Br. Marold S. Palmer 2331 Hyde Street Honolulu 14, Hawaii

DEAR DR. PALMER:

{

Thank you very much for your interesting letter of the 8th. During my stay in Hawaii, I enjoyed the place very much and hope to get back again someday. I found many interesting myths or better, figments of the inmagination. These are freely conjured up by the natives and half casts by the simple process of waving a little green money! There stens to be very little going around today which is worth anything. Probably the best source of real myths is the writings of the sarly explorers and the missionarys. We didn't have many tourists on Maui and none at all in the desert region behind Halfakala. If there was any place where the myths were still fairly pure it was in this back country.

THERE IS ONLY ONE KIPUKA OF THE 1770 FLOW. I HAVE HEARD THE SAME STORY FROM NATIVES IN THE ENVIRONS.

IN REGARD TO THE 1938 EARTHQUAKE, I AGREE THAT IT DOES NOT SEEM PROBABLE TO ASSOCIATE IT WITH THE LAVA FLOW ON THE SOUTH SLOPE. HOWEVER SOME OTHER GOD EXPLANATION IS NEEDED TO EXPLAIN THE PRESENCE OF CHARCOAL <u>UNDER THE LAVA</u>. THIS WAS VERY RECENT AS I ALSO COLLECTED A QUANTITY OF WHITE ASH ON THE SURFACE OF THE CHARCOAL. IF ANY APPRECIABLE TIME HAD ELAPSED, THIS SOLUBLE MATERIAL WOULD HAVE DISAPPEARED. THERE ARE STILL A LOT OF GOOD THINGS TO BE DONE ONHALEAKALA.

Enclosed are the reprints you asked for plus one about my work out there on radio astronomy.

SINCERELY YOURS,

PGROTE REBER

2231 Hyde St., Honolulu 14, Hawaii, Oct. 8, 19509

Prof. Grote Reber, Associated Universities, Green Bank, W. Va.

Dear Sir:-

I was much interested in 'eading your "Age of Lava Flows on Haleakala, Maui," and am permitting myself a few comments - constructive, comments, I hope.

But, first, Stearns and Maccondald, ⁹Geology and ground-Water-Resources of the Island of Maui, Hawaii," barely make reference to Stokes's critique of Thurston's estimate. This was in a letter from Stokes to me, which I have copied off (as best I could) for your files.

Counting by fours, as the old time Hawaiians did, seems to have a rational explanation, at least for fish. On each hand there are four spaces between digits, and the fail of a fish could be nicely held in each such space.

Neo-myths. I came to the University of Hawaii as Assistant Professor of Geology in February, 1920, became Professor in 1923, Senior Professor of G ology in 1954, and retired as Professor Emeritus in the summer of of 1955. I knew Mr. Thurston, a lawyer by education, but owner and publisher of the Honolulu Advertiser and active in political matters from some time during the Monarchy at least into the time of Territorial Status. He was island-born of missionary ≤tock and spoke Hawaiian. He died some years ago.

I know Mr. Stokes, too, though he has aged greatly so that he no longer recognizes me. On a few occasions we cooperated a litle on borderline projects of geology and his **farcheology** and ethnology. He was British born (but I do not know in what part of the empire, though I suspect Australia or New Zealand), and had much experience in his fields. He was on the staff of Bishop Museum in Honolulu for years and years.

On the basis of life-experiences and of training it would be hard to choose between the two men, but I think Stokes more dependable in his analysis of the data.

Oh! I got off the neo-myth track. I know of two, at least, that have spring up during my time here. I understand the know drivers of tour limousines and buses have quite an array of them \oplus not only on Oahu but on the other islands, too.

I strongly doubt that the 1938 earthquake stimulated any outbreak on Maui. Airplanes would have reported such. Also the apicenter was 25 miles at sea NORTH of Pau ela Point, which makes it at least 50 miles north of the 1770 (?) flow. I have not spent more than fifteen days, I judge, on Maui, and the place names around the lava flow in question puzzle me.

On the1928 U. S. G. S. Makena topographic Sheet, 1 : 62,500 I find the following:-

- Keonicio a little settlement of four or five houses in the north corner of La Berouse Bay. The translation is beyond me.
- Kaluaolapa The crater, (pp one of the craters)that discharged our flow
 Ka = the; lua = hole; o = of; lapa = ridge. Hence as I gather,
 "The hole in the ridge."
- Keonehunehune does have appear on this map. Translation???? I think it is too far up the slope to have fed the flow that reached the sea northeast of La Perouse Bay. But I had only half a day in that region and was primarily studying what the effects of wave erosion had been on the aa.

Stearns quotes Thurston as quoting Father Bailey as being told by natives that a woman and child were surround by the lava (obviously in a kipuka) and after the lava had cooled walked out unharmed. That lava would have been hot enough so that they did nor tarry along the way. Your map shows the kipuka, or at least a Kipuka.

In 1919, a MaunaLoa lava flow in Kona or Kau surrounded some c_a ttle in a big kipuka, and after a few days men went in and led or drove the cattle out.

In 1926 I climbed up the steep side of the Hoopuloa lava flow only a few hours after it had reached that point and walked out on the flow perhaps 50 feet. But it was hot enough so that I did not stop walking, even with thick, leather soles on my field shoes. I kept right on!

The January 28, 1938 earthquake off Maui woke me up. I had gone to bed a bit early. I felt a slight sway of the mattress, presumably a motion amplied by the coil springs. I was on sabbatical leave that spring, and I was shown the very small soungeles written by the seismograph at the University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., so it must have been a major shock -likely Rossi-Forel X at the epicenter, though VII and VIII seem to be the highest on Maui, the nearest dry land.

I was in Manoa Valley in Honolu u on Jan. 28, 1938.

I would appreciate it if you would send me two reprints of the article, one for my perstonal reprint file and one for The Hawaiian Collection of the University of Hawaii.

Yours very sincerely Hand & Falmer

Harold S. Palmer.

There now is a recent, new Makena sheet, 72' × 75'; 1:24,000 02 1 m = 2,000 ft, Which I have hot seen

2618 Ferdiaand St. (Honolulu, Hawaii) August 26, 9836

1742 A.D.

Dear Dr. Palmer,

Many thanks for the copy of Thurston's artile on the prob ble date of Keoneoio lava flow. I read it many years ago with much interest, and later regretted that I did not note the reference. Unless you say otherwise. I shall keep the copy.

Analysing Thurston's information from Bailey - the latter's inquiries in 1841 placed the flow as in the of the grandfather of his \swarrow informants, namely two Hawaiian generations prior to 1841. Thurston places the year as 1742, which as he unconsciously shows is \bigstar the birth-year of the grandfathers, and is based on a three-generational count. This is a serious error, a correction of which (using Thurstennis generational unit) would place the estimated year as 1775.

The adherence to the two-generational count is imperative. It attributes adult life to the observers of the flow, but not great age because the reference than would have been to their adult children. More than two generations is unlikely in view of the check provided by the Ako data. See note on kupuna below.

The generational unit used by Thurston is 33 years. I believe that 25 years is better (You have my notes of Hawaiian Chronology). Using the latter unit we may proceed with an estimate.

Bailey's inquiries would naturally have been of the older people, and we may average their age at 50. Hence their birth

	ye ars was	1791 A.D.
That of their grandfathers (25 gen. unit) was		1741 A.D.
If adult when they were observing, they were 25 years	old and	
the date of the flow may be blaced as		1 5 66 A.D.

With a genrational unit of 33 years, and the age of the same 50, the estimate would be 1758 A.D.

Thu-ston's estimate was

Ako's statement that the flows occurred at a time when the grandfather of his father-in-law was old enough to carry two coconuts from the sea to the upper road, and that the latter was 92 in 4 1905, may be accepted for the moment as the basis of a check. Thus the father in law was born in 1813 A.N. His Grandfather was born (25 gen. unit) in 1763 A.D. Coconuts were counted by fours, as I recall, so that a reference to "two coconuts" probably indicated "two 'fours' of Cocnuts." Yet Thurston's estimate of the boy's age as 10 seems filer enough. Adding the the year of the flow, on Ako's statement was 1773 A.D. With a generational unit of 33, the date would be fifteen years earlier, namely 1757 A.D.

be fifteen years earlier, namely This was used by Thurston

COPY

Tabulated for comparison:

#######//##############################	∕<i>Ҟҏ҉҂</i>҂҂҂҂҂ Ӽ	Bailey	Ako	Average
Fresent estimate	(25 gen.unit) (33 gen.unit)	1766 1758	17 7 3 1757	1770 A.D. 1758
Thurston's " " "	correct	1742 1775	1757	1750 1766

On present information, I favor the date 1770 A.D.

KUPUNA. Bailey's informants placed the flow in the time of their "grandparents." The term used could have been none other than kupuna, indicating primarily "grandparents" and secondarily, "earlier ancestors." But the two estimates are interdependent for a check, and Ako's account tend to restrict the period of the actual grandparents.

But the question of the correctness of Ako's estimate of his father-in-law's age must arie. If 92 years old in 1905, his birth year was 1813, a period when Hawaiians gave no thought to year dates - in fact it was not until 30 or 40 years later that the missionaries succeeded in making them of consideration. On the other hand, it is possible that the father-in-law was born in a year coincident with some important event. Then the year-date could have been calculated readily in later years and become established. The event might have been the birth of Kamehameha III, under dispute in 1840-1850 (and since) as in 1813 or 1814.

It is also possible that the age 92 in 1905 may have been an arbitrary exaggeration as may be noted today **among** some very, very"aged" Hawaiians. However, I am inclined to believe that it is approximately correct.

The flow is probably not of extreme antiquity on the basis of the growth of neo-myth. Compare these two: In 1841, Bailey was informed that "a woman and child were surrounded by the flow, but escaped after it colled. Such is a possibility.

In 1922, 81 years later and five generations after the event, Thurston is told of the destruction by the flow and turning to stone of two adults and two children, namely mother and daughter and father and son. Furthermore, he is shown the petrified humans in place. Information communicated to by grandparents to grandchildren, as in Bailey's time, is likely to be correct. Neomuth belongs to later generations.

In 1786, La Perouse arrived at Keoneolio Bay, and observed, according to the translation: "At every instant we had just cause to regret the country we had left behind us; and to add to our mortification, we did not find an anchoring place well sheltered till we came to a dismal coast, were (sic) torrents of lava had formerly flowed/ like the cascades which pour fonth their water in the other parts of the island." This vivid description will apply to the Keoneoio flow, and I presume to the others also, although I have not seen them. La Pe ouse went ashore.

Use preceding as you desire. With best wishes.

Sgd. John F. G. Stokes.

Lofied Oct 8, 1959 Hawld S. Palmer

2