



A · M · E · R · I · C · A · N
A N T H R O P O L O G I C A L
A S S O C I A T I O N

WILEY

Observations on the Anthropology of Hawaii

Author(s): A. L. Kroeber

Source: *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Apr. - Jun., 1921), pp. 129-137

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the American Anthropological Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/660422>

Accessed: 23-02-2020 08:22 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Anthropological Association, Wiley are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *American Anthropologist*

American Anthropologist

NEW SERIES

VOL. 23

APRIL-JUNE, 1921

No. 2

OBSERVATIONS ON THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF HAWAII

By A. L. KROEBER

THE First Scientific Conference held under the auspices of the Pan-Pacific Union at Honolulu, August 2 to 20, 1920, can best be described as surprisingly successful. The well-planned arrangements were realized smoothly, and the intelligence, hospitality, and forethought of the island residents made the conference equally pleasurable and profitable to visitors. The attendance of delegates, of whom there were fifty from outside the Hawaiian Islands, was large and representative enough to invest the proceedings with the quality of stimulating seriousness. At the same time the conference remained sufficiently compact to render not only sectional meetings but the general sessions worth while to all. Thus geographers, geologists, zoölogists, botanists, and anthropologists were drawn together. The writer recalls no scientific gathering in his experience that was characterized by so lively a spirit as this one.

The anthropological delegates present included F. Wood-Jones, Gerard Fowke, Clark Wissler, W. E. Safford, A. M. Tozzer, A. L. Kroeber, K. Kishinouye, and N. Yamasaki; and of local students, or those for the time attached to the Bishop Museum, W. T. Brigham, J. F. G. Stokes, K. Emory, J. S. Emerson, T. G. Thrum, R. T. Aitken, L. R. Sullivan.

In view of the interest in Hawaiian anthropology which the conference will surely help to spread, the following observations of a first time visitor are offered.

Ethnology and Archaeology. It was the unanimous opinion of

those present at sectional meetings that in this region ethnology and archaeology cannot be divorced even temporarily. There appear to be ancient remains of but one culture in the Hawaiian islands—at least nothing significant of any other has yet been noted. This culture is that of the inhabitants whom Cook found, and is given an apparently reliable perspective of at least some centuries, provided a critical attitude is not wholly laid aside, by native tradition. To those who view such material askance, it may be said with positiveness that the temper of the Polynesian and of the North American Indian as to legend is strikingly different, and that oral tradition thus becomes a far more reliable and valuable tool in Hawaii than on the continent. The result is that archaeological studies carried on as such would promise to become mechanical and barren, unless unforeseen findings should develop; and on the other hand ethnology pursued without reference to archaeology would remain unnecessarily intangible. There thus exists for Hawaii a fortunate condition of almost enforced correlation of the two lines of work such as in America is most nearly approximated in the Southwest but nowhere quite attainable.

For the accumulation of new ethnological data the prospect does not seem promising in Hawaii. Something of the old life of course persists along with the language. But it is a full century since the natives, even before the arrival of the missionaries, deliberately broke up their religion and system of taboo. That this act meant a self-disembowelling of the culture needs no argument. A mass of data can still be obtained with patience; but it is likely to consist in the main of corroborations and variants. One subject alone seems to have been neglected, native music. There is urgent need of a systematic collection of phonographic Hawaiian songs and chants, many of which appear to be preserved among the older people uninfluenced by our music. An analytic study of the art by a specialist in the history and theory of music would then be possible.

If new discoveries are likely to be limited, it is because the ethnological literature on Hawaii is really large. At the same time it is very scattered. For something like half a century T. G.

Thrum's "Hawaiian Annual" has regularly contained material of great value. But who would look for first hand and high class ethnology in an almanac and year-book, and how many libraries possess a complete file? The non-specialist in Polynesian anthropology is likely to have an impression that relatively to its importance Hawaiian ethnology has been neglected. This is because of the lack of a single, well-rounded book to serve for ready and authentic reference, and because much of the literature that possesses high intrinsic merit is cast in apparently unscientific form. A general work on Hawaii written for the non-Hawaiian by a modern ethnologist would be welcome in many quarters—much more than residents on the islands, whom daily experience and continued reading have steeped in the subject, can easily imagine. It may be that such a work will soon be produced, either as a unit or as part of a comprehensive ethnic history of Polynesia, by the large-scope investigations in progress under the auspices of the Bishop Museum.

Racial and Psychological Anthropology. The impression that there is a Negroid strain in the Hawaiians can hardly be escaped. Their resemblance to the less specialized Mongoloids, such as East Indians and American Indians, is even more striking. At the same time, so far as the Hawaiians may be representative of the Polynesians generally, there is no doubt that these people form a highly specialized race, not easy to include off-hand in one of the recognized primary divisions of mankind nor to ally specifically with any subdivision. Whether this race has evolved through mixture, through the influence of environment in Polynesia or a former habitat, or through the influence of mutations which geographic isolation has preserved and fostered, will be an intricate and interesting problem to solve. The systematic researches which Mr. L. R. Sullivan of the American Museum of Natural History is carrying on for the Bishop Museum will no doubt commence the replacing of speculations on these topics by interpretations based on facts.

The Polynesian temperament is also difficult to formulate. We are wont to think of these people as child-like, affable, impres-

sionable, passionate, imaginative, volatile, gross, inconstant; yet very brief contacts reveal unsuspected qualities of reserve, shyness, humor, and stubbornness. So much is clear: their psychic life surely presents more sharply diverse facets than the coherent temperament of the American Indian. How far this difference may be congenital or on the other hand the effect on each individual of being reared in a more complexly coruscating culture is another problem that only the future can answer.

In one respect the Hawaiian Islands of today offer an unparalleled opportunity to the psychologist of race: there exists almost no color discrimination among the many races and nationalities. This means that when comparative tests or observations are made, there will be much less of social influence to eliminate before the mental workings of the individual or hereditary group are reached. What this promises, psychologists will be quick to appreciate who have run afoul of the entanglements of culture. A form-adjusting experiment inevitably results differently with a people that has and one that has not the custom of handling numerous devices and of working machinery. How much of the result is due to the subjects' inborn faculty and how much to the habits in which environment has immersed them, is usually pure estimate. In Hawaii, natives, Caucasians, and at least the island born among the Orientals attend the same schools and speak English familiarly. The subtle line that ever hems in the American negro before the white is scarcely sensed here. To be sure, there are social barriers; but they are mainly those of breeding and economic circumstance, rather than of race as a crystallized symbol. At any rate, Hawaiians and Chinese often associate and intermarry with Americans, and in no public matter, whether of residence, conveyance, business, or pleasure, is there exclusion on the basis of nationality or color. Of course, it would be contrary to human nature were prejudice and its consequences wholly wanting. But there is astonishingly little of it in evidence in Hawaii; so that a carefully and vigorously planned investigation in comparative psychology would more readily yield dependable results than almost anywhere else.

Insanity. An unusual opportunity for comparative racial

and social studies is afforded in the territorial hospital for the insane at Honolulu, where the mentally ill of the most heterogeneous nationalities live side by side in comfort and apparently greater contentment than in most asylums peopled by members of a single race. In the absence of Dr. W. A. Schwallie, head of the institution, Captain Abrahamsen was good enough to allow the writer observation of the inmates. He also furnished the following summary of their numbers as of June 30, 1920: Hawaiian, 53; part Hawaiian, 15; Chinese, 46; Portuguese, 50; Japanese, 83; American, 14; British, 2; German, 3; Russian, 7; Filipino, 23; Korean, 39; Spanish, 5; Porto Rican, 18; others 12; total, 370, of whom 104 were females.

When these figures are compared with those for the population estimates for 1919 (the 1920 census data on race are not yet available), there are some surprising results. The Chinese, who have been the longest settled of all the Asiatics on the islands, and have the reputation of keeping their insane at home as long as possible, constitute less than 9 per cent of the population but furnish 12 per cent of the asylum inmates. On the other hand, the Japanese figures are respectively 42 and 22 per cent. Thus the Chinese are more than twice as inclined to mental disease necessitating institutional treatment as the Japanese. A social cause is difficult to assign. A fair proportion of the Japanese are married and almost invariably are rearing families; but the Chinese, who have fewer women, are considerably intermarried with Hawaiians, from whom the Japanese rather rigorously hold aloof. It is quite possible that the underlying cause is either hereditary disposition or something as yet undetermined in the cultural ideals of the two nationalities. The sex proportion in the asylum is about the same: Chinese, 6 women out of 46; Japanese, 12 out of 83. Yet in the population at large there were in 1910 among the Chinese 9 men to every adult woman, among the Japanese but 3. It may be added that everyone on the Islands to whom I mentioned the racial disproportion was unaware of it. At the hospital the Japanese have the reputation of entering in acute states but of being most set of all the nationalities on recovering health and most

frequently doing so. This would point to manic-depressive and perhaps graver psycho-neurotic conditions. On the other hand, my casual survey left me with the impression of dementia praecox as the typical Chinese malady. Placid and vaguely smiling reactions among the Chinese patients are numerous in my memory.

As for the Koreans, they seemed listlessly apathetic. Their numbers are astonishing: less than 2 per cent of the population, 10.5 per cent of the inmates, all of them males. The Koreans are much the latest comers of the Asiatics in Hawaii, and have brought but few women: in 1910 fewer than a tenth of the adults were women. They show somewhat more inclination than the Japanese to marry Hawaiians.

The Filipinos, who are mostly Bisayans and Ilocanos and are bringing some wives—many of whom retain their home style of dress—have a healthy record: over 8 per cent of population, only 6 of insane. The sex proportion among their insane is probably not far from that in their whole population: 19 to 4. The Filipinos probably represent a selection of a more enterprising and vigorous element in the home population than the Koreans.

The Hawaiians form 8.5 and the part Hawaiians—mostly of Caucasian and Chinese admixture—6 per cent of the population, as against 14 and 4 per cent of the insane. The aggregate difference is not large: 14.5 to 18. In view of the apparent low frequency of insanity among most uncivilized peoples,—at any rate as determined for the North American Indians by Hrdlička—the ratio might be expected to run the other way. However, Polynesian culture was far from low, and for the last fifty years most Hawaiians have lived much the life of whites in the same economic circumstances. For instance they are nearly universally literate. Then, too, there is a probability of their rather wide-spread syphilitic infection. Captain Abrahamsen is inclined to look upon this as contributory to their rather high insanity rate. On the other hand, Dr. J. R. Judd of Honolulu is of the opinion that the Hawaiians are not more luetic than most populations. Statistics do not seem obtainable.

Women outnumber the men by 40 to 28 among the insane

Hawaiians and part Hawaiians. Among American Indians, Hrdlička found more than twice as many men as women. The sheltered, subordinate position of the Indian woman and the free social status of the Hawaiian woman may account for the difference. But there may also be an inherent racial difference.

For Caucasians of North European ancestry the populational percentage is 12, of insane 7. But these nationalities own most of the wealth of the Islands, so that it is likely that their mentally diseased frequently come to sanatoria on the mainland instead of the public hospital. Then, too, the American population consists perhaps one fourth of soldiers, who would also not enter the territorial civil hospital. For these reasons the apparent low insanity rate of these nationalities can not be accepted at face value.

The Porto Ricans are new-comers in Hawaii, aggregating 2 per cent of the population, whereas they contribute 5 per cent of the insane. One third of these are women, which is also the sex proportion in the population.

The Portuguese are from the Madeira and Cape Verde Islands, and are distinguished as black and white according as they carry or do not carry negro blood. The white seem more numerous. They have the reputation of being quarrelsome, perversely stubborn, and given to petty thieving. In the asylum they are considered the most intractable, insistent, violent, and least likely to recover of all nationalities. As might be expected, the proportion of insane is rather high: 13.5 as against 9.5 of the sane population. Both in the population and among the insane there are about as many women as men.

In summary, the ratio which the number of committed insane of the principal nationalities bears to the number expectable on a populational basis is approximately as follows:

Japanese55
N. European Caucasian	[.60]
Filipino75
Hawaiian, full and mixed bloods	1.25
Chinese	1.33
Portuguese	1.40
Hawaiian, full bloods only	1.65
Porto Rican	2.50
Korean	5.50

It is evident that it would be of exceeding theoretic interest, and no doubt of practical social value also, if the causes of these striking differences could be determined, especially in connection with the strength of respective tendencies toward the several forms of psychosis. Considerable painstaking investigation would probably be required to obtain sufficiently accurate data; but once secured, the information might well shed light on the psychiatric problem of the causes of insanity as well as on race problems.

At any rate, these facts serve to exemplify the unusual yield with which the Hawaiian field promises to reward a broadly viewed and systematic investigation of its race elements.

Language. The Hawaiian language retains greater vitality than the Hawaiian race. It is spoken by all full and probably nearly all mixed Hawaiians; by a considerable proportion of the longer settled Americans, including the most cultured strata; is partly understood by many of the others; some dozens of words have entered the vernacular English of speech and print; and nearly every one, whatever his nationality, has a few phrases at command. As it is one of the few languages whose orthography is phonetically consistent, it can be read at sight by anyone who speaks it and knows the Roman alphabet. The one theoretically regrettable feature of its spelling is the omission of the apostrophe to denote the glottal stop. But local residents, knowing the language, know where the stop falls though unwritten—and it is gratifying to hear it consistently pronounced by Anglo-Saxon larynges; while the philologist can easily supply it by comparison with other Polynesian dialects, in which it appears as k.

Since no Polynesian language seems to have been described by a phonetician, the following notes, based unfortunately on exceedingly brief observation, are presented.

The vowels are spoken grindingly, with the opposite quality from what we consider the open singing voice. The same handling of the larynx appears to be characteristic of old time Hawaiian chanting. The general effect of the language is therefore far less "musical" than its printed forms would suggest.

E, o, i, u are close, but not stringently so. E and o especially,

perhaps because they lack our *y* and *w* vanishes, seem almost as near to the English open as close vowels.

Accent is never written, but falls so preponderatingly on the penultimate vowel that for scientific purposes it should be recorded when it rests elsewhere.

The stops *p* and *k* are aspirated to about the same degree as in American English in the same position. They appear to lack the unaspirated quality of French surd stops and the momentary voicing characteristic of the "intermediate" stops of many American Indian languages, although on theoretical grounds such quality might be anticipated in a tongue that possesses only one series of stops to its Melanesian and Malaysian congeners' two.

Hawaiian *k* is sometimes described as being as near *t* as *k* in formation. I did not detect this articulation in my informants, and was told that it was chiefly characteristic of the island of Kauai but was going out of use.

The glottal stop is produced with unusual firmness. When intervocalic it is plainly audible in all but the most hurried or mumbling speech.

M and *n* call for no comment.

W is made with less rounding than in English, so that it approximates a bilabial *v*. Americans sometimes render it by a labiodental *v*. As Hawaiian *w* corresponds to *v* in most Polynesian dialects, its quality has historic grounding. What is written as intervocalic *u* seems sometimes to be *w*: I heard Kauai consistently as *Kawai*; but Maui, not *Mawi*.

H is vigorous and made with sufficient construction to suggest a feeble fricative.

L is evidently produced with the tongue more elevated than in English: I occasionally heard it first as *r* or *n*.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.