

**TĀ, VĀ, AND MOANA: TEMPORALITY, SPATIALITY,
AND INDIGENEITY**

Hūfanga 'Okusitino Māhina

*Vava'u Academy for Critical Inquiry and Applied Research
Tonga and Aotearoa New Zealand*

*In fond memory of the late Dr. Garth Rogers, the late Rev. Dr. Sione Lātūkefu,
the late Professor Epeli Hau'ofa, and the late Professor Futa Helu, who are
behind us, in the past, yet before us, in the present.*

This article is derived from the common theme of an ASAO symposium—“Genealogies: Articulating Indigenous Anthropology in/of Oceania”—which raises critical questions of some conflicting spatiotemporal, substantial-formal, and (functional) nature. From reasons that will follow, I would like to make it clear from the outset that I will adopt the ethnographic indigenous-based, internally mediated name Moana in place of the problematic foreign-led, externally imposed label Oceania or, for that matter, Pacific (Ka'ili 2005, 2007; Māhina 1999a, 2008c). Some of the questions relating to anthropology and indigeneity in relation to Moana anthropology and Moana cultures will be focused on critically. As an exercise in realist critical anthropology, where indigenous culture as its actual subject matter of historical investigation is approached philosophically, this article will critique the contradictory spatiotemporal, substantial-formal (and functional) relationships within and across anthropology as an academic discipline and culture as a human practice. Of special interests will be a critical examination of genealogy as an “intersecting” temporal-spatial, formal-substantial (and functional) human phenomenon, across nature, mind, and society (see Bott 1982; Gailey 1987; Herda 1988, 1995). Such a critique will be made in the broader context of the newly emerged general time-space theory of

reality based on Moana concepts and practices *tā* and *vā*, Tongan for “time” and “space” (Māhina 2002a, 2002b, 2004a, 2004c, 2008b, 2008c; also see Ka’ili 2005, 2007; Kalāvite 2010; Potauaine 2010; Williams 2009).

Time, Space, and Reality: A General *Tā-Vā* Theory

Over the past decade, I have been developing a new general *tā-vā* (time-space) theory of reality (Māhina 2008b; Māhina, Ka’ili, and Ka’ili 2006; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007) with a number of Moana scholars, notably, Dr. Tēvita O. Ka’ili, Dr. Nuhisifa Williams, and Dr. Telēsia Kalāvite (Ka’ili 2005, 2007; Kalāvite 2010; Williams 2009), who are in the forefront in its continuing advancement. This time-space theory is based on the Moana concepts and practices *tā* and *vā*,¹ Tongan for “time” and “space.” Given both the generality and the formality informing the theory, it enters all fields of studies, as in the case of anthropology and education. By advancing this novel *tā-vā* theory, Dr. Ka’ili, Dr. Williams, and Dr. Kalāvite effectively utilized it in their investigations of Tongan migration and Pacific education, respectively. The critical unraveling of their subject matters of inquiry demonstrated the conflicting spatio-temporal, substantial-formal (and practical) underpinnings of migration and education as disciplinary practices and forms of social activity.

Several of its general and specific tenets include the following:

- that ontologically *tā* and *vā* are the common medium in which all things are, in a single level of reality;
- that epistemologically *tā* and *vā* are socially arranged in different ways across cultures;
- that all things, in nature, mind, and society, stand in eternal relations of exchange, giving rise to conflict or order;
- that conflict and order are of the same logical status in that order is in itself an expression of conflict;
- that *tā* and *vā* are the abstract dimensions of *fuo* (form) and *uho* (content), which are, in turn, the concrete dimensions of *tā* and *vā*; and
- that *tā* and *vā*, like *fuo* and *uho*, are indivisible in both mind as in reality (cf. Adam 1990; Anderson 1962, 2007; Harvey 1990, 2000; Mitchell 2004).

On both the ontological and epistemological levels, a series of idealist, dualist, and relativist problems are caused by the separation of mind from spatiotemporality, substantiality-formality, and the failure of mind to comprehend spatiotemporal, substantial-formal (and functional) conflicts at the

interface of human cultures (Anderson 1962, 2007; Helu 1999; Māhina 1999c, 2004b; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007). From a realist viewpoint, as opposed to an idealist assertion, the problems caused by separation of mind from reality demonstrate the historical fact that errors in thinking are a problem of mind but not of reality (Māhina 1999c, 2004b, 2008b, 2008c; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina, 2007).

Generally, in the Moana, time and space are culturally ordered and historically altered in plural, cultural, collectivistic, holistic, and circular modes, in stark contrast to their usual cultural ordering and historical altering in the West, in singular, technoteleological, individualistic, atomistic, and linear ways (Māhina 1999c, 2004a, 2004b, 2008c; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007). Whereas the Tongan time-space sense is philosophically informed by a realist expression of empiricism, classicism, and aestheticism, the Western view is problematized by a strict idealist impression of rationalism, evolutionism, and relativism (Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina, 2007).

The plural, cultural, collectivistic, holistic, and circular nature of Moana thinking and practice about time and space are reflected in their formal, substantial (and functional) arrangement of the past, present, and future. Herein, people are thought to walk forward into the past and walk backward into the future, both taking place in the present, where the past and future are constantly mediated in the ever-transforming present (Hau'ofa 2000; Māhina 2004b, 2004c, 2010b; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007).² The past has stood the test of time and space, and it must therefore be placed in front of people as a guidance in the present, and because the future has yet to happen, it must be placed to the back of or behind people in the present, where both past and future are symmetrically negotiated in the process. In the West, however, the past, present, and future are lineally structured, with future and past placed in the front and back of people in the present, in a singular, technoteleological, and evolutionary manner.

The West and the Moana, for example, have entered into ongoing relations of exchange since their initial point of contact. These continuing exchange relations or points of intersection are largely asymmetrical and more often than not favor the West. This form of asymmetry is expressed in terms of time-space, form-content (and functional) contradictions at the axis of Western and Moana cultures, within and across nature, mind, and society (see Hau'ofa 1993; Huntington 2004).³ These spatiotemporal, substantial-formal (and utility-driven) conflicts are prevalent across the whole physical, psychological, and social realms, as most evident generally in the fields of development, governance, and education (see Gailey 1987; Helu 1999; Lockwood 2004; Māhina 1997, 2004b).

As a post-World War II, Western-driven concept and practice, development can be defined as a capitalist economic instrument for the supposed mediation of cultural and historical conflicts at the crossroad of traditionalism and modernity. Similarly, governance can be characterized as a post-Cold War, Western-led concept and practice, a democratic political tool for the proposed negotiation of cultural and historical tensions at the intersection of modernization and globalization (see Gailey 1987; Hau'ofa 1993; Lawson 1996; Lockwood 2004; Māhina 2004a). In reality, economics and politics, like culture and history, are indivisible entities. However, the enforced dualistic separation of development from governance, like the severance of utility of education from its quality or division of knowledge application from knowledge production, amounts to serious problems, commonly faced by Moana peoples across the whole physical, psychological, and social spectrum. These physical, emotional, and social problems are caused not only by the separation of mind from reality but also by the failure of mind to understand intercultural conflicts between the West and the Moana (Māhina 2002a).

The growing existentialist sense of anthropocentrism, egocentrism, and utilitarianism beneath Western capitalism and democracy, as are Western science⁴ and technology, has been largely responsible for the singular, technoteological, individualistic, analytical, and linear fashion in which time and space are organized (Māhina 2004b; Māhina, Māhina, and Māhina 2007; cf. Hau'ofa 1993; Harvey 1990, 2000; Huntington 2004). This rather alarming trend is evident in the world political economy, as in the control of flow of material, intellectual, and human resources across boundaries, localities, and identities. Such a disturbing drift is made manifest in the rupturing of the mutually holistic, symbiotic human-environment relationships, ideologically sanctioned by development and governance as highly contradictory human phenomena (Adam 1990; Harvey 1990; Hau'ofa 1993; Māhina 1992; Mitchell 2004).

Moreover, both development and governance make use of education as a political economic tool for the exertion of Western control over the Moana. The distinction between quality of education and its utility, education, and training or knowledge production and knowledge application has been problematized in the context of development and governance. Herein, training is given precedence over education, utility of education over its quality, or knowledge application over knowledge production, thereby privileging the technical over the critical (see Hau'ofa 2005; Helu 1999; Phillips 1980). This kind of education strictly engages in turning out doers rather than both thinkers and doers. Sadly, this is reflected in the whole Moana region being consumer led rather than producer led (Māhina, 1997, 2004c).

Education needs to be, at best, both critical and technical, with the critical taking primacy over the technical. A consistent shift from Western imposition to mediation of tensions at the intersection of Western-Moana cultures has been long overdue.⁵ With Western capitalism exacted and executed scientifically, technologically, economically, politically, and, worse still, militarily, it runs the risk of democratic ideals being systematically albeit ideologically undermined (Helu 1999; Lawson 1996; Māhina 1999c, 2004b).

Disciplines and Subject Matters

Academic disciplines are temporally and spatially, formally, and substantially (and functionally) organized along the “fault lines” of nature, mind, and society and taken to be subject matters of investigation, largely ranging from the physical through the mental to the social sciences, as in the case of astronomy, psychology, and anthropology (Anderson 1962; Helu 1999; Huntington 2004; Māhina 1999c). The distinctions between subject matters, as those between disciplines, are fluid rather than rigid in nature. All academic disciplines are concerned primarily with the independent operations of things as they objectively are, in one level of reality, and in opposition to their subjective imagining in terms of what we would prefer them to be (Anderson 1962; Phillips 1980; Māhina 2008a, 2008c).

Interests in the independent temporal-spatial, formal-substantial operations of things, in a single order of being, are the primary focus of all academic disciplines, while the concerns with their functional value are themselves secondary (Anderson 1962; Phillips 1980; Māhina 1997, 1999c). Thus, the academic disciplinary focus is concerned primarily with the intrinsic characteristics of the *fuo* and *uho* (form and content) of things, in a single level of reality, involving the production of knowledge through trial and error, that is, observation, experimentation, and verification. The application of knowledge, produced in this intellectual and practical process extrinsically for human use, is a matter of secondary importance. By implication, the logical order of precedence in the scheme of things that knowledge production always precedes knowledge application (Helu 1999; Māhina 1999c, 2008a, 2008c).

Anthropology and Culture

All academic disciplines and their corresponding subject matters of study are temporally and spatially, formally, and substantially connected. These intrinsic yet contradictory spatiotemporal, substantial-formal connections,

defining all subject matters of investigation within and across nature, mind, and society, constitute the primary focus of all disciplinary practices (Māhina 1997, 1999c; also see Anderson 1962; Helu 1999). A consideration of *‘aonga* (function) of things follows after their form and content have been established in the process, pointing to the historical fact that the epistemological questions are secondary to the ontological questions. In the case of astronomy, psychology and anthropology, for example, their time-space, form-content disciplinary interests are tied in with the behavior of the celestial bodies and working of the human mind as their fields of inquiry respectively (see, e.g., Velt 1990). Likewise, the subject matter of study for the disciplinary practice of anthropology is itself culture.

Culture has a multiplicity of definitions, generally classified into the anthropological and classical types. Anthropologically, culture is defined as the totality of human endeavors, such as techniques, beliefs, rituals, art, religion, and kinship. In classical terms, however, culture is defined as making up of the best and permanent forms of human activity that endure over time and space (Anderson 1962; Hau‘ofa 1993, 2000, 2005; Helu 1999; Māhina 1997). This classical definition can best describe the identity of a people, made up of the things that last over time and space. Of the two definitions, the classical view is by far the most philosophically conclusive in that it has the capacity to historically account for both the synchronic and the diachronic dimensions of culture. As a human practice, culture is made up of historically intersecting forms of social activity, that is, conflicting cultural concepts and practices, which basically constitute the principal focus of anthropology, with realist critical indigenous anthropology as no exception (Māhina 1999c, 2004b, 2004c).

Anthropology “In” and “Of” Moana

While all brands of anthropology are characterized by their unified disciplinary focus, involving the critique of the autonomous working of things as they positively are, in a single level of existence, they are simply differentiated by their separate subject matters of inquiry. Such fields of study of different types of anthropology, be they Moana, African, or Asian anthropology, which commonly focus on how things work freely in reality, are themselves culture bound, temporally, spatially (and functionally) demarcated by their relative formal, substantial (and pragmatic) arrangements within and across cultures (Māhina 1999c; cf. Hau‘ofa 1975, 2000, 2005).

Herein, a number of problematic questions arise that include, inter alia (Hau‘ofa 1993, 2000; Māhina 1999c, 2004b) the following: What is indigenous anthropology? Is it Moana, African or Asian anthropology, as in the

case of British, American, or French anthropology? In a way, indigenous anthropology often refers to its subject matter and place (e.g., culture of Moana, Africa, or Asia) and confined “to” and practiced “in” those localities. This is opposed to its Western sense, say, British, American, or French anthropology, with a reference to anthropologists as practitioners, such as Malinowski, Boas, or Levi-Strauss (Hau’ofa 1993; Helu 1999; Ka’ili 2005, 2007; Māhina 1999c).

The distinction between indigenous anthropology “in” and indigenous anthropology “of” Moana is highly problematic, with the former ideological in nature and the latter historical in character (see Crocombe 1975; Hau’ofa 1975, 1993, 2000, 2005; Māhina 1999b; Wesley-Smith, 1995). Anthropology is far more than a confinement to both history and geography, as in Moana anthropology conducted strictly in and restricted only to the place called Moana. Rather, it can be asserted that indigenous anthropology focuses on an historical set of independent physical, psychological, and social characteristics, defined as Moana cultures. This state of affairs, that is, Moana culture, defines the subject matter of investigation of Moana anthropology. A number of serious theoretical and practical flaws of the rationalist, evolutionist, and relativist kind arise when we confine Moana anthropology to a specific temporality and locality. Many of these problems are evident when Moana peoples conceptualize and practice their cultures “away” from and “outside” of the Moana in such places as Australia, Canada, and the United States (Māhina 1999c; cf. Hau’ofa 1975, 1993, 2005). Herein, indigenous anthropology “of” Moana, as opposed to indigenous anthropology “in” Moana, becomes a truly meaningful form of Moana thinking and practice.

Anthropology, History, and Social Genealogy

From a general tā-vā theoretical perspective, I explore genealogy in the context of the disciplinary and social relationships between anthropology and history. Given that all things, in nature, mind, and society, stand in ever-lasting relations of exchange, then anthropology, genealogy, and history are subject to the same logic. Ceaseless as they are, these exchange relations exist in the form of order and conflict. When such relations of exchange acquire order, it results in a condition of symmetry, and, on the other hand, when conflict is inherent in the process, then a state of asymmetry results. Symmetry takes place when these relations of exchange move in equal but opposite ways. In reality, then, order and conflict are logically of the same status, with order as a form of conflict (Ka’ili 2005, 2007; Māhina 2008b, 2008c; Williams 2009).

In disciplinary terms, both anthropology and history deal with contradictory spatiotemporal, substantial-formal relationships within and between order and conflict as changing human entities, taking place across nature, mind, and society (see Māhina 1992). With order and conflict having the same historical status, where order is thought to be synonymous with conflict, then it can be argued that both anthropology and history are concerned primarily with intersecting, intertwining, or conflicting human relationships, where their form, content (and function) are dealt with on the physical, psychological, and social levels. As forms of social activity, culture and history are merely human phenomena, spatiotemporally, substantially-formally (and functionally) differentiated only by their varying rhythms of change, with the former occurring at a slower pace and the latter at a faster rate (Māhina 1992).

Strictly, genealogy, like culture and history, is a human phenomenon. Like culture and history, genealogy is a form of formal, substantial (and practical) intersection, defined by an intermingling of irreconcilable physical, psychological, and social tendencies. Following the general tā-vā theoretical tenet, specifying all things, in nature, mind, and society, as relating in eternal relations of exchange, human genealogy can, thus, be defined as formal, substantial, and functional intersections, linking people physically, emotionally, and socially. Basically, genealogy is connected with human procreation, where the two opposite sexes, that is, men and women, are physically intersected in the process, with their combined genes transmitted through generations (see, e.g., Bott 1982; Gailey 1987; Herda 1988; Moala 1994; Wood-Ellem 1999). This process of genetic transmission results through the interface of connection and separation, behaving in circular modes. In reality, connection and separation, like order and conflict, are one and the same; that is, connection is equal to separation. While genealogy is essentially physical in nature, it is also both emotional and social in character. As a human phenomenon, genealogy is emotionally viewed and, by the same token, socially arranged in different ways in different cultures.

The Tongan word for genealogy is *hohoko*, literally meaning “connecting repeatedly” (see, e.g., Bott 1982; Herda 1988, 1995; Rees 2002). The root word is *hoko*, which means several things: an event, occurrence, or affair that is taking place; connecting or tying together two or more things; ascending to occupy a title, role, or position; being next in line, as in order of persons, events, or things; and a person inheriting another’s physical, emotional and social attributes. The expression *hoko tete’e* refers to a person who inherits largely many of the physical, emotional, and social characteristics of his or her forebears. The phrases *fakahoko fāmili* (connecting

family), *fakahoko kāinga* (connecting extended family), and *fakahoko toto* (connecting blood) commonly refer to the act of vitalizing and revitalizing physical, emotional, and social connections between genealogically related members of a kin group (see, e.g., Gailey 1987; Helu 1999; Moala 1994). Genealogically, the word *toto* is used to mean people who are blood related and an analytical way of talking about the genetically coded DNA (Māhina 2002b).

The thinking and practice hohoko is symbolically likened to a tree, as in the Tongan *lea heliaki* (proverbial saying): ‘*Oku va’ava’a he ko e tangata* (It branches out [like a tree] because it is people) (see Māhina 1992, 2004c; Māhina and Māhina-Tuai 2007; cf. Gifford 1929; Martin 1981; Moala 1994; Rabone 1845; Taliai 1989). As a befitting imagery for genealogy, a real tree, like a symbolized human tree, produces and reproduces *va’a* (branches), like the production and reproduction of *ha’a* (lineages), carried out by means of connection and separation. On the emotional level, members of a kin group who are active and proactive in the revision and standardization of genealogical links are said to be *mata fāmili* (family-oriented-loving face), *mata kāinga* (kin-oriented-loving face), *mata ‘ofa* (loving-hearted face), and *fai fāmili* (family-focused-loving face).⁶ These proverbial expressions point to members of a kin group who are actively engaged in the social process of *tauhivā*, that is, the maintenance of exchange relations within the social unit, on the material, emotional, and social levels, through the performance of their *fatongia* (social obligations; see, e.g., Ka’ili 2005, 2007; Māhina 2002b; Taliai 1989).

As evident, there are formal, substantial, and functional connections between *mata* and *hohoko*, in physical, emotional, and social terms. There is an established way in which Tongans can read the genealogical connections of people on the physical features of their faces. Like the connections between *mata* and *hohoko*, there are those formally, substantially, and functionally linking *mata* and *tufunga lalava*, the material art of line-space intersection. As a material art, *tufunga lalava* is concerned with the production of *kupesī*, complex, elaborate, and beautiful geometric designs, by means of intersecting *kafa kula* (red *kafa-sinnet*) and *kafa ‘uli* (black *kafa-sinnet*), used for holding together house and boat parts.⁷ In terms of gender relations, *kafa kula* and *kafa ‘uli* are treated as *tangata* (male) and *fefine* (female), respectively (Māhina, Ka’ili, and Ka’ili 2006; Potauaine and Māhina 2009). The interlacing formal, substantial, and functional relationships between red and black colors exist within and across the natural, psychological, and social realms, as in *ava kula* (red hole) and *ava ‘uli* (black hole) in nature, *maama* (enlightenment) and *fakapo‘uli* (ignorance) in mind, and *vā lelei* (good relation) and *vā kovi* (bad relation) in society.

The term *kupesi* means two things, namely, mata (facial DNA-induced attributes of people) and kupesi (spiral DNA-like geometric designs). As a technological instrument, *me'afaka'ata* (microscope) functions to bring black-based “inside” of DNA onto the red-led “outside,” in the same way that tufunga lalava, as an artistic device, transforms things from their abstract dimensions to their concrete forms. In both cases, *me'afaka'ata* and tufunga lalava produce DNA and kupesi-related images by means of lineal-spatial, formal-substantial intersection, with the former by way of black-based “inside” and red-led “outside” tendencies and the latter by means of black kafa-sinnet and red kafa-sinnet (Helu 1999; Māhina 2002b; Potauaine and Māhina 2009; Rees 2002). The readability of such facial features is often uttered: “*Sio hifo ki ho matá ko e kupesi 'atā pē ho'ō tamaí 'oku pāpaaki mai*” (“Look at your face where your father’s own design is rightly imprinted; see, e.g., Rabone 1845; Taliai 1989; Tu'inukuafe 1997).

By way of gender relations, there exists a relevant Tongan lea heliaki with a bearing on hohoko, which says, *'Oku fakahokohoko toto 'a fafine ka e fakahokohoko hingoa 'a tangata* (Blood connects through women, and titles through men). By extension, this proverbial saying is borne in the gender division of labor, where the mutually inclusive roles of men and women are merely demarcated in terms of “difference” rather than by way of “status.” This is reflected in the proverbial saying *'Oku falehanga 'a fafine pea 'oku hanga ka e tōkanga 'a tangata pea 'oku manga* (Women possess the house, measured by the hands, and men possess the garden, measured by the feet) (Māhina 2004c; Māhina and Māhina-Tuai 2007; cf. Moala 1994; Rabone 1845; Tu'inukuafe 1997; Taliai 1989). Generally, men are responsible for the production of ngāue, which includes cultivation of crops, domestication of animals, and deep-sea fishing, while women are in charge of the production of koloa, such as fine mats and bark-cloths (Māhina 1992).

In my critical engagement in developing the tā-vā theory of reality (Māhina 2002b, 2004c; Ka'ili 2007; Potauaine 2005; Williams 2009), I have encountered the fact that time and space, as ontological entities, are epistemologically classified along gender lines, in formal, substantial, and functional ways, within and across nature, mind, and society. The epistemological classifications of time and space, therefore, have a bearing on genealogy. This is seen in the treatment of red kafa-sinnet and black kafa-sinnet as male and female, respectively. Belonging in the male realm are tā (time), fuo (form), kula (red), *la'ā* (sun), *'aho* (day), *mo'ui* (life), and maama (enlightenment), and in the female domain are vā (space), uho (content), black 'uli (black), *māhina* (moon), *pō* (night), *mate* (death), and fakapo'uli (ignorance; Māhina, Ka'ili, and Ka'ili 2006; cf. Māhina 2002b; Rees 2002).

Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine, a master of architecture scholar currently working on his thesis, finds that, in Tongan architecture, *fale* (house) is a woman⁸ (Māhina, Dudding, and Māhina-Tuai 2010; Potauaine 2010; Potauaine and Māhina 2009). When it comes to the construction of *fale*, it is said that men are responsible for the *fuo* and women for the *uho*. By *fuo*, reference is made to the task of house building and *uho* to all the activities, such as birth giving, child rearing, child upbringing, and weaving, taking place inside the house. The word for the umbilical cord is *uho*, bearing some genealogical relevance. On the other hand, children with the same mother are referred to as *uho taha* (unified umbilical cord), and those with different mothers are referred to as *uho tau* (warring umbilical cord). Like house building, formally considered a male-centered form of activity, men are likewise said to be in charge only of the *fuo* of the child (see Potauaine 2005; Potauaine and Māhina 2009).

Culture, History, and Intellectual Genealogy

Figuratively, on the intellectual level, connections between teachers and their students can be viewed in genealogical ways. Such genealogical and intellectual connections record the social intercourse of teachers and students as well as the cross-fertilization of their ideas, involving the production of knowledge. My intellectual formation relating to anthropology began some four decades ago, when, in 1972, I entered ‘Atenisi University in Tonga, where I studied Tongan culture under the late Professor Futa Helu. A number of courses, such as Tongan poetry, Tongan music, Tongan dance, Tongan royal kava ceremony, and Tongan oral history, were offered in the Tongan Culture program. There were several culture teachers—poets, musicians, choreographers, orators, and oral historians—who assisted Professor Helu in teaching the Tongan Culture program, such as Malukava (Tēvita Kavaefiafi), Pilvi Moa, Falekāono (Taipaleti Falekāono), Sēmisi ‘Iongi, Peni Tutu‘ila, Nausaimone Tutu‘ila, and Ula Matatoa (Tāufa Nau) (Mēhina 1992, 2004c, 2005b).

At this time, I had my first introduction to anthropology when I took a course on anthropology of religion, together with an exposure to kinship terminologies, taught by anthropologist Professor Steve Carrigues. Given the overall classical emphasis of ‘Atenisi on criticism as a way of life, there were other compulsory courses made available, such as classical languages, pure mathematics, physics, English literature, art history, philosophy, and logic, among others. There was also the formation of a number of extracurricular activities, for example, Friday Night Kava Debaters Society and Afokoula Singers, with the former engaging staff and students in critical talking on almost anything and everything and the latter specializing in

classical Tongan songs and dances and featuring refined works of such great poets as Queen Sālote, Malukava, Afuha'amango (Ula), Taitusi Fūnaki, Uēlingatoni Liu, and many others (see, e.g., Helu 1999; Hixon 2000; Kaeppler 1993; Māhina 1992, 2005b, Moyle 1987; Wood-Ellem 2004; cf. Feldman 1980). Mutually, the aims of both curricular and extracurricular activities serve to aid the formation of critical thinking of both teachers and students in their interactive partnership in constant search of knowledge.

The teaching of courses in philosophy and logic ranging from Greek philosophy through continental philosophy and British philosophy to North American philosophy, as well as formal logic and symbolic logic, was the critical intellectual thread that tied together all courses taught across disciplines (Māhina 1992, 2004c, 2005b). Apart from Tongan culture, Professor Helu also taught alternately philosophy and logic courses throughout the three-term academic year. Professor Helu studied philosophy and logic under the most controversial and influential atheist Australian philosopher, the late Professor John Anderson, Challis Professor of Philosophy, at Sydney University in the late 1950s. Professor Anderson, who, with both rigor and originality, developed realism as a major branch of philosophy into what has come to be known as Sydney realism (Anderson 1962, 2007; Phillips 1980; cf. Anderson, Cullum, and Lycos 1982).

As a philosophical system, Professor Anderson's realism basically advances a theory of independence of reality. Accordingly, this theory puts forward a view that all things exist independently on a single level of reality, (spatiotemporality or four-sided dimensionality), where they are logically connected in eternal relations of exchange. It hinges on the traditional dispute between realism and mind-dependent theories. For realism, the dispute is about ways of being and not about ways of knowledge, arguing that epistemological questions are secondary to ontological questions. Philosophically, realism recognizes the centrality of both complexity and conflict to existence in general (Anderson 1962; Gleick 1987; Māhina 1999c, 2005b; Rimoldi 2004). Through realism, Professor Anderson was led to speak on a group of major topics across entire disciplines, as well as forms of activity across the whole social spectrum, connected with his closely unified but widely ranging views. Evidently, my realist critical anthropology, underpinned by realism, classicism, and aestheticism, puts it in direct conflict with mind-centered anthropological theories, notably functionalism, structuralism, structural-functionalism, poststructuralism, and postmodernism (Māhina 1999c; Rimoldi 2004).

My anthropological view of culture has been hugely influenced by my early exposure to both philosophy and logic at 'Atenisi University. The impact of philosophy and logic in my thinking resulted in the working out

of my realist critical anthropology position. In 1980, I entered the University of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand, where I consolidated my study of anthropology and sociology for a double-major BA degree. There, I came in close contact with a contemporary of Professor Helu at Sydney University, Dr. Max Rimoldi, an economic anthropologist. Like Professor Helu, Dr. Rimoldi also studied philosophy and logic under Professor Anderson in the late 1950s. Given our shared genealogical intellectual connections, Dr. Rimoldi and I continued to commonly promote realist critical anthropology. In reality, however, this common critical engagement was truly met with real intellectual and political resistance (Māhina 1986, 1992, 1999c, 2004c, 2008c; Rimoldi 2004). Despite many obstacles, this critical intellectual partnership culminated in the production of my MA thesis (Māhina 1987), supervised by the late Dr. Garth Rogers and Dr. Rimoldi. During both my undergraduate and my postgraduate years, Marxist anthropologist Dr. Rimoldi and Marxist sociologist Dr. David Bedggood introduced me to Marxism, a conflict and materialist theory that played a crucial role in my intellectual formation (see, e.g., Māhina 1999c, 2004b).

While undertaking my master's studies, I met the late Professor Epeli Hau'ofa, Tonga's first and foremost anthropologist, not to mention the Moana, for the very first time in 1985. An anthropology PhD graduate of the Australian National University, Professor Hau'ofa, together with Rev. Dr. Lātūkefu, and I share a common intellectual genealogy. As a visiting fellow, his wide-ranging expertise was drawn on in talks that materialized in the formation of the Centre for Pacific Studies at the University of Auckland. My contact with Professor Hau'ofa continued in force through our common support of 'Atenisi when we were both involved in many of its curricular and extracurricular activities (Hau'ofa 2005; Māhina 2005b). As one of my PhD thesis (Māhina 1992) examiners, Professor Hau'ofa critically appraised both its strengths and its weaknesses, allowing for the refinement of my realist critical anthropology. Over the years, our shared interests in anthropology, art, and literature increasingly gained momentum in drawing us closer together, especially in light of his unique personality, mentality and sociality, and beautiful sense of humor as well as the originality of his scholarship and creative writings (see, e.g., Hau'ofa 1983, 1993, 1995, 2000, 2005).

My introduction to the work of Professor Hau'ofa took place in my first year as an MA scholar when he engaged the late Professor Ron Crocombe in an interesting debate on a number of issues relating to problematic relationships between Pacific anthropology, Pacific anthropologists, and Pacific people. Professor Hau'ofa (1975: 283–89) argued against the manner in which anthropologists imposed their own cultural values on the cultures of others, as in the case of Professor Marshall Sahlins, whose anthropological

practice was informed by pseudoevolutionary and neoclassical economic perspectives. In reply, Professor Ron Crocombe (1975: 1–9) problematized the issue of insiderism-outsiderism as far from being an ultimate, arguing a case for both its plurality and flexibility. In his seminal essay “Our Sea of Islands,” Professor Hau‘ofa (1993) called for a total shift in the thinking and practice of Pacific/Moana peoples, from seeing Oceania/Moana as “islands in the far seas” to viewing it as “our sea of islands,” that is, from a condition of domination to a state of liberation.¹⁰

In an article, “Theory and Practice in Anthropology: Pacific Anthropology and Pacific Islanders” (Māhina 1999c), I belatedly joined the debate by disputing the insider-outsider distinction as having no intellectual worth, except in the political domain where it rightly belonged, given both its universality and its particularity (Māhina 1992, 2004b). By rethinking Moana/Pacific Islands studies, predominantly yet problematically in functionalist and relativist ways, Wesley-Smith (1995) reviewed the history of the discipline within and across a number of international tertiary institutions as well as its politically led, utility-driven rationales, essentially dealing with the “what does” question to the relative exclusion of the “what is” question.

At the completion of my MA degree with First Class Honors in anthropology (Māhina 1986), in 1986 I rejoined ‘Atenisi University, where I taught courses in anthropology, sociology, and Tongan culture. In late 1987, I took up a PhD scholarship from the Australian National University, Australia, where I studied Moana/Pacific history under the supervision of Dr. Neil Gunson, Dr. Deryck Scarr, and Professor Donald Denoon (Māhina 1992, 1999b). It was here that I came in close affiliation with Tonga’s most senior Moana/Pacific historian, Rev. Dr. Sione Lātūkefu, who was a senior fellow in the Department of Pacific and Asian History, where he did his PhD degree under the supervision of Dr. Gunson (see, e.g., Lātūkefu 1968, 1974). As an original and substantial contribution, I developed a realist philosophical theory of the study of mythology, oratory and poetry, based on Tongan artistic and literary device *heliaki*, meaning symbolically saying one thing but really meaning another (Māhina 1999b, 2003b, 2011; Māhina and ‘Alatini 2007). From a realist philosophical angle, symbols are taken to be merely “pointers” to reality (Anderson 1962; Helu 1999; Māhina 1992, 2004c, 2005b). It therefore calls for a rigorous distinction made between the symbolic and the historical, thereby giving both written history and oral history the same logical status, differentiated only by the respective media in which they are transmitted in time and space.

As a further refinement on this new line of theoretical development, *heliaki* has been found to have two types: qualitative, epiphoric *heliaki* and associative, metaphoric *heliaki* (Māhina 2004c, 2005a, 2008b, 2008c; cf.

Crittenden 2003). The former involves the exchange of qualities between two closely connected objects, events, or states of affairs—for example, *la'ā* (sun) for *tu'i* (monarch) and *la'ātō* (sunset) for mate (death)—and the latter to be the exchange of qualities between two culturally and historically associated objects, events, or states of affairs—for example, *Taulanga Tuku mo Failā* (City of Sails) for Auckland and *'Otumotu Anga'ofa* (Friendly Islands) for Tonga. Basically, the eternal relations of exchange in both cases of *heliaki* exist in the form of intersection, where conflicting spatiotemporal, substantial-formal (and functional) relationships between objects, events, or state of affairs are symmetrically mediated in the creative process.

After completing my PhD degree in 1992, I was appointed to a lectureship position at the newly established Auckland's Massey University–Albany Campus, Aotearoa New Zealand, in 1993. As a foundation member, I was responsible for teaching several Moana-related courses and curriculum development, as well as postgraduate supervision, in the Department of Social Policy and Social Work. In mid-1994, I moved back to the University of Auckland, where I was appointed a lecturer in anthropology at the Tamaki Campus. As a double appointment, my colleague Dr. Penelope Schoeffel-Meleisea and I were in charge of setting up the Anthropology of Development program. During my time at the University of Auckland, I introduced new courses in Pacific/Moana political economy and Pacific/Moana arts, teaching them until I left in 2008 for Auckland's Massey University. My former teachers Dr. Rimoldi and Dr. Steve Webster and I collaborated in teaching an MA course in economic anthropology, with a specific focus on culture and development, which I continued to teach after their retirement in 2003.

I took leave of absence from the University of Auckland between 1997 and 1999, when I was appointed director of 'Atenisi Institute, taking over from my former teacher Professor Helu. In addition to being director, I was also appointed dean of 'Atenisi University, where I was professor of Tongan studies. Both the diversity and the multiplicity of cultural and intellectual experiences in thinking, teaching, and writing over the years inspired me into critically rethinking both old and new problems in novel ways. When I resumed my position at the University of Auckland in 2000, I had already actively engaged in the development of the new general *tā-vā* theory of reality (Māhina 2002a, 2002b, 2003b, 2004a, 2004c, 2005b, 2008b, 2008c), which I began to present in seminars and international conferences. I have published extensively on this theory, mainly in the form of book chapters and journal articles, ranging from culture, history, and political economy through art, literature, and language to education, research, and transcultural psychology.

My supervision of both Moana and non-Moana students, as well as connection with other scholars through other media, has ignited great passions in them for use of the theory. In 2001, both Dr. Ka'ili and Dr. Williams came across the *tā-vā* theory for the first time when I presented a paper relating to some aspects of it at a Tongan History Association (TRA) conference held at the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, United States.¹¹ Subsequently, both of them applied the theory in the investigation of the respective subject matters of their doctoral projects, taking the lead in its further advancement (Ka'ili 2007; Williams 2009). Dr. Ka'ili examined migration as a human phenomenon, involving spatiotemporal movement of people in time and space (Ka'ili 2005, 2007). On the other hand, Dr. Williams critiqued education as a dialectical spatiotemporal, formal-substantial (and practical) transformation of the human intellect from ignorance to knowledge to skills (Williams 2009; cf. Māhina 2008c). Dr. Ka'ili, Dr. Williams, Fetongikava Dr. Viliami Uasikē Lātū (2006), a former student, and I have continued to work on a number of book projects, some of which have resulted in single-authored, coauthored, and coedited published books.

Several other PhD scholars have embraced the theory in their inquiry and research, such as Helen Erana Ferris-Leary, Micah van der Ryn, Sione Vaka, Leonaitasi Hoponoa, Siosiu Lafitani Pouvalu Tōfua'ipangai, and Malia Talakai, from across Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia, and The Netherlands. Their topics of investigation range from dance and architecture through mental health and youth to intellectual property and policy. As a common focus, they deal with time-space, form-content (and practical) intersecting human meanings, that is, conflict. A couple of master's students of architecture, Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine (2005, 2010) and Bruce Moa, are utilizing the theory in their inquiry into Tongan architecture. In their separate projects, they collectively inquire into material art of architecture as formally and substantially (and functionally) intersecting *kohi* (lines) and *vā* (spaces), with wood, stones, steel, and glass as a medium and human use as its function.

A group of us villagers from the village of Tefisi-Nga'akau on the island of Vava'u, Tonga, got together in 2003 to form the Tefisi-Nga'akau Village Education and Development Trust (TEVDT), legally registered in both Tonga and Aotearoa New Zealand. The aims and objectives of the TEVDT are to promote education in the community, with knowledge production taking the lead over knowledge application, on all levels and in all contexts. Our Dr. 'Okusitino Māhina Education Centre was officially opened in 2007, together with the establishment of Vava'u Academy for Critical Inquiry and Applied Research (VACIAR), of which I am founder-director

(Māhina, Potauaine, ‘Alatini, Māhina-Tuai, Māhina, and Māhina 2007). The idea is to establish a small teaching-based and research-led university for Vava‘u, given the extremely high demand, but because of a lack of resources, VACIAR is currently research based and publication driven. VACIAR has formed two publishing arms in New Zealand: Lo‘au Research Society Publishing and Kula-‘Uli Publishing, with the former for academic publications and the latter for children’s books.¹²

Art as Genealogy of Times and Spaces

Art as genealogy of times and spaces suggests that art is a form of intersection of lines and spaces. Apart from form, beat, or cycle, time manifests itself by way of line. On the one hand, genealogy as a form of humanity is an outcome of formally, substantially (and functionally) intersecting physical, emotional, and social tendencies. On the other, art is a form of human activity, a product of temporally, spatially (and practically) intersecting material, psychological, and social entities. Deriving from the general *tā-vā* (time-space) theory of reality, art can, thus, be defined as *tā-vā* (time-space) transformation, where conflicts in *fuo-uho* (form-content) are symmetrically mediated to produce *potupotutatau* (harmony) (Māhina 2004a). This state of harmony is itself *mālie* or *faka‘ofo‘ofa* (beauty). Therefore, the form and content of subject matters of art under the creative process, such as language for poetry, sound for music, and bodily movements for dance, are spatiotemporally transformed from a condition of *felekeu* (chaos) to a state of *maau* (order).

The art exhibition “Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohotohi” at the Govett-Brewster Art Gallery for contemporary arts in New Plymouth, Aotearoa New Zealand, in 2002, by internationally renowned Tongan tufunga lalava artist Sopolemalama Filipe Tohi, exhibited his new works produced in novel forms and media on the material art tufunga lalava. Based on my exhibition floor talk, I wrote a chapter titled “Tufunga lalava: The Tongan art of lineal and spatial intersection” (Māhina 2002b), published in the exhibition catalog “Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohitohi” (Rees 2002). Coincidentally, the word *tohi*, as in the last name of the artist Tohi, means “writing,” defined by a multiplicity of intersecting lines and spaces. Therefore, Tohi, like tufunga lalava, is “intersector of lines and spaces.” The older form of *tohi* is *kohi*, as seen in their elongation, that is, *tohitohi* and *kohikohi*. The entire heavens, configured by intersecting celestial bodies in the form of a huge gridlike, web-type *kupesi* (geometric design) called *kupenga* (fishnet),¹³ of extreme navigational significance, are called *kohi-‘a-Velenga*, literally “writing-of-god-Velenga” (Māhina 1992, 2002b; Rees 2002; cf. Velt 1990).

Tongan art can be generally divided into three types: *faiva* (performance), *tufunga* (material), and *nimamea'a* (fine) arts (Māhina, 2002b, 2008b, 2008c). Conversely, Tongan art is genealogically connected in temporal and spatial ways within and across the three genres. All three terms—*faiva*, *tufunga*, and *nimamea'a*—are constitutive of time and space. The words *faiva*, *tufunga*, and *nimamea'a* literally mean “do-time-in-space,” “beat-space,” and “hand-marking-time-space,” respectively. Also, the word *nimamea'a* literally means “fine-hands,” hence the naming of fine arts *nimamea'a*. Generally, *faiva* and *tufunga* are male dominated, and *nimamea'a* is female centered. It is interesting to take note of the classification of Tongan art into three genres and its alignment to a distinction between body itself and outside-of-body. Performance arts are found to be based on *sino* (body centered) and both material and fine arts on *tu'asino* (non-body centered). Common to all three arts is, in fact, the intersection of either human meanings or lines and spaces or a mixture of both.

In Tonga, at least in ancient times, most, if not all, forms of social activity were classified under the three types of arts. It is, therefore, not surprising to see the high level of refinement and attainment associated with many, if not all, arts. The overseeing of such forms of social practice was in the hands of ha'a professional classes¹⁴ who carried them out with a high degree of specialization. All forms of human activity were produced with both quality and utility. The same was true of arts, where both quality and utility were mutually, symbiotically in coexistence. Although things were made primarily for consumption, when it came to production, quality took precedence over utility. Not only were things made to be *faka'ofa'ofa* (beautiful),¹⁵ but they were equally made to be *'aonga* (useful). Both the *ngaohi* (production)¹⁶ and *tufotufa* (distribution) were controlled by ha'a professionals, leaving *faka'aonga* (consumption) more a matter of generalized public enterprise. The strict control over both production and distribution, as opposed to consumption, meant that knowledge and skills connected with such professions were the possession of a privileged specialized few (Māhina, 1992, 1999b, 2008b).

The transformative, investigative, and communicative nature of art relates to both its intrinsic and its extrinsic qualities. The former deals with “what-is-of-art,” that is, art for art's sake, while the latter with “what-does-of-art,” that is, art in society (Anderson, Cullum, and Lycos 1982; Māhina 1999a, 2002b, 2004a, 2005a, 2008c). By intrinsic qualities, reference is made to such qualities as *tatau* (symmetry), *potupotutatau* (harmony), and *mālie* (beauty) internal to art. On the other hand, the extrinsic qualities are *māfana* (warmth), *vela* (fieriness), and *tauēlangi* (climaxed elation). There is, then, a suggestion of a formal-substantial transformation of fiery, energy-like matter, a sustained spatiotemporal movement of emotional states from

warmth to fieriness to climaxed elation. While the internal qualities of art are strictly spatiotemporal, the external ones are essentially sociofunctional. As a process, the internal qualities of art precede their external qualities, defined as outcome (Gell 1998; Thomas 1995; cf. Kaepler 1993; Layton 1991; Hereniko 1995; Moyle 1987). The term *tauēlangi* literally means “reaching-the-sky,” pointing to a dialectical time-space movement of sustained series of conflict and resolution, as in the case of poetry, music, and dance. The association with *langi* (sky) depicts an emotional state of some “divine” experience characteristic of this noble feeling.¹⁷

The differentiation between *mālie* (good) and *palakū* (bad) works of art hinges on the distinction between their internal and external qualities (Māhina 2005b). The impact of good works of art, in contrast to bad works of art, on both performers and viewers is materialized in terms of warmth, fieriness, and climaxed elation. Good works of art internally display *tatau*, *potupotutatau* and *mālie/faka’ofo’ofa*, resulting in the generation of external feelings of *māfana*, *vela*, and *tauēlangi*. All good works of art are, by their own nature, symmetrical, harmonious, and beautiful. In poetry, music, and dance, for example, the production of these intrinsic qualities is carried out by artistic and literary devices: *heliaki*, *tu’akautā*, and *hola*, respectively. As devices, they further spatiotemporally subdivide formal and substantial divisions of meanings, tones, and bodily movements through a continuous chain of separation and connection or conflict and resolution.¹⁸ The term *hola*, literally referring to “escape,” is often interchanged with the respective words *kaiha’asi* and *haka-funga-haka*, literally pointing to “steal” and “movement-on-top-of-another.” Likewise, the word *tu’akautā* literally means “beat-outside-beats,” a reference to a beat inside yet outside two existing beats. Like *heliaki*, a time-space, form-content subdivision of human meanings, *tu’akautā* and *hola* are expressed as a subdivision by means of a repetition of defined intersection and mediation, with mediation itself a form of intersection (Māhina 2003b, 2004c, 2005b, 2008c; cf. Helu 1999; Kaepler 2005; Moyle 1987).

In existing literature on Tongan art, *faiva* has been mistakenly observed to consist entirely of *faiva ta’anga* (poetry), *faiva hiva* (music), and *faiva haka* (dance) (Helu 1999; Kaepler 1993, 2005, 2007; Moyle 1987). Such an error in thinking is clouded by their naturally closer formal, substantial, and functional relationships, when a poem is composed, then put to a song and a dance. As a matter of fact, Tongan *faiva* is more extensive than has been earlier thought and includes the locally developed arts *faiva heulupe* (pigeon snaring), *faiva fānifo* (surfing),¹⁹ and *faiva fuhu* (boxing) as well as the introduced arts *faiva ’akapulu* (rugby playing), *faiva kilikiti* (cricket playing), *faiva tekapulu* (bowling), and many others. By extension, the fact

that *tufunga lalava* (house kafa-sinnet lashing), *tufunga langafale* (house building), and *tufunga fo'uvaka* (boat engineering) are in close formal, substantial, and functional proximity does not mean that *tufunga* is confined to them. There are other *tufunga*, such as locally developed *tufunga fonua* (social engineering), *tufunga lea* (speech designing), and *tufunga tātatau* (tattooing), as are introduced arts such as *tufunga langauafu* (wharf engineering), *tufunga langa'ā* (fence building), and *tufunga ngaohihala* (road building), among others (see, e.g., Māhina, Ka'ili, and Ka'ili 2006).

Tongan arts are genealogically connected within and across all three genres, either as a conflict in human meanings or as an intersection of lines and spaces. Take, for example, *faiva fakaoli* (comedy) and *faiva fakamahi* (tragedy), both of which deal with mediation of contradictions in thinking. Comedy is concerned with the mediation of conflicts at the interface of *ngalivale* (absurdity) and *ngalipoto* (normality), with *kata* (laughter) as its outcome. Similarly, tragedy involves negotiation of contradictions in thinking at the interface of *anga'i manu* (animality) and *anga'i tangata* (sociality), resulting in *fakamā* (shame). As works of mind, comedy and tragedy are an inquiry into human conditions, including mind. In comedy, transformation from self-ignorance to self-knowledge is celebrated through laughter, with self now being conscious of the commission of an error. A parallel transition underlies tragedy, where failure of conformity to a specific moral code is condemned through shame, allowing for self-reflection on such a behavior typified as animalistic (Māhina 2008b, 2011; see also, e.g., Chapman and Foot 1976; Hereniko 1995; Piddington 1963; cf. Feldman 1981).

Generally, material arts are connected with intersecting lines and spaces, as shown by *tufunga tātatau* (tattooing) and *tufunga tāmaka* (stonecutting). In tattooing, the intertwining lines and spaces are expressed by means of *vaitohi 'uli* (black ink) and *kili kula* (red skin), with *sino* (body) merely a *vaka* (medium). The word *vaitohi* literally means “line-marking-fluid,” that is, a time marker of body as space. Not that time and space are separate, as if time is privileged over and distinct from space, for both entities are inseparable in reality. The tempo lining of body as a spatial entity is done in terms of *kupesi*, produced by *tufunga lalava* as a master art of lineal-spatial intersection. While tattooing and stonecutting share things in common, they do differ in others (Māhina 2002b, 2005b, 2008c). Common to both art forms are line-space interlacing, as well as both deriving from *kupesi*, differentiated by their separate contents, with tattooing and stonecutting made through tempo making of body and stone as their respective media. The devices used for line marking of body and stone are named *hui* (needle) and *toki* (adze), respectively, and their sharp points are called *mata'i hui* (eye of the needle) and *mata'i toki* (eye of the adze).²⁰ The “eyes”

or sharp points of such tempo-making tools are themselves a form of intersection. Their temporal configurations as spatial entities demonstrate the divisibility of *tā-vā* and *fuo-uho* on both abstract and concrete levels.

Like material arts, fine arts are concerned principally with line-space intertwining. Fine arts include *nimamea'a lālānga* (mat weaving), *nimamea'a koka'anga* (bark-cloth making), and *nimamea'a tuikakala* (flower-design plaiting) (Māhina 2002b, 2005b, 2007, 2008b, 2008c). As clear in both mat weaving and bark-cloth making, their individual contents are made up of formally interlacing lines and spaces made up of leaves and barks of pandanus and mulberry plants. The carefully processed leaves and tree barks are their medium. As for *fala* making, the preparation of dried leaves is called *tohi fe'unu*, that is, the creation of finely produced, lining threads of leaves (Māhina 2002b; Rees 2002). The word *fe'unu* literally means “multiple-shifting,” that is, symmetrical mediation of interlacing, line marking threads of dried, treated leaves. Like the devices *hui* and *toki* for tattooing and stonecutting, the instrument for *tohi fe'unu* is called *kapa tohife'unu*, literally meaning “line-marking metal,” and its intersected, sharp point *mata'i kapa*, that is, “eye of the metal.”²¹ In *ngatu* making, the production of intersecting lines and spaces is done in the form of intertwining treated *koka kula* (red koka tree sap) and *tongo 'uli* (black tongo tree sap), based on *kupesi* derived from *tufunga lalava*. Like the device *kapa tohife'unu* for mat weaving, the intersection-produced instrument used for *ngatu* making is *fo'ifā*, a sharp-pointed, brushlike pandanus fruit.

Conclusion: A Matter of Implication

The specificity underpinning this article is a particular theoretical, practical, and ethnographic approach to the generality underlying the unique theoretical, practical, and ethnographic theme of the symposium. By articulating the spatiotemporal, formal-substantial (and functional) relationships between anthropology and indigeneity on the one hand and Moana anthropology and Moana cultures on the other, I situated the problematic issues arising in the broader context of the general *tā-vā* theory of reality. In doing so, I found theory, practice, and ethnography at the base of both essay and symposium in close spatiotemporal, substantial-formal, and functional affinity. From a *tā-vā* theoretical view, genealogy merges with the fact that all things, in nature, mind, and society, enter into eternal relations of exchange where conflict and order are mediated through symmetry. As a human phenomenon, genealogy is about people who cross paths in physical, emotional, and social ways, culturally ordered and historically altered through intersection and separation. By way of articulation, I critiqued both

cultural and historical tensions in temporal-spatial, formal-substantial, and practical connections within and across social, intellectual, and artistic and literary genealogies. As established, intersection and mediation, separation and connection, or conflict and resolution, like time and space or form and content, are inseparable in reality. Like all exchange relations, within and across nature, mind, and society, genealogy embraces both conflict and resolution, with resolution itself a form of conflict.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank organizers for the opportunity to be part of the symposium, where we freely reflected on fundamental issues of great significance to our common struggle in the field, and, more important, for accepting my piece for inclusion in this collection of critical essays. I must thank all the people with whom I have crossed paths over the years of my intellectual struggle for all the actively engaging yet exciting *talanoa*, most of which have not been reflectively interrogated yet now critically intertwined in this article. Many thanks go to Dr. Max Rimoldi, Dr. Tēvita O. Ka'ili, Rob Leary, and Helen Erana Ferris-Leary for all the endless *talanoa*, talking critically yet harmoniously. To the blind reviewers, I thank you too for casting a critical eye over this article. Last but not least, I must thank Dr. Ka'ili, Dr. Nuhisifa Seve-Williams, Sēmisi Fetokai Potauaine, Kolokesa Uafā Māhina-Tuai, Mele Ha'amoā Māhina 'Alatini, and 'Aisea Nau Matthew Māhina for constructively and reflectively reading and commenting on an earlier draft. To you all, ladies and gentlemen, I say *mālō 'aupito!*

Glossary of Tongan Words, Idioms, and Proverbs

Words

'aho	day; symbol for men
'akapulu, faiva	rugby playing, art of
'aonga	useful
fa'a, ha'a	cultivators and domesticators, class of
faiva, ha'a	performance artists, class of
fafine	plural for women
faiva	performance art
faiva, ha'a	performance artists, class of
faka'aonga	make use
fakamamahi, faiva	tragedy, art of
faka'ofa'ofa	used for <i>tufunga</i> ; see <i>mālie</i>
fakaoli, faiva	comedy, art of
fakapo'uli	darkness; symbol for ignorance
fala	mat
fānifo, faiva	surfing, art of
fatongia	social obligation
fatu	formal word for create
fa'u	create

fefine	woman
felekeu	chaos
fe'unu	dried line-marking leave threads
fuhu, faiva	boxing, art of
fonua, tufunga	social engineering, art of
fo'u	same for fa'u
fo'uvaka, tufunga	boat building, art of
fuo; fõtunga	form
fuo-uho	form-content
ha'a	professional class
haka, faiva	dance, art of
haka-funga-haka	dance device; see hola and kaiha'asi
heliaki	poetic device
heulupe, faiva	pigeon snaring, art of
hiva, faiva	music, art of
hola	dance device; see kaiha'asi and haka-funga-haka
hoko	connect; join
hohoko	genealogy
hui	needle
kā	Hawaiian for tā
kafa	sinnet
kaiha'asi	dance device; see hola and haka-funga-haka
kakano	content; flesh
kanoloto	content
kapa tohife'unu	device for line-marking dried leave threads
kata	laugh; laughter
kavenga	social burden
kilikiti, faiva	cricket, art of
koka kula	red koka tree sap
koka'uli	black tongo tree sap
koka'anga, nimamea'a	bark-cloth making, art of
koloa	women's wealth
kuongaloto	literally "age-in-the-middle"; present
kuongamu'a	literally "age-in-the-front"; past
kuongamui	literally "age-in-the-back"; future
kupe	intersect
kupenga	fishnet; spider's web; master kupesi
kupesi	geometric design
kula	red; symbol for men
la'ā	sun; symbol for men
la'ātō	sunset; symbol for death
lakalaka	sociopolitical poetry; dance genre
lalava, tufunga	kafa-sinnet lashing, art of
langa ā, tufunga	fence building, art of
lālanga, nimamea'a	mat weaving, art of
langafale, tufunga	house building, art of
langaufu, tufunga	wharf building, art of
langi	sky; symbol for the divine
lea, faiva	speech giving, art of

lea, tufunga	speech designing, art of
maama	light; symbol for enlightenment
maau	poem; order
māfana	warmth
māhina	moon; symbol for women
mālie	beauty, used for faiva; see faka'ofa'ofa
mata	eye; face
mate	death; symbol for women
moana	ocean; symbol for life and death
mo'ui	life; symbol for men
mate	death; symbol for women
nimamea'a	fine art
nimamea'a, ha'a	fine artists, class of
nimatapu, tufunga	dead handling, art of
noa	zero; nothing; state of balance
ngalipoto	normality
ngalivale	absurdity
ngaohi	make
ngaohihala, tufunga	road building, art of
ngatu	bark cloth
ngāue	men's wealth
papa fānifo	surfing board
peau fisihina	white, foamy waves
pō	night; symbol for women
potupotutatau	harmony
punake, ha'a	poets, musicians, and dancers, class of
sino	body
tā	time
ta'anga, faiva	poetry, art of
tangata	men
tatau	symmetry
tauhi vā	keeping sociospatial relations
tātatau, tufunga	tattooing, art of
tau	war
tauēlangi	excitement ; climaxed elation
tā-vā	time-space
tekapulu, faiva	bowling, art of
tohi fe'unu	line-marking leave threads for weaving
toki	adze
toto	blood; blood relations
toutai, ha'a	navigators and deep-sea fishermen, class of
tatau	symmetry
tu'akautā	music device
tu'asino	nonbody
tufunga	material art
tufunga, ha'a	material artists, class of
Tu'i Tonga	ancient dynasty
Tu'i Kanokupolu	third dynasty

uho	content; substance; space
‘uli	black; symbol for women
‘ulumotu‘a	socials institution based on men
vā	space; substance; content; relation
va‘a	branch
vā kovi	bad sociospatial relations
vā lelei	good sociospatial relations
vaka	boat; medium
vela	burn; fieriness
wā	Hawaiian for vā

Idioms

anga‘i manu	animality
anga‘i tangata	sociality
ava kula	red hole; symbol for men
ava ‘uli	black hole; symbol for women
fai fāmili	activating family ties
faiva mālie	good work of art; see tufunga faka‘ofo‘ofa
faiva palakū	bad work of art; see tufunga palakū
fakahoko fāmili	strengthening family ties
fakahoko kāinga	strengthening extended-family ties
fakahoko toto	strengthening blood ties
hoko tete‘e	fully inheriting physical, emotional, and social traits
mata fāmili	family-loving face
mata kāinga	extended-family-loving face
mata ‘ofa	loving-hearted face
mata afi	eye of the fire
mata ‘ita	eye of the anger
mata lemu	eye of the chewing, i.e., rectum
mata sio	eye of the seeing, i.e., eyes
mata ‘usi	eye of the biting, i.e., anus
mata‘i hele	eye of the knife
mata‘i hui	eye of the needle
mata‘i la‘ā	eye of the sun
mata‘i peni	eye of the pen
mata‘i polosi	eye of the brush
mata‘i toki	eye of the adze
moana ‘uli‘uli	deep black ocean; symbol for women
tufunga faka‘ofo‘ofa	good work of art; see faiva mālie
tufunga palakū	bad work of art; see faiva palakū

Proverbs

Kohi-‘a-Velenga

(Writing-of-Velenga, i.e., god of Navigation)

‘Oku fakahokohoko toto ‘a fafine ka e fakahokohoko hingoa ‘a tangata

(Blood connects through women and titles through men)

‘Oku falehanga ‘a fafine pea ‘oku hanga ka e tōkanga ‘a tangata pea ‘oku manga
(Women possess the house, measured by the hands, and men possess the garden,
measured by the feet)

‘Oku va‘ava‘a he ko e tangata
(It branches out [like a tree] because it’s people)

‘Otumotu Anga‘ofa

(Friendly Islands, i.e., Tonga)

Sio hifo ki ho matá ko e kupesi ‘atā pē ho‘o tamaí

(Look at your face where your father’s design is rightly imprinted)

Taulanga Tuku mo Failā

(City of Sails, i.e., Auckland)

NOTES

1. In Hawai‘i, for example, tā and vā exist as *kā* and *wā*, translated as “time” and “space” (Ka‘ili 2005, 2007).

2. The Tongan words for the past is *kuongamu‘a*, literally meaning “age-in-the-front”; present *kuongaloto*, literally meaning “age-in-the-middle”; and future *kuongamui*, literally meaning “age-in-the-back” (Hau‘ofa 2000; Ka‘ili 2007; Māhina 2008c; Māhina & Nabob-Baba 2004b).

3. Huntington (2004) suggests that the twenty-first century will be characterized more by cultural than ideological, political, and economic conflicts.

4. For example, the scholarly treatment of such issues as identity and sustainable development is existentialist in mode. Rather than treating identity as a set of independent variables, such as culture, language, beliefs, and techniques, to which self can freely relate, these are made to be self-centered, a form of self-centrism that is conflicting through and through. Likewise, sustainable development is strictly, problematically anthropocentric in its formulation that it systematically excludes the environment from the equation (see, e.g., Māhina 1999c, 2004b).

5. There has been a consistent call among Moana scholars, notably Professor Konai Helu-Thaman (2005) and Professor Sitaleki ‘Ata‘ata Finau (2008), for “cultural democracy,” that is, the incorporation of Moana cultures and languages in Moana curricula as well as Moana health, where Moana peoples can freely use their cultural concepts and practices without reservation and fear.

6. The Tongan word *mata* means two things: “face” and “eye” (see, e.g., Potauaine and Māhina 2009).

7. The three material arts *tufunga lalava*, *tufunga langafale*, and *tufunga fo‘uvaka* are temporally-spatially, formally-substantially, and functionally connected in the same way that the three performance arts *faiva ta‘anga*, *faiva hiva*, and *faiva haka* are unified by means of time-space, form-content, and function.

8. Like *fale*, *vaka* is also regarded as a *fefine*. So, *fale* and *vaka* are symbolized as a *fefine* and, in turn, *fefine* a symbol for both *fale* and *vaka* (see, e.g., Potauaine and Māhina 2009).

9. Malukava was a poet laureate, and Falekāono and Ula Matatao were orators.
10. There has been an increasing infestation across a number of academic disciplines and social practices of Moana cultural models, such as *kakala*, *mālie-māfana*, *fa'afaletui*, *talanoa*, *fonua*, and *fonofale* (see, e.g., Helu-Thaman 2005; Māhina 2008c), as a response to such a call by Professor Hau'ofa (1993) for a complete overhaul in Moana thinking and practice. While this emerging trend is more than welcome, it must be pointed out that most, if not all, of these models have yet to be connected to reality, given the fact that models are merely symbolic “pointers” to real things in time and space (Anderson 1962, 2007; Māhina 1999c, 2008c).
11. After the Utah TRA conference, I also gave another paper titled “Tā, Vā and Faiva: Time, Space and Art” at a philosophy conference held at the University of California, Chico, where I began to apply the time-space theory to art and literature.
12. VACIAR has involved in the publication of ten single-authored, coauthored, and coedited academic books as well as a co-guest-edited special issue of a journal, not to mention book chapters and journal articles. Kula-Uli Publishing in New Zealand, in conjunction with VACIAR, has published the first three books of its new series on Moana children's stories. A revolutionary, cutting-edge project, the new series utilizes classical Tongan abstract modes of *talanoa* (storytelling), *tāfakatātā* (image producing) and *tāfakalanu* (image coloring), informed by artistic and literary devices *heliaki* (intersecting human meanings), *kupesi* (intersecting images), and *kula'uli* (intersecting red-black colors).
13. The term *kupe*, as in *kupesi* and *kupenga*, means “intersect,” with *kupenga* as “place of intersection.” The naming of a heroic and daring Maori navigator who discovered Aotearoa Kupe probably had a bearing on ancient Moana navigation and voyaging.
14. In ancient times, especially the era of Tu'i Tonga dynasty, *ha'a* divisions were connected with *fatongia* (economic functions), such as *ha'a tufunga* (professional class of material artists), *ha'a toutai* (professional class of navigators and deep-sea fishermen), *ha'a fa'a* (professional class of crop cultivators and animal domesticators), and *ha'a punake* (professional class of poets, musicians, and dancers), among many others. When the Tu'i Kanokupolu dynasty came to power, the nature of *ha'a* was radically changed to political functions, now associated with titles and persons, such as Ha'a Ngata, divided into Ha'a Ngata Motu'a and Ha'a Ngata Tupu. Ngata was first Tu'i Kanokupolu (see, e.g., Māhina 1999a, 2008c).
15. The terms *mālie* and *faka'ofa'ofa* both mean “beauty” or “beautiful things,” the subject matter of investigation of aesthetics, that is, the science of beautiful things, with the former applied to *faiva* and the latter to *tufunga* and *nimamea'a*.
16. The word *ngaohi* is often interchanged with *fa'u* and *fatu*, as in *fa'u vaka* (boat construction) and *fatu tā'anga* (poetry composition), respectively. Another variation of *fa'u* is *fo'u*, as in the material art *tufunga fo'uwaka*.
17. Some dance scholars view this “divine” effect to be orgasmic in nature.
18. All good works of art are said to be *mālie*, that is, beautiful, in the case of *faiva*, or *faka'ofa'ofa*, that is, beautiful, in the case of *tufunga* and *nimamea'a*. When, for instance,

the performance art *faiva 'akapulu* is considered *mālie*, it simply means that the offensive team outdoes the defensive team, with players on the offense breaking through the defense. By this, reference is made to players on the attack making breaks in between opponent players by scoring points. Such breaks are a form of time-and-space subdivision between players.

19. As an ancient Moana art form, *faiva fānifo* is conducted at the constantly shifting spiral, vortexlike interface of moana *'uli'uli* (deep black ocean) and *peau fisihina* (white, foamy waves), mediated by the device *papa fānifo* (surfing board), which must be at one with the surfer.

20. The word *mata* means “face” and “eye,” both of which have a bearing on genealogy. A number of emotionally led facial expressions include *mata 'ofa* (face of the loving), *mata kāinga* (face of the kin-centered loving), *mata 'ita* (face of the anger), and so forth. On the other hand, eyes are classified in different ways, such as *mata sio* (eye of the seeing), *mata 'usi* (eye of the biting, i.e., anus), *mata lemu* (eye of the chewing, i.e., rectum), and many more. Tools are characterized in terms of eyes, as in *mata'i polosi* (eye of the brush), *mata'i peni* (eye of the pen), *mata'i hele* (eye of the knife), and so on. Also, natural occurrences are described by way of eyes, as in *mata'i la'ā* (eye of the sun), *matā matangi* (eye of the winds), and *mata'afi* (eye of the fire; Potauaine and Māhina 2009). All these instances of *mata* are a form of intersection, where conflicts are mediated in the process, where they are symmetrically transformed from a condition of crisis to a state of stasis.

21. In tattooing, for example, the sharp-pointed *mata'i hui*, that is, eye of the needle, intersects the skin, then mediates it with black ink. Likewise, in painting, the sharp-pointed *mata'i polosi*, that is, eye of the brush, separates the canvas and then connects it with colors.

REFERENCES

- Adam, B.
1990 *Time and social theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Anderson, J.
1962 *Studies in empirical philosophy*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.
2007 *Space, time and the categories: Lectures on metaphysics 1949–50*. Sydney: Univ. of Sydney.
- Anderson, J., G. Cullum, and K. Lycos, eds.
1982 *John Anderson on literature and aesthetics*. Sydney: Hale & Iremonger.
- Bott, E., with the assistance of Tavi
1982 *Tongan society at the time of Captain Cook's Visit: Discussions with Her Majesty Queen Sālote Tupou*. Memoir No. 44. Wellington: Polynesian Society.
- Chapman, T., and H. Foot, eds.
1976 *Humour and laughter: Theory, research and applications*. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Crittenden, P.

- 2003 Philosophy and metaphor: The philosopher's ambivalence. *Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics* 13 (1): 27–42.

Crocombe, R.

- 1975 Anthropology, anthropologists and Pacific Islanders. A reply to Dr. Epeli Hau'ofa. Discussion Paper No. 11. Port Moresby: Institute of Papua New Guinea.

Feldman, H.

- 1980 Informal kava drinking in Tonga. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 89 (1): 101–3.
1981 *Kapekape*: Contexts of malediction in Tonga. *Maledicta* 5:143–50.

Finau, S. 'A.

- 2008 Pasifika @ Massey strategy: Cultural democracy in practice. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, special issue/special edition, 24–43.

Gailey, C. W.

- 1987 *Kinship to kingship: Gender hierarchy and state formation in the Tongan Islands*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.

Gell, A.

- 1998 *Art and agency: An anthropological theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gifford, E. W.

- 1929 *Tongan society*. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

Gleick, J.

- 1987 *Chaos: Making a new science*. London: Abacus.

Harvey, D.

- 1990 Between space and time: Reflections on geographical imagination. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80:418–34.
2000 Time-space compression and the rise of modernism as a cultural force. In *The globalization reader*, ed. F. J. Lechner and J. Boli, 134–40. Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Hau'ofa, E.

- 1975 Anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Oceania* 45 (4): 283–89.
1983 *Tales of the Tikongs*. Auckland: Longman Paul.
1993 Our sea of islands. In *A new Oceania: Rediscovering our sea of islands*, ed. E. Waddell, V. Naidu, and E. Hau'ofa, 2–16. Suva, Fiji: School of Social and Economic Development, Univ. of the South Pacific in association with Beake House.
1995 *Kisses in the Nederends*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

- 2000 Epilogue: Pasts to remember. In *Remembrance of Pacific pasts: An invitation to remake history*, ed. R. Borofsky, 453–71. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- 2005 Autonomy and creativity: A tribute to the founder of 'Atenisi. In *Polynesian paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 17–24. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.
- Helu, 'I. F.
- 1999 *Critical essays: Cultural perspectives from the South Seas*. Canberra: Journal of Pacific History.
- Helu-Thaman, K.
- 2005 In the footsteps of a male mother. In *Polynesian paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 27–36. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.
- Herda, P.
- 1988 The transformation of the traditional Tongan polity: A genealogical consideration of Tonga's past. PhD diss., Australian National Univ., Canberra.
- 1995 Hierarchy and the prerogative of history-making in Tonga. In *Tonga and Samoa: Images of gender and polity*, ed. J. Huntsman, 37–55. Christchurch: Macmillan Brown Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Canterbury.
- Hereniko, V.
- 1995 *Woven gods: Female clowns and power in Rotuma*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
- Hixon, M.
- 2000 *Sālote: Queen of paradise*. Dunedin: Univ. of Otago Press.
- Huntington, S. P.
- 2004 The clash of civilizations. In *The globalisation reader*, ed. F. J. Lechner and J. Boli, 36–43. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Ka'ili, T. O.
- 2005 *Tauhi vā*: Nurturing Tongan sociospatial ties in Maui and beyond. *The Contemporary Pacific* 1 (17): 83–114.
- 2007 *Tauhi vā*: Creating beauty through the art of sociospatial relations. PhD diss., Univ. of Washington, Seattle.
- Kaepler, A.
- 1993 *Poetry in motion: Study of Tongan dance*. Nuku'alofa: Vava'u Press.
- 2005 The Tongan *Lakalaka* as sociopolitical discourse. In *Polynesian paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 154–67. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, Univ. of the South Pacific.
- 2007 *Heliaki*, metaphor, and allusion: The art and aesthetics of *Ko e 'Otua mo Tonga ko Hoku Tofi'a*. In *Tonga and the Tongans: Heritage and identity*, ed. E. Wood-Ellem, 65–74. Alphington, Victoria, Australia: Tongan Research Association.

Kalāvite, T.

- 2010 Fonoga ‘a Fakahalafonoga : Tongan students’ journey to academic achievement in New Zealand tertiary education. PhD diss., Univ. Of Waikato, Hamilton, N.Z.

Lātū, V. U.

- 2006 International migration and societal change in the kingdom of Tonga. PhD diss., Ritsumeiken Asia Pacific Univ., Japan.

Lātūkefu, S.

- 1968 Oral traditions: An appraisal of their value in historical research in Tonga. *Journal of Pacific History* 3:135–43.
1974 *Church and state in Tonga*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press.

Lawson, S.

- 1996 *Tradition versus democracy in the South Pacific: Fiji, Tonga and Western Samoa*. Melbourne: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Layton, R.

- 1991 *The anthropology of art*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lockwood, V. S., ed.

- 2004 *Globalization and culture change in the Pacific Islands*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Māhina, ‘O.

- 1986 *Religion, politics and the Tu‘I Tonga empire*. MA diss., Univ. of Auckland, Auckland.
1992 *The Tongan traditional history Tala-ē-fonua: A vernacular ecology-centred, historico-cultural concept*. PhD diss., Australian National Univ., Canberra.
1997 Post-secondary education: The classical vs. the utilitarian. In *USP strategic planning report: Tongan education for the 21st century, priorities and needs*, 1–14. Suva: USP.
1999a Food *me’akai*, and body *sino* in traditional Tongan society: Their theoretical and practical implications for health policy. *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific* 6:276–87.
1999b Myth and history. In *Voyages and beaches: Pacific encounters, 1769–1840*, ed. A. Calder, J. Lamb and B. Orr, 61–88. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai‘i Press.
1999c Theory and practice in anthropology: Pacific anthropology and Pacific Islanders. *Social Analysis* 43:41–69.
2002a *‘Atamai, fakakaukau and vale*: “Mind,” “thinking” and “mental illness” in Tonga. *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific* 9:303–8.

Māhina, ‘O.

- 2002b Tufunga lalava: The Tongan art of lineal and spatial intersection. In *Filipe Tohi: Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohitohi*, ed. S. Rees, 5–9, 29–30. New Plymouth, New Zealand: Covett-Brewster Art Gallery.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2003a Oceanic mythology. In *Mythology: Myths, legends and fantasies*, ed. H. Baterman et al., 374–81. Willoughby, New South Wales, Australia: Global Book Publishing.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2003b Psychoanalysis and Tongan poetry: Reflection on the song of flowers. *Literature and Aesthetics: The Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics* 13:97–106.

Māhina, O.

- 2004a Art as tā-vā, “time-space” transformation. In *Researching the Pacific and indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, 'O. Māhina, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 86–93. Auckland: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2004b Issues and challenges in Pacific research: Some critical comments. In *Researching the Pacific and indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, 'O. Māhina, N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 186–98. Auckland: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2004c *Reed book of Tongan proverbs: Ko e tohi 'a e Reed ki he lea Tonga Heliaki*. Auckland: Reed Publishing.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2005a The poetics of exile: Love and death in Tongan poetry. In *Before Pangaea: New essays in transcultural aesthetics presented in honour of Professor Grazia*, ed. Marchiano E. Benitez, special issue, *Journal of the Sydney Society of Literature and Aesthetics* 15 (1): 136–47.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2005b Tatau, potupotutatau and mālie: A realist reflection on the symmetry, harmony and beauty of Queen Sālote's poetry. In *Polynesian paradox: Essays in honour of Futa Helu*, ed. I. Campbell and E. Coxon, 168–83. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, USP.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2007 *Faiva ta'anga: Maau filifili 'a 'Okusitino Māhina*. Auckland: Lo'au Research Society Publishing.

Māhina, 'O.

- 2008a Closing remarks: Moana education: Disciplinary practice and form of social activity. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, special issue/special edition, 188–91.

- Māhina, 'O.
2008b *Faiva fakaoli*: The Tongan performance art of humour. *Pacific Studies* 31 (1): 31–54.
- Māhina, 'O.
2008c From *vale* (ignorance) to *'ilo* (knowledge) to *poto* (skill), the Tongan theory of ako (education): Theorising old problems anew. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, special issue/special edition, 67–96.
- Māhina, 'O.
2009 Comedy and tragedy in myths, poems and proverbs: A tā-vā time-space critique. In *Tonga: Its Land, Sea, and People*, ed. T. Steen and N. Drescher (forthcoming).
- Māhina, 'O. and 'Alatini, M. H. M.
2007 On the back of the sea turtle Sangone. In *Peace songs resounding in the Baisun Plain*, 152–60. Seoul, Korea: APCEU.
- Māhina, 'O., T. O. Ka'ili, and 'A. Ka'ili
2006 *Ko e ngaahi 'ata mei he hisitōlia mo e kalatua 'o Tonga: Ke Tufunga'i ha Lea Tonga Fakaako*. Auckland: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., and K. U. Māhina-Tuai
2007 *Lea Tonga heliaki: Faiva mo e tufunga lea heliaki*. Auckland: TVEDT Publishing.
- Māhina, 'O., 'A. N. M. Māhina, and M. 'O. Māhina
2007 Tongans at the University of Auckland: A cause for celebrations. In *'Ātea, Moana and Vanua: Voices from the Brown Edge*, ed. 'O. Māhina, N. Seve-Williams, A. Faaiuso, and D. Hosking, 210–61. Auckland: Langiatea Moana Press, Univ. of Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., and U. Nabobo-Baba.
2004 The issue of Pacific past and future: A challenge for Pacific students and academics in the present. In *Researching the Pacific and indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed. T. Baba, T., Māhina, 'O., N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 202–6. Auckland: Centre for Pacific Studies, Univ. Auckland.
- Māhina, 'O., S. P. M. T. Potauaine, M. H. M. 'Alatini, K. U. Māhina-Tuai, 'A. N. M. Māhina, and M. 'O. Māhina
2007 *Veimau: Maau mo Potupotutatau kae Fepakitu'u mo Fihitu'u: Order and harmony yet conflicting and complex*. Auckland: TVEDT Publishing.
- Māhina, 'O., N. Seve-Williams, A. Faaiuso, and D. Hosking, eds.
2007 *'Ātea, Moana and Vanua: Voices from the Brown Edge*. Auckland: Langiatea Moana Press, Univ. of Auckland.

- Martin, J.
1981 *Tonga Islands: William Mariner's account . . . , Neiafu*. 4th ed. Tonga: Vava'u Press.
- Moala, M.
1994 *Efinangá: Ko e ngaahi tala mo e anga fakafonua 'o Tongá*. Nuku'alofa: Lali Publication.
- Moyle, R.
1987 *Tongan music*. Auckland: Univ. of Auckland Press.
- Mitchell, J.
2004 "Killing time" in a postcolonial town: Young people and settlements in Port Villa, Vanuatu. In *Globalization and culture change in the Pacific Islands*, ed. V. S. Lockwood, 358–76. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Phillips, D. Z., ed.
1980 *Education and inquiry: John Anderson*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Piddington, R.
1963 *The psychology of laughter: A study in social adaptation*. New York: Gamut Press.
- Potauaine, S. F.
2005 The tectonic of the fale. *Interstices: A Journal of Architecture and Related Arts* 6:104–9.
- Potauaine, S. F., and 'O. Māhina
2009 Kula and 'Uli: Red and black in Tongan thinking and practice. In *Tonga: Its land, sea, and people*, ed. T. Steen and N. Drescher (forthcoming).
- Rabone, S.
1845 *Vocabulary of the Tongan language and idiomatical phrases*. Vava'u: Wesleyan Mission Press.
- Rees, S., ed.
2002 *Filipe Tohi: Genealogy of lines: Hohoko e tohitohi*. New Plymouth, New Zealand: Covett-Brewster Art Gallery.
- Rimoldi, M.
2004 Foreword: *Ko e Talamu'aki*. In *Reed book of Tongan proverbs: Ko e Tohi 'a e Reed ki he Lea Tonga Heliaki*, by 'O. Māhina, 10–17. Auckland: Reed Publishing.
- Taliai, 'O. M.
1989 *Social differentiation of language levels in Tonga*. MA thesis, Univ. of Auckland.

Thomas, N.

1995 *Oceanic art*. London: James & Hudson.

Tu'inukuafe, E.

1997 *A simplified dictionary of Tonga*. 2nd ed. Auckland: Pasifika Press.

Velt, K.

1990 *Stars over Tonga: Ko e Ngaahi Fetu'u 'o Tonga*. Trans. 'I. F. Helu. Tonga: 'Atenisi Univ. 'Univesiti 'o 'Atenisi ().

Wesley-Smith, T.

1995 Rethinking Pacific Islands studies. *Pacific Studies* 18 (2): 115–35.

Williams, N.

2009 *A view from the back, times between spaces: Equality of educational opportunity and Pacific students at a university*. PhD diss., Univ. of Auckland.

Wood Ellem, E.

1999 *Queen Sālote of Tonga: The story of an era, 1900–1965*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press.

Wood Ellem, E., ed.

2004 *Songs and poems of Queen Sālote*. Trans. M. Taumoefolau. Tonga: Vava'u Press.