

Hawaiian Archaeology: A Post-Colonial History

P. Bion Griffin
University of Hawai'i

*Lost, is it—buried? One more missing piece?
But, nothing's lost, or else: all is translation,
And every bit of us is lost in it.*

—James Merrill

My first and earliest encounter with Hawai'i was as a child, age unremembered, listening to the old Sears Roebuck radio spilling forth, in a cold, wintry, New England, "Webley Edwards' Hawai'i Calls." Instead of buying only the platters of Elvis, a teenager PBG bought Hawaiian records—one still owned.¹ Ah, Hawai'i called, and like so many ancestral New Englanders (Father Bond of Hallowell, Maine and Kohala was an ancestral neighbor), I too answered the call. Arriving in August, 1969, with the 69th Ph.D. degree in Anthropology awarded by the University of Arizona, I must have been an outrageous *malihini*, and along with Dave Tuggle a year later, part of the new archaeologists come "like invading hippies" who "stormed and raided . . . our [Bishop Museum] storehouse and . . . such knowledge as is lodged in the brains of our staff" as argued by that venerable doyen of *kama'aina*, Keneti, in a 1971 memo.² No flowered aloha shirt, but flowered bell-bottom pants—what can one expect?

Now, there is no question that I might remember the history differently than a *kama'aina*, view the institutions differently, and predict the future differently. Hawaiian archaeology has led a far more checkered history than is *revealed* by Pat Kirch's assessment in this issue of *Hawaiian Archaeology*. Such is his choice, but in my invited reflections on the rather straightforward if somewhat self-serving essay, I will raise alternatives for discussion, even if some points are not as sober as Pat advocates.

The world of Hawai'i in 1997 is not the world of 1969, or any of the decades earlier. As Pat points out, we live with great institutional changes, changes in power bases, prestige sources, academic agenda, and notions of the business of heritage. In 1969, the Department of Anthropology at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa was only beginning to emerge from the Museum's shadow, an emergence not uncontested by the "Mother Institution." Bishop Museum in 1969 was still a colonial institution that desired no competition, and did not, I would argue, encourage local non-haole archaeologists, but did have a most "traditional" view of the Hawaiian people. The Museum, as Pat chronicles, has a history of illustrious "archaeologists," but folk history certainly paints a less than congenial internal history, and one that qualifies the glamorized view. What Hawaiian archaeology would, or could have been, but for a colonialist, internally divided and divisive research staff—and how much earlier a profitable growth of the University.

Both the Museum and the University owe much to Roger Green and his vision(s) (see Graves 1996 for a detailed discussion), for his thinking came to dominate, inspire, and guide much of Hawaiian archaeology, to a greater extent than even Pat advances. Just in July, 1997, Roger and I reflected on the states of the art in 1969 and now, and I again saw his grasp of and insights to central problems. Roger continues to think theoretically. But we have come far from the glory days of Mākaha and Lapakahi, even as we return to those same lands. Part and parcel of the coming, and the present and its troubles, adhere to the practice of contract archaeology/Cultural Resources Management (CRM)/heritage management that began in those same days of the late 1960s.

A colleague and I, not long ago, mused over my remark that "We didn't know what a monster we would create"—the monster of CRM in Hawai'i. For this American monster has variously nurtured us, devoured us, and spit us out, leaving us with the charge of creating more offspring for future (in)digestion. Like it or not, there it is. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the Museum and University archaeologists made annual pilgrimages to the State Capitol to testify for ever stronger preservation laws, for some teeth in Chapter 6E (HRS), and for respect for the past. Roger, Dick Pearson, Dave Tuggle, myself,

haoles all, with aloha jackets (remember those artifacts? No, Dave did not have one, as I recall) but with *aloha* for preserving Hawaiian sites and burials. No Hawaiian civic clubs came forth, but then we didn't ask. This was the domain of the Museum and the University at a time when any archaeologist was assumed by the public to be with the Museum.

The state apparatus was timid and without teeth or claws; administrators, developers, and government lackeys either tolerated the archaeological enterprise as they saw fit or could be harassed into decisions. Francis Ching, a Hawaiian and extremely underappreciated, even denigrated, archaeologist, held forth alone in the Department of Land and Natural Resources. Considered an upstart and outsider (a Hawaiian) by most others, he by force of will put in place the basic apparatus that has become the Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) State Historic Preservation Division (SHPD). He also made many innovations, once ridiculed, now widely adopted. Succeeded by Stell Newman, with his new Ph.D. from UH, based on Kohala research, the program gained substantially in data base generation, inventory, and official concern. Still, the program stumbled along, and is still stumbling far more than Kirch's account would have us see (my alternative history, you remember). After Francis left the DLNR, he, and CRM, still had a friend in the Administrator of DLNR, the late and fondly remembered Joe Souza. This was a time in Hawai'i's past before so-called "rules and regs," a time when a friendly talk with Joe might enable a project to be mandated, funded, and completed. Without nostalgia, I historicize that it was still an older Hawai'i with some *aloha*.

Eventually, Joe Souza retired and new administrators arrived, stronger laws were enacted, and a few additional personnel were added to handle the processes. Pat Beggerly and Rob Hommon, with Farley Watanabe, all did their stints in the State office, trying to maintain an evenhanded, professional set of standards. Wendell Kam and Buddy Neller brought their own visions to the program. And still the program grew, as did consulting firms, which were born and died as the economic health of the state waxed and waned, as their owners indulged in more or fewer trappings of executive lifestyle, and as the laws were interpreted strongly or weakly.

After years of lobbying (how I hated doing it) for a separation of the historic preservation program from the Division of State Parks, SHPD was birthed. One should be cautious of dreaming; the dreams may come true, and one learn that fantasy is always better than reality. For, *contra* Pat Kirch, I see the history into the present with SHPD much of the problem and not the steadfast force for archaeological good he argues. We—the research archaeologists, the CRM consulting firms, the developers, and citizens of Hawai‘i—have suffered unduly from the phony set of “rules and regs,” never taken to hearing, never held up for scrutiny, but used as law to enforce SHPD visions of proper archaeology. (I believe these visions narrow and dated. For other comments see Dye 1997:3–7). Admittedly, they were *trying* to “do good,” but like the IRS of today, they placed themselves above the law in refusing to bring the rules and regs to hearing and acceptance. The professional staff of SHPD is, in fact, both victim and victimizer. The executive branch and administration are uninterested, the infighting within the Division debilitating, and the effect on the archaeological community demoralizing and financially draining. Some of the most professional staff have left, and others may leave when jobs come along. The Burial Program folks have been impossible to integrate into the Division’s overall mandate to preserve the Hawaiian past. The contention generated by them and the reciprocal disdain by the archaeologists have made the Division unlivable. The place is in deep trouble.

Interestingly, SHPD is not the only regulatory game in town. Historic preservation is guided by, in addition to the State’s Chapter 6E, the Federal National Historic Preservation Act, many other federal laws and regulations, and the counties’ various rules and permitting processes. The Army Corps of Engineers, the Army, the Navy, the National Park Service, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service all adhere to or ignore State or Federal law as legally appropriate, and operate with their own CRM priorities. Indeed, professional archaeologists in non-State government positions now outnumber SHPD staff members. The implications for the maintenance of professional research archaeology have yet to be explored. I myself place more importance on these agencies than, I infer, Pat does.

The CRM contracting crowd, both for-profit and non-profit, has a very spotty record. Business is tough. As Vice President (Research) of Archaeological Research Center Hawai‘i (ARCH) in the late 1970s, resigning in the early 1980s, I saw the extreme difficulty of working with hostility emanating from the state offices, from the business community, and from competing consulting firms, including the Museum. One can’t operate losing money, and being professional doesn’t necessarily bring in the profit. I will never forget Francis Ching, President, ARCH, telling me, “We won’t cut corners to save money and we will show them by doing quality work.” ARCH even maintained its own publication series! This happened at the time the state office in DLNR actively discouraged our work and the political hacks called, demanding serious campaign contributions! ARCH is no longer in business. *Na kau a kau* indeed.

Contract archaeology has been a dog-eat-dog world, and no incentives to feed the public, to pay back the public’s dollars have been seen. Only someone with as much courage and brass as then University of Hawai‘i professor Matthew Spriggs was able to amass the collective unpublished CRM manuscripts and duplicate them for the UH and SHPD libraries. He also published in the Department of Anthropology’s *Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series* the concomitant complete bibliography (Spriggs and Tanaka 1988).

Emory, in the memorandum noted above, spoke of the 1960s glory days of University-Museum cooperation, and feared the new different points of view of the 1970s. This is curious, or even disingenuous, since the only Hawai‘i-oriented archaeologists at the University before 1969 were also Museum archaeologists, led by Emory as teacher and researcher. Bill Bonk had already disappeared into Hilo, never to emerge again, and the renowned Asianists Bill Solheim and Dick Pearson comprised the regular archaeological faculty. Both dabbled in Hawaiian archaeology, but dabbling it was. Roger Green, as noted, provided the first real bridge between Bishop Museum and the University, but in spite of efforts to bond him more strongly and wholly to the University, his loyalties were demanded by and were given to the Museum until he got out of Dodge for Auckland.

One era of cooperation between the Museum and the University began with the Coordinating Committee of Hawaiian Archaeology, an ad hoc group of the professionals and senior students then operating in Hawai'i. To be sure, Emory's memo predates the flowering of the Coordinating Committee, but the frequent meetings, reporting of activities, and social encounters were a high spot in the history of our field. The committee died with the explosion of numbers of archaeologists and of the CRM archaeology-for-profit mode. One could not coordinate competing businesses, and the bad blood of competition ultimately soured cooperation. The University, after flirtations with contract archaeology, decided to stay out of the fray, instead concentrating on teaching and research. The Museum, as Pat ably notes, was already into the field, and instead of bowing out, decided to "dig for gold," going head-to-head with other consulting firms. The Museum at that time was still staffed by "island trained, tried, and true" archaeologists, and they, not the present Director, initially sent the Museum down the path, a path then trod also by Patrick Vinton Kirch. Not long after, the appearance of Michael Graves, followed by Terry Hunt and Barry Rolett, led to an unprecedented (since the earliest 1970s) interaction among Museum and University archaeologists operating at a personal and professional level. This interaction continues with ever-increasing strength today. In fact, I would assert that personal and research relations among University and Museum archaeologists are at an all-time peak of strength. Our students routinely work with Museum collections and archaeologists. Museum archaeologists teach in our program and serve on student committees.

In the 1990s CRM archaeology is fitfully gaining professional respectability through good research designs (self-generated, not through the "rules and regs") and through increasing publication in refereed journals or production of quality monographs. Yet, most CRM work remains buried in unpublished reports to funding clients. A sense of professionalism is seen in the work of, for example (others could be cited) International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc. (IARII) (Athens *et. al.* 1996, Athens and Ward 1993, 1997, Goodwin *et. al.* 1994) and Archaeological Consultants of the Pacific (Kennedy 1997, 1994). Within the SHPD, Tom Dye (now

moved to IARII) has always maintained a professional level of publication (Dye 1994a, b, 1990a, Dye and Komori 1992) as well as being prominent in managing the Society for Hawaiian Archaeology (SHA). Bruce Masse, once with the SHPD and the U.S. Navy, maintained a stellar research agenda while still doing his job (Masse 1997, Masse and Tuggle n.d.). Ross Cordy has managed to publish in spite of overseeing the archaeology section of SHPD (Cordy 1996, 1995). Others contribute, but both quantity and quality are in short supply. Dave Tuggle (1997) has continued to publish the highest quality research since returning to Hawai'i and IARII.

In an unprecedented spurt of collective action, SHA was birthed, with the founding meeting at the Ather-ton Halau, Bishop Museum, in 1980. Contract archaeologists, Museum employees, University professors and students, and various government professionals all joined and began several years of profitable activities that promised a new, collegial and cooperative era in Hawaiian archaeology. Alas, it has been downhill as of late, with increasingly few members shouldering the burden. Contract firm CRM archaeologists have been conspicuously absent from the officer roles, especially as President (excepting Joe Kennedy of Archaeological Consultants of the Pacific), with SHPD, Bishop Museum, and University personnel manning the barricades (Martha Yent of State Parks has done more work than any one person except Tom Dye, who has turned a defunct journal into a showpiece). Annie Griffin and I have run five of the last ten SHA conferences, which aside from the journal may be the only really successful aspect of SHA.

The SHA movie promoting Hawaiian archaeology did have a generally favorable impact on the public, but soon one realized that it was both dated and unfortunately representative in its presentation (SHA 1982). Indiana Jones did not have a beard, but the image of the bearded *haole* archaeologists, the rugged male from a dominant institution, comes through loud and clear. Introduction of a Hawaiian voice was realized only with protests after an initial "beta" screening. SHA has since sporadically mused over a re-make, but has never found the will, a lack reflecting the general disinterest of the profession in the non-paying public.

What was the University doing during this historical period and into the present? Or, have the University archaeologists fallen from a former status, losing their vision and their way? What are those (we) privileged few up to and why? Pat Kirch notes that the archaeologists at UH have not done all they might have, a truism in any situation, but one may question the priorities Pat believes important, or his assessment of what actually has been done, as well as the “greatness” of the University’s and Museum’s mega-project past. We all look back fondly to the days of our youth, when our projects were large, well-funded, and seemed to be establishing a new order. The truth is that for all the successes, Lapakahi, Mākaha, and others of the time were both giant messes and fraught with error and omission. Like later field schools, graduate students often had their way with the data, coordination among senior staff was desultory, and consideration of the long term minimal. Lapakahi data were taken from the University by State Parks in an especially sordid chapter of our history. Most of the materials were promptly lost; thank goodness for the retention of Myra Tomonari-Tuggle’s map of the Kohala field system, which is critical to ongoing University research.

The Mānoa Department of Anthropology has over the last four decades never committed to the same area focus as has the Museum, nor has it seen its mission as others have seen it, or thought it should be. The Museum is first and foremost a museum of Hawai‘i and Hawaiian culture. Its expansion into Polynesia and Melanesia has been primarily an effort to find the ancestors of the Hawaiian people. The Society Islands, the Marquesas, and even the Western Polynesian groups have been noteworthy as they inform us concerning Hawai‘i. If the Museum has strayed from its mission, it has strayed with “right” in mind. The University archaeology program never saw its mission as limited to, or even *dominated* by Hawai‘i and Hawaiians. In fact, as noted above, its Hawaiian involvement was initially a matter of following a Museum lead. Instead, the Department joined, in the 1960s, the rest of the University, in a commitment to Asia, the ancestral home of many of Hawai‘i’s people.

In addition, the Department has been committed to multi-area training and instruction in method and theory of graduate students, believing that expertise

in only one area or topic led to provincialism, narrow interests and to a lack of advantage in an international job market. Like most research universities, the University of Hawai‘i, correctly or incorrectly, saw its reach as pan-Pacific and Asia, and spoke to those audiences. In doing so, those more locally committed saw and see an inappropriate lack of benefits to Hawaiian archaeology. They see the University as not training enough B.A., M.A. and Ph.D. students to fill the ranks of CRM archaeology and not enough feed-back to the people of Hawai‘i.

These are legitimate issues to debate, although my opinion is that the diversity of academic backgrounds the CRM practitioners bring to Hawaiian archaeology is essential for a healthy field. Also, in spite of the lack of large, multi-year projects, a rather amazing amount of Hawaiian archaeology has been undertaken and published at the University, and many top-flight students graduated and entered into professional careers. The archaeology field school has continued yearly since “time immemorial” (Spriggs 1993; see also Luomala 1968/69) except for one year in 1996 with the UH budget collapse, a late commitment by the instructor, and Murphy’s Law (K. O’Leary, personal communication). Even Hawai‘i has not been sacred as a field school location, with Dave Tuggle and Karl Hutterer leading one to the Philippines in 1971 (the year of the invading hippies) while leaving Tom Riley to hold down the local fort and 5-O at Kaupō Cave Shelter. The influence of the Museum appeared again in 1972 and 1973, with Yosi Sinoto leading students on Teti’aroa in the Societies.

Should field schools be conducted by regular faculty, by graduate students or by visiting instructors? Field schools, other than those in “sand box” sites, should be conducted with proper attention to archaeological ethics, research design, and publication, and, like other projects, these are “regulated” by SHPD. It seems to me that whether a field school is best as a one shot deal managed by a graduate student with great personal interest (her or his research) or as part of a large, multi-year program is a difficult call. Students easily get lost in complex, ongoing research, yet profit from interaction with teams of specialists. Where schools are offered seems even more important—on O‘ahu or off island. Off-island schools cost the University and the students an often prohibitive amount of money. Living at home may not be

romantic—no getting drunk by the campfire—but it doesn't cost much. And, the relationships of field school training to shovel bum employment on CRM digs remains unresolved. The problem of the who, what, where, how and why need discussion within our community. Clearly the days of the late 1960s, when the Museum believed it should do the research and University stick to the training, are over. The University is now the best research game in town, our graduate students come from top flight programs, and most students get their training on research projects in Hawai'i, Tahiti, the Marquesas, Samoa, Fiji and, of course, Asia. They also get their training in the classroom and labs. Mānoa offers one of the most comprehensive and theoretically sophisticated instructional programs in archaeology for both undergraduates and graduates.

Like Emory, Sinoto, and Kirch of Bishop Museum, early (1970s and 1980s) University archaeologists indeed failed to stick to Hawai'i. (Note that the three Museum archaeologists named above are best known, in fact, for their work outside these *nani* islands.) Tuggle spent years in Kohala, but also worked in the Philippines. I interspersed work in Hawai'i with longer stints in Southeast Asia (Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia) and in doing ethnography. Dick Gould took on small projects in Hawai'i ranging from Queen Emma's Summer Palace to Rathje-esque rubbish, and continued his pre-eminent Australian work. Spriggs conducted no major projects in Hawai'i, but made a great impact through many small efforts, ranging from field schools to interaction with the Hawaiian community. He even joined Ka Lāhui Hawai'i (Lāna'i Chapter). Of course, he was better known in academic circles for his Melanesian researches. Michael Graves brought pan-Pacific (Micronesia/Mariana) experience to Hawaiian archaeology, working on Lāna'i (Graves and Ladefoged 1991) and resuscitating the Nualolo Kai excavations, never reported by Bishop Museum, and has also turned his attention with Kēhau Cachola-Abad to *heiau*. Most recently he has taken UH back to the sweet potato fields of Kohala (Ladefoged, Graves, and Jennings 1996)! And two fully-committed Polynesia scholars joined UH in the persons of Barry Rolett and Terry Hunt. Their research in Polynesia has both theoretical and substantive implications for Hawai'i (Rolett 1996, Rolett and Conte 1995, Terrell, Hunt, and Gosden 1997).

They have consistently trained Hawai'i students in both Hawaiian and Polynesian archaeology. In addition, both Graves and Hunt have "stuck their necks out" in commenting on CRM research and historic preservation issues, and have actively recruited Hawaiian students. Most recently, Kathy Morrison and now Miriam Stark have renewed the flagging effort in Asian archaeology created with the retirement of Bill Solheim. In fact, we might argue that the Asian focus, not the Hawaiian focus, was temporarily most diminished. The last ten years of Hawaiian archaeology at the University have been amazingly productive, given the limited access to CRM funding.³ Since 1987, three doctoral dissertations *focusing on Hawai'i* have been accepted, plus seven M.A. theses. The former include Pat Beggerly (1990), Ann Garland (1996) and Bert Davis (1990). The latter include Conrad Erkelens (1993), Jo Lynn Gunness (1987), Jim Adams (1994), Maurice Major (1995), Laura Carter (1990), Thegn Ladefoged (1987), and Carol Kawachi (1989). Note that all these scholars remain professional archaeologists. Faculty at Mānoa have edited two volumes of *Hawaiian Archaeology*, one special issue of *Asian Perspectives*, and two other volumes (Graves and Green 1993, Kirch and Hunt 1997).

So, what really is lacking, or what are the problems facing the University as we move into archaeology in the future? Should the University rethink itself and get on the ball? First, I do not think we have a problem with theoretical conceptualization—working with up-to-date theory and problem orientations. In fact, the Department is varied almost to the point of contention, with unreformed but "new and improved" processual archaeologists (the old new archaeology updated), with Darwinian evolutionists, and with environmentally oriented culture historians. To be sure, no one is doing "household archaeology," which in its traditional form grew out of settlement pattern archaeology with a smattering of processual archaeology thrown in, something of a mix as seen in K. C. Chang's *Rethinking Archaeology*, which L. Binford mentioned (personal communication) as "retarding archaeology," and might conceivably be related to the household archaeology and household material culture of S. Binford (Bright 1984). Anyway, a unified acceptance by all of important problems and issues in archaeology is less a University problem, where diversity is encouraged, than

one of SHPD, CRM, and apparently Berkeley, given the codification into "rules" as to what constitutes necessary and appropriate data and interpretation.

Second, we at the University emphasize the enduring topics of Hawaiian archaeology where we are seeing the cumulative effects of focusing our work efforts. These include the origins of Hawaiians and the timing of human settlement (Graves and Addison 1995, 1996; Hunt and Holsen 1990), the use of artifact variation to explore stylistic and functional variability in Hawai'i and elsewhere in Polynesia (Cachola-Abad 1993, 1996; Pfeffer 1995, 1997; Moniz *et. al.* 1997), the roles and forms that agriculture took in prehistory (Ladefoged 1987, 1991, Ladefoged *et. al.* 1987, 1996), and changing patterns of subsistence strategies (Beggerly 1990, Davis 1990, Gordon 1993, Moniz 1997). Also included are the development of social complexity and its relationship to monumental architecture (Cachola-Abad 1996, Graves and Ladefoged 1995, Graves and Sweeney 1993), advancements in dating archaeological materials (Graves and Ladefoged 1991, Graves and Cachola-Abad 1996), paleoenvironmental reconstruction (Athens, Ward and Wickler 1992, Graves and Murakami 1993), paleodemography and population collapse (Ladefoged 1991, Sweeney 1992), and the nature and extent of change during and after the arrival of Europeans and Americans in Hawai'i (Carter 1990, Garland 1995, 1996). The training and research program and the graduate students are healthy indeed.

The University does need to assist further the process whereby the Hawaiian people gain their share of the voice of archaeology in the state. As Matthew Spriggs pointed out in a SHA oral presentation and as Roger Green elaborated (personal communication) concerning Aotearoa, where the Maori call the shots, the faster the Hawaiian people gain respectable authority concerning the study of their past, the healthier archaeology will be. And we are doing this with more Native Hawaiians and minority Americans majoring in anthropology and pursuing graduate work at Mānoa than at any other institution in the United States.

So, what more can be said of the future in this post-colonial history? Hawai'i is hardly de-colonized, of course. Both the SHA film and Pat's review point to

the ambiguous or subordinate roles of non-*haole* and women in the study of Hawai'i's past. Recently, Mānoa has been increasingly successful in encouraging and supporting women and Hawaiian scholars. Cachola-Abad's (1993) paper is among the most frequently cited references by preeminent archaeologists. We are still, however, locked into a rather traditional university culture, and need more than a dash of "liberation anthropology" and outreach efforts. But, we can be sure there will never again be the "mega-project" of the sorts seen in the 1970s, anymore than the H-3 extravaganza in CRM is likely to be repeated. Archaeology as heritage is more popular than ever, more valued by more people than surely was the case in 1970 or 1980. We, the practitioners, have not paid our dues to the public, at least not in Hawai'i, and future research will, I believe, bring a blending of the low and high technologies now known with a variety of theoretical foci and with the call for relevance and appropriateness by the Hawaiian community. The Mānoa Department of Anthropology does not exist to replicate its present self. We are moving into the Pacific and Asian millennium, working hard to build an increasingly vigorous program.

Auwē, pihā ka 'eke, Ho'i kākou

Acknowledgments

I thank the following otherwise blameless people for commenting, criticizing (negatively and positively), praising, laughing, and otherwise providing help: Annie Griffen, Dave Tuggle, Joe Kennedy, Michael Graves, and Terry Hunt. Only the author may be held responsible for errors, omissions, tropes, nuances, and any such features.

Notes

1. *Hawaii Calls: Waikiki!* Presented by Webley Edwards with Al Kealoha Perry. Capital Records EAP 2-772.

2. Memorandum dated March 1, 1971 and signed by Kenneth P. Emory. In possession of P. Bion Griffen, Dean Hall 211, University of Hawai'i.

3. I gratefully acknowledge here information provided by Michael Graves concerning numbers, references, and contributions by UH faculty and students, as well as reminding me of the many foci of research and training I have reported.

References

- Adams, J. E. 1994. The changing economic patterns of Kukuipahu in a global perspective: An archaeological consideration of Kukuipahu and Awalua, North Kohala, Island of Hawai'i. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Athens, J. S., and J. V. Ward. 1993. Environmental change and prehistoric Polynesian settlement in Hawai'i. *Asian Perspectives* 33:19–56.
- . 1997. The Maunawili core: Prehistoric inland expansion of settlement and agriculture, O'ahu, Hawai'i. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 6:37–51.
- Athens, J. S., J. V. Ward, and G. M. Murakami. 1996. Development of an agroforest on a Micronesian high island: Prehistoric Kosraean agriculture. *Antiquity* 70:834–46.
- Athens, J. S., J. V. Ward, and S. Wickler. 1992. Late Holocene lowland vegetation, O'ahu, Hawai'i. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 14:9–34.
- Beggerly, P. E. P. 1990. Kahana Valley, Hawaii, a geomorphic artifact: A study of the interrelationships among geomorphic structures, natural processes, and ancient Hawaiian technology, land use, and settlement patterns. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Bright, S. 1984. A talk with sex pioneer Sally Binford. *On Our Backs* 12:12, 13, 38–43.
- Cachola-Abad, C. K. 1993. Evaluating the orthodox dual settlement model for the Hawaiian Islands: An analysis of artifact distribution and Hawaiian oral traditions. In *The evolution and organization of prehistoric society in Polynesia*. Monograph, 19, ed. M. W. Graves and R. C. Green, 13–32. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Society.
- . 1996. The significance of heiau diversity in site evaluations. *Cultural Resources Management* 19:11–16.
- Carter, L. A. 1990. Protohistoric material correlates in Hawaiian archaeology, A.D. 1778–1820. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Cordy, R. H. 1994. *A regional synthesis of Hāmākua District, Island of Hawai'i* Honolulu: Historic Preservation Division, Department of Land and Natural Resources, State of Hawaii.
- . 1996. Rise and fall of the O'ahu kingdom: A brief overview of O'ahu's history. In *Oceanic culture history: Essays in honour of Roger Green*, ed. J. Davidson, G. Irwin, F. Leach, A. Pawley, and D. Brown, 591–613. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Society.
- Davis, B. D. 1990. Human settlement in pristine insular environments: A Hawaiian case study from Barbers Point, Southwestern Oahu. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Dye, T. 1994a. Apparent ages of marine shells: Implications for archaeological dating in Hawai'i. *Radiocarbon* 36:51–57.
- . 1994b. Population trends in Hawai'i before 1778. *The Hawaiian Journal of History* 28:1–20.
- . 1997. Editor's note. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 6:3–7.
- Dye, T., and E. Komori. 1992. A pre-censal population history of Hawai'i. *New Zealand Journal of Archaeology* 14:113–28.
- Dye, T., and D. W. Steadman. 1990. Polynesian ancestors and their animal world. *American Scientist* 78:207–15.
- Erkelens, C. 1993. Archaeological investigation of the Kukanono slope, Kawainui marsh, Kailua, Ko'olaupoko, O'ahu. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Garland, A. W. H. 1995. An archaeological predictive model for the Mission Houses site in Honolulu and its value. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 4:34–44.
- . 1996. Material culture change after Euro-american contact in Honolulu, Hawaii, circa 1800–1870: A selectionist model for diet and tablewares. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.

- Goodwin, C. 1994. *A Kalaupapa sweet potato farm: A report on archaeological data recovery operations, Kalaupapa airport improvement project, Kalaupapa, Moloka'i, Hawai'i*. 2 vols. with contributions by C. Erkelens, C. Favreau, C. H. Fletcher III, G. M. Murakami, M. Tomonari-Tuggle, and A. Ziegler. Honolulu: International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc.
- Gordon, E. A. 1993. Screen size and differential faunal recovery: A Hawaiian example. *Journal of Field Archaeology* 20:453–60.
- Graves, M. W. 1996. An overview of the contributions of Roger Green to method and theory in Oceanic archaeology. In *Oceanic Culture History: Essays in honour of Roger Green*, ed. J. Davidson, G. Irwin, F. Leach, A. Pawley, and D. Brown, 167–82. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Society.
- Graves, M. W., and D. J. Addison. 1995. The Polynesian settlement of the Hawaiian archipelago: Integrating models and methods in archaeological interpretation. *World Archaeology* 26:380–99.
- . 1996. Models and methods for inferring the prehistoric colonization of Hawai'i. *Bulletin of the Indo-Pacific Prehistory Association* 15:3–8.
- Graves, M. W., and C. K. Cachola-Abad. 1996. Seriation as a method of chronologically ordering architectural design traits: An example from Hawai'i. *Archaeology in Oceania* 31:19–32.
- Graves, M. W., and R. C. Green, eds. 1993. *The evolution and organization of prehistoric society in Polynesia*. Monograph, 19. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Association.
- Graves, M. W., and T. Ladefoged. 1991. The disparity between radiocarbon and volcanic glass dates: New evidence from the Island of Lāna'i, Hawai'i. *Archaeology in Oceania* 26:70–77.
- . 1995. The evolutionary significance of ceremonial architecture. In *Evolutionary archaeology: Methodological issues*, ed. P. A. Teltser, 149–74. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Graves, M. W., and M. Sweeney. 1993. Ritual behavior and ceremonial structures in Eastern Polynesia: Changing perspectives on archaeological variability. In *The evolution and organization of prehistoric society in Polynesia*. Monograph, 19, ed. M. W. Graves and R. C. Green, 106–25. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Association.
- Gunness, J. 1987. Archaeological investigations at Kualoa Regional Park, 1875–1985. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Hunt, T. L., and R. M. Holsen. 1991. An early radiocarbon chronology for the Hawaiian Islands: A preliminary analysis. *Asian Perspectives* 30:147–62.
- Kawachi, C. T. T. 1989. Pua'a 2: An upland habitation and agricultural complex in North Kona, Hawai'i Island. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Kennedy, J. 1994. The archaeological recovery of smallpox victims in Hawai'i: Scientific investigation or public health threat? *Perspective in Biology and Medicine* 37:499–509.
- . 1997. Into the netherworld of island earth: A reevaluation of refuge caves in ancient Hawaiian society. *Geoarchaeology* 12:641–55.
- Kirch, P. V., and T. L. Hunt, eds. 1997. *Historical ecology in the Pacific Islands: Prehistoric environmental and landscape change*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ladefoged, T. 1987. Settlement pattern analysis and relational data bases: An archaeological study in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- . 1991. Architectural transformations during the early historic era. *Asian Perspectives* 30:117–32.
- Ladefoged, T., M. W. Graves, and R. P. Jennings. 1996. Dryland agricultural expansion and intensification in Kohala, Hawai'i Island. *Antiquity* 70: 861–80.
- Ladefoged, T., G. F. Somers, and M. M. Lane-Hamasaki. 1987. *A settlement pattern analysis of a portion of Hawaii Volcanoes National Park*. Publications in Anthropology, 44. Tucson: Western Archaeological and Conservation Center.
- Luomala, K. 1968–1969. Imponderabilia for a history of anthropology at University of Hawaii, 1922–1946. *News of the Pacific* 19:1–32.

- Major, M. 1995. The cultural construction of culture reconstruction: An ethnography of Hawaii archaeologists in the contract era. M.A. Thesis, University of Hawai'i, Mānoa.
- Masse, W. B. 1997. The celestial basis of civilization. *Vistas in Astronomy* 39:463–77.
- Masse, W. B., and H. D. Tuggle. In press. The date of Hawaiian colonization. *Rapa Nui Journal*.
- Moniz, J. J., M. S. Allen, and M. W. Graves. In press. Methodological issues in artifact analysis: Stylistic variability in Hawaiian fishhooks. In *Archaeology of stylistic variation in Oceania: Exploring applications and expanding method and theory*, ed. M. W. Graves and E. E. Cochrane. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Pfeffer, M. T. 1995. Distribution and design of Pacific octopus lures: The Hawaiian octopus lures in regional context. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 4:47–56.
- . In press. Chronological assessment of Hawaiian octopus lure weights from primary-use contexts along the south shore of O'ahu, Hawai'i. In *The archaeology of stylistic variation in Oceania: Exploring applications and expanding method and theory*, ed. M. W. Graves and E. E. Cochrane. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Rolett, B. V. 1996. Colonization and cultural change in the Marquesas. In *Oceanic culture history: Essays in honour of Roger Green*, ed. J. Davidson, G. Irwin, F. Leach, A. Pawley, and D. Brown, 531–40. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Society.
- Rolett, B. V., and E. Conte. 1995. Renewed investigation of the Ha'atuatua Dune (Nukuhiva, Marquesas Islands): A key site in Polynesian prehistory. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 104:195–228.
- Society for Hawaiian Archaeology. 1982. Hawai'i's endangered past. 16 mm film and video. Copies in the University of Hawai'i Library, Honolulu.
- Spriggs, M. J. T. 1993. University of Hawai'i Archaeology Field Schools 1950–1984. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 2:18–27.
- Spriggs, M. J. T., and P. L. Tanaka. 1988. *Nā mea 'imi ka wā kahiko: An annotated bibliography of Hawaiian archaeology*. Asian and Pacific Archaeology Series, 11. Honolulu: Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i.
- Sweeney, M. 1992. Settlement pattern change in Hawai'i: Testing a model for the cultural response to population collapse. *Asian Perspective* 31:39–56.
- Terrell, J. E., T. L. Hunt, and C. Gosden. 1997. The dimensions of social life in the Pacific: Human diversity and the myth of the primitive isolate. *Current Anthropology* 38:155–95.
- Tuggle, H. D. 1997. The 'Ewa Plain. *Hawaiian Archaeology* 6:8–36.