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Issues Regarding Hawaiian ‘Ki’i’

An Analysis of the Commercialization and Mass Production of Ancient Sacred Hawaiian Objects

Loxley M. Keala

University of Iowa | Art History Major
The ancient Hawaiian *ki‘i*, most commonly referred to as the tiki, has been a sacred object used by Native Hawaiians since the ancient Polynesian settlers of Hawaii migrated from Marquesas and the Society Islands.\(^1\) The *ki‘i* is an abstract wooden figure that would have been placed upon a *heiau*, or sacred landmark that consisted of a raised platform and hut-like structure that housed god figures and spirits of deceased ancestors (see Fig 1 and Fig 2). *Ki‘i* are unlike any cult statues seen in Classical Antiquity and were used throughout all of ancient Polynesia. They are abstract and highly stylized, with some being even unrecognizable as human figures. Some represent gods, while others represent deceased ancestors. Although each *ki‘i* is different and varies in size depending on where it was made in Polynesia, they share the similar stylistic features of large almond-shaped eyes, exaggerated mouths, and stance of bent knees in a wrestler’s pose (see Fig 3). *Ki‘i* specific to Hawaii possess what is called the Kona style and have wide mouths filled with sharp teeth. The Kona style is unique to the Kona coast and can be found on the big Island of Hawaii (see Fig 4).\(^2\)

The aforementioned *ki‘i* that represented a god or deceased ancestor was identified by its scarification tattoos found on both the figure’s face and body. Only priests were allowed onto the sacred grounds that housed the *ki‘i* because only they could be in the presence of the gods. Using the *ki‘i*, priests would perform religious ceremonies atop the Temple platform. Because religion was such a large part of Polynesian culture, *ki‘i* played a large role in ancient Hawaiian society.

Most cult statues used in Oceania resembled the *ki‘i* found in Hawaii. Though the religious figures have different names, they share similar characteristics and the common problem of being commercialized and mass produced to be sold within the tourist market. *Ki‘i*,

\(^2\) Ibid.
Kiʻi are being misrepresented and mass produced, and they are used as means to gain business within the tourism industry. The issue lies in the fact that kiʻi were originally used as sacred objects in rituals. Although under current US law the use of these sacred figures in “tiki bars” does not violate the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), it should be brought to attention due to its harmful effects on cultural pride. It should also be brought to attention because the replication and misrepresentation of sacred objects has been a problem for other Native cultures. Similar cases have been found within Native Indian and African communities.

The intent of NAGPRA is to preserve native cultures “with respect to the treatment, repatriation, and disposition of Native American human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, and objects of cultural patrimony […] with which they can show a relationship of lineal descent or cultural affiliation.”\(^3\) This means that any native religious or culturally affiliated object is protected under NAGPRA and therefore cannot be sold; any transfer that results in

---

monetary benefit is deemed illegal. Though a step in the right direction, NAGPRA does not completely stop looted native objects from being sold on the black market.

The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990, which was rectified since its original enactment in 1935, can and should be paralleled to the issues regarding the reproduction and profiting of counterfeit Native Hawaiian objects. The original Act of 1935 instated the Indian Arts and Crafts Board under the Department of the Interior in order to “‘promote the economic welfare of the ‘Indian wards of the government’”.

The government attempted to regulate counterfeit arts and crafts and promote the development of authentic Indian art. However, because there had been a lack of enforcement of the original Act of 1935, the government and Board revisited the issue and rectified the Indian Arts and Crafts Act in 1990. This rectification created harsher punishment for violating the Act, and infringement would result in a penalty of up to $1,000,000 and imprisonment for up to 15 years.

Misrepresentation of ki’i, due to its commercialization, has also become a problem within the art community. Not only is this an issue for Native Hawaiian art, but it is also an issue for African art. Although lawsuits have not taken place on behalf of the Native Hawaiian art community, according to past cases, this misrepresentation has been addressed with regard to African art. In the latter, it became an issue of cultural property.

In the Afo-A-Kom case of 1973, a sacred beaded statue from the West African Kingdom of Cameroon had been returned to its original location seven years after it had mysteriously disappeared. The case was made public when the work resurfaced in a New York City gallery. In this particular instance, the law was not in favor of the Kom. However, because many people

---

5 Ibid. 487-514.
rallied, the statue was given back to Cameroon. The Afo-A-Kom case proves that even without the help of the government, progress can be made to preserve cultural pride.

If issues involving both Native Indian and African art can be addressed through legislation or through public engagement, the same should happen for Native Hawaiian art. *Kiʻi* originally created for religious purposes representing deceased ancestors and ancient Hawaiian gods, should not be imitated or commercialized. Furthermore, this exploitation and mockery of the ancient Hawaiian culture must be brought to the attention of both the Office of Hawaiian Affairs and the state and federal governments. It is necessary for both the senators and representatives of Hawaii as well as the public to demand that sacred Hawaiian antiquities, such as *kiʻi*, be protected by NAGPRA.

Understanding the history of Hawaii is crucial to understanding the importance of *kiʻi* to the Native Hawaiian people. The Hawaiian Islands were first inhabited by settlers from both the Marquesas and Society Islands well before A.D. 500. Prior to western exposure in the eighteenth century, Hawaii had been in close contact with Tahiti, also in the Polynesian Triangle. Both ideas and influences were exchanged between Hawaii and Tahiti, which was especially seen in art. Among these include influences in Hawaiian pattern, language, religious practices, and temple ceremonies that were often led by the *kahuna* or priest.

Hawaiian society was separated, more or less, into three classes: the nobility, known as the aliʻi, the commoners, known as the makaʻainana, and the outcasts, known as the kauwa. Aliʻi were of deified genealogy and consisted mostly of royalty and *kahuna*. Classes also determined a

person’s *mana*, which was the “concept of mystical power” that was “embodied in people in rough proportion to their rank”.

*Mana* helped to reinforce class divisions and avoid *kapu* or taboo things; it became a system of religious law. *Mana* and *kapu*, together, created their political system to enforce social control. Just like each person in society, *ki’i* had a certain level of *mana*.

Religion is an important aspect of the Native Hawaiian culture. The religion of Hawaii consisted of polytheism and had both cosmic deities and protective spirits, called the *akua* and the *aumakua*. The *akua* had four major gods and many minor demi-gods, and were similar to ones found in Greek mythology. The four main gods were Ku, god of war, Kane, god of life, procreation, and the male-principle, Lono, god of agriculture, forgiveness, and healing, and Kanaloa, god of the ocean and voyaging. The demi-gods included ones such as Maui, who was said to have pulled the Hawaiian Islands from the sea with a fish hook and grapple with the sun creating longer days in the summer. It also included Pele, the volcano goddess, and her sister Namaka, who was goddess of the sea. *Aumakua* was a deceased relative or young child and could be either benevolent or malevolent; the latter if he or she failed to reach the land of the dead or was neglected by his or her descendants. Through this, came sorcery, which was the use of ritual practice and of human figure images as well as the use of totems. *Kahuna* possessed supernatural powers and could evoke that power through rituals. Artisans were considered *kahuna* because they often used rituals to assist them in the process of creating art. Because the high chief was said to be a descendant of an *akua*, they possessed the highest amount of *mana*.

---

9 Ibid. 14-6.
and when they died, their bones were “concealed in a remote burial”\(^{10}\). Some bones were even “encased in a basket-like image made of tightly knotted cord and set into the *Heiau*”\(^{11}\).

Post-Cook (or Hawaii’s first exposure to European contact), the islands of Hawaii became greatly westernized. Hawaiians had formed ties with Great Britain, which influenced both its worldview and form of government. Within the nineteenth century, Hawaii had become a monarchy. Its rule was first under Kamehameha the Great and lasted until the end of the century with Queen Liliuokalani. In January of 1893 a group of non-Hawaiian businessmen formed the Committee of Safety and on January 17, 1893, overthrew Queen Liliuokalani. The Queen was under house arrest and forced to surrender her position to the United States. President Grover Cleveland called for the restoration of the monarchy, however, both feelings toward Hawaii and its interests changed when President William McKinley came into office. President McKinley encouraged Hawaii to become a US territory, and in 1898, signed the Annexation Act, also known as the Newlands Resolution\(^{12}\). In 1900, the Hawaiian Organic Act “established the Territory of Hawaii, asserted United States control over the ceded lands, and put those lands 'in the possession, use, and control of the [federal] government'”\(^{13}\). The Organic Act gave the United States complete control over the Hawaiian Islands, and the only compensation Native Hawaiians received was through the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. Out of the 1,800,000 acres of land the United States acquired by the annexation, only 200,000 acres was set aside for “Native Hawaiians” to be settled and farmed. “Native Hawaiian”, defined by the Act, was any “descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian


\(^{11}\) Ibid.


\(^{13}\) Ibid. 192.
Islands previous to 1778.” Due to both the unlawful annexation of Hawaii and its less than accommodating compensation, the United States government must consider saving what is left of the Hawaiian culture, which starts with protecting ancient Hawaiian art, such as *kiʻi*.

*Kiʻi* vary in size from miniature, standing at two feet, to life size, and are highly stylized. It has large eyes, a wide smile, and stands with bent knees in the wrestler’s pose. Each *kiʻi* is slightly different depending on which deceased ancestor or god it was meant to represent, and could be identified by its scarification tattoos. The design of the tattoo on the figure would have resembled the design of the tattoo on the ancestor when they were living. Scarification tattoos were unique to each person and often symbolized a family crest. They were done in the traditional fashion and consisted of geometrical shapes. The difference between *kiʻi* made for gods and *kiʻi* made for ancestors was its amount of stylization; the more stylized the figure’s features were, the more mana the figure had. More mana was given to more powerful gods, followed by less powerful gods and then ancestors. The four main gods, Ku, Kane, Lono and Kanaloa were given very little figural representation and were depicted using repeating geometric patterns. Ancestors, on the other hand, had humanistic features.

The process of creating *kiʻi* included artists gathering, shaping and carving the wood. The process also included some kind of ritual, which usually consisted of communication with supernatural beings. Because the process required the calling of spirits, artists were considered to have supernatural powers. The creation of cult statues was strict and the process needed to be executed in a particular way; anything different could result in the empowering of evil totems that would haunt the living. It was the job of the *kahuna* to empower the *kiʻi* and give it the

---

proper mana. After the kiʻi was completed, it was placed on the heiau. Along with being placed on temple platforms, kiʻi were also placed on ship prows. This is because the kiʻi determined much of the destiny of the Hawaiian people. For example, certain kiʻi could grant the community a year of good farming or fishing.

Although kiʻi were sacred to the Hawaiian people, businesses within the tourism industry have appropriated and commercialized them in order to satisfy tourist demands, creating a large market for counterfeit kiʻi. Most often, the imitation and distortion of kiʻi is done in order to be sold to tourists visiting Hawaii from different parts of the world who are interested in learning and capturing the Hawaiian culture. This includes, but is not limited to, kiʻi found in “tiki bars” and kiʻi sold by street venders in Waikiki. Counterfeit kiʻi sold in Hawaii are relatively well crafted and can look Hawaiian to someone unfamiliar with its style origin. Similar to authentic kiʻi, replicas vary in size and have the stylistic features of large eyes and the wrestler stance (see Fig 5). However, businesses fail to be consistent in style and make the kiʻi an abbreviated piece of artwork. For example, some kiʻi sold in Hawaii possess stylistic features of similar figures made in the Marquesas. Similar to the Hawaiian kiʻi, the Marquesan figure stands nude in the wrestler’s pose. However, the Marquesan figure differs in eyes and arm placement. Unlike the Hawaiian kiʻi, figures from the Marquesas have large “moony” eyes and stand with their hands on their abdomen (see Fig 6). For tourists that are unfamiliar with different kiʻi styles, identifying discrepancies is near impossible. Prices of counterfeit kiʻi vary according to size and style and also depend on the location of the vendor at which the figures are being sold. Most range from $20 for smaller figures and can be sold for as high as $1000.

---

The Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601; 25 U.S.C. 3001-3013), that was enacted in November of 1990, was created in order to protect antiquities and artifacts of ancient Native civilizations, more specifically Native Indians, Native Alaskan, and Native Hawaiians. The statute applies to objects of antiquity that can be proven to have cultural affiliation with either Native American tribes or Native Hawaii. Through NAGPRA, Senate deemed certain objects to be protected by the statute:

“Human remains” include any that have been recovered and can be claimed to have cultural affiliation. “Associated” funerary objects include objects that were associated at the time of the ritual or ceremony in which the deceased was honored. However, archeologists have discovered objects that were often placed later and buried with human remains were not affiliated with death rite and in turn, these would not be considered “associated” funerary remains and would not be protected by the statute.

“Unassociated” funerary objects as a part of a death rite or ceremony of a culture are reasonably believed to have been placed with individual human remains either at the time of death or later”, but for the human remains in which the objects are affiliated that are not owned or controlled by the museum or the federal agency. Furthermore, the objects must also “related to specific individuals or families or to known human remains” or “as having been removed from a specific burial site of an individual culturally affiliated with a particular Indian tribe” (Sec. 2(3)(B)).

“Sacred objects” refer to “specific ceremonial objects which are needed by traditional Native American religious leaders for the practice of traditional Native American religions by their present-day adherent” (Sec. 2(3)(C)).

“Objects of cultural patrimony” refer to ongoing historical, traditional, or cultural importance central to the Native American group or culture itself, rather than property owned by an individual Native American, and which, therefore, cannot be alienated, appropriated, or conveyed by any individual” (Sec. 2(3)(D)).

Due to the vagueness of the term “objects of cultural patrimony”, the Senate Committee commented further as to say:

The Committee intends this term to refer to only those items that have such great importance to an Indian Tribe or to the Native Hawaiian culture that they cannot be conveyed, appropriated or transferred by an individual member. Objects of Native American cultural patrimony would include items such as Zuni War Gods, the Wampum belts of the Iroquois, and other objects of a similar character and significance to the Indian Tribe as a whole (Senate 1990:7-8).

---

Evidence for affiliation can include, but are not limited to, “geographical, kinship, biological, archaeological, anthropological, linguistic, oral tradition, or historical evidence or other relevant information or expert opinion” (Senate 1990:9).17

Parties involved in NAGPRA include federal agencies, all museums receiving Federal funding (including state, local, and private institutions), and Indian Tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations.18 Not only, is this an attempt to preserve Native cultures, but it is also an attempt to preserve cultural pride. NAGPRA allows people to stay connected to their ancestry in an otherwise commercialized area filled with tourism. While this is an improvement for the cultural preservation of Hawaii, it does not address imitations or replicas of sacred objects. In order to completely preserve the Native Hawaiian culture, it is necessary that NAGPRA consider counterfeit objects and take action to remove them from the market.

Success for the removal of counterfeit objects that were once sacred to Native peoples has been achieved before, setting precedent for why it must be achieved again. The Indian Arts and Crafts Act of 1990 was created due to a boom in counterfeit Indian sacred jewelry and objects sold within the tourism industry.19 These objects were produced by people that were not of Indian descent and made mostly in Asia, Mexico, and the Philippines. The rectification of the Indian Arts and Crafts Act in 1990 banned the reproduction and profiting of counterfeit Native American objects.20

---

18 Ibid.
20 Ibid. 487.
When settlers first migrated to America, Indian tribes began producing arts and crafts to be traded with white travelers. The beadwork and curios, contrary to what had been practiced in the past, were made purely for aesthetics and used for trade. After an exhibition at the San Francisco World's Fair in 1939, Indian arts and crafts were recognized by the public as a “viable genre of art”. This lead to many following art shows showcasing Indian art. Because of its increasing popularity, many non-Indian people started producing and selling their version of Indian arts and crafts. The imported imitation crafts began to dominate the market, taking 10 to 20 percent of sales from authentic Indian arts. The area affected most by imitation Indian art was Indian jewelry. Prior to the Act of 1990, the only action that was taken was internal. A private association, known as the Indian Arts and Crafts Association, was created. The association encouraged private sellers to join to promote honesty within the Indian arts and crafts market. Objects sold by sellers within the association would have a particular seal in order for people to recognize its authenticity. Although it was an attempt to regulate the Indian arts and crafts market, the association could not control abuses happening outside of the organization, which caused for government regulation.

Government involvement helped to regulate Indian art and keep counterfeit crafts from further dominating the market. The government also enacted the Indian Arts and Crafts Board to ensure its protection. The Board created a museum for Indian artists to showcase their work as well as helped those who were seeking grants and other forms of financial assistance. They not only sought to keep counterfeit Indian arts and crafts from flooding the market, but they also hoped it would help the self-sustainability of the Indian population and preserve its culture and

---

22 Ibid. 489.
23 Ibid.
Because the issue of counterfeit material being sold within the Indian arts and crafts market was addressed by the government, the issue of counterfeit ki‘i sold in the Hawaiian art market should also be addressed.

Not only should Native Hawaiian art be taken more seriously as to create statutes that protect against counterfeits, but pieces should be properly represented when they are authentic. Oceanic art in general is sometimes misrepresented and its meaning skewed in order to create a narrative that keeps the public interested. This also often happens to African art. Mary Rhoads Martin, a University of Iowa graduate student who completed her Ph.D. degree in Art and Cultural Policy, addresses the legal issues and ethics in her dissertation “Legal issues in African art”. Though it specifically challenges issues regarding African art, its foundation is similar to and can be applied to Oceanic art. Her introduction familiarizes the reader with Unpacking Culture: Art and Commodity in Colonial and Postcolonial Worlds, edited by Christopher B. Steiner and Ruth B. Philips and Steiner’s theory of authenticity, which, as Rhoads Martin explains, “is key to understanding the non-Western art market”. Both Steiner and Philips claim that with the expansion and evolution of the western world, there has been an increasing fascination with its “opposite”, meaning things that are non-western and “one of a kind”. This is what Rhoads Martin considers to be “savage fetishes” of the western peoples which contributes to western views of non-western art.

Rhoads Martin also addresses the ongoing problem of forgeries found within the African art market, which is similar to the ones found within both the Indian and Hawaiian art market.

---

26 Ibid. 19-20.
27 Ibid. 1.
One of the larger issues is that skilled forgers are able to get their works to pass thermoluminescence tests. They do this by placing a portion of an old work in the new work, making the new material difficult to detect.\textsuperscript{28} In 1991, for example, Sotheby’s auction house sold a forged terracotta ram from Mali for more than a quarter of a million dollars.\textsuperscript{29}

The misrepresentation of African and Oceanic art has also been an ongoing issue. This includes art exhibited in museums and art that have been sold to private collectors. It involves changing the meaning and function of the piece in order to better suit the narrative of the exhibit or collection. Within her dissertation, Rhoads Martin cites Shelly Errington’s \textit{The Death of Authentic Primitive Art and Other Tales of Progress}, in which Errington “catalogues how non-Western art was displayed over time, from the ethnographic museum to the art museum”.\textsuperscript{30} Errington mentions that although Europeans saw African art as primitive, Africans saw their own art as innovative and advanced, which is also the case for Native Hawaiians. Rhoads Martin continues by stating European interest in museum exhibition was to parade conquests of the British Empire, making spectacles of non-Western cultures.\textsuperscript{31}

With misrepresentation of African art by museums comes the misrepresentation of African art by private collectors. Steiner, in his article “The Art of the Trade: On the Creation of Value and Authenticity in the African Art Market,” mentions that manipulating the function of objects in order to fit a certain narrative is not necessarily limited to the African art market, but is “practice[ed] among art dealers around the world”.\textsuperscript{32} He gives an example of exhibitions staging a certain “discovery” of “unknown” objects in order to create a higher demand and fetch higher

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid. 125.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Ibid. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Ibid. 21.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
prices within the market.33

Both state and federal governments, as well as with the public, should be concerned with the issue of counterfeit objects and the misrepresentation of Native Hawaiian art because it deals with cultural pride and preserving the Native Hawaiian culture. The foundation is respect for another’s cultural and religious background. In order for this to happen, Hawaii must first gain higher recognition from state and federal governments. Hawaii was overthrown and made a territory of the United States without any sort of “consent or [proper] compensation”, resulting in “Native Hawaiians [being] at the bottom of the socio-economic scale in their own islands”.34 Many Native Hawaiians argue that they should once again reach self-sustainability. This would involve Hawaii gaining sovereignty. Others argue that it is the obligation of the state and federal governments to help Native Hawaiians. The latter in order to properly compensate Hawaiians for unethically claiming their land.

Alongside the issue of compensation was the issue of the federal government not wanting to grant Native Hawaiians “federal recognition”. “‘Federal recognition’ is a term used to describe the government-to-government relationship between the federal government and American Indian governing bodies in a political relationship”, and determines how the two parties interact with one another. According to Kevin Gover, Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs for the Department of the Interior, gaining “recognition” can be achieved either through Congress or the executive branch creating a treaty, or by executive order. It is important because it determines “how the Supreme Court will interpret statutes, legislation, or programs specifically designed to give aid or preferential treatment to Native Hawaiians”. In other words, due to “federal

recognition”, issues such as the commercialization and mass production of ancient Native Hawaiian sacred objects, such as *kiʻi*, should be taken to and addressed by the Supreme Court using the “racial basis standard of review”. As of 2006, there are 550 federally recognized Native American nations within the United States, done through either the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Interior, or through congressional action. Native Hawaiians were not included until 2009, when Congress passed the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act, also known as the Akaka Bill. It was only until 2009, that Hawaiians received (minimal) compensation, causing for more action to be done in order to preserve the Native Hawaiian culture.

Difficulties with creating a law that prohibits counterfeit *kiʻi* include whether or not it would apply to cultural institutions such as the Polynesian Cultural Center located in the city of Laie on the island of Oahu (see Fig 7). The Polynesian Cultural Center (PCC) welcomes tourists from all over the world and encourages them to better understand the cultures of Polynesia. The Center is sectioned off by the different islands that make up Polynesia and are meant to resemble its actual landscape. Though seeming like a Polynesian theme park, it enables visitors to experience a day in the life of an ancient Polynesian. Activities involve learning how to basket weave, playing the native drums, and dancing the hula. It also offers a *luau* dinner with authentic Hawaiian food and live entertainment. The beauty of PCC is its relationship with the Brigham Young University of Hawaii. Students of the University are from all over Polynesia, and should they decide to work for PCC, would have the opportunity to have their education fully paid for. Another benefit is that most of the college students who work for the PCC are stationed in the

---

36 Ibid. 186.
section of the center that represents the island they originate from.37 Should a statute be put into place prohibiting counterfeit kiʻi, not only could PCC suffer, but it could also lose its ability to help hundreds of college students. Because of this, the statute should exempt the Polynesian Cultural Center and allow them to display accurate replicas of kiʻi. However, each figure must be correctly labeled.

There are many problems regarding kiʻi that need to be addressed and many aspects that must be considered, making finding a solution more difficult. First, action must be taken, if not to eradicate counterfeit kiʻi being sold for profit, then to regulate it. In order for regulation, it is crucial that both state and federal governments become involved. Among institutions that must be involved, is the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, who maintains the civil relationship between Native Hawaiians and the government and has Hawaii’s best interest in mind. It is necessary for both the senators and representatives of Hawaii, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, and the public of Hawaii to demand that sacred Hawaiian antiquities, such as kiʻi, be protected by NAGPRA.

---

37 Grace, Alfred. interview by Loxley Keala. 2017. Chief Executive Officer of the Polynesian Cultural Center (February 22).
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