

Book Reviews

Kahana: How the Land Was Lost. By Robert H. Stauffer. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004. x + 265 pp. Illustrated. Index. \$38 cloth.

The history of land tenure in Hawai'i, especially during and after the events of the *Māhele* of 1846–1855, is a hot topic these days. A number of people have a particular interest in this issue because their ancestors received land through the *Māhele* either by award or purchase, and now that land is no longer in their hands, leaving them to ask, "What happened?" More recent studies have examined this issue in general, seeking to illuminate the process of the *Māhele* and its aftermath: Jon J. Chinen, Maivan Clech-Lam, Jean Hobbs, Lilikala Kame'eleihiwa, Marion Kelly, Ralph Kuykendall, Riley Moffat and Gary Fitzpatrick, Jon Osorio, David White, and John Wise. And there are a few studies of the changes in land tenure by those who participated in it, such as William DeWitt Alexander, John Lydgate, Jacob Brown, and Curtis J. Lyons. But just as we attempt to create a general description of the Hawaiian land unit known as the *ahupua'a* (land division), then find as we examine the hundreds of *ahupua'a* in Hawai'i that there is a plethora of variations; so, too, as we look at changes in land tenure of those same traditional land units in Hawai'i we find that each seems to have its own unique story that may not neatly fit into the general concept. A few historical studies of land tenure in particular areas have been done, such as Marion Kelly's study of nine *ahupua'a* in Ka'u Hawai'i, Jocelyn Linnekin's study of Keanae, Maui, and Jeffery Stover's thesis on La'ie, O'ahu. Now Robert Stauffer has refined his doctoral dissertation on the *ahupua'a* of Kahana, O'ahu, to present a tale that examines in detail the fate of all the lands in Kahana Valley that were set apart in the *Māhele*, and in so doing brings to light some very interesting events that while validating the common perception that most of the *kuleana* (land, property) awarded during the *Māhele* are no longer in the hands of the awardee's

descendents, points out that some very creative methods were used to maintain control by the Hawaiian *kuleana* owners as well as those seeking to take control away from them.

Stauffer begins with a good detailed description of the *Māhele* process of 1846–1855 and how it was applied in Kahana Valley, both for the common people, the *makaʻāinana*, and the chiefs or *aliʻi*. Stauffer then describes two tracks the land privatization process took in Kahana Valley, one for *makaʻāinana* and one for *aliʻi*.

In Kahana Valley, 96 acres of the best lands were awarded in 34 *kuleana* claims to the *makaʻāinana* living there, while the *aliʻi*, Keohokulole, received title to the remaining 4,954 acres. To see that only 96 acres in that whole lush valley was being used, albeit by only 34 families, is surprising. In Stauffer's historical analysis of the population of Kahana Valley, and considering the size of the cultivated lands of the valley, I was chagrined by how few people apparently lived in what I would consider about the most salubrious and productive *ahupuaʻa* on Oʻahu. Perhaps the carrying capacity of Kahana as well as the other lands of Hawaiʻi isn't as high as we thought. To really understand this I suppose a person would have to have been there to see what the land was capable of within the agricultural practices of the time. In many respects, chapter two leads one to conclude that the common folk with their small but productive fee simple *kuleana* fared better than the *aliʻi* with their huge amounts of undeveloped and often unproductive land. Table 3 on page 83 is particularly illuminating in showing that the small acreage comprising the common people's *kuleana* truly was the most valuable land.

The government of Hawaiʻi under the control of the king and his ministers and advisors had a goal which they thought would benefit Hawaiʻi. However, the *Māhele* was not scripted. It was plowing new ground and evolved as problems were identified and dealt with. We need to be aware of the inexperience of those involved in planning and administering the *Māhele* process. Regarding hints of a conspiracy by foreign merchants and Christian missionaries to gain control of the land, I just don't see any real evidence of it in the events of the *Māhele* process. Stauffer goes on to suggest that for 50 years before the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893 Hawaiʻi was a de facto territory of the U.S. with 90% of the land owned or controlled by American interests, without considering the 984,000 acres of Crown land controlled by the monarch, the 1,495,000 acres of land controlled by the Hawaiian government, the best of which was sold largely to Hawaiians, and the 1,619,000 acres awarded to Hawaiian *aliʻi* in the *Māhele* as their private property. In no description of the events of the *Māhele* do we see evidence of a conspiracy to defraud any person or group of their right to land ownership. While the *makaʻāinana* were one of the three groups with an interest in the land of Hawaiʻi

under the principles established by the Land Commission, the common people were obviously not using one third of the land. So while their claims and awards amounted to a small percentage of the acreage of the land, that percentage did include the best lands. If the *kuleana* awards did not satisfy the *maka'āinana's* desire for land, then the government offered its 1,495,000 acres for sale as described in the *Index of All Grants Issued by the Hawaiian Government Previous to March 31, 1886*, though this did not apply to Kahana specifically since the general title to the *ahupua'a* was awarded by the king to the high chief Keohokulole. This selling of hundreds of thousands of acres of the best government lands is described by Stauffer as being to haoles (Whites), but a perusal of the list of grantees shows about 99 percent with Hawaiian surnames. As we lament the loss of these small, albeit valuable, *kuleana* little or no research has been done to document the fate of this much larger group of government lands sold mostly to Hawaiians. Nor do I see much attention given to the role of land acquisition by Chinese immigrants either by lease or by marriage. In Kahana, during the period being studied, the Chinese were an integral part of the community as leaseholders, owners, and farmers.

I could have understood land values and financial arrangements better in historic dollar values. I am used to thinking in terms of, say, the 1850s economy and prices, and Stauffer's large modern dollar figures I found to be confusing. Given the wildly fluctuating real estate values of recent years even these figures could become quickly obsolete.

In Kahana, the original *kuleana* holders by and large seemed committed to the *Māhele* process and the opportunities it offered and held on to their lands as best they could. Stauffer, by tracing the legal history of each *kuleana* in Kahana, describes the various ways that the *kuleana* holders used to keep control of their lands.

A major theme of the book is the description of the Non-Judicial Mortgage Act of 1874 and how it was used to wrest control of *kuleana* in Kahana from the original awardees and their heirs. Over time, as the *kuleana* owners needed cash they would take out a loan and use their *kuleana* as collateral. This new law allowed the lender to foreclose on the property for non-payment and have it auctioned off without having to go through the court system. Stauffer shows that there was great opportunity for abuse in this system which today we would probably consider unethical and illegal. It was definitely stacked against the *kuleana* owner. In Kahana Valley, from 1888 to 1903, 65 percent of the *kuleana* were taken this way. The Non-Judicial Mortgage Act of 1874, however egregious, played upon a fact of life we all have to deal with; when we borrow money we are expected to repay it. After reading Stauffer's detailed description of how well the Kahana *kuleana* owners used the new economic and financial system to preserve their titles I don't think

we can use the excuse of ignorance of that system to explain how these folks found themselves in the precarious position of being victims of this law. Fortunately today, we have laws that see that we are treated fairly, but if we cannot repay a loan we still may have to forfeit our collateral.

These same exigencies were faced by the *ali'i* who though land rich were usually cash poor, having to generate income from often poor land without their traditional access to labor and tax revenues. Just like the common folk they saw borrowing on the land or selling it outright as a logical way to get the cash they wanted. Hence, many *ahupua'a* passed out of their hands.

The summary of the processes by which many Hawaiians lost control of the lands they had received in the *Māhele* begs the question of, if given the choice, what would the people have preferred: maintain the status quo as it was before the *Māhele* with unlimited access to the resources of the *ahupua'a*, but with often burdensome taxes of produce and labor, or the opportunity of fee simple ownership of the land they worked without the traditional demands of the chiefs? One of the major deficiencies mentioned by Stauffer for the failure of the *Māhele* to achieve its goal was that the government did not take the simple step of making these native lands inalienable which would have kept the land in the hands of the Native Hawaiians by law. I believe this option was discussed in the legislature at the time but was dismissed for a variety of reasons. Making native lands inalienable is part of the land tenure policy in other Pacific countries, such as Tonga, Samoa, and Fiji. The trade-off has been in development when investors with capital, usually non-natives, are concerned about the security of their investments when they cannot secure title to the lands they are investing in. I would like to see a dialogue between Native Hawaiians and Tongans, Samoans, and Native Fijians on the pros and cons of how their nations' land tenure systems have worked for them.

Another important theme described by Stauffer relates to the practice of Hawaiians getting together, pooling their resources, and buying an *ahupua'a* or another large tract of land. The Hawaiian *hui* or group purchase, with individuals buying shares, seems to be an attempt to replicate in many respects the situation that existed before the *Māhele*. The share-holders of the Kahana *hui*, which bought the title to the entire *ahupua'a* was established in 1874, and shareholders held the land outside their individual *kuleana* in common. Stauffer, correctly, I believe, describes the Kahana *hui* as a social statement, a move to return to a more traditional land tenure system that they were familiar with and seemed to work for them. Plus it gave them unrestricted access to all of Kahana's traditional resources.

The Kahana Hawaiians by and large resisted selling their *kuleana* to outsiders. Prior to 1887, none did. The eventual owner of most of Kahana, Mary Foster, was actually one-fourth Hawaiian and a staunch royalist. By the end

of the century, however, many *kuleana* were held by disinterested heirs who usually did not live in Kahana Valley nor cared to. These are the people Foster, her agents, and others tracked down and made offers to. As the Hawaiian population gradually moved out, the rich lands of Kahana Valley were seen as underutilized by local businessmen who saw various opportunities and went after them. Through aggressive purchase of *kuleana* and *hui* shares by Mary Foster and her agents, the Kaneohe Ranch, Lincoln McCandless, William Wilcox, and various members of the Castle family, the Native Hawaiians of Kahana lost control of their valley. Stauffer examines all the methods used by these people to get control of the lands of Kahana.

Stauffer's story of Kahana is very interesting and illuminating. It adds important new dimensions to the dialogue on the evolution of Hawaiian land tenure. I think *Kahana: How the Land Was Lost* sets a high standard for research in a topic too often clouded by emotion and opinion and agendas.

Riley Moffat, Senior Librarian
Brigham Young University-Hawai'i

Inventing Politics: A New Political Anthropology of the Hawaiian Kingdom. By Juri Mykkänen. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2003. xii + 248 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index. \$45 (cloth)

This book is a revised version of Mykkänen's Ph.D. dissertation in Political Science from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (Honolulu: "Locke in a Heathen Land: Cultural Construction of Politics on the Kingdom of Hawaii, 1825-1945," 1993.)

As Mykkänen's title suggests, he is influenced by an array of social theory attached to cultural "invention," and he applies this to Hawaiian political systems in the first half of the 19th century. Haunani-Kay Trask expressed contempt for this body of theory and considered it another colonialist tool used to make modern Hawaiian cultural values appear inauthentic ("Natives and Anthropologists: The Colonial Struggle," in *The Contemporary Pacific* 3(1): 1991: 159-167). Mykkänen obliquely addresses Trask's critique (p. 2), and is careful to use the idea of inventiveness as a cross-cultural process of adaptation employed by foreigners and Hawaiians alike. By drawing attention to the inherent imperfections in cultural translations, and the consequential tensions that affected processes of cultural mediation, Mykkänen conceives a fresh view of the roles played by chiefs, missionaries, *maka'āinana* and foreign residents in the fusion of indigenous and Western ideologies, including

"politics." Although anthropologists and historians regularly study political organization within non-Western societies, Mykkänen takes the position that in the case of Hawai'i, "functionalist and quasi-functionalist understandings of politics have resulted in an unquestioned orthodoxy, and the whole concept of politics has been taken too much for granted" (p. 13). In order to rectify this, Mykkänen investigates the transposition and adoption of words like "government," "governing," and "politics" in Hawaiian culture, and exposes significant structural transformations in the meanings of autochthonous (and supposedly corresponding) terms such as "*auʻunui*," "*hoʻomalua*," and "*kālaiʻāina*."

The author systematically examines relevant Hawaiian and English lexicon pertaining to politics in dozens of Hawaiian-English dictionaries written from the time of Captain Cook to the 1980s, and also presents quotations from missionaries and literate 19th century Hawaiians to contextualize the usage of various terms. This methodology is reminiscent of the compilation of the semiotic icon of the English language, the *Oxford English Dictionary* (see Simon Winchester, *The Professor and the Madman*, New York: Harper Collins, 1998), and the result is a detailed lexicography and historiography of Hawaiian political concepts. His analysis is also an insightful anthropology of culture contact that examines the fluid relationships between church and state in Hawai'i. Mykkänen thus invents a novel ethnography of 19th century Hawai'i, and the changing (and often ambivalent and paradoxical) alliances that were formed between missionaries and chiefs.

The "Introduction" is perhaps the weakest part of the book, not for a lack of theory, but for a lack of clarity. Mykkänen discusses the deconstruction of "savagery" in the writings of Enlightenment philosophers including Voltaire and Diderot, and connects this theme with other recent anthropological critiques surrounding Western portrayals of non-Western political systems. This, in turn, leads to his adoption of ideas pertaining to the "invention of tradition" *a la* Wagner (Roy Wagner, *The Invention of Culture*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); and Eric Hobsbaw and Terence Ranger, Eds., *The Invention of Tradition*, (Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 1983), in combination with other anthropologists and historians who have modified and applied these concepts in Pacific Island contexts, such as Greg Denning, Jocelyn Linnekin, Marshall Sahlins, and Nicholas Thomas. Although Mykkänen successfully demonstrates his familiarity with related theories and research, his introduction appears to be directed towards a relatively small audience of social theorists, and will likely alienate many potential readers before they reach the main substance of the book. Furthermore, the opening sentences in the book (p. 1) contain awkward grammatical structures, and the third

sentence contains a clear grammatical error ("a steadily intensifying encounters"). These stylistic shortcomings provide an unfortunate first impression and foreshadow an awkward and often verbose writing style that makes the book unnecessarily challenging.

By the beginning of chapter one ("Natives and Foreigners: the Cultural Order of Hawaii's Early Missionization"), the merits of Mykkänen's work become more apparent. He opens with commonly discussed aspects of 19th century Hawaiian society (drawn from sources such as Beckwith, Kamakau, Sahlins, and Valeri), but he quickly proceeds into an uncommonly penetrating analysis of the traditional meanings attached to various Hawaiian words, including "*aupuni*," referring to Hawaiian chants including the name chant of Kūali'i, the Kumulipo, and Kūkanaloa. Although this chapter could have been extended further into the past by discussing proto-Polynesian linguistic reconstructions, chapter one provides a traditional foundation similar to an "ethnographic present." From this perspective, Mykkänen begins to address the historical transformations of Hawaiian word usage, and corresponding conceptual changes, that accompanied the development of the Hawaiian monarchy.

I would quibble with the author over his representations of the 1824 insurrection on Kaua'i (p. 49–52) in which he repeats the missionary spin that the battle was a victory of Christianity over a "nativist rebellion" (p. 192). Mykkänen states that "Hoapili and another high-ranking Hawai'i chief, Kai-kio'ewa, had a discussion with William Richards [Maui missionary] about Christian conduct of war and were advised not to kill captives: "It is not certain to what extent these orders were followed, but some of the chiefs certainly boasted of abstaining from even taking captives . . ." (p. 51). The figurehead of the rebellion was Kaumuali'i's son, Humehume, who had left the Islands for New England when he was approximately six years old, and returned with the missionaries in 1820 when he was 21. Hence, in terms of cultural mindsets, Humehume was one of the least native natives that could have led the rebellion, and the Windward chiefs consulted star positions, intentionally killed at least one captive chief, and were also reported by Kamakau and others to have wantonly defiled the bodies of the dead rebels (see *Hawai'i's Russian Adventure: A New Look at Old History* by Peter R. Mills (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002: 146–154). The missionary Hiram Bingham invented the idea that the battle was a victory of Christianity over a nativist rebellion. Like the 19th century Hawaiian chiefs who chose to adopt Christianity, Mykkänen uses the invented event to suit his own purpose.

Chapters two ("The Politics of Virtue") and three ("Culture in the Making: The Rise of Political Discourse") provide insightful anthropological stud-

ies of the culture of missionaries themselves, and how missionaries, Hawaiians, foreign merchants, and foreign governments employed various tactics to restructure Hawai'i as a polity. In chapter two, the author examines the tension that existed in New England between commercial liberalism in the merchant communities and the religious orthodoxy of Calvinism, setting the stage for the conflicts between merchants and missionaries in Hawai'i. The orthodox Calvinists were largely responsible for the creation of missionary societies such as the ABCFM, and were decidedly against many of the liberal ideas that accompanied secular capitalism. Mykkänen touches on the differences between orthodox Calvinism and a more popular reformed Calvinism that adopted emotional styles of Methodist and Baptist preachers (p. 66), but could have strengthened his thesis regarding the Great Awakening of 1837–1839 in chapter four (“Political Economy”) by drawing more attention to the huge impact this transition had on the Hawaiian mission itself. Margaret Ehlke discussed this aspect of the mission, and this source would complement the issues touched upon by Mykkänen (see “Enthusiastic Religion and the Lives of Titus and Fidelia Coan, Missionaries to Hilo,” by Margaret S. Ehlke, M.A. thesis, American Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 1986).

By chapter three and leading in to the subsequent chapters, Mykkänen approaches the heart of his major contribution, drawing attention to the evolution of the concept of “politics” in Hawai'i. It is framed in an ongoing tension between merchants, missionaries, chiefs, and commoners to establish the roles of “church” and “state.” Through the following chapters, the author translates Hawaiian language newspapers and other documents, and provides a historiography of the translation of political concepts. The year 1845 appears to be a pivotal time in Mykkänen's thesis in chapter five (“Natural Rights, Virtuous Wealth”), marked by the initiation of new ceremonial protocols and annual keynote speeches in Kauikeaouli's court (pp. 162–163). Among Mykkänen's findings are that the word “politics” and the concept of political activism were almost completely lacking in Hawai'i through the early 1830s, although “the notions of kingdom and government were frequently used” (p. 108). Likewise, Mykkänen finds that the words “government” and “*aupuni*” were not printed as equivalents until 1854 (p. 110). “*Kālai'āina*” also shifted conceptually from a meaning similar to political economy through land division to one of modern party politics and logistical aspects of running the government. Chapter six (“The Denouement”) is a final impressive compilation of the etymology of various Hawaiian terms tied to politics (too many to cover here).

The author closes his work with a nine-page “Conclusion,” which is more clearly written than the “Introduction,” and perhaps should be read first by those who wish to get a better feel for what the book will be about. *Inventing*

Politics, despite some shortcomings, is an excellent piece of research with a robust methodology and thoroughly insightful analyses of the events that shaped 19th century Hawai'i.

Peter R. Mills
Associate Professor of Anthropology
University of Hawai'i at Hilo

The Mysterious Death of Jane Stanford. By Robert W. P. Cutler, M.D. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2003. x + 161 pp. Bibliographical references. Photographs. Appendices. Index. \$29.95 cloth.

"Mrs. Stanford Dies, Poisoned" read the headline of the *San Francisco Bulletin* on March 1, 1905. Eye witnesses in Hawai'i agreed as to what happened, the doctors in attendance made a diagnosis of strychnine poisoning, chemists confirmed strychnine to be present in large amounts in the bottle of bicarbonate of soda from which she had been given a potion for stomach upset, and stomach contents and body tissues taken at an autopsy were positive for strychnine.

So what is the mystery Dr. Robert Cutler, almost a hundred years later, propounds in his 161-page exposé? There are mysteries enough to go around, but the most intriguing one from the perspective of a reasonably knowledgeable resident of Hawai'i is how it could be that virtually no one in today's California community of Stanford academia was even aware of how the cofounder of Stanford University died or that there is any mystery whatsoever! Dr. Cutler, a Stanford professor of neurology and neurological sciences, emeritus, readily admits that he came across the whole affair accidentally while working on another matter, magnesite mining. Having discovered the story, he queried his colleagues in the school of medicine, finding that they too were totally ignorant of the matter, and one, a lover of mysteries, encouraged him to delve further into the story. How is it possible that the faculty (and many others) of an institution of this caliber could overlook (or repress) the well-documented facts of the case and instead accept a medically preposterous explanation proposed from a distance of thousands of miles from the scene by the then president of Stanford University, Dr. David Starr Jordan? Could it be there was a constituency willing to believe that a diagnosis by physicians from a distant, exotic archipelago was most likely incompetent or even fraudulent, possibly conspiratorial, or perhaps it was all merely a ploy to gain notoriety? Dr. Culter addresses this question by extensively reviewing

the qualifications of the Honolulu physicians and scientists with a conclusion much in their favor.

A preface sets forth Dr. Cutler's happenstance discovery of the story. The introduction provides a short history of the Stanford family, their son's death while they were traveling in Italy, and the founding of the Leland Stanford, Jr. University. Successful businessman and senator from California, Leland Stanford died leaving his wife Jane as the sole trustee. She is described by some in poetic verse as the mother of and moral guardian of California's children, but others found her to be an uneducated tyrant unfit to the task of directing the university, much less micromanaging its affairs.

As a good detective might, Dr. Cutler has divided the work into three parts. The first part in five chapters describes what is known about the events of her death, a description of a previous poisoning some six weeks earlier in San Francisco, the police investigation, witness accounts and later memoirs, the details of the inquest in Honolulu, and the arrival of Stanford's president, Dr. David Starr Jordan, and his party in Honolulu. These generally recognized "facts" have been gleaned from newspaper accounts, official records, archival material, and memoirs. The second part in four chapters discusses and analyzes the theories, correspondence, press releases, accusations, and general confusion and misunderstandings on the part of the main characters: Honolulu physicians and scientists, the long time companions/servants/staff present and involved in the final events, witnesses, the detective agency's investigators, the police in San Francisco and Honolulu, and, most extensively, the machinations of Dr. Jordan. The third part has two short chapters. The first presents briefly what others have written about the character of Dr. Jordan. The summation chapter states bluntly Dr. Cutler's agreement with the finding that Mrs. Stanford died of strychnine poisoning and speculates on just how the entire matter seems to have mysteriously faded from public view. The U.S. mainland papers and the general public generally accepted that the death was due to a ruptured coronary artery or other cardiac disease as Dr. Jordan proclaimed. All of the materials are extensively cited and amplified for each chapter in the notes section following the main body of work.

I would suggest that in reading this fascinating, marvelously well-researched book that after the preface and introduction, one should then turn to the second and third appendices for a most important review of two critical events. One, the "Ross Affair," preceded the death of Jane Stanford and affected her greatly. This affair involved the firing of a professor of sociology and raised a national hullabaloo about academic freedom and freedom of speech. The other event also involved the firing of a professor, Dr. Goebel, a close confidant of Mrs. Stanford and critic of the administration of

Dr. Jordan. The professor was dismissed soon after Mrs. Stanford died. He accused Dr. Jordan of attempts to bribe him in order to silence the professor's criticism and views on the cause of Mrs. Stanford's death. These events are essential for an understanding of the alienation between Dr. Jordan and Mrs. Stanford.

At least for myself, the large cast of characters was difficult to keep track of and required considerable rereading. In view of the vast bibliography and citations, I think it unlikely that any of the mysteries pertaining to the death of Jane Stanford will ever be resolved definitively. By the same token, the theories proposed as to why, by whom, and for what motive are tantalizing, some obviously impossible, and none completely satisfying. The best of mysteries, as in this case, I believe, are really those where readers must settle upon the answer that best suits their own fancy. For a follow-up, one might take a tour of the restored Moana Hotel in Waikiki or perhaps even stay in room number 120 and perchance to dream of what it might be like to succumb to strychnine poisoning.

*Alfred D. Morris M.D.
Cardiologist, Ret.
Honolulu, Hawai'i*

A Date Which Will Live: Pearl Harbor in American Memory. By Emily S. Rosenberg. Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2003. x + 236 pp. Illustrated. Bibliographical references. Index. \$24.95 cloth

Reworking the typed draft of his December 8, 1941, speech to Congress asking for a formal declaration of war, President Franklin D. Roosevelt pencilled out "a date which will live in world history" and made it "a date which will live in infamy"—altering the pedantic into the rhetorical, forever altering Americans' popular-culture association with the word "infamy" and also providing the root phrase for dozens of book titles.

For the first 50 years, the attack on Pearl Harbor was a seminal and singular event in American history, a "hinge of history," as Winston Churchill dubbed it, a moment beyond which the nation was altered. For Americans alive then, it is the moment the world changed into a frighteningly broad and unknowable landscape, but still one that could be tamed. For Americans alive since then, "Remember Pearl Harbor!" had the quaint resonance of "Remember the Alamo!" or "Remember the Maine!" It is a purely historical

event, consigned to the dustbin, on a dimly realized par with the Norman Invasion or Paul Revere's Ride. And any deeply felt patriotic vibrations from the Pearl Harbor attack end at our borders. To the rest of the world, getting wrought up over this long-ago battle is a purely American pastime.

By the 50th anniversary of the attack in 1991, the attack on Pearl Harbor remained largely the province of the veterans who were there and rivet-counting military historians fixated on facts and technologies. There was a growing number of "revisionist" writers, mostly Republican, who seemed dedicated to blaming the success of the attack on either the sheer ineptitude or the evil calculations of Democrat President Roosevelt rather than crediting the Japanese military machine, but these were the voices of factless cranks with an agenda. When the 50th anniversary occurred, the emphasis among historians and veterans was scholarship and commemoration, combined with an old-soldier rapprochement with Japanese veterans of the attack. The vets of both sides discovered they had more in common with each other than with their own children.

During the decade between the 50th and 60th anniversaries of the attack, however, much of what we consider "history" in America underwent a radical change, rendering even the notion of scholarship itself as anchorless and defensive. Emily S. Rosenberg, a history professor at Macalester College, has attempted to distill the scholastic and political turbulence of the period in *A Date Which Will Live: Pearl Harbor in American Memory*. Although it's a slim volume, it is densely packed with ideas and observations about Pearl Harbor as a contested icon in our national mythology.

As the book makes clear, there was a veritable "memory explosion" during the 1990s, sparked largely by conservative groups seeking to "reclaim" history, a notion that literally redefined the abstract study into a salable product. The question posed was, "Who owns history?" A flood of memory products flooded the market, ranging from books such as *The Greatest Generation* to movies like *Saving Private Ryan* to entire television networks like the History Channel to Disney-designed historic theme parks to bizarre patriotic crazes like Civil War reenacting, all geared to culturally adrift Americans seeking solace in a calmly knowable past.

Even more sharply divisive were bitter debates over historical interpretation. Rosenberg notes that the Republican-led Congress, armed with conservative notions about "history standards," has led the attack on professional historical scholarship, seeking to replace history education that is broad-mindedly inclusive with another kind of teaching based on narrow definitions of patriotism. The ugliest battle was over the display of the nuclear bomber *Enola Gay* at the Smithsonian Air & Space Museum, when conservative lobbyists, with the sympathetic ear of Congress and armed with misinformation,

scuttled a professional interpretation of the famous artifact. No less than House Speaker Newt Gingrich—a Ph.D. in history—drew the battle lines when he declared that the debate was “a reassertion by most Americans that they are sick and tired of being told by some cultural elite that they ought to be ashamed of their country.”

Rosenburg makes a convincing and well-documented brief that this assault on culture, elitism, and professional scholarship mightily influenced the way Pearl Harbor was interpreted in the late '90s—and will be interpreted in the future. Another bitter fight erupted over whether to clear the reputations of disgraced Pearl Harbor commanders Admiral Husband Kimmel and General Walter Short. Congress was lobbied repeatedly on the issue and finally passed the buck to the Bush White House, who quietly tabled the notion.

Even so, there has been a recent explosion of “revisionist” texts about the attack, most laying the blame on Roosevelt, and all criticized for lacking data and original sleuthing. It is history by screed and wishful thinking rather than scholarship and reason, and sets the tone for the way history has mutated. Rosenberg notes, rather ruefully, that “Pearl Harbor” now calls to mind political perfidy and bureaucratic bungling as much as it does the Japanese sneak attack.

Her work winds down with the 60th anniversary of the attack in 2001, but there were two events that colored the commemoration. One was the big dumb movie called *Pearl Harbor*, that while historically inaccurate and artistically bankrupt, managed to reinsert the phrase into the consciousness of young Americans. The other was the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington, a sudden, tragic, and evil event of such magnitude that the only cultural touchstone that put it in perspective was the attack on Pearl Harbor. Many newspapers simply used the word “Infamy!” in their headlines, making the cultural and historic connection part of modern times.

As President Bush wrote in his diary on September 11, “The Pearl Harbor of the 21st century took place today,” and later explicitly expanded his political rhetoric to draw links between the Greatest Generation’s “Good War” and the current fight against terrorism.

We live in interesting times. Rosenberg’s meticulous study of the “memory icon” of Pearl Harbor, analyzing the shifting patterns of American thought on the uses of history in modern culture, ought to be required reading for all up-to-date historians and for those wondering why their grasp on history is slipping through their fingers.

Burl Burlingame
Honolulu Star-Bulletin

Pōhaku: The Art & Architecture of Stonework in Hawai'i. Coordinating Authors: David Cheever and Scott Cheever. Editors: Dr. Janine Shinoki Clifford, AIA and Frank S. Haines, FAIA. Photography: Douglas Peebles. Honolulu: Editions Limited, 2003. xi + 171 pp. Illustrated. Bibliography. Index. \$39.95.

In Hawai'i, they surround us, quietly yet insistently shaping our perceptions of place and experience: *pōhaku*—Hawaiian stonework. We seek shelter within their stout walls, follow the paths they mark for us, and, standing in their shadow, reflect on the ancient heritage they represent. A collaborative effort involving contributions from more than 50 writers, *Pōhaku: The Art & Architecture of Stonework in Hawai'i* is devoted to the documentation and appreciation of stonework across all the Hawaiian islands from ancient times to the present. The book is arranged by building types: ancient sites, churches, government buildings, educational facilities, commercial structures, residences, pathways, and infrastructure, along with a chapter on stone quarries. The structures recorded here ranges from civic and religious buildings monumental in scale and importance through sober and forthright commercial structures to charming residences. But the built environment of Hawai'i includes far more than conventional architectural monuments. Fishponds, reservoirs, irrigation ditches, and retaining walls, works that mark the human manipulation of the natural environment, are included here as noteworthy components of the story of Hawaiian stonework. Within each chapter examples drawn from across the state are illustrated and described in short essays. Most of the essayists are architects, preservationists, or journalists, and the texts reflect their various expertise as well as their shared affections for the subject matter.

One of the challenges of a documentary effort like this is to keep the multiple short essays of so many different authors from becoming repetitious or worse, degenerating into a confusing babble of voices devoid of critical threads of continuity. The team responsible for producing *Pōhaku* deserves credit for meeting this challenge so well. Coordinating authors David Cheever and Scott Cheever, working with editors Dr. Janine Shinoki Clifford, AIA, and Frank S. Haines, FAIA, have produced a very thoughtful and readable study of the subject. Douglas Peebles's handsome color photographs provide the book's sustaining core. Peebles has a sensitive eye for photographing stonework; he captures his subject in telling details and odd photographic angles as well as in the standard general exterior views one associates with architectural photography. Text and image balance and amplify each other in an effective way, and this book is a pleasure to read.

If orchestrating the efforts of a team of writers is one challenge for the editors, conveying the rich complexity of stone's story constitutes a second challenge. In the built environment, everything is made intentionally of something, and that something—in this case, stone—has its own unique history, properties, and meanings for those who come into contact with it. Stone structures in Hawai'i have been fabricated out of volcanic basalt and sedimentary coral and sandstone. Rock was picked up off the ground (in a sense, harvested) as fields were cleared for agricultural use, quarried high and low across the Islands, and cut out of the offshore coral reefs. The chapter on quarries details the local origins of stone, but there is a global as well as a local dimension to the story of *pōhaku*. In the 19th century, granite arrived in Hawai'i as ballast blocks on board sailing vessels returning from China. Hawaiian sandalwood bound for Asian markets replaced the granite ballast stones in ships' holds, and the ballast blocks, in turn, were employed as paving stones for streets and sidewalks in Honolulu (examples still survive in the 1100 block of Nu'uuanu Avenue). To balance the materialistic account of the subject, various authors recount the rich cultural history recorded in legends and local histories of *pōhaku*. Russell Oda, for example, contributes an essay about the Naha stone, a 7,000-pound block that now rests in front of the Hilo Public Library. Identified as probably the most famous ancient stone in the state, the legendary block reportedly supported not a physical structure but dynastic claims. Oda describes the stone's significance:

[T]he sacred stone served as a platform to authenticate the Royal Naha lineage. If a male infant, positioned ceremoniously on the venerable stone, remained silent, it was proof of royalty, and he was destined to receive the title of prince, leader or king. If the infant cried, the status of commoner was immediately bestowed upon him. (p. 12)

One of this book's special pleasures is the connections among such disparate fields and disciplines as geology, ecology, architecture, history, and folklore (and this list could be expanded) the reader is invited to make as he or she moves from descriptions of an ancient *heiau* to an Anglican cathedral to bridges and culverts along the Hāna highway and the terrace walls of Doris Duke's Shangri La.

One theme that runs through the book deals with the significance and appreciation of permanence as a design virtue, a virtue increasingly missing in the built environment. In his introduction, David Scott, executive director of the Historic Hawai'i Foundation, notes:

Stone is a building material that shapes future generations by its stamina and longevity. Building for permanence is today, I fear, a lost concept, a forgotten need. (p. x)

Today many of the uses for which *pōhaku* once served so well are handled by the artificial stone we call reinforced concrete. Cheap, easy to use, and durable, reinforced concrete is the global material of our time. But it is hard to imagine establishing royal legitimacy or building a haven called Shangri La with wheelbarrows of concrete. As Douglas Peebles's evocative photographs repeatedly seem to suggest, this must be considered our loss.

*Dennis P. Doordan
Chairperson, Department of Art,
Art History and Design
University of Notre Dame*