# Pacific Studies

Vol. 31, No. 2-June 2008

# PACIFIC STUDIES

A multidisciplinary journal devoted to the study of the peoples of the Pacific Islands

JUNE 2008

Anthropology
Archaeology
Art History
Economics
Ethnomusicology
Folklore
Geography
History
Sociolinguistics
Political Science
Sociology
Literary Studies

PUBLISHED BY
THE PACIFIC INSTITUTE
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY HAWAI'I
IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE POLYNESIAN CULTURAL CENTER

Articles and reviews in *Pacific Studies* are abstracted or indexed in *Sociological Abstracts, Linguistics and Language Behavior Abstracts, America: History and Life, Historical Abstracts, Abstracts in Anthropology, Anthropological Literature, PAIS Bulletin, International Political Science Abstracts, International Bibliography of Periodical Literature, International Bibliography of Book Reviews, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences, Anthropoligical Index Online,* and *Referativnyi Zhurnal.*

**COVER DESIGN:**
Jared Pere, Maori/Hawai'i – *Indigenous Pacific Art Designs*
Anthony Perez, Samoa – *Graphic Design*

# PACIFIC STUDIES



Editorial Policy: *Pacific Studies* is published quarterly by The Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University Hawai'i #1979, 55–220 Kulanui Street, Lā'ie, Hawai'i 96762, but responsibility for opinions expressed in the articles rests with the authors alone. Subscription rate is US$40.00 yearly, payable to The Pacific Institute. The Pacific Institute (formerly The Institute for Polynesian Studies) is an organization funded by Brigham Young University Hawai'i. The Institute assists the University in meeting its cultural and educational goals by undertaking a program of teaching, research, and publication. The Institute cooperates with other scholarly and research institutions in achieving their objectives. It publishes monographs, produces films, underwrites research, and sponsors conferences on the Pacific Islands.

Articles submitted to the editor must not be submitted elsewhere while under review by *Pacific Studies*. Please note that text files should be in Microsoft Word format and should be completely double-spaced (including quotations, references, and notes). Please submit manuscripts to Pacificstudies@byuh.edu. Authors may visit our website, http://w2.byuh.edu/academics/thepacificinstitute/pacstudy.htm, for Instructions to Authors. Books for review should be sent to the editor.



This publication is printed on acid-free paper and meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Council on Library Resources.

ISSN 0275-3596
ISBN 0-939154-77-3

Volume 31 June 2008 Number 2

CONTENTS

*Articles*



*Reviews*



*Books Noted*



PUBLISHED 9/2008

# PACIFIC STUDIES

Vol. 31, No. 2 June 2008

## CHANGING CONCEPTS OF CHIEF AND HIERARCHY ON A POLYNESIAN OUTLIER

William W. Donner
*Kutztown University*

Sikaiana is a Polynesian society with a legend of a powerful, centralized chief or *aliki*. However, Sikaiana is a very egalitarian society, and it has resisted efforts by Protectorate and national government administrators to establish a local chief. This article examines the legendary and modern history of Sikaiana chiefs to show how power and authority became and remained decentralized. The ideology of Sikaiana egalitarianism is supported by familiarity and face-to-face experience with personally known others. This egalitarianism faces new challenges because Sikaiana society both differentiates internally and becomes incorporated into larger, regional and international social systems. There is a dynamic interaction between the environment, past experience, and foreign influences as the Sikaiana reformulate their notions of chiefdomship and hierarchy.

The chief T. complained that he could get no respect from the people. The people complained that they could not respect him as he seldom came to the main island and they had no confidence in him.

(BSIP 1 III F 49/6: report dated December 19, 1939).

On the occasion of my last visit in September 1948, I noted that there was a certain amount of friction between the headman and a section of the community; I did not raise the matter. M. is not a good chief—rather foolish of mien and manner . . . .

In view of the friction which exists and the obvious unpopularity of the present headman, I informed the people that M. would relinquish his office as headman on 31st December 1949.

(BSIP 1 III F 49/6; attached to report dated May 1949).

> The morale of the island is lower than on my last visit and I gather that the chief, TK, has lost his grip and that the people are trying to show Government that he needs changing by very half-hearted response to his efforts.
>
> (BSIP 1 III F 49/6: report dated May 17, 1956).

THESE QUOTES DESCRIBING THE TROUBLES of three different Sikaiana "chiefs" are from the files of colonial district officers who visited Sikaiana in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s. Sikaiana offers an interesting anomaly. It is a Polynesian society with a legendary tradition of a centralized and hierarchical ranked office, which corresponds with classic anthropological conceptualizations of a chiefdom, but Sikaiana is a very egalitarian society where most people have an aversion to hierarchy and centralized authority. In this paper, I want to describe the environmental, historical, and cultural factors that shape various, changing, and sometimes conflicting concepts of chiefdomship and leadership on Sikaiana.

Anthropologists once made a distinction between the relatively egalitarian "bigman" societies of Melanesia and the stratified "chiefly" societies of Polynesia (Sahlins 1963). More recent scholarship, however, has called conceptualizations of chief and bigman into question, arguing that such contrasts are misleading simplifications (see Thomas 1989; Feinberg 2002; Feinberg and Watson-Gegeo 1996; also Flanagan 1989). In the late 1950s, Sahlins (1958) proposed that variations in Polynesian chiefdomship can be understood in terms of the redistribution of resources and environmental adaptation: generally the larger the amount of surplus resources that were produced the higher the stratification. In contrast, Goldman (1970) proposed that Polynesian chiefdomships could be understood in more cultural or ideological terms as the outcome of "status rivalry" between competing chiefs. By the 1980s, Sahlins (1981, 1985) developed a perspective that described the reciprocal relationship between historical events and cultural interpretations shaping conceptualizations of Polynesian chiefs, especially during contact with Europeans. Generally, there has been a trend toward examining the specific dynamics that shape leadership, perhaps reflecting a more general trend in social theory to examine the relations between culture and action (see Ortner 1984; Giddens 1984; Sahlins 1985; Bourdieu 1990). There is now a general agreement that traditional Polynesian chiefdoms were dynamic systems in which chiefs had to combine divine legitimacy and popular support (see Marcus 1989; Howard 1985; Valeri 1985; Shore 1996; Feinberg and Watson-Gegeo 1996).

Kirch (1984) and Kirch and Yen (1982) have shown that change is an inevitable feature of island adaptations, especially small islands and atolls, because humans alter their environment as they use it. Combining cultural

and environmental factors, Kirch (1984, 2000) has used extensive archeological and ethno-historical sources to argue that Polynesian chiefdomships are the outcome of an interplay between cultural ideologies and historical events that operate within certain environmental constraints. These environmental constraints change as human populations increase and human use of the environment alters that environment.

The historical, cultural, and environmental context of chieftaincy broadens radically with colonization and modernization. Chiefs became political issues in colonial relations and Western contact, and often times chiefs serve as centers of contention between exogenous and indigenous interests. In some cases, colonial forces worked through chiefs, trying to get chiefs to serve their interests, and sometimes, as on Sikaiana, they tried to create politically stable chiefs where there had been none. Recently, anthropologists have found that local communities have rallied around chiefs as symbolic centers of an indigenous identity, often presented in opposition to dominating external powers (Keesing 1989; Firth 1979; White 1992; White and Lindstrom 1997; Feinberg and Watson-Gegeo 1996).

Sikaiana chiefs and leadership can best be understood as reflecting some general Polynesian cultural themes about hierarchy that are modified to specific environmental and historical circumstances. As a small atoll with limited resources, Sikaiana never generated the surplus wealth that is associated with a hierarchical system of resource control and redistribution. Sikaiana's settlers retained an image of a centralized, hierarchical chief, probably derived from an important institution in the social relations of their ancestors. But cultural institutions respond to environmental and historical forces. In the Sikaiana case, the centralized, hierarchical chief was maintained as an image in a legend that legitimated the distribution of important land resources to commoners and decentralized the authority system. By 1900, before the introduction of Western institutions, Sikaiana is remembered and described by elderly people as egalitarian in its social relations with institutions that limited centralized authority. Throughout the twentieth century, the Sikaiana people incorporated new Western institutions into their lives in a manner that supported and reflected their egalitarian relationships. British colonial officials tried to establish a chief as part of their colonial policy, and more recently there has been a trend to try to identify local chiefs as part of efforts to establish customary rules in the independent Solomon Islands.

Generally, the Sikaiana people tried to resist these trends to centralized authority and leadership, but there are new contexts that continue to reshape Sikaiana social relations. Sikaiana egalitarianism emphasizes equality of outcomes, whereas the Sikaiana people participate in many Western institutions and a global economic system that almost ensure inequality of outcomes.

Furthermore, Sikaiana egalitarianism is expressed in a small-scale, face-to-face society; increasingly, the Sikaiana have become involved in new forms of hierarchy and leadership that are remote, impersonal, and global. In the following pages, I will describe Sikaiana concepts of chiefs and their resistance to centralized authority throughout my stays in the 1980s and early 1990s. In doing so, I will use a variety of sources including Sikaiana legends and memories, British colonial records, the organization of Sikaiana groups, their interactions, and the way they talked about daily life and events. I want to show how conceptualizations of the past, the organization of social institutions, and everyday interactions and speech shape Sikaiana social relations. In the case of Sikaiana, there is a clear recognition of hierarchy in legends, but there are strong values for egalitarianism in their institutions, ideology, and interactions.[1]

## Legendary Chiefs

Sikaiana is an atoll about 100 miles east of Malaita in the Solomon Islands. Its inhabitants are Polynesian in their language, culture, and traditions. Before intensive contact with Europeans, the atoll had about 200 inhabitants. But over the past 150 years, Sikaiana life has undergone many changes, most of which are the direct or indirect result of contact with Western cultural traditions and Sikaiana's partial incorporation into regional and global social systems. The population had more than tripled between 1900 and the time of my first arrival in 1980, and more ethnic Sikaiana resided in Honiara, the capital of the Solomon Islands, than resided on the atoll. Nevertheless, most Sikaiana people, including those living abroad and those on the atoll, form a community of shared interests, cultural traditions, and dense, interlocking relationships.

Sikaiana legends claim that the atoll's present settlement was founded in the remote past by Tehui Atahu who sailed from Luahatu, an unknown location. As he journeyed, Tehui Atahu took on different people from various Pacific islands as members of his crew. When he first arrived at Sikaiana, it was still submerged under shallow water and he asked one of his crewmen to stake a claim. Then he sailed on to Luaniua (in Ontong Java) and befriended a leader there, Tehui Luaniua. When Tehui Atahu returned to Sikaiana, it had emerged above the water and was occupied by a different people, the Hetuna. Tehui Atahu tricked and eventually annihilated all the Hetuna and claimed the land for his own. After a dispute with Tehui Luaniua, and a draw in a tug-of-war contest, they divided the land into two sides, Tehui Atahu taking the larger share. Tehui Luaniua and Tehui Atahu became Sikaiana's gods, and images were erected to represent them in the central ritual house,

*Hale Aitu*. Their patrilineal descendants alternated in succeeding to the position of *aliki*, which is cognate with the widespread Polynesian term for chief.

Over the following generations, migrants arrived on Sikaiana from various islands. Sometimes immigrants were allowed to live and intermarried with the Sikaiana people; other times they were put to death. The patrilineal descendants of Tehui Atahu and Tehui Luaniua are still called the *heto aliki* or *mata aliki* (chiefly clans) and are recognized as having the right to succeed to the chieftaincy. The patrilineal clans formed by descendants of the migrants who were allowed to survive are called *tantavale*. There are three named clans (*hale akina*) that claim chiefly descent from Tehui Luaniua and Tehui Atahu (Saalupe, Vaka Vusu, and Saatui), although they dispute each other's legitimacy. There are four named clans (Saakava, Saapei, and two different clans sharing the name Saatelua) that are tantavale or "commoner clans."[2]

The Sikaiana use the term *aliki*, a reflex of the common Polynesian term for chief, to refer to Tehui Atahu and all the succeeding chiefs. The chiefs of this legendary period are described as having considerable authority and power, controlling all of Sikaiana's land and managing its ritual life. Indeed, some Sikaiana people told me that commoners starved when these chiefs controlled all of the atoll's resources. Commoner descent lines gained access to land about six to ten generations ago, although there is disagreement among the Sikaiana about the specific manner in which rights to land became distributed. Some people say that several successive chiefs felt compassion (*aloha*) for the landless commoner tantavale and decreed that land could be claimed by anyone who cleared (*kai taa*) or worked it. Any man who developed plots of land for use attained the rights to this land. This land includes swamps for taro and dry land for coconut groves. These plots of land were inherited by the patrilineal descendants of the original clearer, or in some accounts, the children designated by him. One chiefly descent line, Vaka Vusu, disagrees with this version and claims that one of their ancestral chiefs took many wives and then gave his wives' families conditional rights to use plots of land.

There is also controversy about the principles governing use of these land rights. Some people, mostly in chiefly lines, argue that the chiefly lines retain residual rights of eminent domain over all land on Sikaiana and under certain circumstances can repossess land from commoners. Others, including some members of chiefly clans, claim that cleared land (kai taa) belongs inalienably to the patrilineal descendants of the original clearer, whether chiefly or commoner. In whatever manner land was distributed and howsoever it is held, present-day groups of people with rights to use tracts of land can be

thought of as patrilineages (*kano hale*) whose genealogical origins can be traced back to founding ancestors from about ten generations ago. These patrilineages are segments of the clans (hale akina) described above.

At present, there also is bitter controversy about competing claims to legitimacy among different descent groups within the chiefly descent lines. One clan claiming descent from Tehui Luaniua is divided into two separate land-holding lineages (kano hale), but one of these lineages has disputed the genealogical legitimacy of the other.[3] There are two chiefly clans, Saalupe and Vaka Vusu, claiming descent from Tehui Atahu, each of which challenges the legitimacy of the other. Members of Saalupe claim that the members of Vaka Vusu are not descended from Tehui Atahu; instead they are the descendants of Vusu, a man favored by Tehui Atahu with the right to succeed to the chieftainship because of Vusu's kindness when no one else would help Tehui Atahu. Although they do not dispute the Vaka Vusu clan's right to succeed to the chieftaincy, they do dispute its claims to rights of eminent domain over land. Representatives of Vaka Vusu assert that the Saalupe are commoners, tantavale, who never had the right to succeed to the chieftaincy and, therefore, do not have any rights of eminent domain over land on Tehui Atahu's side of Sikaiana. Among the Saalupe themselves, there is some discord concerning who can succeed to the chieftaincy. Traditionally, only one of several different Saalupe lineages has provided the chief (aliki), although the nominal "paramount chief" during my stay in the 1980s was from a different Saalupe line.

The egalitarian nature of Sikaiana social relations is supported by the fact that lineages provide their membership with autonomous control over land. Sometimes members of chiefly clans asserted rights of eminent domain over all land; but as a practical matter, each lineage, whether chiefly or commoner, operated independently of others in its management of land. Moreover, the disagreements about land distribution and chiefly legitimacy further limit the possibility of centralization of power and any attempts to actually exercise claims of eminent domain over land. The disputes themselves can be understood as functioning to support a decentralized political structure.

## The Traditional Chief

I find it difficult to define any period of Sikaiana history as "traditional" because it seems clear that Sikaiana was undergoing constant change before intensive contact with Europeans. I consider the early 1900s as a kind of traditional baseline for my study of Sikaiana history because that is a time period remembered by my oldest informants during my first stay in 1980–1983.

However, even by 1900, sporadic contacts with Europeans had made impacts on Sikaiana life, especially in their use of Western manufactured goods including steel tools and clothing.

The aliki of the early 1900s is remembered as being a ceremonial and ritual role but not a political office with authority. The aliki oversaw the ceremonies that ensured the atoll's welfare. He is not remembered as receiving any ceremonial deference or restrictions (*tapu*): unlike many Polynesian chiefs, his person does not seem to have been sacred (see Marcus 1989). Older Sikaiana, including the two oldest living people during my stays, denied that the chief had any authority to settle disputes. In some ritual ceremonies, the chief is described as taking on his ritual role after dressing, with the aid of a female assistant, the *sapai ulu*. All this suggests that the role of aliki was somewhat transitory: a person moved in and out of a ritual role.[4]

Some chiefly authority was manifested during certain harvest ceremonies that were overseen by the aliki and his successor, the *takala*. Ritual assistants, the *pule*, made sure no one harvested fruits before they were ripe and oversaw their collection and distribution. Although this can be viewed as a first fruits ritual enjoyed by chiefs in other Polynesian societies, this right of first fruits did not extend to other more important foods, including taro and fish, which are the main staples in the diet. The ceremony and its prohibitions on harvesting probably prevented the premature harvest of these seasonal fruits and ensured the communal collection and distribution of mature fruits.[5]

By 1900, there were a variety of other ways in which the aliki's power was limited and decentralized. Succession to the chieftaincy alternated between the lines descended from Tehui Luaniua and Tehui Atahu, so that, if one of Tehui Atahu's descendants held the office, his successor, the takala, should be a descendant of Tehui Luaniua. Both the aliki and the takala had a different set of ceremonial officers; thus, all the atoll's ceremonial positions changed (*hakahiti*) when a new chief succeeded. Many of these ceremonial assistants came from commoner descent lines. During one of the traditional ceremonies, the *teika llee*, which was performed when a very large fish or unusual animal washed ashore, a young person could be designated as aliki for the ceremony.

Furthermore, supernatural power was decentralized. When older Sikaiana people talked about supernatural activity during the period before their conversion to Christianity, they most often described the activities of ancestral spirits, *aitu mate*, and their mediums, who were their immediate descendants, usually sons or grandsons. These mediums and their ancestral spirits could be from any lineage, commoner or chiefly, and are remembered with great fear for causing much harm and many deaths. As opposed to the aliki, whose activities were concerned with the welfare of the entire community,

the spirits and their mediums were concerned with personal jealousies and antagonism. In the 1980s, people still remembered the names of especially powerful and feared spirits and their mediums. These powerful mediums came from both commoner and chiefly clans. No one remembered that a powerful ancestral spirit was associated with the last aliki or his successor. The aliki's role in the late nineteenth century was largely ritual, not political, and mostly concerned with communal ritual, as opposed to the more individual concerns of the feared ancestral spirits and their mediums.[6]

By the early twentieth century, life on Sikaiana was influenced by contacts with traders and to a lesser extent by visits of administrators representing the British Solomon Islands Protectorate. Trade goods were essential in the local economy, and some young people left the atoll to work for Europeans to earn wages. The last aliki is remembered as living to a very old age, outliving several of his successors, takala. Shortly before this chief's death, a zealous European trader somehow convinced Sikaiana people to destroy their ritual centers. Upon this last chief's death, no one seems to have been interested in succeeding him. Many of his potential successors were either too young or too involved with new activities associated with Western culture contact to learn and practice the ritual considered essential to the position. After the destruction of these ritual houses, some Sikaiana people asked the Melanesian Mission to send missionaries to Sikaiana. These missionaries arrived in 1929; there followed a rapid conversion to Christianity, which included almost the entire population by the outbreak of World War II. Many Sikaiana people told me that, following their conversion to Christianity, their parents and elders were reluctant to teach traditional ritual practices, and younger people, many of whom left the atoll to attend mission boarding schools, were not interested in learning them.

Protectorate reports and travelers' accounts suggest that early in the twentieth century the Protectorate's officials looked upon the last aliki as the local authority and their intermediary with the Sikaiana people under their policy of indirect rule (MacQuarrie 1952; Lambert 1941). However, government influence on the atoll was limited and sporadic before the 1930s. At some point around 1930, the British appointed the last aliki's son as their local headman and the quotations about "T" at the beginning of this paper refer to the troubles experienced by this and succeeding appointees. If the British were interested in traditional legitimacy, the successor should have been from a different clan, because the chiefly clans alternated in succession. However, probably more troublesome for the Sikaiana, there was no legitimate centralized political authority in the nineteenth century similar to the one that the British apparently expected this person to fulfill. Although some Sikaiana people were allied with the appointed choice, many others did not

recognize his legitimacy. The British expected their appointed chief to perform political functions that the last traditional chief did not have.

Throughout the Protectorate period, the appointment of a local headman (or paramount chief) remained a problem. After several changes of appointment (see BSIP 9 F 63, letter dated 2/5/49; BSIP 1 III F 49/6, letters dated 5/18/49, 4/14/50), a man was selected who remained in office for about 20 years, although with decreasing authority. Most people, although not all, agree that he came from the appropriate clan to succeed to the chiefdomship. This headman appointed a council that was responsible for governing the atoll and handling minor court cases pending the arrival of the District Officer. But increasingly, Western institutions, including an elected council and local court, became the main government institutions on Sikaiana.

During my stays in the 1980s, there was a local headman (or as some referred to him, paramount chief), but the position was viewed as ceremonial, and beyond his family and relatives, he did not have any authority or influence as the result of that position. The eldest surviving person on the atoll, who had witnessed the chief's ritual activities as a young woman, told me that she associated the term aliki with the pre-Christian ritual life that ended with the destruction of the ritual houses and the atoll's conversion to Christianity. She refused to consider the present-day paramount chief as having anything to do with the traditional ritual role, which she described as destroyed. A reenactment of Sikaiana traditions involving the traditional ritual activities of the aliki was performed when the Prime Minister visited Sikaiana in 1982. The role of aliki was performed by an influential Sikaiana man who had a medical degree, even though he was not from a chiefly line. The paramount chief was an observer of these reenactments.

Some members of the chiefly clans proudly proclaimed their heritage to me, but they had no real authority deriving solely from that fact. Several rivals disputed the legitimacy of the government's designated paramount chief and supported their own cause for holding that position, but that position in itself had no authority and very little prestige. In over three years of living with the Sikaiana, I never saw the paramount chief act in any official capacity deriving from this position.[7] In 1982 during a court case, the local court asked that a local custom (*kastam, kastomu*) committee give its opinion about several points of traditional land tenure. The custom committee was informally constituted and included the oldest people residing on the atoll regardless of whether they were from commoner or chiefly descent lines. In the meeting of the custom committee in 1982, the three oldest people, all women, had the most influence.

The traditional term for chief, aliki, is presently used to refer to the captain of a boat or of an airplane crew. Most often, however, leadership

positions and influential people are described by the term *tama hakananiu* (person make-big), most likely a loan translation from the Solomon Islands Pijin term *bikman* (bigman), a term that is also used frequently when the Sikaiana are speaking in Pijin. As used on Sikaiana, tama hakananiu and bikman are generic terms referring both to leaders and also to ordinary men who should be respected for their maturity or responsibility. In Sikaiana usage, the term bikman can refer to situations in which a foreign group has a leader, for example the leader of a local community or the supervisor of a group visiting the atoll. However, when used among themselves, its usage is much more inclusive, not isolating a leader but referring to anyone who should be respected.

Consistent with their egalitarian ethos, Sikaiana descriptions of their traditional chiefs often include some disparaging undercurrents. Tehui Atahu is described as having supernatural powers and also as being clever at deception and manipulation, traits that the Sikaiana both grudgingly admire and criticize. The last traditional chief was sometimes described as malleable: some older Sikaiana claim that, during their youth, worship services in their ritual house were actually opportunities for secret romance in the house's total darkness. Several different old people recounted a similar claim that young adults used to offer the last traditional chief pieces of tobacco to hold services in the ritual house (hale aitu) so that young people could go there and engage in sexual activities in the darkness of the house.

In 1985, the Solomon Islands National Parliament passed an act legislating that land dispute cases must be heard by customary councils of chiefs before they were referred to the local court system. In part, the parliament was responding to the large volume and bitterness of land cases in the Solomon Islands court system. The writers of the legislature seem to have assumed that there were explicit customary principles determining land tenure. The Sikaiana agree that there were clear and explicit rules of land use in former times, and they agree that these rules have become twisted in recent generations by people who are trying to gain land where they do not have legitimate entitlement. However, depending on their own interests, they bitterly disagree about who is breaking the rules and trying to deceitfully gain land. Losing sides in court decisions often blame the inadequacies of the court system in deciding customary issues of land tenure and the favoritism of the justices who were hearing the case. My own findings indicate that traditional principles of land tenure were always being disputed and changing, and there never was any formal institution for resolving disputes (Donner 1992a).

The Sikaiana responded to the new legislation by allowing for representation on their "chief's committee" from each of the approximately sixteen

land-holding lineages, including both chiefly and commoner. Furthermore, the meetings I attended were basically community discussions. Some lineages had several people attending and speaking. There was an attempt to reach a consensus of those present. The decisions of the chief's committee tried to find a compromise, asking people to return to the good feeling (*laoi*) of their ancestors when people, supposedly, lived in harmony.[8]

The chief's committee is a classic example of the complexities and ironies of reconstructing, or as some say "inventing," tradition (see Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Keesing 1989; Hanson 1989; Keesing and Tonkinson 1982; Handler and Linnekin 1984; Jolly and Thomas 1992; Lindstrom and White 1993). The Solomon Islands' national legislature was responding to a model of centralized leadership which is probably not appropriate for many of the local communities within the Solomon Islands. Even more ironic, Sikaiana is a society that did have a tradition of centralized authority and long before contact with Europeans had rejected that form of authority.

## New Forms of Equality and Inequality

In many areas of Sikaiana life, the Protectorate brought both new forms of hierarchy along with new forms of egalitarianism. Christian teachings suggested a basic equality and opportunity toward salvation. The first converts to Christianity are remembered as people who believed that their ancestral spirits were weak and, therefore, felt vulnerable to the attacks of the ancestral spirits (aitu mate) of others. These converts felt protected by the new Christian ritual. Schools offered opportunities to everyone who attended, and eventually education became an important goal for most Sikaiana people. In fact many people claim that one of the main reasons that Sikaiana requested missionaries to come there in the late 1920s was to provide for the education of their children. Eventually, education, occupation, and money became the new measures of success, and these were open to everyone who was successful within colonial and later national institutions.

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the Protectorate government established local institutions on Sikaiana, including a local court and elected government council. The local council consists entirely of elected representatives and its membership reflects the constituencies of its voting wards, which generally correspond with the residential land tracts of different descent groups. This council is now the main governing body on Sikaiana. The government also established a local court with several justices who adjudicate local criminal cases and land disputes. The missionaries of the Melanesia Mission established Sikaiana's first schools and sent students to mission schools in other parts of the Solomon Islands. Late in the Protectorate

period, the national government took over primary responsibility for the school system.

Egalitarian values were expressed in how the Sikaiana incorporated Western institutions. As described above, the atoll's ritual roles were spread among several different men, and the succession alternated between different descent lines that all had different men in these ritual roles. Furthermore, individual supernatural power was acquired through spirit possession, which was accessible to many different men. This decentralization of authority and diversity of roles is maintained in Sikaiana's modern institutions. In addition to the area council and local court, there are a church committee, a school committee, a cooperative store committee (until the store was destroyed by a cyclone), a Mother's Union (a women's religious group), a club (which organized dances), the Companions (a men's religious group), and the chiefs committee, among others. Often these committees are informally formed; anyone who wants to attend meetings does so. There are frequent public meetings to discuss projects and activities that are attended by most of the atoll's residents. In addition, there are a variety of local part-time offices including catechists in the church, area constable, copra graders, court clerk, and radio operator. Although some people are influential, the diversity of roles and organizations and the emphasis upon consensus maintain a decentralized political system.

By the time of my first stay in 1980, there were three Sikaiana men who were recognized by everyone as very influential: the local priest, a doctor, and an important government official. All were among the first people to successfully enter important roles associated with Western institutions. All three were reluctant to take positions of authority, preferring to be circumspect and to lead by influence and persuasion. All also suffered some gossip and opposition when others thought they were exercising too much influence. None was a patrilineal member of the chiefly descent lines.

Sikaiana egalitarianism applies most strongly to indigenous relations. Most Sikaiana were accepting of the hierarchical relations with the British Protectorate officials and church officials, although they appreciated the more egalitarian behavior of the Americans whom they met during World War II (see Donner 1989). One Sikaiana person summed a common attitude when he told me that, when working for wages, it was easy for Solomon Islanders to accept an unfamiliar European as a supervisor, but it was much more difficult for them to accept another Solomon Islander as a supervisor.

Most Sikaiana people admire the Queen of England, who is the nominal head of state in the Solomon Islands, and some hang pictures of the British royal family on their walls. But they do not see such roles as appropriate in their own relations. A common idiom to criticize a lazy person on Sikaiana is

to call that a person a *kuini* (queen), implying a person who sits around and does nothing, waiting to be served by others. Behavior appropriate for a foreign monarch is not appropriate in their own social relations.[9] The Sikaiana are also somewhat distrustful and resentful of the national government, which they do not believe supports them as much as it should. In this respect, however, they are not unlike many other local communities in the Solomon Islands; and, indeed, they are less extreme than some (see Feinberg 1986).[10]

A small society which traditionally had a relatively isolated population of about 200–250 residents, Sikaiana's egalitarianism rests on interpersonal face-to-face interaction. Gossip, ridicule, and public opinion are important sanctions. Also, many of the institutions that reflect and reinforce egalitarianism are themselves structured around close interpersonal interaction. There are strong values that shape egalitarian interaction. Modesty is admired and the term *hakapaapaalalo* (meaning literally to make-flat-below) refers to socially approved interactional behavior. Praise is considered embarrassing for the person who receives it. The term *hakanapa* often is used to refer to situations in which one is praising another, but the literal meaning of hakanapa is to "make embarrassed"; for the Sikaiana, to praise a person is to embarrass that person. The term *tilo* is used to describe situations in which one admires the beauty of another, as showing a young child or looking at oneself in the mirror. But both situations are considered to be immodest and the term tilo is usually used to tease someone for being so concerned about physical appearance that they are admiring themselves in the mirror or showing off the appearance of their children. People are criticized for trying to coerce others. The term *kkolu* means "bend" as in bending a hard substance such as iron. But it is also used to describe the demanding behavior of young children who insist on having their way and to criticize the behavior of adults who may try to bring others to their viewpoint by constantly using pressure and persuasion to "force" a change of opinion.

Men generally have more authority in public affairs than women, and older people are supposed to have more influence than younger people. But there is a considerable tension in these relations, again reflecting a lack of ease with systems of coercion and control. Women can wield considerable influence and authority. There was one important traditional ritual role for women, the sapai ulu. The sapai ulu assisted the aliki, dressing (hakamalo) him when he took on his ritual functions. Because the aliki seems to have been primarily a ritual role, the sapai ulu had a crucial part in transforming the aliki into his ritual status. Moreover, there were ritual occasions when women and men broke into separate groups and composed songs critical of the opposite sex (see Donner 1987). During these occasions, the women

could compose songs that were highly critical of male activities in general and of specific men in particular (see Donner 2008). Sikaiana women founded a religious sisterhood in the Solomon Islands, the *Taina*. They are important participants in many of Sikaiana's present-day activities, and older women may assert their authority over younger men. Age also affects Sikaiana relations, and older people generally have more authority than younger people. But this again creates problems for the egalitarian Sikaiana. Many younger brothers, for example, feel uncomfortable with the theoretically greater authority of their elder brothers. Many younger Sikaiana feel that their elders are less educated and capable in the modern world.

Egalitarianism is also manifest in important institutions. There is widespread fosterage of children, and children often move between different families, extending the range of kinship ties and limiting the effects of wealth differences. Most Sikaiana, including the wealthiest and most successful, have several foster parents to whom they remain loyal, foster children they are now raising, and natal children living with foster parents. The result is to intensively create ties of obligation and commitments among people who may have different resources (Donner 1999). Drinking fermented toddy is integral in Sikaiana life and its patterns of distribution and consumption stress egalitarian relations. Drinking is often a community activity that involves large numbers of people. Moreover, drunken behavior is often erratic and tends to level any distinctions (see Donner 1994). Sikaiana people are dedicated Christians, many on the atoll attend two church services every day. The ideology of the Christianity presented by Anglican missionaries has a strong egalitarian strain in terms of the potential for universal salvation and the common plight of all humanity before God.

Finally, a crucial feature of Sikaiana leadership and egalitarianism is that it is based upon interaction that is face to face. Community projects and activities, both in Honiara and on Sikaiana, are discussed in community meetings where opinions are expressed and widespread participation is possible. Gossip, ridicule, public opinion, and daily association or avoidance are the main mechanisms of social control and they maintain an egalitarian structure.

## Sikaiana in Comparative and Historical Perspective

The Sikaiana possess an image of a classic Polynesian centralized hierarchy, but it was not functioning by the time of European contact. Archeological studies by Kirch and Yen (1982) have shown that island adaptations are never at an equilibrium, especially on small atolls: There are continual changes in the environments, often brought about by human usage. A small atoll such as

Sikaiana is especially vulnerable to a variety of environmental changes, resulting from human use, drought and cyclones, and also outside invasion as well (see Donner 1992a, 1995).

Sikaiana shares its closest historical and cultural relations with other Polynesian outliers, including Rennell-Bellona, Tikopia, Anuta, and Ontong Java, and other western Polynesian societies, including Tuvalu and Samoa (see Bayard 1976). Comparative ethnographic information about leadership and hierarchy in the region is variable and often depends upon the interests of the ethnographer and the time period that is being examined. Moreover, there seems to be considerable variability across the region, with Tikopia and Anuta being more hierarchically organized and Bellona seeming to have the least hierarchy.

On Tuvalu at present, there is some desire for traditional hierarchical leadership and the return to a strong chief who was weakened by Western contact. Besnier (1996) writes that there were two types of discourses, or ways of talking about hierarchy, on Nukulaelae. One discourse emphasizes a return to a peaceful time of chiefly rule, whereas another discourse emphasizes egalitarian values. Luem (1996) reports that on Nanumaga atoll there is a desire to reinstate a powerful chief to restore a traditional harmony that is viewed as lost. Sikaiana people sometimes talk about the harmony of former times, but this is not couched in the terminology of chiefs, rather in a terminology of traditional culture, which is sometimes viewed as good and other times as bad (Donner 1993). Some members of chiefly lines argue for a return to their power. This is not a claim for ritual power but part of an argument about asserting rights over land. However, there would be no consensus about the implications of this for land use, nor a consensus about which lines would have these chiefly rights.

Monberg (1996) describes precolonial Bellonese society as largely chiefless, although ritual leaders emerged based upon their acquisition of knowledge and ability to attract followers. Although these ritual leaders were replaced following the island's conversion to Christianity, Monberg speculates that there might be some effort to revive these leaders as part of a way for the Bellonese to preserve traditional culture in a rapidly modernizing context.

Tikopia and Anuta have the most hierarchical organization of all the Polynesian outliers, both in the precolonial past and at present: Their chiefs were ritual leaders who also held political authority over individuals, and they received considerable deference (see Firth 1970; Feinberg 1996). Feinberg (1996: 79–80) reports that succession to Anutan chieftaincy was not based purely upon genealogy. He was told that his own son could succeed to the chieftaincy if he learned the proper knowledge and had the

proper commitment to Anutan life. Although ritual knowledge was an important component of succeeding to the chieftaincy on Sikaiana, I think genealogical succession was considered crucial.

Ontong Java has close historical relations with Sikaiana, in fact one of the founder heroes of Sikaiana, Tehui Luaniua, came from Luanguia, the largest of two villages on Ontong Java (the nasal consonant shifts back from Sikaiana to Ontong Java in pronouncing Luaniua/Luangiua). In many respects, Ontong Java had a ritual system with many similarities to that of Sikaiana. There were leaders of descent groups, *maakua*, who had some authority and ritual responsibility. But Hogbin reports that, about eight generations before his stay in 1927–1928, a secular leader or strong man emerged on Luangiua. Hogbin describes this position as a king and writes that this person had a great deal of secular power, which was based upon his ability to mobilize an army of supporters and to kill opponents. This role, which was called *heku'u* on Luangiua, continued to the time of Hogbin's research. Hogbin states that similar developments took place on Pelau, the smaller village located at the other end of the atoll from Luangiua. Compared to Sikaiana, there was a much stronger centralized authority on Ontong Java and much more violence both in opposition to and support of it (Hogbin 1934/61:224–231). It should be noted that Ontong Java is a very large atoll with a larger population and much more land and sea resources than Sikaiana.

There is a common pattern for people from chiefly descent lines to become prominent in Western administrative roles (for examples on Rotuma, see Howard 1996; on Kapingamarangi, see Lieber 1968: 70–71). This is not the case on Sikaiana, where all descent lines have access to Western leadership roles.

Sikaiana's small size and limited resources make it unlikely to become highly stratified (see Sahlins 1958; Kirch 2000). In addition to environmental limitations, Sikaiana ideology is also grounded in egalitarian values that also shaped how these limited resources were and continue to be managed. These values themselves developed in response to specific historical conditions including competition for Sikaiana's limited resources. Some of the present-day disagreements about chiefly succession and land rights may well be derived from different interests in the past, especially competition between newly arriving immigrants and previously settled people.

However, there are new influences on Sikaiana life and new forms of stratification based upon wealth and globalization that are not localized within the community; indeed, these tend to differentiate and fragment the community. Sikaiana people are now consumers and, to a lesser extent, producers in a world economy in which they of necessity participate but over which they have very little control (Donner 2002; see Wallerstein 1974, 1980,

1990; Bodley 1995). New hierarchical and stratified relations are established quite independently of the face-to-face communal relations, which typified Sikaiana society until recently. In Gidden's (1990, 1991) terms, there are important processes that are "disembedding" local relations by introducing new mechanisms for shaping social relations from outside the community. Many occupations require certification and Western-derived expertise. A national currency is used to purchase commodities; the value of the currency is determined by international monetary markets; and many of the commodities are imported. They are producers and consumers in a global economic system in which they may have little relationship with other, often more advantaged, producers and consumers. Sikaiana people have developed and maintained a distinct face-to-face community, which, in Gidden's terms, is highly embedded (see Donner 1988, 1992b, 1994). However, the members of this community are increasingly involved in a much larger social system with new forms of hierarchy that affect the community but are external to it. It is not clear how they will manage these new forms of hierarchy in the future.

## Conclusion

The Sikaiana have several different models for chiefs or aliki: (1) the centralized leaders of its earliest legends with power and authority in both ritual and economic affairs; (2) the chiefs of other Melanesian and Polynesian societies and perhaps European monarchs; (3) the ritual priests of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century with ceremonial responsibility for communal welfare but without control over individual ritual power and without secular authority; (4) the government-appointed headmen of the 1930s and 1940s who were controversial intermediaries between the Sikaiana people and the Protectorate's administration; (5) the largely ceremonial office of chief during my stay in the 1980s; (6) the decentralized system in which the leaders of various land-holding lineages attempt to reach consensus that was established in response to national legislation; and (7) the captain of a ship or airplane. Only the first and second of these conceptualizations are close to the centralized, ascribed, ranked, redistributive, and hierarchical positions that anthropology textbooks label as a chief. Even if someone claimed to be designated as this kind of chief, there would be little consensus about who could claim traditional legitimacy for such a position. The Sikaiana have consistently and resourcefully resisted outside efforts to introduce a centralized chief. The disagreements within the community about the claims of legitimacy of different chiefly lines would make any consensus about centralized leadership very unlikely. Moreover, their legendary history provides

them with examples of the abuses of centralized power and legitimates the decentralization of access to land, the major economic resource on the atoll. The disputes and disagreements in fact create a structure that supports egalitarian relations and make any centralization of power very difficult.

Although Sikaiana will tolerate powerful leaders in distant lands and in distant times, they will not tolerate this kind of hierarchy in their present-day social relations. Indigenous history—quite literally "ethno-history"—can be viewed as a local resource offering the Sikaiana various models for understanding hierarchy. These models compare and contrast different views of leadership. Without conceptualizations of hierarchy, conceptualizations of equality are less clear and explicit. In this respect, history provides images of ancestral "others" with whom the Sikaiana can compare themselves and legitimatize their present-day social relations (see Donner 1993).

On Sikaiana, a historical legend of hierarchy is transformed to legitimate egalitarian relations. In the tension found in Polynesia between populist and divine leaders, Sikaiana developed a system that used genealogical hierarchy in shaping ritual offices but decentralized ritual authority by rotating the leadership between different descent lines; furthermore, all men had access to the power of spirit mediumship regardless of their position in the descent system. In secular matters, the Sikaiana completely decentralized political leadership. In part, this reflects a feature of Sikaiana's environment and its history. With scarce resources, it is difficult to maintain the kind of economic surplus that supports a chieftaincy (see Kirch 1984: 162–164; also Kirch 2000).

Sikaiana egalitarianism is not simply grounded in ideology. It is expressed and maintained in their face-to-face relationships and daily life through sharing, modesty, and gossip. Drinking fermented toddy brings people together and levels them in their loss of inhibitions. Very high rates of fosterage move children between different households and further mitigate social and economic difference. There is widespread participation in the many different roles and institutions that organize atoll life. The disagreements about the legitimacy of different chiefly descent lines and the disputes about the distribution of land may reflect these past conflicts and competing interests. At present, these disputes make it very unlikely that there will be any centralization of chieftaincy and or any other authority on the atoll.

The Sikaiana people are now part of a global economic and cultural system. In some respects, new institutions and ideas have enhanced egalitarianism (for example, the universal salvation offered by Christianity and the widespread participation in many different Western roles and institutions). Western contact has introduced new ideologies of egalitarianism, but it has also introduced new institutions of hierarchy. There are new ways in which Sikaiana people find that they are becoming separated in terms of resources

as the result of immigration, different levels of education and differences in wealth. Moreover, they are now part of a global system that has very stark differences in wealth and opportunity. It remains to be seen how Sikaiana egalitarianism, which has its ideological roots in traditional legends and modern experience and expressed in face-to-face interactional behavior on a small atoll, responds to new kinds of economic and global stratification in which many social relationships are far more impersonal, abstract and global. The expression of egalitarian values in everyday community life may have relatively little effect in leveling these new forms of hierarchy.

## NOTES

1. I did ethnographic field research on Sikaiana from October 1980 to July 1983, and March 1987 to September 1987. For several weeks in May and June 1993, I lived at the Sikaiana settlement at Tenaru, outside of Honiara. Most of the ethnographic material in this article is based on research done during this period. I have relatively little data about the impact of ethnic fighting that took place in the Solomon Islands in the late 1990s.

2. These migrants intermarried with the descendants of Tehui Atahu's crew members who were the original founders of various *hale akina*. One person said the term *tantavale* is a contraction of *taanata* (men) and *vvale* (crazy, foolish). This person claimed that after a long canoe trip, people arrived on Sikaiana weakened and walked around in a daze as if crazy. But this is probably a false etymology. A usually reliable informant told me that the term, *tantavale*, is a contraction of *taanata* (men) and *aavale* (after). The commoner clans are people who arrived later.

3. Most of the *hale akina* (clans) are divided into patrilineal segments, *kano hale* (lineages) which are corporate groups with rights to separate tracts of land.

4. Hogbin (1934/1961: 174) describes the *maakua*, ritual leaders of Ontong Java, as being in their ceremonial ritual roles only when they were dressed to perform ceremonies. Some of his discussion seems relevant for Sikaiana which has strong historical and cultural ties with Ontong Java.

5. I have been on Sikaiana when some of these crops matured. There are no restrictions on the harvesting of these foods and children often harvest fruits before they are fully ripe.

6. Hogbin (1934/61) describes similar kinds of ancestral spirits on Ontong Java where he argued that they helped preserve social control.

7. However, the headman did have some influence as a president of the local court. Local court members were appointed by British administrators with the consent of local people. In this capacity, the paramount chief did wield some authority and power. When he voluntarily retired from this position in the court in 1982, he kept his position as the local paramount chief. His position on the court was taken by a person from a commoner line that was considered to be knowledgeable about the court's procedures. His selection was made by officials from Malaita Province with the advice of the local council.

8. In fact, this ambiguous "good feeling" may correspond with the conditions of land use in the precontact period when ambiguity may have masked competing interests in the same land tracts (see again Donner 1992a).

9. Some, although far from all, younger men who had been educated abroad were concerned about what they had come view as European (and American) imperialism, both in the past and at present.

10. Sikaiana's isolation makes it especially dependent upon and interested in access to outside resources. British officials were powerful outsiders who provided valued opportunities in education and employment. In the present-day Solomon Islands, other Solomon Islanders are competitors for limited resources and opportunities, and the national government has a difficult task to maintain the resources provided by the former Protectorate government.

## REFERENCES

Bayard, Donn
1976 *The cultural relationships of the Polynesian outliers*. [Dunedin]: Univ. of Otago, Department of Anthropology.

Besnier, Niko
1996 Authority and egalitarianism: Discourse of leadership on Nukulaelae Atoll. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 93–128. London: The Athlone Press.

Bodley, John
1995 *Anthropology and contemporary human problems*. 3rd ed. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1990 *The logic of practice*, trans. Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

BSIP British Solomon Islands Protectorate. Files of Outwards Correspondence. Solomon Islands National Archives, Honiara, Solomon Islands.

Donner, William W.
1987 Don't shoot the guitar player: Tradition, assimilation and change in Sikaiana song composition. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 96:201–21.
1988 The contexts for egalitarian relationships on a Polynesian outlier. In *Rules, decisions and inequality*, ed. J. Flanagan and Steve Rayner, 145–63. London: Gower Press.
1989 "Far-away" and "close-up": World War II and Sikaiana perceptions of their place in the world. In *The Pacific theater: Islander representations of World War II*, ed. G. White and M. Lindstrom, 149–66. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.
1992a Lineages and court disputes on a Polynesian outlier. *Man* 27:319–39.

1992b "The same old song but with a different meaning": Expressive culture in Sikaiana ethnic and community identity, in *The arts and politics*, ed. Karen Nero, special issue, *Pacific Studies* 15 (4): 67–82.
1993 *Kastom* and modernisation on Sikaiana, in *Custom today*, ed. Lamont Lindstrom and Geoffrey White, special issue, *Anthropological Forum* VI (4): 541–56.
1994 Alcohol, community and modernity: The social organization of toddy drinking in a Polynesian society. *Ethnology* XXXIII (3): 245–60.
1995 From outrigger to jet: Three centuries of Polynesian voyaging. In *Seafaring in the contemporary Pacific islands*, ed. Richard Feinberg, 144–58. DeKalb: Univ. of Northern Illinois Press.
1999 Sharing and compassion: Fosterage in a Polynesian society. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* XXX:4: 703–22.
2002 Rice and tea, fish and taro: Sikaiana migration to Honiara. *Pacific Studies* 25 (1/2): 23–44.
2008 Separation and support, conflict and romance in relations between Sikaiana men and women. In *Pulling the right threads: The ethnographic life and legacy of Jane C. Goodale*, ed. Laura Zimmer-Tamakoshi and Jeanette Dickerson-Putnam, 149–67. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Feinberg, Richard
1986 The "Anuta problem": Local sovereignty and national integration in the Solomon Islands. *Man* 21 (3): 438–52.
1996 Sanctity and power on Anuta: Polynesian chieftainship revisited. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 56–92. London: The Athlone Press.
2002 Elements of leadership in Oceania. *Anthropological Forum* 12 (1): 9–44.

Feinberg, Richard, and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, eds.
1996 *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*. London: The Athlone Press.

Firth, Raymond
1970 *Rank and religion in Tikopia: A study in Polynesian paganism and conversion to Christianity*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
1979 The sacredness of Tikopia chiefs. In *Politics in leadership: A comparative perspective*, ed. William A. Shack and Percy S. Cohen, 139–66. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Flanagan, James G.
1989 Hierarchy in simple "egalitarian" societies. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 245–66. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.

Giddens, Anthony
1984 *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
1990 *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
1991 *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

Goldman, Irving
1970 *Ancient Polynesian society*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Handler, Richard, and Jocelyn Linnekin
1984 Tradition, genuine or spurious. *Journal of American Folklore* 97:273–90.

Hanson, Alan
1989 The making of the Maori: Culture invention and its logic. *American Anthropologist* 91:890–902.

Hogbin, Ian
1934 *Law and order in Polynesia: A study of primitive legal institutions*. Hamden, CT: The Shoe String Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger
1983 *Invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Howard, Alan
1985 History, myth and Polynesian chieftainship: The case of Rotuman kings. In *Transformations of Polynesian culture*, ed. Anthony Hooper and Judith Huntsman, 39–77. Auckland, NZ: The Polynesian Society.
1996 Money, sovereignty and moral authority on Rotuma. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 205–38. London: The Athlone Press.

Jolly, Margaret, and Nicholas Thomas, eds.
1992 *The politics of tradition in the South Pacific*. Special issue of *Oceania* 62 (4).

Keesing, Roger
1989 Creating the past: Custom and identity in the contemporary Pacific. *Contemporary Pacific* 1: 19–42.

Keesing, Roger, and Robert Tonkinson, eds.
1982 Reinventing traditional culture: The politics of Kastom in island Melanesia. *Mankind* 13 (4).

Kirch, Patrick
1984 *The evolution of Polynesian chiefdoms*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
2000 *On the road of the winds: An archeological history of the Pacific islands before European contact*. Berkeley: Univ. of California.

Kirch, Patrick, and Douglas Yen
1982 *Tikopia: The prehistory and ecology of a Polynesian outlier*. Honolulu, HI: Bernice P. Bishop Museum Bulletin No. 238.

Lambert, S. M.
1941 *A Yankee doctor in paradise*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Lieber, Michael
1968 *Porakiet: A Kapingamarangi colony on Ponape*. Eugene: Univ. of Oregon, Department of Anthropology.

Lindstrom, Lamont, and Geoff White, eds.
1993 *Custom today*. Special issue of *Anthropological Forum* VI (4).

Luem, Barbara
1996 A new king for Nanumanga: Changing demands for leadership and authority in a Polynesian atoll society. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 129–41. London: The Athlone Press.

MacQuarrie, Hector
1952 Sikaiana or Stewart Island. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 61:209–22.

Marcus, George
1989 Chieftainship. In *Developments in Polynesian ethnology*, ed. Alan Howard and Robert Borofsky, 175–209. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.

Monberg, Torben
1996 The Bellonese: High, low—and equal: Leadership and change on a Polynesian outlier in the Solomon Islands. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 187–204. London: The Athlone Press.

Ortner, Sherry
1984 Theory in anthropology since the sixties. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26:126–66.

Sahlins, Marshall
1958 *Social stratification in Polynesia*. AES Monograph Number 29. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.
1963 Poor man, rich man, big man, chief: Political types in Melanesia and Polynesia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5:285–300.
1981 *Historical metaphors and mythical realities: Structure in the early history of the Sandwich Islands*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
1985 *Islands of history*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.

Shore, Bradd
1996 The absurd side of power in Samoa. In *Leadership and change in the western Pacific: Essays presented to Sir Raymond Firth on the occasion of his ninetieth*

*birthday*, ed. Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 12–186. London: The Athlone Press.

Thomas, Nicholas
1989 The force of ethnology: Origins and significance of the Melanesia/Polynesia Division. *Current Anthropology* 30 (1): 27–41.

Valeri, Valerio
1985 The conqueror becomes king: A political analysis of the Hawaiian legend of 'Umi. In *Transformations of Polynesian culture*, ed. Anthony Hooper and Judith Huntsman, 79–103. Auckland, NZ: The Polynesian Society.

Wallerstein, Immanuel
1974 *The modern world-system: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.
1980 *The modern world system II: Mercantilism and consolidation of the European world-economy, 1600–1750*. New York: Academic Press.
1990 Culture as the ideological background of the modern world-system. In *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone, 31–55. London: Sage Publications.

White, Geoffrey
1992 The discourse of chiefs: Notes on a Melanesian society. *The Contemporary Pacific* 4 (1): 73–108.

White, Geoffrey, and Lamont Lindstrom
1997 *Chiefs today: Traditional leadership in the postcolonial state*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

# ETHNIC REPRESENTATIONS AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF CONTEMPORARY FRENCH MIGRANTS IN TAHITI, FRENCH POLYNESIA

Laura Schuft
*Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis and Université de la Polynésie Française*

This study analyzes the discourse on social integration and ethnic representations of French civil servants working short and long term in Tahiti, French Polynesia. Appointed to positions in education, public administration and law and order by the mainland authority, the attitudes and social interactions of this community compose a dynamic element of ethnic identity formation in Tahiti. Habitually the literary and academic voice on Tahitian culture and history, the discourse of this dominant socioeconomic category is herein redefined as the object of sociological study. Analysis reveals three principal *ideal type* attitudes toward ethnic representations and relations, each positioned differently around reactions to and interpretations of their social role as mainland civil servants in French Polynesia. Similarities of these migrants' identity strategies with those of migrants elsewhere suggest that these self-preservation identity strategies are inherent to negative stigma rather than dependent on socioeconomic status or duration of stay.

SOCIOLOGICAL AND ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH regarding French Polynesia has traditionally focused on the "exotic" Tahitian customs and traditions, omitting study on the cohabiting French[1] population. The Western perspective on indigenous and subordinated peoples—"isolated tribes in exotic lands, colonised peoples . . . dominated classes and groups"—remains the preferred object of fieldwork in these disciplines. According to one student fieldwork guide, for example, dominant groups are considered difficult subject matter, better equipped to dodge the ethnographer's scrutiny (Beaud and Weber 1998, 8, 10). Yet, such principles construct marginal groups as

*Pacific Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2—June 2008

exotic and concurrently disqualify the social processes and discourse of "dominant" social categories, just as racial minorities in the United States were once constructed as exotic "ethnics" fit for academic analysis, as opposed to majority "nonethnic" whites. In rejection of this exoticism, which removes dominant discourse from sociological analysis, this study places the elite, dominant French civil servants at the center of analysis.

Although the European population has figured in a few studies regarding the colonial period,[2] such as *Farani Taioro* (Panoff 1981) or *Tahiti Colonial (1860–1914)* (Toullelan 1987), the contemporary mainland population is the topic of rare publications (Saura 1998; Brami-Celentano 2002), which nonetheless do not directly address this population's own discourse and representations. However, as "to speak of an ethnic group in total isolation is as absurd as to speak of the sound from one hand clapping," (Bateson 1979, 78), analysis of French Polynesia's mainland community, whose pens have traditionally recounted Tahitian society, is integral to the study of the latter. Furthermore, the mainland French presence has primarily been referred to within the mythical context of ideal racial mix and utopian society (Panoff 1989; Toullelan and Gille 1992; Doumenge 1999). Regardless of the visible biological amalgamation caused by the migratory waves primarily from Europe as well as China over the past two centuries, the construction and maintenance of ethnic categorization persist.

This article[3] considers French civil servants' discourse on their social integration within Tahitian society, as well as their portrayal of their own ethnicity and that of the host population. French civil servants (*fonctionnaires*) are the focal point of this study, because their presence and function in this French Overseas Country (*Pays d'Outre Mer*)[4] are an extension of the colonial mission to convey elements of French society within the domains of education, public administration, and law and order. Within the migratory structure of temporary elite migrations from the mainland power, this article considers the discourse of short- and long-term civil servant migrants in the urban regions of Tahiti, in and around the capital Papeete.[5] The political and social context influencing the attitudes of mainland civil servants within Tahitian society shall herein be outlined, followed by an analysis of the attitudes themselves and the unexpected similarities of communal emotions and identity strategies with those of other migratory populations.

## Sociopolitical Factors

### *Elite Temporary Migrations: Exacerbating the Ethnic Divide*

In addition to the centralized State mission bestowed upon them, two particular features characterize civil servants posted in French Polynesia:

elite status and temporary residence. The elite status is implicit to the State's colonial mission of exporting know-how through qualified posted workers, in that these individuals occupy influential administrative, educational, and law enforcement positions within a small-scale social and economic framework. Moreover, elevated socioeconomic status is assured by the substantial salary increase of 40% to 120% allotted to civil servants posted in French Polynesia (du Prel 2003, 5). Bernard Poirine noted in 1992 that, according to territorial surveys (ITSTAT 1988), economic differences in French Polynesia were largely ethnically divided, a situation which exacerbated latent ethnic tensions. He noted that although "European and assimilated" households made up only 20% of the total household number, their heads of household represented 72% of intellectuals and senior management. Conversely, the "Polynesian" households, 58% of the total, constituted only 10% of intellectuals and senior management, and 82% of all farmers and 76% of blue collar workers (Poirine 1992, 21). Subsequent surveys, although void of ethnic categorization,[6] seem to display similar statistics, showing, for example, that of the working population born outside of French Polynesia, more than three-quarters occupied positions in white collar sectors.[7] Such ethnically divided economic differences greatly determine the representations and integration of the mainland French and contribute to the ethnic labeling that is reflected in their discourse.

These migrations are also predominantly temporary. The status of posted civil servants currently allows a maximum stay of four years for the approximate 2,000 State positions in French Polynesia.[8] Rare exceptions include candidates who apply for and are granted the maintenance of their positions in French Polynesia, as well as judges and university professors, who are appointed to their positions indefinitely. This structure of temporary positions creates a "turntable" of civil servant arrivals, which, generating constant newcomers from the French mainland, contributes to the perception of the overall mainland population as "foreign" and "outsider."

### *Invasions*

Along with cultural change and economic activity, migrations from mainland France multiplied exponentially following the 1963 installation of the Centre of Nuclear Experimentation (CEP). Therefore, these migrations are occasionally interpreted as invasions. As Bernard Gille notes in reference to the French presence in French Polynesia, "it is evident that since the beginning of time, the universal phenomenon of migration is presented in its most brutal form, that of invasion" (1999, 9). Ethnologist Bruno Saura, for example, speaks of an increased sentiment of invasion caused by the opening of

charter flights, which led to increased migration and contact from mainland France (1998, 83). Historian Jean-Marc Regnault also refers to the myth of an invasion in Tahiti by the mainland French who are viewed as foreigners. His work highlights the political discourse of Oscar Temaru, leader of the Independence Party *Tavini huiraatira*, who denounced the dangers of migration from Europe and referred to the French immigration policy as a "whitening policy" or a "slow genocide" (Temaru 1995). Whether a widespread vision or one launched by the political movement, the association between "migration" and invasion testify to the existence of this sentiment which, regardless of numeric or symbolic reality, also affect the social relations and attitudes of those having migrated themselves.

*Integration, Assimilation, Domination*

France has adopted an "assimilationist" model of integration for its immigrants and territories, as opposed to countries that advocate a "multiculturalist" model of society that celebrates diversity (cf. Bertheleu 1997). In this concept, in which "integration" entails "assimilation," prevails the definition of the latter: "the policy of incorporating migrants into society through a one-sided process of adaptation" (Castles 1995). Although boasting equality through equal education, the assimilationist model, however, paradoxically creates a new inequality between dominant and subordinate cultures. "If equality is translated by a negation of differences and thus of individual identities, it actually creates a new inequality, as it takes the values of a dominant group as a universal model" (De Carlo 1998, 39). Therefore, assimilation policies impose the reproduction of dominant social norms, notably through school and language.

The assimilation of French Polynesian residents into the French linguistic and cultural model has been promoted through the State school system and the recruitment of French civil servants into the socioprofessional roles of teachers and agents of administration, law, and order. Since the beginning of the French colonial enterprise in the Polynesian islands, the role of these agents has been to convey knowledge and sociocultural values and symbols, particularly through social reproduction in school. Pierre Bourdieu revealed the symbolic pedagogical violence exerted by the dominant class who maintains their dominant social position through the reproduction within the classroom of society's inequalities (Bourdieu and Passeron 1970, 21–22). This hypothesis is applicable to French Polynesia's pedagogical system whose 1883 transplantation, when the Jules Ferry laws made primary school obligatory for all French citizens including those in the colonies, was considered what Ferry termed the "educational and civilizing mission belonging to the superior race" (De Carlo 1998, 19). Thus, the school system was a means

of instilling the values and culture of a dominant French civilization to the "uncivilized" and "inferior" race. Polynesian languages, for example, were strictly banned from usage in schools until 1980, at which time the Tahitian language was officially recognied (Baré 2002, 26) and thereafter introduced in a very limited form in schools. Thus, despite an ensuing revival of the Tahitian language in the local media and political discourse, alongside a generalized movement of cultural revival during this era, the domination in the school and public structures of the French language, laden with all its inherent cultural symbols, has participated in maintaining the social dominance of the mainland French.

*The Image of the Popa'a*

Often referred to in racial terms as *Popa'a*, a Tahitian term equivalent to "white," the mainland French are said to be frequently viewed by the local population as individualistic and lacking generosity (Saura 1998, 83). This image is reinforced by actual economic advantages in favor of posted mainland civil servants, including salary increases, expatriation bonuses, housing subsidies, and travel compensations. For this reason, the anti-French "allergy" is, according to Bruno Saura, especially demonstrated against the "passing military and State agents who have come to Polynesia to save money thanks to the atomic bomb and who do not even spend their high salaries within the local economy" (in Regnault 1995, 145). This harsh perception represents the civil servants' primary interest as being the financial advantages. Thus, the expatriation system has fed these images through its creation of ethnically delineated economic divisions.

Recent sociopolitical movements defending "Polynesian" or *Ma'ohi* culture and identity also influence perceptions of the mainland French. In the decade following the cultural revival of the 1970s and 1980s, first sparked by anti-nuclear protests, Gaston Flosse, then President of French Polynesia, proposed to introduce a "Polynesian citizenship"[9] to promote positive discrimination in land ownership and employment. Although the proposal initially included citizenship through kinship with a resident or by birthplace, these aspects were considered unconstitutional by the French *Conseil Constitutionnel*, which reduced the criteria to a minimal length of residence. To further counter the ethnic and political nature of the proposal, the Overseas Minister set an example by replacing the term "Polynesian" with "French citizen residing in French Polynesia." In the media at the time of the interviews, this proposal provoked strong reactions in the mainland French population, many of whom found the proposal to be discriminatory, thus significantly influencing the interviews.

*Colonial Shame*

Another factor affecting and subsequently emerging from the civil servants' discourse is colonial shame, extending to guilt related to French nuclear testing in the islands (1966–1996). The ensuing imagery divides social actors into "the Parisian State agent" and the "Polynesian" victim "who suffered at the hand of the State and its agents" (Doumenge 2002, 29). Bruno Saura also refers to ongoing colonial representation, stating that the Frenchman is seen first and foremost as colonizer (1998, 86). This colonial guilt is also present in social discourse and imagery throughout mainland France, as attests a contentious 2005 law proposal, later repealed, calling for the recognition of the "positive role" of the French colonial mission, prompting renewed debate between those opposing colonial "repentance" (Lefeuvre 2006) and those requesting greater recognition of the French colonial past (Stora and Leclerc 2007). The colonial past, socially present, incites differing reactions from the interviewees who take the defence of the "Parisian State agent," sympathize with the "indigenous victim," or else feel caught between justifying and criticizing their own affiliation with colonial history.

## The Ideal Types

Selected for their maximum diversity in age, family status, and personality, the mainland civil servants interviewed held occupations within three different public institutions: an elementary school, the State police and the university. Having worked for several years at the university alongside primarily mainland French colleagues and being considered Popa'a, although not French, I was often included in the interviewees' use of "we," which may have participated in their uninhibited willingness to speak openly during the interviews.[10] Of the selected interviewees, I compared those civil servants whose length of stay in French Polynesia was limited (four years maximum) with those migrants who were able and had chosen to stay longer (over six years). The comparison allowed observation of the impact of duration of stay upon the perceived integration, ethnic representations, and overall discourse within the French civil servant population.

The interviews are organized into *ideal types* as defined by Max Weber, in which exaggerated archetypal forms of classification are employed to categorize otherwise elusive concepts or phenomena into easily conceptualized forms for analysis (1996, 412). Although the qualitative interview method associated with ideal type analysis inhibits statistical representation, it does allow representation of attitudes that exist and function in society, albeit in unknown proportions. The ideal types observed from the interviews have

been broken into three principal attitude types concerning discourse on ethnic representations and varying sentiments of acceptance, belonging, and social integration within Tahitian society. The three major categories of interviewees embodying these attitudes are the embittered patriot, the proudly integrated, and the laissez-faire fatalist.

## 1. The Embittered Patriot

The first ideal type, the embittered patriot, is characterized by a general rejection of the Polynesian. The inability to feel integrated within Tahitian society creates social discomfort and frustration that is transformed into bitterness toward Polynesians who "are not welcoming" as had been imagined. Feeling unjustly rejected for one's ethnic belonging, whereas "Tahiti is part of France," the rejection of the "other" is all the more justified. In parallel, the embittered patriot displays increased patriotism toward mainland France and accuses Polynesians of profiteering from this privilege, claiming that the latter "do not recognize their privileges" and are "spoiled children." Thus, their discourse evokes a solid boundary between the mainland French "us" and the Polynesian "them."

### *Contested Rejection*

The feeling of unfair rejection, injustice toward the mainland French, is one of the foremost themes of the embittered patriot. An interviewee from the university, whom we shall call Anne, laments:

> With the police, there is a dual system . . . A Polynesian pulled over doesn't get a ticket . . . People died [in France] for their ideas, that the laws should be the same for all. In the private sector we feel discriminated against . . . The [Tahitian] language is an excuse. It's not fair. A Polynesian in Nantes is not obliged to speak Breton . . . [The Polynesians] are living on my tax money . . . Coming here is a right. They have you come because they need you, but it's your right to come.

The right to equality is supported by citizenship in a country founded upon its fought-for Constitution and by rights as a taxpayer supporting the French Overseas Country. Thus, patriotic ties are strengthened in response to feeling treated as a foreigner in a place that expectation dictates should be "home." Adding that the French system prescribes migration from the mainland toward Polynesia, Anne accepts even less any complaints against the

mainland French from Polynesians who, on the contrary, she esteems should be appreciative.

Also in his third year of employment in Tahiti, an interviewee from the middle school reiterates the existence of such racial discrimination: "The Popa'a are not welcome here . . . It's evident even in politics . . . The racism is rather surprising . . . They don't accept you because they think that you shouldn't be here" (Bert). According to Albert Memmi (1999), racism is the generalized and definitive assessment of real or imaginary differences that, benefiting the accuser to the detriment of the victim, serve to legitimize an aggression or privileges. Because this entails domination of one group over another, racism generally refers to that exercised by the dominant group, particularly in a colonial context. Thus, the discourse here is striking in that, attempting to demonstrate the personal affliction of feeling discriminated against for belonging to the dominant ethnic group, the speaker uses the term "racism" to refer to a "reverse racism" in which the dominant group of Popa'a are placed in the role of victim. Bert places the fault on Polynesians who are guilty of rejecting the mainland French and therefore responsible for the ethnic divisions: "At first we socialised with Polynesians. But we stopped. We realized that it was useless. They really take advantage. We invited the same people several times and were never invited back." Bert therefore feels unfairly rejected and discriminated against.

An interviewee from the national police, in his fourth year in Tahiti, also feels targeted by racism and invokes in this case the accusation of colonialism:

> We're beginning to see racist remarks. For example here a mainlander is called a Popa'a, and when you see the definition of Popa'a, in the end it translates the colonizer aspect. In other words . . . that person is a colonizer, he steals my work, he helps himself, and then he leaves. Or else he stays, but he takes my spot. (Christophe)

Rejection of the mainlander is thus associated with a negative colonial image, which the interview associates directly with the racial designation Popa'a. A husband and wife, who have both taught at the middle school for two years, express similar feelings: "There's a boundary . . . We are perceived somewhat as invaders; but in fact you come to realize that the Polynesians are not from here either. It's a mix . . . no one is 'from here'" (Donald). The feeling of being perceived as invaders is again considered unfair, in this case because the ethnic categorizations construct the descendants of previous foreigners as Polynesian, or from here, whereas he and his wife are treated as outsiders.

His wife, Deborah, also attests to a boundary despite their efforts: "Regarding invitations, we are mostly invited by people like us . . . who are here for a defined time. We have not had an invitation from a resident for example. We have, however, made the effort to invite . . . But with no return." Like other embittered patriots, Deborah complains of lack of reciprocity, which strengthens her conviction that the rejection and social barriers come from the other.

For François, the rejection is again accompanied by the image of the Popa'a as invader, leading to the feeling of being unjustly discriminated against: "There is a certain rejection of the Popa'a . . . who takes our land . . . our work . . . No. If we have someone on a job it's because there is no one else, because you are more qualified than another . . . . So there is this sort of reverse racism." The image of Popa'a as invading profiteers is once again emphatically contested as a false and unfair reason for differential treatment. Nonetheless, the term reverse racism concedes that it is the reaction to an original racism by the dominant group.

Geraldine, who has worked at the university for many years, also attests to the presence of racism, particularly on the job:

> When someone wants to apply for a job, if he is not Polynesian, he has no chance . . . I know a few examples of young people who were born here because their grandparents moved here and who are unemployed because they are not . . . of Polynesian stock.

She also cites her own place of work, where she feels like a victim of discrimination: "At work, there is segregation between the Polynesians and the non-Polynesians, even if you may have good relations with certain colleagues . . . And at the smallest disagreement, the French are often accused of racism, but I think that the racism is especially in the other direction." Thus, Geraldine sees the accusation of racism as unprovoked and as participating in reverse racism, in which "the French" are constructed as the victims, rather than the opposite.

### *"Tahiti, c'est la France!"*

The injustice of perceived rejection and racism is reinforced by the fact that equality for the mainland French should prevail, as *"Tahiti, c'est la France"* (Tahiti is France). To the question regarding the frequently used term "expatriate," the embittered patriot contests this expression with vigor. The following extract clearly expresses this sentiment regarding French proprietorship and belonging:

> It is part of France. It's French, *French* Polynesia. The term "expatriate" is surprising . . . Polynesia is French, so I thought I was at home. For me, I was headed to discover a part of my country that I didn't know . . . And when I feel, not a rejection, but a mistrust regarding the Popa'a . . . I wonder, what's going on, this is my home . . . I am in France . . . I am expatriated in the sense that I am thousands of kilometres from the mainland. (Deborah)

Despite the social interactions that bring her to understand the contrary, Deborah insists on considering herself at home in France, justifying this claim and contesting all unfair rejection.

Others echo this feeling, such as "Expatriate? No, I am not outside of my country here" (Bert), or more strongly:

> Expatriated? Here? No, I am French . . . This is a French university in the Pacific . . . There is no reason that I should be considered expatriated here . . . Is a Tahitian, when he goes to Paris, an expatriate? . . . I am from the south of France; I like the south of France . . . like the Polynesians in Polynesia. (François)

The overly defensive attitude is recurrent in the embittered patriot, who emphatically justifies the legitimacy of his/her presence and social role in Polynesia, strongly rejecting any questioning of this.

*The Polynesian, Spoiled by the Mainland*

Another recurring theme with the embittered patriot ideal type, which is also a long-present stereotype (Rigo 1997, 75), is the image of the Polynesian as a "spoiled child" with whom the mainland has been too generous. In his fourth and final year working at the university, Henri declares: "There is a total lack of understanding about what goes on in France . . . They don't know their privileges; they are spoiled children." The indifference toward France is reproached in light of the privileges provided by the mainland. Another interviewee sees exploitation of France's generosity, claiming that "they take from France only what they want" (Anne). Yet another attributes the cheerfulness of Polynesians to the economic and medical benefits provided by the mainland:

> There are *many* Polynesians who should take a trip to Fiji. They would see how good things are here . . . Because when you hear certain negative discourse, and when you see a country like

> Fiji—you see, they got their independence—but it's terrible . . . Here the people smile . . . I think to myself, maybe they should take a look over there so they realize that this is a rich island . . . . Look at all the medical coverage which is provided by the mainland. (Elise)

The leisure of Polynesians is coupled with their ingratitude, demonstrated by their desire for independence. Her colleague echoes this feeling: "Here, compared to Africa, there is everything. And the people, the Polynesians, are not aware in my opinion of the wealth and the happiness they have. They are assisted . . . social security for everyone" (François). Although mainlanders are assumed to be appreciative or legitimate beneficiaries of State programs, Polynesians are accused of not appreciating the "wealth and the happiness" assured by the mainland.

These reproaches accompany the defensive patriotism vis-à-vis an exemplary mainland. Defending the Mainland and rejecting colonial shame, one interviewee goes so far as to deny colonial history, declaring: "They were not colonized . . . They were evangelized. It's not their fault . . . Why did we come to disturb them? We brought sickness, even if we also brought civilization" (Hélène). This amalgam of contradictory ideas reveals guilt for having disturbed the Polynesians, who are innocent ("it's not their fault"), and for having brought sickness. Yet at the same time, she denies the colonization and boasts the well-doings of the Mainland, which "brought civilization." Employing "we," she also directly associates herself with the actors of French colonial history.

Developing his thoughts related to the term expatriate, François displays stronger emotion concerning colonial guilt:

> Do I feel guilty for having colonized Polynesia? Not at all . . . Do I feel guilty for having colonized Africa? Not at all. Such is history . . . Do the Italians feel guilty because the Romans colonized Europe? Not at all. Do the English feel guilty for having gone to America . . . ? . . . I have no guilt. None.

The term expatriate seems to evoke great insult as well as the idea of colonialism, responsibility for which he aggressively distances himself. Having lived in Algeria until its independence, this interviewee then links colonial history directly to independence struggles, which he belittles:

> If the Polynesians are intelligent enough to understand that, in the middle of the ocean all alone with 240,000 inhabitants . . . , they would be subjugated to other powers . . . It would no longer be the

> French who give the money. Because France gives a lot of money . . . They'll have to get to work straight away. The hotels have to be cleaned up . . . I don't see the point [of being independent].

Mainland France is once again praised, whereas the local intelligence and motivation to work are questioned.

*Disappointment*

A final theme of the embittered patriot involves the disappointment of Tahiti not being as French or as paradisiacal as expected. Some had imagined "the myth . . . images of warmth, the lagoon . . . the mythical idea" but were "quickly disappointed . . . Day-to-day life had nothing to do with that . . . The people are not welcoming" (Anne).

Another interviewee makes similar comments:

> I had the image of an easy life, the beach, coconut trees, the kindness of the people. It's not at all like that . . . In Tahiti it's the same life as anywhere . . . we are disappointed. I expected an easy life, but it's rather hard. There are traffic jams . . . it's like a Parisian lifestyle! (Bert)

For the latter, having imagined a mythical and paradisiacal place, the disappointment is tied to the banality or the demystification of the island.

The disappointment from unmet expectations contributes to the "effect of bitterness," in which the "European has lost his illusions; he was hoping to encounter the noble savage" (Rigo 1997, 161). The disillusionment from unmet expectations, resulting in the emotional reaction of bitterness, is reminiscent of Pierre Livet's claim that emotions are signals of alarm which let us know that our desires or expectations are maladjusted to the reality around us (Livet 2002). The disparity between expectations and reality is also pertinent to Emile Durkheim's notion of "anomie" in which a malaise is provoked when "society fails to provide a limiting framework of social norms" (Jary and Jary 1991, 21). The discrepancy between expectation and actual social experience can clearly lead to a communal emotional response, as demonstrated by the embittered patriot.

### 2. The Proudly Integrated

The opposite extreme of the above category is the proudly integrated migrant. Having accepted the criticism toward the mainland French and the colonial

shame, rather than denying it, the proudly integrated utilizes a different strategy of identity preservation by distancing him/herself from other mainland French. Claiming that the latter "are there to put money aside," have a "colonialist mentality," or "live in their little world," the proudly integrated claims to "not create relationships with Popa'a." Considering him/herself an exception to the majority of Popa'a, the individual adopting this strategy continually tries to distinguish him/herself from this ethnic belonging and its negative associations. Thus, this reaction involves pride regarding one's successful integration among the host population, as opposed to other mainland French who have, allegedly, failed because of a lack of will or of personal or cultural characteristics.

*Adoption of the Negative Perception of Popa'a*

First, the proud integrated accepts the negative perception of Popa'a. This national policeman, in his third year in Tahiti and married to a Polynesian woman met during a previous military stay at the site of the nuclear testing center, shares a negative image of Popa'a:

> They are here to put money aside . . . I don't like the mentality of taking all, then leaving. Especially the military try to save the maximum . . . There is still a problem of integration in the colonial style, like the teachers. The teachers have often lived in Africa. They are used to being served . . . to paying little for services . . . They have created segregation . . . The teachers don't mix with others . . . they feel superior to others. (Isaac)

His reproaches include the image of profiteers who have come with their superior and colonialist attitudes only to put money aside. He displays disdain for Popa'a, particularly military and teachers who are accused of intentionally separating themselves socially from the host population.

Another policeman, a few years into his stay in Tahiti and hoping to remain there with his Polynesian girlfriend, shares the same reproaches:

> And the Popa'a who have been in Polynesia for a number of years . . . think they are superior to Polynesians . . . For them, they are the Popa'a, the whites, and they are the ones who command . . . Generally, they are retired people who worked in the administration. They stay in Polynesia and because they have a higher salary, they have a nice house . . . They have a superior quality of life. They don't try to form relationships. They're in their little world. (Jacques)

The superiority and the disdainful regard, stemming from the socially and economically superior position, are once again among the negative images adopted. Retirees and long-term migrants are again criticized for lacking will to "form relationships" with Polynesians and for staying "in their little world."

The logic of this accusation is nonetheless contradicted in further commentary highlighting the interviewee's "luck" in meeting Polynesians, revealing a paradox in the representation of Popa'a. He states: "Myself, I was lucky—well, I'm very sociable as well—to form relationships, to be invited into families." He later repeats: "Myself, I was lucky to have a friend who was here, and through him I was able to meet other people, some Polynesians that he knew." (Jacques) Highlighting the fact that it is not easy to get to know Polynesians, he attributes his own achievement to both luck and his own sociability, both of which distinguish him from other mainland French.

Another proudly integrated, resident in Tahiti for twelve years and married to another civil servant, likewise criticizes his own ethnic group:

> Many, especially among the teachers . . . haven't got a single Polynesian friend; they practically kept on as if they were on the mainland. They only socialize with French, whites, mainlanders . . . It's up to us, when arriving from the mainland, to take the first step. You see right away if you are accepted or not. You don't say, I am a teacher, I know everything. No. You must remain humble . . . I don't socialize much with teachers; just a few. They are worthless . . . They want money . . . They save up. That way when they return to France they buy the nice home . . . Ourselves, all the money we earn, we spend it here, in the Territory . . . We have two colleagues, they've been here for two years and they are not going to renew their contract. They don't like it here . . . In France, people don't like to travel. (Kevin)

Kevin furthers the idea that other Popa'a are not socially integrated among the host population because they make no effort, criticizing them for this lack of will. He particularly targets teachers, who are seen once again as profiteers, and even criticized for their desire to return to mainland France. Naturally, having embraced this negative representation of Popa'a, he also invests much dialogue in distancing himself and his wife from the ethnic group he describes, employing "they" to criticize other Popa'a, and "we" to speak of himself and his family.

Two other colleagues from the elementary school, both in Tahiti since their teens, and whose parents were civil servants at the time, share these critiques of French teachers. One admits that her image of other teachers is

not very positive and declares that her "true friends are Polynesians" (Lorna). The other elaborates on this not very positive image:

> Some only come for the money . . . and say we are the best, what we think is good, what Tahitians think is not good . . . There are people who still function in a colonial system . . . They are never happy. They never give five extra minutes . . . They earn nearly twice as much as what they earn in France, they have holidays . . . But they criticize. The students here are adorable . . . When you see people who are well paid and who come with their theatrics . . . they might as well stay home . . . Their salaries are multiplied by 1.84 . . . And personally I know Tahitians who struggle, who have no money, who live poorly, simply . . . That is why myself I was anti-Popa'a before. (Marie)

The colonial attitude is once again evoked, as well as the superiority and discontent despite economic privileges, the latter of which are presumed to be the reason to stay in Tahiti. This outspoken image of teachers is common among the proudly integrated and, as is perceptible in the term "anti-Popa'a," is once again extended to generalize about the entire ethnic group.

*Distancing from Popa'a, Identifying with Polynesians*

The proudly integrated separates him/herself from the negative stigma notably by attaching his/her self-image to Tahitian people and culture. Isaac, married to a woman from Tahiti, distinguishes himself from other mainland French by his mixed marriage: "I am in favor of positive discrimination. Tahitians with equal qualifications should be favored . . . I would have no right to stay if it weren't for my wife." As opposed to the embittered patriot, he applauds differential rights for Tahitians and claims preferential rights associated with this group of belonging thanks to his wife. In addition, he claims, "We are at home" and identifies with Tahiti as a political entity, stating, "We are headed toward Independence," as opposed to the embittered patriot who employs "we" to refer to mainland France.

Jacques, who had attributed his integration in Polynesia to luck, distinguishes himself from other mainland French by his adventurous character, which he affirms throughout the interview:

> I live it as an *adventurer*. You know . . . [in Tahiti] there will not be all the same commodities as in the mainland . . . That is why I said you have to be somewhat *adventurous* to come . . . I am an *adventurer*, and material things don't attract me. So that is why,

> concerning integration, there is no problem. But I have colleagues who can't get adjusted.

He claims that whereas some colleagues are unable to adjust, his own adventurous character allows him to integrate, thus distinguishing himself from other mainland French. He continues: "Myself, I do not form relationships with *Popa'a*, with whites. Myself, I have greater ease in forming relationships with Polynesians." Not only is his personality different from other mainlanders, but he also does not associate with the latter, preferring to associate with the local population.

At the middle school, Kevin also wishes to identify with Polynesians and to distance himself from the mainland French: "Many Polynesians are convinced that I was born here because I have the accent of *pieds noirs*."[11] Later, he continues, "Many people, parents, think I was born here. Because I speak with an accent, I speak a lot, I speak with my hands." He underlines his natural similarities with Polynesians, demonstrating satisfaction to be often taken as a native of the local territory.

Yet when associated with mainlanders, Kevin exhibits rejection:

> A *Farani* is someone born in France. I was not born in France . . . Farani is a mainlander . . . There is a colleague who just renewed his contract to stay here. And he wants to make others think that he is from here . . . and when he sees a white, he says, "Hey, hello Farani." So the last time, I said, that's enough: I am not Farani because I wasn't born in France.

In this "competition" of integration, both Jacques and Kevin wishes to be associated with Tahiti and to be considered an exception from other Farani. Kevin continues his dissociation from the latter in favor of association with the Polynesian population, displaying pride in his integration:

> I have more Polynesian than Popa'a acquaintances and friends . . . I have friends from Bordeaux who are here, visiting me. They are surprised because, well, from my job and my profession, I know all the parents . . . When I go to the store to buy bread it takes me three hours . . . You know everyone.

His colleague, who arrived in Tahiti as an adolescent and is married to a local man, also feels different from other mainland French, choosing the "side" of Tahitians:

> Often people ask me if I was born here. I have a manner that makes people think I am from here. I feel more from here than from elsewhere . . . I don't feel Popa'a. I don't feel Tahitian, but I feel it by adoption. And if I had to choose a side, I choose the side of the Tahitians. I am at home here. (Marie)

Thus, Marie asserts allegiance to Tahiti and the Tahitian side, as opposed to identifying with Popa'a, toward whom she had earlier displayed hostility.

The proudly integrated display a contrasting identity strategy in response to the ethnically salient social context encountered in Tahiti, a strategy which involves distancing the self from one's socially assigned and negatively stigmatized ethnicity. Much energy, in action and discourse, is therefore allocated to displaying difference from other Popa'a and emphasizing similarities with Polynesians. In reference to Frederik Barth's fieldwork analysis, Jocelyne Streiff-Fenart notes that it can be advantageous to change one's ethnic label "to avoid paying the price of defeat" (2003, 192). In a similar identity strategy, the proudly integrated avoid paying the price of their assigned ethnic label by optimizing the options available to them and identifying with an alternative ethnic label.

### 3. The Laissez-Faire Fatalist

The reactions exhibited by the third ideal type, the laissez-faire fatalist, are a compromise between those of the proudly integrated and the embittered patriot. Like the latter, the laissez-faire fatalist recognizes ethnic divisions and the regretted impossibility of feeling socially integrated among the host population, finding him/herself in a rather isolated ethnic community. Yet in contrast, this attitude neither entails feeling bitter or resentful of this situation, nor conversely trying to adopt Polynesian ways or to dissociate oneself from other mainland French. Accepting his/her social position and largely ignoring the negative ethnic stereotyping, the laissez-faire fatalist declares to live quite happily in Tahiti, despite the regretted social barriers to interethnic mixing.

*Recognition of Regrettable Ethnic Divisions*

First, the laissez-faire fatalist recognizes ethnic divisions and resigns to accept them. A physical education teacher, who decided not to renew his contract after two initial years in Tahiti, attests to the presence of boundaries that maintain superficial relations with Polynesians:

> The Polynesians are very nice; but from there to having deeper relations . . . In the neighborhood where we live, all is going well. We always greet each other, but that's it . . . It's quite difficult to have real contact with the Tahitians. The reserve . . . It remains superficial. It's not easy. (Norbert)

The reasons given for these divisions and for the superficiality of relations, rather than targeting individuals' actions, are explained by socioeconomic differences:

> At kite-surfing . . . it's an activity that costs a lot. So once again we are among ourselves . . . It's related to money. If I can chat with the neighbours from one side it's because they work; they both leave in the morning like us. Whereas on the other side, they don't work; they fish, they sell fruit and fish by the side of the road . . . We don't have the same culture, we don't understand each other. It's a different lifestyle. (Norbert)

Norbert frequently justifies ethnic divisions by cultural differences, never praising or blaming one side or another.

A university teacher, who requested to keep her position in Tahiti, also attests to superficiality in interethnic relations:

> It's a different type of friendship . . . It's a different culture . . . Later, I distanced myself . . . it didn't correspond to what I wanted. With Tahitians [I only had] superficial contacts . . . We stay on the outside . . . [There are] socioeconomic differences, differences in interest . . . a huge gap between those who studied . . . Their culture is closed . . . it's difficult to integrate . . . you have to make the effort . . . I think that there are two choices: either you integrate completely and take up the daily life of Tahitians, or you remain on the sidelines. (Olive)

Once again the explications are neutral and accompanied by a resigned regret that relations with Tahitians are superficial and that such ethnic and cultural divisions exist. The acceptance of the role as foreigner permits acceptance of the divisions that the embittered patriot violently refuses:

> I don't want to impose . . . It's their country, the country of the Tahitians. But it's better that way . . . I try to do as they do, to respect

> the local codes; to not honk, . . . to yield to people even if it's up to them to stop. (Olive)

Thus, she attributes her adaptation efforts to an accepted role as foreigner.

A colleague, in Tahiti for ten years, has also accepted these divisions, living happily with wife and children in a convivial residential community:

> The true friends are mostly Popa'a who have been here for a long time . . . At the beginning, we had two couples of Polynesian friends [neighbors and their friends] . . . But since then, they moved to Moorea, and we have more or less lost contact . . . It's kind of a shame. (Paul)

He regrets the lack of deepened contact with the host population, despite his long-term residence. Another colleague in her fifth year in Tahiti echoes this regret of ethnic boundaries. After discussing difficulties to integrate among Tahitians, she continues:

> I tried to make contacts when I saw that the children had some Polynesian friends . . . They don't make an effort because they know that they [Popa'a] are here to put money aside . . . [There are] obstacles for integration. We have different pastimes . . . parties, humor, and language too. (Quinn)

Although also desiring deepened relationships, she notes that cultural differences produce natural obstacles to integration, in addition to the obstacle of the negative perception of Popa'a, reinforced by the system of economic privileges.

A middle school teacher who was recently authorized to keep his position in Tahiti confirms that the boundaries are difficult to penetrate and expresses a desire to adapt one day:

> You must take the first step. And even when you take the first step, sometimes he assumes in any case you are just passing through, you do not interest him . . . Sometimes there is this retreat from the foreigner . . . I can't say that I know the Polynesian culture as of now. I don't really have the time to get into it. But I would like to get into it, either regarding the language or the culture itself . . . But it is not easy . . . I don't feel rejected, but I don't have the impression that I'm 100% integrated either. I hope it'll come. (Ronald)

Thus, Ronald recognizes regrettable boundaries but preserves the hope that integration and improved contact will prevail with time.

For a policeman beginning his second year in French Polynesia, the urban context of Papeete is responsible for the lack of intergroup contact:

> We regret being in Papeete. I think that elsewhere it is easier to live well and amongst the Polynesians. In the islands there are less Popa'a; they are amongst them; they live together. In Papeete, we feel like we are living on the sidelines. (Stéphane)

This final statement is demonstrative of the laissez-faire fatalist's overall feeling of regret for living "on the sidelines" and not among the host population.

*Satisfaction with Life in Tahiti*

Despite regrets over ethnic boundaries, the laissez-faire fatalist makes the best of the situation to live well and take advantage of life in Tahiti. Some express this satisfaction by the desire to stay beyond expiration of the temporary contract. Others explicitly articulate this satisfaction and feel at home:

> I don't have the impression that we live much differently to on the mainland . . . I live with comfort, with a lot of happiness . . . There is a different culture, yes, but I don't feel like an expatriate. I feel like I am somewhere in France, as if I had gone from Brittany to the south of France. (Ronald)

Regardless of regretted ethnic divisions, the laissez-faire fatalist feels at home and lives in Tahiti "with a lot of happiness." However, the following interviewee demonstrates cynicism regarding his own integration in the system laid out for him:

> I feel well. I don't know . . . I have the impression that we are here to earn money and that money is distributed across the Territory. We are a mailbox to take money and distribute it. If I am integrated, it is because I play my role as a mailbox: I pay a very expensive rent, et cetera. My social role here is more that than anything else. I think it's the structure that is built that way. (Norbert)

Thus, he associates his social role and integration directly with his professional role. Representing the French State, his social position is determined

by the structure of relations between the State and the Overseas Country. Nonetheless, despite this predetermined social role, he asserts to live happily in Tahiti.

### Similarities with Other Migrant Populations

The ideal types observed throughout this study have striking similarities with reactions and attitudes adopted by other migrant populations, in conditions of both socioeconomic domination and marginalization. Similarities have been found (1) with the Maghreb population in France, (2) with migrant elites in multinational companies, and (3) with the former French colonial population in Algeria. Each mainland French ideal type observed in this study resembles an identity strategy adopted by other populations. Although each sociohistorical context bears stark differences with the French Polynesian context, the interest of this comparison lies in the surprisingly similar emotional reactions and identity strategies of other individuals faced with structural sociopolitical patterns and ethnic representations that classify their self-identity within an unfavorable communal categorization.

Malewska-Peyre's study (1989) regarding the Maghreb population in France highlights the fact that the individuals react diversely to the negative image of their ethnic belonging. "Over-assertion" (*sur-affirmation*)[12] is one observed manner to combat the negative image, where the criticized characteristic is positively emphasized, as in the American "black is beautiful" movement. As Abdelmalek Sayad noted, the first reaction against stigma consists of asserting the stigma that is then constituted as an emblem of identity (Sayad 1994, 254). Although in this case adopted by a dominant group, this reaction clearly resembles the overemphasis on French nationality in the case of the embittered patriot, who defends and positively reinforces this contentious aspect of his/her ethnic identity. Similarly, in Philippe Pierre's study (2003) regarding elite corporate migrations and their identity strategies, migrants demonstrating this type of reaction are coined the "defensives" (*les defensives*) because of their strong defensiveness of the most criticized aspect of their group belonging. A similar ideal type exists in observations of colonial Algeria, in which Albert Memmi (1985) employs "the colonist who accepts his role" (*le colon qui s'accepte*) to identify the individual who feels the need to vigorously defend the legitimacy of his/her colonial presence.

Regarding the proudly integrated, Malewska-Peyre and Camilleri designate such a reaction as "displacement," where the migrant accepts the negative ethnic image yet distances his/her own image from the targeted group. Like the proudly integrated, the individual distinguishes him/herself

from the negative depiction by assimilating to the host population, displacing the depreciated image upon other members of the ethnic group from which he/she would like to be distinguished (Camilleri 1989, 383). For Pierre, migrants expressing the proudly integrated reaction are termed "the converted" (*les convertis*), having changed their lifestyle and behavior to assimilate to new norms. Memmi correlates this type of reaction in a colonial context to "the colonist who refuses his role" (*le colon qui se refuse*), refusing the concept of self as colonist or member of the dominant group. To contest this notion, the individual expressing this reaction type modulates his behavior to illustrate this refusal, both to self or others.

As for individuals who, aware of negative ethnic representations yet choose to ignore their existence, Malewska-Peyre recognizes this reaction as "repression" (1989). The migrant represses any pain provoked by prejudice to protect self-image and retain a decent quality of life. For those in a dominant social category who display the will to maintain a high quality of life within a foreign culture, Pierre coins the term "the opportunists" (*les opportunists*) for their predominant expression of pleasure in the discovery, change, and travel associated with their migration.

Overall, there are unmistakable similarities in identity strategy between the mainland French migrants in Tahiti and those of other individuals reacting to and recreating ethnic boundaries. All strive to optimize their self image in light of the social depreciation of an ascribed identity. All of these identity "defense mechanisms" are in fact manners of preserving self-esteem and value, strategies that are recognized by the psychoanalytical community. Anna Freud's *Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense* (1936) first elaborated some of these terms, such as "repression" or "displacement," to describe some of these self-preservation strategies that, utilized on an individual level to counter negative stigma, are observed here on a societal level.

## Conclusion: Common Reactions to Structural Divisions

The interviews indicate structural ethnic divisions, of which the difficulty of permeability provokes diverse reactions. These divisions are continually recreated and reinforced by the polarization of ethnic perceptions, bringing social actors to choose sides and to continue to divide ethnicity into "us" and "them," a process that has carried on since the beginning of the colonial mission. Bruno Saura, confirming such social barriers to be continually and structurally formed, states that "the 'Popa'a' minority [. . .] can live in a closed circuit and in an almost completely autonomous manner in regards to the Polynesian population, as they occupy functions tied to French institutions and superstructures imported in Polynesia." In light of these observable

ethnic divisions, he adds, "Rather than trying to integrate or adapt to the territory and its inhabitants, the French minority takes advantage of the system" (Saura 1985, 9). Thus, the blame is placed on the will of the individual migrants. However, the persistence of this very stereotype participates in maintaining ethnic barriers and complicates the possibility of escape from socially assigned identities and roles, regardless of individual will.

The very definition of "ethnicity" is associated with the macrosocial construction of groups, which precede the individual and yet which are continually reproduced by each individual. Marco Martiniello states that "ethnicity concerns the structural constraints of a social, economic and political nature which shape ethnic identities" (1995, 24), indicating that the political and economic structure generates constraints upon the individual's ethnic identity and social interactions. As William Whyte stated regarding Italian integration into the American society of the 1930s, an Italian could not simply "become" American, because of the organization of his/her own and the host society's social groupings (1996, 190). Similarly, macrosocial structural constraints largely determine the social position of the mainland French in Tahiti, encouraging the adoption of identity strategies to enhance self-identity through various interpretations of one's relation to his/her inescapable ethnic identity.

This study was limited to a select sample of subjects and did not investigate the attitudes and social integration of the full array of the French presence, including those retired, in the private sector or of second generation residence. The civil servants involved in the temporary and elite migrations from mainland France take various stances in relation to their own ethnic group, the host population, colonial history, and their social role as posted agent of the State. The ideal type reactions have several factors in common: the demonstration of communal emotion, whether in the form of bitterness, pride, or else proclaimed satisfaction; mechanisms of identity defence to surmount ethnic depreciation; and similarities in identity strategy and emotional reactions with those of other communities faced with justifying and acting within ethnic divisions.

Contrary to expectation, the attitude types displayed were independent of length of stay. The accounts of ethnic boundaries across the range of ideal types and stay-lengths suggest that the continual arrival and presence of temporary migrants assist in reinforcing the divided social structure and the continually reconstructed ethnic boundaries, especially because assimilation or integration are long-term, multigenerational processes (Alba 2003, 34). Rather than forming a "neo-Polynesian" society, whose political proponents strive to find a "permanent and daily mix of cultures [. . .] and not just a juxtaposition of cultures within the same territory" (Saura 1986, 236),

polarization of ethnic identity and negative ethnic representations appear exacerbated within the current political structure. In consequence, omnipresent in the discourse of present-day posted civil servants in Tahiti are "colonial guilt" and negative stigma, which are asserted, assumed, transposed, or ignored in each migrant's quest to construct a favorable individual identity within a socially and individually credible ethnic belonging.

## NOTES

1. Although all of the Tahitian population is French by nationality, typically only those from mainland France are termed French, otherwise referred to as "mainlanders" or Farani in Tahitian language. "Tahitian," like "Polynesian" or Ma'ohi, is generally used to designate individuals who are considered to be of a local, indigenous descent or "race." Race, like "ethnicity," shall be referred to as "the belief that there is a relationship between the membership of a socially created category and the possession of specific characteristics. The underlying explanation of these differences may be, for example, cultural, religious, or historical and need not be biological or pseudobiological" (Jary and Jary 1991, 21). Although other ethnic categorizations exist and much discussion could be dedicated to their social usages and evolutions, for the purposes of this paper, ethnic designations shall generally be employed as used by the interviewed social actors themselves.

2. Although since 1948 France no longer applies the terms "colonial" or "colony," the current sociopolitical system is still based on colonial relations. Victoria S. Lockwood (1993) applies Bertram and Watters's (1985) term "welfare state colonialism" to specify the current economic setup, in which colonial relations of dependency are created through comprehensive financial support. Moreover, political leaders such as Oscar Temaru of the proindependence party *Tavini huiraatira* still speak of decolonizing this region.

3. This article is primarily derived from my graduate thesis, "Attitudes and Integration of Mainland French State Employees in Urban Tahiti," defended at l'Université de la Polynésie Française, 2004. Quotations have been translated into English for the purposes of this article.

4. At the time of the interviews (2003–2004), French Polynesia was termed a French Overseas Territory. In 2004, it became a French Overseas Country but by name only, because legally it remains a Collectivity.

5. With its population of 169,674, the island of Tahiti, also the administrative center, is home to nearly 70% of the total 245,516 French Polynesian population (ITSTAT 2002).

6. After the 1988 poll, ethnic categories no longer appeared in national polls with the application of the 1978 law *Informatique et liberté* prohibiting the request of personal information such as racial and ethnic origin.

7. ITSTAT 1996, Table M11.13. It can be assumed that the majority of those 12,300 born outside of French Polynesia were born in mainland France, although the figure does include Polynesians born abroad and French citizens of various origins.

8. Numbers provided directly by the *Vice-Rectorat* and the *Haut-Commissariat*, 2002.

9. Proposal available at the university website : 'La Citoyenneté de pays: l'Exemple de la Polynésie française' presented by Gaston Flosse at the conference "Identité, nationalité et citoyenneté dans les Territoires d'Outre-mer," Papeete, 9 et 10 Novembre 1998.

10. The twenty-one recorded and transcribed interviews entailed a series of open-ended, semidirected questions that followed the natural course of conversation as much as possible. The interviews generally extended over an hour and were held at the individual's place of work in a private space.

11. "*Pieds noirs*" refers to the French from Algeria who were repatriated to the mainland in 1962 upon Algeria's independence.

12. Carmel Camilleri, "La communication dans la perspective interculturelle," concluding upon the findings in Hanna Malewska-Peyre, "Problèmes d'identité des adolescents enfants de migrants et travail social."

## REFERENCES

Alba, Richard
2003 L'assimilation aux Etats-Unis. *Futuribles* 284 (March): 34–44.

Baré, Jean-François
2002 *Le malentendu pacifique*. Paris: Editions des Archives Contemporaines.

Bateson, Gregory
1979 *Mind and nature: A necessary unity*. New York: Bantam Books.

Beaud, Stéphane, and Florence Weber
1998 *Guide de l'enquête de terrain*. Paris: La Découverte.

Bertheleu, Hélène
1997 De l'unité républicaine à la fragmentation multiculturelle: Le débat français en matière d'intégration. *Les Cahiers du Cériem* 2, http://www.uhb.fr/sc_humaines/ceriem/documents/cc2/CC2Helen.htm.

Bertram, Geoffrey, and Ray Watters
1985 The MIRAB economy of the South Pacific microstates. *Pacific Viewpoint* 26:497–519.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Jean-Claude Passeron
1970 *La reproduction*. Paris : Editions de Minuit.

Brami-Celentano, Alexandra
2002 Frontières ethniques et redéfinition du cadre politique à Tahiti. *Hermès* (La France et les Outre-Mers: L'enjeu multiculturel) 32–33:367–75.

Camilleri, Carmel
1989 La communication dans la perspective interculturelle. In *Chocs de cultures: Concepts et enjeux pratiques de l'interculturel*, ed. C. Camilleri and M. Cohen-Emirique, 383–85. Paris: Harmattan.

Castles, Stephen
1995 How nation-states respond to immigration and ethnic diversity. *New Community* 21 (3): 293–308.

De Carlo, Maddalena
1998 *L'interculturel*. Paris: Marie-Christine Couet-Lannes.

Doumenge, Jean-Pierre
1999 L'immigration dans les territoires d'outre-mer: réalités et perceptions. In *Identité, nationalité, citoyenneté outre-mer*, ed. J-Y. Faberon and Y. Gautier, 135–52. Paris: Centre des Hautes Etudes sur l'Afrique et l'Asie Modernes.
2002 Diversité culturelle et construction des identités collectives outre-mer. *Hermès* (La France et les Outre-Mers: L'enjeu multiculturel) 32–33:27–33.

du Prel, Alex W.
2003 Touche pas à mes privilèges. *Tahiti-Pacifique Magazine* 150:5.

Flosse, Gaston
1998 La citoyenneté de pays: L'exemple de la Polynésie française. Paper presented at the conference Identité, Nationalité et Citoyenneté dans les Territoires d'Outre-mer, Papeete.

Gille, Bernard
1999 *De la conquête à l'exode: Histoire des Océaniens et de leurs migrations dans le Pacifique*. Pirae: Au Vent des Îles.

Freud, Anna
1971 *Ego and the mechanisms of defense*. New York: International Universities [1936] Press.

ITSTAT (l'Institut Territorial de la Statistique de la Polynésie Française)
1988 Résultats du recensement général de la population.
1996 Résultats du recensement général de la population. Table MII.13.
2002 Premiers résultats du recensement général de la population de 2002. www.ispf.pf.

Jary, David, and Julia Jary
1991 *Harper Collins dictionary of sociology*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.

Lefeuvre, Daniel
2006 *Pour en finir avec la repentance coloniale*. Paris: Flammarion.

Livet, Pierre
2002 *Emotions et rationalité morale*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Lockwood, Victoria S.
1993 *Tahitian transformation: Gender and capitalist development in a rural society*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Malewska-Peyre, Hanna
1989 Problèmes d'identité des adolescents, enfants de migrants et travail social. In *Chocs de cultures: Concepts et enjeux pratiques de l'interculturel*, ed. C. Camilleri and M. Cohen-Emirique, 117–34. Paris: Harmattan.

Martiniello, Marco
1995 *L'ethnicité dans les sciences sociales contemporaines*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Memmi, Albert
1985 *Portrait du colonisé précédé du portrait du colonisateur*. Paris: Gallimard. [1957]
1999 *Le racisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Panoff, Michel
1981 *Farani Taiaro*. La première génération de colons français à Tahiti. *Journal de la Société Océanienne* 70–71.
1989 *Tahiti métisse*. Paris: Denoël.

Pierre, Philippe
2003 Mobilité internationale des élites et stratégies de l'identité. *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales* 19 (1): 29–49.

Poirine, Bernard
1992 *Tahiti: Du melting-pot à l'explosion?* Paris: Harmattan.

Regnault, Jean-Marc
1995 *Des partis et des hommes en Polynésie française*. Papeete: Haere Po No Tahiti.

Rigo, Bernard
1997 *Lieux-dits d'un malentendu culturel*. Pirae: Au Vent des Îles.

Saura, Bruno
1985 Approche du phénomène pluri-ethnique et pluri-culturel en Polynésie française. *Bulletin de la Société des Etudes Océaniennes* 233, Tome XIX (no.10).
1986 L'identité polynésienne: Facteurs de revendication et discours identitaires à Tahiti (Polynésie française). Mémoire de DEA, Université de Droit, Aix-Marseille III.
1998 *Des Tahitiens, des Français: Leurs représentations réciproques aujourd'hui*. Papeete: Les Essais.

Sayad, Abdelmalek
1994 Le mode de génération des générations immigrées. *Migrants Formations* 98:6–20.

Stora, Benjamin, and Thierry Leclerc
2007 *La guerre des mémoires: La France face à son passé colonial*. Paris: l'Aube.

Streiff-Fenart, Jocelyne
2003 Frontières et catégorisations ethniques: Frederik Barth et le LP. In *L'école et le défi ethnique: Education et intégration*, ed. F. Lorcerie, 187–95. Paris: ESF éditeur & l'Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique.

Temaru, Oscar
1995 Speech to the United Nations, October 8, 1990. *Tavini Huiraatira* document. Cited in J.-M. Regnault, *Des partis et des hommes en Polynésie française*, 145. Papeete: Haere Po No Tahiti.

Toullelan, Pierre-Yves
1987 *Tahiti colonial (1860–1914)*. Paris: Publication de la Sorbonne.

Toullelan, Pierre-Yves, and Bernard Gille
1992 *Le mariage franco-tahitien: Histoire de Tahiti du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours* Papeete: Editions Polymages-Scoop.

Weber, Max
1996 *Sociologie des religions*. Ed. J.-P. Grossein. Paris: Edition Gallimard.

Whyte, William F.
1996 *Street corner society*. Paris: La Découverte.

# CONTACTS BETWEEN NATIVE AMERICANS AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS SINCE WORLD WAR II

Emanuel J. Drechsel
*University of Hawai'i at Mānoa*

This essay explores the relationship of sociocultural complementarities that Native Americans and Native Hawaiians as the only native peoples of the United States have developed through recent mutual contacts. Of special interest are references not only to military training, rest, and rehabilitation during and after World War II, but also to the search by both native peoples for traditional identities and political alternatives. Contrary to isolationist expectations, Native Americans and Native Hawaiians have found much in common because of similar experiences in their colonial and modern histories; hence, they have understood more of each other's concerns than divide-and-conquer–minded colonists and their descendants have realized. Initial investigations suggest that casual contacts have developed into formal encounters in which Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have increasingly drawn on each other for support and have proven a major source of solidarity in their struggle for cultural and political autonomy.

## Preliminaries

A RECENT BOOK by the Standing Rock Sioux historian Philip J. Deloria (2004), *Indians in Unexpected Places*, examines how Native Americans have coped and contended with modernity contrary to standard stereotypical expectations of their traditional social roles. Deloria considers examples of unanticipated, even disorienting, discordance such as Geronimo sitting behind the wheel of a Cadillac, a string quartet or jazz band consisting of Native American musicians, and Indians appearing in various athletic or staged functions. The present essay similarly reviews the question of native

*Pacific Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 2—June 2008

peoples "out of place," specifically American Indians in the Hawaiian Islands since early World War II, and explores contacts between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians.[1] The following pages document what appears a commonplace presence of Native Americans, long thought in decline, even in the fiftieth state, and survey interactions between American Indians and Hawaiians in the past decades. Not only have Native Americans and Native Hawaiians shared many sociohistorical parallels in spite of their different origins, but their paths have crossed again and again, which raises interesting broader issues of recent Pacific history and challenge some widely held stereotypes about both peoples.[2]

## Native American-Hawaiian Contacts in Historical Perspective

A hemispheric, macrohistorical overview of the United States might suggest an expansion from east to west, in which the Hawaiian Islands were little more than an extension of the West Coast en route to the Philippines (see Coffman 1998: 289–313; Drinnon 1980). By logical extension, this kind of reasoning would not be receptive to the idea of any contacts between Native Americans and Hawaiians before the arrival of U.S. Americans in the Hawaiian Islands and their westward expansion. Much less would such a reductionist east-to-west interpretation of U.S. American history favor contacts between Native Hawaiians and Native Americans before the arrival of Europeans on grounds of the mistaken assumption that the native peoples lacked the technological or navigating expertise necessary to sail long distances across high oceans.

In reality, it is reasonable now to assume that, as highly skilled sailors on double-hull canoes, Native Hawaiians did not merely voyage to other Pacific islands, but could have extended their ventures into the northeastern Pacific and western North America some 2,200 nautical miles away. These Hawaiian sailors would not have encountered empty islands as elsewhere in their first explorations of the Pacific, but would likely have arrived on inhabited territory. Short of returning to sea, any voyaging Hawaiians must have succumbed to the native population, which would have adopted and absorbed them, if it did not kill them, because the visitors were comparatively few in number (Finney 1994: 283–87). Thus, we can hardly expect seafaring Polynesians to have left many, if any, distinctive traces in North America before the arrival of the British explorer James Cook. If the absence of evidence need not indicate the absence of contact between Hawaiians and Native Americans before the Europeans' arrival, the archaeologist Terry L. Jones and the linguist Kathryn A. Klar (Jones and Klar 2005; Klar and Jones 2005) have offered some convincing arguments and data in

support of a pre-European contact by Polynesians with the Chumash Indians of southern California and the neighboring Gabrielino: sewn-plank boats among these Indians, common to Polynesians but not to Native Americans, and accompanying loanwords of apparent Polynesian origin in Southern Chumashan languages, reconstructable as proto-Southern Chumashan **tomolo'o* (sewn-plank canoe) for approximately AD 400 to 800.

Native Hawaiians, too, were among the very first newcomers to western North America in the European-American explorations of the northern Pacific from the late 1780s, as crew members. The Hawaiian Islands had not only come to serve as a wintering place for British, American, and Russian ships, soon to develop into a major way station for tall ships in the trans-Pacific trade, but within years, the islands assumed a strategic commercial role by serving as ports of call for fresh provisions, repairs of ships, recreation for crews, and new manpower in the emerging trade of fur, sandalwood, and whale oil between western North America (including Alaska) and Asia (Gibson 1992: 44–50, 187–88, 212–13, 253–58, 278–91). European and European-American sailors who had jumped ship in the islands or elsewhere in the Pacific needed replacement. Substituting for them were adventurous Hawaiians, who joined to leave untenable lives or to explore new opportunities, who quickly proved skillful sailors in dangerous endeavors, and who demonstrated dexterity, courage, and reliability as canoe men, fishermen, and whalers in rough waters (Chappell 1997).[3]

Beginning in the early nineteenth century, fur-trade companies, foremost the Hudson's Bay Company, engaged hundreds of Native Hawaiians in the fur trade of the Northwest Coast, which brought them into direct, regular contact with Native Americans. Known as *Kanakas* (< Hawaiian *kanaka* "human being, man, person, individual; subject, as of a chief; laborer, servant, helper," or *kānaka*, plural of *kanaka* [Pukui and Elbert 1986: 127]), Native Hawaiians succeeded as fur traders, lumbermen, farmers, and miners and in still other occupations. Jean Barman (1997–1998: 12) has estimated a thousand Hawaiian men, possibly more, to have moved to northwestern North America "as seamen, fur trade labourers, or adventurers," and has identified several reasons why Native Hawaiians remained in the Pacific Northwest or even returned there after a visit to the Hawaiian Islands:

> Visiting seamen likely brought news of deteriorating conditions at home, where local people were losing their autonomy and self-respect in the face of religious and economic exploitation by outsiders. Land on the west coast of North America was plentiful, unlike the Hawaiian Islands where newcomers had acquired control over the best land. William Naukana is said to have gone back sometime

> in the 1850s only to find family land appropriated for a sugar plantation, and so returned to North America. Men with families by local women had personal reasons for staying in the Pacific Northwest. (Barman 1997–1998: 13)

However, a major reason for the Hawaiians' stay in the Pacific Northwest undoubtedly was also the spread of various epidemic diseases in the Hawaiian Islands, resulting in a rapid depopulation of native Islanders (see Stannard 1989).

Still another motivation for many Hawaiians not to return, even when by contract they already had a paid passage home after having completed service with the company, was that they had sought and found companionship among Native Americans and often married into native communities (Barman 1995, Duncan 1973, Koppel 1995, Naughton 1983). According to records of the Catholic Church and other historical documentation, Hawaiian men often wedded Chinook women, or less frequently found wives among the Chehalis and Cowlitz tribes, all located on the Columbia River and close to fur-trade routes (Naughton 1983: 30–32, 39–41). Moreover, Native Hawaiians came into regular contact with Kwakiutl, Algonquian-speaking Métis, Iroquois of northeastern North America, and still other tribes of the area (Koppel 1995: 17, 18, 22, 23, 53, 57, 99–100, 140 [fn. 4]). In the second half of the nineteenth century, the association of Hawaiians with American Indians received a boost by laws forbidding marriage between whites and people of color, including Hawaiians, in Oregon and Washington but not in British Columbia (Barman 1997–1998: 14). Thus, Hawaiians settled in new homes in northwestern North America in spite of temperatures ranging lower by some 20°F than in the islands.[4]

Sadly, little substantive information is currently available about these Hawaiian-Indian relations. Still, historians have not hesitated to present Indian-Hawaiian encounters in terms of animosity and even hostility (for recent examples, see Chappell 1997: 104–05, 165; Duncan 1973: 102), just as traditional depictions attributed to Hawaiians little adaptability to new environments, especially a colder climate such as that of the Northwest Coast. However, such characterizations do not reflect so much a true historical picture as more the divide-and-conquer wishful thinking of colonists whose primary interest was to prevent any alliance between American Indians and Hawaiians and, with it, any possible rebellion by native peoples. In reality, engagement in the fur trade by outsiders such as Hawaiians required close cooperation with the indigenous population, still the primary provider of the desired goods. As was the case for instance with French traders, whether accredited *voyageurs* or unlicensed *coureurs de bois*, and their *métis* descendants, Native Hawaiians must have developed fairly

close and intimate, even symbiotic relations with Native Americans of the Northwest Coast and Inuit of Alaska with a mutual give and take, although not always without conflict.

A few years after the first Native Hawaiians had shipped out to the Northwest Coast in support of Europeans and Americans in their explorations, the French-born poet and naturalist Adelbert von Chamisso, writing about his Pacific travels in German between 1815 and 1818, reported the presence of as many as a hundred Aleuts from Kodiak ("Kadiacker" or "Aleuten") in the Hawaiian Islands. They had come as crew on a sealing expedition of the Russian-American Company whose ship ran aground—eventually to end up as sealers on an American ship destined for California (Kotzebue 1821: II: 113–14; III: 153, 158). What happened to these Aleuts remains a mystery at this time. Whether and how other Native Americans visited the Hawaiian Islands in the nineteenth century is an open question short of other specific historical evidence and protracted research with primary documents on that topic. However, as the example of Kodiak Aleuts suggests, adventurous members of Western tribes—engaged as sealers, in some other function of the fur trade, or as whalers—made it to the Hawaiian Islands. Just as the fur trade had already brought Iroquois and Algonquians from eastern North America to the west coast, the tradition of traveling by seagoing canoes did not keep native peoples of the Pacific Northwest from globetrotting, even if they could not draw on the high-sea voyaging skills of Polynesians (Gould 1968, Neel 1995; for a general discussion, see Helms 1988).

The primary institution responsible for the transfer of Native Americans to the Hawaiian Islands likely was the Hudson's Bay Company, because it had been the principal player in the Hawaiians' relocation to the Northwest Coast. Notably, the eminent and long-standing institution of fur trade did not merely use the islands as a convenient base for its ships in commerce with Asia; but from 1829 until 1861, it maintained a store in downtown Honolulu for reducing dependence of its posts in the Pacific Northwest on imported supplies and diversifying its business beyond the fur trade to timber and salmon, agricultural and manufactured products, plus services in expanding markets in the Hawaiian Islands, western North America, and England in addition to those to Asia (Spoehr 1986: 27, 29, 46–59; 1988). Just as the company kept employing native people as hunters and agents on the North American continent, it apparently hired Native American sealers and whalers as ship crew. In spite of its expansionist goals, the company maintained "a firm policy for the conduct of the Agency—namely, that the agents support the Hawaiian government and not meddle in its affairs" (Spoehr 1986: 37). If this policy amounted to a rare enlightened approach on

the Hawaiian Islands, the Hudson's Bay Company never became an indigenous or local business, but has remained one of the dominant corporations in the European expansion of North America (Wolf 1982: 172–90).

Although there is evidence for some fairly wide-ranging Indian-Hawaiian interactions in the Pacific Northwest in the early nineteenth century, historians need better documentation to demonstrate what, on grounds of her rather limited study, E. Momilani Naughton (1983: 74) has interpreted as "a significant impact" by Native Hawaiians on the Pacific Northwest. Not only is there little information available about Hawaiians who became absorbed into Native American communities of the Northwest, but it is far from clear to what extent and in what ways Native Hawaiians, other than those adopted into native communities, kept interacting with the latter in the late nineteenth century. Native Americans and many "mainland" Hawaiians apparently parted ways with the decline of the fur trade after the mid-nineteenth century and with the California Gold Rush in 1858. When after 1860 the Hawaiian Islands ceased as intermediary station in the fur trade, and with it the Hudson's Bay Company as a local company, Hawaiians found other work as loggers, in sawmills, as longshoremen, and on subsistence farming with the renewal of their contracts (Barman 1997–1998: 15–16), whence there existed much less of an obvious incentive for Hawaiians to visit Native Americans in numbers or vice versa. Significantly, some of the Native American sources whom Naughton (1983: 38) could still consult for her research on Hawaiians in the fur trade did no longer appear aware of their Hawaiian forefathers, and others preferred not to claim any Hawaiian ancestry, even when they apparently were aware of it.[5]

If the fur trade, whaling and sealing defined the interactions between Native Americans and Hawaiians in the nineteenth century, there appeared a silence in the records of the following decades. Does it indicate an absence of interactions or merely an absence of recorded observations? Future research will have to answer that question.

## "Unexpected" Native Americans in the Hawaiians Islands for Military Service

The next major occasion for contact between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians was World War II, when after basic training in the continental United States, Native Americans came to the Hawaiian Islands for final training "in the bush," as was true especially for code talkers. Not only did Native Americans make a disproportionately large contribution to the war efforts, with motives ranging from adventurism to the pursuit of warrior traditions, the prospect for employment and education, and patriotism,

Native American soldiers also distinguished themselves by using their native languages as military codes, sometimes in reduced and disguised form, which neither German nor Japanese intelligence ever broke. In World War II, the U.S. armed forces in the Pacific made use of at least six different Native American languages as military codes among no less than fourteen different ones (Meadows 2002: 68, 70–71, 241–42): Assiniboine (Siouan), Hopi (Uto-Aztecan), Kiowa (Kiowa-Tanoan), Lakota and Dakota (Siouan), Muskogee and Seminole (Muskogean), and Navajo (Athapaskan).[6] Their reason for selection had in part been highly distinct phonologies, lexica, and grammars with few published data accessible to the enemy; the other major justification was large, viable speech communities from which the armed forces could draw sufficient bilingual men for military and specialized training. Except for the Muskogee-Seminole Indians, who served in the Aleutian Campaign and who never had any need to leave North America, these Native American servicemen fought in the South or western Pacific, and passed through the Hawaiian Islands for stopovers, "jungle training," instruction, and recovery.

Specifics of the Native American code talkers' visits have remained rather obscure other than for Navajo Indians serving with the Marine Corps in the Pacific. However, the Hawaiian Islands came to serve as the final training grounds, where Navajo Marines took part in military exercises in which they practiced taking small islands from ships. For four weeks, Parker Ranch on the Big Island of Hawai'i also was the location of field training, including gruesome multiple-day maneuvers.[7] Many Navajo returned to Pearl Harbor on O'ahu, the only location of the Navajo code books other than Camp Pendleton in California, for retraining with a revised code before the impending invasion of Okinawa and Japan to inhibit any decoding by the enemy. Some Navajo visited the Hawaiian Islands again on rest and rehabilitation before going home. By a recent estimate, there were some 400 Navajo participants in the project, whose existence remained classified until 1968 because of the extra secret nature of their assignment and of whom 150 were still alive in 2001. Socially, the code talkers occupied a tenuous position within the military. They frequently faced prejudices against people of color prevalent at the time; moreover, non-Indian American servicemen regularly mistook them as Japanese, jammed their telephone and radio messages, and threatened to kill them. Some code talkers received non-Indian "body guards" assigned to them. Officially, these guards were said to protect the Navajo soldiers from Japanese, but in reality had to shelter them also from fellow servicemen (Bixler 1992: 73–74; McClain 2001: 99, 114–15, 120, 125, 145, 154–55, 171–72, 192–93, 203, 205; Paul 1973: 61–63, 85, 87).[8]

Even less information is available on how Native American code talkers adapted in the civilian domains of the Hawaiian Islands. Still, after completing their duties, Navajo Marines occasionally enjoyed a game of horseshoes, which provided "a strange sight . . . in the backwoods of Hawaii" (McClain 2001: 157–58). Navajo soldiers also participated enthusiastically—and apparently with some success—in rodeos in competition with local cowboys (Bixler 1992: 73), known as *paniolos* (< Hawaiian "Spaniard, Spanish" [Pukui and Elbert 1986: 315]). Still, at least during their training in the Hawaiian Islands, Navajo Marines probably did not have extended contacts with the local population for reasons of military security, until they returned for rest and rehabilitation on their way home from the South Pacific or Asia, and even then they did not have permission to recount their war experiences.

For the period after World War II, there exists a similar gap of information about the presence of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands.[9] This conclusion does not necessarily mean that they disappeared from the islands. Some Native American soldiers on rest and rehabilitation in Hawai'i during the Korean and Vietnam Wars apparently found a home and settled in the Islands on their return. Unfortunately, the first census to take account of Native Americans in the islands did not appear until 1960, after which the numbers have been rising steadily (Table 1).

TABLE 1. **U.S. Bureau of the Census Figures for Native Americans and Part-Native Americans Living in the Hawaiian Islands.**

| | Census Year[a] | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1960 | 1970 | 1980[10] | 1990 | 2000[11] | Classification of ancestry |
| American Indian | 472 | 1216 | | | | not available |
| | | | 2210 | 4738 | 3535 | with single or without other ancestry |
| | | | 11728 | 14835 | 24882 | with at least one or other ancestry |
| Eskimo and Aleut | | | 675 | 361 | | with single or without other ancestry |
| | | | 881 | 323 | | with at least one or other ancestry |
| Total Native American and Part-Native American | 472 | 1216 | | | | not available |
| | | | 2885 | 5099 | 3535 | with single or without other ancestry |
| | | | 12609 | 15158 | 24882 | with at least one or other ancestry |

[a]U.S. Bureau of the Census data for 1960 appeared in 1963; for 1970, in 1973; for 1980, in 1983; for 1990, in 1992 and 1993; and for 2000, in 2002.

Tracing the numbers of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands does not permit easy comparisons from 1960 through 2000. Not only did the censuses of 1960 and 1970 make no distinction about ancestry, and that category has in turn undergone redefinition through the subsequent decades, but for 2000, even the classification of "American Indian" has endured undue narrowing to Native Americans of the lower forty-eight states. Nonetheless, the census figures for Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands have shown increases for three decades after 1960, ranging from 82% to 158% as applied to people with no other ancestry (single ancestry). In contrast, the 2000 census reflects a decline of 31% if one considers Native American residents in the same category, yet another burst of 64% if one includes residents of Native American *and* other ancestries (Hawaiian, European, Asian, etc.). Whereas the decline in the single-ancestry category may reflect a growing intermingling with other ethnic groups (as it has happened throughout the Hawaiian Islands and the continental United States at large), the total of almost 25,000 Native Americans appears suspect and probably includes people who marked "American Indian" or "Alaskan Native" as part of their ancestry without regularly identifying themselves as such, participating in Indian community affairs, or otherwise distinguishing themselves as Native American.[12] However, although the census data for 1960 and 1970 seem unduly low, those for 1980 and 1990 probably reflect actual population figures quite closely if one includes Native Americans with other ancestry. Already in 1988, Janthina Morris, Executive Director of the Indian Health Service and Counseling Service and Referral Project at the American Indian Services Corporation in Honolulu, counted 11,728 members in Hawai'i who qualified for her services (Dixon 1988: A8). Similarly, in response to the 1990 census, the Vice-President and Secretary of the American Indian Service Center of Honolulu, A. Hank Raymond, estimated Hawai'i's Native American population as three times as big as the official figure: "I think 5,099 could jump to 15,000 . . . The census is just a snap-shot . . . Our biggest problem is that the turnover rate is so high" (Tanahara 1992). The comparatively low figures in the first two censuses for which data on Native Americans living in the Hawaiian Islands are available may reflect a lack of official recognition as much as other issues such as problems of demography.[13]

Most Native Americans living in the Hawaiian Islands have come from Alaska, the West Coast, or other western states, with only few originating from tribes east of the Mississippi River. However, Native Americans of Hawai'i have had diverse prior homes in western North America, among them the Inuit and the Gwich'in of Alaska, the Colville Confederated Tribe of eastern Washington, the Lakota of South Dakota, the Cherokee of Oklahoma, the Southern Ute of Colorado, the Hopi of Arizona, and the Navajo of New Mexico and Arizona as a few representative communities. As

in the past, most Native Americans have probably come to the State of Hawai'i with the armed forces and, as a result, have lived on O'ahu, the island with most military installations and only in smaller numbers on the outer islands.[14]

Like most military communities, local Native Americans have formed an open, fluid population with a high turnover that in part answered the demands of the military and in part reflected its members' isolation from their home communities. These facts have also defined many of the key social issues of returning veterans: health problems, including alcoholism and drug abuse; employment; questions of cultural identity; and the maintenance of native traditions. Over the years, some Native Americans have married locally and have usually blended in easily into the community. Many have found life in the Islands attractive relative to blatantly racist environments that they had experienced in their home states; indeed, some apparently escaped prejudice and racial discrimination in the continental United States, which they have regularly discovered to be more conspicuous than in the Hawaiian Islands. However, Native Americans of Hawai'i have also found themselves in a dilemma. As they have often acknowledged publicly, living in the Hawaiian Islands has usually meant losing or even breaking ties with their home communities, if for no other reason than the interfering great distance, making travel across the hurdle of the Pacific Ocean expensive. A member who joined the military already was likely to maintain loose ties with his or her home community's elders in hold of the traditions, and ran the danger to acquire or maintain less tribal knowledge than home-bound, culturally more conservative members, unless the community resocialized him or her with appropriate rituals. Living in the fiftieth state has made maintaining tradition even more challenging. The diverse heritages represented by the Native American community in Hawai'i and its open character have not made it any easier for its members to establish conventions or traditions of their own.

By 1971, Native Americans of Hawai'i began organizing as the Hawaii Council of American Indian Nations, initially raising funds by car washes and the sale of fried bread for a yearly *powwow* (< Eastern Algonquian "dance or noisy festivity proceeding a council, a warlike expedition, or a hunt" among other meanings [Friederici 1960: 484–85]); but then they pursued federal funds to help Native American soldiers on leave or returning from duty in Vietnam. The Council established the American Indian Service Center in 1974 to assist local Native American residents and especially veterans with health counseling and referral plus job training as well as traditional support. In 1983, the center became incorporated as a nonprofit organization under the name of American Indian Services Corporation, and received partial

sponsorship by the Indian Health Service and the U.S. Department of Labor. In subsequent years, the center also acquired funds to develop a program to assist Native American adolescents in Hawai'i, in recognition that this age group required increased attention. Moreover, the center became a hub for cultural activities and spiritual renewal, ranging from craft and language classes to traditional religious practices and gatherings of the American Indian Powwow Association for hosting annual intertribal dances. In early 1992, a new organization by the name of Native American Center came about with the principal goal of helping to preserve Native American culture and by seeking private funds. Federal grants no longer sustained the American Indian Service Center, which closed its doors in 1993. Four years later, Wendy Schofield-Ching, who herself cannot claim Native American ancestry, began picking up some of the former center's community services through her Native Winds Gift Gallery and Craft Supply in Honolulu by offering craft classes, promoting powwows, and cosponsoring educational events at schools, museums, and universities, including the Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (Dela Cruz 2005, Ramirez 1990, Tanahara 1992).

Yearly intertribal powwows at Thomas Square Park in Honolulu have since become a tradition, indeed an institution. Since the early 1990s, another organization by the name of the Intertribal Council of Hawaii has sponsored the Annual Warrior Society Powwow at Kapi'olani Park in March. In recent years, Hawai'i's American Indians have occasionally organized other powwows, with the one at Thomas Square Park in October remaining the most prominent. These events have highlighted native songs, drumming, and dances, and have often sponsored prominent guest musicians or dancers from various tribes of the continental United States aside from featuring native food and craft for sale. Sometimes local powwows have also included religious ceremonies such as spiritual retreats and sweat lodges, usually in characteristic Plains Indians tradition with some West Coast variations. As such, these events have not only accommodated considerable cultural diversity among Native Americans in Pan-Indian fashion, but have also permitted innovation by participants and representation by Native Hawaiians, who have often provided various supportive functions as friends, spouses, or family members.

These events have had a great entertainment value for Native Americans as well as the public, and have regularly received considerable attention in the media. However, one of their prime functions has been to recognize Indian veterans of Pacific and Asian wars. Among the most recently honored soldiers were three Navajo Marines, Teddy Draper, Keith Little, and Sam Tso, who had served as code talkers in the Pacific during World War II

(Hoover 2007). These events have also provided their participants with important spiritual functions that have allowed them to regain strength as individuals, to build community solidarity, and to reinforce their identity as Americans Indians—with positive effects on their growth and health (Dixon 1988, Mager 1999, Simon 1993). Moreover, the October powwow has become an occasion for Native American groups of continental North America to visit the Islands to seek support from Hawai'i's senatorial delegation, foremost Senator Daniel Inouye, Vice-Chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, for or against specific federal legislation or to learn about the Hawaiian language immersion schools from 'Aha Pūnana Leo.

As unexpected or "out of place" powwows in Hawai'i may appear at first sight, they come to be ordinary on closer inspection, especially when one considers their origin and social functions: Powwows arose from a rich tradition of intertribal celebrations by the Plains Indians, attested already in the earliest colonial documents, and developed in the 1950s and 1960s "out of early intertribal movements and men's societies . . . reminiscent of intertribal movements of the nineteenth century that had spread across the Plains" (Young and Gooding 2001: 1011). Although multiple sociohistorical factors have contributed to the development of modern powwows, a significant one apparently was the military service by Native Americans during World War II and subsequent wars, which provided opportunities to servicemen of different tribal origins with recent opportunities for intertribal camaraderie and which explains the close link of veterans to powwows. Another factor was the increasing urbanization by which Native Americans moved from reservations to major cities after World War II and which likewise fostered pan-Indian developments (Young and Gooding 2001: 1015–20).[15]

By their association with Plains traditions and the military, powwows have unintentionally reinforced among nonparticipants the unfortunate cliché that Native Americans must all have descended from horse-riding bison hunters of the Plains, who by the adoption of the horse themselves reflected a major adaptation to European contact. Stereotypes of Plains Indians may have inadvertently widened some imagined differences between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians that had not existed originally and have also focused on unfavorable representations of American Indians, as may still be present in the popular images that older generations of Hawaiians have of Native Americans. Moreover, Native Hawaiians possibly associate with western Native Americans images, justified or unjustified, of reservations with which they wish no connection, but that sociologically and economically may differ little from their own life on Hawaiian Home Lands—property rights held by some state or federal government agency, a

location on land of marginal quality, and a poor infrastructure with inadequate access to resources for education, employment, and business (Parker 1989: 154–56). What has distinguished Hawaiian Homes from American Indian reservations is merely the issue of political control, including police and judicial powers, which federally recognized tribes usually possess over their communities unlike Native Hawaiians. However, stereotypes about American Indians, such as their Plains image, have made many Native Hawaiians overlook sociohistorical parallels with Indians other than Plains tribes, especially the complex chiefdoms of southeastern North America. By this omission, Hawaiians, as descendents of chiefdoms and a kingdom, have inadvertently introduced some unnecessary social distancing from American Indians and from any identification with them or in terms of a tribe (for further discussion, see E. J. Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, but . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript).

## Reaching-Out by Hawaiians to Native Americans

If military service dominated postwar Native American-Hawaiian relations as late as the Vietnam War, it has since declined in significance for political alliances and cultural exchanges in recognition of native peoples' common issues. In one defining instance, the Hawaiian activist Haunani-Kay Trask found much inspiration for her political engagement from the American Indian Movement (AIM), especially the Lakota Russell Means, in the 1970s. In the first portion of her essay, Trask (1984: 101–07) recognized several parallels in the colonial histories of Native Hawaiians, Native Americans, as well as other peoples of color. She did not develop a point-for-point contrastive comparison, but acknowledged Means for conceiving "a radical alternative to Western imperialism," and cited him as a critical voice from the perspective of a Native American in "the first step toward psychological de-colonization" (Trask 1984: 106).

Activist Hawaiians have received "a heightened consciousness about their status as indigenous people" (Trask 1984: 127) from interactions with Native Americans, whom Trask also credited with the nation-within-the-nation model for Hawaiian sovereignty. Occasions for contact came about when Means and another cofounder of AIM, the Ojibwe Dennis Banks, visited the Hawaiian Islands in 1973 and when Hawaiian activists called on their Native American counterparts in the continental United States after the occupation of the island of Kaho'olawe in 1976 and on later occasions (Trask 1984: 126, 127; Wong-Wilson 2005: 145). Yet Trask likely embraced many of these ideas during her graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in the

1970s when Native Americans of Wisconsin, foremost the Menomini, were struggling to regain control over their land (Shames 1972) and when discussions on these topics embroiled the campus, as I can attest from personal experience.

Many of these issues eventually bore fruit in new Native Hawaiian political organizations. In one instance, a Hawaiian nonprofit corporation by the name of Hoʻāla Kānāwai ("to awaken the law") "proposed legislation for the creation of a Hawaiian corporation, fashioned after the Alaska Native situation" in the late 1970s (Wong-Wilson 2005: 144). Alas, with Alaska Native communities as models, Native Hawaiians have been able to hope for no more than a reduced independence with even less political autonomy than federally recognized tribes in the lower forty-eight states. "Like Hawai'i, Alaska became part of the United States *after* the period of signing treaties with Indians [had] ended" (Van Dyke 1998: 126 [emphasis added]), which left no more than the Alaskan Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) in 1971. Unlike their southern relatives, Alaskan Natives have not only been short of their own tribal laws, law enforcement, and judicial bodies, but they have also remained subject to Alaska state laws, and do not enjoy any authority to assess taxes of their own (Kauanui 2005: 14–15).

On the other hand, the year of 1987 saw the native initiative for Hawaiian sovereignty *Ka Lāhui Hawai'i* (the Hawaiian Nation), in whose foundation Trask and her sister Mililani Trask, an attorney, played a key role. Although some of its representatives have espoused a nation-within-a-nation model similar to federally recognized Indian reservations, Ka Lāhui Hawai'i has always demanded more for Hawaiians to the point of full sovereignty and international recognition through the United Nations, and as a result has rejected attempts at recognition by the federal government, foremost later, scaled-down versions of the Akaka Bill, as poor compromises (Wong-Wilson 2005: 146–49; for further discussion of federal recognition, see below).

From May 14 through July 15, 1995, Hawaiians paid a historic visit to the West Coast with the double-hull canoes *Hōkūleʻa* and *Hawaiʻiloa*, which shared the pride and excitement of Polynesian voyaging traditions with Native Americans as well as emigrant Hawaiians under the aegis of the Bishop Museum, the Hawai'i Maritime Center, and the Polynesian Voyaging Society. While *Hawaiʻiloa* was on display at the Center for Wooden Boats at Seattle's Maritime Heritage Museum, *Hōkūleʻa* called on the Puyallup Indians in Tacoma. Both canoes then visited the Suquamish Reservation on Bainbridge Island, the Lummi Reservation near Bellingham, and the

Swimnosh Reservation Long House in the State of Washington, plus the Musqueam Indians of Vancouver before parting ways. *Hōkūle'a* turned south with stops in Portland, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Long Beach, and San Diego, calling on "transplanted" Hawaiians (some of whom had never been to their homeland) and Native Americans (who had fewer cultural and financial resources farther south than northern groups). In the meantime, *Hawai'iloa* continued its passage to the Kwaguitl (Kwakiutl), Heiltsuk, Tsimshian, Haida, Nisga'a, and Tlingit Indians (see Polynesian Voyaging Society, n.d.b). The purposes of this journey were to:

- Participate in cultural exchanges with native peoples, particularly with those who depended on ocean and forest resources and canoes for survival. Events [included] the traditional welcoming of the canoe at each village; potlatches; and singing and dancing performances.
- Share information and educational materials on the values, practices, and arts (including canoe building) that enabled the first peoples of the Pacific and the Pacific Northwest to survive successfully in their environments for centuries and to insure the health and productivity of their lands and seas for future generations. Slide shows and canoe tours [were] conducted by crew members.
- Document the journey to educate students and the public in Hawai'i and nationwide about how native peoples in different part[s] of the world are facing similar cultural and environmental challenges and what steps they are taking to meet these challenges. (Polynesian Voyaging Society, n.d.a)

The canoes and their crews did not only inspire Hawaiians on the West Coast with pride by helping to confirm their ethnic identity and to regenerate an interest in their home culture, but they also intrigued Native Americans to the point where they could ignore traditional differences among themselves, and the crews received a warm welcome (Anonymous 1995). The crew of *Hawai'iloa* felt especially emotional on their visit to the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian Indians of western Canada and southwestern Alaska, who gave them a true sense of homecoming as documented on videotape (Williams 1995). These Indians had donated two 400-year-old Sitka spruce logs for the construction of the canoe, for which large enough trees were no longer available in Hawai'i's forests. For Hawaiians to draw on these resources symbolized a bond of native peoples across oceans and did not violate local convention; already before Cook's arrival, they had relied on drift logs from the Pacific Northwest such as fir, known not to grow in the

islands, for the construction of large canoes, as the British explorer George Vancouver (1967 [1798]: 218–19) had witnessed in the early 1790s.

The most distinct item linking Hawaiians and Native Americans in recent years has been the Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act or the so-called Akaka Bill, directly modeled after legislation for Native American federal recognition. "The Committee on Hawaiian Affairs which [in 1978 had] formulated OHA [the Office of Hawaiian Affairs] at the Constitutional Convention [had] closely examined the rights of mainland Indian groups who have traditionally enjoyed self-determination and self-government in internal matters even though, like Native Hawaiians, they no longer possess the full attributes of sovereignty" (Houghton 1989: 46). As Native Hawaiians sought greater self-determination, a joint committee of the U.S. Senate on Indian Affairs and of the House of Representatives on Resources received testimony in Honolulu from August 28 through September 1, 2000 (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001). Among numerous local witnesses, most of whom could claim Hawaiian ancestry, a few Native Americans also spoke, who had traveled to the Hawaiian Islands for this purpose and several of whom testified in official capacity: Bob Anderson, a Minnesota Chippewa (Ojibwe) and Counselor to the Secretary, Department of the Interior; Jacqueline Agtuca, Acting Director, Office of Tribal Justice, Department of Justice; Julie Kitka, a Chugach Eskimo and President of the Alaska Federation of Natives in Anchorage; Edward Thomas, President of the Tlingit Haida Central Council; Susan Masten, a Yurok and President of the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and largest Native American organization, representing some 550 tribes; and Marc C. Van Norman, a Cheyenne River Sioux and former director of the Office of Tribal Justice (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: I. 81–101; II. 79–86; III. 100–05). All encouraged federal recognition as a means of strengthening self-determination, native rights, and cultural traditions without limiting access to international organizations, even if they offered a few friendly amendments to the Akaka Bill or other recommendations on how to deal with the federal government. In addition, strong support came from a Hawaiian woman by the name of Robin J. Puanani Danner, who expressed appreciation of the benefits of federal recognition from having lived thirty-five years among Inupiaq Eskimo of Alaska and on reservations with the Navajo, Hopi, and Apache (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: I.101). The primary critical voices by Native Americans were Russell Means, Oglala Lakota, and Glen Morris, Shawnee, of the American Indian Movement (AIM) of Colorado, read by the Hawaiian activist Roy

Dahlin. Means and Morris questioned any jurisdiction by the United States over native peoples, and argued against federal recognition on grounds that it had led to apartheid with genocidal policies by the government, extensive corruption in the Department of the Interior, and destructive effects on the survival of Native Americans. In Means' and Morris' minds, Native Hawaiians had an extraordinarily strong case for regaining their sovereignty on grounds of international law, whereas accepting federal recognition would mean "a diminished political status" (U.S. Congress, Senate 2001: IV.115–17).

The testimonies by the visiting Native Americans did not find much of a receptive ear in the Hawaiian audience, who recognized most of these testimonies as statements of federal representatives endorsing official policy in opposition to the independence movement. The Hawaiians' primary concern was not to be identified as Native Americans, let alone as American Indians, but as *kānaka maoli Hawai'i* (native Hawaiians), who preferred to see themselves as a displaced kingdom instead of a "tribe," however loosely defined. Their disapproval has also included objections because of a missing plebiscite for Hawaiians to vote on such a political alternative as well as the recognition of gross violations of both national sovereignty and self-determination, including questions about the legitimacy of the State of Hawai'i under international law (see Kauanui 2005 and Wong-Wilson 2005: 150–55), even if such arguments have often overlooked the fact that Native Americans had been in the same or similar situations as Hawaiians.

The dissension in the Hawaiian community then attracted most of the attention in the local press, resulting in few reports on the Indians' testimony (Dayton 2000, Omandam 2000a,b). Disagreements have also distracted from a discussion of specific issues such as options to federal recognition short of full sovereignty, including alternatives to some 160 federal laws regarding health care, education, housing, land use, fishing rights, economic sufficiency, religious freedom, grave protection and repatriation, and cultural revival upon which Native Hawaiians have relied since 1974 when the amended Native American Programs Act included them as indigenous people of the United States for some of the federal assistance programs in the past reserved exclusively for Native Americans (E. J. Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, *but* . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript).[16]

On September 21, 2004, Native Hawaiians participated in the festive openings of the Smithsonian Institution's National Museum of the American Indian on the Capitol Mall of Washington, DC, in perhaps the largest recorded gathering of some 30,000 Native Americans and other native

peoples, representing more than 500 different tribes and indigenous communities of the Western hemisphere. This event did not only host a delegation of some 400 Hawaiian participants, including "Hawaiian royal societies, representatives of the *Hōkūle'a* and *Hawai'iloa* voyaging canoes, Hālau Lōkahi Hawaiian charter school, the State Council of Hawaiian Homesteaders Association, Hui Kāko'o 'Āina Ho'opulapula [a communications and resource network for Hawaiians seeking Hawaiian Home Lands], the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, hālau hula [hula dancing schools] from the Washington area, and many others" (Boyd 2004: 1, 14); but to complement Native American celebrations, the museum also featured 70 Hawaiian items of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries (including an original feather cloak, feathered capes, the oldest known Hawaiian outrigger canoe, and a kapa beater, used to pound tree bark into fabric) and various events (such as the screening of Edgy Lee's film *The Hawaiians—Reflecting Spirit*) as part of the exhibition *Nā Mea Makamae O Hawai'i* (Enduring Treatures of Hawai'i) (Risser 2004). Moreover, the museum's openings probably brought Native Hawaiians of socially more varied backgrounds into contact with a greater diversity of Native Americans than ever before and included some groups east of the Mississippi River plus representatives from Central and South America (i.e., descendants of former paramount chiefdoms [comparable to pre-contact Hawai'i] and even complex societies [or civilizations] who had not usually been among their earlier acquaintances). Now their company consisted no longer of mostly Indians of western North America, but included also Iroquois of New York, eastern Delaware, eastern Shawnee, eastern Cherokee, eastern Choctaw, Seminole of Florida, Aztecs of Mexico, and Quechua from the Andes among numerous others. In spite of all cultural differences, participants evidently felt among each other a strong sense of community as native peoples of the Western hemisphere, which has given them a new sense of empowerment in the domains of culture and identity as well as in politics and in which Native Hawaiians participated enthusiastically (Anonymous 2004, Boyd 2004, Oliveri 2004).

Hawaiians and Native Americans have further found common grounds beyond formal parallels in common cultural experiences of a substantive nature, as illustrated by the Hawaiian slack-key guitarist Keola Beamer and the Navajo-Ute flutist R. Carlos Nakai in their recent recording *Our Beloved Land* and joint concerts (Fox 2005). Nakai had learned of Beamer "while stationed at the Naval telecommunications center in Wahiawā" years earlier and had invited the Hawaiian guitarist to speak about Hawaiian culture at a workshop. An impromptu performance demonstrated "how their cultural idioms interact[ed]," which led to further collaboration and the creation of an album.

> "You don't just pick up your instrument and start blasting. We had a nice cross-cultural exploration before we even started playing a note," says Beamer by phone from Maui. "We were looking for cultural integrity, and a way to communicate. There was a beautiful commonality of nature themes, of chant, of music, of dance. There were so many things that we have in common, though we are from a half a planet away."
>
> "There is a close affinity about things cultural and philosophical between Native American and Hawaiian people," says Nakai from his Arizona home. "As we spoke about the Athapascans and our journeys through time we found (our cultures) are very much congruent with each other." (Fox 2005: 15)

Hawaiians and Native Americans have collaborated on other recent occasions of cultural exchange, such as the Sixth Annual Mary Kawena Pukui Storytelling and Performance Festival at the Bishop Museum in Honolulu on February 19, 2006, which featured alongside several prominent local storytellers and performers: Jack Dalton, professional Yup'ik storyteller, author, and teacher; Stephen Blanchett, Yup'ik singer, songwriter, dancer, and member of the internationally renowned native band Pamyua; James Patkotak, Inupiat storyteller; and Tobias J. Vanderhoop, Wampanoag educator and tribal council member, singer and drummer (Bishop Museum, n.d.).

Over the years, the Akaka Bill of federal recognition for Native Hawaiians came to lose much support in the public, and in 2006 stalled in Congress. Although its advocates struggled to maintain the backing by the Hawaiian community, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) contracted Patricia Zell, former long-time congressional staff director and chief counsel of the Senate Committee of Indian Affairs and an Arapaho-Navajo. In a major newspaper and in public talks, Zell addressed fundamental objections to the Hawaiians' federal recognition: its constitutionality; the status of Hawaiians as native people comparable to Native Americans; the irrelevance of "tribe" as a political category; concerns about racial discrimination; fears about gambling; the historical status of Queen Lili'uokalani's overthrow; sovereignty; land ownership; and future options (Zell 2005a,b). In the editorial page of the same daily a month later, Tex G. "Red Tipped Arrow" Hall, President of the National Congress of American Indians, a Mandan-Hidatsa, and apparently a frequent visitor to the islands, presented federally recognized Native

American communities as political rather than racial entities, which by self-governance succeeded in strengthening their economies, health care, and education (Hall 2005). He addressed some of the same concerns about racial discrimination and the unique political relationship of native peoples to the U.S. government as Zell had raised. Hall also reminded readers that similar counterarguments to the Akaka Bill had led to the earlier destructive policies toward American Indians, ranging from military extermination, Indian boarding schools, and land allotment to forced assimilation, termination, and relocation. However, Hawaiian self-determination with federal recognition would benefit the native language and culture, which in Hall's mind would in turn help tourism and the economy at large (Hall 2005). Because the Bush administration recently imposed further restrictive amendments about gambling, civil and criminal jurisdiction, military commitment, and federal liability about trust, land, and other claims by Hawaiians, the Akaka Bill did no longer enjoy the unanimous support of OHA. The office refrained from comment on these restrictions without having first consulted "legal scholars versed in Indian law and native rights to analyze what impact these proposed amendments [would] have on the Hawaiian and non-Hawaiian communities." (Borreca 2005: A6)

During three days in January 2006, Native Americans lent support to Hawaiians through the Native Leadership Forum sponsored by the California-based American Indian Resources Institute in conjunction with OHA's Native Hawaiian Leadership Conference in Honolulu. The theme was "Native Leadership and Challenges Ahead; Protecting Sovereignty, Culture, Homelands and Resource Rights and Achieving Economic Self-Sufficiency." Prominent Native American participants included: Richard Trudell, Santee Sioux and Executive Director of American Indian Resources Institute; John Echohawk, Pawnee and Executive Director of the Native American Rights Fund; Billy Frank Jr., Nisqually and Chair of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission; and Patricia Zell, Arapaho-Navajo under contract by OHA. "In 30 years, I've never seen the outpouring of support other native peoples have for Native Hawaiians," Zell reportedly said. "What we want to accomplish, we cannot, unless we see ourselves (indigenous peoples) as one" (Boyd 2006). Alan Parker, Ojibwe-Cree and Director of the Northwest Indian Applied Research Institute at Evergreen State College, has since taken the argument a step further: The National Congress of American Indians and with it the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians have supported Hawaiians in their search for federal recognition not only out of solidarity but also for self-protection of their tribal rights, because they realize that undermining the Hawaiians' rights ultimately means a direct attack on their own sovereignty (2007). Many Native Hawaiians have

likewise come to recognize a need to expand common grounds with Native Americans—not only in public affairs but also in the domain of culture (Hoover 2006). Reintroduced in 2007, a revised, but emaciated Akaka Bill (U.S. Congress, Senate 2007) has since received approval from the House of Representatives, still awaiting endorsement by the Senate and the President at the time of this writing.

Hawaiians in search of more radical solutions than the Akaka Bill (i.e., full sovereignty) have similarly continued drawing on prominent Native American leaders for cultural and political inspiration in one form or another. In early 2006, the Mohawk activist Taiaiake Alfred spoke on the colonial experience, native answers to it, and leadership in a talk sponsored in part by the Kamakakūokalani Center for Hawaiian Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. The center was also the site for a public showing and discussion of Robert Redford's documentary *Incident at Oglala*. The film addresses the fate of the AIM activist Leonard Peltier, an Ojibwe-Lakota, whose conviction to two consecutive life sentences for the murder of two FBI agents on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, South Dakota, in 1975 has raised substantial controversy about justice in his trial and about his guilt.

In late October 2007, the National Indian Education Association (2007a: 2), which had admitted Native Hawaiians as voting members already in 2000, held its first annual convention in the Hawaiian Islands, at Honolulu's Convention Center. The oldest and largest education organization aiming for the educational equity by and quality of Native Americans congregated some 2,300 educators from North America and about 1,000 local contributors with the theme of *E Ho'i I Ka Piko Aloha* (Return to Cultural Honor and Caring). Most of the participants, either Native Americans or Native Hawaiians, met "to discuss problems facing indigenous students and possible ways to raise the bar of achievement" and to address specific topics such as "high dropout rates of native students, [use of the] indigenous language in the classroom, literacy rates, the federal No Child Left Behind law [,] and college enrollment rates" (Moreno 2007). Particular sessions examined language revitalization, English as a second language, the use of modern technology, cultural integrity, generational and gender differences, economic poverty, and health problems such as diabetes among others. In addition, the convention provided opportunities for Native American visitors to learn about local issues and Hawaiian traditions, and in return hosted a powwow featuring several prominent performers (National Indian Education Association 2007a, 2007b).

## Conclusions

This essay presents an annotated chronology of contacts between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians with particular attention to the period since early World War II. Although the above discussion makes no claims to being comprehensive or exhaustive in an attempt at filling a dearth of historical information, it reveals certain emergent patterns.

Contrary to isolationist expectations, Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have not been strangers to each other's communities during the past two centuries. After intermittent contacts since at least the early explorations of the Northwest Coast of North America by Europeans in the late eighteenth century, members of both communities interacted with each other by fur trading, whaling, and sealing through much of the nineteenth century. If there was a low season of interchange after whaling, World War II brought Native Americans to the Hawaiian Islands—as soldiers, who were the forerunners of today's veteran community of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands, principally on O'ahu. Both populations crossed the Pacific Ocean, perhaps committed to some higher authority, leaving untenable lives, tracking new opportunities, out of a sense of adventure, or for other reasons; but their pursuits were not unique. Although the initial long-term encounters by Native Americans and Native Hawaiians were clearly economic and military in nature, subsequent relations took on an explicitly political and cultural character. Not only did Native Hawaiians and Native Americans reach out to each other for political inspiration, leadership, and support, be it in the form of the Akaka Bill of federal recognition or alternative political solutions; but they increasingly came to appreciate the other's cultural institutions, ranging from double-hull canoe voyaging to music, dance, and storytelling, as well as other arts and extending to issues of education.

By mere proximity and for historical reasons, most Native Americans whom Native Hawaiians have met have come from western North America, including the greater Northwest Coast, California, the Southwest, and the Plains—largely at the exclusion of groups from eastern North America. This geographic-ethnographic concentration, together with the fact that most Native Americans in Hawai'i came to the islands with the military, helps to explain the wide popularity of an institution of distinctly Western and specifically Plains origin—the powwow. However, attention to western North America and specifically the Plains perhaps has also distorted Native Hawaiians' views regarding historical parallels between traditional Hawaiian society and Native American chiefdoms, especially those of southeastern North America. They at times envisage more differences than exist at closer inspection.

As Native Americans and Native Hawaiians have visited each other's communities during the past two centuries, they have shared much in common because of similar experiences in their colonial and recent histories, whence they have understood more of each other's concerns than divide-and-conquer–minded colonists and their descendants have realized or liked to admit. First, casual encounters have developed into formal meetings in which Native Hawaiians and Native Americans have increasingly drawn on each other for comparable experiences in how to deal with dominant Europeans and Americans, for mutual political support in legislatures, and for political independence notwithstanding their cultural differences. By no means have Native Americans been any more "out of place" in the Hawaiian Islands than Hawaiians had been "strange" among Northwest Coast Indians a century and half earlier. In spite of their Polynesian origin, Hawaiians may come to recognize Native Americans as prime allies in their struggle for cultural and political autonomy, just as Native Americans have discovered Native Hawaiians as significant partners in developing stronger political coalitions.

Still few details are available about historical interactions between Native Americans and Native Hawaiians, and specifics of exchanges remain vague; but the documentation for such reliable examples as Hawaiian loanwords in Chinook Jargon and lomilomi salmon in the Hawaiian diet suggests a give-and-take relationship. The evidence also presents pictures of Native Hawaiians assimilating with Native Americans on the Northwest Coast in the nineteenth century as part of the fur trade and of Native Americans intermingling with the local population in the Hawaiian Islands, especially Hawaiians, in the twentieth century. By all superficial indications, both communities have blended in with each other remarkably well, if only for reasons of a common colonial experience and similar histories. However, further research will have to show how in individual cases Native Americans merged into the local community and specifically with Hawaiians. Indeed, the present review points to the need for an in-depth sociological study of modern Native American-Hawaiian families.

Sociohistorical commonalities and actual community links ultimately cannot hide potential sources of conflict between Native Americans and Hawaiians. Although often struggling with issues of political unity themselves, Native Americans have sometimes expressed surprise at the great divisiveness among Native Hawaiians about community issues, advocating unification. On the other hand, Hawaiians, fully aware of the need to speak with one voice, have legitimately resisted what some may even consider as no more than patronizing by outsiders. These differences might provoke further arguments among Hawaiians to distance themselves from any association with Native Americans rather than finding some solidarity with them. When

one remembers the cultural differences between Native Americans and Polynesians, these conflicts seem minor in perspective, because they have not surpassed conflicts in their own communities. Thus, little seems gained by overemphasizing any such potential conflicts except to encourage age-old divide-and-conquer sentiments by those objecting to any political alliance by native peoples.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank James Caron, Director of the Honors Program at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM), and Peter T. Manicas, Director of UHM Interdisciplinary Studies, for encouraging me to pursue this topic, and also express my appreciation to the students for their interest and bearing with me. Moreover, I recognize Herbert R. Barringer, my wife Teresa H. Makuakāne-Drechsel, Manicas, Eugene Ogan, and three anonymous reviewers for valuable criticisms and editorial suggestions as well as Ernest Sickey for supplementary information. As a matter of course, I take sole responsibility for all contents and the format of the present essay, and dedicate it to the memory of Herbert Barringer (1931–2007), who had roots in the Native American community of Montana just as he was committed to the Native Hawaiian community.

## NOTES

1. The use of "Native Hawaiian(s)" draws a deliberate analogy to "Native American(s)," just as it leaves no doubt that this reference applies to the indigenous people of the Hawaiian Islands at the exclusion of immigrants and their descendants. Such usage need not preclude "Hawaiian(s)" or "(American) Indians" for conciseness and stylistic variation. In either case, these terms are broad ethnological categories for the purpose of a historical discussion, which bypass questions of quantum of biological ancestry ("blood") here.

2. This essay emerged together with a review of Native American-Native Hawaiian parallels (E. J Drechsel, "Native Hawaiians are not Native Americans, *but* . . .": Federal recognition for Native Hawaiians in light of macro-historical arguments, unpubl. manuscript) from an Honors proseminar at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa in Fall 1993, Fall 1995, and Spring 2003, which has since developed into a separate course, Native Americans and Native Hawaiians.

3. My current historical-sociolinguistic research on Maritime Polynesian Pidgin, a Polynesian-based pidgin including Pidgin Hawaiian from the late eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth or late nineteenth century, indeed, suggests that the fur trade and—with it—contacts with Native Americans were of greater significance to Native Hawaiians than most historians have recognized.

4. From what we know, Native Hawaiians contributed place names to the Pacific Northwest such as "Kanaka," "Owyhee," and "Kalama" (Naughton 1983: 51–59, 67). They also furnished single loanwords to two Native American pidgins, which at the time served as interlingual media in multilingual contexts such as trade: *kanaka*, "Hawaiian" (noun and adjective) and something like *o$^{w}$aihi* (?), "Hawai'i" (referring to the Island of Hawai'i and the entire archipelago) and "Hawaiian" (noun) in Chinook Jargon; *make*, "dead, to die,

broken," *pau*, "not," *panipani*, "sexual intercourse," *'anā'anā*, "sick, sickness, cause of pain," *wahine*, "woman," and *hanahana*, "to work, to sew, sewing" plus the loanwords *kaukau*, "food, to eat, to bite" (< Chinese) and *pikanene*, "small, little, child" (< Portuguese) in Eskimo Jargon (Drechsel and Makuakāne 1982).

Conversely, the Northwest Coast and Native Americans probably were the source of *lomilomi* salmon, a dish often thought to be traditionally Hawaiian but consisting of imported salmon, massaged by hand (< reduplication of Hawaiian *lomi* "to rub, to press, to squeeze, to crush, to mash fine") and mixed with tomatoes and green onions. The primary vehicle of transmission was the Hudson's Bay Company, which introduced lomilomi salmon to the Hawaiian Islands in the 1830s (see Chappell 1997: 103, 167; Naughton 1983: 46; Spoehr 1986: 50).

5. One person who illustrates these social changes was Maria Mahoi, born on Vancouver Island in the 1850s to an unidentified "Aboriginal" woman and a Hawaiian man who had worked in the fur trade (Barman 2004: 5, 6). Maria did not hide her Native American ancestry, as was evident in her wearing of Cree moccasins, her fluent use of Chinook Jargon (notwithstanding any Hawaiian loans suggested by other Hawaiians), her consumption of Native American foods, her expertise in medicinal plants, her role as midwife, and her traditional ways of thinking (Barman 2004: 49, 55, 57, 73–74). Related to the long-established Hawaiian family of Mahoe [*sic*], "[s]he herself drew far more on her Hawaiian inheritance than she ever did on her aboriginality" (Barman 2004: 6) and thrived in the island world off Vancouver as if it had been Hawai'i's very own (Barman 2004: 50, 54–55). As Maria remained suspicious of the Indians, "[s]he embodied her heritage as a woman of the Hawaiian Islands in her surname, physicality, and strength of character" according to her biographer Jean Barman (2004: 75, 86). Although Maria could have equally represented a Native American woman, she had good sociological reasons for her preference: Her vicinity was the home to other families of Native American-Hawaiian ancestry with whom she associated regularly, and she took advantage of "the somewhat greater social acceptance of Hawaiians than Aboriginals. It was not that Hawaiians were wanted, though they possessed all the rights of newcomers [in British Columbia], but rather that Aboriginal people were so much more disparaged and demeaned" (Barman 2004: 89). As a person of dark skin, she also had to worry about losing her civil rights (voting and owning land) that as a Hawaiian she had in British Columbia, but that she had never enjoyed in the United States (Barman 2004: 17, 41, 71–72). Several of Maria's lighter-skinned children, however, redefined themselves as both "non-Aboriginal" and non-Hawaiian (Barman 2004: 6, 89); they increasingly blended in with the larger population rather than maintaining a separate identity. Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest are the subject of a major recent history (Barman and Watson 2006), which integrates many of the earlier findings by the primary author.

6. Other Native American languages that we now know to have been used as military codes during World War II were: Cherokee (Iroquoian), Choctaw (Muskogean), Comanche (Uto-Aztecan), Fox and Sauk (Algonquian), Menomini (Algonquian), Ojibwe (Algonquian), Oneida (Iroquoian), and Pawnee (Caddoan), which by all indications came into operation in Europe and possibly northern Africa (see Meadows 2002: 35–72, 241–42, with the names of language families added above to indicate some of the linguistic diversity of the Native American languages in use).

7. Navajo tell how on such occasions they outwitted a non-Indian lieutenant in a fierce two-day maneuver crossing the desert with only one canteen of water. He had warned

them against drawing on Hawai'i's prickly pear cactus as potentially hazardous; but they recognized it as a safe source of liquid, from which they drew at its top behind the lieutenant's back. Thus, Navajo could easily survive in the desert without relying on their canteens, whereas their non-Indian companions depleted their canteens and almost died from thirst (Paul 1973: 62–63).

8. These observations undermine the earlier claim by Doris A. Paul (1973: 18) that "the white Marines marveled at the skills of the Indians and accepted them readily. Race friction was unknown."

9. As far as I can determine, there are no academic publications on the presence of Native Americans in the Hawaiian Islands since World War II. The following paragraphs draw on newspaper articles (duly noted where applicable) and on observations of my own (with no further references given).

10. The *1980 Census of Population*, Volume 1: Characteristics of the Population, Part 13: Hawaii (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1982: table 15), however, listed 2,655 American Indians, 68 Eskimos, and 45 Aleuts with a total of only 2,768 Native Americans for Hawai'i in 1980 without giving further information about single or multiple ancestry. For comparability with the census figures for 1990 and 2000, I have chosen the figures of the more specific "Supplementary Report," which distinguishes "Persons Who Reported a Single Ancestry Group" from "Persons Who Reported at Least One Specific Ancestry Group" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1983: tables 3 and 3a.)

11. The 2000 census includes figures only for the categories of "American Indian" and "American Indian and Alaskan Native," from which one cannot simply deduct the number of the first to arrive at that of the Inuit ("Eskimos") and Aleut; the category of "Alaska Native," reflecting particularities of the Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement Act of 1971 and a purely legal distinction of little anthropological consequence, includes Northwest Coast and Athapaskan Indians of Alaska. Under these circumstances, I have taken the liberty of listing the total figure for "American Indian and Alaskan Native" in the first row under "American Indian" rather than entering the corresponding numbers for "American Indian," which are only 2,335 and 24,398, respectively. The 2000 census differs from earlier censuses in other ways that make a comparison difficult. Although the category of "alone" matches that of single or no other ancestry in earlier censuses, the 2000 census—unlike earlier demographic surveys—includes people of single native descent also in the category of "American Indian (and Alaska Native) alone or in combination with one or more other races."

12. In other words, this category inadvertently includes some individuals who might recognize a distant Native American ancestor (such as the proverbial "Cherokee grandmother"), but otherwise have no actual ties, biological or sociocultural, to a Native American community.

13. There remain major problems with the 2000 census in the Native American population, including "big, ever-changing households, frequent moves, mistrust of government officials and differing definitions of who is an Indian. The tabulations of Indians had some of the highest error rates for any minority" (New York Times, November 28, 2003). On grounds of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996,

more than 100 tribes have begun challenging the 2000 census results in the hope of gaining additional federal support for health care and housing; thirty-nine of seventy-eight tribes that have completed their recounts have succeeded in contesting official figures (ibid.).

14. A Native American who did not fit into this pattern was the prominent Navajo healer and doctor by the name of O. H. McKinley, MD, who in 1993 attended the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa for a master's degree in public health. On this occasion, he demonstrated healing practices based on traditional approaches (such as the Talking Circle Ceremony, in which participants sat in a circle around an altar and shared their personal thoughts with each other when a single eagle feather reached them).

15. This observation points to a sociological characteristic of Native Americans living on the Island of O'ahu: All in all, they have shared more with Indians in major urban centers than reservation Indians, although some may reside on military bases or in suburban or rural areas rather than in truly urban amalgamations in and around Honolulu.

16. A reviewer has suggested that this essay address the sociopolitical situation of other Pacific Islanders because of their status as native peoples within territories under the United States' control. While culturally similar to Hawaiians, these peoples differ politically from both Hawaiians and Native Americans (including Native Alaskans) in that their homeland is not within one of the fifty states. Although Pacific Islanders living in U.S. territories can reasonably expect to achieve full independence and sovereignty if not always without difficulties (as realized by the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Belau; see Kauanui 2005: 17–18), it is far less certain that native peoples within the United States, namely Native Americans and Hawaiians, can hope for the same (i.e., an arrangement beyond a nation-within-a-nation model, notwithstanding all injustices that these native peoples have experienced). Not only has the United States largely ignored international law as applicable to native peoples, but any unilateral secession is officially unconstitutional and would require congressional approval. Moreover, to release the State of Hawai'i or portions of it from the federal union, the United States will take into consideration the Islands' strategic significance in the Pacific today and in the future. Any such action would open this opportunity to Native Americans in similar sociopolitical circumstances and would challenge the federal union's very foundation. Despite the unexpected recent demise of another modern superpower, that of the Soviet Union in 1991, such a political option would currently seem inconceivable to most Americans and many residents of the Hawaiian Islands, including numerous Native Hawaiians, all of whom would likewise have to approve it in some plebiscite (for a differing perspective, see Kauanui 2005: 14–19). These historical-political circumstances, too, indicate to Native Hawaiians a common path with Native Americans, whether via federal recognition or some alternative political strategies.

## REFERENCES

Anonymous
1995 Historic West Coast canoe tour draws to an end. *Ka 'Elele* 22 (5): 2.

Anwar, Yasmin
2000 Protests don't deter bill's supporters. *Honolulu Advertiser*, August 30: A1, A2.

Barman, Jean
1995 New land, new lives: Hawaiian settlement in British Columbia. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 29:1–32.
1997–1998 Whatever happened to the Kanakas? *Beaver* 77 (6): 12–19.
2004 *Maria Mahoi of the islands*. (Transmontanus 13.) Vancouver: New Star Books.

Barman, Jean, and Bruce McIntyre Watson
2006 *Leaving paradise: Indigenous Hawaiians in the Pacific Northwest, 1787–1898*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Bishop Museum
n.d. The Sixth Annual Mary Kawena Pukui Storytelling and Performance Festival. http://www.bishopmuseum.org/calendar/events/feb19.html.

Bixler, Margaret T.
1992 *Winds of freedom. The story of the Navajo code talkers of World War II*. Darien, CT: Two Bytes Publishing Company.

Borreca, Richard
2005 Revamped Akaka Bill awaiting attention. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, September 17: A1, A6.

Boyd, Manu
2004 Native nations gather in DC: Tribes converge at inauguration of American Indian Museum. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 21 (10): 1, 14.
2006 Common ground: Native Alaskans, American Indians and Native Hawaiians share differences and similarities at a pair of leadership conferences. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 23 (2): 5.

Chappell, David A.
1997 *Double ghosts. Oceanian voyagers on Euroamerican ships*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Coffman, Tom
1998 *Nation within. The story of America's annexation of the nation of Hawai'i*. Kāne'ohe, HI: Tom Coffman/EPI Center.

Dela Cruz, Linda
2005 Promoting Native American culture. *Mid-Week*, December 14.

Deloria, Philip J.
2004 *Indians in unexpected places*. Lawrence: Univ. Press of Kansas.

Dixon, Sue
1988 Janthina Morris. Sustaining Hawaii's Indians. *MidWeek*, November 23: A8, B5.

Drechsel, Emanuel J., and T. Haunani Makuakāne
1982 Hawaiian loanwords in two Native American pidgins. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48:460–67.

Drinnon, Richard
1980 *Facing West. The meta-physics of Indian-hating and empire building.* Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press.

Duncan, Janice K.
1973 Kanaka world travelers and fur company employees, 1785–1860. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 7:93–111.

Finney, Ben
1994 *Voyage of rediscovery. A cultural odyssey through Polynesia.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Fox, Stephen
2005 Native blend. R. Carlos Nakai and Keola Beamer connect. *Honolulu Weekly*, October 26: 15.

Friederici, Georg
1960 *Amerikanistisches Wörterbuch und Hilfswörterbuch für den Amerikanisten.* Deutsch, Spanish, English. (Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiet der Auslandskunde, Vol. 53, Series B: Völkerkunde, Kulturgeschichte und Sprachen, Vol. 29.) Hamburg, Germany: Cram, De Gruyter and Co.

Gibson, James R.
1992 *Otter skins, Boston ships, and China goods. The maritime fur trade of the Northwest Coast, 1785–1841.* Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

Gould, Richard A.
1968 Seagoing canoes among the Indians of northwestern California. *Ethnohistory* 15: 11–42.

Hall, Tex G.
2005 Economy, Hawaiian culture would gain from Akaka Bill. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, September 13: A12.

Helms, Mary W.
1988 *Ulysses' sail. An ethnographic odyssey of power, knowledge, and geographical distance.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin
2004 Native tribes celebrate museum's opening. Hawaiians attend the opening of the facility in the nation's capital. September 22: A11.

Hoover, Will
2006 Conference helps soften opposition to Akaka Bill. *Honolulu Advertiser*, January 12: A1, A8.

2007 Code talkers steal show at pow wow. *Honolulu Advertiser*, October 7: A33, A41.

Houghton, Richard H., III
1989 An argument for Indian status for Native Hawaiians—The discovery of a lost tribe. *American Indian Law Review* 14:1–55.

Jones, Terry L., and Kathryn A. Klar
2005 Diffusionism reconsidered: Linguistic and archaeological evidence for prehistoric Polynesian contact with southern California. *American Antiquity* 70: 457–84.

Kauanui, J. Kēhaulani
2005 Precarious positions: Native Hawaiians and US federal recognition. *Contemporary Pacific* 17:1–27.

Klar, Kathryn A., and Terry L. Jones
2005 Linguistic evidence for a prehistoric Polynesia–southern California contact event. *Anthropological Linguistics* 47:369–400.

Koppel, Tom
1995 *Kanaka. The untold story of Hawaiian pioneers in British Columbia and the Pacific Northwest*. Vancouver: Whitecap Books.

Kotzebue, Otto von
1821 *Entdeckungs-Reise in die Süd-See und nach der Berings-Strasse zur Erforschung einer nordöstlichen Durchfahrt*. Unternommen in den Jahren 1815, 1816, 1817 und 1818, auf Kosten Sr. Erlaucht des Herrn Reichs-Kanzlers Grafen Rumanzoff auf dem Schiffe Rurick unter dem Befehle des Lieutenants der Russisch-Kaiserlichen Marine Otto von Kotzebue. Enthält die Bemerkungen und Ansichten von dem Naturforscher der Expedition, Adelbert von Chamisso, nebst Beiträgen von anderen Gelehrten. Weimar, Germany: Gebrüder Hoffmann.

Mager, Marcia Z.
1999 Preparing for the powwow. *MidWeek*, May 19: 22, 35.

McClain, Sally
2001 *Navajo weapon. The Navajo code talkers*. Tuscon, AZ: Rio Nuevo Publishers.

Meadows, William C.
2002 *The Comanche code talkers of World War II*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Moreno, Loren
2007 Native student issues assessed. *Honolulu Advertiser*, October 27: B3, B5.

National Indian Education Association
2007a *E Ho'i I Ka Piko Aloha: Return to cultural honor and caring. Schedule of the 38th annual convention, National Indian Education Association, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 25–28 October 2007*. Washington, DC: NIEA.

2007b Native language immersion schools, culture preservation programs and unification of indigenous peoples of the United States are main points at 2007 NIEA Annual Convention. http://www.nieca.org/sa/uploads/postconvention/55.57.NIEAPressRelease11052007.pdf.

Naughton, E. Momilani
1983 Hawaiians in the fur trade: Cultural influences on the Northwest Coast, 1811–1875. Master's thesis, Western Washington Univ.

Noel, David
1995 *The great canoes. Reviving a Northwest Coast tradition*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press.

Oliveri, Frank
2004 "First People" celebrate. Native Hawaiians feel kinship honored by role in procession. *Honolulu Advertiser*, September 22: A1, A2.

Omandam, Pat
2000a Alaska Natives praise federal recognition. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, August 29: A1, A8.
2000b Trask: Hawaiian kids would benefit from recognition bill. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, August 21: A3.

Parker, Alan
2007 Attacks against Native Hawaiian recognition aimed at all tribal rights. *Ka Wai Ola o OHA* 24 (3): 8.

Parker, Linda S.
1989 *Native American estate. The struggle over Indian and Hawaiian lands*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Paul, Doris A.
1973. *The Navajo code talkers*. Pittsburgh, PA: Dorrance Publishing Company.

Polynesian Voyaging Society
n.d.a Hawai'iloa's Northwest-Alaska journey / May-July 1995. http://pvs.kcc.hawaii.edu/alaskabackground.html.
n.d.b The Northwest-Alaska and West Coast tours. http://pvs.kcc.hawaii.edu/alaskawestcoast.html.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, and Samuel H. Elbert
1986 *Hawaiian dictionary. Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian*. Rev. exp. ed. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Ramirez, Tino
1990 Tribal ties unite, far from home. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, October 8: B1.

Risser, William
2004 Hawai'i treasures on display. *Honolulu Advertiser*, September 23: A1, A10.

Shames, Deborah
1972 *Freedom with reservation. The Menomini struggle to save their land and people.* Madison, WI: National Committee to Save the Menomini People and Forests .

Simon, Liza
1993 Call of the drums. *Honolulu Weekly*, October 6: 15.

Spoehr, Alexander
1986 Fur traders in Hawai'i. The Hudson's Bay Company in Honolulu, 1829–1861. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 20:27–66.
1988 A 19th century chapter in Hawai'i's maritime history: Hudson's Bay Company merchant shipping, 1829–1859. *Hawaiian Journal of History* 22:70–100.

Stannard, David E.
1989 *Before the horror. The population of Hawai'i on the eve of western contact.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, Social Science Research Institute.

Tanahara, Kris M.
1992 Native Americans are carving out their niche in Hawaii. *Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser*, February 23: A23.

Trask, Haunani-Kay
1984 Hawaiians, American colonization, and the quest for independence. *Social Process in Hawaii* 31:101–36.

U.S. Bureau of the Census
1963 *Census of population: 1960. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1973 *1970 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1982 *1980 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1983 *1980 census of population. Ancestry of the population by state.* Supplementary Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1992 *1990 census of population. Vol. 1: Characteristics of the population, Part 13: Hawaii.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
1993 *1990 census of population. Detailed ancestry Groups for states.* Supplementary Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
2002 *2000 census of population and housing. Summary population and housing characteristics, Hawaii: 2000, PHC-1-13.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Congress, Senate
2001 *Native Hawaiian federal recognition. Joint hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, and the Committee on Resources, United*

*States House of Representatives. 106th Congress, 2nd Session, on S. 2899 . . . and H.R. 4904* . . . . Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

2003 *Native Hawaiian Recognition Act of 2003*. 108th Congress, 1st Session, S. 344 [Report No.108–85]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

2007 *Native Hawaiian Government Reorganization Act of 2007*. 110th Congress, 1st Session, S. 310 [. . .]. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Van Dyke, Jon M.

1998 The political status of the Native Hawaiian people. *Yale Law & Policy Review* 17: 95–147.

Vancouver, George

1967 *A voyage of discovery to the north Pacific Ocean and round the world*, . . . . [1798] Vol. 2 (Bibliotheca Australiana, No. 31.) New York: Da Capo Press.

Williams, Karin

1995 *The voyage home. Hawai'iloa's Northwest journey*. Seattle, WA: Williams Communication Production [videorecording].

Wolf, Eric R

1982 *Europe and the people without history*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Wong-Wilson, Noe Noe

2005 A conversation with Mililani Trask. *Contemporary Pacific* 17:142–56.

Young, Gloria A., and Erik D. Gooding

2001 Celebrations and giveaways. In *Handbook of North American Indians: Vol. 13, Plains, Part II*, ed. Raymond J. DeMallie, 1011–25. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution.

Zell, Patricia

2005a Roots of freedom. The U.S. Constitution provides for recognition of native rights. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, August 14: F9, F12.

2005b Akaka Bill—What are the facts? Kamehameha Schools Alumni Association, O'ahu Region, and the Association of Hawaiian Civic Clubs, Honolulu, August 25.

## REVIEWS

John Charlot. *Classical Hawaiian Education: Generations of Hawaiian Culture; Moses Kuaea Nākuina: Hawaiian Novelist; and Approaches to the Academic Study of Hawaiian Literature and Culture.* Honolulu, HI: Pacific Institute, Brigham Young University-Hawai'i Campus, Lā'ie, Hawai'i, 2005. Pp. 902. CD-ROM, distributed by the University of Hawai'i Press. ISBN 978-0-939154-71-5

*Reviewed by George M. Williams, California State University, Chico*

Professor John Charlot has written a book that far exceeds the promise of its title. First, it is an electronic book of 902 pages divided into six chapters, copious endnotes, eight appendices, and a huge bibliography. Then there are two additional essays: "Moses Kuaea Nākuina: Hawaiian Novelist" (57 pp.) and "Approaches to the Academic Study of Hawaiian Literature and Culture" (37 pp.). Both essays are gems in totally different ways: one a masterpiece of literary and cultural criticism and the other a practical proposal and guide for a profound understanding of Hawaiian culture and language.

### Getting Started

*Classical Hawaiian Education* (hereafter, *CHE*) represents a lifetime's study that is both masterful and artistic. A review of a thousand-page tome might overreach even if it only attempts to suggest the usefulness, content, and perhaps even its place in the history of a discipline.

I would suggest that the reader might well be served by beginning first with the two essays because *CHE* situates one in so complex a topography

that the two essays help set the scale and adjust the perspective. Charlot is a first-rate literary critic as evidenced in his analysis of Moses N. Nākuina. First, Charlot knows Nākuina as few can unless they have spent a lifetime with Hawaiian literature. Charlot's nine-hundred page book is nothing if it is not specific, providing one example after another and concrete instances of each nuance and context that he wishes the reader to appreciate, or at least to know they exist. Why so thorough? Perhaps, so that no one with any education can never again utter the old stereotypes: that Native Hawaiians had no real culture to lose, no literature worth preserving, no language the equal of English, and no values that could not be better replaced with those of the modern, globalized present. (I remember with sadness a retired University of Hawai'i political science professor who said the best thing for Native Hawaiians would be to stop wasting their time learning a language incapable of aiding scientific thought and "join modern, globalized, English-speaking culture." Charlot's book should more than counter this chauvinism.)

## Digital Publication

Before summarizing the content in the constraints of a review, let me suggest what I think is a historic moment in academic publication. A major scholar has entrusted a lifetime of study to a genre, digital publication, that as yet is not totally accepted in the academic community. An academic book publisher gladly would have published *CHE* if Charlot had condensed the book by two-thirds. But he persevered and the Pacific Institute published this ground-breaking edition as an electronic book. It is odd that this technology, which has been around for several decades, is so underused in academic circles. The Pacific Institute implemented this task well and is to be commended.

First, this book is electronically searchable; and since one can follow instances of Hawaiian word usage in varying contexts, one can experience aspects of the language in new and profound ways. It is also a dynamic translation guide. It preserves themes and issues that meet the test of intercultural understanding: when interpreting in English (or any other language), can this notion be said in Hawaiian? And conversely, what is lost when Hawaiian is no longer used?

*CHE* may contain more than a hundred pages of representative literary sayings in Hawaiian plus innumerable individual words carefully defined and used as illustrations of points being made. A searchable electronic (digital) book with this amount of Hawaiian examples could be considered a Hawaiian language thesaurus, a concordance as well as a repository of literary samples.

The very publication of *CHE* is a testament to digital publication of resources that could not be published economically in any other form. Modern publishers cannot afford to bring out multivolume works that are this specialized. Yet, despite this degree of specialization, this book remains available to a larger readership than might have been anticipated. (There are developments in digital publication of books and digital reading devices—eReaders—that are currently on the horizon. Thus far, they are being controlled by commercial interests and are still proprietary; hence, they can generate a monopoly in the production of content for their devices. Perhaps a new generation of eReaders that are open-source will encourage the use of this technology for academic publications—well beyond the proprietary limitations of the Kindle.)

## Content

Classical Hawaiian education (chapter one) can be characterized by two main foci: family and place (*'āina*). The cultural vision is captured in the notion that "Life is *ka 'imi loa* 'the great search' that involves all aspects of sensitivity, perception, intelligence, and action" (2).

Charlot must bridge the gap between the object of his study, classical Hawaiian education in an oral culture, and a methodology that will reveal that nearly extinguished oral tradition and its institutions. His method is simple and direct; there are thousands of extant records: manuscripts, books, and newspapers written in Hawaiian with varying degrees of desire to preserve precontact language, history, and culture. Charlot mines these treasures in a way that calls into question the lack of use of these primary resources in much of what has been written, but Charlot is almost too gentle in his implied criticism of works on Hawai'i that neglect these sources.

Charlot explicates a vast Hawaiian vocabulary on education, specifying how these words are used—literally and metaphorically. It is a richness of contextual meanings that begins to emerge with the sheer number of examples that Charlot provides. Concepts are placed in contexts that illustrate the richness of language and an intrinsic demand for proper usage. (Again, this is afforded because of the digital book publication that uses inclusion and not exclusion as its organizing principle.)

Hawaiians were trained to grasp what they had heard (*'apo* or *'a'apo*) and then to place it in long-term memory by silent rehearsal, so as not to be heard by unauthorized ears. Items should be organized into groups, categories, or classes.

Classical Hawaiian education was a major factor in the formation of Hawaiian character, and many of the personal qualities described by early

visitors to Hawai'i can be ascribed to it: "the Hawaiians' alertness, intellectual curiosity, quickness to learn, and tenacious memory" (19).

Charlot's description of the intellectual and educational environment of Hawaiian oral culture (chapter two) is richly illustrated with a particular interest in precise vocabulary and the notion of a literature of education. Against those who maintain that only a literate culture may have a literature, Charlot demonstrates that an oral culture can have a literature as well because it has been preserved by postcontact authors ('Ī'ī, Kamakau, Malo, Nākuina, Poepoe, Pukui, etc.). In fact, Charlot does not even argue this but proceeds to literatures of family and place, because each area raises its children as *kama'āina* (children of the land) with unique stories, descriptions, and even vocabularies. What is interesting is that a well-educated Hawaiian was expected to know about all these other subcultures and their oral traditions through storytelling, travel, sightseeing, and their intellectual games of riddling, *kākā'ōlelo* (word-fencing, oratory) and *ho'opāpā* (contests of wits): "The high level of knowledge in the general community set high standards for expertise and performance. To be outstanding in any field demanded considerable achievement" (76).

Hawaiian views of education (chapter three) reflected the culture: individualistic with a high degree of difference and variation, competitive, and ready to judge degrees of practicality and perfection. A genealogical view of the universe saw membership in a universal family, with resemblances between words and things, between species both plant and animal, even between animate and inanimate. Charlot alludes to all this as a nonanimistic worldview where "there was no supernatural beyond the universe" and "nothing purely immaterial" (89). He adds, "The Hawaiian view of the materiality of human activity—perceptions, emotions, and thought—avoided also the separation of the human mind from the world it contemplated and modified" (89). Despite how one might access this in terms of Western notions, one cannot but agree with Charlot that Hawaiian education has proved its usefulness in the centuries "of pre-contact Hawaiian life and has preserved and inspired invaluable cultural treasures from that time until today" (91).

The ideals of Hawaiian education included its practicality; its being powerful (*mana*), religious and moral (*pono*), industrious; its goals of perfection and completeness; and its capability of being displayed. It was this very display of knowledge that produced its esthetics as evidenced in the presentation, recognition, and pride of that education. Recognition (*mahalo*) was appreciated with prestige and reward.

The practice of this classical, oral education (chapter four) began with observation, not questions and answers. Children, even rulers (*ali'i*), must

listen and remember. Memorization was aided by silent repetition (there was a *kapu* about repeating lessons aloud because lessons were specifically for that learner), memory aids, and games; and formal learning structures were built into the language. These included assonance, canonization of vocabulary, regularity of oral literary forms, and close parallelism between the form of composition and a method of memorization. Charlot profusely illustrates each of these linguistically and in translation. The richness of classical Hawaiian education in mastery of language skills can be illustrated by the preference for a list with its ideal of completeness rather than a general or generic term for an entire type or class. Charlot notes that "[i]n translating the Ten Commandments, it was found they had about twenty ways of committing adultery" (113). This level of specificity required that the list be complete without anything being left out, demonstrating one's mastery of the subject, one's excellent memory, and the proper and precise use of the Hawaiian language. Christian missionaries found it necessary to express a general prohibition "in another way, by 'Thou shalt not sleep mischievously'" (113). This was intended to counter the need of complete and specific knowledge, accurately and beautifully listed.

The love of appropriate lists to locate one in the universe, in the family and in one's place (*'āina*) produced a culturally specific form of classification: "objects can be divided, *mahele*, into sections, groups, or divisions, *'āpana* or *papa*, by their type or character, *'ano*. Individual items are selected, *'ohi*, for a category and inserted, *ho'okomo*, into it as are subordinate levels under higher ones. An item is counted, *helu 'ia*, as belonging to a category" (227). At its ontological level, this classification entailed opposites, dualities, or dichotomies (sky/earth, land/sea, male/female, night/day) to symbolize the wholeness of the universe as well as its harmony and beauty.

At this point, Charlot introduces the oral literary forms: prose and poetry; narration, cautionary tales, trickster stories, stories that contrast smart and dumb or good and evil persons; historical reports; genealogies; chants. The subject areas and the bodies of knowledge—from fishing to martial arts, from medicine to religion—were all part of the general education that Hawaiian society could enjoy and evaluate their mastery in the ho'opāpā. Charlot provides an enormous service because he describes how the contests of wits function in their variety of tests and strategies. (This section could easily become required reading for students who wish to understand any oral culture and those in Pacific or Hawaiian studies.)

The fifth chapter deals with Hawaiian educational institutions. The strength of this chapter arises from the wealth of postcontact descriptions of precontact institutions and surprises us with the range of knowledge that these institutions taught. Yet this points to a weakness, not of this study, because it has done exactly what it has proposed, but that this study begs to

be combined with future studies of the archaeology of classical Hawaiian education locating the *heiau* of each educational institution—the medical *heiau*, the astronomical *heiau*, the fishing observatory, etc. Just as Charlot has brought an entire body of literature from obscurity into the light, so also more must be done for the preservation of the places where classical Hawaiian education actually took place—before there are no actual remains left.

Charlot's own evaluation of this literature is correct, it would seem, from the sheer volume of specific examples he has given us: "Despite its problems and limitations, post-contact historiography remains one of the greatest achievements of Hawaiian culture. Hawaiian historians preserved a vast amount of history and ethnography, defended the value of their past and thus their culture, provided a context in which Hawaiians could understand themselves and the rapid changes of their time, and articulated a critical yet supportive image of themselves" (547).

The final chapter on the encounter with Western education is a needed aside to prove an implicit notion: that precontact Hawaiian culture was of inestimable value. Charlot concludes, "However much Hawaiians have learned from the West, they still have their culture to teach the world" (663).

This tome is highly recommended for every university and college library and for every public library with any interest in Hawaiian studies. It should also be a required reference for both Pacific and Hawaiian studies programs.

William C. Clarke. *Remembering Papua New Guinea: An Eccentric Ethnography*. Canberra, A.C.T.: Pandanus Books, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University; distributed by UNIREPS, University of New South Wales (Sydney, NSW), 2003. Pp. 178, colored and B & W photos, illus. A$49.50, paper. ISBN 1-74076-034-4.

*Reviewed by Ceridwen Spark, Monash University*

In 1964 and 1965, William C. Clarke conducted geographical field research among the Bomagai and Angoiang clans who live on the edge of the Central Highlands of Papua New Guinea. In the introduction to his aptly titled book, *Remembering Papua New Guinea: An Eccentric Ethnography*, Clarke says he chose this site "far east down the Simbai Valley adjacent to a large stretch of uninhabited forest" because "it was the most remote of the Maring

communities" (3). At this point the Bomagai and Angoiang had only been in contact with European peoples for six years.

In addition to informing his choice of a doctoral field site, Clarke's longing to connect with people from a place as remote as possible underlies the present text. Although the book contains little to nothing about the Bomagai and Angoiang as they are today—Clarke acknowledges that he can only speculate about the present, having not been back to the Simbai Valley since 1977—*Remembering Papua New Guinea* compellingly represents this early colonial era. A collection of photos and reminiscences, the book presents the memories of an aging American geographer seeking to honor relationships formed, and lessons learned, forty years ago.

On the right of each double-page spread, there is a large photo. In each case, the left-hand page accompanying the photo contains Clarke's reflections. Sometimes there is an obvious relationship between the text and photo, as when Clarke addresses the subject of the photo directly, writing for example, in a letter to Ngirapo, his "keenest teacher," "sometimes you would amuse yourself by hooking me with a tall tale" (8). At other times, the words and pictures bear a less direct relationship to one another, as when we read Clarke's ruminations about contemporary Melanesia, while looking at a 1960s photo of a man carrying a pig.

Those in the former category are almost invariably more powerful, partly because it is the "eccentricity" of Clarke's memories and personal recollections that give the book its primary appeal. However, it also has to be said that Clarke's ruminations on more general topics, including gender relationships, exchange, and cultural difference, are somewhat simplistic and at times too romantic to be convincing.

However, this is not the case when it comes to his exploration of the Bomagai and Angoiang peoples' relationships with their land and gardens. Clarke's work among the Maring involved appraising their agricultural practices, and his deep respect for their intensely interdependent relationship with their environment richly textures the book. Without ever romanticizing the Maring's relationships with their lands, he conveys a strong sense of their profound knowledge of the places so beautifully represented in his breathtaking pictures of green smoke-filled valleys and forests.

Although the book is at best an introduction to one area of Papua New Guinea, the wealth of color in the photos gives credence to Drusilla Mojdeska's (2003) claim that after living in PNG, everywhere else can seem "somehow flat." This certainly seems to have been the case for Clarke whose willingness to share his photos will be welcomed by many who have spent time in this spirited, memorable place.

## References

Modjeska, Drusilla
2003 PNG writing, writing PNG. *Meanjin* 62 (3): 51.

## BOOKS NOTED

### RECENT PACIFIC ISLAND PUBLICATIONS SELECTED ACQUISITIONS JUNE 2007–DECEMBER 2007

THIS LIST of significant publications relating to the Pacific Islands was selected from new acquisitions lists received from Brigham Young University Hawai'i, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, University of Auckland, East-West Center, University of South Pacific, National Library of Australia, Melanesian Studies Resource Center, Center for Pacific and Asian Studies, University of Nijmegen, University of California San Diego, Secretariat of the Pacific Community Library, Center for South Pacific Studies, University of New South Wales, Macmillan Brown Library at University of Canterbury, and the Australian International Development Assistance Bureau's Center for the Pacific Development Training. Other libraries are invited to send contributions to the Books Noted Editor for future issues. Listings reflect the extent of information provided by each institution.

Adds, Peter. *The Transit of Venus: How a Rare Astronomical Alignment Changed the World*. Wellington: Awa Press, 2007.

Ahrens, Prue, ed. *Tour of Paradise: An American Soldier in the South Pacific*. Carlton North, Vic.: Vulgar Press, 2006.

'Aiavao, 'Apelu. *E Vaetuli le Fale Samoa 'a 'o le Fa'asinomaga*. Apia: Inst. of Samoan Studies, National Univ. of Samoa, 2004.

Allouch, Richard. *Légendes anciennes de Tahiti*. Papeete: 'Una 'Una Tahiti, 2006.

Amosa, Maulolo Leaula Tavita Uelese. *Fausaga o Lauga Samoa*. 2 vols. Apia: National Univ. of Samoa, 1999–2002.

Anderson, Atholl, Kaye Green, and Foss Leach, eds. *Vastly Ingenious: The Archeology of Pacific Material Culture*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2007.

Aporosa, S. G. "Yagona and Education in Fiji: A Clash of Cultures." MPhil thesis, Massey Univ., 2006.

Banner, Stuart. *Possessing the Pacific: Land Settlers, and Indigenous People from Australia to Alaska*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press, 2007.

Bargh, Maria, ed. *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism*. Wellington: Huia Publishers, 2007.

Barneche, Sophie. *Gens de Nouméa, gens des îles, gens d'ailleurs: langues et identités en Nouvelle-Calédonie*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2005.

Bashkow, Ira. *The Meaning of Whitemen: Race and Modernity in the Orokaiva Cultural World*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2006.

Bauin, Emmanuelle, and Sarah Vincent. *Gauguin en Polynésie*. Garches, France: À Propos, 2006.

Biggs, Bruce. *Kimihia te Mea Ngaro: Seek That Which Is Lost*. Auckland: Polynesian Society, 2006.

Binney, Judith, ed. *Te Kerikeri 1770–1850: The Meeting Pool*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2007.

Bonnefoy, Jean-Pierre. *Polynésie: l'odyssée d'un rêve*. Papeete: Editions le Motu, 2005.

Bonnevie, Johan. *Aotea (Great Barrier Island): A World of Its Own*. Paraparaumu, New Zealand: Viking Sevenseas, 2007.

Boulay, Roger. *Hula hula, pilou pilou, cannibales et vahinés*. Paris: Editions de Chene, 2005.

Brison, Karen J. *Our Wealth Is Loving Each Other: Self and Society in Fiji*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2007.

Brown, Charles S. *The Coming of Pakeha Religion: The Spiritual Significance for Maori; A Revisionist Analysis of Maori Spirituality and Pakeha Religion*. Auckland: Crystal Publishing, 2006.

Brown, Deirdre, and Ngarino Ellis. *Te Puna: Maori Art from Te Tai Tokerau Northland*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Brown, M. Anne, ed. *Security and Development in the Pacific Islands: Social Resilience in Emerging States*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2007.

Browne, Christopher. *Pacific Island Economies*. Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund, 2006.

Cadilhac, Dominique. *Les montagnes du Pacifique*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2005.

Campbell, Jeff. *Hawaii*. 8th ed. Footscray, Vic.: Lonely Planet, 2007.

Campbell, Tom W. *Religious Communities of the Anglican Communion: Australia, New Zealand and the South Pacific*. Canberra: T. W. Campbell, 2007.

Céré, Raoul. *Inventaire cartophile de Polynésie Française: cartes postales anciennes 1898–1945*. Tremblay, France: Imprimerie CN2, 2005.

Cerf, Patrick. *La domination des femmes à Tahiti: des violences envers les femmes au discours du matriarcat*. Pirae, Tahiti: Au Vent des Iles, 2007.

Chun, Malcolm Naea. *Aʻo: Educational Traditions*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

———. *Hoʻomana: Understanding the Sacred and Spiritual*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2007.

———. *Hoʻoponopono: Traditional Ways of Healing to Make Things Right Again*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

———. *Kakaʻolelo: Traditions of Oratory and Speech Making*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2007.

———. *Kapu: Gender Roles in Traditional Society*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

———. *Pono: The Way of Living*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

———. *Welina: Traditional and Contemporary Ways of Welcome and Hospitality*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

Clark, Alan. *The Great Sacred Forest of Tane* [Te Wao Tapu Nui a Tane]: *A Natural Pre-history of Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Clark, John R. K. *Guardian of the Sea: Jizo in Hawaii*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Clunie, Fergus. *Birds of the Fiji Bush*. 3rd ed. Suva: Fiji Museum, 2007.

Coffey, John Oliver, and Bernie Wood. *The Kiwis: 100 Years of International Rugby League*. Auckland: Hachette Livre New Zealand, 2007.

Collins, Chris, and Steve Jackson, eds. *Sport in Aotearoa/New Zealand Society*. 2nd ed. Auckland: Thomson, 2007.

*Converging Currents: Custom and Human Rights in the Pacific*. Wellington: Law Commission, 2006.

Coron, Anne. *Henri Matisse, Polynésie*. La Garenne-Colombes, France: B. Chauveau, 2006.

Crocombe, Ron. *Asia in the Pacific Islands: Replacing the West*. Suva: Inst. of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific, 2007.

Cruchet, Louis. *Le ciel en Polynésie: essai d'ethnoastronomie en Polynésie orientale*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2005.

Culbertson, Philip, Margaret Nelson Agee, and Cabrini Ofa Maka, eds. *Penina Uliuli: Contemporary Challenges in Mental Health for Pacific Peoples*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Cunningham, Denis, D. E. Ingram, and Kenneth Sumbuk, eds. *Language Diversity in the Pacific: Endangerment and Survival*. Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters, 2006.

Dale, Paul W. *The Tonga Book*. London: Airleaf Publishing, 2006. Reprint of Mariner, William. *An Account of the Natives of the Tonga Islands in the South Pacific*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh, U. K.: Constable & Co., 1827.

Daude, Jean Hervé. *Mega El Nino et déforestation de l'Île de Pâques: L'effet combiné d'un dérèglement climatique et de l'action de l'homme*. Laval, QC: Jean Daude, 2008.

Debonne, Patrick Gérard. *Théophagie et formes polynésiennes*. Paris: Connaissances et Savoirs, 2007.

Demmer, Christine, and Marie Salaun. *A l'épreuve du capitalisme: dynamiques économiques dans le Pacifique*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2006.

Deschamps, Eric. *La cuisine des révoltés du Bounty, dans le sillage des mutins, de Tahiti à Pitcairn*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2008.

Diamond, Paul. *Makereti: Taking Maori to the World*. Auckland: Random House, 2007.

Doutre, Martin. *The Littlewood Treaty: The True English Text of the Treaty of Waitangi Found*. Auckland: De Danann Publishers, 2005.

Dunmore, John. *From Venus to Antarctica: The Life of Dumont D'Urville*. Auckland: Exisle Publishing, 2007.

———. *La Peyrouse dans l'Isle de Tahiti*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2006.

Durban, Jean-François. *Les acteurs de la tradition en Polynésie française*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2005.

Endersby, Ian. *Bibliography of Norfolk Island Natural History*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 2003.

Estensen, Miriam. *Terra Australis Incognita: The Spanish Quest for the Mysterious Great South Land*. Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen and Unwin, 2006.

Faatonu, Liumaunu Vaelua, and Su'a Julia Wallwork. *Samoa Ne'i Galo: Tala tu'u ma Tala o le Vavau a Samoa* [Samoa, Lest We Forget: A Compilation of Oral Traditions and Legends of Samoa]. 2nd ed. Apia: Commercial Printers, 2007.

Falgout, Suzanne, Lin Poyer, and Laurence M. Carucci. *Memories of War: Micronesians in the Pacific War*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Farrell, Don A. *Rota*. Tinian, Northern Marianas Islands: Micronesian Productions, 2004.

Fau'olo, Oka. *O Vavega o le Alofa Lavea'i: O le Tala Fa'asolopito o le Ekalesia Faupotopotoga Kerisiano i Samoa*. Apia: Malua Printing Press, 2005.

Fayn, Marion. *'Ori Tahiti: La danse à Tahiti*. Pirae, Tahiti: Au Vent des Iles, 2007.

Ferloni, Julia. *Lapérouse: voyage autour du monde*. Paris: Conti, 2005.

Finney, Ben R. *Tahiti: Polynesians, Peasants and Proletarians*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2007.

Finnis, Bill. *Captain James Cook: Seaman and Scientist*. London: Chaucer Press, 2003.

Firth, Stewart, ed. *Globalization and Governance in the Pacific Islands*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2006.

Forster, George. *Cook, the Discoverer*. Sydney: Hordern House, 2007.

Foster, John B. *He Whakamarama: A Full Self-Help Course in Maori*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Fraenkel, John, and Stewart Firth, eds. *From Election to Coup in Fiji: The 2006 Campaign and Its Aftermath*. Canberra: Asia Pacific Press, 2007.

Franks, Joel Stephen. *Hawaiian Sports in the Twentieth Century*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 2002.

Fraser, Lyndon Andrew. *Castles of Gold: A History of New Zealand's West Coast Irish*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2007.

Gardner, Helen Bethea. *Gathering for God: George Brown in Oceania*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2006.

Geiger, Jeffrey. *Facing the Pacific: Polynesia and the U.S. Imperial Imagination*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Gerber, James, and Lei Guang, eds. *Agriculture and Rural Connections in the Pacific, 1500–1900*. Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate/Variorum, 2006.

Gille, Bernard. *Histoire des institutions publiques à Tahiti du XVIIIe siècle à nos jours*. Pirae, Tahiti: Ministère de l'Education, Centre de recherche et de documentation pédagogiques de la Polynésie française, 2006.

Glazier, Edward W. *Hawaiian Fishermen*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2007.

Goetzfridt, Nicholas J. *Pacific Ethnomathematics: A Bibliographic Study*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

Goldberg, Harold J. *D-Day in the Pacific: The Battle of Saipan*. Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2007.

Gunn, Michael, and Philippe Peltier, eds. *New Ireland: Art of the South Pacific*. Paris: Musée de Quai Branly, 2006.

Gustafson, Barry. *Kiwi Keith: A Biography of Keith Holyoake*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2007.

Harding, Bruce. *The Complex Phenomenon of Alan Duff*. Christchurch: Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Canterbury, 2006.

Harlow, Ray. *Maori: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2007.

Harris, R. Carl. *Building the Kingdom in Samoa, 1888–2005: History, Personal Narratives, and Images Portraying Latter-Day Saints' Experiences in the Samoan Islands*. Heber City, UT: R. Carl Harris, 2006.

Hastings, David. *Over the Mountains of the Sea: Life on the Migrant Ships, 1870–1885*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2006.

Haworth, Jenny. *New Zealand Then and Now*. Wingfield, S.A.: Cameron House, 2007.

Hereniko, Vilsoni, and Teresia Teaiwa. *La dernière vierge du paradis*. Nouméa: Editions Agence de Développement de la Culture Kanak, 2006.

Hess, Aimee. *Margaret Mead*. San Francisco: Pomegranate, 2007.

Higuchi, Wakako. "A U.S. Territory in Japan's South Sea Islands: The Japanese Navy Administration of Guam." PhD diss., Australian National Univ., 2006.

Hilliard, Chris. *The Bookmen's Dominion: Cultural Life in New Zealand 1920–1950*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2006.

Hilyard, Maureen Marama. *Stories of Palmerston*. Auckland: M.M. Hilyard, 2007.

Ho'oulumahiehie, and M. Puakea Nogelmeier. *The Epic Tale of Hi'iakaikapoliopele*. 2 vols. Honolulu: Awaiulu Press, 2006. (Reprint of 1906 ed.)

Horibata, Jarrett Masato. "Asian American and Pacific Islander Adolescents: The Role of Parental Monitoring, Association with Deviant Peers and Ethnic Identity on Problem Behavior." PhD diss., Univ. of Oregon, 2006.

Horne, Gerald. *White Pacific: U.S. Imperialism and Black Slavery in the South Seas after the Civil War*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Hovdhaugen, Even, and Ashild Naess, eds. *Stories from Vaeakau and Taumako* [A Lalakhai ma Talanga o Vaeakau ma Taumako]. Oslo: Kon-Tiki Museum, 2006.

Howard, Alan, and Jan Rensel. *Island Legacy: A History of the Rotuman People*. Victoria, BC: Trafford, 2007.

Huntsman, Judith, and Kelihiano Kalolo. *The Future of Tokelau: Decolonizing Agendas, 1975–2006*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2007.

Ihimaera, Witi, ed. *Get on the Waka: Best Recent Maori Fiction*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

James, Rob. *The Battle of Nu'uanu, May 1795*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2004.

Jenkins, Carol, and Holly Buchanan-Aruwafu. *Cultures and Contexts Matter: Understanding and Preventing HIV in the Pacific*. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 2007.

Jones, Kevin L. *The Penguin Field Guide to New Zealand Archaeology*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2007.

Jourdan, Christine. *Parlons pijin: histoire sociale et description du pidgin des îles Salomon*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2007.

Kahele, Mona. *Clouds of Memories*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools, 2006.

Kailahi, Sandra. *Pasifika Women: Our Stories in New Zealand*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Kaplan, Robert B., and Richard B. Baldauf Jr. *Language and Language-in-Education Planning in the Pacific Basin*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

Kaup, Katherine Palmer, ed. *Understanding Contemporary Asia Pacific*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2007.

Keith, Hamish. *The Big Picture: A History of New Zealand Art from 1642*. Auckland: Godwit, 2007.

Keller, Janet Dixon, and Takaronga Kuautonga. *Nokonofo Kitea: We Keep on Living This Way*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Kimball, Kristin. *Maui*. 2nd ed. Footscray, Vic.: Lonely Planet, 2005.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton, and Jean-Louis Rallu, eds. *The Growth and Collapse of Pacific Island Societies: Archaeological and Demographic Perspectives*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Kjellgren, Eric. *Oceania: Art of the Pacific Islands in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 2007.

Klarr, Caroline Katherine. "Painting Paradise for a Post-colonial Pacific: The Fijian Frescos of Jean Charlot." PhD diss., Florida State Univ., 2005.

Koch, Gerd. *Probleme und Erfahrungen: Expeditionen in die Südsee*. Leipzig: G. Koch, 2005.

Koloto, 'Ana Hau'alofa'ia, and 'Alisi Numia Katoanga. *Diverse Forms of Pacific Families and Their Financial Decision-Making Approaches*. Wellington: New Zealand Families Commission, 2007.

Kuchler, Suzanne, and Daniel Miller, eds. *Clothing as Material Culture*. Oxford: Berg, 2005.

Kwon, Soo Ah. "Second-Generation Asian and Pacific Islander Youth Social Change Practices." PhD diss., Univ. of California, 2005.

LaBriola, Monica. "Lien Ippan Doon (This Time Together): Celebrating Survival in an Atypical Marshallese Community." MA thesis, Univ. of Hawai'i, 2006.

Labrum, Bronwyn, Fiona McKergow, and Stephanie Gibson, eds. *Looking Flash: Clothing in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2007.

Lal, Brij V., ed. *The Encyclopedia of the Indian Diaspora*. Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2006.

———. *Fiji*. London: TSO, 2006.

Lambert, Sally-Anne. *New Zealand Maori Word Encyclopedia*. Auckland: WE International, 2007.

Lee, Pali Jae. *Ho'opono: Hawaiian Way to Put Things Back into Balance*. 2nd ed. Mountain View, HI: I. M. Publishing, 2006.

Levy-Bossi, Richard. *Légendes de la mythologie polynésienne*. Papeete: 'Una 'Una Tahiti, 2007.

Lineham, Peter, ed. *Weaving the Unfinished Mats: Wesley's Legacy; Conflict, Confusion, and Challenge in the South Pacific*. Orewa, N.Z.: Wesley Historical Society, 2007.

Louis, William Roger. *Ends of British Imperialism: The Scramble for Empire, Suez and Decolonization*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2006.

Luangphinith, Seri I. *Kukilakila: Writing from the Big Island*. Hilo, HI: Ka Noio 'A'e Ale, 2007.

Luthria, Manjula. *At Home and Away: Expanding Job Opportunities for Pacific Islanders through Labour Mobility*. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2006.

Madrid, Carlos. *Beyond Distances: Governance, Politics and Deportation in the Mariana Islands from 1870 to 1877*. Saipan: Northern Mariana Islands Council for Humanities, 2006.

Makihara, Miki, and Bambi B. Shieffelin, eds. *Consequences of Contact: Language Ideologies and Sociocultural Transformations in Pacific Societies*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.

*Te Mana Taumaru Matauranga: Intellectual Property Guide for Maori Organisations and Communities*. Wellington: Ministry of Economic Development/Manatu Ohanga, 2007.

Marston, Daniel. *The Pacific War Companion: From Pearl Harbor to Hiroshima*. Oxford: Osprey, 2007.

Maude, H. E. *The Gilbert Islands Observed: A Source Book for European Contact with, and Observations of, the Gilbert Islands and the Gilbertese, from 1537 to 1873*. Adelaide, S.A.: Homa Press, 2006.

Maui, Wil. *2006 Saipan Atlas: The Complete Location Resource*. Saipan: Wilhelm Maui, 2006.

McCoy, Mary M., and Siotame Drew Havea. *Making Sense of Tonga: A Visitor's Guide to the Kingdom's Rich Polynesian Culture*. Nuku'alofa: Training Group of the Pacific, 2006.

McFadgen, Bruce G. *Hostile Shores: Catastrophic Events in Prehistoric New Zealand and Their Impact on Maori Coastal Communities*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2007.

McHugh, Evan. *1606: An Epic Adventure*. Sydney: Univ. of New South Wales, 2006.

McIntyre, William David. *Dominion of New Zealand: Statesmen and Status, 1907–1945*. Wellington: New Zealand Inst. of International Affairs, 2007.

McLean, Gavin, ed. *Whare Korero: Best of Reed Writings*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2007.

McMurray, Christine. *The Samoa Family Health and Safety Study*. Nouméa: Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2007.

McQuarrie, Peter. *Tokelau: People, Atolls and History*. Wellington: Peter McQuarrie, 2007.

Milledrogues, Lucie, Ségolène Pigeon, and Catherine Vincente. *Tahiti, Polynésie française 2007*. Paris: Gallimard, 2006.

Moerenhout, Jacques-Antoine. *Voyages aux îles du grand océan: géographie, les tribulations d'un négociant, armateur et ethnographe en Polynésie orientale, 1828–1834*. Besançon, France: Lanterne magique, 2006. Reprint of *Voyages aux îles du grand océan*. Paris: Arthus Bertrand, 1837.

Moon, Paul. *The Newest Country in the World: A History of New Zealand in the Decade of the Treaty*. Auckland: Penguin, 2007.

———. *The Struggle for Tamaki Makaurau: The Maori Occupation of Auckland to 1820*. Auckland: David Ling, 2007.

Morton, John Edward. *Seashore Ecology of New Zealand and the Pacific*. Auckland: Bateman, 2004.

Morvan, Dominique. *Marché de Papeete*. Papeete: Editions le Motu, 2006.

Moulds-Carr, Maile, and Charles Langlas, eds. *Na Wahi Pana o Ka'u: An Oral History of Ka'u*. Pahala, HI: Ka'u High School, 2005.

Moyle, Richard, ed. *Oceanic Music Encounters: The Print Resource and the Human Resources: Essays in Honour of Mervyn McLean*. Auckland: Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Auckland, 2007.

———. *Songs from the Second Float: A Musical Ethnography of Taku Atoll, Papua New Guinea*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Murphy, Takawai. *Te Pumaomao: An Awakening, a Discovery, a Celebration of Mana Maori*. New Plymouth, N.Z.: Taranaki Polytechnic, 2004.

Murray, John Thomas. *The Minnows of Triton: Policing, Politics and Corruption in the South Pacific Islands*. Canberra: John T. Murray, 2006.

Museum of New Zealand. *Art: Icons from Te Papa*. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2006.

National Univ. of Samoa. *The National University of Samoa: 20 Years: 1984–2004*. Apia: Malua Printing Press, 2004.

Naumann, Ruth. *The Big Resource Book of the Pacific*. South Melbourne, Vic.: Thomson/New House, 2006.

Nena, Tauhiti, and Chantel Selva. *L'art en mouvement: émergence d'un art contemporain à Tahiti*. Papeete: Editions Le Motu, 2005.

Nendel, James D. "Duke Kahanamoku—Twentieth Century Hawaiian Monarch: The Values and Contributions to Hawaiian Culture from Hawai'i's Sporting Legend." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State Univ., 2006.

Nickum, Mark Thomas. "Ethnobotony and Construction of a Tongan Voyaging Canoe, the Kalia Mileniume." MS thesis, Univ. of Hawai'i, 2002.

O'Connor, Tom. *Pathways of Taranaki*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2006.

Offei, Stephen. *Law of Torts in the South Pacific*. 2nd ed. Lake Mary, FL: Vanderplas Publishing, 2006.

Ogilvie, Gordon. *Banks Peninsula: Cradle of Canterbury*. 3rd ed. Christchurch: Phillips & King Publishers, 2007.

Oram, Rod. *Reinventing Paradise: How New Zealand Is Starting to Earn a Bigger, Sustainable Living in the World Economy*. Auckland: Penguin, 2007.

Pacific History Association Conference. *Histoire de la Nouvelle-Calédonie: approches croisées*. Paris: Indes savants, 2007.

*Papua New Guinea (2006–2010)*. Manila: Asian Development Bank, 2006.

Parry, Roger. *Roger Parry, 1932: au-delà du mythe tahitien*. Pirae, Tahiti: Au Vent des Iles, 2006.

Parsons, John. *New Zealand Writer's Handbook*. 5th ed. Auckland: David Bateman, 2007.

Petrosian-Husa, Carmen. *Traditional Plaiting in the Marshall Islands: Mats, Fans, and Belts*. Majuro: Republic of the Marshall Islands Historic Preservation Office, 2005.

Phillips-Gibson, Edith. *Tamaki-makaurau: Myths and Legends of Auckland Landmarks*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2006.

Plimmer, Neil, ed. *The Future of the Pacific Labour Market: Labour Mobility in the Pacific*. Auckland: Pacific Cooperation Foundation, 2006.

Pohatu, Warren. *The Marae: Nau Mai Haere Mai ki te Marae: Welcome to Our Marae, Welcome to Our Culture*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Pool, David Ian, Arunachalam Dharmalingam, and Janet Sceats. *The New Zealand Family from 1840: A Demographic History*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2007.

Raphalen, Daniel. *L'odyssée de Port-Breton, ou le rêve océanien du marquis de Rays*. Rennes, France: Les Portes du Large, 2006.

Reed, Alexander Wyclif. *Illustrated Myths and Legends of the Pacific*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Richard, Rhys. *Manu Moriori: Human and Bird Carvings on Live Kopi Trees on the Chatham Islands*. Wellington: Paremata Press, 2007.

Rigo, Bernard. *Lieux-dits d'un malentendu culturel: analyse anthropologique et philosophique du discours occidental sur l'altérité polynésienne*. 2nd ed. Papeete: Au Vent des Iles, 2003.

Riley, Murdoch. *Traditions et coutumes des Maoris de Nouvelle-Zélande*. Paraparaumu, N.Z.: Viking Sevenseas, 2006.

Rio, Knut Mikjel. *The Power of Perspective: Social Ontology and Agency on Ambrym Island, Vanuatu*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2007.

Rockefeller, Michael Clark. *Michael Rockefeller: New Guinea Photographs, 1961*. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum Press, 2006.

Rodman, Margaret, ed. *House Girls Remember: Domestic Workers in Vanuatu*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Rogers, Anna. *Illustrated History of Canterbury*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Rout, Ettie Annie. *Maori Symbolism: Being an Account of the Origin, Migration and Culture of the New Zealand Maori as Recorded in Certain Sacred Legends*. London: Kessinger Publishing, 2003. Reprint of *Maori Symbolism*. London: Kegan Paul, 1926.

Ruka Te Korako, Makere. *Whispers of Waitaha: Traditions of a Nation*. Canterbury, New Zealand: Whariki Publishing, 2006.

Rynkiewich, Michael A. *Cultures and Languages of PNG: The Story of the Origins, Migrations and Settlement of Melanesian Peoples, Language and Cultures*. Goroka, P.N.G.: The Melanesian Inst., 2004.

Salaün, Marie. *L'école indigène: Nouvelle-Calédonie, 1885–1945*. Rennes, France: Presses Univ. Rennes, 2005.

Salisbury, Richard Frank, and Marilyn Silverman. *Ethnography and Development: The Work of Richard F. Salisbury*. Montreal: McGill Univ. Libraries, 2004.

Sanga, Kabini, and 'Ana Taufe'ulungaki, eds. *International Aid Impacts on Pacific Education*. Wellington: Inst. for Research and Development in Maori and Pacific Education, 2005.

Saquet, Jean-Louis. *Moana: de Tahiti, des îles, des hommes et de la mer*. Papeete: Port autonome de Papeete, 2005.

Savoie, Hélène. *Du rocher à la voile: recueil de récits et nouvelles*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2006.

Siikala, Anna-Leena, and Jukka Siikala. *Return to Culture: Oral Tradition and Society in the Southern Cook Islands*. Helsinki: Suomalaien Tiedeakatemia and Academia Scientarium Fennica, 2005.

Sivo, Loraini. "Ecotourism and Environmental Conservation: A Case Study of Nacula District, Fiji." M.A. thesis, Univ. of the South Pacific, 2006.

Soga, Yasutaro Keiho. *Life behind Barbed Wire: The World War II Internment Memoirs of a Hawaii Issei*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2008.

So'o, Asofou, ed. *Samoa National Human Development Report 2006: Sustainable Livelihoods in a Changing Samoa*. Apia: Centre for Samoan Studies, National Univ. of Samoa, 2006.

Souhami, Diana. *Coconut Chaos*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2007.

*Spain's Legacy in the Pacific*. San Diego, CA: Maritime Museum of San Diego, 2006.

Spennemann, Dirk R. *The June 1846 Eruption of Fonualei Volcano, Tonga: An Historical Analysis*. Albury, N.S.W.: The Johnstone Centre, 2004.

Stafford, Donald Murray. *A Wild Wind from the North: Hongi Hika's 1823 Invasion of Rotorua*. Auckland: Reed Books, 2007.

Steadman, David W. *Extinction and Biogeography of Tropical Pacific Birds*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 2006.

Steinen, Karl von den. *Les marquisiens et leur art: étude sur le développement de l'art ornemental primitif des mers du sud d'après des résultats personnels d'une mission et les collections des musées*. 2 vols. Puna'auia, Tahiti: Musée de Tahiti et des îles, 2005.

Stoddart, David R. ed. *Tsunamis and Coral Reefs*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution, 2007.

Strachan, Stuart, and Linda Tyler, eds. *Ka Taoka Hakena: Treasures from the Hocken Collections*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2007.

Tawhai, Alice. *Luminous*. Wellington: Huia, 2007.

Te Awekotuku, Ngahuia, and Linda Waimarie Nikora. *Mau Moko: The World of Maori Tattoo*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Teitelbaum, James. *Tiki Road Trip*. 2nd ed. Santa Monica, CA: Santa Monica Press, 2007.

Treadway, Julian. *Dancing, Dying, Crawling, Crying: Stories of Continuity and Change in the Polynesian Community of Tikopia*. Suva: Inst. of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific, 2007.

Trompf, Garry W. *Religions of Melanesia: A Bibliographic Survey*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers, 2006.

Viana, Augusto V. de. *In the Far Islands: The Role of Natives from the Philippines in the Conquest, Colonization and Repopulation of the Mariana Islands, 1668–1903*. Manila: Univ. of Santo Tomas, 2004.

Vogt, Scott R., and Laura L. Williams. *Common Flora and Fauna of the Mariana Islands*. Saipan: S. R. Vogt & L. L. Williams, 2004.

*Voices of Pacific Island Women Residing in the Pacific Northwest: Reflections on Health, Economics, Education and More*. San Francisco: Pacific Island Women's Association, 2006.

Von Holt, Ida Elizabeth Knudsen. *Stories of Long Ago, Niihau, Kauai, Oahu*. Honolulu: Daughters of Hawai'i, 2004. Reprint of 1985 edition.

Walker, Paora. *Maori: A Visitor's Guide*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Walter, Annie, and Vincent Lebot. *Gardens of Oceania*. Canberra: Australian Centre of International Agricultural Research, 2007.

Webb, Jen, and Kavita Nandan, eds. *Writing the Pacific: An Anthology*. Suva: Pacific Writing Forum, 2007.

Weir, Jim. *Strong Language: Very Quotable New Zealand Quotes*. Auckland: New Holland, 2007.

Wesley-Smith, Terence. *China in Oceania: New Forces in Pacific Politics*. Honolulu: East-West Center, 2007.

Whistler, W. Arthur. *Samoan Herbal Medicine*. Lawai, HI: National Tropical Botanical Garden, 2006.

Whittaker, Robert J., and Jose Maria Fernandez-Palacios. *Island Biogeography: Ecology, Evolution, and Conservation*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.

Wiart, Christophe. *Medicinal Plants of Asia and the Pacific*. Milton Park, N.S.W.: CRC Press, 2006.

Williams, Julie Stewart. *Moloka'i: Where I Live*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Schools Press, 2006.

Williams, Tony. *101 Incredible Kiwis: How New Zealanders Lead the World*. Auckland: Reed, 2007.

Wiri, Kingi Robert J. *Te Ao Maori: The Maori World*. Auckland: Reed Publications, 2007.

Wolfe, Richard, and Stephen Barnett. *From Jandals to Jaffas: The Best of Kiwiana*. Rev. ed. Auckland: Random House, 2003.

Wood-Ellem, Elizabeth, ed. *Tonga and the Tongans: Heritage and Identity*. Alphington, Vic.: Tonga Research Association, 2007.

## CONTRIBUTORS

**William W. Donner,** Anthropology Department, Kutztown University, Kutztown, PA 19530 USA. E-mail: donner@kutztown.edu

**Emanuel J. Drechsel,** Interdisciplinary Studies, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, 2500 Dole St., Honolulu, HI 96822 USA.

**Laura Schuft,** Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis & Université de la Polynésie Française, URMIS, Université de Nice, CNRS, 24 avenue des Diables Bleus, 06300 Nice, France. E-mail: schuft@unice.fr

**Ceridwen Spark,** Monash University, School of Political and Social Inquiry, Faculty of Arts, Victoria 3800, Australia. E-mail: Ceridwen.Spark@arts.monash.edu.au

**George M. Williams,** Professor Emeritus, Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Chico, 13246 W. Castlebar Dr., Sun City West, AZ 85375 USA and 84-718 Ala Mahiku St. 76C, Wai'anae, HI 96792 USA. E-mail: georgewilliams2@mac.com

**The Pacific Institute**

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY HAWAI'I

0275-3596(200806)31:2;1-U