history without one. His own perceptions of Tolai accounts of the past are posited within a clear chronology that he has obtained from, among other sources, published accounts of the Tolai past by other Europeans. Neumann must realize that he himself is bound by, or at least immersed in, the disciplinary constraints from which he wishes Pacific history to break free. This is not to belittle Neumann's account; his book is well written and enjoyable to read. More important, his questions are well worth asking and well worth debating by those interested in the Pacific past.

PHYLLIS S. HERDA  
* * *


Lilikalā Kameʻeleihiwa, associate professor at the Center for Hawaiian Studies, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa, has written one of those rare and important works that, while not completely convincing in the argument she most ardently wishes to make, nevertheless succeeds in ways other scholars can only envy. With her interpretation of the Māhele from a Hawaiian cultural perspective, Kameʻeleihiwa has succeeded in creating a book that is both challenging to the professional academic and, because of the simple elegance of her language, invaluable to the novice. It also succeeds as an inspiration to our people as we struggle to reclaim our nation in the late twentieth century.

Early in her introductory chapter, Kameʻeleihiwa acknowledges the significant contributions of scholars Dening and Sahlins to the field of Pacific Islands history and to her own work and then proceeds to demonstrate why a history of native peoples can be neither complete nor completely legitimate without the contributions of native historians. Her argument is that if a people's conception of the world is structured and described by certain metaphors that are understood within their culture, then a knowledge of the language that shapes and defines those metaphors is essential to the understanding of the metaphors.

Intimacy with the language is, indeed, one of the tools that Kameʻeleihiwa brings to this study, interpreting various creation chants such as the Kumulipo and other moʻo kū‘auhau ‘genealogies' in order to construct a coherent and convincing metaphor of the relationships that existed between ‘aina ‘land' and kanaka ‘human' in prehaole Hawaiʻi.

In her first three chapters Kameʻeleihiwa describes that relationship as both familial and spiritual. People were servants of the ‘aina, and the ali‘i nui ‘ruling chiefs' were the semidivine mediators of the spiritual power, or mana between the gods, the land, and the people. All of creation, including the Hawaiian people, were descendants of spiritual forms that mated and gave birth to land, kalo ‘taro', and then to the ali‘i, in that
order. One of these relationships, a metaphor she refers to as *mālama ʻāina* describes the special role held by the *aliʻi* in the care and maintenance of land and people.

That metaphor explains the continuing devotion that the *makaʻainana* ‘planters’ had for the *aliʻi* even after European influences began to distort this relationship with the introduction of foreign commerce, religion, and especially disease. In her fourth chapter, Kameʻeleihiwa traces the decisions made by Kamehameha I and his heirs that fundamentally altered Hawaiian society. She sees them as attempts to reconcile those changes with what Hawaiians had always regarded as the need for *pono* ‘balance in the cosmos’, in which all members of the natural world, ʻāina, *aliʻi*, and *makaʻainana* lived, if not always harmoniously, with mutual dependence and mutual respect.

Scholars will welcome the exhaustive attention to detail paid by this historian to details like the disbursement of lands made to the heirs of Kamehameha I and his heirs that fundamentally altered Hawaiian society. She sees them as attempts to reconcile those changes with what Hawaiians had always regarded as the need for *pono* ‘balance in the cosmos’, in which all members of the natural world, ʻāina, *aliʻi*, and *makaʻainana* lived, if not always harmoniously, with mutual dependence and mutual respect.

Chapter 8 describes the *Māhele*, the division of the lands by Kauikaeouli, Kamehameha III, that ultimately made ʻāina alienable and failed to provide the *makaʻainana* with adequate access to land. If the *aliʻi* were greedy in their pursuit of lands, it is not indicated by the dispersal of ʻāina that took place between 1846 and 1850. While the lands that were retained by the *aliʻi*—most lost over half of their lands to the government—seem to have been sufficient to assure their wealth, Kameʻeleihiwa stresses that wealth for the *aliʻi* rested not in the ʻāina but in the fruitful use of it by the *makaʻainana* who had once thrived on it.
Ultimately, the true dimensions of the tragedy cannot be confined to the loss of economic power that the loss of ‘āina heralded. Rather, Kameʻeleihiwa would argue, the tragedy is the loss of the relationship enjoyed by Hawaiian people, their akua, and the ‘āina that undergirded the once proud and successful society. The separation from ‘āina is responsible for Hawaiians' inability or unwillingness to relate well to modern capitalist society. In her final chapter Kameʻeleihiwa appeals to her people not to integrate into American society but to continue to cleave to their historical aloha for the ‘āina and to restore the nation (lahui) with the values of malama ‘āina.

Her unabashed nationalism will set off alarms in the dens and fortresses of liberal scholars. To be sure, there are occasions in this book where the author’s reasoning is strained by her reluctance to portray the aliʻi as anything but sincere and unsophisticated pursuers of pono in the society. One of the few aliʻi that she does criticize for being grasping, forward, and ambitious was Kekuanaoʻa, and she points out that he was not of the higher ranking genealogical lines, making his rude and unsuitable behavior a function of his birth (207). Even here, Kameʻeleihiwa is quick to reveal that as father to a granddaughter of Kamehameha, it was his duty to safeguard his child's interests, if not his own.

Indeed, Kameʻeleihiwa is not convincing in her portrayal of mōʻi responsibility for the Māhele. She holds neither the Mōʻi Kamehameha nor his heir Kauikeaouli sufficiently accountable for the changes in land tenure inaugurated during their reign because she will not accept the notion that they may have been greedy and considered only their individual interests. Why didn’t the Mōʻi Kauikeaouli take steps to alleviate the plight of the maka‘aina even after the Kuleana Act had run its course? The author states that it was because that responsibility had already been delegated to the Land Commission that nothing was done, making Kauikeaouli appear to be one of the victims of modernization and the bureaucratization of government.

But if Kamehameha III was a victim, he was still mōʻi, and therefore responsible for the maka‘aina welfare. Since none of the mōʻi after him would correct this great ʻhewa ‘wrong’ we must assume that at least some of the aliʻi were no longer willing to take responsibility for the needs of their people. In my mind, there is no question that the aliʻi stopped being accountable. I wonder if Kameʻeleihiwa realizes that the transformation of the aliʻi from konohiki to landowner may have been as traumatic for the maka‘aina as their separation from the ʻāina?

The real problem for western historians reading this book is that their own cultural metaphors are constructed around the classic liberal skepticism especially reserved for powerful institutions and the people who inhabit them. To accept a sincerity and nobleness on the part of the aliʻi while vociferously attacking the integrity of missionaries and businessmen may well strike them as being impossibly duplicitous. Furthermore, should the author’s admission that she herself is a descendant of the powerful Piʻilani genealogy that gave birth to Kaʻahu-
manu be taken as a sign of her personal bias?

Indeed, it is her genealogical claim, far more than her expertise in language, that separates Kame'eleihiwa from Dening and Sahlins and separates her work from theirs. For the culture, according to Kame'eleihiwa, is not simply language, it is genealogy. Just as ka po'e kahiko 'ancient people' could not express their history except through the mo'o kū'auhau, neither can anyone claim a Hawaiian identity unless they are linked to the lāhui by birth.

It is a typically uncompromising claim for this incredibly gifted scholar, and it strongly implies that there are limitations to a non-Hawaiian's understanding of our culture. This is a claim that she might have made even stronger except that she digresses into an unnecessarily contentious argument that haole should not try to be Hawaiians and that their genealogy forever bars them. It is not their genealogy, I think, but the ideologies that are nested in their culture that limit the haole understanding and acceptance of many things that Hawaiians take for granted. I wonder, for instance, how many foreigners, especially Americans, could identify with a Hawaiian's continued fondness for the memory of a landed and privileged aristocracy?

Kame'eleihiwa's argument is not a racist one. She says on page 326, "Foreigners should remember who they are and should be unashamed of their race." I agree.

I also know that reading her book made me proud of the ancestry we share. If pride in one's heritage is one of the more important gifts that a historian can bestow, as I believe it is, He makana māoli i ka po'e Hawai'i kēia mo 'olelo a Kame'eleihiwa. She has given to scholars a brilliantly exciting and thoroughly researched history that will spur debate and rekindle outsiders' interest in the Pacific Islands. Equally important to me, she has written a history that teaches and touches the young and older students who have little or no knowledge of their own history. She has lightened the burden of teaching and not many scholarly works can make that claim.

JONATHAN KAMAKAWIWO'OLE OSORIO
Kapi'olani Community College


Many if not most Westerners conceive of Pacific Islanders either as fun-loving, oversexed Sybarites or backward, head-hunting cannibals. Anthropologists commonly decry what Angela Gilliam calls "sex, savages, and spears" stereotypes (270) and blame the popular press for their perpetuation. But most contributors to this volume—a mix of ten Pacific Islander and American academics, former political leaders, and self-proclaimed "activists"—point the finger back again, claiming, as do the editors, that the "widespread nature of such images owes much to the continuing legacy of Margaret Mead and later anthropologists" (xix).