

[Mouvement Ouvrier-Paysan] that sought to establish a populist democracy headed by ex-provisional President Daniel Fignolé.

In 1964 the exiles (except the Fignolé supporters) decided to unite under one leader, Paul E. Magloire, and to create La Coalition Haitienne. This organization published a weekly newsletter, *Le Combattant Haitien* for about five years and broadcast a morning radio program "Vonvon." In 1970 the coalition was dismantled to form La Résistance Haitienne which attracted a broader base of popular support.

When Duvalier died in 1971 a number of Haitian presidential candidates presented themselves in New York. Antoine Colas, Henry Vixamar, Emmanuel Fordes, and Ernst Fénélon campaigned actively among the New York Haitian population. At that time various Marxist-Leninist and Maoist political groups emerged from underground activities; today they number more than thirty.

Also in 1971, a progressivist coalition, the Comité de Mobilisation, was formed to overthrow the administration of Jean-Claude Duvalier. Before the end of that year, because of internal dissent within the Comité de Mobilisation, a new coalition, Le Mouvement Haitien d'Action Patriotique, was founded on an anti-imperialist and anti-dictatorial platform. The most recent, Le Regroupement des Forces Démocratiques Haïtiennes, was formed in 1977 to force Jean-Claude Duvalier out of office after he completed his six-year term.

While émigré politicians have agitated for the overthrow of the Duvalier administration, other Haitians have become eager participants in American politics. In 1968 Haitian Americans formed the Haitian American Political Organization, a group of activist Democratic party members. Haitian-American candidates for elective offices in Brooklyn and Queens have had little success; in 1977, however, during the campaign for mayor in New York City, black candidate and Manhattan Borough President Percy E. Sutton appointed a Haitian, Louis A. Brun, chairman of his "election committee on the nationalities."

Bibliography

Helpful surveys of the historical development of Haitian society are found in Sidney W. Mintz, *Caribbean Transformations* (Chicago, 1974) and James G. Leyburn, *The Haitian People*, rev. ed. (New Haven, 1966).

Articles in popular periodicals provide the most current information on the changing community of Haitian Americans in New York City. The most useful come from the daily papers in New York City. Jervis Anderson, "The Haitians of New York," *The New Yorker* (March 31, 1975), is very informative.

The first systematic study of the Haitian population in New York is an unpublished dissertation by Nina Barnett Glick, "The Formation of a Haitian Ethnic Group" (Department of Anthropology, Columbia University, 1975). It deals with institutional factors that have shaped the Haitian-American community in New York City. Also useful is Michel S. Laguerre, *Ethnicity as Dependence: The Haitian Community in New York City* (New York, 1978). Pierre-Michel Fontaine, "Haitian Immigrants in Boston: A Commentary," in Roy Bryce-Laporte and Delores Mortimer, eds., *Caribbean Immigration to the United States* (Washington, D.C., 1976), provides an overview of Haitian emigration to Boston and discusses their adaptation. *Migration Today* 7 (September 1979): 9-46, is a special issue on Haitians.

The situation of the Haitian family in the United States is discussed in Michel S. Laguerre, "The Impact of Migration on Haitian Family and Household Organization," in *Family and Kinship in Middle America and the Caribbean*, ed. Arnaud F. Marks and René A. Römer (Van Gorcum, Netherlands, 1978); and K.H. Rey, *The Haitian Family* (New York, 1970).

The status of Haitian refugees who have sought political asylum in the United States is examined in *Haitian Emigration: Report of the*

Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, and International Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 94th Congress (Washington, D.C., 1976).

MICHEL S. LAGUERRE

HAVASUPAIS: see AMERICAN INDIANS

HAWAIIANS

The ethnic designation "Hawaiian" is generally reserved for the descendants of the original Polynesian inhabitants of the Hawaiian Islands. A combination of circumstances has rendered the term ambiguous and variable in current usage, however, and it is far from clear precisely who is a Hawaiian in the contemporary world. The situation has been greatly complicated by Hawaii's history of immigration, which has produced a cosmopolitan population that includes substantial numbers of people with Polynesian, European, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Korean, Portuguese, or Puerto Rican ancestry as well as their various intermixed offspring. A particularly high rate of intermarriage between native Polynesian Hawaiians and immigrants has resulted in an increasing proportion of people whose ethnicity can be described as problematic. Some people regarded as Hawaiian may have only one great-grandparent of Hawaiian ancestry, while others may have nearly all Hawaiian ancestors. One person of mixed background may identify himself as Hawaiian; another of equal or greater genealogical purity may consider himself or herself something else. Some with a low proportion of Hawaiian ancestry may have had far greater exposure to traditional cultural knowledge and practices than others with a higher proportion. Furthermore, within Hawaii's multiethnic community, people of mixed ancestry tend to change their ethnicity according to circumstances. For these reasons the boundaries of the group are unclear, and official statistics pertaining to the Hawaiian population must be regarded as questionable.

A recent estimate of persons of Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian ancestry in the islands, based on a state Department of Health survey conducted in 1974-1976, is 151,652, making them the third largest ethnic group in the state following the Caucasians (*haoles*) and Japanese Americans. In this case the criterion for inclusion was reporting one or more native Hawaiian great-grandparent. In addition, according to 1970 Census data, approximately 27,000 people of Hawaiian ancestry reside on the mainland, more than half of them in California. This article discusses only Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians living in Hawaii. (For those on the mainland, see Pacific Islanders.) It is not clear how ethnic ties and ethnic identity have changed among Hawaiian migrants to California. Having a greater familiarity with the American way of life to begin with, they have had an easier adjustment than the Samoans and Tongans with whom they are sometimes confused.

The initial colonization of the Hawaiian Islands took place some 1,500 years ago by Polynesian voyagers, mostly from the Marquesas Islands more than 2,000 miles to the south. A subsequent immigration from Tahiti is believed by archaeologists to have contributed to their cultural development. The settlers thrived in the benign environment; by the time Captain James Cook

discovered the islands for Europe in 1778 the population had grown to approximately 300,000.

The Hawaiian language is a branch of Eastern Polynesian, which includes among other tongues Tahitian, Marquesan, Easter, and New Zealand Maori. In the absence of a written language, oral traditions played a great role in perpetuating cultural tradition and practices. At the time of the first European contact the Hawaiian social system was highly stratified, with a sanctified class of chieftains (*alii*), a class of specialists (*kahuna*) who controlled vital knowledge in arts and crafts, medicine, and religion, and a class of commoners (*makaainana*) who made up the bulk of the population. There was also a small pariah group (*kauwa*) of individuals who were regarded as ritually impure and degraded. The religious concepts of *mana* and *kapu* supported the status system. *Mana* refers to potency; it is power derived from the gods and genealogically inherited. The concept of *kapu* (taboo) refers to ritual avoidances, on the one hand, and the requirement for obeisance to persons possessing *mana* on the other. Failure to comply with taboos resulted in the imposition of supernatural as well as secular sanctions.

Among chiefs primogeniture was the principle for determining status, with first-born children of first-born parents taking precedence. Respect for rank based on genealogical seniority permeated the entire social system and was fundamental for ordering social relations. Even within families children were required to be deferential to their elder siblings. Among commoners, however, the importance of rank was complemented by a strong emphasis on affiliation and the maintenance of interpersonal harmony. Reciprocity between kinsmen was basic to the functioning of the extended family (*ohana*), which depended on a continual exchange of goods and services for its well-being. Chiefs functioned as redistributive agents within the economic structure, drawing from their subjects food and other commodities that they returned in the form of favors and ceremonial feasts. In general, the value of material goods was subordinate to the significance of social relationships; transactions were aimed primarily at affirming existing relationships and consolidating new ones. Generosity—the willingness to share what one had—was a primary virtue.

The extended family was rooted in the land (*aina*) of a particular locality and functioned as a corporate group for many purposes. It was the responsibility of the senior male to supervise the affairs of the group. He presided over family councils and exercised authority in such matters as worship, communal work, entertaining strangers, welcoming visiting chiefs, and other activities involving member households. The socialization of children was largely a concern of the extended family rather than the individual household, with all available elders taking responsibility for teaching children basic skills such as fishing, weaving, farming, and building. Adoption of related children was a common practice. Social harmony among family members was reinforced by a variety of customs and symbols, while conflicts were deterred by the threat of supernatural intervention.

The arrival of Europeans and the opening of the previously isolated islands to the outer world had disastrous effects on the Polynesians and the society they

had evolved. In 1819, a year before the arrival of the first Congregational missionaries from New England, the traditional religious system was dramatically overturned when Liholiho, son of the recently deceased Kamehameha and heir to the position of premier chief, or king, of the islands, broke some sacred taboos at a public feast. Along with the traders who swarmed to the islands, the missionaries wrought further great changes. They vigorously attacked many traditional Hawaiian practices and attempted to replace them with Yankee beliefs and customs. Commercialization of the economy led the chiefs to engage in trading and to claim rights in land, fishing grounds, and other valuable property that went well beyond traditional prerogatives. Pressure to make land available to aliens resulted in a redefinition and reallocation of land rights in 1848, in which less than 30,000 out of some 4 million acres were awarded to native tenants. The remainder were set aside for approximately 250 chiefs, designated as crown lands of the Hawaiian monarch, or placed in the public domain. By sale and lease, crown and public lands increasingly came under the control of foreigners, and many Hawaiians were enticed into disposing of their land for trivial sums. Combined with the demoralizing effects of depopulation from European diseases and other wrenching changes, this had a shattering effect on Hawaiian society, particularly on the welfare of the common people.

Like most Pacific Islanders who had been isolated for centuries and lacked immunity to newly introduced diseases, the Hawaiians suffered a tragic decline in population following contact with the West. The first official census of the islands in 1853 reported a total of 71,019 native Hawaiians, less than a quarter of the number who dwelt there before the Europeans came. The decline continued until 1910 when the total Hawaiian population, including those of mixed ancestry, dropped to 38,547. As a result of depopulation and the massive immigration of aliens brought to work on the sugar plantations that were established in the mid-19th century, Hawaiians became a minority group in their own land, and by 1900 Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians constituted altogether only 24.4 percent of the population. The proportion continued to decline despite the fact that absolute numbers began to increase at a rapid rate after 1910.

A high rate of intermarriage between Hawaiians and immigrants resulted in an increasing proportion of people with mixed ancestry. As early as 1853 nearly 1,000 people were listed in the census as "part native." By the close of the century the number of Hawaiians of mixed ancestry recorded in the census had increased to nearly 10,000, constituting more than a quarter of all Hawaiians in the islands, and by 1930 they exceeded those claiming to be "pure" Hawaiians. From 1930 through 1960 the U.S. Bureau of the Census classified those with any Hawaiian ancestry as part-Hawaiian. The category therefore had a residual quality, inasmuch as persons with any degree of Hawaiian ancestry not eligible for inclusion in other groups were so classified. The 1960 Census showed 10,502 Hawaiians and 91,597 part-Hawaiians resident in the state of Hawaii, composing 1.7 and 14.5 percent of the population respectively. In 1970, however, people of mixed ancestry were classified either by self-identification or by race of father, and

the part-Hawaiian category was dropped. The census report for 1970 is therefore not comparable with previous ones; it shows 71,274 Hawaiians forming 9.3 percent of the state's population. This compares with a health department estimate for the same year of 135,152, or 18.3 percent of the population, using the criterion of one or more native Hawaiian great-grandparents. A count based on language other than English spoken in the home during a person's childhood (but not necessarily by the respondent) yielded an estimate of 18,700.

Demographic data compiled according to ethnic designation in Hawaii for 1970 show the Hawaiians to have an exceptionally high fertility rate, more than double the state average; their median age was 20.8 years. Despite a drift to the city of Honolulu over the years, the strongholds of Hawaiian ethnicity remain in non-plantation rural and semirural areas, especially in relatively remote subsistence communities, on cattle ranches, and in Hawaiian homestead communities.

Contrary to its avowed purpose of rehabilitating Hawaiians by returning them to the soil, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 promoted movement to urban areas, partly because the areas allocated for homesteading were marginal lands unsuitable for farming; as a result most have been leased by wage-earners for house sites. Over half the lessees now reside on the island of Oahu within commuting distance of Honolulu. Within Honolulu itself, Hawaiians have always been the most widely and evenly distributed of all the ethnic groups.

A 1976 needs-assessment study of the Hawaiian people revealed that, although the population as a whole is not a depressed one, segments of it are. The findings showed considerable economic differences between the Hawaiian population and other groups in the state. The percentage of non-Hawaiians in professional and managerial occupations was almost twice that of Hawaiians (18 percent compared to 10 percent). Median family income for Hawaiians was some 15 percent below the state average. Approximately one-fifth of the families had incomes below the poverty line, and 22.0 percent received welfare aid in 1975 compared to 13.5 percent for the state as a whole. Nor did Hawaiians fare as well as other groups on most health indicators. Death rates at all ages were higher than rates for the general population. Hawaiians also have higher rates of specific conditions such as cancer, diabetes, coronary heart disease, prematurity, infant mortality, and congenital malformations. Other problems were noted in housing, education, and the law.

As a consequence of their overrepresentation on indexes categorized as social problems, Hawaiians have been a prime target population for various health, education, and welfare programs. Implementation of these programs has raised issues over the viability of Hawaiian traditions and customs. On the one hand, some commentators assert that Hawaiian culture is dead and that these social problems are the consequences solely of economic impoverishment. They point to the demise of the Hawaiian language (which is spoken only in isolated rural enclaves) and the disappearance of most other formal cultural practices. They advocate providing Hawaiians with better educational and economic opportunities so that they can more rapidly assimilate into the local middle-class society. On the other hand,

some see in the Hawaiian people a uniqueness that derives from their Polynesian past. Despite the loss of much of their cultural heritage and the acknowledged corruption of Hawaiian art and music displayed to tourists in Waikiki, many important values that formed the underpinnings of traditional Hawaiian life still show considerable vigor. Those of this persuasion advocate a revitalization of Hawaiian ethnicity and a unification of the Hawaiian community for the purpose of preserving the Hawaiian lifestyle.

A three-year study of a working-class Hawaiian homestead community on Oahu revealed that traditional principles guide the behavior of many contemporary Hawaiians. These researchers found that the people they studied placed a strong emphasis on affiliative values and deemphasized individual achievement. One manifestation of this commitment was a tendency among the residents to choose to invest resources in social relations rather than in the accumulation of material wealth. The more money people had at their disposal, the more they tended to expand the number of people in their households and personal networks. Extended families were prevalent in the community, and nearly one-third of the households contained children who were adopted, usually in accordance with traditional practices. Exchanges of food, labor, and other commodities between households were common. The researchers also documented the persistence of traditional supernatural beliefs and the practices associated with them.

Although the traditional social structure based on genealogical priority completely disappeared following the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893, seniority remains an important principle for allocating privileges and responsibilities, particularly among kinsmen. At the community level, however, leadership has been fluid and increasingly has been based on accomplishment. For some time following annexation to the United States in 1898, Hawaiian politicians, in alliance with the Caucasian elite, were a prominent force in the islands. This changed after World War II when political control of the islands shifted to Asian Americans; for most of the 1950s and 1960s Hawaiians as a group were politically passive.

The 1975 state legislature included seven representatives and three senators of Hawaiian background, and in 1976 the first Hawaiian representative, Dan Akaka, was elected to the United States Congress.

Sparked by a number of political issues and encouraged by the rise of ethnic militancy on the mainland, a revitalization movement developed among Hawaiians in the 1970s. Led by the younger, relatively well-educated segment of the population, several organizations have taken root that champion Hawaiian social, political, economic, and cultural causes. Interest in traditional art and musical forms, in the Hawaiian language, and other aspects of the cultural heritage amounts to a genuine renaissance and has become the focus of a revitalized ethnic identity.

But the central theme for militant Hawaiians has been the alienation of land and its abuse. In the mid-1970s Kahoolawe, an uninhabited island, but a place of social significance for many Hawaiians, became a symbol of the Hawaiian cause. The island is used by the U.S. Navy for target practice. In defiance of legal orders,

groups of young militants led by Walter Ritte and Emmett Aluli, occupied Kahoolawe for brief periods, forcing the navy to halt the practice bombing and in the process drawing national attention to their cause. They are leaders of an organization known as the Protect Kahoolawe Ohana, an outgrowth of a group founded in 1973 on the island of Molokai to fight for more public beaches. The organization has spread throughout the islands and is concerned with redressing the political, economic, and cultural grievances of the native Hawaiians.

At a conference in 1976 sponsored by the Council of Hawaiian Organizations, five common goals were defined and given priority: to achieve self-determination through establishing and maintaining political influence in the state of Hawaii; to establish a land base for use by native Hawaiians; to ensure that the educational system adequately provides for what the Hawaiian people define as their needs; to achieve economic self-sufficiency; and to strengthen the spirit of *ohana* (family) and *puwale* (cooperation) through the establishment of a communication system. The first edition of the *Native Hawaiian*, a newsletter reporting on issues concerning the Hawaiian people, was published in Honolulu in June 1977.

From the very beginning Hawaiians were receptive to outsiders and assimilated them through marriage, adoption, and neighborliness. The values placed upon generosity and *aloha* were extended to all, with the result that group boundaries were not clearly marked—by race, by language, or by culture. This has posed a serious problem for those who are attempting to mobilize the Hawaiian community for political purposes. As a rallying point some incipient leaders have encouraged antagonism toward groups in power, particularly the haoles, who have come to the islands in increasing numbers since Hawaii became a state in 1959. These leaders perceive mainland haole immigration as the primary cause of social, political, and economic changes that have disrupted their lifestyle, and they direct their anger accordingly. The critical problem for Hawaiians today appears to be the need to define what is central to their ethnic identity, so that they can mobilize effectively to pursue their common goals. Once this has been determined, it is likely that commitment to those goals will become a mechanism for preserving Hawaiian ethnicity.

Bibliography

For an account of traditional Hawaiian society, see E.S. Handy and Mary Kawena Pukui, *The Polynesian Family System in Ka'u, Hawaii* (Wellington, New Zealand, 1958). The social history of Hawaii following discovery is well told by Francine Gray in *Hawaii: The Sugar-Coated Fortress* (New York, 1972); Andrew Lind, *Hawaii's People* (Honolulu, 1967), provides useful sociological and demographic data. The effects of acculturation are explored in Ernest Beaglehole, *Some Modern Hawaiians* (Honolulu, 1939). Three more recent studies, Ronald Gallimore, Joan Boggs, and Cathie Jordan, *Culture, Behavior and Education: A Study of Hawaiian-Americans* (Beverly Hills, Calif., 1974); Ronald Gallimore and Alan Howard, eds., *Studies in a Hawaiian Community* (Honolulu, 1968); and Alan Howard, *Ain't No Big Thing: Coping Strategies in a Hawaiian-American Community* (Honolulu, 1974), treat various aspects of the contemporary scene.

ALAN HOWARD

HEALTH BELIEFS AND PRACTICES

Beliefs about maintaining health and curing sickness are part of the culture of any group. They stem from the

world view, symbols, values, and patterns of social conduct that together constitute the essence of the life of the group, its ethnic identity, and its adaptations to one of life's major concerns—health, along with its corollaries, sickness, mental illness, and death. Health beliefs are integral to virtually every person's daily life. They merge with, and are often difficult to differentiate from, other beliefs that govern behavior in such areas as religion, ritual, and relations among kin. Routine principles, usually unexamined, guide therapeutic activities and make up the practical strategies used to manage health problems effectively.

A few important distinctions will be helpful in the discussion that follows. First, beliefs and practices vary widely. People have all sorts of ideas about the nature of health and sickness—for example, that colds are caused by "germs" or an imbalance of "hot" and "cold" qualities in the body. They also have beliefs about how healthy they are and how best to stay that way, and about how to label and categorize various symptoms. When people decide they are sick, yet another set of beliefs determines how they will act and the choices they will make among the various remedies or nostrums available to them. Finally, beliefs help determine how people evaluate the efficacy of the treatment they choose.

Health beliefs fall generally into two categories: those concerned with preventing sickness, and those involved in treating sickness when it occurs. Cures can involve both technologic treatments (such as massage, herbs, drugs, or surgery) and symbolic treatments (such as rituals or talk therapies) or frequently both. All social groups for whom there are adequate medical ethnographic data have ways of controlling, and culturally approved ways of explaining, both dysfunctional behavior and ill health.

Most important, what is known about the health beliefs and practices of American ethnic groups parallels knowledge about the historical experiences of the groups themselves. Although similarities among group beliefs abound, in most cases a result of the widespread influence of the scientific medical system and its success in curing disease, the impact of scientific medicine has been restricted to the last 60–70 years. There are still many differences among groups, closely linked to the maintenance of other cultural traditions within these groups. Two factors in particular contribute to the diversity of American health beliefs and practices: the homeland medical cultures of immigrant groups, and American folk medicine—an amalgam of medical traditions existing in the United States prior to the 20th century.

Members of American ethnic groups who come into contact with orthodox medicine that differs significantly from their traditional practices will often react by ignoring the treatment prescribed, or misusing it, or complaining about the quality of the care they are getting. The results are generally poor. Nevertheless, almost everyone eventually does come into contact with the medical profession, and in the process acquires still other beliefs and practices which are then added to the ethnic and popular store of health notions. The results are considerably less coherent than those in a traditional cultural setting; they often diverge across family and individual lines, even within the same local ethnic group. A general description of ethnic health beliefs is