TEU LE VA: TOWARD A *NATIVE* ANTHROPOLOGY

Melani Anae
University of Auckland

The Samoan word *va tapuia*, includes the term "*tapu*," within. The term literally refers to the sacred (tapu-ia) relationship (va) between man and all things, animate and inanimate. It implies that in our relationships with all things, living and dead, there exists a sacred essence, a life force beyond human reckoning. The distinction here between what is living and what is dead is premised not so much on whether a "life force," i.e. *a mauli* or *fatu manava* exists in the thing (i.e. whether a "life-breath" of "heart beat" exudes from it), but whether that thing, living or dead, has a genealogy (in an evolutionary rather than human procreation sense) that connects to a life force. The va tapuia, the sacred relations, between all things, extends in the Samoan indigenous reference to all things living or dead, where a genealogical relationship can be traced. (His Excellency Tui Atua Tupua Tamosese Efi 2007, 3)

My Genealogy[1]

As a New Zealand–born Samoan woman, (mother, daughter, sister, aunt, niece), born and bred in inner-city Auckland, I often wonder when the significance/importance/salience of our Samoan *measina* (Samoan cultural references)—*tautua, faʻaaloalo, feagaiga*, the va and *teu le va*—materialized for me. Was it in the warm embrace of my *ʻaiga* in New Zealand and the many relatives from Samoa who boarded with us and then moved on? Was it in my schooling years at AGGS,[2] where I felt like a brown fish out of water but where I developed a real love of learning? Was it my experience of Newton Church,[3] where I learned to embrace Pacific

Pacific Studies, Vol. 33, Nos. 2/3—Aug./Dec. 2010

cultural diversity and the tensions/joy involved therein? Was it in my "radical" Polynesian Panther years where I learned to make a line in the sand and say "Enough!" And where I learned that the biggest form of protest for an ethnic minority was to succeed and then use that success for the betterment of "our" people (see Anae, Iuli, and Burgoyne 2006)? Or was it closer to home, where Samoan parental discipline and being the youngest girl in a family of eight siblings alerted me to both seemingly inequitable positionings to tautua and faʻaaloalo (everyone else on the planet it seemed, especially my elders. . .) and positionings of favor (I was my father's pet)? Then there were the many *faʻalavelave*, *siʻi*, and *fono* occasions I attended/witnessed/participated in with my father and brother (both *matai*) and family?

I think momentum was gained about these understandings as I matured, formed relationships with diverse groupings of individuals/people, became a mother and matai (and therefore able to both give *and receive* tautua and faʻaaloalo from others) and during my empowering years at University, where I was able to formalize my theorizing of New Zealand *faʻasamoa* and ethnic identity for New Zealand–born Samoans, my *native* research methodology, and become the champion for ethnic-specific considerations Pacific in research praxis in some contexts, and more recently impel the construction of the Fale Pasifika and complex as the University of Auckland's commitment to the burgeoning numbers of Pacific students, and the acknowledgement of Auckland as the Polynesian capital of the world (Anae cited in Phillips 2006, 232; see also Anae 1997, 1998b). As a teacher, I have gained the title "Pacific scholar" from my students and others. Most recently there have been the honors which have been bestowed on me—the Samoan chiefly title of Misatauveve and New Zealand State Honors, the palagi title of QSO.[4]

After all, everything around me—literature, media, the art world, movies, critics, island-born Samoans—keeps telling me that I, as a New Zealand–born Samoan am a product of the Pacific diaspora, and there is an assumption that therefore I am on the hyphen, a hybrid, a schizophrenic, displaced, an assimilated person, not a "real" Samoan because I do not speak mother tongue (Hey! But I understand Samoan! And I understand and practice faʻasamoa values. Does that count?), an academic (and therefore not a "community" person), a middle-class snob (if only they knew I didn't say "hello" because I didn't have my glasses on!!). . . the list goes on.

So why was it that despite all this, I have felt very "Samoan" and have tried to act out being Samoan also in all my various capacities. This "materialization" of feeling secure about being Samoan and knowing that I am Samoan cannot be pinpointed to any one thing/event(s) nor any one

time in my life. All I know is that as a young girl, my earliest feelings of being "different" to my New Zealand peers/society/culture has matured into the exposing/understanding and reconciling that I am my Samoan parents' child and a product of the fa'asamoa that they brought with them to New Zealand—a *Niu Sila* fa'asamoa which has flourished through our Pacific Islanders' Presbyterian Church, Newton, our 'aiga in New Zealand, Samoa and elsewhere, and my family's commitment to our roles and responsibilities to our 'aiga (extended and Church) materialized through fa'alavelave (my father, brother, nephew, and sister-in-law are also matai).

It is this very "difference" that has allowed me to succeed in New Zealand and has allowed me to maintain my identity as a Samoan born in New Zealand. And as such I am able to contribute immensely to wider New Zealand society in being able to use my dual cultural "world views" and understandings with which to optimize my relationships at all levels to obtain positive outcomes for Pacific peoples in New Zealand. I put this down to my understanding of the tenet/principle/concept/cultural references (for it is all these and more) of va, and teu le va, as it has materialized for me.

Efi's quote at the beginning of this chapter describes how va tapuia refers to the sacred (tapu-ia) relationship (va) between man and all things, animate and inanimate. Moreover he states that a va tapuia exists where a genealogical relationship can be traced, not necessarily through blood ties, but through relationships which have evolved through interactions between people and things in the va tapuia thus generating "a sacred essence" a "life force" beyond human reckoning.

Put simply, my reading of this is, that if one views all reciprocal relationships (va) with others as sacred, then the relationship will be more valued, and nurtured more closely. The teu le va cultural reference (see Anae 2007) uses Efi's notion of va tapuia and genealogy and focuses on the centrality of reciprocal relationships in the development of optimal relationships. But it also focuses on *how* to teu le va or how within the va there is (inter)action by parties involved and this requires that one regards these (inter)actions as sacred in order to value, nurture, and if necessary tidy up the va—the social and sacred space that separates and yet unites in the context of va tapuia experienced in relationships. This is not to say that to teu le va in all one's relationships is doable nor an easy process. More often than not, it is complex, multilayered and fraught with difficulties. But if all parties have the will, the spirit and the heart for what is at stake, despite the hiccups along the way, then positive outcomes will be achieved.

I contend that the teu le va cultural reference is fundamental in moving beyond merely the identification, description, and understanding of the va

to points of interaction between parties in a win-win situation which benefits all parties and which upholds the moral, ethical, spiritual dimensions of social relationships for all participants/people/stakeholders involved in these relationships. As such teu le va incorporates faʻasamoa—the holistic framings of its associated institutions and concomitant values (see Anae 1998a)—as a way of knowing, of living and acting out of and within our multileveled social, cultural and political relationships. This understanding of teu le va is from my perspective as a Samoan woman born in New Zealand and my own particular life experiences.

In this chapter I extend this understanding of teu le va to proffer my redefinition of a *native* anthropologist (read researcher). It is based on my genealogy as a Samoan anthropologist and Pacific researcher in New Zealand, and how I have learnt to teu le va in anthropological spaces with the discipline, the academy, my colleagues, my work, and my own Samoan (read Pacific) research participants and communities. In doing so teu le va provides a philosophical, methodological and ontological cultural reference with which to carry out research with all research stakeholders for positive outcomes. An exploration of the Samoan (and other Pacific) discourses on va, teu le va and teu le va in the New Zealand context has been discussed elsewhere (Shore 1982; Duranti 1981; Lilomaiava-Doktor 2004; Anae 2007; Tamasese, Peteru, and Waldegrave 2007; Vaʻai 2002; Tupa Tamasese Tupuola Efi 2007; Aiono Fanaafi Le Tagaloa 1996; Lui 2003; La Va 2009; Stefano 2002; Wendt 1996).[5] This chapter thus focuses on concepts of native research as defined and experienced by me. As such it is hoped that my genealogy, not as an indigenous anthropologist but as a *native* anthropologist as redefined in this chapter—this chapter contains excerpts from other research (Anae 1998b) will provide space for those of us as practising Pacific researchers to sit back and reflect on what we are doing, who are we doing it for, why we are doing it, and what we will be doing with the results of our research. That is to say it provides a space to consider philosophical, ontological, ethical, and methodological issues as *native* researchers and how we can teu le va with all parties involved in the research process.

I draw on insights provided by other non-Western anthropologists and scholars to explore notions of indigineity, nativeness and and insidedness and my own lens as a Samoan anthropologist to proffer a redefinition of native anthropology for those of us born in the diaspora.

On Becoming an Anthropologist-Insider/Outsider/Native?

My love and fascination for anthropology began in my first year at the University of Auckland (or has it always been there?) in the early 1970s.

Some of my life experiences have been documented elsewhere (Anae 1998a, 2003). I remember my friend Sally and I spending most of our mornings in the University cafe doing the *New Zealand Herald* crossword. Soon we became the center of attraction for our mates—Maori and Polynesian radicals and others on campus. Other students who would rally to help us solve the daily crossword were fellow Polynesian Panthers (Will Ilolahia, Wayne Toleafoa, Norman Tuiasau) our Maori mates in Nga Tamatoa (Hana and Sid Jackson, Tame Iti, Graham Smith), some of the very first Samoan All Blacks and lawyers . . . and it was from this activity that the usual social events of the day were planned—pub crawls, drinks at the Kiwi tavern, a day at the beach, going to the movies, spending time in the Library, or hanging out at coffee bars in Queen Street sipping real coffee. This didn't include the host of parties that were had. How we managed to pass exams and graduate, I still wonder about.

In those days Pacific Studies didn't exist. Maori Studies was still ensconced in the Anthropology Department, and Linguistics was just being offered. There was no Maori Meeting House or marae, Engineering students were performing derogatory mock hakas at graduation and being pummelled by Polynesian Panthers and other Maori activists. Donna Awatere and Ripeka Evans were forming the Black Women's Movement. The Vietnam War was in full swing, and as Tuisau observed, we were being influenced by writers like Noam Chomsky, Samir Amin, Andre Frank, James Baldwin; Franz Fanon; Fidel Castro and Che Guevara; Romero Chavez; Karl Marx; and being blasted with songs like Jimi Hendrix's "Machine Gun," the Four Tops' "Papa Was a Rolling Stone," Isaac Hayes's "Shaft," Stevie Wonder's "Living in the City," Miles Davis's *Bitches Brew* and *Sketches of Spain*, and many others told of change, courage, and uncertainty. Bob Dylan was always niggling away at us in the background. It was a swelter of energy, questioning, and finding identity (Tuiasau 2006, 97).

Yet through all this, I can still remember listening to the soul song "What the World Needs Now is Love Sweet Love," and Marvin Gaye singing, "What's Going On" while going to church at the Newton PIC, and being involved with the Polynesian Panthers (ibid.).

Why anthropology? Well I took Maori Studies and Anthropology as double majors. Maori because I wanted to know more about *tangata whenua* and was fascinated by Maori men doing the haka (so unlike the seemingly feminine dance movements of Samoan males I thought then . . .) and inspired by the emotional hype of *tino rangatiratanga* and Maori culture . . . and Anthropology because it was the only discipline which studied culture and which focussed on the Pacific. There were no Maori or Pacific Anthropology lecturers or PhD students then.

Some years later in the 1980s I returned to complete my BA part time. Maori Studies had become a separate Department, Tane Nui a Rangi[6] was being built, and in the late 1980s the Centre for Pacific Studies was established. I still wanted to continue with Anthropology. I saw the value in the salience of culture and the need to prioritize it in its relationship with a whole lot of other social/scientific theories about people, about communities, about the world. I double majored in Maori Studies and Anthropology at BA level while I worked full time at the Maori and Island Affairs Department (MAD) raising a young family, and this was followed by a MA in Anthropology. When due to restructuring MAD became the Iwi Transition Agency, pregnant with my youngest child, I took the retraining option and enrolled in a PhD in Anthropology. What followed was a whirlwind of study, tutoring responsibilities and setting up equity initiatives—I set up the first Maori and Pacific tutorial programs in the Anthropology Department and even successfully lobbied with others for a dedicated Mauriora Room for Maori and Pacific students to learn, study, and socialize in.

During the writing of my PhD thesis I had no Pacific anthropologist role models to emulate. I knew of only four other Pacific PhD students—Unasa Leulu Vaa from Samoa, Okusitino Mahina and Melenaite Taumoefolau. But of course eminent Maori anthropologists, alumni of University of Auckland had preceded me. People like Pita Sharples, Pat Hohepa, Hugh Kawharu, Rangi Walker. The Pacific anthropologists I knew about were Asesela Ravuvu and Epeli Hau'ofa, but no women!! I was the first Pacific anthropologist female to graduate from a New Zealand University. Thus began my foray in reading about non-Western anthropologists in trying to understand how I was to position myself in Anthropology and the work I wanted to do—transformative change for our Pacific youth in New Zealand.

From my reading of the burgeoning scholarship on insider/outsider anthropology by non-Western anthropologists, I have developed my own definition of the anthropology that I try to "do" which I define as *native* anthropology (in particular, see Kuper, 1994; Jones 1970; Medecine 1987; Narayan 1993; Cerroni-Long 1995; Polanyi 1966).

Native Anthropology

Native anthropology should be research by a native that people of his or her community want to get done and should result in research that "ameliorates the human condition" given that all native anthropology requires grappling with issues of power (Cerroni-Long 1995). The primary

concern of native anthropologists according to Jones is social equality and social justice. The starting point for a native anthropology therefore is to understand that nonwhite populations in plural Western societies, share a history of colonization and other forms of domination, rooted largely in racial, ethnic and cultural differences (ibid., 59).

What Jones demarcates is the idea that native anthropologists are *native* by the fact that they have experienced racist contexts and are committed to work towards change in the status quo for their communities. I agree with this. But what I add to Jones's explication is that in my own context, native anthropologists are *native* also by the fact that they concomitantly identify with and are part of the persistent identity system (Spicer 1971) of their parents, grandparents and their 'aiga (family, extended family) and church, thereby maintaining a strong ethnic specific identity and strong commitment to practicing their Pacific culture and maintaining links with the homeland.

Native anthropology, according to my definition and my own situation then is practiced by those natives who are born out of Samoa, who live and work in the diaspora where Samoans are an ethnic minority, and who are committed to working for their people and communities for transformative change. I acknowledge that there may be multiple persistent identity systems to which different *native* anthropologists might be differently connected, and providing that the commitment to alleviate the subordinate position of their people is there, then the definition is a workable one.

The Salience of Emotional Ties to Being a *Native*

Many New Zealand–born Samoans self identify as Samoan or New Zealand–born Samoan despite their being afakasi, or of mixed heritage or a New Zealander according to their official birth place designation (Anae 1998a). As ethnic minorities in New Zealand, ethnic identity, in the context of opposition and conflict is therefore personal with emotional long-lasting attachments experienced in the economic, spiritual, historic symbols that one is exposed to during a lifetime, and must be differentiated from the statuses which are transient and not emotionally binding, but a mere fact of circumstance (see Anae 1998b; Epstein 1978; Spicer 1971; Barth 1969).

Merton argues in an important paper (1970) that individuals have not a single status but a status set—some statuses which provide us with native membership and others that we enter. Status sets involve social identities and associated roles. Kopytoff states that these roles are made up of immanent existential identities (people do x because of what they are e.g. father, woman, priest); or circumstantial existential identities (people are x because

of what they do e.g. physician, teacher, academic) (Kopytoff 1990, 80). The latter implies that the former lapses when a role is shed, whereas an immanent existential identity is relatively immutable. Thus the status sets that each person is provided with through birth and early life experiences provide us with native membership, but only if the person is *emotionally* tied to various statuses within those status sets.

Therefore although my status-set is woman, New Zealander, of Samoan parents, academic, teacher, anthropologist, pianist, etc., throughout my own identity journey various statuses have taken more prominent positions (or not) than others, depending on the context, and at times, social identities have been separated from my personal identities in some contexts. In my secured identity skin, I define my ethnic identity as a New Zealand–born Samoan woman because I am more *emotionally tied* to the imminent existential identities of "New Zealand–born Samoan" and "woman" (mother, sister, daughter, etc.) rather than my other statuses. The other statuses or identities e.g. "pianist," "academic," "New Zealander" are circumstantial or transient—merely facts. Another way of saying this is that an ethnic identity must be one that you can live with. As a participant in my 1998a study stated, "... I know I am part-Chinese as well as Samoan ... but while I acknowledge my Chinese side, I draw more strength from being Samoan. I identify myself as a New Zealand–born Samoan."

Where does this strength come from? My answer to this is that if history is "the art of remembering" (Wendt 1987), then identity is the art of remembering who our mothers and grandmothers told us we were, and how these memories have impacted on our life experiences, and vice versa (see Anae 1998a; Wendt 1993).[7] Our ethnic identity is thus situated historically, socially, politically, culturally, but more importantly *emotionally* through the stories told to us by our matriarchs—mothers, grandmothers, even fathers who have been strongly influenced by their mothers.

Native anthropologists therefore need to think about this aspect of their personal and social identities. In my case it is my ethnic identity which influences much of my social identities. To put it simply I am a Samoan who happens to be an anthropologist, rather than an anthropologist who happens to be Samoan.

Praxis and Empowerment Must Be Key Themes of *Native* Research

Conducting research in Pacific communities whether using qualitative, quantitative, mixed methods or a combination of these will help us to better understand what really makes a difference in meeting the needs of Pacific peoples, families, and communities to achieve optimal outcomes; in

particular, how to meet both home culture and New Zealand education/health/socio-economic needs. This is important work which must not only meet rigorous scientific standards but must also "honour the wisdom of native/local traditional knowledge" (Benham 2006, 35).

According to Benham, when describing interdisciplinary qualitative research work on Pacific islanders in the United States, what was alarming was the variability in the quality of work. The two most important issues regarded the lack of social, cultural, and historical context of the home community studied and the absence of researcher/author positionality (ibid.) Benham attributes this to colonizing perspectives which must be suspended or unlearned. "What came to mind as I reviewed each study was the need for the researcher (whether insider, outsider, or external-insider) to examine her/his own lenses to articulate her/his current understanding of voice in this particular community, and to make a sincere effort to either or both suspend and/or unlearn colonizing perspectives" (ibid., 37; see also Anae 1998a). For some it is to unlearn western philosophies in order to relearn and embrace one's spirit as a "native." So, presenting both the context of the community as well as one's own positionality (in regard to that context) is extremely important in qualitative work.

Benham advocates the need for multi-ethnic research teams "for the most part native/local scholars and scholar practitioners who are fluent and respectful of culture and language principles." She states that "this is to ensure that the hegemony of the west characterised by the attitude of observing an extinct indigenous specimen or examining a cultural practice as an artefact is avoided" (ibid., 38). In addition she stresses more mixed-method approaches and interdisciplinary approaches that embrace culture and history, are informed by oral narratives, and indigenous ontology that can offer insights into Pacific relations across a number of complex settings and contexts. More importantly research and inquiry with and for Pacific Islanders, she states, must be seen as a dynamic, living, and contemporary process. She therefore implies that the focus should be on the transformation of Pacific cultures as vibrant and living, rather than the assumption that Pacific cultures are dying because of Pacific people's assimilation to the dominant ethnic group. "It is not the scholarship of a dying culture" (ibid.).

We need to create and participate in conversations that forward multi-dimensional reference points that explain the rich ethnic identities of Pacific children, youth, their families and communities. These reference points must include the socio-political history, spiritual and/or religious values, mother-tongue language, cultural traditions as well as contemporary traditions, subcultures (for example nonethnic self-identities) and issues within the larger cultural context, and the implications of each unique

group's worldview. Benham argues that the work of indigenous researchers is to create policy and inform practice through research, programs and interventions that will empower communities, teachers and children, and that is enriched by history and spiritual foundations and will be applied in dynamic ways to address larger, global issues. She states:

> In the end, our work as policy makers, scholars and/or practitioners will be judged by at least three criteria: a) does it meet a high standard of social justice that ensures local freedom to self-determine and plan for future progress for . . . Pacific Islanders; b) does it ask important questions that moves us and others to transform our thinking and generate new ways of viewing learning and teaching that make a difference in the lives of . . . Pacific Islanders; and c) does it invite to the conversation voices of the cultural experts, elders, families and communities? (ibid., 45)

What Benham is advocating mirrors the *native* anthropology I have been doing and reflects the trajectory of my own research experiences and praxis in New Zealand.

My Experiences of Teu Le Va and Doing *Native* Anthropology

Over the last decade, I have been involved in a range of research projects in mixed research teams as Team leader or as Coprinciple investigator. In all of these projects I have tried to apply *native* anthropology in terms of qualitative/ethnographic projects informing policy in areas of education (Anae et al. 2001, Anae, Anderson, Benseman, and Coxon 2002a; Airini, Anae, Mila-Schaaf 2010), mental health and well-being (Anae et al 2000, 2002b), economic issues (Anae et al. 2007) and governance (Anae 2007b; Macpherson and Anae 2008). The cumulative experience of this and the teu le va experiences I have learned, taught, and practiced have materialized in the form of two fundamental Pacific research guideline documents.

The first was the *Pasifika Education Research Guidelines 2001* which I developed as main author. These Guidelines (2001) commissioned by the Ministry of Education and which was initiated by holding a national fono of Pacific researchers in New Zealand and a robust process of consultation, provided and still provides a clear understanding of the cultural and socio-historical complexities involved in doing Pacific research in educational and other social science settings in New Zealand and provides practical protocols for carrying out research with Pacific peoples and communities.

Moreover it delineated the research relationships between Pacific researchers (outsiders and insiders), the researched (Pacific peoples and communities), and other research stakeholders (funders, research institutions etc) and introduced the concept of a Pacific research methodology in terms of the complexity that this entails, the centrality of Pacific values, the need for the ethnic-specific, the intergenerational, gender, place considerations, reciprocity, thorough consultation and the involvement of Pacific communities at all levels of the research process from inception to dissemination, and the need to mentor junior Pacific researchers.

On reflection my understandings of teu le va were implicit or assumed in my analysis and documentation of these guidelines, in that the centrality of reciprocal relationships and the saliency of mutual respect and understanding amongst all parties involved in all research relationships were sacrosanct.

The second Ministry of Education Pasifika Education Research Guideline (Airini et al. 2010) commissioned in 2007, makes more explicit the underlying nuances of the philosophical and methodological issues contained in the 2001 guidelines and expands on already introduced issues, themes, reference points and praxis contained therein regarding relationships between Pacific researchers and Pacific peoples and communities, but more importantly it formalizes more overtly the cultural reference of teu le va. That is, it exposes the cultural references of va and teu le va as a lens with which to expose, understand and value the relationships involved in Pacific research. In effect it builds on the 2001 guidelines at the higher level of identifying protocols as to how to teu le va in the relationships with Government Ministries, research institutions and funders—the spaces of translating high quality Pacific research into real policy and changes for Pacific peoples and communities in New Zealand. It advocates Benham's call for avoiding western hegemony, the value of interdisciplinary and mixed method approaches to research, the saliency of Pacific voices of the researched, understanding cultural references of both the dominant New Zealand culture and Pacific cultures, and the need for research which leads to policy change and formation which is empowering for Pacific communities. More importantly, the Second Ministry of Education Guidelines (Airine et al. 2010), in its focus on the Samoan indigenous reference of teu le va, provides an overarching ethical ethos for all relationships formed during the research process. It calls for a full exploration and commitment of the relationships within which the ethical moment is enacted, especially for indigenous people(s) and communities who exist in context-derived power differential asymmetries.

Finally. . .

It is not surprising that anthropology in New Zealand is proving to be at the forefront of native anthropological endeavour. The debates over anthropology in New Zealand do reflect the presence of indigenous intellectuals and there is a greater emphasis on the relationship between the researcher and the researched. We have had the benefit of a New Zealand anthropology that encourages cutting edge native and insider research by natives—Linda Smith and her work on kaupapa Maori and decolonizing research (1998), Pat Hohepa on Waima (1970), Kawharu on Orakei/Bastion Point (1975), Walker on Maori society (1990), Mahuta on structure of *whaikorero* (1974), Ravuvu on Fijian ethos (1983), as well as Te Rangi Hiroa (see Condliffe 1971) and Apirana Ngata (see Walker 2002), Mahina on Tongan history (1986), and my work on the Samoan diaspora and Pacific/Samoan ethnic identity (Anae 1997, 1998a, 2001, 2004). Other indigenous anthropologists include Merata Kawharu of the James Henare Research Centre (1986), and Paul Tapsell and his work on museums and Maori society (1998).

What we need in the Pacific are researchers who care about people. In all research investigations, mutual trust and understanding must be built carefully and sensitively. As with any human relationship, reciprocity, mutual participation, responsiveness, commitment and responsibility are essential. In turn this relationship will form the basis of our intellectual pursuit—the need to comprehend something in as many ways as possible to construct the composite that finally, more comprehensively, allows us to understand an issue, phenomenon, or culture from perspectives of both the researcher and the researched.

As *native* anthropologists, we can teu le va in Pacific research in general by exposing, understanding, and reconciling our va with each other in reciprocal relationships in the research process. For me it means this: people and groups we meet and have relationships and relational arrangements with, all have specific biographies (whole plethora of ethnicities, gender, class age, agendas, etc.) whether they are family members, colleagues, funders, participants, leaders etc. To teu le va means to be committed to take all these into account in the context in which these relationships are occurring. Put simply it is about regarding our va with others as sacred, thus valuing, nurturing and if necessary, tidying up relationships we have as Pacific researchers with those above, below and beside us in order to achieve positive outcomes for all. Through face-to-face interaction, words spoken and behavior (body language, etc.), with purposeful and positive outcomes of the relationship in mind, the

relationship progresses and moves forward. To not do this will incur the wrath of the gods, the keepers of tapu, and positive successful outcomes will not eventuate, progress will be impeded, parties to the relationship will be put at risk, and appeasement and reconciliation will need to be sought.

The two Ministry of Education Pacific research guideline documents referred to above (Anae et al. 2001; Airini et al. 2010) are starting points with which to expose, understand and reconcile the va and how to teu le va in Pacific research contexts. As Pacific academics, researchers, scholars, and teachers we must encourage our Pacific students in the diaspora to be proud of their Pacific identities as they themselves define these and to show them that their Pacific worldviews and how this plays out in their lives, their realities, their understandings of the world, their work and research can enrich their understandings of anthropology as a western discipline. Hopefully some of them will become *native* anthropologists too. Their research will most definitely (in)form and change multisectoral policy directions and service delivery for Pacific peoples and communities in the diaspora. But in order to do this they must learn, as many of us already have, to teu le va, to value, nurture and if necessary "tidy up" the physical, spiritual, cultural, social, psychological, and tapu "spaces" of human relationships in our research praxis.

Soifua.

NOTES

1. This chapter contains excerpts from M. Anae, "Research for Better Pacific Schooling in New Zealand: Teu le Va—A Samoan Perspective," *Mai Review* 2010, no. 1 (2010), http://review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/issue/current. This paper provided the theoretical, conceptual, ethical, and philosophical basis for the second Ministry of Education Guideline document (see Airini et al. 2010).

2. Auckland Girls' Grammar School.

3. Pacific Islanders Congregational Church—the first Pacific ethnic church to be established in New Zealand.

4. Companion to the Queens Service Order (QSO) awarded 2 June 2008 for services to the Pacific Island Communities.

5. See also Efi's comments of the relationship between va and tua'oi (boundaries) in T. Suaalii-Sauni, I. Tuagalu, N. Kirifi-Alai, and N. Fuamatu, eds., *Su'esu'e Manogi: In Search of Fragrance. Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi and the Samoan Indigenous Reference* (Lepapaigalagala, Samoa: Centre for Samoan Studies, National University of Samoa), 161–172.

6. Wharenui (meeting house) of Te Wananga o Waipapa (Maori Studies) at University of Auckland.

7. See the Anae dissertation on the influence of Samoan matriarchs—mothers and grandmothers—on identity. Also see the Wendt interview in Hereniko (1993).

REFERENCES

Airini, Melani Anae, K. Mila-Schaaf, with E. Coxon, D. Mara, and K. Saga
2009 *Teu le va: Relationships across research and policy: A collective approach to knowledge generation and policy development for action towards Pasifika education success.* Wellington, N.Z.: Ministry of Education.

Anae, Melani
1997 Towards a NZ-born Samoan identity: Some reflections on "labels." In *Pacific peoples of New Zealand*, ed. Colin Tukuitonga and Sitaleki Finau, special issue, *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific* 4 (2): 128–37.
1998a Fofoa-i-vao-ʻese: Identity journeys of NZ-born Samoans. PhD diss., Univ. of Auckland.
1998b Inside out: Methodological issues on being a "native" researcher. In *The health of native Hawaiians*, ed. J. Tsark and Sitaleki Finau, special issue, *Pacific Health Dialog: Journal of Community Health and Clinical Medicine for the Pacific* 5 (2): 273–79.
2001 The new Vikings of the sunrise: NZ-borns in the information age. In *Tangata O Te Moana Nui: Evolving identities of Pacific peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand*, ed C. Macpherson, P. Spoonley, and M. Anae, 101–22. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.
2003 ʻO aʻu/I: My identity journey. In *Making our place: Growing up PI in New Zealand*, ed. P. Fairbairn-Dunlop and G. Makisi, 89–101. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.
2004 From kava to coffee: The "browning" of Auckland. In *Almighty Auckland*, ed. I. Carter, S. Mathewman, and D. Craig, 89–110. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.
2007a Teu le va: Research that could make a difference to Pacific schooling in New Zealand. Paper presented at the Ministry of Education symposium "Is your research making a difference to Pasifika Education?" Wellington.
2007b *Waitakere Pacific communities report*, prepared for the Waitakere City Council as part of the FRST-funded Local Government Partnerships Research Project.
2010 Research for better Pacific schooling in New Zealand: Teu le va—a Samoan perspective. *Mai Review* 2010 (1). http://review.mai.ac.nz/index.php/MR/issue/current.

Anae, Melani, H. Anderson, J. Benseman, and E. Coxon
2002a *Pacific peoples and tertiary education: Issues of participation*. Wellington, N.Z.: Ministry of Education.

Anae, Melani, E. Coxon, with I. Lima, L. Atiga, and H. Tolley
2007 *Pacific consumers' behaviour and experience in credit markets, with particular reference to the "fringe lending" market*. Wellington, N.Z.: Ministry for Consumer Affairs.

Anae, Melani, E. Coxon, D. Mara, T. Wendt-Samu, and C. Finau
2001 *Pasifika education research guidelines*. Wellington, N.Z.: Ministry of Education.

Anae, Melani, N. Fuamatu, I. Lima, K. Mariner, J. Parkland, and S. Suaalii-Sauni
2000 *Tiute ma matafaioi a nisi tane Samoa i le faiga o 'aiga: The roles and responsibilities of some Samoan men in reproduction*. Auckland: Pacific Health Research Centre, Univ. of Auckland.

Anae, Melani, T. Iuli, and L. Burgoyne, eds.
2006 *The Polynesian Panthers 1971–1974: The crucible years*. Birkenhead, Auckland: Reed Publishers.

Anae, Melani, H. Moewaka Barnes, T. McCreanor, and P. Watson
2002b Towards promoting mental health in Aotearoa/New Zealand: The holistic "houses" of health. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion* 4 (2): 5–14.

Barth, F., ed.
1969 *Ethnic groups and boundaries*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Benham, K. P.
2006 A challenge to Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander scholars: What the research literature teaches us about our work. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 9 (1):29–50.

Cerroni-Long, E. L., ed.
1995 *Insider anthropology*, special issue, *NAPA Bulletin* 16:1–16.

Condliffe, J. B.
1971 *Te Rangi Hiroa: The life of Sir Peter Buck*. Christchurch: Whitcombe and Tombs.

Duranti, A.
1981 *The Samoan fono: A sociolinguistic study*. Canberra: Research School of Pacific Studies, Australia National Univ.

Efi, His Excellency Tui Atua Tpua Tamasese Ta'isi Efi
2007 Bio-ethics and the Samoan indigenous reference. Keynote address at the UNESCO bio-ethics conference, Tofamamao, Leauvaa, Samoa.

Epstein, A. L.
1978 *Ethos and identity: Three studies in ethnicity*. London: Tavistock.

Fairbairn-Dunlop, P., and G. Makisi, eds.
2003 *Making our place: Growing up PI in New Zealand*. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.

Fanaʻafi Le Tagaloa, A.
1996 *O motugaafa*. Apia: Western Samoa.

Finau, Sitaleki, ed.
2009 Pacific mental health and addictions, special issue, *Pacific Health Dialog* 15 (1).

Hereniko, V.
1993 Following in her footsteps: An interview with Albert Wendt. *Manoa* 5 (1): 51–52.

Hohepa, P. W.
1970 *A Maori community in Northland*. Wellington: A. H. & A. W. Reed.

Jones, D. J.
1970 Toward a native anthropology. *Human Organisation* 29:251–59.
1995 Anthropology and the oppressed: A reflection on "native" anthropology. In *National association for the practice of anthropology (NAPA)*, ed. E. L. Cerroni-Long, special issue, *Insider Anthropology* 16 (1): 58–70.

Kawharu, I. H.
1975 *Orakei A Ngati Whatua Community*. Christchurch: Whitcoulls.

Kawharu, M.
1998 Dimensions of kaitiakitanga: An investigation of a customary Maori principle of resource management. PhD diss., Oxford Univ.

Kopytoff, I.
1990 Women's roles and existential identities. In *Beyond the second sex: New directions in the anthropology of gender*, ed. P. R. Sanday and R. G. Goodenough, 75–98. CITY: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press.

Kuper, A.
1994 Culture, identity and the project of a cosmopolitan anthropology. *Man* (n.s.) 29:537–54.

Lilomaiava-Doktor, S.
2004 Faʻa-samoa and population movement from the inside out: The case of Salelologa, Savaiʻi. PhD diss., Univ. of Hawaiʻi.

Le Va
2009 About Le Va. In *Pacific mental health and addictions*, special issue, *Pacific Health Dialog* 15 (1): 7–8.

Lui, D.
2003 Family—A Samoan Perspective. Keynote presentation to the SF National Conference, Christchurch.

Macpherson, C., and Melani Anae
2008 The small ministry with the large reach: Using relationships to extend organisational capacity. *Kotuitui, New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online* 3:35–55.

Mahina, O.
1986 Religion, politics, and the Tu'iTonga Empire. MA thesis, Univ. of Auckland.

Mahuta, R. T.
1974 Whaikorero: A study of formal Maori speech. MA thesis, Univ. of Auckland.

Medecine, B.
1987 Learning to be an anthropologist and remaining "native." In *Applied Anthropology in America*, ed. E. Eddy and W. Partridge. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Merton, R. K.
1970 Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (1): 9–47.

Narayan, K.
1993 How native is a "native" anthropologist? *American Anthropologist* 95:671–86.

Phillips, J., eds.
2006 *Settler and migrant peoples of New Zealand*. Auckland: David Bateman Ltd.

Polanyi, M.
1966 *The tacit dimension*. New York: Doubleday.

Ravuvu, A.
1983 *Vaka I Taukei: The Fijian Way of Life*. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, The Univ. of the South Pacific, Suva.

Setefano, P. M.
2002 Regional representatives report: Samoa. Paper presented at the FAO/USP/RICS Foundation South Pacific land tenure conflict symposium, Univ. of South Pacific, Suva.

Shore, B.
1982 *Sa'alilua:A Samoan mystery*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Smith, L.
1998 *Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* Dunedin: Univ. of Otago Press.

Spicer, E.
1971 Persistent identity systems. *Science* 174 (4011): 795–800.

Suaalii-Sauni, T., I. Tuagalu, N. Kirifi-Alai, and N. Fuamatu, eds.
2009 *Su'esu'e Manogi: In search of fragrance. Tui Atua Tupua Tamasese Ta'isi and the Samoan indigenous reference*. Lepapaigalagala, Samoa: Centre for Samoan Studies, National Univ. of Samoa.

Tamasese, K., C. Peteru, and C. Waldegrave
1997 Ole taeao afua, the new morning: A qualitative investigation into Samoan perspectives on mental health and culturally appropriate services. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry* 39 (4): 300–10.

Tapsell, P.
1998 Taonga: A tribal response to museums. PhD thesis, Oxford Univ.

Tuiasau, F. N.
2006 Remembering the PPP experience. In *The Polynesian Panthers 1971–1974: The Crucible Years*, ed. Melanie Anae with T. Iuli and Burgoyne. Birkenhead, Auckland: Reed Publishers.

Va'ai, E. K.
2002 Talanoaga na loma ma Ga'opo'a by Tuiatua Tupua Tamasese Taisi Tupuola Efi: A linguistic perspective. Paper presented at theMeasina Samoa Conference, National Univ. of Samoa.

Walker, R.
1990 *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou—Struggle Without End*. Auckland: Penguin.
2002 *He Tipua: The life and times of Sir Apirana Ngata*. Auckland: Penguin.

Wendt, A.
1987 Novelists and historians and the art of remembering. In *Class and culture in the South Pacific*, 78–92. Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies of the Univ. of the South Pacific and Centre for Pacific Studies of the Univ. of Auckland.
1996 Tatauing the post-colonial body. *Span* 42/43:15–29.

GLOSSARY

'aiga—family, extended family, descent group or kinship in all its dimensions; transnational corporation of kin
fa'aaloalo—courtesy, respect, honours, regard highly and treat with respect
fa'alavelave—a ceremonial occasion (weddings, funerals, etc.) requiring the exchange of gifts, anything which interferes with 'normal' life and calls for special activity
fa'asamoa—in the manner of Samoans, the Samoan way; according to Samoan customs and traditions
feagaiga—covenant between a brother/sister and their descendants, currently used to refer to covenant between minister/congregation; a contract

fono—governing council, a council of chiefs, a meeting
matai—political representative of *'aiga* who holds a title bestowed by *'aiga*, custodian of *'aiga* land and property. There are two orders of matai: *ali'i* and *tulafale*
measina—fine mat; treasure(s)
palagi—also *papalagi* sky-breaker (lit.), white man, Europeans, foreigner, Samoan person not born in Samoa
si'i—lit. to lift; to carry ritual exchanges to present at rituals
tapu—be forbidden
tautua—(of untitled men and other dependants) serve a *matai*, carry out orders of; those who stand behind those in authority; to serve
teu le va—value/nurture/if necessary tidy up/look after the sacred and secular relationships in the va—the spaces between persons/person and things which separate yet unite
va—referring to the distance/position of two people/places/things in relation to each other/their relationship, separate yet closely connected
va fealoaloa'i—the relationships of mutual respect in socio-political and spiritual arrangements
va tapuia—the sacred relationships in the socio-political and spiritual arrangements