By the end of May 1942, less than six months after the attack on Pearl Harbor, some 320,000 Allied personnel had been seized by Japanese military forces in Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific. Some 140,000 were American, Australian, Canadian, British, Dutch, and New Zealand—that is to say, “white”—military prisoners of war (POWs). Of these, nearly one in three died in captivity. Most succumbed to starvation or to disease aggravated by malnutrition and hard physical labor. About a third of those who died were killed by “friendly fire,” crammed into overcrowded transport ships and then killed by Allied bombs and torpedoes. Many were killed outright by the Japanese: executed by decapitation, bayoneted, or beaten to death. Some died from torture or were killed in medical experiments. Sadly, a small number were killed by their fellow prisoners, murdered for a few scraps of food or tobacco or put to death to stop their screaming in the packed holds of the “hellships.”

Those who survived endured years of hardship and privation. Some were fortunate enough to be in the hands of less brutal guards, or to pull relatively easy duty, like cooking or truck driving. But most spent the war years at hard physical labor, beaten for the most capricious of reasons, their strength and will sapped by illness and lack of food, and in constant fear that they would die as their comrades had died.

During the war, stories of such atrocities as the Bataan Death March caused an outcry, but once the surviving POWs were liberated, they were quickly forgotten. They received nothing but their back pay and, in some cases, a pittance of additional compensation. American POWs found the Veterans Administration unsympathetic to their prison-induced ailments. Those still living continue to suffer the effects of physical and psychological damage. They are angry that the Japanese government glosses over the atrocities inflicted by its soldiers and were outraged when the U.S. government agreed to pay some $20,000 to each Japanese and American of Japanese descent interned in the wartime relocation camps while ignoring its own POWs who suffered far more grievously at the hands of the Japanese.

Gavan Daws, Australian-born writer of the well-known history of Hawai‘i, *Shoal of Time*, became interested in the ex-pows when he heard one of them talking in a bar. He went on to interview hundreds of former pows and to do years of research culminating in this harrowing, sobering, and enlightening book. His technique is to focus on the experiences of a small number of pows, while providing sufficient background and commentary to provide a larger perspective. For the most part, Daws lets the ex-pows tell their own stories in the blunt, earthy language of 1940s enlisted fighting men.

Even in this tale of almost unrelieved horror, there are moments of soldiers’ humor. Tobacco was prized almost as much as food, but factory-made cigarettes were scarce. The best cigarette paper came from Bibles and this led to theological pondering:

> A Dutch Jesuit chaplain on Sumatra said the word of God was sanctified, not the paper, so roll away. Sick men smoked their Army-issue Bible after reading it. Or they smoked without reading, and about this the chaplains had nothing to say except that it was better for men to get the Word into them by inhaling than not at all. For those who were willing to read before rolling, where should they start? An English chaplain said Revelation, which no one understood anyway. The Dutch Jesuit said the Old Testament, then the Acts of the Apostles because they were only practicalities, then the Gospels; leave the Sermon on the Mount for last, and learn it before smoking it. (p. 116)

Daws returns time and again to the question of why some pows lived and others died. Survival was often a matter of luck (being assigned to a camp in China or Taiwan instead of to the labor camps on the Burma-Siam “Death Railway” or the hellships). But other factors, such as physical condition, mental attitude, and special skills, could be crucial. Daws was struck by the extent to which the pows retained their national (or “tribal”) identities in spite of extremes of degradation:

> The Americans were the great individualists of the camps, the capitalists, the cowboys, the gangsters. The British hung onto their class structure like bulldogs, for grim death. The Australians kept trying to construct little male-bonded welfare states. None of the Anglos had much useful experience of the tropics; the Colonial Dutch did. (p. 23)

In some cases these differences could be a matter of life and death and it is not surprising that the Dutch had the lowest death rate of all the pows, under 20 percent compared to around 33 percent for the “Anglos.” Dis-
cipline and group solidarity were important, as was the presence of good officers. There were good officers and some acted with extraordinary heroism and self-sacrifice, but all too many chose self-preservation and the retention of “officer privilege” over the welfare of their troops.

His purpose is to bear witness, to describe rather than analyze, but Daws touches on the crucial issue of why these atrocities happened. He acknowledges such cultural factors as a Japanese military tradition that stressed loyalty and endurance rather than compassion, and the brutal training to which Japanese soldiers of that era were subjected, but he regards these as secondary. They may have shaped the pattern of Japanese behavior, but they did not cause it. Nor did the Japanese military culture preclude humane treatment of POWs, as attested by Japanese actions in some earlier wars. More important, in Daws’s view, was a mindset throughout the Japanese chain of command which ignored, acquiesced in, or even encouraged the mistreatment of POWs. To this extent, the “sustained atrocity” of the POW camps was a failure of leadership aggravated by attitudes bred during the years prior to the Pacific War. Describing the confrontation between Japanese conquerors and their American captives on Wake Island, he says, “The yellow man knew what the white man thought of him; on that subject the white world had taught him bitter lessons in the twentieth century, and the yellow man returned the white man’s hate and contempt” (p. 44).

But Japanese reaction to a century of Western arrogance and condescension is not a full explanation, either, for as Daws points out, the Japanese were even more brutal toward their Asian prisoners, the death rates for Asian laborers on the Burma-Siam railway reaching as high as 70 percent. Perhaps the most important factor was a prevailing attitude that Japan’s enemies of whatever race were somehow different—lesser—and thus unworthy of compassion. Daws rejects any notion that the Japanese are unique in this respect (that it is somehow in the Japanese “nature” to act as they did). During the Pacific War, each side viewed the other as not quite human and this affected their actions. Japanese who survived to be captured were almost always treated humanely while imprisoned, but few Japanese survived to be captured. Americans, too, could be cruel. Indeed, all human “tribes” have the capacity for savagery if presented with the right conditions: slavery, the Holocaust, and the killing fields of Cambodia are but three examples from history. Nor is such conduct confined to history, as today’s headlines about Rwanda and Bosnia attest. The lesson of this book, if there is to be a lesson, is that hatred, cruelty, and indifference to suffering wait in every human society, ready to be unleashed.

The ex-POWs themselves would probably reject all this philosophy. They just want to have their suffering acknowledged, the brutality of their Japanese
captors and the indifference of their own governments recognized, and their story told. This, Gavan Daws has done—magnificently.

DONALD W. BOOSE, JR.
Colonel, U.S. Army (retired)
Carlisle, Pennsylvania


In Challenging the Status Quo, authors Cecil K. Dotts and Mildred Sikkema undertook an ambitious project. They ask, “Can there be democracy in public education in Hawaii?” By democracy, the authors mean “equality and social justice for all students” (p. xxii). The authors discuss and interpret the attitudes, values, and beliefs that influenced educational policies during one hundred forty years of public education in Hawai‘i, and by doing so, attempt to reveal the disparity between the ideals of education and the reality of what “actually occurred” in Hawai‘i (p. xxiii).

The authors conclude that, with the exception of the programs of a few educational leaders like Henry S. Townsend, Vaughan MacCaughey, Miles Cary, and R. Burl Yarberry, public educational policies have failed to reflect “democratic values” and a “humane society” (p. 224).

The authors provide useful information, including a good summary of the oft-cited federal survey of 1920, superintendent Vaughan MacCaughey’s efforts to improve educational opportunities, and a discussion of educational policies during the past two decades. In the front matter (pp. xi–xv) they include helpful data for those interested in the history of education in Hawai‘i: the various title changes used for the superintendent, department of education, Normal School, and University of Hawai‘i; information on the Commissioners of Public Instruction; and a list of superintendents with their dates of service.

There are some problems, however. Citations to lead the interested reader to sources are sometimes missing, as, for example, when including ethnic group percentages (p. 63) and when giving MacCaughey credit for opening English standard schools to students of all ethnic groups (p. 104). Also, the authors assert that “a serious consequence” during World War II was the “developmental deprivation of a generation of children and youth” (pp. 136–37). Their lack of evidence suggests that their claims are conjectural.

The authors discuss “pidgin English” as the language of the children of
immigrants (pp. 26, 66) without making a distinction between Hawai‘i Pidgin English and Hawai‘i Creole English, or stating that “ pidgin” is the popular term for Hawai‘i Creole English. Also, they summarize incorrectly the main objections to Japanese language schools (p. 68) because they use an article written in 1916 in The Friend, a publication of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association, instead of scholarly works that have examined this well-researched issue.

The text could have used another round of editing to improve sentences, paragraphs, and chapters. As they stand, the chapters are collections of mini-descriptions of people, institutions, and ideas—interesting, but lacking clearly articulated integration with stated themes.

Perhaps the scope of the project was too ambitious, for in their effort to discuss one hundred forty years of public educational policies in Hawai‘i, the authors sacrificed depth for coverage.

Although beyond the authors’ intent, the book leaves a question unanswered: To what extent were policies as articulated by Hawai‘i’s educational leaders carried out at the school and classroom levels? This is an important question, because policies influence but do not determine what “actually occurred.”

EILEEN H. TAMURA
Curriculum Research & Development Group
College of Education
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa


As a Pacific mariner since at least the 1950s and a University of Hawai‘i anthropologist who has ranged from Tahiti to New Guinea, Ben Finney co-founded the Polynesian Voyaging Society in 1975. He has been sailing on and writing about replicas of ancient canoes ever since and has even discussed cross-cultural strategies for explorers of outer space. As these words are being written, Finney is voyaging again, this time in the “fleet” of three Hawaiian canoes revisiting Taputapuatea marae on Ra‘iatea (March 1995). There he is witnessing the birth of a new “Polynesian alliance”—an identity built partly on his own experiments. This book is an engaging overview of the rise of that movement of rediscovery.

Finney is explicit about the dual purpose of the canoe replica studies: “In addition to resolving issues about Polynesian seafaring, we wanted the canoe
and the voyage to serve as vehicles for the cultural revitalization of Hawaiians and other Polynesians" (p. 71). The paternalism in that vision is well-meaning, and the genesis of the Hokule'a voyages testifies to a convergence of "scientific" research and indigenous symbolism. Finney built his first double-hulled canoe in Santa Barbara, California, with the help of his mainland college students. Later, he persuaded his Hawaiian surfer friends to try out the canoe: "their growing skill at handling the canoe seemed to give them a new sense of identity as heirs to a great seafaring tradition . . ." (p. 72).

To launch the Polynesian Voyaging Society, Finney teamed up with Herb Kane, a Hawaiian artist with historical interests, and Tommy Holmes, a canoeist who founded the Hawai'i Maritime Center. The first voyage of the Hokule'a to Tahiti was navigated by a Carolinian, Mau Piailug, but subsequent voyages have been commanded by Polynesians. The most notable is Nainoa Thompson, who has put his own spin on traditional navigation techniques, aided by Will Kyselka of the Bishop Museum. Today, the Hawaiian canoes travel under the scrutiny of NASA and school children who monitor its progress. Moreover, voyaging replicas are multiplying as other Islanders join in the celebration, especially at the 1992 Pacific Arts Festival and at this year's rededication of Taputapuatea marae.

Finney focuses on the 1985—87 voyage to Aotearoa (New Zealand) and back, but he also presents an update on the information on (and debates about) Polynesian voyaging, from the Lapita potters who became the ancestors of Samoans and Tongans to the rediscoveries being made by east Polynesians. Finney gives the reader a detailed lesson in history and seafaring, as well as a running discussion of the technical challenges encountered in the reenactments, which have attempted to retrace legendary voyaging routes by using noninstrumental navigation. When discussing the latter, he relies both on his own experiences and on testimony from nine other participants in the project, including Thompson.

The reader gets a clear impression that movement and skillful command of sea lanes have been a part of Polynesia since its first settlement. Not only ancient migrations but interisland exchange systems created networks among the Islanders that are symbolically reemerging today, as the Hokule'a and its companion vessels are used as "floating classrooms." Finney shows that easterly trade winds did not always prevail, so that Polynesian explorers could wait for seasonal westerlies to get to isolated places like Rapanui (Easter Island). He also reveals the humanity of the voyagers, who sometimes experienced mishaps like losing a man overboard (p. 119) or misjudging distances (p. 146). In 1988, for example, Thompson had to by-pass Ra'iatea on the return north from Aotearoa because of unfavorable winds (pp. 155—56). Finney even puts himself into the adventure story, as when he was trying to steer the Hokule'a on a cloudy night (p. 183).
In an effort to “put voyaging back into Polynesian prehistory,” he devotes an important chapter (8) to the role of these reenactments in settling questions about ancient migrations and interactions. He weaves together oral traditions, archaeology, and firsthand experience to make a good case for a more holistic approach to Pacific Islanders’ past, even suggesting that their ancient “colonizations” were structured processes, not haphazard episodes (p. 265). Thompson and his fellow voyagers emerge as heroic figures worthy of their legendary ancestors, and they are clearly going beyond the “scientific” goals of the experiments.

Finney ends on an understandably positive note, with a quotation from Thompson’s father, Myron, about how the voyaging had changed the participants: “We went out as Hawaiians and scientists, and came home as Polynesian brothers and sisters” (p. 326). Figuratively, this was true to the spirit of the enterprise, and Finney no doubt feels like an honorary Polynesian at this point. Yet the rededication of the Taputapuatea marae, the background to which Finney discusses (pp. 109, 290), ultimately challenges the approach of the “scientists.” Invoking a date of A.D. 1350, when Tahitians were said to have killed a Maori priest and thus ended an era of pilgrimages to that sacred site, some participants argued that they were reopening relations between the Society Islands and Aotearoa.

Ironically, the 1350 date (calculated in 1904 by new Zealander S. Percy Smith as a time when a “great fleet” of canoes supposedly sailed to Aotearoa) has been criticized by scholars, as Finney dutifully reports (p. 164). He also says that the “Maori” voyagers whose priest was killed were really Rarotongans (p. 290). Meanwhile, Tahitian nationalists protested that the Taputapuatea ceremony was designed only to promote tourism in French Polynesia. But these issues are perhaps material for later reflections by Finney, whose book is recommended reading for both specialists and the general public.

DAVID A. CHAPPELL
Assistant Professor of History
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa


The International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) sponsored this “document” as “the first full fledged attempt to present the Hawaiian situation to the international community.” The publication was funded through a grant from the Solstice Foundation, Denmark. The selection of
pieces that went into this compilation was largely influenced by cooperating members of the Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.

Contributions by several leaders in various aspects of the Hawaiian Movement present their views on the issues involved, the relevant historical, cultural, and legal background, the question of land ownership and use, and the effects on the environment of tourism and the military presence. Colette Machado contributes a thoughtful piece titled “Keep Moloka‘i Moloka‘i.”

The work is dedicated “to the memory of Kawaipuna Paekukui Prejean,” an early and important proponent of Hawaiian sovereignty, as well as of self-determination for other indigenous peoples worldwide. He is credited with having initiated this document. A piece by Nakoa Prejean is an excellent survey of the international aspects of the drive toward Hawaiian self-government.

All of the contributors present the same point of view, which is unrelentingly anti-“haole” and anti-U.S.A. The voices of several other leaders of the Hawaiian Movement are not presented. Nevertheless, this compilation does set forth the views of a significant group of vocal proponents involved in the drive for Hawaiian self-determination.

SAMUEL P. KING
Senior U.S. District Judge


Hula Pahu, volume I, makes a courageous attempt to trace and describe the origin of the Hawaiian hula drum and the accompanying sounds and movements performed in conjunction with it. “This shroud is especially difficult to penetrate when attempting to sort out the uses of the pahu with its sounds and movements,” writes Adrienne Kaeppler in her preface (p. xiv). This revelation leaves the reader with a speculative if not controversial conclusion, undermining the text. Thus the reader is left with the following perplexing questions: (1) Who was this research written for—native or foreign scholars
(2) What purpose does this book serve? (3) What impact will the contents of this book have for native Hawaiian practitioners of the *hula pahu*? (4) Does the speculative thesis of this book add to or negate the innate and scholarly viewpoint of the native practitioners of the *hula*?

To compartmentalize aspects of Hawaiian dance is to relegate it to a Western frame of reference or mindset. The idea of packaging and boxing with neat little ribbons best suits the Westerner in his approach to dance academia—whereas the Hawaiian observes it with the flow of *mana* (spiritual essence), the spirit of emotion of creativity which is realistically the approach of the native perspective. There are many shades of gray in Hawaiian art form that are just that—nebulous and unexplainable by words. It means very little to *hula* practitioners because they will view it as another interpretation from a source outside the arena of *hula*.

The author uses non-native informants when discussing Hawaiian religion. The use of these *haole* scholars is an attempt to give the work credibility in the Western realm of consequence. Neither Marshall Sahlins nor Valerio Valeri possesses the credentials to be an interpreter of Hawaiian religious practices.

How much of Kaeppler’s own biases are woven into this work is based on her own conclusions and accomplishments not born to the *hula*, language, and Hawaiian cultural rearing—she is still an outsider looking in. The author is not a practitioner of the *hula*, let alone the *pahu*. To the Hawaiian, this is suspect because “only he knows the sacred places of his house and can stand from the opening of his house to explain it.” In other words, one cannot be a scholar of Hawaiian culture being born in another culture.

Though Kaeppler’s sources and informants are Hawaiian, the conclusion and final outcome of her work fit the justification of the *haole* intellectual in the dance—hoping to break new ground, squeezing from it some far-out interpretation to elevate academic pursuits.

The variables in Hawaiian *hula pahu* poetry and dance are legion and cannot be cloistered or shoved into an ultranarrow form of speculation. The result is misleading, thus adding to the many fallacious theories of the *hula pahu*.

It is widely known that Hawaiian masters of this art form never give or divest themselves of all their knowledge for it would erode their stewardship. This volume on *hula pahu* would have been best served if a native practitioner or several native practitioners of the *hula pahu* had authored it; at least the speculation, if any, would have been Hawaiian in viewpoint.

As explained by Dr. Elizabeth Tatar in Volume II, the “Pahu Project” began in August 1979 in response, albeit reluctantly, to Adrienne Kaeppler’s request
to include a section on the music of the Hawaiian drum in a publication planned to supplement an exhibition at the Bishop Museum on pahu and puniu. Like Kaeppler, Tatar concentrated on the hula pahu tradition of three major schools. These schools are connected with credited hula practitioners and pahu traditions that can be traced to the nineteenth century.

The work focuses on Keahi Luahine and Mary Kawena Puku'i, Pua Ha'aheo, his student Kau'i Zuttermeister, Katherine Kanahele, and Eleanor Hiram Hoke. These experts, who were born to the hula, passed the tradition they learned to later generations of hula students.

This project was interrupted in 1981 by a series of other commitments. It resumed in 1984—however, lacking a crescendo of enthusiasm.

Upon examination of traditional literature primarily at the Bishop Museum Library, Tatar recognized the vast importance of this information. “The difficulty of interpreting it within broader cultural terms was even more heroic.”

The first draft of the manuscript was completed in 1985, however unsatisfied Tatar was with its accomplishments due to the complexity of the subject. Work was suspended until November 1988, “when Kaeppler called from the Smithsonian Institution.” She proposed that a recording of hula pahu be prepared for the 1989 Festival of American Folklife, of which I and my halau were a part. “I replied that a publication of our work on hula pahu might accompany it. She agreed, and we embarked on completing a manuscript.”

The reader will note that the recording of most of the mele hula pahu examined in this volume has been produced by Folkways Records, Smithsonian Institution. The beauty of volume II rests in the great number of printed mele with translations to assist any practitioner of the hula pahu. It is a how-to book showing and giving explanations of the employment of the hula pahu. Photographs are valuable in that they illustrate visually the traditional use of the pahu with its accompanying beats. “For the actual sounds of the chanting voice and the beating of the drum will, in the end, be the ultimate expression of the tradition of the Hawaiian drum, the pahu.”

The concentrated efforts of this book are seen in the areas of context, methods, sources, history, construction, and mele of the pahu. Indeed, these areas of study are the strong and obvious sources of the author. It is geared to inform, help, and instruct the younger generations of hula pahu practitioners in their quest for excellence.

Tatar takes no outstanding liberties by forming inappropriate interpretations in speculative jargon of the pahu, its use, and the mele associated with it. She treats it in an honest and straightforward approach to her thesis, which best serves the readers’ understanding and clarity on the subject. Native practitioners of the pahu will especially benefit from this research, as was the author’s intention. In short, the native practitioner of the pahu, along with
future generations, could easily circumvent the first volume of *Hula Pahu* and feel confident that their practice will be secure owing to the fullness of Tatar’s research. Much cultural information on Hawai‘i has been put to press by many non-natives which lack the native Hawaiians’ own true, in-depth justifications and interpretations. To this the Hawaiian historian Kepelino adds this timely statement:

Ahu kupanaha ‘ia Hawai‘i ‘imi loa! E noi‘i wale mai nō ka haole-ā, ‘a’ole e pau nā hana a Hawai‘i ‘imi loa. He wahi mea ‘ano a’e kā! ho‘i ‘ia, he wahi mea ‘ano a’e kā! ho‘i ‘ia!
Ahu ka hepa iā Hawai‘i moku nuī!

[Many are the strange things to be learned about Hawai‘i. However diligently the foreigner seeks he cannot find out all. [He misinterprets and interprets the facts to suit his own thinking.] He gets a fragment here and there and goes home. [Eager to impress others with his pseudo-intellectual accomplishments] a heap of absurdities is all he has to show from greater Hawai‘i.

We should remember this and be encouraged by Tatar’s research, which esoterically invites the native Hawaiian scholar to challenge other viewpoints from the Hawaiian perspective.

**KAHA‘I TOPOLINSKI**

*Kumu Hula*


This biography of the long-lived (1871–1956) seven-term Democratic mayor of Honolulu (two-year terms at various times from 1920 to 1954) and first Hawaiian member of the Democratic Party has the defects of its intentions. This is a “Kolowalu Book,” which, although worthy of publication, in the opinion of the University of Hawai‘i Press does not carry scholarly analysis and interpretation far enough. *Johnny Wilson* needs 1 percent to 25 percent more work on different sections in order to be of real value to understanding Wilson’s person and his impact on Hawaiian political history. What it needs is what Bob Krauss, an experienced journalist and instrument of Honolulu *Advertiser* civic activism, could have provided: more and better journalism.
More and better journalism in this case means more facts, more figures, more pictures, and better correlations of the old and new facts. Like Johnny Wilson's brick factory (chapters 35 and 36), this book produces too few bricks and there is too little machinery to shape the material. Krauss does indeed explore three archives of primary source material (see p. 347), but he treats them as the Honolulu papers treat a press release: instead of seeing the document as the window to the event, the document itself is the event. Nevertheless, the book does provide an outline of an important political personality and career.

The best parts are the sketches of young Johnny Wilson: as the son of a Hawaiian and non-haole mother and a Scots-Tahitian father growing up when the diminished number of Hawaiians still outnumbered everyone else; as a small, energetic, tough, willful, bright, and pugnacious boy and youth in Kaka‘ako, Moloka‘i, and other places under the kingdom, republic, and territory; as a clever young engineering student at the newly opened Leland Stanford Junior University in the 1890s; as an eager young engineer building the first Pali highway; and most interestingly as a kind of Hawaiian Sol Hurok promoting Hawaiian-style song and dance reviews across the mainland and Europe. There is even a good sound-bite delineation of Wilson's personality which probably characterized him throughout his eighty-four eventful years: "He liked to think of himself as a little man whose ingenuity could lick the world" (p. 65). It seems that the rest of the book could have elaborated on this trait and its variations, but a cloud of country-club fog and disconnectedness descends as the book moves into important political action. Occasionally a ray of interpretive sunlight peeps through—as with the lobbying efforts in Washington—but not when it counts locally. Stanford engineers of the 1890s, like Wilson and Herbert Hoover, did begin with the can-do spirit, even if they ended disappointed.

Where the extra work is needed is not hard to find, and it could be done in no more than ten or twelve pages.

First, we get almost nothing of his very self and voice when they are most important: during his fourteen years as mayor of Honolulu. We get the acts but not the personality and mentality behind the acts. By contrast, we are given a good sense of Johnny's epistolary voice when he is in Washington as Democratic national committeeman making deals with Jim Farley, FDR's postmaster general and fixer; but that's not wheeling and dealing as mayor. Krauss quotes Frank Fasi in a tantalizing way: "[Wilson] took care of his friends. And he punished his enemies" (p. 333). Who? When? Where? How? How many? How much? Wilson certainly learned how patronage worked at the very beginning of his career when it was understood that his construction crews would vote his way. And how much of it did he say or write in Hawaiian,
since he was apparently genuinely bilingual? Readers cannot make informed inferences without the specifics. Add the equivalent of two pages.

Second, Krauss could have given us a chart of who was connected to whom by either the red magic of "blood," the white magic of power, or the green magic of money. Such a summary of information would have biodigitically connected the ontogeny of the individual with the phylogeny of the political process. For example, we really are not told why Lincoln McCandless and Wilson had such a bitter falling out after almost thirty years of close association that was both money green and power white. What about family, "blood," connections among Wilson's many supporters? Or why did Wilson and his engineering partner from Stanford, Lou Whitehouse, split? Or, when John Burns worked at a liquor store in Kailua, was it owned by Takaichi Miyamoto (Lily Okamoto's father), a big power in the early Democratic Party? Then there is the red, "blood," question of why Johnny and Kini, his wife, had no children. And who was the mysterious haole who may have been the father of Kini (p. 19)? Red, white, and green connections count in Hawaiian politics. Add the equivalent of two pages.

Third, why are there so few pictures and why are they so whimsically chosen? For example, there is one full-page photo of the Wilsons and General and Mrs. Henry Aurand when Aurand is in neither text nor index. But there is no picture of McCandless, who figures more than anyone besides Johnny and Kini in the narrative. Add three pages.

Fourth, tables of the changing ethnic demography of Hawai'i would have been a big help for understanding the electoral politics that obsessed Wilson most of his life. Ethnicity is still the major, though not the only, factor in Hawaiian elections. Krauss does introduce the ethnic demographics of voter registration here and there, and he does give some election results and Johnny's attitudes, but the information and analysis are less than the ordinary stamp licker in any campaign knows. During Wilson's long career, the largest voting groups had changed from Hawaiian to haole to Japanese. Add one page.

Fifth, although there are scattered accounts of how much money was reported spent in campaigns, what did Johnny and the boys of the "Wilson Gang" (p. 236)—whether early with the rich McCandless or later with Matsy Takabuki—really do with how much money and from where? Add one page.

Sixth, there is one attempt to deal biographically, analytically, and historically with the big theme of power, and it is introduced at an appropriate moment, as Wilson begins his first term of office, on February 29, 1920 (pp. 168–69). But then Krauss lets the matter drop until he pronounces that "Nobody but Johnny ever ran any department he headed" (p. 279). There is only a hint at the manini dirty tricks and shame games that characterize the
infighting among politicians in Hawai‘i even now. Add the equivalent of one page.

Seventh, the media are mentioned with some point but with little incisiveness. The best anecdote about the media goes way back to the *Maui News* in 1904, when Wilson was trying to organize the four-year-old Democratic Party on Maui and Moloka‘i. The *Maui News*

thoughtfully ran full pages of Republican propaganda couched as news. . . . On October 29 the only news about a Democratic rally in Wailuku appeared on the Republican propaganda page. Naturally, the Democrats didn’t come off too well in the story. (p. 90)

This shows that civic politics repeats itself: it reminds one of the sandbagging Congressman Neil Abercrombie gets from Krauss’s newspaper, the *Honolulu Advertiser*, ninety-two years later. Add the equivalent of one page.

Finally, the style of Johnny Wilson is readable mid-cult 605 Kapiolani Boulevard. But there are too many “must have beens” at the beginning (e.g., pp. 7, 9, 12, 16) and the very end, and a few too many Columbia Inn roundtable visuals like “the headline erupted . . .” (p. 306). There is also an annoying Outrigger Club tendency to leave out names, a cardinal sin in good journalism, like that of the no-name U.H. professor who wrote a piece in the *Star-Bulletin* worthy of a quote and a footnote but no name (p. 195 and note 24); of the no-name wife of Link McCandless (p. 79); of the no-name police chief who was convicted of graft (p. 306 ff.); and of a coyly no-name “Advertiser columnist” who interviewed the widowed Kini Wilson in 1959 (p. 344). Delete a half page and add a half page.

So why should all these shortcomings be reported? The answer is that there is one extremely important message in the life of Johnny Wilson: the history of the Democratic Party did not begin in 1954 but on April 30, 1900, and much of political history here is cyclical. For example, Frank Fasi, a Democrat then, lost in 1954 to Neal Blaisdell after bitterly attacking Johnny Wilson just as Mufi Hannemann lost to Pat Saiki after smearing Neil Abercrombie in 1986. And although we tend to think of politics in Hawai‘i as personality-based rather than party-based, the longer history shows that both are important. The Democrats were sustained by a real pol who cared about the little guy and the party as much as he cared about patronage and himself.

The example of Johnny Wilson appears at a particularly crucial moment in the history of electoral party politics in Hawai‘i. It adds perspective to the liberalizing reforms and revitalization of the Democratic Party carried out during fifteen years of unrelenting effort by new party chair Richard Port. In 1994 Port was able to liberalize and reform the Democrats without losing the elections for governor, the U.S. Senate, Congress, the state Senate, and the
state House. That bucked the whole national trend. On the other hand, Hawai'i's Republican Party, a political basket case, has needed a Johnny Wilson or a Richard Port since 1954. Instead, for forty years it has fielded curiosities like Randolph Crosley, who fled, and Orson Swindle, who swarmed ashore demanding unconditional surrender. Pour encourager les autres?

GEORGE SIMSON
Director
Center for Biographical Research
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa


One turns gratefully to “local history,” which has come into its own in recent years, for a sense of place. Unlike histories with a larger scope that strive for objectivity and unfold from concentrated scholarship by one or two experts (for example, Land and Power in Hawaii by George Cooper and Gavan Daws, or Hawaii Pono by Lawrence H. Fuchs), Mānoa was written by thirteen contributing authors, plus an additional seven writers, all of whom enthusiastically transmit their deep affection for their neighborhood, with its dramatic physical beauty, just two miles from congested metropolitan Honolulu.

The introduction presents an overall physical description and a historical context beginning in ancient times when pie-shaped ahupua'a (land division—Mānoa means “wide” or “vast”) stretched from the mist-shrouded Ko'olau mountains to (present-day) Waikiki. Waterfalls laced the uplands after heavy rains—up to 160 inches annually. The volcanic mountains held hidden burial caves. In the past, in the lush valley below, fresh-water springs fed the rich taro lo'i (terraces). Farmers also cultivated breadfruit, ti, and yams. Mānoa was home, too, for Hawaiian ali'i (nobility).

Foreigners arrived in the late eighteenth century when Captain George Vancouver trekked through the valley. In the nineteenth century, Queen Ka'ahumanu was likely its most famous resident. Change destroyed the ancient patterns, and the transition was made from rural to residential status, from an idyllic place to contemporary problems. Chinese and Japanese farmers moved in and grew vegetables and flowers. Mānoa became home to missionary and professional business-class families. Small ethnic enclaves sprang up to house the living—and the dead, in several cemeteries. In the twentieth century, Mānoa was the locale of two horrifying kidnapping/murder cases: in
1928, of a young boy, Gil Jameson, and, in 1931, of Joseph Kāhāhawai in the infamous Massie case.

Five chapters follow, each covering a geographical section and its own history, as in “Lower West Mānoa” and “Upper Mānoa Valley.” This is an artificial division but one that allows the volume to be organized around notable places, each concluded with a “memory” written by a long-time resident. For example, in “East Mānoa Valley,” there are descriptions of Noelani School, the Mānoa Japanese Language School, and the Mānoa Public Library, followed by “The Memory of Keaulana & Woolsey Poi Factory” and “Travels through Old Mānoa with Malia Woolsey...” Through Malia Woolsey, we catch a glimpse of ancient lore and of the more recent poi factory that was destroyed by a torrential downpour flooding the valley in the early 1920s. Woven throughout chapters are stories of individual families. Royalists and annexationists lived side by side through the overthrow of the queen. Later, bridge and tennis clubs, a short-lived golf course, and an orphanage existed, as well as the College of Hawai‘i, which became the University of Hawai‘i. At the volume’s close are a Postscript, Sources and Special Notes, a People of Mānoa Index, and several blank pages to be filled by the book’s owner with his or her own history in the valley.

Although generally accurate in its details, Mānoa does contain an unfortunate error. It repeats the tired myth (in chapter 2) that Californians in the mid-nineteenth century sent their children by sailing ship to Punahou School. Not so. The error arose because a decade earlier than Punahou’s founding in 1841, six young boys from California were sent to the O‘ahu Charity School, run by missionary Arthur Johnstone and Mrs. Johnstone. The Johnstones were advised by the mission to discontinue the school, their connection with the mission was severed, and the school closed.

This is a minor lapse, however. Mānoa is handsomely designed and printed. It is filled with photos and drawings by the talented Thelma Greig. Significantly, too, when one buys the book, one also contributes to preserving the valley. Residents, who have struggled to keep out high rises, have formed Mālama o Mānoa, a historical preservation organization, to help preserve, protect, and enhance the unique “sense of place” of the Mānoa community. Mālama o Mānoa is one of the publication’s sponsors, and all profits from the book return to this group to fund community projects aimed at retaining the neighborhood’s distinction. The project’s participants also want to serve as catalysts to other neighborhood groups to collect and chronicle their own unique histories.

HELEN GERACIMOS CHAPIN
Professor of English
Hawaii Pacific University

Voices of Eden is an extraordinary scholarly work; it is stunning in its breadth and depth and will serve as the model for similar studies of other languages.

Nothing else of any significance has been published on this subject. Schütz’s work is awesome in its scope, seeming to include everything that has ever been written about the Hawaiian language. At the same time, it is extremely thorough in its treatment of each topic. This is not only a history but also an analysis and critique of the studies he identifies, involving careful comparisons and reconstructions of the material as necessary.

The book covers the period from 1778 to the present, from Dr. William Anderson’s modest list of 250 words to the establishment and expansion of Hawaiian immersion schools as part of the State Department of Education system. It includes a thoughtful discussion of the political considerations and implications underlying the decisions made regarding the study and use of the language since 1778.

The author shows himself to be a competent linguist, with a solid background in speech, and a careful historian. He also writes well and is able to explain linguistic concepts clearly and simply enough for the nonlinguist. His style is easy and readable, almost conversational and not clogged with scholarly jargon, yet his scholarship is impeccable.

The exhaustive annotated bibliography would be worthy of publication alone. Much of the most useful work on the finer points of Hawaiian grammar has been done in recent years and is found in unpublished papers, theses, and dissertations written by students and faculty at the University of Hawai‘i; Schütz has included many of them. More general published works that contain relevant references to the language and its study have also been listed, along with articles in journals not commonly consulted by Hawaiian language scholars.

I have a personal response to one specific question Schütz raises. Regarding the Hawaiian phrase book first published in 1854 that quite rightly offends the author and his perplexity that it continues to be reprinted and purchased (pp. 307—9), I have always encouraged my students to purchase and study it for two reasons. First, it is a source of colloquial Hawaiian of its time and, second, it is a reflection and reminder of the social attitudes toward Native Hawaiians that prevailed and were openly and unabashedly expressed. It is easily accessible and useful as counter evidence against those who would rewrite history.

The primary audience for this book will probably be Hawaiian language
scholars and students and the growing number of Hawaiians in the community who are reclaiming their language for themselves and their children and grandchildren. In addition, historians, linguists, international scholars, and others interested in socio-political histories of indigenous languages will want this book not only for the wealth of information it contains but also for comparative purposes and insights into other language histories and as a model for similar works. Internationally there is a growing recognition of the importance of indigenous languages to the survival of native peoples; from my own experience, I know this is true of Native American languages, Maori, Australian indigenous languages, and Malay. This book could very well lead the field and set the scholarly standards for others to come.

ALBERTA PUALANI HOPKINS
Professor of Hawaiian language (retired)
University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa