RAPA NUI RENDEZVOUS: A PERSONAL VIEW

Paul G. Bahn, Ph.D.

Only the third (after Hanga Roa 1984 and Frankfurt 1989) and easily the biggest gathering ever of Easter Island specialists, Laramie’s Rapa Nui Rendezvous (August 3 to 6) was a highly enjoyable occasion which provided the opportunity to put faces to well-known names, make new friends and acquaintances, hear of some new data, and witness amazing sights such as the island’s Governor, Jacobo Hey Paoa, strumming a guitar of its Mayor, Alberto Hotus Chavez, making a ‘ritual greeting’ to an ArapaiO dancer. The event, held in the University of Wyoming’s Classroom Building (a kind of giant slide carousel) was efficiently organized by George Gill and his dedicated committee of helpers.

According to the official tally, about 170 people attended. Conversely the presence of so many islanders was a terrific bonus, though, as one of them pointed out, simultaneous translation into Spanish would have been a courteous if expensive gesture towards them. Other minor quibbles one could make were the lack of permanently manned book/souvenir display, and the sheets of rain that fell every day....

With impeccable timing, copies of Steven Fischer’s new edited book Easter Island Studies arrived from Oxbow the day before the conference. It proved extremely popular among participants, and deservedly so, being an up-to-date survey of most aspects of research on the island. [See review, this issue]. Now that it is available, one remains utterly baffled why a small handful of specialists chose to boycott the project and, worse, tried to block its publication. An interesting topic for future historians of archaeology... or perhaps students of psychology?

So many papers were on offer (over 60) that, on two afternoons, concurrent sessions were held. This made for some difficult choices, and a certain amount of dashing back and forth between two auditoria, fortunately in close proximity to each other. These attempts at being everywhere at once were facilitated by the fact that speakers kept (more or less) to time, with chairpersons using either a hi-tech approach (Joan Kurze’s pitiless bleeping device) or a low-tech one (the Bill Liller method of standing up a few minutes before the end and hovering threateningly around the speaker). Nevertheless, the limit of 20 minutes meant that there was often little time, or even none at all, for discussion, which was particularly frustrating after the more controversial talks.

There were a number of highlights such as the papers by Steven Fischer (on Hotu Matu’a), Grant McCall (on the recent sociopolitical history of the island), George Gill (see below), David Steadman (ditto), and Emily Mulloy (who demolished, one hopes for good, the long/short ears story with impeccable logic). Tricia Allen gave an objective account of the impact made on the island by the recent movie-making, and presented some devastating slides of the resulting constructions and damage which brought gasps from the audience.

Charlie Love was responsible for two tours-de-force; first, his detailed presentation of ahu Tongariki before and after the 1960 tsunami, illustrated with his superb and accurate colour-coded plans of the remains. He was able to hypothesize precisely how, and how far, each statue, each stone almost, had been moved by the different waves.

His second highlight, in tandem with a preceding paper by Pavel Pavel, concerned his experiments in transporting a full-size concrete moai in an upright position, and how he
eventually hit on what seems a remarkably easy and rapid method of doing so—i.e., standing the statue on a fixed sled of trunks which is then pulled forward over rollers.

It was very curious that a third paper on moai transportation, by Jo Anne Van Tilburg, was placed in an entirely different session and on a different day. She gave us the ‘cartoon version’ of moving statues, doing it entirely by computer. Like any computer simulation in archaeology, therefore, this is inevitably and irrevocably divorced from reality and remains completely theoretical: one can never know if it works without actually trying it out as Pavel and Love have done. Unfortunately we were shown computer stills, rather than the full animated version but one can already foresee lucrative commercial possibilities in the world of computer games, perhaps starring the ‘Super Moai brothers’?

For her computer simulation, Van Tilburg calculated what an ‘average’ Easter Island statue would be in terms of weight and dimensions; alas, the ideal candidate proved to be one of the moai on ahu Akivi, a very un-average platform! Resolutely denying any possibility of upright transportation, she has decreed that the statues were pulled horizontally on their backs. As I understood the technique, she has then arriving at the ahu feet first, then being raised forwards and onto the platform. This could indeed work well at Akivi, which is easy to approach from the back, but what about the many coastal ahu where there is no room behind for such operations? Interestingly, she has to accept, from their varying positions, that many statues along the road were originally upright, but has decided that this has no bearing whatsoever on their transportation method.

Two fascinating papers on the Easter Island palm, pseudo-Jubaea chilensis or Paschalococos dispersa, by Juan Grau and by Bill Liller (with Robert Gurley) made the absence of John Flenley keenly felt. Liller’s talk was particularly useful since he had not only brought samples of Jubaea nuts, honey and trunk with him to demonstrate its properties, but had also estimated that a trunk might withstand a weight of 6 tons. It is to be hoped that actual experimentation (rather than computer games) with trunks and replica statues in Chile will eventually provide crucial data on the tree’s potential for construction and for transporting statues. However, all such data will remain provisional since the palm was not Jubaea, merely very similar to it in some respects.

One important contribution of the Rapa Nui Rendezvous was to enable us at last to hear some results of the excavations carried out on the island over the past decade or so, especially around Anakena. With the obvious exception of the conscientious Chris Stevenson, very little has ever been published about recent excavations on the island, and one has to rely on the scraps that filter out through the Rapa Nui Journal, such as the Marquesan-type harpoon (presented at the conference) or the new work at the Poike ditch (not presented at Laramie). Hence it was a treat to hear brief reports about the Anakena dig from Arne Skjelsvold, the discovery of circular post-built structures by Patricia Vargas, the burials at Tongariki from Guiseppe Orefici and Andrea Drusini, and especially the astonishing record of bird and porpoise bones at Anakena by David Steadman. The latter speaker claimed that, before humans arrived and wiped most of them out, Easter Island may have been the world’s richest island in seabird species, since it housed both tropical and temperate forms.

Steadman’s data seem to fit very well, in general and in dating terms, with the scenario of deforestation and environmental destruction built up by John Flenley, whose absence once again was particularly regrettable at this point. Steadman also chided John (and therefore myself) for including the supposed discovery of dog bones at Anakena in Easter Island, Earth Island (p.91), stating that they turned out to be nothing of the kind, and that one should await published data, but in our defense it should be pointed out that the discovery had indeed reached print (RNJ 5(3):45). Otherwise we would not have mentioned it.

The Rapa Nui Rendezvous as a whole, in its location and its intent, was to be a tribute to William Mulloy and, by extension, to the entire Norwegian Expedition of 1955; all of its surviving members were present, but the only one to speak about its aims, methods and achievements was Carlyle Smith. He seems to think that nobody reads the Expeditions’ monographs anymore—and brought Xerox’s of the contents pages of Volume I along to distribute! So I was happy that I had, by chance, reread his papers in the monograph for the occasion. Carlyle also said he’d seen the two volumes listed in bibliographies with erroneous attributions such as "Allen and Unwin, London"—this was presumably aimed at Easter Island, Earth Island, where they are so listed on p. 225. But I can assure him that I have the English edition, and that is indeed the correct publisher! Besides it is a lot quicker to type than the ‘Monographs of the School of American Research and Museum of New Mexico, Santa Fe’ business, and in any case, surely, anyone seeking the books in a library will look under ‘Heyerdahl and Ferdon’?

At times, the Rendezvous seemed to be a celebration of Thor Heyerdahl rather than of Bill Mulloy, and in some respects that was only right and fitting—it’s Heyerdahl having captured our imagination with Kon-Tiki and then having focused the world’s attention on Easter Island in 1955. Nevertheless, the fact that only Heyerdahl was called upon to give a public lecture one evening ensured that the public received the clear impression that his views are widely accepted, whereas it needs to be made aware that his views form one extreme in a spectrum, and that the vast majority of Easter Island researchers disagree strongly with many of his claims. As a result, the Laramie Daily Boomerang—which gave the Rendezvous lengthy and accurate coverage every day—ran the following headline: ‘Heyerdahl still champion of Easter Island researchers!’ Personally, I wasn’t aware that the field was a competition.

Whether or not that is how Heyerdahl himself sees it, he and his associates put on a very puzzling show at the Rendezvous. Having glimpsed his doubtless very important recent excavations in Peru in his Kon-Tiki Man TV series, and had our appetites whetted in the Rendezvous abstracts by claims of major finds there including ‘unmistakable’ egg-wielding birdmen and seagoing reed boats in clay bas-relief, we
expected a major, detailed account of the work and the discoveries. This was surely the ideal event and the perfect audience for such revelations. We got nothing of the kind.

Hoyerdahl himself—despite being given twice as long to speak as anyone else—read out a paper which went over the tired old claims for colonization of Easter Island from the east, and never got beyond the introduction. His public lecture made only passing reference to the Peruvian finds, with no illustrations. On the last day, his colleague from the Kon-Tiki museum, Øystein Johansen, gave a paper about Túcume, the site in Peru. But once again, our hopes of a detailed account were frustrated. He devoted a good part of his talk to lecturing the assembly, and particularly what he seems to consider the ‘anti-Hoyerdahl camp’, about the evils of bias [sic], of staring a piece of work with one’s mind already made up [sic] and of careless superficial analogy [sic]. When he finally turned to the much-trumpeted clay bas-relief it was presented by a single slide showing what seemed to me a squatting curvilinear anthropomorph with a circular hand. It bore a remarkable resemblance, in style and content, to Chimu clay friezes at Chan Chan (e.g. the maize relief in the Velarde palace).

Within the talk it was given no archaeological context whatsoever, and its supposed link to Easter Island birdmen was backed up, as ever, by the ‘island of Puna’ birdman bead, which has even less archaeological context, having been bought in an Ecuadorian junk shop.

Johansen seemed deeply offended by the conclusion in Easter Island, Earth Island’s 2nd chapter (p.68) that, on the island, ‘Peruvian culture is notable by its absence.’ But even if—and its a very big if—the Túcume finds were to be a genuine link with the island, our conclusion still stands: where are the Peruvian blocks, the Long/Short Ears saga, and, above all, the claim that the potsherds, the pressure flaking, the textiles on Easter Island—the primary characteristics of Peruvian culture?

One astounding and depressing feature of the conference was to hear old fallacies being trotted out again in the face of all the evidence—the supposed links between the Vinapu façade and Peruvian blocks, the Long/Short Ears saga, and, above all, the claim that the tootora reed and the Jubesaa-like palm were brought to Easter Island by man from South America. Hoyerdahl made the latter claim in the conference hall. He was reminded once again that John Flennery’s diagrams prove that both species have been on the island for at least 30,000 years. Yet the very next day, in his public lecture, Thor again, unbelievably, made the same claim. He did, however, allude to Flennery’s work with a bizarre reference to “miracle plants” from South America dropping their pollen in Easter Island’s crater lakes for 30,000 years. I didn’t understand what he was trying to say here, and would be grateful if anyone else can enlighten me.

Thor’s public talk was an amazing event: it began with a group of islanders, including the Mayor, singing songs accompanied by the Governor on guitar, followed by two excellent dancers, Yenicet Araki and Nancy Manutomata. It culminated in a standing ovation for Thor from an adoring audience of Laramie folk. In between were a number of claims from the speaker which made my jaw plummet to the ground: not just the one about the plant species, but especially the idea that a Peruvian king had sent out 20,000 men in a whole armada of big reed ships, fanning out across the Pacific to find Easter Island. The mind boggles....
Easter Island, archaeology (the above-mentioned lack of Peruvian culture on the island), or genetics: Erika Hagelberg's soon-to-be-published data on the Mitochondrial DNA of Easter Island skeletons will have a marked impact on this theory. Watch this space!

Paul Bahn obtained his doctorate in archaeology at the University of Cambridge. A prolific writer, he recently co-authored (with John Flenley) the popular book, Easter Island, Earth Island. Bahn lives in England and is a regional editor for RNJ as well as a member of the Board of Directors of the Easter Island Foundation.

**The "Dreaming Moai" Unveiled on the Island of Texel, Holland**

Steven Roger Fischer, Meersburg, Germany

"Do not wake him, he is sleeping," warned the Rapanui sculptor Bene Aukara Tuki Paté. He was unveiling his 3-meter tall moai of German tuff stone in front of Texel's "Scholarie" on Sunday, the 22nd of August 1993. "His eyes are not open, he is asleep and dreaming of Rapanui."

Dream the nameless colossus well may. For few places happen to be further from the island of Rapanui than the billiard-table-flat, verdant, sheep-salted tourist isle of Texel in Holland's far north, in the North Sea, accessible only by ferry and plane. There are several stone moai of recent creation in the world: in Spain; Italy; Santiago; Honolulu; and Valparaiso-Viña. But few can compare in quality to Bene Tuki's new "Dreaming Moai of Texel," a veritable poem in tuff, a declaration of love to the unique Rapanui patrimony.

Texel's erstwhile "Scholarie" (School house) was converted in 1978 into a gallery and art center by the well-known local artist Niek Welboren. Niek intends to create here an "Islands Art Center" that will display unique creations from throughout the island world. His three-month sojourn on Rapanui in 1992 laid the foundation for this first cultural exchange, resulting in the 1993 formation of the Stichting de Vogelman ("Birdman Foundation"). A visible and permanent symbol of the special relationship that exists between Texel and Rapanui, the "Scholarie’s" moai was carved in three weeks. Bene Tuki had been brought from Rapanui to Texel specifically for this purpose.

The moai's unveiling formed one symbolic moment in a larger Rapanui exhibit at the "Scholarie." "Easter Island: Impressions from Niek Welboren" presented a series of 74 framed ink sketches that Niek completed on Rapanui in 1992: introspective, biting, satirical, sometimes humorous, always provocative. In these sketches, Niek has concentrated on the life-and-death motif of the island, its perdition, the archaeological stones and bones of a vanished culture. These are hardly your everyday tourist watercolors of 'Anakena palms and Tahai colossi. They are a European artist's painful confrontation with the Rapanui heritage in all its brutal and brilliant nuances.

Also gracing the "Scholarie's" exhibition hall and loft was the panoply of an especially gifted Rapanui carver Bene Tuki's exquisite moai, moai kavakava, moai pa 'apa a, rei miro, ika, moko, tahonga, ua, and many more objects in a stark and eloquent conversation with Niek's interspersed ink sketches. The overall effect was that of familiar Rapanui splendor echoed in a pen-and-ink European abstraction. Fascinated, my wife Taki and I spent four full hours immibing it in.

But then the guests began arriving--for the historic 3 pm unveiling of the "Dreaming Moai of Texel."

Outside it was pouring rain under an ominous sky. Inside, Niek loudly welcomed the some 100 visitors. Among them were Bene's wife Ana Maria Arredondo; brother Ignacio Tuki with son Manuel of Frankfurt, Germany; and brother Waldo Tuki from just outside Paris, France. In his opening speech,
Nick stressed the special relationship between Texel and Rapanui, and pointed out the "positive force of the moai" in establishing better relations between the many peoples of Europe and the people of Rapanui.

At which moment Bene greeted everyone in the Rapanui language, much to their delight. Whereupon he spoke in Spanish (a translator was busily rendering his speech into Dutch), expressing his thanks to all those who came to attend the historic unveiling..."on such a wet day, too!" Bene stressed the importance to the Rapanui people of such an artistic contribution as the Texel moai, saying it represented a "new road" for Rapanui artists to travel. He honored Horst Cain of Germany, who was present in the "Scholario" together with Annette Bierbach. And calling up to the impromptu stage young Stefan "Vai Roa" de Velde, who was born in Rapanui, and his mother Jini de Velde, Bene mentioned the close links between Holland and Rapanui, links not of the past but of now and of flesh and blood. Representatives of the Chilean Embassy were introduced. And a ceremonial rapper was presented to the local contractor Maiert Boon for his special support of the Texel moai project.

Then came the unveiling of the "Dreaming Moai of Texel." Everyone pressed outside, into the pouring rain. After initial difficulty, Ana Maria and young Stefan finally managed to lower the covering veil and everyone clapped enthusiastically.

Whereupon Ana Maria offered a short speech in English about the special significance of this moai, after which Bene was honored with the local Texel Prix de Joke 1993: a gold medallion on a long colorful ribbon.

All hurried back inside again, out of the rain, to enjoy the superb exhibition, refreshments, and lively conversation in five competing languages.

Till the end of the season, visitors to Holland's island of Texel will be able to delight in this exciting Rapanui tour de force at the "Scholario." And the "Dreaming Moai of Texel," weighing in at 5.5 tons, can of course be enjoyed there too...till the end of time.

---

**DRAWING, PHOTOGRAPHING, AND SURVEYING ALONGSIDE PAYMASTER THOMSON, 1886-1889**

*Alan Drake, USA Regional Editor for RNJ*

William Judah Thomson, Paymaster aboard the *U.S.S. Mohican* during its exploratory voyage through the southern Pacific in 1886, has contributed greatly to our knowledge of Rapanui, but through the years he continues to receive undue artistic credit. A common error recently appeared in *RNJ* 7(2), within Robert R. Koll's "The Eye of the Beholder." Although Mr. Koll's short paper provides insights into his subject, throughout the comparative examination of various artists' sketches made of a particular Orongo petroglyph, a sketch produced during the 1886 Smithsonian investigation of Easter Island is several times credited to Thomson. Figure 2 accompanying this same *RNJ* article displays a sketch which is clearly signed "Ayasse." As far as I am aware, Thomson did not draw a line while on Rapanui or, for that matter, after his return to the United States. Mr. Koll's primary error was to take Heyerdahl at his word, for it is, in fact, Heyerdahl (1975:63) who states "...the slabs in the houses of Orongo...were drawn and published by Thomson."

---

**Figure 1: Portion of map of Easter Island by Lt. Symonds and Cadet McCormick, with its distinctive lettering.**

In his report, Thomson credits only two crew members for their draftsmanship: Lt. F. M. Symonds and Navel Cadet C. M. McCormick, who created the published map of the island. See Figure 1.

**Figure 2: Samples of signatures on sketches found in Thomson's report.**

Although not stated directly, these seamen appear to have also created the map of Orongo which identifies the locations of 49 stone houses. One of the map-makers may have been left-handed, for his handwriting displays a distinctive backward slant. This shows on the full island map, the Orongo map, and the reconstructed elevation of an ahu at Hanga Varevare. (A second figure of ahu Anaoraka and a hare paenga, reveals a handwriting different from the one found in the other three drawings.)

Most of the sketches in Thomson's report display the signatures of either "Ayasse," "Chandlee," or "Chan," the latter two being the same individual. Other sketches are unsigned. Figure 2 illustrates samples of both Ayasse and Chandlee's various signatures. As will be proven shortly, Ayasse was clearly a member of the crew, but readers may be as surprised as I was to discover that a majority of the drawings in the report were not made on Rapanui, for they were created by Chandlee, who was not aboard the *Mohican*.  

Published by Kahualike, 1993
Figure 4: An example of a picturesque creation by Chandlee and Thomson.

In Figure 3, hidden among the rocks and grass surrounding a moai in the “Rana Roraka crater,” is the signature “Chandlee 89,” clearly inscribed three years after the Mohican departed from its “position off Anakena Bay (La Pérouse Bay) [from whence we] shipped the stone image, now in the National Museum” (Thomson, 1891.) A cursory look through sketches in other papers in the same 934 page volume revealed the joint signature “WHC+CBH” within the report “Aboriginal Skin-Dressings.” Could the first initials be those of a W. H. Chandlee? Indeed. Two other drawings reveal “Chan+CBH.” These are W. H. Chandlee and perhaps W. H. Burger who were at that time both employed by the National Museum in Washington as ‘draughtsmen;’ elsewhere in the volume they are listed as having worked on three projects accompanying the Smithsonian’s Annual Report. I cannot as yet reconcile the initials ‘CBH’ among its long list of employees. As for Burger, it seems improbable that the two Museum draftsmen would have the same first two initials as listed in the roll of the Smithsonian’s labor force. The only Burger listed in the Ethnology department, along with Chandlee, is a Peter Burger. Chandlee no doubt worked side-by-side with Thomson as the deadline for the Easter Island report approached. The inclusion of the date “89” in at least two sketches reveals the urgency of their intention to provide more drawings for the report. This assumption is supported by G. Brown Goode, Assistant Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, in charge of the U. S. National Museum. He states in his 1889 “Report” that drawings for Thomson’s paper were still in preparation. These drawings were delivered after the June 1889 deadline, which may in part explain the 1891 publication date. Papers like Thomson’s were not actually part of the Report, but were instead part of a separate section “devoted to the publication of papers illustrative of collections in the National Museum” (Goode, 1891.)

Chandlee may have sketched from photographs, but more likely simply created a variety of filler pieces inspired solely by Thomson’s memory. This is not to say a subject could not have been redrawn several time to satisfy any need for an artificial accuracy; still, Chandlee’s picturesque style often expresses an obviously concocted subject, similar to photos of artificially posed groups prevalent when the art of photography was essentially still young. (Examples of such group photos can also be found in Thomson’s report.) Figure 4 shows Chandlee’s “Native Houses Built of Bulrushes.” Thomson states that these “primitive huts, formerly used by the natives… have been abandoned for more comfortable dwellings…” This is a scene from the imagination.

There are several published drawings displaying no signature in the Thomson paper. These were without doubt created in Washington, under Thomson’s supervision, either by Chandlee or Burger, more likely the former. Take for example the familiar drawing of the Orongo slabs which the Mohican crew brought back to the Smithsonian. (Nearly a hundred years later they were finally returned.) These were no doubt artificially arranged across the floor of a Smithsonian office or basement, where they could be drawn, so to speak, in situ. Was it Chandlee who also created the fanciful creature (distinctly uncharacteristic both in form and technique) on a slab which no one has yet been able to recover? See the slab in the center of the top row in Figure 5.
Careful observation continues to show that Chandlee’s creations are fanciful. Figures 15 and 16 in Thomson’s report sit side-by-side on the page. They are reproduced here as Figure 6. The captions describe them as two distinct moai, one ‘Wry-Neck’ on the left and on the right, the other “the mutilated image ‘Hiara.’” Except for a half-hearted attempted at expressing ‘mutilation,’ they are essentially the same moai drawn twice.

Four of Ayasse’s drawings appear in the Thomson report, each recognized by signature: two illustrations of rock art at Orongo, Ahu ‘Ohau,’ and the āhu at Akahanga. We know from Cooke’s descriptions of the team’s clockwise circumambulation of the island, that Ayasse must have produced many more drawings than those published. Seeing the above mentioned drawing and the one shown in Figure 7, I suspect they were found unacceptable; unlike the usual crisp style found in the Museum’s reports, they were rejected. Ayasse’s drawings are almost all produced on laid textured paper, the lines of which are emphasized by his medium, a soft charcoal pencil. Can we believe that Ayasse, who traveled around the island for so many days, visiting 114 numbered sites, plus Orongo and Hangaroa Village, would return to his ship with but four drawings?

Chandlee’s drawings outnumber those done by the official draftsman, Ayasse. In contrast, Chandlee’s style is more etching-like, drawn with short ink strokes. His signature can be found on 12 drawings, with others attributable to him. No doubt a different hand altogether created the two large fishhook drawings. The two elevation drawings of āhu have already been mentioned; the map drawer’s handwriting is plainly evident. The drawings done by Chandlee, in a style similar to Ayasse, all appear to have been done on a linen-textured paper. One such example suggests that Chandlee may even have made drawings from Ayasse’s originals. Figure 8, unsigned, is drawn on the same paper Chandlee had been known to use. It reproduces in detail a petroglyph on a stone on Āhu Akahanga’s façade. Note the arrow indicating the same stone in Ayasse’s drawing in Figure 7.

Thomson’s paper also contains 44 photographs; some are re-touched so as to be almost drawings themselves. The photographer or photographers remain unknown, although there is a photo of the team that came to the island as they proudly posed in the midst of raising the Orongo slabs from their berths in the cobelled houses. Among the places and objects photographed are: a fishnet; two groups of islanders; two views down and across the crater of Rano Kau; a view of

Figure 6: Two moai of questionable origin. Artist not credited but comparison to similar drawings show that it is clearly from Chandlee’s hand.

Figure 7: An example of Ayasse’s soft pencil style. This is titled “Akahanga (King’s Platform), No. 80, Rear View.”

Fortunately, Thomson was not the only crew member to publish his observations collected during the Mohican’s thirteen-day landing. A few years later, in the Smithsonian’s 1897 report, another crew member confined himself “to the line of investigation assigned him, in order that there might not be a needless repetition in the reports of the several officers concerned in the work.” This was US Navy Surgeon George H. Cooke. (Beside Thomson, who are the other officers and where are their reports, or notes?) Although no illustrations accompany Cooke’s thirty-three page report, he acknowledges
the outer slopes of Rano Kau from Hangaroa; five views of the houses and environs of Orongo; a panoramic view of the three motu below Orongo; three views outside and in Rano Raraku; a view of the 'Plains of Anakena;' five views of Tongariki, fourteen reproductions of rongorongo (obverse and reverse), many retouched; and ten photos of groups of wood carvings, paddles, clubs, feather hats, mata'a, needles, fish implements, carved skulls, and other artifacts. Among the photographs listed above are invaluable images of both the seaward and front sides of the ahu at Tongariki. These combined with the few published by Mrs. Routledge give us a rare glimpse at this now destroyed grand ahu.

One can only assume what logic drove the Mohican crew to aim its camera in one direction but not another. There were no doubt many other photographs taken. What was lost? Photographing is indeed quicker than drawing. One can imagine the small survey group reconnoitering a chosen area, measuring the lengths of stone and writing obscure observations in notebooks, while Ayasse removed himself to an out-of-the-way rock or grassy hillock to quickly sketch what only a trained eye could reproduce.

I wish to emphasize a final series of points centered on the dates associated with Thomson's visit to Rapanui. In various writings during the last hundred years certain dates have been used interchangeably. The dates marking the Mohican crew's stay on Rapanui were December 19 to 31, 1886. Although Thomson's report to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was part of the Institute's Annual Report for the year ending June 30, 1889, the actual date of publication by the Government Printing Office in Washington was 1891. (Mr. Koll was clear on these final dates, although he errs with the report's title.) There is an incorrect date within Cooke's paper, no doubt topographic: one cannot believe Dr. Cooke believed he and his fellow travelers sailed out into the Pacific "from the port of Callao, Peru on March 6, 1868, under orders for a protracted cruise." Protracted indeed. Could they have sailed the South Pacific for nearly twenty years?

 торговок, clubs, feather hats, mata'a, needles, fish implements, carved skulls, and other artifacts. Among the photographs listed above are invaluable images of both the seaward and front sides of the ahu at Tongariki. These combined with the few published by Mrs. Routledge give us a rare glimpse at this now destroyed grand ahu.

One can only assume what logic drove the Mohican crew to aim its camera in one direction but not another. There were no doubt many other photographs taken. What was lost? Photographing is indeed quicker than drawing. One can imagine the small survey group reconnoitering a chosen area, measuring the lengths of stone and writing obscure observations in notebooks, while Ayasse removed himself to an out-of-the-way rock or grassy hillock to quickly sketch what only a trained eye could reproduce.

I wish to emphasize a final series of points centered on the dates associated with Thomson's visit to Rapanui. In various writings during the last hundred years certain dates have been used interchangeably. The dates marking the Mohican crew's stay on Rapanui were December 19 to 31, 1886. Although Thomson's report to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was part of the Institute's Annual Report for the year ending June 30, 1889, the actual date of publication by the Government Printing Office in Washington was 1891. (Mr. Koll was clear on these final dates, although he errs with the report's title.) There is an incorrect date within Cooke's paper, no doubt topographic: one cannot believe Dr. Cooke believed he and his fellow travelers sailed out into the Pacific "from the port of Callao, Peru on March 6, 1868, under orders for a protracted cruise." Protracted indeed. Could they have sailed the South Pacific for nearly twenty years?

Figure 8: Close-up of "sculptured rock" found at Akahanga, "the burial place of Hotu Matua. (See arrow in Fig. 7 for its placement in the ahu). Indications are that this drawing is by Chandlee.

Sources


INVESTIGACION ARQUEOLOGICA EN LA CAVERNA ANA KAI TANGATA, ISLA DE PASCUA

Miguel Cervellino Giannoni, Arqueólogo Director, Museo Regional de Atacama, Chile

[English Summary follows]

Introducción: La cueva Ana Kai Tangata se encuentra ubicada en las cercanías de Hanga Roa, en el sector Sur de la costa Oeste de la Isla (zona de Mataveri). Se trata de una espectacular ensenada que se adentra unos 100m hacia el interior de las rocas, en cuyo fondo existe una cueva natural, casi al norte de la línea de marea. Sus dimensiones son de 10m de alto por 16m de ancho (promedio) y de 17m de longitud (aprox.), orientada hacia el mar con su eje Oeste a Este. Al ingresar a la cueva, mirando desde la boca hacia el interior se ubican en la pared izquierda un grupo de pinturas. En un macizo principal que cubre una superficie de 3.50m de alto por 4.00m de ancho, se sitúa un conjunto de figuras de pájaros manuturas (Sterna fuscata) en distintas posiciones en vuelo y tamaño (realizados en color blanco, rojo y negro, contrastado con los variados colores de la piedra). En el área del borde inferior izquierdo existen vestigios de pinturas pero en un estado ilegible. Hacia la derecha se ubican dibujos en negro más recientes, al igual que grafitis.

Diversos investigadores coinciden que las expresiones simbólico-plásticas del más conocido ceremonial de esta singular Isla, el llamado Tangata Manu o del Hombre Pajarito, que tuvo mayor vigencia en un momento tardío del desarrollo antropológico y cultural de los pascuenses, tienen una estrecha relación entre las pinturas de Orongo, o los Motu y Ana Kai Tangata. Así creemos que las pinturas no son simples expresiones estéticamente ornamentales, sino signos con un gran contenido antropológico, relacionados con su consmovisión y su realidad.
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Estratigrafía:
Entre 0cm a 10cm la generalidad de la superficie de la cueva está constituida por una capa de piedras laja o apizarradas con tierra semi compactada de color café oscuro. Este estrato se denomina Estrato I.
Entre 20cm a 60cm existe una zona con bastantes restos de fauna malacológica y material cultural que podemos llamar histórico o Estrato II. La tierra es de color café oscuro.
A los 60cm y 80cm el color de la tierra cambia a menos oscuro. Disminuyen los restos de fauna malacológica y huesos de pescado, ave y roedor. Los fechados de obsidiana de este Estrato III, son contemporáneos con la protohistoria de la Isla (1722 d.C. adelante).
Entre 80cm y 1.40m, que es la profundidad máxima casi al fondo de la cueva, aparece la mayor cantidad de material cultural, como instrumentos de obsidiana; anzuelos de huesos humanos, agujas de hueso de ave, huesos y deitos humanos; pigmento rojo, blanco y amarillo; fogones; manos de moler y percutir de basalto; cuentas de collar, tubo para tatuaje y otros. Los fechados de obsidiana y de radio carbono 14, indican a este Estrato IV como Prehistórico (1660 d.C. promedio), correspondiente al término del Periodo Medio y comienzo del Periodo Tardío de Isla de Pascua.

Breve Descripción del Principal Material Cultural

1. Material Lítico.
   1.1 Obsidiana: Se obtuvieron 35 mataa, clasificados en 6 tipos, según Skinner. El más popular es el tipo 2 que aparece desde la superficie a la base. El tipo 4 sólo aparece en la Estructura I y el tipo 6 corresponde a un ejemplar de superficie.
   1.2 Basalto: Se agrupan las manos de percutir, de moler, pequeños guijarros y un solo toki o azadón de mano.
   1.3 Taheta: Pequeño recipiente labrado en una roca, para contener agua o preparación de pinturas (?).

   2.1 Cráneo Humano Grabado: En la Estructura I, tras un macizo rocoso, se descubrió un cráneo humano con un grabado geométrico, inciso frontal, que representa el dios Make-Make.
   2.2 Anzuelos de Hueso Humano: Se hallaron dos. Uno completo del tipo "barbado", y otro fragmentado.
   2.3 Tubo para Tatuaje: Es un hueso finísimo de ave, cilíndrico y alargado, presentando un corte achaflanado aguzado, en un extremo. En su interior y exterior se advierten pigmentos de color.
   2.4 Agujas: Se recuperaron doce hallados en todos los niveles, de los cuales tres están completos, seis puntas y tres bases con ojeteillos.
   2.5 Huevos Trabajados: Se encontraron cuatro huesos fragmentos con notables huellas de trabajo (cortes) dejados por un instrumento cortante, seguramente obsidiana. Uno de ellos es humano.
   3. Material de Madera.
   Quizás una de las piezas más importantes halladas en estratigrafía (a 40cm de profundidad, cuadricula A) lo constituye un trozo de madera, de forma triangular. Mirando la pieza de canto, un lado presenta una canaleta que servía para ensamblar de otra pieza, y el borde del otro lado termina en punta redondeada en todo su largo, sirviendo también para encaje en otra canaleta de otra pieza, a manera de machihembr. La madera es de toromiro y sin duda que este objeto formó parte de una canoa.

4. Cuentas de Collar: Se encontraron tres cuentas de conchas marinas, en la cuadricula C y a 140m de profundidad. Son del tipo circular presentando dos oírificios centrales semi unidos.
5. Pigmentos Minerales: Desde el primer nivel de ocupación de la cueva, se encontraron pigmentos de minerales de color: blanco, rojo y amarillo.

Conclusiones Principales:
1. La ocupación estratigráfica de la cueva, evidencia una ocupación estable y continua, no registrándose estratos intermedios estériles.
2. El nivel prehistórico y primero en ocupación, tiene una fecha promedio de 1660 d.C. a 1700 d.C. Esto quiere decir que la cueva fue ocupada y habilitada (estructuras) al término del Periodo Medio y comienzo del Periodo Tardío de Isla de Pascua.
3. La confección de las pinturas, sus motivos y el material cultural obtenido en estratigrafía (pigmentos, tubo de tatuaje, entre otros) sugieren que la cueva fue utilizada como un ritual, relacionado con el culto al hombre pajaro o Tangata Manu y al dios Make-Make del ceremonial llevado a cabo en la ciudadela de Orongo. Esta relación estaría dada por las pinturas (manutara) y el cráneo grabado (Make-Make).
4. La cueva sirvió como lugar de precesamiento de materias primas, tales como líticos y obsidiana (mataa, toki, pulidores, otros); huesos (agujas, anzuelos, punzones); maderas (canaos, otros).
5. En el nivel prehistórico la alimentación se basó en la pesca marina, recolección de fauna marina costera y de la caza de aves marinas y roedores. También se debe incluir la carne humana. Así lo demuestran los innumerables huesos calcinados de diferentes partes del cuerpo humano, que dicen relación con la antropofagia vivida en la isla.
6. En los estratos superiores se encuentran huesos de mamíferos (vacunos, caprino, ovino y de cerdo) que fueron introducidos por los europeos a partir de la Perouse (1786).
7. En la cueva tres elementos tienen relación con una "tecnología marina". El primero es parte de una canoa y ello obedece a una técnica de construcción de naves para ser utilizadas en la pesca y caza marina. El segundo elemento lo constituyen los anzuelos confeccionados en hueso humano; y el tercero, con las agujas que bien pudieron servir para la confección de redes para la pesca.
8. La cueva fue utilizada como lugar de refugio, de habitación y defensa; también fue necesario la fabricación de artefactos defensivos, como los mataa.
9. Las tecnologías y procesos productivos están en relación a determinada organización social. La sociedad en Rapa Nui sabemos que estaba fuertemente estratificada, por lo que a través de los elementos culturales obtenidos en la cueva, se
advierte una especialización en la producción de alimentos, artefactos y otros.
9. Las pinturas de Ana Kai Tangata están vinculadas con las de Orongo y Motus adyacentes, a través de sus formas plásticas, características técnicas, colores y épocas de confección, de acuerdo a las dataciones de radio carbono 14 y obsidiana (1576 d.C a 1680 d.C).
10. En la caverna se practicó la antropología, constatándose a través de los restos arqueológicos (huesos humanos), como de las leyendas dejadas por la tradición oral recogidas a fines del siglo pasado (W. Thomson, 1886) y a comienzo de este siglo (K. Routledge, 1919; A. Metraux, 1940).

**English summary:**
This report discusses an archaeological excavation at the cave known as Ana Kai Tangata, located near Hangaroa in the southwest section of the island. The dimensions of the cave, which faces toward the sea, are 10 meters high and 16 by 17 meters in size. The ceiling of the cave has paintings of flying birds in red, white and black pigments and vestiges of other paintings can be seen nearby. Graffiti is also present. The paintings are not merely ornamental but are signs of great anthropological content, with relationships to cosmovision.

The results of the excavation suggest that the cave was in use continuously; no sterile intermediate levels were encountered. Radiocarbon dates indicate that the cave was in use from 1660-1700 (the end of the Middle Period and the beginning of the Late Period). The paintings and material culture (tattoo needles, etc.) indicate the cave was used for ceremonial and ritual purposes, connected to the Birdman Cult and the cult of Make Make. A human skull with incised designs was excavated. The elements that are connected to marine technology include a piece of a canoe.

In the prehistoric levels evidence was found for fishing as well as cannibalism. Historic levels contained bones of cattle, sheep, etc.

Fishhooks of human bone and needles for making fish nets were also recovered.

The paintings, which are dated A.D. 1576 to 1680, are tied to those of Orongo and Motu Nui because of their style, use of color, etc. Human bones suggest that cannibalism was indeed practiced here, according to the legend.

---

**THE VOYAGE OF JACOB ROGGEVEEN TO EASTER ISLAND: FURTHER DETAILS**

Francisco Mellen Blanco

Asociación Española de Estudios del Pacífico, Colegio Mayor Universitario Ntra. Sra. de África, Madrid

In "A new and complete collection of Voyages and Travels..." by John Hamilton Moore, published in London in 1778, are contained different voyages from the 18th century. One of these voyages is Jacob Roggeveen's travel to the South Pacific (pp.77-79). These pages include his visit to Easter Island during 1722. This version of Roggeveen's voyage provides new details concerning Easter Island archaeology and ethnology, of great interest for all experts investigating these two subjects.

Below is a full description of Roggeveen's visit to the island: a valuable document for the history of Easter Island.

**Account of the voyage of Jacob Roggeveen**

"... Afterwards, being in 27° south lat. they saw many birds, and other signs of land but met with none till they had sailed 12 leagues farther, when, on the 6th of April, being Easter-day, they came up with an island which they concluded to be unknown before to any European, to which, according to the day on which it was discovered, they gave the name of Easter Island. The most remarkable parts of this relation being exactly copied from the Dutch account, we shall, in general, give them in the author's own manner, whereby the reader may be the better enabled to form his judgement of this discovery.

As soon (says he) as the anchors were ready to drop, we observed at a distance a neat boat of very remarkable construction, the whole patched up together out of pieces of wood, which could hardly make up the size of half a foot. This boat was managed by a giant of twelve feet high, who exerted all his strength to escape us, but in vain; for he was surrounded and taken. His body was painted with a dark colour. We tried with such signs and words as are used here and there among the islands of the South Sea, to get some intelligence from him, but could not perceive that he understood any thing. Wherefore we permitted him to go into his boat again and depart. Two days afterwards, the whole sea was covered with the savage inhabitants of this island, who came swimming round the ship in such multitudes that we neither could, nor did we think it advisable to land. They clambered like cats up the ship's sides, with the utmost assurance, and would not be moved, these overgrown fellows stood abashed, and were in appearance, very much out of humour. They no sooner came aboard, then we immediately found that they were naturally as thievish and nimble-fingered as the inhabitants of those isles to which voyagers have affixed the name of the Islands of Thieves, from the propensity of the people to rob and steal, if they were not beaten from it. Rusty nails, old iron, and whatever they could catch or lay hold on, was equal to them, with which they jumped overboard. They attempted with their nails to scratch the bolts out of the ship, but these were too fast for them.

These huge fellows at last came on board in such numbers, that we were hardly capable of keeping them in order, or keeping a watchful eye upon their motions, so that fearing they would become too many for us, we used our best endeavors to get rid of them in a friendly manner, but they not seeming...
inclinable to leave us, we were obliged to use harsher methods, and drive these savages out by force.

On the 10th of April, we made for the island with our boats well armed, in order to land and take a view of their country; where an innumerable company of savages stood on the beach, to guard the shore, and to prevent our landing. They threatened us mightily by their gestures, and shewed an inclination to await us, and turn us out of their country; but, as soon as we, through necessity, gave them a discharge of our musquets, and here and there brought one of them to the ground, they lost their courage. They made the most surprising gestures in the world, and received their fallen companions with the utmost astonishment, wondering at the wounds which the bullets had made in their bodies; and then they hastily fled, with a dreadful howling, dragging the dead bodies along with them: So the shore was cleared, and we landed in safety. These people do not go naked as other savages do; every person is clothed in different colours of cotton and worsted, curiously woven or striped. But nothing misbecomes them more than their ears, which are abominably long, and in most of them hang upon the shoulders, so that though they themselves look upon this as the greatest ornament, they appeared very uncouth to us, who were not accustomed to such, especially as there were in them extravagantly large holes and openings, that we could easily put our hands in them.

Thus far (adds he) my narrative will gain credit; because it contains nothing uncommon, yet I must declare that these savages are of a more than gigantic size: they measured, one with another, the height of twelve feet; so that we could easily without stopping, have passed between the legs of these sons of Goliah. According to their height, so is their thickness; and they are all, one with another, well proportioned, 50 that each could have passed for a Hercules: but none of their wives came up to the height of the men, being commonly not above ten or eleven feet. The men had their bodies painted with a red or dark brown, and the women with a scarlet colour. I doubt not (says the voyager) but most people who read this voyage, will give no credit to what I relate, and that this account of the height of these giants will probably pass with them for a mere fable or fiction: But this I declare, I have set down nothing but the real truth, and that this people, upon the nicest inspection, were in fact of such a surpassing height as I have here described."

The writer says that the Gods of these savages were two large stones; one was excessively broad, and lay upon the ground. Upon this the other stood, which was so large, "...that seven men with outstretched arms, would hardly have been able to incircle it, and besides this thickness it was fully as high as three men," so that it seemed wonderful (thus as strong as these people were) how they could have contrived to place them one upon another." There was a sort of head carved on the top of this stone which was adorned with a garland that was set
somewhat in the manner of inlaid work. By what the Dutch could understand, one of these idols was called Taurico, and the other Dago, as by these words they address them. They paid great regard to these idols, clapping their hands and jumping, when they approached them; and being in great terror when the great guns were fired among them, they applied, as it should seem, to one of their gods for assistance, shouting and howling out Dago! Dago! whose succour they thought so necessary in that time of danger.

After having experienced a great storm while they lay before Easter Island, they departed from thence on the 12th April; ...."

Conclusions

Our conclusions, after studying the aforementioned account of Jacob Roggeveen's voyage, are the following:

a) In 1722, the men in Easter Island were tall and had heavy-boned and well proportioned bodies. They painted themselves with red and dark brown colours. The women were not as tall as the men and they were painted with a scarlet colour.

b) The Dutch observed that the pukao "...was adorned with a garland". Thirty-eight years after, in 1770, the Spanish sailors drew on the maps of the island some moai with their pukao and marked the crowns with little dots. This explains that some of the "cupules pecked" found in several pukao correspond to the crowns mentioned by the Dutch and drawn by the Spaniards. Consequently, the pukao had these cupules when they were placed over the moai's heads. The cupules very probably had white coral incrustations as well as the eyes did, or maybe they had just white stones showing the difference with the red colour of the pukao.

In our opinion, since the moai represented a deceased person, they were possibly painted with the same or similar colours and had the same or similar drawings and ornaments as the deceased, including the hat or crown.

Thomson (1891), Lavachery (1939), Mellén (1986 and 1990), Van Tilburg and Lee (1987), Van Tilburg (1992) and Lee (1992) made references to the hats and drawings of the moai as well as to the pecked cupules of the pukao.

c) The first name of a moai that we know of are Taurico (maybe Tau riku, Ta uriri ko or Ta uru riku, and Dago (Ta kou). These names must be accepted with the maximum linguistic precaution.

d) John Hamilton Moore's account includes several errors, i.e., the native's height of 12 feet (3.66 meters).

Note

RNJ readers will be able to compare John Hamilton Moore's account with the Roggeveen and Bouman Journals, translated by Dr. Herbert von Saher and published by RNJ (1990), vol.4, No.3 and (1990-91), vol.4(4).
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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The following article is a response to Christian Walter, RNJ 7(2):32.

MORE DETAILS FROM THE JOURNALS OF JACOB ROGGEVEEN AND CORNELIS BOUMAN, NAUTICAL DEPARTMENT

Herbert von Saher, The Netherlands

When I wrote my articles under the title of "Some Details from the Journal of..." the discoverers of Easter Island (RNJ, Volume 4, Nos. 3 and 4) I thought that the readership of RNJ was more interested in information in the field of archaeology and ethnography than in navigation and meteorology. The journals of the old seafarers consist of a large part of this nautical information, for it forms the justification to those that ordered and financed their voyage, it shows what was possible and impossible under the given circumstances and it serves future navigators to find their routes.

So I left out a lot, thinking that RNJ readers would not be interested and would find these comments on navigation boring. But now I have been challenged by a reader who is of...
the opinion that even my limited indications in this field contained mistakes and that I got Roggeveen's landing site on Easter Island wrong; moreover, the editors of RNJ have been criticized for printing my mistakes without properly checking first.

**Monday 6 April**: In the morning they still have the island in the West at 8 to 9 miles, wind East South East. They changed course (#2) from West to North West in order to reconnoiter the lee side of the island and not run the risk of being on the windward side. I realize that the line on the map does not run WNW, but if it did, it would leave the map.

When they have the island at 2 miles in the East the captains of the three ships come together in 'ship's council'. From the smoke they have seen they conclude that the island is inhabited; they want to orient themselves and they plan a landing party for the next day, hoping to find a suitable anchorage and to get some vegetables, fresh fruit, and meat. With that purpose in mind they keep their ships near to the coast during the night (but without dropping anchor because the water was too deep). They must have been moving to and fro in the lee side of the island.

**Tuesday 7 April** (#3): Very unstable weather, thunder, lightning, heavy showers, changing winds from the North West, with the result that the West coast had now become the windward side. Under those weather conditions it would be impossible to land. Bouman: we kept moving near the coast. This was the day the naked fisherman from Rapa Nui came on board [see page 50, RNJ 4(4)]. Bouman: at 20.00 hours we changed course to East, (#4) strong winds during the night.

---

*Map showing the course and bearings taken by Roggeveen as he circled around the island.*

I must defend myself and I do this by producing a map upon which I indicated the course that the Dutch fleet followed in those first days of April 1722, the bearings they took on the coast and the site where they finally anchored and landed. With every change of course recorded in the journals, there is a numbered note on the map (#1, etc.) that corresponds with the notes given below. Now we take the journals of Roggeveen and Bouman in hand and follow them from day to day. I follow Roggeveen's text and only indicate when Bouman is quoted; he has fewer entries, but is sometimes more exact. [The translation from the Linschoten edition is my own.]

**Sunday 5 April** (Easter Day), #1: Late in the afternoon the *Afrikaansche Galev* [the smallest ship in the fleet of three] sighted land West by North at 5½ sea miles. It was decided to lower sails and stand off during the night until daylight. Roggeveen decides to call the island "Easter Island".
Wednesday 8 April, Bouman: at 2.00 hours we changed course to South West (#5).

Bouman: at daylight we came very near the Northwest corner of the island and then changed course to East (#6); we saw some heathen statues on land and many people.

Roggeveen: after breakfast we sent two sloops to the coast for orientation but with the instruction not to land if there were too many people on the beach [because of the danger of a small landing party being attacked by a large group of islanders].

The sloops returned without landing because there were too many people about. They reported that the islanders – unlike the first fisherman seen – were "smartly" dressed and made friendly signs inviting the sailors to come ashore.

Bouman: we started tacking towards the coast (#7) and at 11.00 hours we were so near the coast that we could drop anchor in 23 fathoms. The soil was grayish white coral-like sand.

Roggeveen: at sunset we arrived on the roads between the two other ships that had already anchored there; we dropped anchor at 22 fathoms, coral ground, a quarter mile from land.

So this was the first time the fleet dropped anchor at Easter Island after slowly moving around for three days in a clockwise direction. [The accusation that I miscalculated the landing place once, on page 34, "...this must have been along the West coast" is beside the point. I stated that the fleet was traversing along the West coast, no one suggested a landing on the 6th of April.]

Where were they now? Both Roggeveen and Bouman gave the same orientation:

Roggeveen (#8): we took a bearing on the Eastern corner of the island, we had it East by South and the Western corner West North West of us. Bouman speaks of the "Northern corner" in the East (evidently meaning the Poike peninsula) and the Northwestern corner also at West North West [I tried to explain that already on page 50.] These were of course the Eastern and Northern corners that they could see from their ships, not the farthest points East and North of the island.

From these two bearings it becomes irrefutably clear that they were somewhere on the North coast of the island. Bouman adds another bearing: we have a big, erected statue, standing near the shore South West by West.

We do not know what moai were still standing in 1722, but this moai standing near the shore limits the landing site to only four possibilities: Anakena, La Perouse Bay, Hanga Taramoa, and possibly the vicinity of Playa de Ovahe as these are the only places on the North coast where moai have been found or could be clearly seen from the sea. Why do swimmers only go to Anakena and Ovahe? Because these are the only places with a nice sandy beach, the grayish white sand that Roggeveen as well as Bouman noticed on their anchors. At La Perouse Bay and Hanga Taramoa there is only hard rock.

Now we follow the journals again, because there is more relevant information coming.

April 9, Bouman: for the first time nice weather, we used this quiet day to careen our ships in order to clean the bottoms.

Roggeveen: many islanders came on board bringing chickens, bananas, yams for which they did not ask payment, but also stealing hats, etc. The ships remain at anchor.

April 10, Bouman: at 7:00 the landing party goes ashore, he then gives a long description of the island already reproduced on pages 51-52 in Vol. 4(4).

Roggeveen: In the morning the landing party of 134 men (being the greater part of the whole crew) leaves in five sloops [see page 34 in RNJ Vol. 4(4)].

Later in the day when the King of Rapa Nui invites the Dutch party to the other side of the island where they understood that agriculture and fruit trees were to be found, they noticed that a strong Northerly wind was starting so that their anchorage was suddenly on the windward side of the island. This very much concerned the sailors, because a dangerous situation had arisen: they had left too few men on board to be able to handle this emergency. So it was decided to return immediately to the ships. After their return they wanted to sail away.

However, 11 April still finds them at anchor, with a strong wind blowing North-North West to North West. They cannot sail out of the bay with the wind coming from this direction. They even lower the yards from the main and foremasts (in order to catch less wind). The anchor rope of the Thienhoven snaps, but its crew can manage the situation.

12 April: a very bad day. As a result of the strong wind in combination with heavy seas, the anchor ropes of two ships snap, now they are in great danger of being thrown on the rocks. They raise the yards again and prepare for a desperate sailing, and then luck is with them: during a shower the wind turns to the West and at last they can sail out of the bay clear of the rocks. At sunset they have the Eastern corner of the island at six miles to the South West and they do not intend to return.

13 April: the fleet turns to the west to continue their journey in search of the Southland.

What do we learn from these events? In a strong Northerly wind these ships are unable to escape from the bay. When we now look at the map, we see that from Playa de Ovahe, from La Perouse Bay and from Hanga Taharoa you can easily sail out to the East at a 90° angle with the Northerly wind. On the 11th, when they would dearly have loved to sail out, for they were two whole days in great danger of being thrown on the rocks, Roggeveen described the wind as NNW and NW. Only in Anakena Bay is one trapped and cannot move out in the North East direction. In my opinion this was the decisive factor that excludes all the alternatives: the high hill called Maunga Puha blocks the way, thus making it too much against the wind for the square-rigged ships of the 18th century. So I maintain my contention as set out in RNJ (1991:50-51) that the landing was at Anakena.

Since reaching this conclusion, I have been trying to find reasoning by others trying to locate Roggeveen's landing site. The really authoritative source, the edition of Roggeveen's journal by the "Linschoten Vereeniging", (the Dutch equivalent of the English Hakluyt Society), generally edited by retired admirals who are very critical of the navigation mistakes they manage to find in the old journals. Roggeveen gets very
high marks for his calculation of the position of Easter Island on the globe, which was only 1°39' wrong (actual position: 109°20' West).

In those days the exact chronometers needed to calculate longitude were not yet available and it had been months before they had left their last fixed point of orientation. Roggeveen's own indication of the anchorage has been given above under #8, but the editor of Roggeveen's journal did not try to identify it in present-day terms.

The anonymous account "Tweejarige Reyze rondom de Wereld" of 1728 contains no indication. In Behrens' French edition (1739:123): "We entered to the Southeast into a bay in order to drop anchor there." No further details are given. But Andrew Sharp says (1970:97) that Behrens indicated La Perouse bay. Where he found this, I do not know. [Don't forget that La Perouse arrived only 66 years after Behrens had left.] Anyhow, Behrens was only a soldier, whose knowledge of navigation was nil, as can easily be demonstrated from many items in his report. Behrens gives an indirect reference however, saying later on April 10th that a strong Westerly wind developed, preventing the fleet from leaving the bay where they were at anchor (if this were true it would be even stronger support for the Anakena thesis); whereas Roggeveen himself speaks of a Northerly wind (Mulert 1911:124). Claret Fleurieu (1790:300), evidently basing himself on Behrens' information, concludes erroneously: "Because a Westerly wind obliges Roggeveen to leave his anchoring site, it is probable that he had dropped anchor at the West coast and most likely in the Southern part, it is also in this part that Cook and La Perouse anchored".

When Roggeveen's journal was finally found in 1836, 114 years after it had been written, it was first published by the "Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen" [Scientific Society of Zealand] in Middelburg in 1838. The writer compared the navigational part of Roggeveen's journal with previous reports and in 5 Appendices he gives 15 pages of corrections on the old reports. There is a lot of discussion on Easter Island's position on the globe, but no attention is given to the landing site itself. C.E. Meinicke repeats this exercise in 1874, giving Roggeveen very high marks for his navigation and the exactitude of his methods. But unfortunately he also limits himself to the general location of Easter Island and other islands discovered by Roggeveen and makes no mention of the landing site.

I did make a mistake in my first article on Roggeveen's journal (RNJ 4(3):35) in describing the anchorage as being "on the northwest coast" whereas it was on the North coast. I made this error prior to my investigations for Vol.4(4) and I considered it too slight to correct.

I did not add a bibliography to my two articles in 1990 and 1991 because the text clearly stated that I had only one source: the journals of Roggeveen and Bouman (in the 1911 edition of the Linschoten Vereeniging, translated by myself).
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Beyond Romanticism


Review by Alan Drake

Natural History, the History of Settlement, Archaeology, Traditions, Language and Scripts, the Arts, and Postcontact Change: these are chapter headings hinting at the full frame of this exceptionally rare collection of diverse new essays, written by leaders in their respective fields of Rapanui studies. Much of it is repetitious, but everything is updated and contained within one volume, a source book of current studies and viewpoints. Even those Rapanui scholars and researchers who did not contribute papers to this collection are acknowledged and their work reviewed. This is a major publication in the field of Rapanui studies.

The volume is logically conceived. Rapanui is revealed from the ground up. Dr. Fischer has gathered (perhaps inspired) a collection that grows out of the firm ground of the island's 'geological parameters' and its terrestrial/marine flora.

Beginning with the editor's introduction and the first chapters, we are at once presented with two of the collection's central themes: 1. Easter Island as a microcosmic mirror of human experimentation (and folly) and 2. encouragement to preserve what remains of this unique society. This volume flows out of the pioneer thinking of its dedicatee, William Mulloy. In this way it parallels Paul Bahn and John Flenley's recent Easter Island Earth Island. Not coincidentally, John Flenley's hypothetic model of ecological events on Rapanui is prominently placed at the beginning of Easter Island Studies, creating a viewpoint from which the reader might contemplate and judge all that follows. There remains plenty of room for skepticism.

Once the physical and natural environment has been presented, we proceed logically out of the ground into the history of settlement, relying primarily on osteology and archaeology. With osteology, through the work of George Gill and Douglas Owsley, we see the possibilities of determining the origins of the Rapanui population. Fischer groups within this 'the history of settlement' section his own discussion of a variety of presumably modern names for the island and André Mark's bibliographic list of Rapanui material in the archives of the Fathers of the Sacred Heart. As list and definitions, these would ordinarily have been appendices to the book, instead, these lists of the oldest existing materials are presented as verifiably genuine glimpses into the Rapanui past, before the infusion of new ideas and customs from both Europe and Rapanui's closer Polynesian neighbors. (The coming of the Europeans released the Rapanui from their isolation).

Chapter 3, 'Archaeology', opens with Paul G. Bahn's "Brief History of Rapanui Archaeology Up to 1956" (the year of the Norwegian Expedition, which, more than anything before, brought Rapanui clearly into world view) with many rare illustrations of European views (some hilarious) of early Rapanui. Many technical papers are here, including a joint paper on obsidian dating. They provide but a cursory attempt at making these mysteries comprehensive to the general public. The chapter ends with A. Elena Charola and Carlos A. Weber's report on the current work being done to preserve the island's archaeological heritage. This is clearly written and far-reaching in its vision and understanding of the factors involved. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 bring us away from 'things' and into traditions and language. There are so many treats here, including separate essays with revealing insights into the Rapanui pantheon, traditional foods and medicine, the Rapanui language and scripts, the performing arts, traditional and tourist crafts, and symbolism in Rapanui 'art'. There are other studies as well. Occasionally the writing is dense, written for those with knowledge of the subjects, still, each of the studies is accessible to the careful reader.

The final chapter, Postcontact Change, consists of but a single essay by J. Douglas Porteous, "The Modernization of Rapanui." He presents an excellent outline of European contact and its indomitable exploitation of Rapanui, up to the current day. As he states, "Future research on the modernization theme should address the problems of tourism economy, the preservation of archaeological sites, the possibilities of a wider economic base, and the geopolitical and cultural role of the Rapanui in the wider Pacific context." This should be an eye-opener to the rose-colored glasses crowd. Still, it is a shame, as always, that Rapanui (or whatever its name may have been) continues to be picked apart by foreigners (governments, tourists and scholars alike), whatever their good intentions. The Rapanui themselves rarely have a voice in volumes such as this. Politics no doubt continues to play a deterring role, for the concern of the modern Rapanui is primarily self-rule and no one, no one, wants to lose their footing. Except for a few papers at the end of the collection, and cursory mention here and there, it might appear that the Rapanui died out a hundred or so years ago. As anyone who has visited the island knows, this is not so. Granted, these are not the same Rapanui who play a prominent role in this volume, but who are we to prevent them from having their own voice? Can't we provide space for their own concerns, adapting their voice to our studious framework?

The volume ends with Fischer's postscript. It follows his introduction in tone and intent, humanizing all that we have read about the island and its people past and present.

Fischer is to be praised for his insistence on publishing all contributions in English, refusing to take the polyglot approach adopted in other collections of Rapanui studies, where the finer points remain hidden beneath the scientific jargon of several languages, rendering much good work incomprehensible to many, perhaps most, readers. (In this vein, it would be good one day to see 1500 Jahre Kultur der Osterinsel published in English).
Be there no misunderstanding: as a whole, Fischer has done an outstanding job. It is a successful attempt at presenting a broad and detailed picture of Rapanui studies and the studied. Your library will be incomplete without this volume.


Review by W.W. Schumacher, Denmark

Skottsberg started to build up Gothemburg Botanical Garden in 1916, following in the wake of his two Swedish countrymen, Daniel Solander and Anders Sparrmann. Solander and Sparrmann had participated in James Cook's First and Second Voyage respectively. As Cook had not called at every South Sea island, it was not until 1917—the year Skottsberg came to Easter Island—that the collecting and describing of the entire new flora of the South Seas was completed according to Linne's classification system.

Bengt Danielsson, now in his seventies, began studying philosophy before turning to sociology and ethnography. By chance—and because he happened to be in the area—he became a member of Thor Heyerdahl's Kon-Tiki Expedition in 1947 and the South Seas have not left him since. A resident of Tahiti for forty years, he therefore was the right person to deal with South Seas botany.

Danielsson expounds 18 pages on "Skottsberg's mysterious island", giving the history of Easter Island and his story of its prehistory (he is not influenced by his fellow-Scandinavian, Heyerdahl). Thus he explains the creation of the *moai* as a transfer: when the islanders no longer had trees to make canoes, they had to look for other activity. And, he also discusses *rongorongo*, agreeing with Emory who had doubts as to whether it is writing at all. He still waits for Barthel's translations.

Tack så mycket, Bengt!

INTERNATIONAL NEWS

**Belgium Diving Expedition.** We reported at length on this projected expedition in RNJ 7(2):30-31. We now hear that permission to conduct this expedition has been denied in Chile.

**Anthony Pujador y Estany** (see RNJ 2(2):8, 1988) who erected a modern copy of a *moai* in the town of Olot in Catalonia, Spain, died recently in Barcelona. Tony was a confirmed Rapanuiophile with a great love of the island and islanders.

**French nuclear tests.** More than 1000 people rallied in Paris in June, calling for a continuation of the moratorium on nuclear testing. Other rallies were organized in other cities in France and a signature campaign is underway to urge France to not resume its nuclear testing in the Pacific.

**WHAT'S NEW IN POLYNESIA**

**Mangaia.** The Mangaia Archaeological Project, headed by Patrick V. Kirch, director of the Archaeological Research Facility, University of California, Berkeley, has yielded a mass of new information on ecological change during the past 7,000 years on this small island. The Mangaia Project has conducted two field seasons of interdisciplinary research; the results indicated that humans first began having a serious effect on the island environment about 2500 years BP.

The Project has excavated a major rockshelter, Tangatatau, with a well-stratified sequence spanning the last thousand years of Mangaian prehistory. Artifacts recovered include stone adzes, shell fishhooks, bone tattooing needles, and carbonized plant remains including the oldest documented fragments of sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) from Polynesia. [From *Berkeley Archaeology*, Archaeological Research Facility, Vol.1(1). Readers who wish to be added to their mailing list, send name and address to Editor, ARF Newsletter, 232 Kroeber Hall, Berkeley CA 94720.]

**Kaho'olawe, Hawaii.** The Proyect Kaho'olawe Ohana has received liability and entry agreements it needs to restore the environment of the former target island. The *ohana* has a $250,000 grant from the legislature to restore native vegetation on this severely eroded island.

The initial two-year project will be a model for restoring the Hawaiian *ahu pua'a* concept of mountain-to-sea land divisions. One mile of pipe and movable irrigation equipment will be installed, and a rain catchment system established. [Honolulu Advertiser, May 13, 1993.]

**HE RONGO HO'O U: WHAT'S NEW IN HANGAROA**

**Anakena Excavation results.** The news that a possible dog bone had been found in a dig at Anakena, as reported by Claudio Cristino and mentioned in RNJ 5(3):45, has now been...
clarified. Dr. David Steadman of the New York State Museum, stated that the bone in question was not from a dog.

His fascinating reports given at the Rapa Nui Rendezvous conference in Laramie noted the early faunal record. In an excavation on the sea side of Ahu Nau Nau, Steadman found 6433 identifiable bones in three pits. More porpoise bone (2312) was found than all other kinds; and there were three bones from pinnipeds—either sea lion or seal. The preponderance of porpoise bones from an early level is evidence that the islanders had sea-going canoes. Later levels lack porpoise bone, indicating a decline in the ability to get out to sea. Thus the loss of forest relates to the lack of porpoise bones in the upper levels of the excavation.

Steadman’s second report dealt with extinct species of birds due to the impact of man. It was not only predation by man that extirpated the birds; such other things as introduced diseases from chickens, habitat destruction, and the introduction of rats. This not only happened on Rapa Nui but throughout the Pacific. The evidence from Anakena indicates that the early arrivals ate sooty terns, storm petrels, albatross, fulmar, sheevers, booby, rails, pigeons and doves, heron, parrots and barn owl.

Steadman noted that Rapa Nui once was the richest seabird island in the world as it had birds from both the tropic and the temperate zones. Today on the island, only the tropic bird remains plus a few other species can be found on Motu Nui and Motu Iti. The massive reduction can only be attributed to the impact caused by the arrival of man on this fragile island.

✓ The Island Museum. The director of the Sebastian Englert Museum on Rapa Nui, Claudio Cristinio, has been replaced. The new director is Chilean anthropologist, Claudio Gomez, who will take over in October of this year.

✓ Tongariki. Work has halted at Tongariki. A directive from the Consejo de Monumentos states that no further efforts will be permitted until more funding is available and a full archaeological report is forthcoming. Two statues were raised, some say prematurely, and they must be stabilized to prevent further erosion.

The ahu platform at Tongariki has been heavily layered with cement which is apt to crumble under the weight of the heavy stones that comprise the bulk of the structure. The two statues that were raised have been cemented to their pedestals, an unfortunate choice as cement prevents rain water from escaping from the bases of the statues.

✓ Show Biz. The movie filmed on Rapa Nui ['a major Warner Brothers release!'] is expected to be released in December or January. The title is still ‘Rapa Nui’ and a book will be published as a companion to the film. The book will tell "...the complete story of the epic film, including the screenplay, black-and-white and color photographs, features on the history and people of Easter Island, and exclusive behind-the-scenes stories on the film's production." The paperback version will cost $16.95.

The plot has undergone many changes and now has an ecological twist, influenced by the book Easter Island Earth Island by Paul Bahn and John Flenley. The infamous iceberg scene described in RNJ 7(1):7 has been, mercifully, eliminated.

A statue being raised onto the ahu at Tongariki
Photo credit: M.C.Poirier

A New Zealand TV crew visited the island shortly before filming was completed and their program was aired in NZ on Frontline. Some of the highlights of the news program have

The two statues placed on the ahu at Tongariki
Photo credit: M.C.Poirier

been provided by John Flenley: The program focused on mixed feelings among the islanders, some pro and some very 'anti'. The show mentioned the strikes, the Maori actors, and the soaring of freight charges that doubled food prices in the island stores. The presenter was Rod Vaughan, and his
exchanges with Director Kevin Reynolds and producer Barry Osborne are of interest:

Vaughn: How much of it is fact and how much fiction?

Reynolds: I'd say it's about 50-50. No one really knows what fact is. I mean there's a lot of legend as to what happened here, and then what the archaeologists tell us most likely occurred, and I've sorta taken that and extrapolated on it and used some dramatic license and come up with what I think could be the true story.

Vaughn: You see nothing wrong is using dramatic license in a situation like this?

Reynolds: I don't really care if people say, well, that's not what happened. I'd have to say yeah, it may not be what happened. At least it will make people aware of the place and they can explore it for themselves and decide what they think really happened.

Later, the conversation turned to damage that occurred to the archaeological sites:

Vaughn: It's alleged that this slab-house [at Orongo] collapsed under the weight of the production crew; the film makers have promised to make good any damage as well as remove all the materials that were used in the making of the movie. But many people are wondering whether the island will ever be the same again. This despite assurances by producer Barry Osborne....

Osborne: I'm sure that we've made some mistakes and at the same time I think we've done some good.

Vaughn: But three or four moai have been damaged...during the course of the filming, is that correct or not?

Osborne: We had, you know, on several occasions, rubbed against the moai some of our ropes and because they are sensitive and they are exposed to the air there might be some little abrasion, but really, no, I would say no, if you look at what we did in comparison to the condition of the moai, I'd say no, the impact has been very slight.

Vaughn: What about the clean-up afterwards? Osborne: It's a monumental job to restore a location, but we intend to leave the locations in better condition than we found them.

Easter Island Foundation
Fundación Rapa Nui

Taking advantage of the number of EIF members present in Laramie, Wyoming, a meeting of the Easter Island Foundation/Fundación Rapa Nui was held on August 3rd, 1993 at the home of Emily Ross Mulloy.

Members attending were President Joan Seaver Kurze, Governor Jacobo Hey, Alcalde Alberto Hotus, Tom Christopher, Steven R. Fischer, Ted Kurze, Wilhelm Solheim, Yoshiiko Sinoto, Patrick McCoy, Judy and Carlyle Smith, William Liller, Gary Wirth, Georgia Lee, George Gill, Rose Marie Wallace, and Emily Mulloy.
Governor Hey and Alcade Hotus both addressed the group, stressing their support for a library on Rapa Nui. Rose Marie Wallace of Santiago, Chile, was voted in as Vice-President for South American affairs.

The William Mulloy Library (or the Biblioteca William Mulloy as it is called in Chile) is now open and functioning at the Fonck Society Museum in Viña del Mar. It's very capable and trained librarian is Ana Betty Haoa Raphango, a native islander now living on the mainland. Come and visit when you are in Chile!

Easter Island Foundation/ Fundación Rapa Nui
666 Dead Cat Alley, Woodland, CA 95695.

PUBLICATIONS


Everything one needs to know about the islands of Fiji is in this pocket-sized book. Going to Fiji? Don’t leave home without it. The amount of information, timely tips, and interesting asides is really staggering. Stanley clearly loves his work, and it shows.

- University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji. A workshop on marine education was held recently at the University. Teachers, curriculum developers and educators in marine studies came from the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomons, Tokelau, Tonga, Vanuatu, and Western Samoa. The Director of Marine Studies, Professor Robin South, noted that—despite the fact that the ocean is an overwhelming feature in the Pacific islands—there still is no strong program for marine studies. The workshop was intended to encourage a series of in-country training programs in biological, chemical, geological and physical oceanography, as well as ocean resource management and environmental issues.

Tok Blong SPPF: A Quarterly of News and Views on the Pacific Islands. May 1993, #43. This issue has several important papers concerning Pacific tourism: "Tourism in the Pacific" by David Stanley; "Tourist Trap" by Patricia Tummons; "Tourism's negative impact on native Hawaiians" by Rev. Kaleo Patterson; and a send-up of the Polynesian Cultural Centre by Norman and Ngare Douglas: “Where the Tiki are Wired for Sound and Poi Glow in the Dark.” A complimentary copy of this Quarterly can be had by writing to SPPF, 415-620 View Street, Victoria, B.C., Canada V8W 1J6.

Far Horizons Cultural Discovery Trip to Easter Island
February 1994
Spend a week on Rapa Nui and see the famous Tapati Rapa Nui festival. This in-depth, archaeologically oriented trip is led by Georgia Lee.

Optional side trip to Northern Chile available.

Further information? contact Far Horizons, PO Box 91900, Albuquerque NM 87199-1900, (800) 552-4575.
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