger Green and under the field direction of Ed Ladd and Rob Hommon, making this the best known valley area in Hawaii from an archaeological point of view.

The Mōnoa campus of the University of Hawaii again held its Summer Field School in Archaeology at Lapakahi on Hawaii Island. An extensive site survey was conducted during the first few weeks of the project followed by problem-oriented excavations, all under the direction of Dr. Roger Green. This summer's work added an additional four-month-years of research time to the total for the Lapakahi archaeological area.

The Field School was expanded to Molokai with one crew excavating and conducting test excavations in conjunction with another University Summer Field School in ecology.

Walter Frederickson began excavations in Lahaina, Maui on the site of the "Brick Palace" of Kamehameha I, based on work he had done on the site in 1965.

The Division of State Parks did extensive salvage excavations in the Keahole Point Airport area of North Kona under the direction of Francis Ching. A crew of sixteen workers spent about three and one half weeks excavating sites located during the 1968 survey of the area.

Ed Ladd and crew completed a site survey of the north side of Hōnaunau Bay and later Rob Hommon and crew conducted an intensive site survey of a portion of Kaowaloa Flat at Kealahou Bay, both for the Lieutenant Governor.

In addition to the field and lab work, 1969 has seen the newly formed Coordinating Committee taking an active role in lobbying before the legislature, disseminating news of archaeological interest, coordinating projects, reacting to developers, and continuing planning for the state-wide site survey. A bill strengthening antiquities laws for Hawaii was passed by the Legislature practically unchanged from the draft originally submitted by the Committee. The Committee also sent representatives to testify at the hearings for bills funding the state-wide survey and for establishing the State Foundation for History and the Humanities -- all of which were approved by the Legislature.

I think that one can now see the great strides being taken in Hawaiian archaeology during the last two years. This development is the basis for my belief that Hawaiian archaeology is stimulating and keeping pace with the increasing public interest in Hawaiian historic roots and the sites that illuminate them.

PACIFIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL RECORDS

The Anthropology Department of Bishop Museum now publishes reports under the title PACIFIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL REPORTS, popularly known as PAR. The subject matter is intended to cover all aspects of Pacific Anthropology, ancient and modern: archaeology, ethnology, linguistics, as well as social and physical anthropology.

Publications to date: PAR #1. Studies in a Hawaiian Community: na makomaka o Nanakuli. Ronald Gallimore and Alan Haward, editors.

PAR #2. Pinao Bay Site (H24): a small, prehistoric fishing settlement near South Point (Ka Lae), Hawaii. William J. Wallace and Edith Taylor Wallace.

PAR #3. The Kumuhonua legends: a study of late 19th century Hawaiian stories of creation and origins. Dorothy B. Barrere.

PAR #4. Makaha Valley historical project, interim report No. 1. Rober C. Green, editor.

PAR #5. Behavior modification of the under achieving rural Hawaiian: an experimental classroom. Barbara B. Sloggett.

Copies of the reports may be purchased from Bishop Museum Press, P. O. Box 6037, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96818, or from the Museum Bookshop. Manuscripts may be submitted to the Editor, PACIFIC ANTHROPOLOGICAL RECORDS, Department of Anthropology, B. P. Bishop Museum, P. O. Box 6037, Honolulu, Hawaii, 96818.

ASH OFFICERS 1968 - 1969

PRESIDENT Alice Dewey
 VICE PRESIDENT Joan Boggs
 SECRETARY Mike Seelye
 TREASURER Cathie Jordan
 ACTING EDITORS Alice Dewey & Joan Boggs
