

Maunaloa, Moloka'i: An Ilokano Community in Hawai'i (1974-1976)

Michael L. Forman
and
Sheila M. Forman

This paper proposes to describe *as an Ilokano community* Maunaloa, Moloka'i in the State of Hawai'i, USA as it existed during our nearly two years of residence in 1974-76. Clearly this effort of ours at such description is problematical; how can some place not in the Ilokos, some place indeed many thousands of miles removed, some place in Hawai'i where people from Ilokos often describe themselves as "foreigners" be construed as "Ilokano"? Fortunately this problem has already been faced by others on whom we can lean. H.T. Lewis (1971) has described two barrios in the Philippines—one in Ilokos Norte and one in the province of Isabela in the southern part of the Cagayan Valley, concluding that the latter is still validly considered an Ilokano barrio. Our paper attempts to extend the distance and maintain the same claim. We utilize some of the criteria employed by Lewis, focusing on the maintenance of an "alliance system" (Hollnsteiner, 1963) and the extent of Ilokano language usage. Our observations on the social organization of the town support Lewis's contention that, aside from language, Ilokano culture is not fundamentally different from that of lowland Philippines.

The second purpose of the paper is to describe social and economic conditions that, over the years, modified the Ilokano character of the town (again focusing on language usage and the "alliance system").

A crisis, the withdrawal of the pineapple plantation company, in combination with the development of a nearby resort area, has, we believe, created a situation in which the alliance system can no longer operate. We predicted that Maunaloa would very shortly cease to be an Ilokano town.

Maunaloa is situated at approximately 157° 13' W longitude and 21° 7' N latitude on the island of Moloka'i. More specifically, it may be found at an elevation of 1,103 feet on the western slope of the extinct dome volcano Mauna Loa which reaches a height of 1,300 feet and forms the dry western end of the island.

The main county road that crosses the island and connects all the major communities ends at Maunaloa, which covers 200 acres of Moloka'i Ranch land.

Most of the houses in Maunaloa were built in the early 1930s. Most of the homes, except a few on the paved county road and two other small paved roads, are connected by narrow dirt lanes. Many homes have small front and back yard vegetable gardens. Scattered vacant lots around the town are extensively used for growing bananas, sweet potatoes, eggplant, bitter melon and other popular Ilokano plants. The use of these vacant lots was controlled by a complex "inheritance" system devised by residents. An analogous system applied to the allocation of several rows of detached garage structures.

Politically, the village of Maunaloa may be described with respect to federal and state governmental systems. Maunaloa has a federal post office and its own zip code: 96770. It is under the jurisdiction of Maui County which includes the islands of Moloka'i, Lana'i and Maui. The county provides Maunaloans with police protection. The state, on the other hand, through its Department of Education, operates Maunaloa's elementary school. Students must attend intermediate and high school at Moloka'i High in Ho'olehua, which is some 12 miles distant from Maunaloa. Some parents, however, elect to send their children to schools away from Moloka'i. During elections, villagers who are citizens may vote for county, state and national candidates.

Dole Company Office housing records in March 1975 showed the Maunaloa population to be approximately 850 persons with the following distribution of ethnic groups: Filipino (90%), Japanese (4%), Caucasian (3%), Hawai'ian (1%) and Others (2%).

Of the Filipino population, approximately 86% was Ilokano, 10% Visayan and 4% Tagalog. Approximately 13% of the Filipino population were pre-school children, and 20% 5-18 years of age. Approximately 13% of the Filipino adult population were between the ages of 19-31, 20% between 32-41, 15% between 42-51, 20% between 52-61 and 32% over 62 years.

The pattern of Ilokano settlement in Maunaloa was almost identical to that described by Alcantara for the Waialua plantation (Alcantara, 1975). Well over half of the Ilokano population arrived prior to 1947, practically none (1%) between 1947 and 1965 (a period characterized by restrictive United States immigration policy) and 44% after 1965, as a result of the liberalized immigration policies enacted into law that year.

Family reunification, which was a primary objective of the 1965 Immigration Act, was as successful in Maunaloa as it was in Waialua. In 1965, 73% of the permanent male Filipino residents of the town did not have wives and

families (Norbeck 1959: 62). In 1975 only 7% of the men were in the same situation. As in Waialua, the staggered arrival of Ilokanos at Maunaloa perpetuated the largely first generation nature of the town. Eighty percent of the adult Ilokano population in 1975 was born in the Philippines.

The Maunaloa of 1974-76 was different from Waialua in one very important respect. According to Alcantara, the decision of many Filipino employees to remain permanently in Waialua was clinched by the opportunity to buy plantation homes (Alcantara 1975: 10). "By 1974, almost two-thirds of the homes originally purchased by the Filipinos as old, existing plantation homes...had been replaced by newer pre-fabricated dwellings" (Alcantara 1975: 12). In contrast, that same year at Maunaloa, a local newsletter featured the following report:

No More Maunaloa?

The May 9th Maunaloa Community Action Council Meeting produced some rather startling news for the already shocked west end town.

A Moloka'i ranch employee surprised the 65 people at the meeting by announcing that they would not be able to buy their homes...because Maunaloa would probably be relocated. This was due to plans being made by the Kaluakoi Corporation. "There is big money here" said (the manager) in reference to the decisions being made concerning the future of west Moloka'i (*Pukoo Examiner*, Vol. 1, No. 5).

Maunaloa residents did not accept the statements reported above as final. They organized to try to retain the town and buy their homes and lots. Their activities and statements during this crisis made explicit what it was that they valued about a town which many observers have labeled nondescript and even shabby. Above all, the residents made clear, they valued the "alliances" they had successfully established. The remainder of this section will detail the nature of these alliances as Ilokano residents of Maunaloa described them.

Features of the "Alliance System" in Maunaloa

Lewis (1975) described the basis of Ilokano social structure as a combination of several ego-centered systems: bilateral kin groups, affines, agemates and friends, neighbors, workmates and ritual or fictive kinsmen. The total network of interdependence involving these social relationships is similar to the "alliance system" described by Hollnsteiner (1963: 63) as "a network of reciprocal relationships whose members extend to one another and expect mutual assistance and loyalty." The degree to which relatives and neighbors exchange goods and

services with one another is an important measure of the strength of mutual assistance networks.

Key informants in Maunaloa, when speaking of traditional values they wanted to preserve in the town, occasionally used the term *panagkakadua*, which translates broadly as 'feeling and behaving with responsibility towards one another'. This term is not normally applied to the whole village population, in everyday conversation, but is used for smaller networks of specific town residents whose day-to-day interactions demonstrate responsibility and good will.

In Maunaloa's networks, older men, including single men whether or not related, were explicitly recognized as integrated elements in the composition of the group. These men functioned as chief cooks for celebrations, as butchers, gardeners, fishermen, caretakers (for children) and so on.

These networks typically included six or seven families whose members were related to one another by consanguinity and/or ritual kinship ties. As with other descriptions of such networks in studies of Philippine social structure, it is not possible to define the boundaries between networks because they are in fact interlocking and overlapping and sometimes shifting as the result of the repatriation of members or major ritual events such as baptisms or marriages that introduce new ritual kin. We studied one such network closely and secondarily participated in the activities of another partially overlapping network.

The following are the most important and regularly shared goods and services within these networks:

1. shared services involving children, including watching each other's children, cooking for them and accepting general responsibilities to mediate in disputes among children;
2. shared food;
3. shared cooking activities;
4. shared gardening;
5. shared entertaining functions;
6. availability during emergencies;
7. helping newly arrived kin get started (with monetary donations being a typical form of help);

8. informing others about potentially dangerous situations;
9. looking after the needs of older members.

The few non-Ilokano Filipinos in town were also integrated into these networks.

In a survey we conducted of 146 Filipino residents, all the respondents said they had at least one fictive relative (“cumpares”, “cumpares” or ritual kin, and their children). Eighty-nine percent could name more than ten such fictive kin.

Maunaloans commented, during some of our earliest interviews, that the networks at Maunaloa were larger and more intact than the networks of other places they were familiar with in Hawai‘i. This, they explained, was what made the town a desirable place in which to live. Their convictions that, in this respect, the community was more integrated than other places they might be able to live are supported by data from Anderson et al. (1984). Table 1 presents these data which show that more Maunaloa residents stated that they shared consumer goods and services than did residents of either Kualapu‘u, the other Filipino community on Moloka‘i, or of Puhi, a predominantly Filipino formerly plantation community on Kaua‘i, or of a group of Filipino professionals mostly residents on O‘ahu. The latter group is not directly comparable to the first three since the professionals do not live in the same community. Anderson et al. were exploring differences on a rural-urban continuum, but their data are suggestive of the extent to which Maunaloans participate in networks of reciprocal relationships.

Lewis (1975: 14) cited cooperatively organized barrio fiestas as demonstrations of social cohesiveness. The frequency of such fiestas in Maunaloa and the number of residents actively involved in the months-long preparations for them impressed us a great deal during our residence in the town. By far the most elaborate and best attended of these fiestas was the Flores de Mayo, followed, roughly in order of importance or visibility, by Rizal Day, Parents’ Night and Christmas. Besides these, there were also numerous large baptisms, weddings, “bienvenidas” (welcome parties) for new relatives, and “despedidas” for departing kin. Some Maunaloans adopted first birthday baby luaus as occasions for large celebrations. The biggest of these fiestas featured organized folk dances by several groups of children and adults. There were also speeches, contests, raffles, bands, singing and dancing, and plenty of Ilokano food. Activities were efficiently managed by the residents, underlining the extent of organization and communication within the town.

Table 1

Sharing Consumer Goods and Services

Community	Number	Percent of Sample
Maunaloa	32	53.3
Kualapu‘u	17	37.0
Puhi	17	20.0
Professionals	0	0.0
<i>Consumer goods</i> chi square significance .0001		
Maunaloa	39	65.0
Kualapu‘u	17	37.0
Puhi	25	29.4
Professionals	5	23.8
<i>Services</i> chi square significance .0001		

Language in Maunaloa

While Lewis has described Ilokans as essentially like other lowland Christian Filipinos in culturally and socially significant ways, he recognized that at least one thing can reveal a particular Filipino community as Ilokano: “what clearly distinguishes Ilokans from non-Ilokans is language” (1971: 81).

Ilokans are noticeable as Ilokans by the way they speak, at least by the speaking of Ilokano. When we moved to Maunaloa we found from the first day that Ilokano was ubiquitous. Eventually we were to learn that the speaking of Ilokano was constrained in certain ways, but from the first we were scarcely ever out of earshot of someone speaking Ilokano.

The house which the plantation company rented to us, #333, was located in the middle of the third-lowest row of houses, facing the *bulangan*—the cockfight area—across two garden areas. These gardens were tended by a married couple who lived in the house at the south side of ours and by a single man, a camp barber, who lived in the house at the north side of ours. Paths which were in almost constant use by pedestrians cut through the spaces on either side of our

house. We could hear Ilokano being spoken by the people traversing these paths even when they were not speaking to us, nor yet aware of our presence.

On our first day in Maunaloa we met a man and his two children, aged four and two, both children born on Moloka'i and never away from the island. They brought food to our house as we moved in. One of the early topics of the conversation between us—conducted in Ilokano, Tagalog and some other variety—perhaps a variety of English or Pidgin English, concerned the ages of our own children (then four, seven, eight and ten). The father's interest was to know the ages of his own children relative to ours; when he had the information, he made a considerable point of instructing both sets of children in the appropriate use of the Ilokano kinship terms *ading* 'younger sibling', *manang* 'older sister', and *manong* 'older brother'. This neighbor's two children used Ilokano extensively in their efforts to communicate with us.

The garden in front of our house had large fruit trees at its corners. These were near enough to our house that often we could overhear conversations between those elderly Ilokano speakers who owned the trees and the many children who stopped to ask them permission to take some fruit. Through such events, we were soon enough able to develop a sizeable list of children who did use Ilokano in these conversations. Also, our growing closeness to certain families permitted us to observe the use of Ilokano in homes. We noted that many children were spoken to in Ilokano, and they normally responded to the parents' satisfaction to what were frequently quite complex directives given wholly in Ilokano. It was possible, and not at all unusual, to note Ilokano being spoken to children outside of the home: at the post office and the store, at gatherings in the community clubhouse and at picnics at the beach. Often on such picnics, we would notice one or two women off in a quiet corner reading a copy of *Bannawag* magazine, an Ilokano weekly published in the Philippines. Such copies were normally passed around among a set of readers, and in a number of homes we frequented, piles of back issues would be seen in the salas or more often stacked beside a sewing machine. Women were the main readers; there were only a few men we ever saw reading *Bannawag*. We did find a copy of Hermon P. William's English-Ilokano, Ilokano-English dictionary which one man had brought from the Philippines and carefully preserved, rebinding it himself with sewn-on cardboard covers.

What were the numbers of Ilokano speakers in Maunaloa? What percentage of the population spoke Ilokano? According to Norbeck in 1959, "[n]ative speakers of Ilokano, principally from the provinces of Ilokos Norte and Ilokos Sur, comprise nearly 70 percent of the total Philippine-born population of

Table 2

Language Use as Reported by Residents

Named as language most used everyday in Maunaloa	Percent of Respondents born in Philippines	Percent of Respondents born in Hawai'i
Ilokano	42	2
(Combination)	13	9
English	8	10
No scorable answer	16	0
	79	21

approximately 350 people" (Norbeck 1959: 57). A decade later Peterson (1970: 117) told us that 74 percent of Maunaloans spoke, read and wrote a language other than English. Peterson did not say what language(s) were involved, but he was comparing Maunaloa's 74 percent to the 54 percent of Kualapu'u, the other predominantly Filipino plantation town on Moloka'i. His figures were taken from the 1969 State of Hawai'i State Planning System study. It is likely that Ilokano is most of what produced those statistics.

Our own language survey in Maunaloa, conducted with the assistance of three Maunaloans, asked residents to say what was the language most used in everyday talk in Maunaloa. Forty-two percent named Ilokano. An additional 22 percent named Ilokano as one of a set of ways of speaking used, declining to exclude other varieties from their choice. Only 18 percent named English as the most used language. Even then, what "English" means in this context is problematic.

This language information on use and attitudes was not simple data to gather. The word "language," gave considerable difficulty because many use the word "dialect" for Ilokano, not "language," and are not sure what to call the varieties of English they use. Labels recorded include "mix-up" and "mix-mix," "halo-halo," "kapakahi" from Hawai'ian, meaning "askew, inside-out, backwards" (often pronounced "kapakay" by Maunaloans), "pidgin English," "bro-

Table 3

Language Use Reports by Immigration Periods

Languages selected 'most'	Pre-1946 %	1946 %	Post-1946 %	Date of arrival unknown %	Total %
Ilokano	10	7	21	4	42
(Combination)	1	3	7	2	13
English	7	1	0	0	8
No answer	2	7	7	0	16

ken English", "carabao English," "American English (because this is America)," "Maunaloa English", and "our English." In all the variety what seemed clear was that a high percentage of the verbal interaction in Maunaloa would, by Lewis's criterion, justify the claim that Maunaloa was an Ilokano community.

Possibly the amount of use of Ilokano in Maunaloa had risen throughout the decades, particularly so because of increased migration since the 1965 immigration law. Below is a closer look at responses of the Philippine-born Maunaloans, broken down by period of arrival. The split among the pre-1946 immigrants is noteworthy, but we are not prepared to discuss it in any detail here.

At least two local-born Filipino Maunaloa adults were recognized by others and identified themselves as Ilokano speakers. Both of them were born on Maui. The female worked in the store where she was the only clerk fluent in Ilokano. The male was recognized as a key figure in the weekend cockfights and said that it was an interest in cockfighting which motivated his developing skill in speaking Ilokano.

A number of Visayans were found to have learned to speak Ilokano while residing in Maunaloa. At least one case each of a single man, a married man, and a married woman can be cited. We are not sure of the exact number of Maunaloa residents born in the Visayas or born to Visayan parents, but we never heard Visayan spoken in Maunaloa (although we did hear it spoken a few times in East Moloka'i).

The Ilokano of all speakers showed signs of Hawai'i influence. Hawai'ian words such as *hula* and *lu'au* and *manuahi* (a gratis addition, a bargain) occur as loan words in Maunaloa Ilokano. The Tagalog of at least some speakers likewise showed Ilokano influence. Thus we noted that many speakers would use Ilokano post-clitic *mi* rather than Tagalog *namin* in their Tagalog, that Ilokano (and Visayan) *balay* frequently occurred in place of Tagalog *bahay* (house), and that people said things like *mabuti man* (fine thanks), using Ilokano *man*, rather than Tagalog *naman*.

Neither Norbeck nor Peterson provided figures on children's competence in Ilokano. We can provide a few relevant figures and some databased estimates, even though we did not do a full survey on this question. Reasons why such a survey would have been problematic are presented below.

The principal of the elementary school reported that "children from nearly 40 percent of Maunaloa School families speak primarily Ilokano at home" (Medeiros 1975). There were 120 students in the school (grades K through 6) at that time, coming from 67 different families. Ninety-three of the students had a Filipino ethnic background, but only 20 of them (or 16 percent of the student population) were born in the Philippines. Fifty-eight percent had at least one parent born in the Philippines. None of the teachers spoke Ilokano, although they did indicate willingness to learn about the language while we were there. In Ilokano orientation workshops which we organized, the one Filipina-American teacher revealed some competence in Ilokano of which even her co-teachers and principal had until then been unaware. The principal noted the

teachers' feeling that many students who have Filipino backgrounds would do much better academically and on standardized tests were there a good way for them to bridge the gap between the...American culture and language and their own.

The presuppositions underlying this quote should be noted: It is the students who are thought responsible for bearing the burden of doing this bridging, not the teachers nor the curriculum materials developers.

When we asked adults in the community other than the teachers to name children they could converse with using Ilokano, children (ages not specified) of 45 different families were named. A number of respondents said that there were many but considered it inappropriate to indicate names.

Our information adds up to a picture of substantial numbers of children in Maunaloa with at least some competence in Ilokano. It is clear to us that the widespread belief in Hawai'i that it is only Philippine-born and immigrant children who speak Philippine languages is a belief which does not accord with these facts.

Pressures Against Ilokano in Maunaloa

It is true, however, that the observation in any depth or the recording of children's speech in Ilokano proved exceedingly difficult. Although we set about making efforts to do so early on, it was only in the second year of our stay that we managed to obtain any extended samples of preschoolers' Ilokano. This experience was the source of some real frustration in the fieldwork, arousing our curiosity to seek explanations. We expect that in any research site in the Philippines, we would not find a similar difficulty. Why then was it so difficult to obtain tape recordings of childrens' Ilokano in Maunaloa?

The reason, we believe, is that many children had been taught to conceal their ability to speak Ilokano, to exercise their skills only covertly, or only with considerable circumspection if in less than very private settings. Some children and their parents would deny that children spoke Ilokano. For example, at a Parent-Teacher Association meeting at the school, a classmate of our then nine-year-old stood beside MF and spoke Ilokano, sotto voce, with her mother. A number of sentences went back and forth. As the girl turned to leave, MF commented to the mother that he had been unaware her daughter spoke Ilokano. "Oh, but she doesn't," "No, I don't", they said to him almost in chorus.

Why deny the ability to speak Ilokano? After all, it is a major language of the Philippines and the Philippine language most widely used in Hawai'i. The United States Congress has even declared it a matter of national interest to support the learning of Philippine languages by American citizens. One of us enjoyed the financial support of this program. The denial requires explanation.

It seems that in Maunaloa influential persons have persuaded parents that it is un-American and not beneficial for the growth, development and futures of their children for them to speak Ilokano. This message is communicated in a number of ways, and the persons most often mentioned as source are certain nurses, first, but also school principals from earlier years, teachers, and especially one well-liked woman of Japanese-American ancestry whose husband was a plantation official. Twenty-three parents in our survey reported that someone

had told them they should speak English with their children for the sake of the children's futures. This message was probably communicated indirectly too as children came to realize the status held by many of those residents of Maunaloa who cannot speak Ilokano.

We knew of five children, all born in Moloka'i and all speakers of Ilokano, whose parents had been told by health services professionals that their children were learning disabled, as evidenced by language development assessment devices. The screening tests in questions were, of course, tests which presumed the acquisition of English rather than the acquisition of Ilokano. Normal development in the speaking and comprehension of Ilokano was not even considered by the testers.

In another case which parents and relatives of a first grader asked us to look into, we found that the child had scored quite low on a "professionally administered" battery of tests, after referral of the child to the (Department of Education/Department of Health) Child Study Team by the Maunaloa School staff. Teachers said they thought the girl had "an oral-aural problem." The clinical psychologist who tested her reported that she probably had

specific deficits in the auditory-verbal channel in addition to the interferences due to her bilingual background...Her language problems are further compounded by her bilingual background, but this does not seem to be the main cause of her language problems. I would, therefore, recommend learning disability certification and special assistance as soon as possible, before negative attitudes toward learning begin to develop.

Neither this psychologist who did the testing, nor earlier testers, nor the referring teachers, nor the special education teacher from whose classroom this first grader "dropped out" spoke Ilokano at all. We were told by another member of the Child Study Team that it is standard practice to score an error whenever a child being tested uses anything but English. This was a norm quite out of sorts with the norms of talk in Maunaloa.

We do not believe such incidents are isolated. In another case, a child psychiatrist in the service of the State of Hawai'i described a particular child as 'inarticulate'. Being rather well acquainted with the child, we asked the psychiatrist for more detail. When we mentioned that the child was one we knew to be a speaker of Ilokano, a look of chagrin came over this psychiatrist's face, and he admitted that this possibility had *never even occurred* to him, particularly as the records showed the child was born in Hawai'i.

One thing quite evident to us was that on the part of persons employed as professionals by the State of Hawai'i to serve children in Maunaloa, there was little or no regard for the children's existing and naturally developed language repertoires where these go beyond the confines of English. Such a situation must have some effect on the children's natural development, and thus some effect on the community into which these children were being socialized. Children learn that many powerful persons they and their kin and neighbors come into contact with do not speak Ilokano. Some of the children are pressed into service, for a time at least, as interpreters for grandmothers or parents, e.g., when a government agency's outreach worker comes to the door. They are not paid for such work, of course, and nothing is done in their schooling to practice and polish their work as interpreters or to prepare them for professional employment to serve this need. Soon enough they learn that there are people who disapprove of the use of Ilokano in America, and they begin to become more circumspect in their use of it. Some decide to stop learning. For these children, if not for all, the pressures against Ilokano are threats to the social cohesion of the groups to which they would otherwise naturally belong. The child who can no longer participate in the talk of the alliance network may drop out of it, be lost to it. How many Maunaloa children will maintain and develop their Ilokano we cannot say. We can only hope it will be many, though we know this is not likely unless some things change very soon.

Threats to the Maintenance of Maunaloa as Ilokano

In addition to the constraints on Ilokano language use, the key threats to the community were the efforts (both implicit and explicit) of county decision makers to relocate and/or repatriate its residents.

The pineapple plantation company, which was the sole source of income for the vast majority of Maunaloa residents, terminated its employees on September 12, 1975. Few alternative jobs were available on the island. Since houses were rented from the company, the future of housing arrangement became critical, threatening the continued existence of the community.

County decision makers were either unaware of the value the Maunaloans attached to the maintenance of existing alliances or did not consider it a priority, as the following 1976 Maui County report suggests:

One of the immediate concerns of the Task Force was the unemployment situation. *Fortunately*, all but 35 of the 130 employees terminated by the Maunaloa company either *retired*, *relocated*, or found new jobs. (*Kalana o Maui*, 1976: 1) [emphasis supplied].

Unfortunately, however, many of these new jobs did require that families leave Maunaloa. We recorded the departure of 36 adults and 33 children while we were in Maunaloa. Friends report that the exodus continued until almost no one remained. We interviewed almost all those who left in the early groups, and the majority indicated they would have preferred to stay if there had been employment and housing options. Relocation alternatives were prominent in decision makers' discussions. One alternative offered by the manager of the Moloka'i Ranch (owner of Maunaloa land), at a May 1974 meeting reported by a local newspaper, was housing in a new ranch subdivision in Kaunakakai started earlier that year. The Moloka'i Task Force (a group authorized by the State Legislature to address the problems of Moloka'i) put money into an 88-unit low-to-moderate-income housing project just outside Kaunakakai, 17 miles away.

In late 1975 Maunaloa residents tried to pursue the option of purchasing existing homes and lots. "We took a petition around, asking who wants to buy houses. I had 150 signatures (there are 170 rental units—S.F.)" (Maunaloa Housing Committee meeting, January 31, 1976, Minutes, p. 15).

A few months later, the Housing Committee took an official vote, and the residents overwhelmingly chose the option of purchasing homes and lots in Maunaloa. The opportunity to do so failed to materialize for fifteen years. At one point, Moloka'i Ranch stated it would be willing to sell but that county zoning regulations would be a problem.

The county government also announced that federal funds would be used to construct housing to meet the needs of elderly Maunaloans—in Kaunakakai. Again Maunaloans objected. An elderly resident surveyed the town for a subcommittee of the Moloka'i Task Force, and there was virtual unanimity that such housing should be constructed in Maunaloa. Given the importance to elderly members of alliance networks, this response was not surprising. Task Force arguments about the conveniences of Kaunakakai (closeness to hospital, shopping, etc.) did not persuade Maunaloans to change their minds on this issue. Nevertheless, housing was constructed in Kaunakakai and excluded those elderly with children, reportedly to conform with federal definitions.

Another matter which figured prominently in discussions of alternatives for Maunaloans was incentives for repatriation. Two policies of the pineapple company and the union at the time greatly influenced residents to return to the Philippines: (1) lump sum pension payments coupled with free airfare to the Philippines, and (2) separation pay at the higher rate of eleven days' pay per year of work for those who would agree to return to the Philippines, as opposed to a

lower rate, without repatriation, of nine days' pay per year of work for those who would not commit themselves to leave Hawai'i. The union-company contract stipulated that those who accepted the benefits of the higher rate could not return to the United States.

Given the severity of the social and economic crises in 1974-76, these incentives were not dismissed lightly by Maunaloans. However, less than 20 percent of survey respondents said they intended to leave, and over half of these residents who did intend to leave specifically stated that this was not because they really wanted to but because they felt they had no choice.

Some bitterness was expressed about this lack of choice. A male immigrant in his early 30s who had come to Maunaloa in the 1970s summarized the repatriation dilemma and its relationship to alliance preservation goals:

To our father they say, 'Oh, if you go back to the Philippines, you will have plenty of money there; you will live like kings!' But to us, they say, 'How can you complain about the money you make here? Isn't it still better than what you'd make if you stayed in the Philippines? You young immigrants expect too much.' Both ways they get away with not doing anything to make it possible for both my father and me to stay here and live decently.

The irony was not lost on at least one old man: "They're *pau* with us. We can go home. But they need our sons for the hotel."

The attitudes of some decision makers toward the crisis had discernible impact upon residents of the town. There were a few residents who defended the unpopular relocation options as "progress," citing and repeating statements from county and company officials in defense of such a view. Such influences were important in determining how long and to what extent Maunaloa would remain an Ilokano town. The material we have presented clearly suggests that an erosion of the alliance system was taking place. Subsequent developments in Maunaloa—continued out migration because of the lack of options to buy existing homes and lots and severely limited employment opportunities—indicate that the residents' values, specifically those that relate to the maintenance of existing alliances, did not prevail.

In closing we would like to note, however, that residents' values had some impact on us as a family. The following is a quote from our field notebooks, dated 5 May 1976:

Sheila and I both note how much a role children seem to play in the inside-view definition of 'community'. People always talk about the children being a

major factor in what makes this a good community—how this is a good place to raise children—how they want to stay here, to try to preserve the community, so that their children can grow up here. Sheila observes that 'in the literature' few definitions or discussions of 'community' attend to the role or place of children. We note how we have been socialized into the Maunaloa view of community in that we refer to our own children in talking about how Maunaloa has come to affect us.

For years after our residence and study in Maunaloa, our children would look out at Moloka'i across the Kaiwi Channel and would ask when we were going back. We understood that it would likely not ever be possible, for the Maunaloa we had known would probably no longer exist. This year part of our family revisited Maunaloa briefly. We found the school and the post office still there, the general store still busy but under new management by a family who had come from India; we saw the same Moloka'i Ranch official who had managed the town when we left still driving around in a shiny company truck—but we found the gardens, the garages, and the old cockfight arena now bulldozed, our former house site now just a patch of weeds (the house burned down, we were told), and almost none of the people we had known still living there.

Acknowledgements

Michael Forman gratefully acknowledges a fellowship (F-74-227) from the National Endowment for the Humanities, which supported our first year of work in Maunaloa. The second year was supported by Michael Forman's sabbatical from the University of Hawai'i at Manoa. The ideas expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the National Endowment for the Humanities nor of the University of Hawai'i. As a family we wish to extend heartfelt thanks to the many in the community for welcoming us, assisting us, befriending us and helping us to learn and to grow.

References

- Alcantara, Ruben R. 1975. "Filipino Adaptation in a Hawai'ian Plantation Setting." Paper read before the Conference on International Migration from the Philippines, East-West Center, Honolulu, June 2-6, 1975.
- Anderson, Robert N., Blaine Bradshaw, and W. Niarders. 1973. *Moloka'i, Present and Future*. Honolulu: Hawai'i Agricultural Experiment Station.

- Anderson, Robert N. with Richard Collier and Rebecca Pestano. 1984. *Filipinos in Rural Hawai'i*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Forman, Michael L. 1974-76. Unpublished field notes.
- Forman, Sheila. 1976. *The Social-Psychological Context of Planning in Response to Industrial Withdrawal: A Case of a Filipino Plantation Town in Hawai'i*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawai'i.
- Hawai'i, State of. 1969. *Moloka'i Community Profile*. State Planning System, Community Action Program, Honolulu.
- Hollnsteiner, Mary R. 1963. *The Dynamics of Power in a Philippine Municipality*. A Community Development Research Council Publication. University of the Philippines.
- Kalana O Maui* 1976. March, 1976 issue. Maui.
- Lewis, Henry T. 1971. *Ilocano Rice Farmers: A Comparative Study of Two Philippine Barrios*. Honolulu: University Hawai'i Press.
- Lewis, Henry T. 1975. "Causes and Consequences in Ilocano Migration." Paper read before the Conference on International Migration from the Philippines, East-West Center, Honolulu, June 2-6, 1975.
- Medeiros, Elizabeth J. 1975. p.c., letter, 16 October, to Clifford Horita, Administrative Liaison Officer, Maui District Department of Education.
- Norbeck, Edward. 1959. *Pineapple Town: Hawai'i*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Peterson, John Malcolm. 1970. "Technology and Community in Two Plantation Environments." In *Moloka'i Studies: Preliminary Research in Human Ecology*. Henry T. Lewis, editor. Honolulu: Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai'i, (pp. 97-121).
- Pukoo Examiner*. Vol. 1, No. 5, Kaunakakai, mimeographed.
- Williams, Hermon P., Angel Guerrero and Santiago Gaces. 1929-1930. *Revised Dictionary: English-Ilocano, Ilocano-English*. Manila: Christian Mission. Two volumes in one.