Pacific Studies

Vol. 36, No. 3—December 2013

PACIFIC STUDIES

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

DECEMBER 2013

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

PUBLISHED BY
THE JONATHAN NAPELA CENTER FOR HAWAIIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDS STUDIES
BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY HAWAI'I
IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE POLYNESIAN CULTURAL CENTER

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

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

PACIFIC STUDIES

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

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

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

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

Volume 36 December 2013 Number 3

CONTENTS

PUBLISHED 05/2014

PEDAGOGICAL PROMISE, DISCIPLINARY PRACTICE, AND THE FASHIONING OF IDENTITIES AMONG MARSHALLESE YOUTH IN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Laurence Marshall Carucci
Montana State University

SCHOOLING IS OFTEN CONSIDERED a primary locus of socialization, a place where children and youth come to control central understandings about the nature of the world, where they become worthy citizens with some comprehension of fundamental moral principles that a culture holds dear, and also a context where young people learn to interact with their age mates with acceptable interactional grace. On the flip-side, these same idealistic propositions are counterbalanced by the view that schooling is a disciplinary regime that inscribes certain dispositions within the bodies of its members. Superficially, these two views seem contradictory but, on closer inspection, they are in large part simply differently situated views of the same extant reality. The socialization view adopts a perspective that posits a normative reality that has significant effects on people's actions to demonstrate the importance of the way in which humans are shaped by social factors; the more recent perspective, following Foucault (1977), points out the differential effects of power relations in causing a common set of social practices to be inculcated into daily routines of all of the members of a particular social group. This complementarity becomes far more complicated, however, when two or more distinct cultural perspectives are juxtaposed to produce a new set of practices and interpretations.

In this paper, I consider two extremes in the schooling of fourth- and fifth-grade students from the Ujelang/Enewetak community: those in

Pacific Studies, Vol. 36, No. 3—December 2013

residence on Ujelang in the 1970s, and the same age students living in Hawai'i in 2002–03.[1] These children are members of a society that has experienced extremely rapid social change yet, at the same time, a group that places very high value on the perpetuation of core elements of their unique cultural and historical identity. Situated on the outermost periphery of the current-day Republic of the Marshall Islands, Enewetak residents remained on the fringes of empire through Spanish, German, and even Japanese colonial regimes, only to be repositioned on center stage in the penultimate phases of World War II and in the years that followed that war. Enewetak people lost over twenty percent of their dwindling population during the Battle of Eniwetok in 1944, leaving fewer than 140 people alive. Their suffering continued in the aftermath of the war when they were forced into exile for thirty-three years on a small, relatively unproductive atoll, Ujelang, to allow the United States to soil their homeland with the radioactive wastes of nuclear testing. The hugely devastating ecological effects of nuclear testing continued to have a radical impact on the community after a partial clean up of Enewetak and the community's return to the atoll in 1980. Life on Enewetak was so substantially altered that less than half of the residents chose to continue their struggle on this "New Enewetak." Large segments of the community have moved to Majuro, governmental center of the Marshall Islands, or to the Big Island of Hawai'i to try to begin life anew without the worries and constraints of living in the direct shadow of nuclear testing. Smaller groups of Enewetak/Ujelang people live in states along the west coast of the United States or in Marshallese settlements in Arizona, Springdale, Arkansas, or Spokane, Washington (Carucci, 2004, 2012).

My interest in schooling derives from members of the Enewetak/Ujelang community themselves, because they see schooling as reformative and revitalizing, as a way for their children to "turn over the ways of their lives," to rid themselves of suffering (*intaan*) and to alter the course of their impoverished lives (*moud eo an di jeramel*; "the life of the unfortunate"). They believe that schooling will help their offspring as they seek to fashion powerful Marshallese identities, images infused with strength (*kajur*) and renown (*bunbun*), in the contemporary world. Indeed, most of those who moved to Majuro during the years of suffering on Ujelang, and virtually all of those who have moved to Majuro or the Big Island since the time of repatriation, rationalize their decisions in terms of better schooling and access to health care. However much schooling is in its Hawaiian–American or Marshall Islands–American guises that may attempt to reshape, pacify, and colonize Marshallese identities, Enewetak/Ujelang people welcome the enterprise with a different vision in mind. As a reformative endeavor, they

imagine that schooling will resuscitate pride for Enewetak/Ujelang youth and provide them with a sense of power they feel they have lost since the First World War. In historical perspective, their disempowerment comes to be felt as the negative imprint of increased colonial and post-colonial interaction.

With the linkages of schooling, identity, and power in mind, I wish to consider two extremes in schooling to see how going to school both posits and, in certain ways, produces differently positioned identities. The products, of course, express differential relations of power and, in the case of Hawai'i, a great deal of shared frustration. Therefore, even though many variant models of schooling have been experienced by Enewetak/Ujelang Marshallese, for purposes of brevity, the second half of this paper traces only the two most distinct varieties—my mid-1970s experiences with schooling on Ujelang, and its regimented antithesis on the Big Island of Hawai'i more recently—although I have also lived extensively with Enewetak/Ujelang on Enewetak during several periods of time from 1982 through 2010 and with Enewetak/Ujelang and other Marshallese families in the government center of Majuro, on Kwajalein, and Utedik (Carucci 2007a). I have worked for shorter periods of time with Enewetak families in Springdale, Arkansas and in Spokane, Washington. These combined field-research experiences have allowed me to come to appreciate the variety of Marshallese children's practical schooling activities in a wide array of comparative circumstances.

The Progressionist Model

While Enewetak/Ujelang people do not perceive themselves as prototypical primitives trapped in an ancient past awaiting enlightenment to progress toward a modern existence, outsiders, including several teachers at Na'alehu Elementary School on Hawai'i, Hawai'i, speak about them using verbal formulations that derive from the primitivist–modernist trope. Education fits nicely within this paradigm as a standard salvation path that leads premodern people into the contemporary world. Enewetak/Ujelang people do not see themselves as either primitive or premodern, and certainly, there is no reason to think that the formulation has any real legitimacy beyond the nineteenth-century notion that Europeans and Americans used to inscribe their own desires to feel superior to others around the world. Nevertheless, the imbalance in power between Germany, Japan, or the United States and local peoples residing on the small atolls and islands that they colonized or actively managed in the Pacific meant that European constructions of the primitive had real effects on others. Certainly, this was

the case for Marshall Islanders. Therefore, Enewetak/Ujelang people presume that some of the assumptions of the European formulation are true. For example, community elders frequently voice the idea that young members of the community in today's world must think about or "prepare for tomorrow and the next day" or to "look to the times in front." Community members also believe that schooling is important if their young members are to be able to adapt to life in the current era (*moud eo ilo raan ke in*). Therefore, although there is neither a discourse of modernization nor of development that accompanies these pronouncements, a significant component of their worldview has changed. Having access to income and to the goods that money can buy is now viewed as an important component of one's identity. Marshallese with no access to money are said to be *jebwabwe* (without direction) and are occasionally said to have no significance (*ejjelok tokjen*; literally "nothing coming from" [that person]). These judgments by Marshallese of their own compatriots are of recent vintage. Certainly, nothing of the sort existed in the 1970s and 1980s when I first began my inquiries into Marshallese social life. At that time, extraordinary skill in fishing, working the land, weaving mats and handicraft, or managing community affairs were the most highly valued attributes of an empowered adult. Money, classed by Marshallese as a "child class possessive," *neji-* (a category that includes toys) had value when it was used wisely, but when frittered away, it was of little consequence. Certainly, having access to money was not central to the construction of a meaningful identity. In addition to the value-added component of money in fashioning a contemporary sense of identity, Big Island Marshallese also have a clear understanding that, although anyone can work and earn some money, education allows some people to hold jobs that pay better and contribute more meaningfully to a person's identity than jobs that require menial labor. However, if more empowered identities are the aim, the educational process itself requires that ambivalence toward one's own identity, if not a straightforward degradation of identity, must take place prior to the moment when those judged most deserving receive their just rewards.

American education, of course, involves practices and procedures that reflect, in their design, elements of the larger milieu of which they are a part. For example, one segment of educational practice typically ranks students vis-à-vis one another and then distributes rewards (in the form of grades, etc.) based on that ranking. As American-educated readers certainly realize, such grades are presumed to reflect a student's knowledge or ability and has real effects on a person's feelings about themselves and their own construction of identity. By repositioning education to occupy a central place in the construction of what it now means to be a productive, money-earning adult, members of the Enewetak/Ujelang community have

accepted a whole array of assumptions about what an American-style institutional education means and how it can enable a certain desirable identity construction. Equally, by entering into a Marshallese–American or Hawaiian–American school, the retinue of everyday practices encountered by each student requires adherence to other ritual routines that have a direct impact on identity construction as well.

The desire for education among Enewetak/Ujelang people has become increasingly central in recent years, particularly as a people who experienced the way of life in the government center, Majuro, in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s. This was a time when living in exile on Ujelang, the most isolated atoll in the Marshall Islands, required local self-sufficiency and the ability to live off of indigenous resources for extended periods of time. The only option was to move to Majuro and live a life largely separate from the community on Ujelang. Nevertheless, among those who elected to reside in "Ujelang Town," on the small islands of Majuro between Rita and Delap, a few young Ujelang people successfully completed high school and went on to college, thereby positioning themselves as future community leaders. Of course, the bulk of the community did not move to Majuro permanently but simply came to visit, enjoy the attractions of urban life, resupply, and return to Ujelang. In the process, however, they witnessed the alternate lifestyle of their urban compatriots and presumed that, if they were to follow a similar path, their offspring might also reap the benefits that had been obtained by the first-educated members of the community.[2] The centrality of education has been even more accentuated since people began moving to the Big Island in 1991 and to other US mainland locales since that time.[3] In these multi-ethnic locales, feedback about the centrality of education to financial success and personal renown receive constant reinforcement. Nevertheless, the sedimentation of some of the central tenets of education into local ideology is of much longer duration. Initially inspired by nineteenth-century American missionary and German government practices, ideas about the unilineal character of knowledge (fully controlled by Europeans and Americans), and the elevated forms of identity that could be accessed by those who controlled such knowledge, were accepted without critique even though the value of such "ways of thinking of outsiders" (*lomnok ko an rumwaijet*) were minimal for those living on atolls on the outer fringe of the Marshall Islands. Lacking any evident practical value, it took a long time to inspire people to lend significant value to the Euro-American educational enterprise as a whole. Life on Ujelang provided few opportunities for those with high school or college degrees; but with the community's repatriation to the southern-most islets of Enewetak in 1980, with far more frequent contact between Enewetak and

Majuro, and with Marshall Islands' independence in the mid-1980s, pragmatic conditions shifted and the emerging group of young adults began to imagine a new "forward-looking" trajectory for the community. As much as it may have aligned with the ideology of their colonizers, education was identified as a key pathway that would allow the new generation of Enewetak/Ujelang people to realize these new and empowered imagined identities.

Ironically, of course, the work of educational transformation fell on the shoulders of the youth, whereas the imagined accomplishments that were to result from a stress on education were the dreams of adults. During a heated argument at a Council Meeting on Enewetak in 1990, wherein the young adult men challenged the authority of the elder men, Joseph, speaking for the elders, told the young men that, from that time forward, the younger men would be in charge of community decision making. In part, this strategy was simply a ploy to demonstrate that young men did not have the wisdom to lead the community, but it also marked a shift in community priorities. Already an increasing number of young men and women had moved to Majuro to marry men and women from a wide variety of Marshallese atolls. More importantly, within five years of the confrontational meeting, the community, with the support of both elder and younger adults, committed to invest a substantial part of their nuclear claims compensation fund in the Enewetak school program, and yet another segment of the community established a vibrant and growing community of Enewetak/Ujelang residents on the Big Island. In addition to better health care, the stated attraction of the Big Island was access to better schools. Therefore, even if younger community members were not immediately successful in their educational pursuits, the dreams of the adults combined with an increasingly well-traveled populace and a much more cosmopolitan set of social contacts and practices to transform the thinking about education in the worldview of members of the community.

Rethinking the position of education, and placing it as a central focus in the formation of local identities—both at the personal and communal level—has resulted in numerous contradictions both conceptually and in terms of everyday practice. Although Enewetak/Ujelang community members on the Big Island, in Majuro, and on Enewetak all share the assessed value of education, the contradictions that are experienced by each group differ significantly from one another. The specific contours of these contradictions are most apparent when comparing the educational practices on Ujelang in the mid-1970s and the educational encounters of students on the Big Island in 2002 and 2003. First, I present an overview of educational practices on Ujelang where the resident population varied between 265 and 410 people.

Formal Education and Experiential Learning on Ujelang

On Ujelang, all of the teachers as well as the principal were Marshallese who had taught in the school for a number of years. All of these educators were either "true Ujelang/Enewetak people," or they had married into the Ujelang community and had been in residence for at least a decade. The language of instruction was Marshallese although, of course, for classes that required English, the same teachers, each in his own island-inflected English idiolect, provided the role models. Although the Ujelang school was part of the larger Marshall Islands educational system, the atoll's isolation, some 630 miles from the government center, meant that there was little centralized control over the daily functioning of the school. Most decisions about the school were made at the atoll level and, in many senses, it operated as an independent Ujelang school. The most distinctive feature of the Ujelang school, which included students in grades one through eight, was how seldom it was in session. Frequently, the school year began late since many people traveled to the government center for the church conference or to resupply during the summer months. Supply ships only visited the atoll every two to four months; therefore, in 1976, 1977, and 1978, school started from three weeks to nine weeks late because two or more teachers were missing from the staff. Community events and unplanned disasters added more non–school days to the yearly schedule. In the 1976–77 school year, the community decided to rebuild the cookhouse used to prepare meals for the students. Initially, the younger grades were dismissed because their rooms abutted the cooking facilities. Soon, however, the entire school was closed on account of the noise and disruption. The 1977–78 school-year was shortened by the rebuilding of the church adjacent to the school. This all-involving community project became such a distraction that neither students nor teachers could maintain their focus. Then, in the same year, the atoll was struck by a typhoon and a subsequent tropical storm. The school was closed briefly, reopened, and ultimately closed for nearly six weeks to allow families to spread out across the entire atoll to gather foods during the period of famine that followed the typhoon. With all of these closures, it was not surprising that no Ujelang students were admitted to the only public high school in the Marshall Islands, located in Majuro, in 1977 or 1978 although certainly a few select students had been chosen for high school both prior to and after that time.[4]

After living on Ujelang for a few brief months, it seemed imminently clear that a Peace Corpsman's late 1960s assessment of school functioning was largely correct. In his view, in spite of his attempted interventions, schooling on Ujelang was a complete failure.[5] To the degree that there was

a curriculum, it followed the old "3Rs" formula, with a greater stress on reading and arithmetic than on writing.[6] Although most reading took place in Marshallese, students in the upper grades also had a minimal exposure to reading in English. Writing requirements were almost nonexistent and consisted in large part of fill-in-the-blank responses or very short answers to questions posed in the book. Given the pedagogical approach, and the amount of time school was closed, successes were minimal.

However, the longer I resided with Ujelang people (ultimately twenty-five months in the 1970s combined with many subsequent research visits), the clearer it became that most schooling took place outside the walls of the schoolhouse. This alternative pedagogy had little to do with the 3Rs but everything to do with learning to be a skilled and productive member of the local community.[7] Yet, with the exception of bible readings and some basic arithmetic, the community had little use for the 3Rs. Indeed, given the paltry number of complaints about the failings of the school, it became clear that the community had essentially redesigned the official curriculum to fashion a curriculum that fit local needs. When not in school, schooling consisted of learning the gender-, age-, and rank-appropriate activities that were expected of any person on Ujelang. Girls washed clothes, learned to prepare foods, helped with childcare, learned to identify and gather various local foods, and learned to weave mats and fashion handicraft. Boys learned to climb trees and retrieve coconuts, pandanus, and breadfruit; to sail, to capture a wide variety of fish, birds, and turtles; to care for younger siblings; and to build houses, boats, and canoes (Carucci 1980, Ch. 4 et. seq.) The mentors were older siblings if the tasks were relatively simple. With more skilled activities, like weaving mats or canoe building, mentoring shifted its tone to a relationship more reminiscent of apprenticeship.[8] Young girls often apprenticed with one of many grandmothers, a grandmother who was a particularly skilled mat maker and either lived in the house or nearby.[9] Similarly, young boys often apprenticed with a father, grandfather, or matri-clan uncle to learn the complexities of canoe building, sailing, or navigation. Unlike formal schooling, these apprentice relationships involved hands-on applied learning, what in the "new discovery" parlance of current-day education circles might be called "experiential learning." Rather than being confined to the institutional setting of the school, mentoring took place in contexts of ordinary production. Rather than being restricted to the formal hours of the school day, it took place at all hours of the day or night. With one canoe-building site immediately adjacent to my lagoon-side hut, I was often awoken a bit before daybreak when a master canoe builder and one or two young apprentices were gathering materials, reorienting the 36-foot hull of the canoe, or adjusting its moorings. Equally, on many

nights, the canoe builder and two or three of the most dedicated students would be working by lantern long after dark, eager to complete the canoe and race in the communitywide canoe race. Similarly, when word of the imminent arrival of a supply ship reached the community, young women apprenticed to skilled old weavers and handicraft specialists would work late into the night to prepare as many mats and handicraft items as possible prior to the anticipatory, excited cries of *Jeiloo!* (Sail Ho!)[10]

Not surprisingly, an archaeology of the contrast in these educational practices reveals discordant layers. The very first institution that might be considered a European-style school was the mission school on Ebon where literacy in a missionary-inspired local script allowed people to read chapters of the Bible as it was translated chapter by chapter in the 1850s and 1860s. Missionaries took their translational duties seriously, even if their assumptions about translation were somewhat naive, inasmuch as they believed it was part of their duty to give local people access to God's word. The first government-sponsored school was constructed by German colonial administrators in the 1890s with the school on Jaluij (German administrative center of the Marshalls) attended by only two of the most promising young Enewetak scholars around the turn of the century. This selective approach to education was replaced during the Japanese era (1915–44) with a more populist approach to schooling in which three grades were taught locally and then the most skilled local students went from Enewetak to Pohnpei to continue their education at a distance from their home community. After the war, American administrators expanded on the Japanese model, with local schools providing classes through the eighth grade and the most skilled Enewetak scholars continuing their schooling in Majuro, the new government center of the Marshall Islands.[11] On Ujelang, the most distant school from Majuro, local people had clearly indigenized the institutional approach to schooling in large part by discontinuing its active sessions and shifting the burden of education into the experiential heart of the community.

Ironically however, in spite of the success of the Ujelang model in producing the best sailors, fishermen, tree climbers, mat makers, and perhaps even the best cooks in the entire Marshall Islands, the inequalities in power between the colonizers, Marshallese elites, and local outer island people could not escape the purview of community members.[12] The Japanese ideology of dedication and hard work, along with the US ideology of self-improvement through (formal) educational accomplishment, were messages that could be heard interwoven in the discourses of Enewetak/Ujelang people.[13] As much as Ujelang residents highly valued their identities as members of a cohesive family-like group (the people of Ujelang) and as much as they realized that their community-oriented approach to education

promoted this sense of unity (cf., Reagan 1996, 142), they also recognized that others saw them as backward and child-like in relation to any number of powerful groups around the world. Having appropriated components of the discourse of marginality that were part of this colonially inspired imagined identity, they began to feel that they were increasingly marginalized. Equally, they accepted the accompanying premise that education would set them on the course to a better life, a life that was the equivalent of Americans, and many Ujelang people sensed that it was only their physio-geographic marginality that kept them from realizing the benefits of a more modern existence. Therefore, when people became disgruntled with life on the radically transformed Enewetak after their return in 1980, one proposed solution came with a trip to the Big Island of Hawai'i in 1989 to see about the feasibility of setting up a colony in that new land. One central theme of the mantra for those most in favor of setting up the new colony was the increased educational opportunities available in Hawai'i. Even though the community as a whole did not buy the land they had gone to assess, a few young couples made the move to the Big Island on their own. By the mid-1990s, they had been joined by many others, and in 2003, around 400 Enewetak people resided on Kona Coast of Hawai'i, Hawai'i. The size of the community has continued to expand each time I have returned to conduct further research with the Big Island Marshallese community, with subsequent research visits in 2006, 2008, 2010, and 2012. By 2012, well over 800 Ujelang/Enewetak people resided on the Big Island.

Schooling and Disciplinary Practice on the Big Island

In Hawai'i, schooling became far more institutionalized, and of course, it fell out of control of the newly established Marshallese migrants. Indeed, this was by plan, because the new settlers set off the advantages of their educational opportunities by noting that:

> In Hawai'i, the children have real teachers, clothed people [white people], not the false teachers of the Marshall Islands. There you have Marshallese who lie a little bit about knowing English, and knowing mathematics, but when it [the schooling] is completed, you go off and come back and [have only] emptiness (comment by Ijao, LMC Field notes, 1995).[14]

Of course, while the educators in Hawai'i were undoubtedly better prepared than the teachers in the Marshall Islands, what was lost in moving

to the Big Island was control. The community controlled the education system on Ujelang and shaped it to the needs of the community. On the Big Island, Enewetak/Ujelang Marshallese were at the mercy of an educational system far beyond their own control.[15] By 2002, the English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) teacher at one school, who worked with several Enewetak/Ujelang children, said:

> The problem is that these teachers really hate the Marshallese. They see them as the lowest of the low and have the attitude that they don't need to do anything for them. . . . There are lots of negative stereotypes of the Marshallese: a lot of people call them "black, niggers—negroes," and treat them like shit because they don't want to deal with them. The teachers say the Marshallese are really dirty because a lot of them [the teachers] live in the lower part of Ocean View, and they bring their attitudes with them to school. I am always thinking "Here we are [in Ocean View] living without any water; what right do we have to say that they [the Marshallese] are not acting properly?" People come to school saying "What are they doing with their sewage? Where does it go?" Well, where does your own sewage go? I certainly do not know where mine goes. The people down below have to live with it, I guess (LMC Field notes, October, 1 2002).[16]

Although the Enewetak/Ujelang Local Government Council members controlled the teachers on Ujelang (because they were either local people or long-standing in-married spouses who had become an integral part of the community), on the Big Island, the Marshallese community is imagined as the equivalent of the Jews, wandering the landscape without a land of their own, a community that, in some ways, has always been at the mercy of others. Even though Marshall Islanders can live legally in the United States, they live in fear of being thrown out of the country. They deal with these fears by avoiding interactions with any government agencies, and the schools are but one setting where interactions are avoided. An (ESL) teacher at a different school noted: "Well we have tried everything to get the [Marshallese[parents to attend, but they won't come in. I don't expect things will be any different tonight" [when a special presentation by the Marshallese ESL students was being conducted]. Indeed, none of the parents did come for the event, even though it was designed to honor the ESL students. Later, when I asked Joniten, a parent and leader of the community, why he had not been at the event, he said:

> There is no value to going to the school. One time, I went to pick up the children and the person who was high up, the principal, called me over and said, "Niito is causing damage. You need to really watch him, because he is making trouble."[17] Niito! Why did that fellow [the principal] call me? [Niito] is not my child. [He] is not an Enewetak person. But, to that fellow, it is all the same. It is as if all Marshall Islanders are one and the same.

Silence and noninteraction have proven to be a viable adaptive strategy for Ujelang/Enewetak people on the Big Island, but obviously, it does nothing to alter the stereotypes of Marshallese or to confront the imbalance in power relationships that separate people at the school from Marshallese in the area.

The student's perspective differs from that of adults because their range of comparative experience is narrower. Nonetheless, among the Enewetak/Ujelang migrants, students' experiences also vary. Some, like Bilimon, a high school junior in 2002, have spent virtually their entire lives on the Big Island. The entirety of their lived experience is as Big Island Marshallese. Others have attended school in the Marshall Islands as well as in Hawai'i. In this paper, I concentrate mainly on interactions with fifth graders both on Ujelang and on the Big Island, although I also rely on comparisons with older students upon occasion, to discern a few of the outcomes of schooling practices at the primary level. I worked most extensively with fifth graders in Ka'u, meeting with them each week in 2002–03 to help them with issues of translation in math, English, and other topical areas where they struggled to make sense of the material.

Ironically, even though Ujelang/Enewetak people came to the Big Island with education in mind, most students now attend a school that many people consider the least desirable school on the Big Island.[18] Not surprisingly, this relates to residence, economics, and issues of class distinction (Bourdieu 1984, 466 et. seq.). As the bulk of the community migrated from Kailua Kona to the south Kona coast where land was more affordable, so too the quality of the schools declined. Most fifth graders now attend Na'alehu Elementary. The special education teacher at that school notes:

> Na'alehu is one of the poorest schools in the district [on the Big Island]. There is very high turnover and it is hard to keep teachers. That makes it more difficult to provide good programs. . . . This school is very traditional and out of date. It is probably about thirty years behind the times.
>
> There are some really good teachers here, but others believe in the idea that the students must respect authority or else. That

> model of education doesn't work now. Kids aren't like that anymore. They must know that they are respected. . . . Science is particularly rigid and the Marshallese really hate it. The teacher uses a lecture format and then tests the kids. It is difficult for the kids to follow: totally noninteractive.
>
> . . .Even though no one around here wants to deal with the Marshallese kids, they do not want to lose them either, because all of the funding comes as a result of having them here. Trouble is, the funds go into the general fund and never benefit these kids. So, we have a new remote, large screen DVD player, . . . not more services.

School children have no difficulty making similar judgments. Bilimon, for example, a high school student who attended Konawa'ena schools (Kealakekua, Hawai'i) for a number of years before moving to Ka'u, says: "Konawa'ena is much better than this (Ka'u), but I could not (go to) school every day because of 'the path' [i.e., I did not have adequate transportation to get to school], so I had to move to this place (near to us)," and one of his younger female siblings, Jenita, notes:

> I wanted to stay at Waimea because it was much better than this school [Na'alehu]. The teachers in the north [Waimea] were much better and there were not so many Marshallese." [LMC: "Why? Are Marshallese bad?] No, but if there are a lot, it is not any good because then they group up and speak Marshallese, and then you don't have to speak in English. . . . And, if there are a lot of Marshallese, they also make trouble—as if other people then hate ["it" or "you"]. But, as long as it is just one or two, they [others] will befriend you; there is no problem.

Not only do these students have a good grasp of the differential value of schools, they fully recognize the disadvantage of being required to attend a *jikul uaan* "bush school" or "fake school."[19] In addition, Jenita notes the complexities of identity politics on the Big Island. Like many Enewetak/Ujelang students, she knows that, in this setting, non-Marshallese teachers and school children define her as "other" and, equally, she recognizes that Marshallese present no threat to other Big Island residents until some sort of critical mass is reached within local communities. None of these complexities were present on Ujelang where all students were part of the same communal identity: children of Ujelang.

The marking of difference, which constitutes an entire symbolics of judgment and stereotype about Marshallese people, comes to be manifest in a multiplicity of ways on the Big Island where the entire understanding of the pedagogical process is different. In the classrooms on Ujelang, the general noise level was always high. Frequently, a cacophony of children's voices could be heard at some distance from the school. Within classrooms, however, all was not in disarray. Instead, students were frequently talking with one another, some in more animated tones than others, to work on group projects or solve problems communally. The fourth/fifth–grade teacher did not consider the animated student interactions at all untoward when I queried him about the "noise" [LMC: "They're certainly making lots of noise"]. Taiwel (the teacher): "Such is the case [i.e., that's typical]. They are working together and their noise-making is good because they do not know the answer. They are getting very upset [with one another]." Although I considered Taiwel's answer to be a bit unsettling at the time, looking back on this event, it is clear that he considered arguing in an animated way about the answer to be a normal part of the learning process. The students were actively engaged in trying to figure out an agreeable solution to the problem at hand.[20] Indeed, adult council meetings, if somewhat more ordered in terms of turn-taking, are analogous in structure to the interactions in Taiwel's classroom.

On the Big Island, classroom conditions were quite different. Indeed, when I worked at Ka'u High School with many older siblings of the Na'alehu students, the cacophony in the classroom was overwhelming, unlike anything I had experienced in any other rural school. But, unlike Ujelang, the high school students' banter was frequently aimed at disrupting the teacher. Led by the local Hawaiian students, these disruptions were part of a struggle for power aimed at demonstrating that the students, not the instructors, were in control.[21] Because Marshallese students were fighting for their own place in this school, with Hawaiian and Filipino students in particular, they certainly did not attempt to contravene the Hawaiian students' disruptive ploys.[22] Frequently, Marshallese contributed to the disruption to create a domain where their own solidarity and competition with the outspoken Hawaiian students could be demonstrated. The sense of shared Marshallese-ness at Ka'u High School was, perhaps, mildly reminiscent of what Ujelang/Enewetak students experienced when they went to school in Majuro. Their sense of a shared group identity was defined by others—on the Big Island, largely by local Hawaiian students—and their relation to that identity was largely reactive. In other words, in Ka'u, Enewetak/Ujelang students did not feel they shared much with other Marshallese unless they happened to reside nearby, but the Hawaiian

students, the teachers, and ultimately others like the Filipino students imagined them as a unitary group and interacted with them as if they were one. Quite unlike students on Ujelang who were simply born with a shared sense of identity, the result in terms of identity was extremely ambivalent (cf., Gershon 2012, 148). At one level, the sense of a shared Marshallese identity had to be accepted by Ujelang/Enewetak students because others acted toward them in this way. On the other hand, they were not fully invested in their shared Marshallese-ness, because it did not reflect the identities that they imagined for themselves.[23] When combined with a power gradient that was controlled by others, this ambivalent commitment to an other-fashioned identity is critical to an understanding of the sense of insecurity experienced by Ujelang/Enewetak students on the Big Island.

The primary school students were quite different since the significance of group identities was far less ossified at the fourth- and fifth-grade level. Equally, in this setting, periods of classroom instruction were primarily focused on directive instruction with the expectation that students would remain silent as the teacher conveyed the necessary information. Although some teachers in the earlier grades employed more interactive styles, the directive style was certainly the method of choice in the fifth-grade classroom described in this paper. Even in the lower grades, instruction of Marshallese children was often from teacher to student, and always in English, because none of the teachers could speak or understand spoken Marshallese. The method that was shared between the primary school and the high school was a stress on discipline and control, even if that framework was being embedded in student's understanding of how the learning process should proceed at the primary level, and if it was being overtly challenged by cadres of Hawaiian, Filipino, and Marshallese students at the high school level.

A number of structural changes differentiated student–teacher interactions on Ujelang and on the Big Island, and many of the differences focused on identity, group processes, and power or control. With one exception, all of the Ujelang teachers in the mid-1970s were in-married spouses who shared with their students a need to fulfill the desires of community elders who were the power brokers in the community. Dictating to students how the classroom should be run was not their focus, and even though the Ujelang Primary School was, in theory, under the control of educational authorities in Majuro, those authorities asserted little control over what transpired on Ujelang, 630 miles from the government center. Curricular materials were occasionally sent to the atoll, and as mentioned, the teachers attended summer workshops in Majuro, but in the 25 months that I resided

on Ujelang, not once was there a visit from authorities representing the Department of Education in the Marshall Islands. Virtual independence allowed the principal and teachers on Ujelang to set their own curricular design, and even this design was frequently altered by the larger flow of community events.

Enewetak/Ujelang people encountered a very different set of structural parameters on the Big Island where they perceived themselves as *ruamwai-jet* (outsiders/visitors) and where they had virtually no control over the curriculum or the daily interactions that took place in the school. Idealistically, community elders continued to view schooling as a key to success for their offspring and hoped that the success of the students would benefit their own extended families and the broader Marshallese community. Nevertheless, their lack of power, to say nothing of their own strategies of self marginalization, "just hiding out," positioned them solely as bystanders or end users in a much more highly institutionalized system of education that was lending contour to their children's everyday lives as well as to their community's future. The ambivalence of their position as welcome/unwelcome US residents made community elders uncertain of their rights, resulting in near-total disempowerment in relation to the schools.

From the students' perspective, schooling was viewed very differently from the position it occupied for their parents and grandparents. The students were certainly aware of the idealistic, salvation view of education maintained by adult members of the Enewetak/Ujelang community. It was frequently voiced in public and was held over the heads of students to create enough social pressure to try to force them to succeed. From the students' perspective, the risks of unfulfilled community expectations were felt as an added source of stress, or of alienation. At the same time, experiencing the discordant cultural values and the sense of being despised by others when they were at school, students were far more ambivalent than were community elders about the potential advantages offered by schooling. Their concerns were far more immediate, pragmatic, and day-to-day. Completing their work at school and minimizing the effects of school on their lives outside were primary student concerns, ideas that may well have been shared with other students in Ka'u. Avoiding confrontations with teachers and with other students was also a core concern. In this respect, the students were not unlike their parents for whom "hiding out" was a primary means of dealing with others. Other than a shared feeling by the Enewetak/Ujelang students in Ka'u that were receiving an exposure to English that was superior to their siblings and cousins in the Marshall Islands, there was no shared feeling that an extraordinary dedication to

school work would benefit them, either as individuals or as part of the larger community. School was the expected norm, and through their attendance, they were fulfilling the expectations of their elders and the larger Marshallese community. If they showed up, did what they were asked, and remained out of sight, they had accomplished what their elders had asked of them.

Contested Identities and the Positioning of Social Practices in the Classroom

Faced with an approach to pedagogy that placed a high stress on discipline, an approach far beyond their own control, the Big Island Marshallese students employed a strategy that was, for them, both productive and logical. During independent work time, the Marshallese high school students still relied on work-sharing (what Marshallese call *kumiai* "working together as a group" [from Japanese *kumi*, "group"]) to solve problems in math and science. The fifth grade teacher interpreted this as continued disruption and constantly said, "Do your own work," or rhetorically "Can't you do your own work?" The ethic of independence and individuality so typical of the United States is, in this context, being brought into direct confrontation with a very different Marshallese communal approach to problem solving. This proves threatening to the teacher because it contradicts the fundamental precepts of what Lave and Wenger refer to as the schooling model (1991), that is, a place where the intent is to measure the individual appropriation of a set corpus of materials that have no necessary relation to community use values. The teacher's comments point to his own fears: "How will I assess each individual's (so-called) knowledge if each student is not doing independent work?"

Underlying this teacher's fears is an entirely different way of positioning knowledge in relation to models of personal identity. The standard model in the United States posits that knowledge is, and should be, a type of alienable possession with market value that is held by individuals and deployed selectively to demonstrate part of a person's self-worth. In contrast, the Marshallese model presumes relational identities, a construction in which "it is the whole not the part that is thing-like" (Strathern 2005, 120), and for Marshall Islanders, knowledge is the product of group effort oriented toward solving a particular thinking exercise or aimed at completing a shared project. But, in this instance, not only is knowledge task specific, its ownership is viewed as collective. Indeed, although co-ownership is a common feature of Marshallese social action reflected lexically in the use of a wide array of possessive adjectives, it was also highly visible in the

activities of the fifth graders in Ka'u. Unless they were forced to act differently, the group would wait until they had collectively completed worksheets or other pedagogical tasks and then ask: "We [exclusive, four or more] are now finished. May we use the computer?" For students in Ka'u, the computer was seen as a reward for completed class work. But, in the Marshall Islands, and equally among Marshallese on the Big Island, even tasks completed by individuals are commonly reported as the result of labor of two or more persons. Thus, kumiai, or collective work toward completing a task, is a deeply embedded feature of Marshallese practice, and it is certainly evident among students on Ujelang and the Big Island alike.[24] Kumiai makes sense in a society that stresses group labor and shared accomplishments rather than individual achievement and success. In their use of kumiai, fifth graders at Na'alehu were simply being well-socialized Marshallese.

At the same time, a second complementary theme is also worthy of attention because it is critical to understanding how Enewetak/Ujelang students interact with persons in positions of authority. As Gershon suggests for Samoa (2012), this element of demeanor is grounded in the fact that persons in positions of subservience should not question or directly confront other social actors who occupy more highly ranked social positions. Although Marshallese are certainly not identical in this regard to Samoans, their ideas about hierarchical relations are described in ways that make them far more similar to Samoans than to the ideas of personhood that Strathern discusses for Melanesia. In terms of the actions of Marshallese students, like their Samoan counterparts, it would be considered rude for them to suggest to their elders or teachers how they should act, because those in positions of authority are deserving of their rank on account of their ability to foresee the needs of those for whom they are responsible (c.f., Gershon 2012, Ch. IV). However, this does not render Enewetak/Ujelang students silent. Questions of clarification are common; yet statements couched as imperatives or commands are never uttered by those who occupy subservient social positions. Suggested courses of action may also be posited by those who are speaking with others in more empowered positions than they perceived themselves to be. However, those actions are always framed as suggestions, not as declarations of what will occur. With these dual ideas about proper Marshallese action in mind, one focused on relational identities, the second on the local understanding that relational interactions are quite distinct among persons of equal and unequal rank, a much more nuanced theory of the approaches to schooling adopted by Marshallese youth can be posited.

Fifth-Grade Interactions

Unlike the high school, the fifth-grade classroom was highly regimented and the teacher insisted on strict discipline. Little talk was permitted among students in this classroom. Mature Marshallese often recall the strict school discipline instituted by Japanese teachers in Marshall Islands' schools before the war, and the Japanese-Hawaiian teacher in the fifth-grade classroom in Ka'u may well have gained the respect for discipline circuitously from the same source. In spite of the regimented class design, Marshallese students still attempted to engage in group problem solving as a way to make sense of complex questions with which they were unfamiliar. Indeed, as I worked independently with several of these students in the special education resource room, they used the same strategy: *kumiai*. The aim of the strategy was to solve the problem at hand, not to stress an individual's specific skill or his/her contribution to the solution. The resource room group used at least two sub-strategies. First, when everyone was working on the same project, math, for example, each student solved a certain unique set of questions. Then the answers were shared. The more knowledgeable young Marshallese mathematicians readily suggested alternate solutions to the others before the group moved to another subject with its own set of knowledgeable specialists.[25] The young student "specialists" absolutely felt no ownership over their work. Instead, they shared as readily with the least-skilled student mathematicians as with the others to come up with a strategy that was satisfying to the group. Second, when working on different topics—math, history, science—each student began his/her own work, as the resource room teacher had instructed me was what the students had to do, at least initially. However, as soon as difficulties were encountered, a specialist in that field provided answers while another member of the group answered the questions on which the otherwise-occupied specialist was originally working. At other times, a student encountering problems moved on to another worksheet, often in a very different subject. In my small group, Liijen was the "math specialist," an area where Retinal (a pseudonym) and others struggled. As Retinal encountered math difficulties, he moved on to another worksheet, sliding his math toward Liijen. Liijen always completed his own math worksheet, sometimes asking his fellow classmates not to interrupt him. However, as soon as he was done, he reviewed all of the students' math worksheets while Retinal and the others shifted their attention to English or science. The method worked well for the group. Clearly, their aim was to complete all of the work in a short amount of time so that the group could relax and talk or use the computer. Of course, the idea of getting the work done quickly and then shifting to talk or more enjoyable

tasks is hardly restricted to Marshallese, but in this case, the reward scenario was set by the teacher in the resource room who, before leaving me with the kids, would remind them: "O.K., no talking or computer time until all the work is done." The students' kumiai strategy was chosen to meet the requirements that had been set for that particular context.

When I presented a talk on the Ujelang/Enewetak community for the faculty at Na'alehu, the fifth-grade teacher asked about cheating. I described Marshallese kumiai—working in groups with one subgroup working hard and then resting while another subgroup took over. Although this helped a few teachers see through issues that otherwise might be seen as cheating, the fifth grade teacher persisted in his view that students had to do their own work; otherwise they would not learn the material:

> If they continue cheating, they will never learn this stuff. They need to read the book, do the exercises, then take the test to prove that they've actually learned it. If Retinal keeps getting his answers from Liijen, I have to keep sending him to the principal's office because we do not allow cheating.

The Enewetak/Ujelang students saw this very differently. When they came to work with me in the resource room they often positioned me as a friend who could try to help them decode why their teachers acted in a certain way. Some of their comments were:

> Why is it that that fellow [the fifth-grade teacher] keeps "putting our thoughts in jail"? He says "Work on the assignment!" but when we are working then he says "Bad! Why is it that you keep combining your abilities" [working together]? He really hates working together (*kobamaron*). He always sends Retinal to detention because he says "cheat" [in English]. [He] really gets mad.

With seeming irony, it is often math, the subject with which many American students struggle, that is the most straightforward for Marshallese. When they come to the resource room, they frequently begin with math because "we understand," or "it is easy."[26] In contrast, the contextual clues that allow an American to interpret a story by Jack London or John Steinbeck are much more difficult for Marshallese to bring to life. Equally, the value of Social Studies/History texts are not apparent to Enewetak/Ujelang students. Because Enewetak/Ujelang students struggle with these texts, some teachers give up on them and simply want to get them out of the way. Even though the law requires teachers to integrate so-called low-functioning

students into the classroom, often they end up tucked away in the Special Education room. Here Bjorn would be sent with his assigned work. As an example, on December 3, 2003, I wrote:

> Bjorn's work today was at an all time level of lunacy. For his Social Studies [American History] assignment, he was asked [by his teacher] to copy the first line of each paragraph under each subheading in the chapter on which they are working. I see absolutely no pedagogical value in this exercise other than, possibly, teaching him a small amount about spelling. It seems to be the teacher's way of avoiding dealing with a student with whom he does not wish to deal. Under a subsection entitled "Adams Stands Firm," for example, Bjorn, following the directions of his teacher, copied down: "Congress established a Department of"; "During these years, President"; and "In 1800, France and the United States" [etc.].

Even tracking the topic sentences of each paragraph would be a more useful exercise, no matter how limited in value. Needless, to say, it was hard to keep Bjorn on topic once the other boys completed their work and began working on the computer.

Bjorn responded to this assignment with a number of comments, including, "There is no value to these [kinds of] things," "My writing is becoming tiresome," and "Why is it that white people think there is a great deal of value in these things?" When I suggested that Bjorn ask his teacher what he thought the value of the assignment was, he responded: "We [the students] will never respond [ask him] because [he] will be upset."

Of course, on Ujelang, the formal curriculum was far from ideal, often suffering from the limitations of the teacher's own knowledge—a long-standing problem (Hezel 1995, 259, 288). Nevertheless, the school was still attuned to local needs and practices (including kumiai). Local students had no fear of talking with the teachers who were senior members of their own community. However, because the teachers were of an older generation, the students would never tell them what to do. For example, in the autumn of 1977, students in Ijamo's class were reading some Marshallese traditional stories that had been translated into English by the Department of Education. One of the stories was about the primordial trickster, Etao who, in a famous tale staged on Majuro Atoll, was building a fine-looking canoe that he exchanged with a local chief prior to a canoe race. The students were struggling with the English translation and arguing about which canoe parts were being discussed in the story. One student, Etmōn, said "Perhaps

we should go down to the lagoon shoreline and really look at the canoes of the chiefs [respected men] to clarify these things [the parts of the canoe]." Soon, many students were appealing to Ijamo to go to see the canoes. Nevertheless, their appeals were guarded. They were not command forms: "It would be helpful if we looked at the canoes," or "The canoes could be viewed [just] before we eat lunch." If Ijamo had been more flexible, he may have agreed to the visit. For him, however, being "in school" had something to do with being in the school building. He told the students: "School time is now; we will never go play on the seashore because it is time for class." The students continued to suggest, without success, that the impromptu "field trip" would be of value. Ultimately, Ijamo agreed to bring in one of the elder canoe builders to help with the story, and indeed, one of these experts came to the class later in the week to help clarify the lesson.

At the time I recorded this sequence, the written version demonstrated how Ijamo's response to the students may have been less than ideal. The hands-on learning with the canoe builders may have been more useful. Nevertheless, the comparison with the fifth-grade students on the Big Island reveals far more. First, Ijamo did actually bring someone within the official confines of the school who knew a lot about canoes. More important, however, the students acted in a far more empowered manner than their more worldly counterparts on the Big Island nearly thirty years later. They interacted with Ijamo as an elder deserving of respect but not so distant that they were afraid to intervene with their own different ideas. Indeed, Etmon, one of the more outspoken boys voiced the suggestion, but others actively supported the idea of the impromptu field trip. All students used speech forms that were suited to their lesser rank: "perhaps we should . . . ," "it would be helpful," etc. In contrast, none of the Marshallese in Ka'u felt that they could actively engage the fifth-grade teacher in any sort of conversation. In Bjorn's words, "We will never respond [to the teacher's proclamations] because [he] will be upset." Not only were they intimidated, not only did they lack any meaningful control over their own educational process, in Bjorn's case—and he was among the most talented Ujelang/Enewetak students—the teacher's strategy lay somewhere between total marginalization and dismissal. Although not universal, this teaching strategy was obvious to the ESL teacher at Na'alehu. He said (paraphrased):

> The model here [for dealing with the Marshallese students] is antiquated. People want to keep them separate. This will not work. I have seen it fail before. These kids are smart; they are a population that has some behavioral problems, but they are smart.

> [He often talks of them abstractly as "a population"]. They are not special needs kids. To isolate them is not fair to them. They pick up on English fine. Even the youngest ones who just are arriving here for the first time have some skill. Their main problems are with science, math,[27] and maybe social studies.

Later, the ESL teacher noted that "he is worried about the Marshallese boys. They are starting to 'act out'". Given the differences in power, given the disciplinary educational regimes meant not only to indoctrinate but also to fashion Ujelang/Enewetak students as both marginal and "other," it is hardly surprising that the "Marshallese boys" were beginning to seek alternate strategies for gaining recognition.[28]

Conclusion

If we accept Bourdieu's idea that people in a wide variety of social circumstances use the symbolic resources available to them in various self-empowering ways (1991), a great deal can be learned from the experiences of Enewetak/Ujelang students in different school settings. In this paper, we have only gotten a glimpse of two such social arenas. In the 1970s on Ujelang, the community was cohesive and communally "self"-confident. Yet, having settled on the belief that formal educational opportunities would allow them to "move forward," they perhaps under-appreciated the fact that they had, in fact, redesigned the colonially imposed formal education systems and substituted a local, hands-on, active-learning, form of education where the boundaries between school and community remained permeable. The Ujelang school successfully produced citizens who were extremely well versed in activities of critical importance to outer island life.

In an attempt to realize their forward-looking dreams, a sizeable segment of the community migrated to the Big Island where, by their own estimate, better educational opportunities were available. Ironically, if not surprisingly, economic circumstances forced them to recalibrate their Beacon Hill educational aspirations when they relocated in Ka'u, where they encountered some of the least progressive of Hawai'i's schools. In seeking a better education in Hawai'i, Enewetak/Ujelang people also moved from an experiential learning approach toward education locally designed on Ujelang to an educational model "thirty years behind the times" under the full control of outsiders to the Marshallese community in Ka'u. There, students have come to recognize the degree to which new immigrant groups are welcomed with a form of aloha that willingly places them onto

the lowest rung of the social ladder. Discursive and instructional strategies in the Ka'u schools help to ensure marginalization to a far greater degree than they provide students with the educational opportunities required to "move forward" in the United States. Indeed, Bourdieu notes that in contexts of this sort, the symbolics of marginalization form an integral part of the process that legitimates inequalities through the disguised distribution of a variety of forms of violence (1990, Ch. 8). These marginalizing practices are entirely contrary to the experiential learning strategies that were implemented on Ujelang where one principal aim was what Timothy Reagan calls "the development of a *good person*" (Reagan 1996, 144). At this historical juncture, members of the Big Island Marshallese community certainly recognize the signifiers that are aimed at ensuring their marginalization, but they have largely resisted the full internalization of these strategies of defamation by concentrating their energies on Marshallese communal events that extend far beyond the control of the school or of other state agencies. Indeed, in their relations with others, the entire coping strategy within the Enewetak/Ujelang community on the Big Island is to hide out and avoid interactions with others. Although this strategy successfully circumvents negative encounters with people from a variety of institutions including the schools, it also reinforces the marginal condition of students who are left without parental advocates to intervene on their behalf in the school setting. The confident identities of school children on Ujelang are certainly compromised on the Big Island where an identity politics controlled by others repositions Marshall Islands children as peripheral social actors, even as disruptive cheaters and rule breakers, with no understanding of what education is all about. In the eyes of some teachers, Marshallese students are not junior citizens who must come to be socialized as meaningful members of tomorrow's society, nor are they disciplined in a fashion to inscribe within their bodies the practices of the larger social group. Rather, they are the recipients of a form of discipline that marks them as other, as existing outside of an imagined community that counts them as citizens. Given the fact that an increasing number of Marshallese youth are American born, they are positioned in an entirely liminal social stance as the most marginal people who reside in Hawai'i. Indeed, in the imagination of the most judgmental of their teachers, the Marshallese students are, quite simply, the newest "dirty, black niggers" in the land of aloha.

NOTES

1. Research on which this paper is based was funded by the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Montana State University Research and Creativity grants. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Meetings of the Society for Psychological Anthropology. I am particularly

grateful for the comments of members of that session as well as for the comments of Dr. Aiden Downey. In spite of my indebtedness to these persons, institutions, and agencies, all of the interpretations expressed herein are strictly mine.

2. Although common, this assumption was incorrect. Job options for high school and college educated graduates were extremely limited in the Marshall Islands, and many of the second-generation graduates had to return to a traditional subsistence lifestyle or face long-term unemployment. Nevertheless, these circumstances, a product of the long-term US policy of underdevelopment in Micronesia, were not foreseen by members of the community. Instead, they presumed that all graduates would be able to use their education to advantage and, thus, readily accepted the idea that education would result in success for all graduates and that the families of those graduates would benefit from their increased access to money.

3. As mentioned above, the successful employment of a handful of Enewetak students in the 1970s and 1980s certainly contributed to the community's reframing of education as a venture with substantial promise even though the accomplishments of those students is discussed with great ambivalence by members of that same community. That ambivalence always arises on Ujelang and Enewetak when egalitarian social relations are confronted with practices that result in the unequal distribution of resources. Therefore, although education is perceived as providing something desirable, a route to personal and family success, the unequal outcomes produced by that success are then judged negatively in relation to the strong egalitarian ethos of the Enewetak/Ujelang community.

4. In theory, all students were eligible to go to high school, but because the Marshall Islands High School in Majuro could only enroll a select number of students, in point of fact, only those outer island students whose performance in the primary grades was of the highest quality—and equally, those among them who could arrange to live with a relative in Majuro—actually continued their schooling beyond the eighth grade.

5. The typification of the Ujelang educational program as a total failure (that is, the surface-level analysis with which I begin this paper) largely aligns with the image of Ujelang education in the 1960s as depicted in Asselta (1971; also see footnote 7).

6. Falgout outlines a set of analogous histories of shifting educational values for nearby Pohnpei where, she notes, American style schooling focuses on "literacy, mathematical ability, and scientific understanding" (Falgout 1992, 39). Although scientific understanding may have been part of the published Marshall Islands curriculum, it was certainly under-stressed in Ujelang classrooms.

7. This feature of the Ujelang community's approach to pedagogy aligns with what Timothy Reagan contends is true of all so-called non-Western systems. Reagan refers to such approaches to pedagogy as "civic education," that is, as systems in which "there is a concern with helping the child grow into the kind of adult who will function effectively and appropriately in his or her society" (Reagan 1996, 143). Lumping all non-Western educational traditions together or even lumping all African or Native American approaches to education together—the *modus operandi* in Reagan's *Non-Western Educational Traditions*—risks the creation of a yet another orientalist stereotype (Said 1979). My aim is not to suggest that Reagan's generalization is true of all non-Western educational

systems, only that it is applicable to local educational practices on Ujelang. Even if Regan's hypothesis is true (and the regional stereotypes offered in the book are far too broad to establish the legitimacy of his hypothesis), it seems likely that the detachment of a functional connection between personal identities and the central ethos of any society may only be a logical option in complex societies. Indeed, such a disjunction may well have lead early social theorists like Emile Durkheim to think about psychosocially disruptive conditions like anomie (Durkheim 1966 [1897]). Although useful, Reagan's civic education designation reverses the "markedness" condition that might otherwise point out the ironic uniqueness of societies that are so socially complex that a disjunction between personal and collective identities can be sustained. Only in such societies can a "who cares?" attitude be sustained in relation to the functional outcomes of education at the level of individual identities. It is precisely such a "who cares?" attitude that Ujelang students first encountered in the attitudes of some teachers when they moved to the Big Island. Such a devaluation of personal identities is of central concern in this article.

8. Lave and Wenger's discussion of what they call "legitimate peripheral participation" in the apprenticeship practices of Yucatec Mayan midwives fully aligns with my consideration of the community-embedded learning practices that took place on Ujelang (Lave and Wenger 1991). To shift away from a learning model of this sort, one that is embedded in community practice, the type of schooling model encountered on the Big Island requires a great deal of risk and faith on the part of the community. As Lave and Wenger note, the schooling model relies on a very different set of social practices, "the goal of which is to increase the exchange value of learning independently of its use value" (Lave and Wenger 1991,112). Although Enewetak/Ujelang residents on the Big Island hope to increase their access to power by parlaying the exchange value of schooling into increased opportunities in the job market, as we shall explore in greater depth, they sacrifice control over the entire educational process and its goals, accepting on faith the notion that somehow, increased opportunity will benefit the community rather than contribute to a radical reshaping of the very contours of that community.

9. An elaboration of grandmother/grandchild relationships can be found in Carucci (2007b).

10. In a comparable fashion, Levin notes that Hawaiian children "prefer observation as a method of learning and . . . verbal modes (asking questions and explaining) are rarer and less valued" (1992, 61). She also notes that Hawaiian children "are not asked to display their own increasing but perhaps partial competence." Learning through observation is one core part of the active and contextual learning mode that Ujelang people employed in their apprenticeship strategies although, I would argue that learning through actually doing was equally important. Likewise, as apprentice learners, mat makers or canoe builders often worked on the less demanding parts of a task and were shown the products of the finest artisans, along with a demonstrated method, as examples of what they were trying to accomplish. In other words, they neither had time to perpetuate a culture of youth, nor did they find value in observing the "substandard" products of their children. In Hawai'i, community members found it laughable that *di palle* (white) adults would fawn over the substandard drawings and other products of their offspring. For them, this was a type of false indulgence.

11. A substantial ambivalence accompanied the formal "expansion" of learning opportunities under the Americans. For example, when the Naval administration of the region began after World War II, Pine and Savage note that the underlying attitude was one in which the "ultimate level of formal education should be limited to preclude false expectations" (1989, 85) Following Nevin (1977, 34) they suggest that this attitude was manifest in what can be seen as a simultaneously disciplining and disenfranchising idea that "education is not enough to give them success in the new society [American], [but] is ample to sever them from the old subsistence society." These policies aimed at producing liminal persona were largely maintained through an underfunded educational program until the Kennedy administration developed a more comprehensive approach to education in the 1960s (Nevin 1977).

12. Of course, there are no formal measures of "tree climbing abilities" and the other mentioned specialties. However, there was an understood hierarchy of familial abilities that was shared by members of the community. In 2012, Joniten (a parent and leader of the community) said, "Well, I was never one of those who could climb. But those born to Obet, and Kileon, and Etwot, well, they were extremely highly skilled" (*mokodi*). Ujelang residents were also proud of their regional reputation. Still today, Enewetak/Ujelang people discuss the fact that, in interisland competitions in the Marshall Islands, they frequently won events in these domains in spite of the relatively small population size of the atoll. Their canoe-making and sailing abilities are, perhaps, better marked by the fact that members of the Enewetak/Ujelang community won the Pan Pacific race for outrigger-class vessels in Rarotonga in 1992 (Carucci 1995, 31).

13. The American valuation on schooling was impressed on Ujelang people by Peace Corps volunteers who were sent to the atoll to help with the school. The PCV on Ujelang once said to me, "Well, when they don't go to school, it is only hurting themselves. They are only going to get ahead by going to school and getting an education." Important elements of this view were captured by Benjamin some years later on Enewetak. Benjamin headed one of two families that was most substantially represented by immigrants to the Big Island. In 1993, partly in defense of his children's decision to move to Hawai'i, he said:

> Well, life here on Enewetak has no substance. It is not like former times when Enewetak was an idyllic atoll. And if you stay here now, even if you go to school, what is it all for? Where will you work? Will you become one of the planters (those who were trying to replant the food trees on Enewetak) [facetiously]. There is no value to your burdens [in getting an education]. But, in Hawai'i there are real teachers, and after you graduate [from school] you can get a job and maybe work at a Macadamia nut plantation like that fellow Tobin [one of his sons], and become fairly elevated. Or you can work at a hotel, or in a restaurant. There are lots of jobs. And then you can go ahead and buy a house, and a [piece of] land, and move on still in a forward direction and. . . [thought not completed]. In these days, there is a great distance between Enewetak and the Big Island. It is still a great distance.

14. The Big Island community of Ujelang/Enewetak people has also shifted its feelings about certain components of education since their arrival. Joniten, for example, notes that at first

> in terms of tossing away Marshallese [in daily speaking], there was no speed that was too fast in terms of getting rid of it. But, after only a few months, we thought again and realized this was wrong. If the children did not understand spoken Marshallese, almost all of their knowledge of Marshallese custom would be gone. So around the houses, we then changed so that then, like you know is the case now, we speak only in Marshallese. In all other locations, at school, or walking around or working in Kona, or watching TV, the children will know how to speak English, they will understand, but if they do not speak Marshallese in these houses, well their customary practices will be gone.

Very early on, then, speaking Marshallese was seen as critical to the construction of a Marshallese identity and Ujelang/Enewetak community members worked systematically to have their children retain meaningful Marshallese (and Ujelang/Enewetak) identities. Of course, not all Marshallese families went along with the strategy that emerged among Ujelang-Enewetak residents of the Big Island. Of those from other Marshall Islands, locales who chose to speak English-only in their households Joniten said, "Now, it is as if they are not Marshallese at all. They do not know anything" [*rejaji jabedewot*].

15. Certainly, they were working toward establishing a meaningful presence in Hawai'i. By 2003, two Enewetak Marshallese teachers had gotten at least part-time education positions on the Big Island.

16. Both the ESL teacher and the teachers to whom he refers self-identity as kama'aina Hawaiian [*haole* or Hawaiian Japanese] instructors who have resided on the Big Island for a considerable length of time. The ESL teacher is one of the newest, having moved from Oregon to the Big Island three years prior to the time of his comments. Ocean View, "the World's Largest Subdivision" is well known for having no local source of water, and all Ocean View residents must haul water from Waiohinu to live in this location.

17. Niito is a pseudonym. I use the actual names of students in most instances in this article, but in cases where some negative evaluation of a student is involved, I have replaced the name with a pseudonym.

18. This "on-the-street" assessment of Na'alehu Elementary, of course, reflects a local folk ideology based on people's shared theories about the value of various elementary schools on the Big Island, not a controlled study of educational outcomes. Nevertheless, a ranking of third- through fifth-grade performance from the 2005–06 school year, after the implementation of the Bush-era No Child Left Behind requirements, lists Na'ahelu as 184th of 188 schools in the state of Hawai'i. The four lower-ranked schools are located on Oahu, two of them in Wai'anae, which has its own folkloric reputation for producing under-prepared students on that island (School Digger, 2005–06 Hawai'i Elementary School Rankings, available from: http://www.schooldigger.com/go/HI/schoolrank.aspx). This suggests that folk constructions of a school's value closely align with the culturally valorized outcomes for performance in such things as reading and mathematics that are measured by the Hawai'i State Assessment.

19. *Uaan* refers to a state of aimlessness, or a pretense to be that which something or someone is not—a degenerate "bush" pandanus that pretends to be like a delicious preferred variety of pandanus (*edwaan*); *mijuaan*: a variety of breadfruit that is less

desirable than other highly preferred varieties; *jerbal uaan* (aimless/useless work; without a defined intent). In terms of Marshallese schooling in Hawai'i, Okamoto et al. (who lump the urban Marshallese they surveyed with Chuukese and Pohnpeians as Micronesians [a counterproductive European designation that obliterates culturally distinct communities of significance to local people]) note that many of their survey subjects considered moving a stressful circumstance that, in the eyes of the investigators, may have had a negative effect on educational outcomes (Okamoto et al. 2008, 136). Clearly, Jenita and Bilimon have a much more nuanced approach to mobility. In their view, it is only moving from a better school to a school with a lower reputation, or from a school with a lower critical mass of Marshallese to one with more Marshallese, that is viewed as negative. Much of this "local knowledge" is lost in the survey by Okamoto, et. al., who readily admit that a major limitation of their investigation was created by "language barriers between interviewers and participants" (2008, 146). Although the researchers view this as a problem deriving from their participant's "limited comprehension of the English language" (2008, 146), a more culturally sensitized approach might view this as the *researchers'* lack of knowledge of Chuukese, Marshallese, and Pohnpeian.

20. In a Master's thesis that deals with educational issues on Ujelang in the 1960s, Asselta also notes this sense of disarray in the classroom (1971, 103) although he interprets the disarray as one representation of educational failure. In a sharply bifurcate form, Asselta positions himself as the judge of good educational practice and bad, as being able to ascertain the difference between that which is educationally relevant, and that which is irrelevant—in his judgment, most of the activities that occupy the school day (1971, 105). Yet, the lack of a consistent analytic framework and the slipshod way in which Asselta deals with issues of quotation and translation brings issues of ethnographic legitimacy to the surface. In spite of these shortcomings, Asselta helps clarify certain issues. Among these, it is clear that, in the 1960s, Ujelang people held the amorphous idea that schooling was important even though, as Asselta notes, "nobody is quite sure why." [Without offering supporting evidence, Hezel contends that it was schools under Robert Gibson's educational administration of the 1950s that "fuel[ed] the desire of Micronesians for formal education" (Hezel 1995, 291).] Hezel's idea is, in large part, too generic and mono-causal to explain the local beliefs of Ujelang/Enewetak people; nevertheless, Asselta's observation about the importance of schooling continues to be true today. A large segment of the nuclear compensation fund has been invested in the educational program and school building on Enewetak, and much of the justification for living in Majuro or on the Big Island has to do with the imagined idea among Enewetak/Ujelang people that somehow schooling is important. Why this continues to be true in spite of the fact that so few Enewetak/Ujelang people have used their schooling to significantly shape the careers they pursue as adults, and why this ostensible "success rate" differs so radically from a place like Namoluk (Marshall 2004) could easily form the central thesis for an additional work on the educational practices of the community.

21. Okamoto et al. (2008, 137–39) suggest that what they term "racism" is another source of stress that is disruptive to the educational process. This process, in their idealistic view, is an integral part of the socialization and self-realization. The idea that education may serve as a disciplinary force, contouring personal identities in ways that limit individual choice and lead to the embodiment of certain socially acceptable practices, is not considered by these authors. They identify racism both in relation to the Micronesian

students' interactions with other students and in relation to the teachers' interactions with those same students. It is difficult to know what the Micronesian students actually told the researchers, but it appears that at least one student, responding in English, used the word "racist" to describe other students' interactions with them. The researchers themselves seem to classify the teachers' interactions with Micronesian students as racist: for example, by referring to the high school students' English usage as "third-grade English" (Okamoto et al. 2008, 138). In my own research, conducted in Marshallese, neither students nor parents ever used the terms racism or racist. Nevertheless, as noted, they certainly recognized that the interactions of those around them positioned them as "other," and they realized that these stereotypes were most frequently negative in texture. For this reason, I use "othering strategies" to refer to the types of interactions that students and teachers used when dealing with Marshallese. Clearly, these stereotypes align with what Okamoto et al. (2008) term racism.

22. Enewetak/Ujelang students complained bitterly about the Hawaiian and Filipino students who often ganged up on them and tried to start fights with them. In an urban setting on Oahu, Okamoto et al. note that Micronesian students complained about gangs as well as about other groups who attempted to start fights. In that setting, Samoans appear to be the instigators of the fights (2008, 140).

23. In her analysis of children's interactions in the Marshall Islands, Berman notes that children are defined as "non-adult" and forced by adults to act in ways that demonstrate their lack of an adult persona (2012: 27–28). Similarly, teachers in Ka'u label their students' actions as immature (non-adult) and, thereby, assert that they hold a lower rank. The Ka'u students' attempts to control interactions in the classroom directly contest the teachers' assertions of control. At the same time, the Marshallese students are multiply indexed as marginal, and forced to inhabit Marshallese identities that are made problematic not only by teachers but by the Hawaiian students as well.

24. The term itself, *kumiai*, is of Japanese derivation, but this should not be taken to mean that collective working/thinking/feeling processes were, therefore, introduced to Marshall Islanders during the Japanese colonial era. In all likelihood, the collective sensibilities within this small-scale community are of much greater historical depth. Nevertheless, inasmuch as socio-centric identities of similar sorts have been posited for both Japanese and Marshallese (as well as other Pacific Islands groups), further inquiry into the nature of these similarities (along with close scrutiny of what must separate these different types of identity constructions) would be extremely valuable.

25. Even the corrections involved group work because the math specialists would look through the work and say "it is incorrect there, 11 × 12 is not 128." Not infrequently, discussions and arguments would follow, with the work's author contesting the specialist's claim. Ultimately, the group would agree on an answer and all change their papers to reflect the agreed-upon solution. For the boys, this approach largely replicated the way tasks within their own community were accomplished. A division of labor among age mates was agreed upon with different specialists performing a variety of jobs and then reuniting to put together all of the component elements of a complex task under the leadership of a respected elder who would overview what had been accomplished and request the necessary corrections to fully complete the process.

26. These are Enewetak/Ujelang children's statements and should not be taken to mean that Marshallese students do not struggle with math, particularly at the high school level.

27. Although, as I argue above, this is not universal.

28. Indeed, even the relatively enlightened ESL instructor engaged in his own strategy of identity elision by referring to his students as "the Marshallese boys." By far the bulk of the Na'alehu students were Ujelang/Enewetak students, although there was a smattering of Marshall Islanders from other locations enrolled in the school. However, all of those in the ESL group in 2002–03 were Ujelang/Enewetak offspring, a fact that clearly had no meaning to the ESL teacher. For decades, Ujelang/Enewetak people have argued strongly for their own unique identity, distinct from Marshallese, governed by their own chiefs, and only forced by US desire and United Nations decree to join with the independent Republic of the Marshall Islands in the mid-1980s. Ujelang/Enewetak people in Ka'u still frequently self-identify as part of the Ujelang/Enewetak community although, of course, in certain contexts, they refer to themselves as Marshallese. In contrast, Enewetak/Ujelang residents of Spokane, who constitute a much smaller fragment of the local Marshall Islands community, self-identify as Enewetak/Ujelang people far less frequently.

REFERENCES

Asselta, Richard M.
1971 Formal and informal learning in the Marshall Islands of Micronesia with special emphasis on the culture of Ujelang Atoll. Master's thesis. Western Connecticut State College.

Berman, Elise Chertoff
2012 Children have nothing to hide: deception, age, and avoiding giving in the Marshall Islands. PhD diss., Univ. of Chicago.

Bourdieu, Pierre
1984 *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
1990 *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.
1991 *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Carucci, Laurence Marshall
1980 The renewal of life: a ritual encounter in the Marshall Islands. PhD diss., Univ. of Chicago.
1995 Symbolic imagery of Enewetak sailing canoes. In *Seafaring in the Contemporary Pacific Islands*, ed. Richard Feinberg, 16–33. DeKalb: Northern Illinois Univ. Press.
2004 The transformation of person and place on Enewetak and Ujelang Atoll. In *Globalization and Culture Change in the Pacific Islands*, ed. Victoria S. Lockwood, 414–38. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Prentice Hall.

2007 Life in dis-place: re-searching processes of imagining with Enewetak–Ujelang people. In "Back in the Field Again: Long Term Fieldwork in Oceanic Anthropology," ed. John Barker and Alan Howard. *Pacific Studies* 27(3/4): 107–34.

2007b Continuities and changes in Marshallese grandparenting. In Grandparenting in the Contemporary Pacific, ed. J. Armstrong and J. Flynn. *Pacific Studies* 31(3/4): 32–55.

Durkheim, Emile

1966 *Suicide*. New York: Free Press.
[1897]

Falgout, Suzanne

1992 Hierarchy vs. democracy: two strategies for the management of knowledge in Pohnpei. In Transforming Knowledge: Western Schooling in the Pacific. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 23(1): March 1992.

Foucault, Michele

1977 *Discipline and Punish*. London: Penguin Books.

Gershon, Ilana

2012 *No Family Is an Island: Cultural Expertise among Samoans in Diaspora*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

Hezel, Francis X. SJ

1995 *Strangers in Their Own Land*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Lave, Jean, and Etienne Wenger

1991 Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation. In *Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive, and Computational Perspectives*, ed. Roy Pea and J. S. Brown. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Levin, Paula

1992 The impact of preschool on teaching and learning in Hawaiian families. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 23(1): 59–72.

Nevin, David

1977 *The American Touch in Micronesia*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Pine, Pamela, and William Savage

1989 Marshallese and English: evidence for an immersion model of education in the Republic of the Marshall Islands. *World Englishes* 8(1): 83–9.

Okamoto, Scott K., David T. Mayeda, Mari Ushiroda, Davis Rehuher, Tui Lauilefue, and Ophelia Ongalibang

2008 Risk and protective factors of Micronesia youth in Hawai'i: an exploratory study. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 35(2): 127–47.

Reagan, Timothy
1996 *Non-Western Educational Traditions: Alternative Approaches to Educational Thought and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Said, Edward
1979 *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Strathern, Marilyn
2005 *Kinship, Law and the Unexpected: Relatives Are Always a Surprise*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.

EXILE AND COMPASSION: THE MANAGEMENT OF LEPROSY IN THE COOK ISLANDS, 1925–95

Raeburn Lange
Golden Bay, New Zealand

After its introduction to the northern Cook Islands in the nineteenth century, leprosy (Hansen's disease) gradually spread throughout the group and became a public health problem. This article traces the history of the disease and its management from the time when the colonial government ceased to rely only on the isolation of leprosy sufferers on islets within the Cook group and began to supplement its internal control measures by sending many of the patients to Makogai in Fiji. The authorities' changing approaches to the control of leprosy in the group throughout the period are examined as a way of exploring the relationship between colonial power and the indigenous population, and inquiry is made into the balance between the Cook Islands leprosy sufferers' experience of exile to Makogai and the more positive aspects of their community life there.

Introduction

LEPROSY IS ONE OF MANY infectious diseases introduced to the Cook Islands when this cluster of fifteen small islands in the South Pacific came into contact with the wider world in the nineteenth century.[1] As a disfiguring and disabling chronic condition, it had long been feared in many other places around the globe. Now also called Hansen's disease,[2] this bacterial infection affecting the skin and nerves is in fact not very contagious and is spread only by prolonged close personal contact. But for most of its history, leprosy has been noted for its insidious beginnings, slow progress, long duration, often disfiguring and disabling symptoms, and uncertain

Pacific Studies, Vol. 36, No. 3—December 2013

cure. Indeed, until the 1940s, it was essentially incurable, although certain treatments seemed to help. While an effective drug therapy now exists, the precise mode of its transmission and the extent of its communicability have not yet been definitively established.[3]

The earliest known mention of the existence of leprosy in the Cook group is 1871, and efforts to control it date from 1890, soon after a colonial regime was first established. Until 1965, when self-government was granted to the territory, the management of leprosy control was in the hands of the New Zealand colonial administration in Rarotonga, the largest of the Cook Islands. Led by the Resident Commissioner, the New Zealand officials made attempts in the first part of the century to limit the spread of the disease by isolating cases on islets in the lagoons of several of the islands. Confined on these motu, the sufferers were provided with care and treatment at a minimal level.[4] In 1925, however, the decision was made by the colonial authorities in Rarotonga and the New Zealand capital, Wellington, to send the Cook Islands cases away to Makogai in the distant British colony of Fiji. For the next thirty years, this strategy dominated leprosy control in the Cook Islands and hugely affected the lives of Cook Islanders affected by the disease.

Today, the exiling of sick people to a faraway country would be regarded by many as an insensitive or even barbaric practice, but in the middle decades of the twentieth century, its wisdom as a way of controlling leprosy was hardly questioned. The Fiji government's leprosy institution on the island of Makogai was opened in 1911 as an isolation center and hospital for Fiji cases of the disease. The island is less than ten square kilometers in area and is located about fifty kilometers northeast of the coast of Viti Levu, the large island on which Fiji's capital Suva is situated. The institution was headed by a Medical Officer appointed by the government, and from the beginning its nurses were Catholic nuns, members of the Congregation of the Missionary Sisters of the Society of Mary. The more advanced cases were accommodated in a hospital. If they were able to live independently, male patients occupied houses clustered in "villages," and females resided in a central women's area. Able-bodied patients did domestic or plantation work. By 1919, Makogai accommodated 352 leprosy sufferers from many parts of Fiji. Careful nursing and treatment was provided for the residents, some of whom were eventually discharged when there were indications that the disease had been arrested. The institution developed a reputation for being well run and medically effective, and visitors commented on the contented and cheerful atmosphere among the patients.[5] Makogai was, however, still a place of confinement and isolation, situated more than 2,000 kilometers away from the Cook Islands. One of the purposes of this article is to inquire into the balance between the

harrowing experience of being exiled and the more positive aspects of life in a community where adversity was shared, care was given, and hope was held out for cure and a return to the homeland.[6]

Makogai was only one element in the policies for dealing with leprosy in the group, however, and this study of Cook Islanders suffering from leprosy in the Makogai era examines their experience both in Fiji and in the home islands. The article places the Makogai story within the wider context of Cook Islands leprosy control. Several brief clinical and epidemiological studies of leprosy in the Cook Islands have been published by medical writers, and reference will be made to these in what follows. The broader history of the disease in the Cook Islands setting, however, especially its impact on leprosy sufferers and the community in general, has not been told before. Nor have historians of the Cook Islands given much attention to leprosy control as a focal point for studying the intersection of colonial authority with indigenous society, and this is a second focus of the article.

The Decision to Send Cook Islanders to Fiji

The idea of opening up Fiji's Makogai station to leprosy sufferers from other Pacific islands (beyond the borders of Fiji but still within the orbit of Britain and its Dominions, such as New Zealand) originated in 1920. Samoan patients arrived in 1922 and a small group from New Zealand in 1925.[7] The next admissions were a large group of Cook Islanders transferred in 1926, followed by patients from a number of other island groups in later years.

The number of known leprosy cases in the Cook Islands had fluctuated over the years but at this time was stated to be twenty-seven. Penrhyn, one of the northern atolls, was the main focus of the disease, but all the other northern islands (Manihiki, Rakahanga, and Pukapuka) had had cases from time to time, and few of the southern islands had escaped either. In 1925, all the cases were in the northern group except for two on Aitutaki and one each on Atiu and Mauke.[8] Despite efforts since 1890 to control the disease, it had slowly spread from one island to another and showed no signs of ceasing its insidious advance.[9] There were fears that measures taken against it would be unavailing, and a growing consciousness had developed that its victims were poorly cared for.

From 1922, New Zealand's Minister for the Cook Islands and his departmental officials in Wellington gave thought to transferring the Cook Islands cases to Fiji.[10] After the Secretary of the Cook Islands Department visited Rarotonga in May 1922, he acknowledged that caring for leprosy sufferers

locally was a less expensive proposition but emphasized that for him the question of cost was "not the most important consideration. Under existing conditions they receive absolutely no medical attention and no assistance except such as they can render to each other." He argued that sending the patients to Fiji would "give these unfortunates decent conditions of life and a fighting chance of recovery" and instructed officials in Rarotonga to discuss the proposal.[11] The Resident Commissioner there was concerned by the cost and also raised the issue of patient rights, warning that transfer to Makogai would probably bring "an outcry from the relatives"; he concluded, however, that protest of that kind was "not a matter of much moment, compared with the welfare of the patients."[12]

When the Minister for the Cook Islands, Sir Maui Pomare, visited the group toward the end of 1923, a decision had still not been made.[13] A few months later, however, the discovery of a new case on Rarotonga, where hitherto only a few people had been known to have leprosy, caused the Minister some concern. The Resident Commissioner was asked to give fresh thought to the idea of adopting the Makogai solution.[14] His Chief Medical Officer conceded that the leprosy patients would receive better care in Fiji but emphasized the substantially higher cost of looking after them there. He also pointed out that there would still have to be provision for the local maintenance and treatment of patients awaiting transfer to Fiji and raised a new point for consideration: whether Cook Islands patients could legally be moved to a foreign country.[15] The expectation of the Resident Commissioner was that not all patients would voluntarily consent to being transferred, and he agreed that providing legislative authority would be needed.[16] Although it was considered desirable to impose such a transfer on the people suffering from leprosy, "in their own interests," questions were raised about those who did not consent. The Cook Islands officials had predicted some resistance, and the Cook Islands Department was advised by the Crown Solicitor that it would be necessary to prepare a means of dealing with this eventuality.[17] It was not until the middle of 1925 that Parliament enacted the legislation, giving the Cook Islands Administration the authority to transfer leprosy cases to Makogai and bring them home again if and when they were deemed to be cured.[18]

The decision was made to take the thirty-two known leprosy cases to Makogai the following May (1926).[19] The agreement with Fiji was for New Zealand to pay £40 for the maintenance of each Cook Islands patient and to meet the cost of building new accommodation.[20] Preparations were made for collecting the cases from around the group and conveying them to Makogai, the constantly articulated objective being "proper care and modern treatment." The estimated cost of the voyage in the government

steamer *Hinemoa* was £3,000, and the Cabinet approved the allocation of this amount.[21]

Throughout these discussions and the making of decisions, it was of course the interests and wishes of the colonial rulers that dominated the process. In enunciating its policy, the New Zealand government laid emphasis on its benevolent intentions. When introducing the enabling legislation to Parliament in 1925, Pomare highlighted the availability of "proper treatment" in Fiji.[22] This concern for patient care was congruent with the humanitarian strand that had always been prominent in New Zealand's imperialist rhetoric.[23] There was, however, some commercial sensitivity about the presence of leprosy in the Cook Islands. Nervousness about the possible harmful effects of publicity about the disease on the island economy led the Resident Commissioner to write to Wellington about an item in the New Zealand press. It had been reported that one of the leprosy sufferers on Quail Island in Canterbury was a Rarotongan, and the Commissioner asked for it to be checked whether the man was in fact from Rarotonga and for it to be publicly corrected if he was not: "To draw the attention of the public to the fact that we have lepers here would possibly injure our fruit trade."[24]

There is no evidence that any input into the Makogai decision was sought from the Cook Islanders themselves. It had been decided paternalistically that transfer to Fiji would be in the best interests of Cook Islands leprosy cases. It was hoped that they would welcome the chance to have their situation improved by excellent care and treatment facilities. As noted above, however, it had been anticipated that some might object to being taken away, and provision had been made for such objections to be overridden.

The First Transfer of Cook Islanders to Makogai

A very personal interest in the Makogai scheme was taken by the Minister for the Cook Islands, Sir Maui Pomare, who was a medical doctor (the first Maori to achieve this status) and twenty years earlier had investigated leprosy in the Cook Islands in his capacity as New Zealand's Native Health Officer.[25] Pomare announced that he would go on the transfer voyage himself. He decided to take with him the new Chief Medical Officer of the Cook Islands, E. P. Ellison (also Maori), so that he could visit Makogai and familiarize himself with leprosy in all its stages.[26]

The *Hinemoa* called at nearly all the islands of the Cook group in May 1926. Ellison reported that on each landfall, the known cases were examined, with a more thorough survey being done where time permitted.

Penrhyn, for example, was "thoroughly combed through." The number of cases grew too big for the accommodation available on the ship, and it was decided "to take the less advanced cases and improve their chances of early recovery." In all, forty people (twenty-six men and fourteen women) were taken. By the time the vessel reached Manihiki, it was full, so only two could be taken from there; Ellison reported that although this island was "badly stricken" with leprosy, twelve cases had to be left behind.[27] No one had to be taken against their will: all were willing to go after the "position had been explained." Pomare described the "pathetic" scenes of farewell but noted that the patients and relatives were cheered by the hope held out for recovery. The newspaper that interviewed him commented that the policy of transferring the cases from the Cooks, "where it is impossible to give sufferers proper medical and nursing attention, must commend itself to all humane people."[28]

Pomare told the New Zealand press that Makogai would be "a paradise" for the Cook Islands leprosy patients.[29] He spoke enthusiastically about the island as an ideal place for the leprosy station but added that he intended to recommend to the New Zealand government that it assist Fiji to provide better buildings, more hospital accommodation, and more medical and nursing assistance. He also made an appeal to the general public for donations for an entertainment hall and a nurses' rest house and asked his fellow Ministers to contribute.[30] News of the leprosy voyage had aroused much public interest in the disease and in Makogai, and many people expressed a willingness to raise funds for additional comforts and equipment for the patients and sisters.[31] The public appeal met with a good response in New Zealand and the Cook Islands.[32]

The forty Cook Islanders admitted to Makogai in 1926 formed the vanguard of a large number of their compatriots (282 in all) who made the journey to Fiji until transfers from the Cook Islands ceased in 1953.

Cook Islanders at Makogai: The First Decade

The size of the Cook Islands community at Makogai fluctuated considerably. To the forty original arrivals in May 1926 were added twenty-nine more in August 1927 and a further nineteen in May 1928.[33] A large group was built up by these three early transfer voyages—more than eighty, making the Cook Islanders the largest non-Fiji community.[34] The size of the group was gradually reduced, however, by the discharge of patients regarded as cured and, sadly, also by deaths so that by the middle of 1932 there were only thirty-six.[35] Their numbers had decreased even further by March 1935 when they were augmented by a long-delayed fourth Cook Islands transfer voyage that brought thirty-one new patients.[36]

Although they came from many different islands, the Cook Islanders were conscious of their difference from the other ethnic groups at Makogai, and as exiles in a foreign country they naturally developed a strong group identity. The institution encouraged this by its practice of providing each national group with its own residential and plantation area. The Cook Islands Department explained to the New Zealand public that Makogai was an ideal place for Pacific Islanders because the patients could live in conditions similar to those to which they were accustomed in their villages at home; a headman for each island group was appointed by the Medical Superintendent and given a small payment, taking responsibility for the cleanliness of the "village" and the good behavior of its residents.[37]

The Cook Islands patients at Makogai continued to benefit from the gifts of money and "comforts" trickling in from the home islands and also from New Zealand. In 1928, the Mayor of Wellington presided over a well-attended public lecture on Makogai. The audience was addressed by the sister in charge at Makogai, the Reverend Mother Mary Agnes, who thanked New Zealanders for the Christmas gifts and other donations made over the past few years.[38] The Minister for the Cook Islands, Pomare, praised Makogai's Medical Superintendent and the devoted Catholic sisters and spoke of the welcome he was given by the Cook Islands patients when he visited recently: "You would not know they were lepers they were so happy."[39] Although the patients periodically submitted complaints about the supply of food, it was the positive side of life at Makogai that was emphasized in public representations of the institution. It was plainly implied that the patients were far better off than they would have been if allowed to remain in their home islands, and the highlighting of the physical attractiveness of the Makogai setting was probably made in conscious comparison with the dreadfulness of the symptoms of leprosy. A publicity article written about this time typifies this approach in its praise of Makogai as "one of the most beautiful islands in the South Seas" and the leprosy station as clean and well run and doing a great work. "The different villages consist entirely of small cottages housing from one to four, but usually not more than two, patients; and set as they are amidst the beautiful foliage of the island, and fronting the open sea and beach, no more peaceful or beautiful spot could be imagined."[40]

During the 1930s, the general public in New Zealand continued to give generously for the Makogai patients, with a focus on those from New Zealand, Samoa, and the Cook Islands. In Christchurch, a "Mr Twomey" was active in fundraising. He was "very devoted to this worthy object," an official reported, "and should be encouraged in every possible way."[41] Patrick J. Twomey had begun his charitable work for the relief of leprosy

patients in the 1920s when he assisted leprosy sufferers on Quail Island. From 1927, he was assisting the Makogai patients, for whom the Makogai Lepers' (New Zealand) Trust Board was set up in Christchurch in 1939.[42] As will be seen below, during the 1930s this organization widened its focus from Makogai to Pacific leprosy sufferers in their homelands, including the Cook Islands.

It was not only the happy and secure life on Makogai that was compared to the miserable existence of leprosy sufferers if they had been left on their home islands but also the prospect of modern therapy and eventual cure rather than the slow death that could be expected on the remote isolation islets where treatment facilities were inadequate. The Wellington audience in 1928 was told that "except in the most advanced cases the patients enter the institution with a definite hope of cure" and that "wonderful results" were obtained by treatment with chaulmoogra.[43] Pomare explained in Parliament that "at one time leprosy was looked upon as a hopeless disease, but there is now some hope for an individual, especially if the disease is taken in the early stages; and with the treatment of chaulmoogra oil they benefit to the extent of a complete cure." He hastened to add that not all were cured, but mentioned that nine of New Zealand's patients at Makogai, including some from the Cook Islands, had already been cured and discharged.[44] In fact, treatment with chaulmoogra (a plant traditionally known in Indian medicine) was not always effective and never in the more advanced cases. It had its strong advocates, but its value was never fully accepted in the medical world.[45] Nevertheless, as Pomare had said, many Makogai patients were indeed discharged as cured. By 1934, about a third of the patients sent from the Cook Islands up to that time had returned home. Some of these should not be included in the total number of "cures," as they were found to have been misdiagnosed.[46] But other cases undoubtedly suffering from leprosy did respond favorably to treatment, and from June 1928 the medical staff began to discharge Cook Islands patients from time to time. By 1932, there had been twenty-five such discharges.[47] Naturally, the authorities were gratified, and the discharges also had an impact in the homeland. The Secretary of the Cook Islands Department wrote in 1935, after returning from the Pacific, "The fame of Makogai has spread throughout the Cooks, and it was most pleasing to see the manner in which all our new patients came willingly on the *Matai* when they were found to have the disease." In the Cook Islands, he was also very happy to meet people who had returned cured and were now "apostles of the Institution."[48] Although the 1931 International Leprosy Congress had recommended that the use of the word "cure" be avoided and that the term "arrested" should be used in preference, talk of cures continued.[49]

On the other hand, some patients died at Makogai. The first deaths occurred in 1926, when two advanced cases died only a few months after the Cook Islanders arrived.[50] Up to 1932, there were twenty-four deaths.[51] No evidence was found about the effect of these sad events on the other Cook Islanders at Makogai. Nor do we know much about the experiences of the thirty-seven children born at Makogai during the life of the institution.[52] One case of this kind was that of a girl born to a Cook Islands patient and removed immediately to the institution's orphanage. She never showed any sign of leprosy and, in 1934, at the age of six, was sent back to her grandfather in Manihiki.[53]

Leprosy Control in the Home Islands, 1926–35

Removing leprosy cases to Fiji did not by any means rid the Cook Islands of the disease. In 1927, less than a year after the first transfer to Makogai, the Chief Medical Officer reported on the situation he found in the northern islands of the group. As well as the cases left behind on Penrhyn and Manihiki when the first voyage took place, twenty-six new cases had been found on Penrhyn as well as three on Pukapuka and one on Rakahanga; there were also twenty-nine "suspects" on Penrhyn and three elsewhere.[54] Pomare was informed of this "truly serious state of affairs" and the need for "prompt action" in the form of another transfer as soon as possible.[55] The Minister felt a "deep concern"; he took the matter to the Cabinet, and a further transfer was approved.[56] When this second transfer voyage took place in August 1927, the number of people taken was twenty-nine, all from the northern group.[57]

In order to prevent further spread from the northern focus, vessels arriving at Rarotonga from the northern group were "strictly inspected," but a few cases continued to appear on the main island.[58] There were three in isolation there in 1928; they were being visited and treated regularly.[59] The third *Hinemoa* voyage, in May 1928, took twenty more cases (fifteen from the northern group, three from Rarotonga, and one from Aitutaki, plus a "suspect" from Rarotonga).[60] Officials reported that "for the first time during New Zealand's connection with the Cook Group the Islands were free from known cases of the disease." They added, however, that new cases were likely to be found from time to time.[61] This prediction proved to be correct, and by the time another transfer became possible (in 1935), there were about thirty prospective Makogai patients. It was noted, however, with reference to Penrhyn, that there was now a greater willingness to report suspicious symptoms. "The fact that several cases have returned cured from Fiji," observed the Chief Medical Officer, "is no doubt largely responsible for this."[62]

Confined on the designated isolation islets in Penrhyn, Manihiki, Rakahanga, and Aitutaki or in temporary facilities elsewhere, the leprosy patients were visited as regularly as possible for care and treatment. Only in Rarotonga could these services be provided by a doctor, except during the infrequent visits of the medical staff to the other islands. In the northern group, it was usually the Resident Agents who gave chaulmoogra treatment (administered orally or by injection), made sure ulcers and sores were washed and dressed, and kept the patients' family members under observation.[63] Living conditions on the islets were poor, and isolation was difficult to maintain.

The arrangements for looking after leprosy sufferers on or near their home islands were regarded as stopgap measures only, since transferring patients to Makogai had been accepted by the Cook Islands and New Zealand governments as the mainstay of leprosy control policy. S. M. Lambert, the influential medical adviser of Britain's Pacific colonial administrations, was confident that the cooperative Makogai scheme would eventually result in the eradication of leprosy from the territories involved.[64] In New Zealand, the responsible Minister (Pomare) had a very high regard for Makogai and fought hard for increased government funding.[65] In 1928, however, Pomare lost his cabinet post when his party suffered electoral defeat. E. A. Neff, the Medical Superintendent at Makogai, lamented this loss of the institution's "great friend."[66] The Secretary of the Cook Islands Department assured Neff that the new Minister, Sir Apirana Ngata, would be sympathetic too.[67] Indeed, Ngata wrote almost immediately to the Prime Minister in support of his predecessor's financial proposals and secured his concurrence with them.[68] Ngata was soon to intervene again in leprosy policy matters, but Pomare's long role in Cook Islands affairs was brought to an end by his departure from office and then his serious illness. When he died in 1930, Neff paid warm tribute to him as a friend of Makogai: he was "the well-beloved of my patients and staff, and his visits have indeed meant much to us all."[69] Ngata later reminded Parliament of the part played by Pomare in organizing the leprosy transfers and advocating for New Zealand's "disinterested expenditure" on Makogai at a time when the funds were available for such a purpose.[70]

By 1932, the financial depression was threatening the Cook Islands leprosy control program. Ngata had publicized the tribute paid by Makogai's Medical Superintendent (now C. J. Austin) to the Cook Islands health services for making such thorough surveys and thus achieving the highest proportion of early cases in the total number of patients sent by any one administration. But now, Ngata regretfully pointed out, due to financial stringency, no patients had been transferred to Fiji for three years, and the

inspection program had been reduced.[71] The National Expenditure Commission recommended in 1932 that the spending of the Cook Islands and Niue administrations be cut back by about half.[72] Citing New Zealand's obligation of "trust and guardianship," Ngata argued against such a drastic reduction of the budget, especially in health and education. In regard to the leprosy program, he undertook to reduce the cost but refused to accept that it could be halved.[73] Budgetary difficulties continued, and in 1933 Ngata was still sorry that another expensive transfer voyage, though well overdue, could not be contemplated in the current depression conditions.[74] Those in charge of leprosy control continued to regard the quality of the treatment available at Makogai as the main reason for transferring patients there. Medical opinion in the Pacific continued to assert that Makogai was a place where "lepers receive treatment and care unsurpassed in the world and where there is a measure of contentment impossible to understand by one who has not seen it."[75]

By 1934, the existence of many leprosy cases in both the northern and the southern groups was known, and the desirability of another transfer was widely acknowledged.[76] The Cook Islands Department pointed out that a number of the new cases were young people, "who have a good chance of recovery under proper treatment, but who unless they are given a chance are condemned to a slow death under conditions in which they receive no medical aid." In one of his last actions as Minister, Ngata took the matter to the Cabinet.[77] Treasury wanted to have the request declined on the grounds that the Cook Islands Administration should rely on its own funds and not seek subsidies from New Zealand.[78] The Cook Islands Department argued that grants from New Zealand for the Makogai program were nothing new, "it being recognised by the Government that this work was part of New Zealand's medical responsibility in the Cook Islands and that the cost could not be found from local funds."[79]

The fourth Makogai transfer voyage took place in March 1935 on the government ship *Matai*. Ellison, the Chief Medical Officer, identified passengers for the trip and cared for them en route. The Secretary of the Cook Islands Department (S. J. Smith) and a New Zealand journalist were also on board. The number of patients turned out to be greater than expected. A total of thirty people were taken (twenty-six of them from the northern islands). The journalist noted that all the patients were anxious to get to Makogai, "of which they had heard good reports from cured lepers." When they arrived at the island, the newcomers were welcomed with "kisses and weeping" by the Cook Islanders already there. Many will no doubt return cured, wrote Smith; "the advanced cases, who should have been there long ago, will never leave."[80]

Smith regarded it as "tragic" that financial problems had made an earlier transfer impossible and wrote that it was important for the control program to be more actively pursued in the northern group if leprosy was to be stamped out. During the voyage and later in Suva with Lambert, Smith and Ellison discussed an intensified assault on the disease. The plan involved a leprosy survey to be made by Lambert, the stationing of a leprosy officer on Penrhyn to make frequent inspections and monitor the cases, and the establishment of a leprosy center there. The officials thought of giving special leprosy training to John Numa, a Cook Islander studying in Suva to be a Native Medical Practitioner (NMP), and then basing him on Penrhyn to supervise the new program. Makogai would still be the destination of the cases identified in the Cook Islands, but all cases identified in the northern group would be sent to the new Penrhyn station for proper care and surveillance while awaiting transfer to Makogai. All this would pay off in the long run, it was hoped, by improving on the present situation in which leprosy sufferers continued to have contact with other people for a long time, and many early cases were missed during hurried medical inspections.[81]

The New Zealand government was receptive to the idea, particularly the way in which case finding would be intensified, and asked Lambert to make the survey. The objective stated in the government's letter of approach was the entire eradication of leprosy in the Cook Islands within ten or fifteen years.[82] The implementation of the Penrhyn-based plan, modifying the previous reliance on Makogai, opened a new phase in the history of leprosy control in the group.

Managing Leprosy in the Islands, 1935–50

It took some time to set up the new leprosy station on Penrhyn. In securing funding, the Minister for the Cook Islands and his departmental officials acknowledged that stepping up the existing measures against the disease by establishing a center in the north would certainly incur extra costs but argued that "this is New Zealand's responsibility and in the cause of humanity and the good name of New Zealand should not longer be delayed." Told that only in this way would leprosy be eradicated in the group, the Cabinet's response was favorable, and early in 1936 the required expenditure was approved by the newly elected Labour government.[83]

Numa finished his training as an NMP at the Central Medical School in Suva at the end of 1935, and at the request of the Cook Islands authorities he spent a short time at Makogai before leaving for the Cook Islands.[84] There was some hesitation about using such a young and inexperienced man (he was then only in his early twenties) for the responsible task of

heading the intensified case finding, monitoring, and treatment program on Penrhyn. But it was recognized that it would be hard to find a fully qualified European doctor willing to be stationed in such a remote place.[85] The proposed comprehensive survey by Lambert did not eventuate, and a subsequent plan for a similar survey by Austin, the doctor in charge of Makogai, did not proceed either.[86] It was Numa who accomplished the task. The plan to deploy him on Penrhyn had gone ahead, and by mid-1937 he had made his first survey of the island's population. Lambert described it as "outstanding."[87] Many "suspects" were discovered, which to Smith, now the Resident Commissioner, indicated that the wisdom of setting up the program was already proven.[88]

Plans were quickly made to establish the "leper concentration hospital" on Matunga, the motu used since 1890 for isolating local cases.[89] A lease was obtained for Te Sauma, a very small piece of land at the northern end of Matunga and cut off from it at high tide.[90] There the center was constructed, with everything completed by July 1937. A "caretaker" was appointed to attend to the buildings, rations, and kitchen. He was a former Makogai patient from Atiu and stayed in his position for many years. "No local man could be trusted" to maintain the isolation regime, it was said.[91] Soon, seventeen patients (mostly young) were in residence. As well as cases from Penrhyn and the other northern islands, there were seven from Aitutaki and one from Rarotonga.[92] Smith admitted that setting up the project had been quite costly and that continuing high expenditure on leprosy would be necessary but reminded the Minister that thorough measures were essential if leprosy was to be stamped out in the Cook Islands.[93]

The new center was not intended as a permanent leprosy institution that would replace Makogai.[94] Soon after it was established, however, Smith reported that all the patients were responding so well to treatment that their transfer to Makogai would probably not be necessary. In fact, he wondered if Te Sauma could soon replace Makogai as far as the Cook Islands were concerned since nearly all advanced cases had already gone to Fiji and future cases would be early ones and receptive to the treatment available at Penrhyn—which would be much cheaper.[95] This suggestion was rejected by New Zealand's Health Department, which did not believe that the excellent treatment available at Makogai could be replicated by a single inadequately supervised NMP on a remote island, and pointed to the high cost of bringing Te Sauma up to Makogai standards.[96] The medical authorities in Suva and at Makogai similarly believed it would be a great mistake to attempt to set up an independent leprosy center on Penrhyn; to give leprosy sufferers every possible chance of recovery and future rehabilitation, the very best in equipment and staff must be provided.[97] The idea of ceasing to use Makogai went no further at this stage.

The practice in the Cook Islands from this time was for all diagnosed cases or "suspects" to be isolated on their home islands initially, either on the designated segregation islets or elsewhere, and then transferred as soon as possible to Penrhyn.[98] In 1938, the patients on Te Sauma were said to be "cheerful and happy."[99] Numa reported that, almost without exception, they were seeing their disease being arrested under the chaulmoogra treatment he was giving.[100] He visited the islet twice a week and tended to four outpatients in the village. Parents and close relatives were permitted to visit on the first Saturday of every month but were excluded from certain areas and had to be at least twenty years of age.[101] From the beginning, the people on the islet received gifts from the Lepers' Trust Board in New Zealand, which had decided to support patients at Te Sauma as well as at Makogai.[102] In 1942, the board made an offer of more substantial help and soon afterward donated £1500 for a recreation and worship hall that was built on the islet in 1944.[103]

Along with his general duties as Penrhyn's NMP, Numa gave much of his time to the leprosy work. He found that the "many manifestations" of the disease were well known on the island and acknowledged later that the Penrhyn people had given him "the greater part of his early training in the diagnosis of its early stages."[104] One of the observations he made when talking with older people in the northern islands was that the disease was associated so closely with particular families that it was thought to be hereditary rather than infectious. He noted that some of these families had died out, leaving practically no descendants. "There is no family to-day in Penrhyn," he wrote in 1939, that "can boast that they are leprosy-free."[105] For many years, Numa was the Cook Islands' main leprosy specialist, conducting surveys on most of the islands, but in order to improve case finding throughout the group most new NMPs were sent to Makogai on leprosy familiarization courses before returning home from Fiji.

With the reaffirmation of the policy of sending all Cook Islands cases on to Fiji, plans for another Makogai voyage were commenced in 1938.[106] This fifth transfer was made by the *Tui Cakau*, a small vessel chartered in Fiji. Although in previous years the passengers always "went quietly," warrants were prepared in case anyone resisted.[107] No one did, and there were even some nonpatients asking the Chief Medical Officer to be allowed to go with their family members on the ship or join relatives already at Makogai.[108] The number of people taken on this voyage was forty-three, of whom thirty-four were picked up from Te Sauma (some of them having come there earlier from Aitutaki and Rarotonga and more than half of them aged fifteen or younger). Ellison addressed the parents of those being taken on the ship "to soothe their minds" and assure them that going to Makogai for

proper food and good treatment was "the best that could possibly happen."[109] He was confident that Te Sauma had "proved its usefulness. We have never before transported so many with such reasonable prospects of recovery in every case where early treated." In his view, most of those taken on this voyage would be cured.[110]

Such transfers reduced the prevalence of leprosy in the Cook Islands for a time, but new cases were frequently found in both the northern and the southern groups. In 1940, ten patients were taken to Te Sauma from Aitutaki.[111] By September of that year, there were twenty-four people on the islet awaiting transfer to Makogai, and the necessary finance for another voyage was approved.[112] In October, the *Tagua* took twenty from Te Sauma as well as seven others.[113] The Penrhyn station quickly filled up again but with early cases. The comparatively large number of Cook Islanders discharged from Makogai in 1942 was again attributed in Fiji to the success of the Cook Islands medical service in finding cases early.[114] There were thirty-two people on the *Tagua* when it next sailed to Makogai in November 1943. Twenty of them had been found in a new survey of Penrhyn, ten were already at Te Sauma, and two were taken from Rarotonga.[115] The Resident Agent at Penrhyn noted that the relatives of the young patients seemed "very hopeful that their poor sick people will be coming home again after some time and cured."[116] Numa recorded that successful treatment had led the people to give up their belief that leprosy would always end in death; he wrote that he had been "embarrassed on occasions by people pretending to have leprosy, hoping for the excitement and adventure of a trip to Fiji."[117] Three more voyages from the Cook Islands to Makogai took place before 1950—in 1946 (sixteen patients), 1947 (ten), and 1948 (ten). All those on the 1948 voyage, on the *New Golden Hind*, were from Aitutaki, and all except three were thirteen years and under.[118]

By this time, about 250 people had been taken to Fiji, and a careful study in 1949 by Makogai's Medical Superintendent, Austin, pointed to a distinctive feature of the Cook Islands admissions since 1934: in the terminology still current at that time, there was a marked increase in the percentage (80.2 percent) that were "neural" rather than "lepromatous" in type, the latter being much more severe. Among the groups admitted from the various participating territories, this was by far the highest proportion of neural cases. To Austin, it indicated the importance of early diagnosis, and he again explained that in the Cook Islands this was accomplished by means of contact follow-up, the regular examination of school children, and the training of local medical personnel in leprosy control; it was reflected in a high Cook Islands discharge rate (53.4 percent for the period 1934–48).[119] But an ominous note was beginning to sound. Until 1951, the great

majority of the patients admitted from the Cook Islands (171 out of 238, or about 72 percent) came from Penrhyn, Manihiki, Rakahanga, and Palmerston, the populations of which were closely connected. It was starting to become evident, however, that while there was a decline in the prevalence of leprosy in the north, the number of cases on Aitutaki was increasing.[120]

It was still difficult to enforce complete isolation at Te Sauma. Numa noted that isolation was going to be even harder to impose on the growing number of Aitutaki cases since the people there did not yet understand that leprosy was contagious rather than hereditary; he recorded that it was common for young men to go to the isolation motu during the night to fraternize with the patients and even sleep there.[121] In the opinion of the Resident Agent on Aitutaki, "concealment of the disease is ingrained in the people," who feared "the lonely isolation of our small islet" or, even worse, "complete separation and exile in Makogai."[122]

Although two more transfer voyages were made before the policy of sending patients to Fiji was abandoned, doubts about the usefulness of Makogai for the Cook Islands were again beginning to emerge. It was difficult and expensive to arrange regular transfers, and collecting the cases at Te Sauma to await transfer to Fiji was not easy either. In addition, the discovery in the late 1940s of a vastly more effective therapy, using sulfone drugs, began to have an impact on leprosy control and treatment measures in the group. In the meantime, however, Makogai was in its heyday. The number of patients in residence there in 1947 was 703, of whom 274 were from beyond Fiji.[123]

Cook Islanders at Makogai after 1935

After the journalist R. K. Palmer visited "Beautiful Makogai" in 1935, he wrote articles describing its fertile plantations and tidy villages. Referring to "the horror that the average New Zealander seems to feel" at the mention of leprosy, he declared that "the mere sight of Makogai was the best antidote to that sort of morbidness. There was no sign here of a curse."[124] This positive view of the leprosy island, often tinged with surprise that a place of illness and exile could be so pleasant, was the perception most often found in the documentation of Cook Islands and New Zealand attitudes to Makogai. Ellison's impression when he reached Makogai on the transfer voyage of 1938 was that all the Cook Islanders there were "very happy and very contented."[125] This report was repeated many times in the succeeding decades. A missionary from Rarotonga visited in 1951 and was "tremendously impressed." He wrote that the reward of the Makogai staff

was "found in the smiles, affection and confidence of the patients—men, women and children."[126] The peace and order prevailing in the institution was commonly linked with the benevolent leadership of successive Medical Superintendents and the dedicated service of the universally praised Catholic sisters—Palmer called them "The Bravest Women in the World"—who cared for the leprosy patients with great compassion.

Yet the island was a place of exile, especially for people such as the Cook Islanders, who were not only confined in a place cut off from the world but also separated by hundreds of miles from their homeland and its culture. It is not surprising that dissatisfactions and tensions sometimes arose. As before, mundane matters, such as disputes over food supplies, were an indicator that discontent often lay beneath the surface. There were several instances of this, and the patients sometimes also complained that they were neglected by their own people. The Resident Commissioner agreed that the needs of the Cook Islands patients at Makogai were often overlooked by their relatives at home, probably unintentionally and as a result of a lack of information.[127] The patients were of course separated from their families, and some died on the island before they could return home. There had been twenty-nine deaths by 1935 and sixty-eight by 1948.[128] Of the two patients who died in 1942, one had been there only a couple of years, but the other was one of the original 1926 admissions.[129] Another example of a death after many years in Makogai was the passing in 1948 of a man who had been admitted in 1927 as a ten-year-old.[130] The total number of Cook Islands patients who died on the island is recorded as seventy-four.[131]

The other side of the coin was the number of people reunited with their relatives at home on being discharged as cured. Following the first discharges in the 1920s, there had been 125 by 1948.[132] A total of 206 Cook Islanders were returned to their homes from Makogai.[133] As mentioned above, the hope of being cured had encouraged leprosy sufferers to go willingly to Fiji for treatment.

The advent of sulfone therapy after the war revolutionized leprosy treatment all over the world. Chaulmoogra had undoubtedly produced an improvement in some cases, but it had to be injected, in ever-increasing doses, and was dreaded for the pain it caused. Sulfetrone arrived at Makogai in 1948 and immediately brought outstanding results in advanced (lepromatous) cases. Later another sulfone, DDS (Dapsone), administered in tablet form, was used.[134] Speaking in New Zealand in 1950, Dr. Austin of Makogai described the new drug as an unprecedented advance in treatment. He pointed out that although chaulmoogra therapy had been of limited effectiveness, its use had still enabled the Makogai staff to discharge thirty to forty patients a year. Despite his enthusiasm for the sulfone drugs,

he warned that only time would tell if they would cure completely. He also took the opportunity to explain that drugs were not the only factor in successful treatment: the psychological element was also very important, and the much-appreciated gifts from the Lepers' Trust Board and other New Zealanders had played a major role.[135]

Reduced periodically by discharges and deaths, the Cook Islands community on Makogai was reinforced every now and again by new patients: 163 were brought on the eight transfer voyages made in the years after 1935. The number of Cook Islands patients admitted during the life of the institution made them the largest national group apart from the Fiji majority.[136] In 1935, there were sixty-one Cook Islanders on Makogai.[137] By 1943, despite two more intakes, the number had dropped to forty-three.[138] Patients returned or died, but continuing admissions brought the number to fifty-seven at the end of 1948. Makogai was a very large institution by this time, with 684 residents in 1948 and 744 in 1951.[139] The Cook Islanders were a comparatively tiny group among all these people from other islands. Nevertheless, after the arrival of the last Cook Islands admissions in 1953, there were still forty-one Cook Islanders resident there.[140]

In the years following, the size of the Cook Islands community on the island gradually decreased. It was decided in 1953 that in view of the improvement in follow-up procedures in the Cook Islands and some other places, their patients could be provisionally released only one year after becoming bacteriologically negative instead of two years as had been the practice up to that time.[141] Many of the patients were brought home in 1954.[142] The departures continued, and by 1956 there were only twenty-five Cook Islanders left. This number fell to twenty in 1958 and twelve in 1960.[143] When the agreement with Fiji came up for renewal in 1960, it was noted that several Cook Islands patients had elected to remain at Makogai, and the New Zealand government agreed to continue paying its annual contribution as long as they stayed there (the individual fees were paid by the Cook Islands Administration).[144] Some of the other Cook Islands patients asked if they could be sent home. In the words of the official who passed on this request, they "do feel quite strongly their inability to see their own people and suffer keenly the fact that they are so far from home."[145] By 1962, there were only five Cook Islanders on the island and by 1963 only one. She was still there in 1965 but was not listed by 1968.[146] The departure of the last Cook Islands patient marked the end of an era for the Cook group, but Makogai itself continued. There were still 166 patients there in 1965, mostly from Fiji, but in view of falling numbers, the decline of leprosy as a health problem, and the move to outpatient and domiciliary treatment, the Fiji government decided in that year to close the

institution and replace it with a smaller hospital in a more accessible location.[147] In 1969, all the remaining patients were transferred to the new P. J. Twomey Memorial Hospital at Tamavua near Suva.[148]

The End of the Makogai Era in Cook Islands Leprosy Policy

After 1950, leprosy continued to engage the attention of the Cook Islands Administration and (until the group achieved self-government in 1965) New Zealand's Island Territories Department. Under the oversight of the Chief Medical Officer, it was John Numa who was most active in implementing the control program. In 1952, he completed six months of postgraduate studies in leprosy and medicine in Suva and Makogai. The senior doctor with whom he worked wrote that Numa "revealed a splendid practical knowledge of leprosy. This was expected of him, for the Cook Islands patients sent by him to Makogai are always early cases, in better condition than those from any other of the Pacific Territories." He was an "outstanding" practitioner, "possessed of initiative, clinical judgement and reliability far beyond most of his fellows."[149] During his studies Numa wrote an article on leprosy in the Cook Islands, acknowledging the assistance of Dr. Austin of Makogai. It was published in the *International Journal of Leprosy*.[150] Later, he collaborated with D. D. McCarthy in the writing of another article, published in the *New Zealand Medical Journal* in 1962.[151]

The leprosy center at Te Sauma was not often used after the late 1940s.[152] Since 1937, it had been an intermediate station for Cook Islands leprosy patients designated for Makogai, but the authorities were more and more dissatisfied with it. For one thing, its location on the distant northern atoll of Penrhyn made access difficult, and this became more important as the prevalence of leprosy declined in the north and increased in the south. Also, the advent of sulfone therapy meant that the treatment of patients in sites far away from their home islands was increasingly recognized as unnecessary. Not only was the focus moving away from the Penrhyn station, but the use of Makogai itself was more and more questioned.

Such a significant modification of policy as abandoning Makogai took some time to crystallize. In 1951, there was no talk of taking such a step, and in that year eighteen patients were transferred to Fiji on the *Alexander*. Eight were from the northern group and ten from Aitutaki and Rarotonga.[153] In 1951 also, however, the suggestion was made by the Chief Medical Officer that the central leprosy station for the Cook Islands should be on a less isolated island than Penrhyn.[154] The Island Territories Department in Wellington could see the wisdom of providing good treatment facilities in the south rather than in the north now that many of the cases were

occurring on Aitutaki.[155] The Lepers' Trust Board, too, stated its opinion that the rudimentary facilities at Te Sauma were now of limited usefulness and pointed out that the new sulfone therapy required better laboratory services than could be available in the outer islands. The board's suggestion was a small leprosy center attached to the Rarotonga hospital.[156] The move to focus on the southern islands was given further impetus by Numa's survey of Aitutaki in September 1951, followed soon afterward by surveys of the northern islands. Only a few cases and suspects were found in the latter, but sixteen positive cases and nine suspects were found on Aitutaki. In Numa's words, leprosy "will be a problem at Aitutaki for the next five years at least."[157]

A modern leprosy station in the southern Cook Islands continued to be mooted in 1952. The respective advantages of Aitutaki, where there was the highest number of cases and a need for a continuing intensive program of case finding and treatment, and Rarotonga, where hospital and laboratory facilities existed, were debated.[158] By the middle of that year, there were twenty positive cases awaiting transfer to Makogai, but when Numa completed another intensive survey a further forty-four positive cases, including thirty of school age, were discovered on Aitutaki.[159] This news alarmed the Makogai management.[160] It also contributed to the tendency in the Cook Islands Administration to contemplate replacing Makogai with a local leprosarium—an idea not welcomed by the Departments of Island Territories and Health in Wellington. One factor in this opposition, of course, was the need to respect the partnership that had been maintained with the Fiji government since the 1920s. At the same time, health officials were not convinced that an institutional approach to leprosy control and treatment was better than a modern home-based program of surveillance and therapy.[161] These doubts reflected the fact that for some years it had been increasingly recognized that there was no need to isolate all leprosy cases, only the infective ones classified as lepromatous.[162]

Discussion and disagreement continued into 1953, with arguments being advanced for and against a Cook Islands institution and for and against Rarotonga and Aitutaki.[163] A report for the South Pacific Commission by the American leprologist N. R. Sloan recommended the establishment of a leprosarium on Rarotonga, in "nearly normal surroundings"; only bacteriologically positive cases would be sent to Makogai, and most of the patients already there could be returned.[164] Setting up a local establishment was opposed by H. B. Turbott of New Zealand's Department of Health, who argued that the Cook Islands were too small an entity to maintain a good institution and that anyway the days of leprosaria had passed. Such places were now needed only for the treatment of infectious cases, and Makogai,

an institution with an international reputation, already existed for this purpose and for the training of local practitioners.[165]

No decision had been made by the end of 1953, but in a reversal of the previous practice, which had seen patients taken north to Te Sauma, two cases from Penrhyn were brought to Aitutaki for supervised treatment.[166] At this time, there were 179 known cases of leprosy in the group as a whole, of which about half (eighty-five) were on Aitutaki. A high proportion (49 percent) of these and an even higher proportion (76 percent) of the new cases were children fifteen years and under. The only other island with a large number of cases (sixty-eight) was Penrhyn, but the status of fifty-five of these was "discharged."[167]

It was decided that since most of the new cases discovered through intensified surveys on Aitutaki were not contagious, not all of them needed to be moved to Fiji. When the next transfer to Makogai took place in 1953, it involved only seven patients.[168] This was the last such relocation, although it was not known at the time that there would be no more. There had been twelve transfers since 1926, and a total of 282 patients had made the long journey from their homeland to Fiji.[169] It might be noted that some of these were relapsed cases, discharged and then readmitted. Between 1935 and 1952, there were twenty-eight such readmissions from Penrhyn as well as two from Aitutaki and one from Manihiki.[170]

In the Cook Islands and in Wellington, the debate about future policy continued. As a strategy for leprosy and treatment, sending patients to Makogai faded from the picture, although no formal pronouncement on this matter was documented. It was recognized more and more that if a local center were set up, it would not need to be an elaborate "leprosarium" with an emphasis on isolation.[171] In the end, the decision was made to include a leprosy treatment center in the small general hospital to be built on Aitutaki; the new facility opened in 1955.[172]

Surveys continued to uncover new cases here and there, though not in large numbers. In October–November 1955, however, Numa's new survey of the Aitutaki population brought to light a fresh "outburst" of leprosy there.[173] More new cases were found in 1956, 1957, and 1958. Figures compiled in September 1957 showed that since 1950, there had been 166 notifications on Aitutaki, with young children making up nearly 80 percent of this figure.[174] Of the 296 cases discovered in the Cook Islands in the period 1952–58, 273 originated in Aitutaki.[175] To cope with this big surge in the incidence of leprosy in the group, plans were made for establishing a purpose-built treatment and isolation center on Aitutaki, and it was opened in October 1958.[176] By the end of that year, there were forty patients in the center, along with 151 under domiciliary treatment in the villages of

the island.[177] As with the earlier Te Sauma center, the Lepers' Trust Board in New Zealand donated funds for "the little extras that help to make life worth living."[178] But Aitutaki's "colony," as officials called it, had only a short life. Discharges gradually reduced the number of residents, who were transferred to home treatment and then to follow-up or observation status, and by December 1960 the center was empty.[179]

Between 1926 and 1958, there had been 517 known cases of leprosy in the Cook Islands, with a considerable surge in annual notifications in the 1950s (fifty-eight in 1953, seventy-one in 1957, and seventy in 1958). Of these, 204 were aged sixteen and over and 313 aged fifteen and under. The age distribution changed over time, with the older age-groups dominating only until the late 1940s. The number of cases known to the authorities fluctuated from year to year, with highs of eighty-three in 1940, ninety-six in 1954, 144 in 1957, and 220 in 1958. Nearly a sixth of the people known to be suffering from leprosy in this period had died of the disease, mostly before 1946 and most of them at Makogai.[180]

The spectacular increase in incidence in the 1950s turned out to be the last gasp of leprosy in the Cook Islands. By 1962, McCarthy and Numa were able to state that the disease was "no longer a major problem." "It may well be," they wrote, that "leprosy in the group will soon be a matter of history."[181] Its disappearance from the scene took some time, however. New cases continued to be notified in the 1960s, and the control program was maintained at a high level. The number of cases under home treatment dropped from fifty-five in 1964 to twenty-seven in 1966.[182] Surveys and other control measures continued in the 1970s, and new cases still appeared sporadically. An incidence rate of fifty-three per 100,000 persons was reported for the year 1975–76.[183] In 1979, the cases under treatment numbered thirty-eight (twenty-three of them on Aitutaki).[184] Soon afterward, in the 1980s, the development of multidrug therapy took the assault on leprosy further forward. The last new case in the Cook Islands was reported in 1995.[185] By 2005, the nation was listed by the World Health Organization as one of many countries that had achieved and sustained the "elimination of leprosy as a public health problem" (defined as the achievement of a prevalence rate of less than one case per 10,000 persons).[186] In 2010, while some Pacific island groups still recorded cases, the Cook Islands were among those registering zero prevalence of the disease.[187]

Conclusion

Leprosy is a disease that alarmed and puzzled the medical world for many years. Uncertainty about how it spread, the long interval between infection

and the appearance of symptoms, the slow but sure progress toward severe disfigurement and disablement, and the absence for many years of an effective therapy meant that strategies for treating leprosy sufferers and containing the spread of the disease were difficult to devise and implement. In the small and scattered Cook Islands, where finance and personnel were always in short supply, leprosy proved an intractable problem indeed for the New Zealand colonial administrators responsible for controlling the disease. Despite efforts to isolate people suffering from leprosy, at first on islets near their home communities and then by transferring them to Makogai in distant Fiji, the infection persisted resolutely in the Cook Islands until recent years, even after much more effective treatment became available after World War II. Although Makogai was the mainstay of leprosy policy between 1926 and 1953, efforts continued throughout the period to control the spread of the disease within the Cook Islands and to provide local care and treatment. The control program necessitated many difficult decisions both during the Makogai era and for many decades afterward.

Official policy was not unaffected by a desire to avoid damage to New Zealand's commercial interests in the Cook group and to prevent any spread of the disease to resident Europeans (or any further incidence in New Zealand itself, where it was present already in a small way). There was an important humanitarian element in the control policy, however, reinforced in the interwar period by a commitment to guardianship and trusteeship. From the beginning, the transfers to Makogai were seen as wholly beneficial to the leprosy sufferers. This approach was strongly associated with the two Maori politicians, Pomare and Ngata, who had ministerial responsibility for the Cook Islands for many years. Nongovernmental organizations and charitable donors, both in the Cook Islands and in New Zealand, were also prominently involved in the support of leprosy sufferers and later in programs to combat the disease.

The benevolence of New Zealand had a strongly paternalistic tinge since the Cook Islanders themselves were not invited to share in the making of decisions about leprosy control (although an indigenous medical practitioner, John Numa, stood out as a knowledgeable and effective leader in the leprosy control programs). Medical progress and public health improvements were seen as part of colonial development and welfare, and these policies were to be implemented for the good of the community even if they involved drastic intrusions into people's lives. The most obvious example of compulsion exercised for public health purposes was when leprosy sufferers were deprived of their freedom by being isolated on islets or transported across the ocean for confinement on Makogai. This approach was summed up in 1936 by Victor Heiser, who had been Director of Health

in the Philippines and a founder of the large Culion leprosy establishment there. Heiser explained why he favored a policy of segregation, which is "cruel to relatively few, whereas non-segregation threatens an entire people."[188] The authorities were well aware that Cook Islands leprosy sufferers were likely to fear an exile to Makogai but did their best to allay these anxieties by emphasizing the hope of cure. At the same time, they were prepared to take people to Fiji even if they were unwilling to go.

The negative aspects of enforced exile and confinement are obvious, but to reach a balanced assessment they must be viewed alongside the more positive features of the Makogai experience. Heiser commented on this point also: he "believed that isolation not only protected others from contracting leprosy but, furthermore, was the most humane solution for the leper himself. Instead of being shunned and rebuffed by the world, he could have an opportunity to associate with others of his kind in pleasant relationship."[189] In her book *Makogai—Image of Hope*, Sister Mary Stella encapsulated "the spirit of Makogai" as

> a combination of "sadness and gladness"—of mental anguish, physical and moral sufferings, loneliness, fear of what might be happening to loved ones and the uncertainty of not knowing; there was sorrow at separation from them and powerlessness to aid them; there was uncertainty about the future—how long would this isolation last? . . . And yet—there was the deep joy of so many wonderful friendships, the mutual sympathy, the courage, . . . the bond of union that drew all groups together in their common suffering and formed true community; simple but real enjoyment that came from the happy times, the pleasant social activities; and trust, loyalty and gratitude towards the staff.[190]

Naturally, the positive side of life on Makogai was always emphasized by officials in New Zealand and the Cook Islands. Other, more negative assessments were made later, with emphasis put on authoritarianism, deportation, and the breaking up of families. In 1999, however, *Compassionate Exile*, a documentary film about Makogai and some of its former patients, captured the positive in a story that could have been told in a completely negative way.[191] This more balanced approach is a reminder that the original meaning of the word "asylum" is not a place of banishment or punishment but a refuge, a place of care and protection. In the Cook Islands, at a time when local treatment was difficult and there seemed to be little chance of containing the disease if leprosy sufferers remained in the community, a control policy built around the provision of care in a large and distant institution was not altogether pitiless or unreasonable.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Marsden Fund, as part of a project based at the University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand: "Community and Isolation, a Social and Contemporary History of Leprosy in the South Pacific, 1890–2004." My thanks are due to the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, New Zealand Government, for granting access to certain files held by Archives New Zealand, Wellington, and to the Cook Islands Government for permission to conduct archival research on this topic in the National Archives, Rarotonga.

NOTES

1. Raeburn Lange, Plagues and pestilence in Polynesia: The nineteenth-century Cook Islands experience, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 58 (3,1984): 325–46.

2. Although leprosy is now called Hansen's disease, I refer to it in the article as "leprosy," as it was identified in that way during most of the period under discussion here. Except when it is used in direct quotations from historical sources, however, I avoid the word "leper," which is now regarded as an insensitive way of referring to sufferers from leprosy.

3. Ann G. Carmichael, Leprosy, in *The Cambridge world history of human disease* (Cambridge, 1993), 834, 836–37.

4. See my forthcoming article in *Journal of Pacific History*.

5. Information about Makogai and its history is conveniently available in a book by Sister Mary Stella: *Makogai: Image of hope. A brief history of the care of leprosy patients in Fiji* (Christchurch, 1978). Annual patient statistics are found in C. J. Austin, Leprosy in Fiji and the South Seas, *International Journal of Leprosy* 17 (4, 1949), table 1.

6. For a discussion of this theme in relation to Makogai and the Pacific Islands generally, see Jane Buckingham, The inclusivity of exclusion: Isolation and community among leprosy affected people in the South Pacific, *Health and History* 13 (2, 2011): 65–83.

7. Memorandum, Acting Colonial Secretary, Fiji, *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (*AJHR*), 1928, A-3A, 6; S. M. Lambert, *A doctor in paradise* (London, 1942), 124; Stella, 72–75.

8. *AJHR*, 1925, A-3, 5; 1926, A-3, 34.

9. See my forthcoming article in *Journal of Pacific History*.

10. Secretary, Cook Islands Department (SCI), to Resident Commissioner (RC), April 11, 1922, Island Territories (IT) 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1, Archives New Zealand (ANZ), Wellington.

11. Extract from report of visit of SCI to Rarotonga, May 1922, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

12. RC to SCI, July 11, 1923, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

13. SCI to RC, December 15, 1923, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

14. Secretary of External Affairs to RC, February 22, 1924, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

15. Chief Medical Officer (CMO) to RC, September 2, 1924, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

16. RC to Secretary of External Affairs, September 6, 1924, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

17. SCI to PLO, September 23, 1924; Crown Solicitor to SCI, October 9, 1924; SCI to RC, October 21, 1924; RC to SCI, November 16, 1924; Minute, Minister, November 25, 1924, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

18. New Zealand Parliament, Cook Islands Amendment Act, 1925.

19. Prime Minister to Governor-General, October 3, 1925, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ).

20. *AJHR*, 1928, A-3A, 7.

21. SCI to Minister, February 1926, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

22. *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* (NZPD), 1925, 206, 727.

23. Raeburn Lange, European medicine in the Cook Islands, in *Disease, medicine and empire: Perspectives on Western medicine and the experience of European expansion*, ed. Roy MacLeod and Milton Lewis (London, 1988), 61–79.

24. RC to SCI, November 26, 1924, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

25. *AJHR*, 1906, H-31, 70–72.

26. SCI to RC, January 26, 1926, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ).

27. CMO to Minister, June 18, 1926, H 1 131/12/16 (3806) (ANZ).

28. *Evening Post* (*EP*), June 11, 1926.

29. Unidentified undated clipping [1926], IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

30. *EP*, June 11, 1926; Pomare to all Ministers, June 25, 1926, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/3 (ANZ).

31. SCI to Colonial Secretary, Fiji, August 26, 1926, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

32. SCI to RC, June 17, 1926, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/3 (ANZ); RC to Resident Agent (RA), Pukapuka, December 1, 1926, Medical 6/6 1/2, National Archives of the Cook Islands (NACI), Rarotonga; SCI to Minister, January 12, 1927, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ).

33. CMO to SCI, August 17, 1927, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ); CMO to SCI, June 8, 1928, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 2 (ANZ).

34. In January 1928, there were more than 300 from Fiji, 27 from Western Samoa, 13 from Tonga, and 8 from New Zealand; Minister to Prime Minister, January 31, 1928, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/3 (ANZ).

35. Cook Islands leprosy statistical note, 1932, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

36. SCI to RC, March 29, 1935, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

37. Notes on Makogai [February 1928], IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

38. SCI to Mayor, February 20, 1928, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ); *EP*, February 23, 1928.

39. Transcript of speeches made at lantern lecture [1928], IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

40. Typescript, Makogai Leper Asylum, Fiji, n.d. [*ca.* 1929], IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 2 (ANZ).

41. Director-General of Health to SCI, December 10, 1934, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/15 (ANZ).

42. Derek Douglas, *A brief outline of the development and operations of the Leprosy Trust Board (the Leper Man Appeal)* (Christchurch, n.d. [1985]); Jane Buckingham, The Pacific Leprosy Foundation Archive and Oral Histories of Leprosy in the South Pacific, *Journal of Pacific History* 41 (2006): 81–84. The Makogai Lepers' (New Zealand) Trust Board became the Lepers' Trust Board in 1942 (renamed the Leprosy Trust Board in 1978). In 1991, the organization, still based in Christchurch, became the Pacific Leprosy Foundation.

43. Notes on Makogai [February 1928], IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

44. *NZPD*, 217, 1928, 950.

45. Leonard Rogers, Progress in the control of leprosy in the British Empire, *British Medical Journal*, no. 4456, June 1, 1946, 826; Jane Buckingham, *Leprosy in colonial South India: Medicine and confinement* (Houndsmills, 2002), 91–96; John Parascandola, Chaulmoogra oil and the treatment of leprosy, *Pharmacy in History* 45 (2003):, 47–57; F. S. D. dos Santos, A. P. A. de Souza, and A. C. Siani, Chaulmoogra oil as scientific knowledge: The construction of a treatment for leprosy, *História, Ciências, Saúde-Manguinhos* 15 (2008): 29–46.

46. Governor, Fiji, to Governor-General, New Zealand, July 12, 1926, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ); Acting Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to CMO, Fiji, August 18, 1926, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ); IT 1 W2439 130 110/4/3 (ANZ).

47. Cook Islands leprosy statistical note, 1932, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

48. SCI to Twomey, April 5, 1935, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/15 (ANZ).

49. Dos Santos, de Souza and Siani, 37.

50. Governor's Deputy, Fiji, to Governor-General, New Zealand, August 27, 1926; SCI to RC, October 11, 1926, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ).

51. Cook Islands leprosy statistical note, 1932, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

52. Stella, 56.

53. Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to CMO, Fiji, June 15, 1934, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

54. CMO to RC, March 3, 1927, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

55. SCI to Minister, March 16, 1927, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

56. SCI to RC, March 29, 1927, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ).

57. CMO to SCI, August 17, 1927, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 1 (ANZ); CMO to RC, November 1, 1927, Medical 6/6 1/2 (NACI).

58. *AJHR*, 1927, A-3, 6, 7.

59. B. G. Thompson, quarterly report, January 3, 1928, G (Governor) 48 3 C/7 (ANZ).

60. CMO to SCI, June 8, 1928, IT 1 613 IT 110/4/2 pt. 2 (ANZ).

61. *AJHR*, 1929, A-3, 9.

62. Ibid, 10.

63. CMO to RC, May 26, 1927, IT 1 609 IT 110/2/1 (ANZ).

64. S. M. Lambert, Medical conditions in the South Pacific, *Medical Journal of Australia*, September 22, 1928, 369.

65. Minister to Prime Minister, October 10, 1928, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/3 (ANZ).

66. Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to SCI, December 19, 1928, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

67. SCI to Medical Superintendent, Makogai, December 19, 1928, IT 1 IT 110/4 pt. 1 (ANZ).

68. Minister to Prime Minister, December 18, 1928, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/3 (ANZ); Prime Minister to Minister, January 30, 1929, AALR 873 W3266 39 52/496 (ANZ); Prime Minister to Governor-General, February 6, 1929, IT 1 W2439 130 110/4/5 (ANZ).

69. *EP*, June 30, 1930.

70. *AJHR*, 1932, A-3, 3.

71. *EP*, December 1, 1931.

72. *AJHR*, 1932, B-4A, 41.

73. *AJHR*, 1932, A-3, 1-3.

74. Ngata to Governor-General, June 6, 1933, G 48 3 C/7 (ANZ).

75. Western Pacific Health Service, annual report, 1934, IT 1 IT 110/5 pt. 1 (ANZ).

76. W. MacKnight, September 12, 1934; RC to SCI, 3 Oct 1934, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

77. SCI to Minister, October 19, 1934, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

78. SCI to RC, November 27, 1934, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

79. SCI to Minister, November 30, 1934, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

80. SCI to Minister, March 28, 1935, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ); unidentified clipping, *ca.* March 29, 1935, filed in IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

81. SCI to RC, March 29, 1935; SCI to Lambert, April 15, 1935; CMO to RC, June 5, 1935, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); *Dominion* clipping, April 30, 1935, filed in H 1 131/12/16 (3804) (ANZ).

82. Prime Minister to Lambert, May 22, 1935, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

83. SCI to Minister, September 5, 1935; Minister for the Cook Islands to Minister of Finance, September 5, 1935; SCI to Minister, February 19, 1936, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

84. IT 1 110/6 (ANZ).

85. SCI to RC, August 26, 1935, IT 1 W2439 130 110/8 (ANZ); SCI to CMO, Fiji, September 6, 1935; RC to SCI, October 3, 1935; SCI to Director of Medical Services, Fiji, May 15, 1936, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

86. SCI to Minister, May 4, 1936, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

87. Lambert, *A doctor in paradise*, 392.

88. RC to Minister, August 5, 1937, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

89. RC to SCI, April 16, 1936, IT 1 W2439 130 110/8 (ANZ).

90. RC to SCI, November 7, 1936, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

91. CMO to RC, November 29, 1945, Medical 6/6 6 (NACI).

92. RC to SCI, July 21, 1937; RA, Penrhyn, to RC, September 24, 1937; photographs sent by RC, November 11, 1937, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); extract from letter from RC, November 10, 1937, H 1 131/12 (26331) (ANZ).

93. RC to Minister, August 5, 1937, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

94. SCI to RC, August 26, 1935, IT 1 W2439 130 110/8 (ANZ).

95. Extract from letter from RC, November 10, 1937, H 1 131/12 (26331) (ANZ); RC to SCI, February 28, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

96. Director-General of Health to Secretary for External Affairs, December 20, 1937, H 1 131/12 (26331) (ANZ).

97. Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to Director of Medical Services, Suva, March 16, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); Lambert to Secretary for External Affairs, April 28, 1938, IT 110/6 (ANZ).

98. RC to SCI, January 15, 1937, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); *AJHR*, 1937, A-3, 14; 1938, A-3, 12, 14.

99. *AJHR*, 1938, A-3, 13.

100. Numa to CMO, January 20, 1938; RC to SCI, April 28, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

101. RA, Penrhyn, to RC, September 30, 1939, Medical 6/6 5 (NACI).

102. RC to T. F. Telford, February 11, 1938; W. G. MacNaughton and Sister M. Agnes to Telford and Twomey, February 15, 1938, H 1 131/12/16 (3804) (ANZ).

103. Twomey to RC, August 25, 1942, H 1 131/12/16 (26379) (ANZ); RC to Twomey, September 20, 1943; Note for file, May 9, 1955, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/15 (ANZ); Twomey to RC, August 10, 1948, Medical 6/6 6 (NACI).

104. John Numa, The prevalence of leprosy in the Cook Islands, *International Journal of Leprosy* 21 (2, 1953): 154.

105. John Numa, Penrhyn Island, *Native Medical Practitioner* 3 (1, 1939): 416; Numa, Prevalence, 154.

106. RC to SCI, May 23, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

107. RC to SCI, August 15, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

108. CMO to RC, December 1, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

109. RC to SCI, October 18, 1938; RA, Penrhyn, to RC, October 18, 1938; RA, Manihiki, to RC, October 18, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

110. *EP*, November 1938; CMO to RC, December 1, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

111. RA, Aitutaki, to RC, July 9, 1940, Medical 6/6 5 (NACI).

112. Acting Assistant SCI to Minister, September 10, 1940, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

113. Assistant Medical Officer to CMO, January 7, 1941, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

114. Medical Department, Fiji, annual report, 1942, 15, IT 1 154 EX 8/34 pt. 2 (ANZ).

115. *AJHR*, 1945, A-3, 11.

116. RA, Penrhyn, to RC, November 11, 1943, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

117. Numa, Prevalence, 155.

118. List, October 1946, Medical 6/6 6 (NACI); Report by Ualesi F. Toelupe, n.d. [1948], IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ); RA, Aitutaki, to RC, October 25, 1948, Medical 6/6 7 (NACI); *AJHR*, 1949, A-3, 12.

119. Austin, 404–6.

120. Numa, Prevalence, 157–59.

121. Numa to CMO, October 26, 1951, H 1 336/4 (32644) (ANZ); Norman Mitchell to Minister, March 15, 1958, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ).

122. RA, Aitutaki, to Official Secretary, Rarotonga (OS), July 22, 1952, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

123. Austin, 401.

124. *The Press*, April 29, 1935, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

125. CMO to RC, December 1, 1938, IT 1 IT 110/4/1 pt. 2 (ANZ).

126. W. Murphy to OS, n.d. [1951], Medical 6/6 7 (NACI).

127. RC to Secretary for Island Territories, August 25, 1950, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

128. Table, 1935, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ); Austin, 408.

129. Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to Cook Islands Department, January 10, 1942, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

130. Director of Medical Services, Suva, to Secretary for Island Territories, July 21, 1948, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

131. Stella, 171.

132. Austin, 408.

133. Stella, 171.

134. C. J. Austin, Leprosy in Fiji and the South Seas, in *Proceedings of the Seventh Pacific Science Congress of the Pacific Science Association, 1949*, vol. 7 (Christchurch, 1953), 287–90; Stella, 96–98, 149–50.

135. C. J. Austin, Fiji Leprosy Hospital, Makogai (radio script, November 26, 1950), Medical 6/6 7 (NACI).

136. Stella, 171.

137. Table, 1935, IT 1 614 IT 110/4/2 pt. 3 (ANZ).

138. Fiji Government account, 1943, H 1 131/12/16 (26379) (ANZ).

139. South Pacific Health Service, report 1947-48, IT 1 154 EX 8/34 pt. 2 (ANZ); Inspector-General's report, South Pacific Health Service, 1960–61, 17, H 1 333/1/1 (32066) (ANZ).

140. South Pacific Health Service, Inspector-General's Report, 1951–53, 8, H 1 1750 333/1/1 (27287) (ANZ).

141. Minutes of meeting, South Pacific Board of Health, Suva, August 19–22, 1953, H 1 1750 333/1/1 (27287) (ANZ).

142. CMO to RC, July 30, 1954, H 1 333/12 (25441) (ANZ).

143. Maintenance papers, 1950–65, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/16 pt. 2 (ANZ); CMO, monthly report, March 1958, H 1 333/12/2 (27868) (ANZ).

144. Secretary for External Affairs to Secretary for Island Territories and Director-General of Health, June 29, 1960; Director-General of Health to Secretary for Island Territories, August 24, 1960; Secretary for Island Territories to Secretary for External Affairs, October 18, 1960, AAFB (Health) 632 W3463 122 131/12/16 (48399) (ANZ).

145. Inspector-General, South Pacific Health Service, to RC, November 19, 1960, Medical 6/6 9 (NACI).

146. Maintenance papers, 1950–65, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/16 pt. 2 (ANZ); Inspector-General's report, South Pacific Health Service, 1964–65, 17, H 1 333/1/1 (32066) (ANZ).

147. Inspector-General's report, South Pacific Health Service, 1964–65, 17, H 1 333/1/1 (32066) (ANZ); Acting Colonial Secretary, Fiji, to Secretary for External Affairs, January 13, 1964; Secretary for External Affairs to Director-General of Health, August 12, 1965, AAFB 632 W3463 122 131/12/16 (48399) (ANZ).

148. Stella, 162–63.

149. Memorandum, P. T. Griffiths, August 4, 1952, IT 11 8 pt. 1 (ANZ).

150. Numa, Prevalence, 151–60.

151. D. D. McCarthy and John Numa, Leprosy in the Cook Islands, *New Zealand Medical Journal* 61 (354, February 1962).

152. CMO to OS, February 6, 1959, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 3 (ANZ). The facilities at Te Sauma were dismantled in 1955.

153. OS to Director of Medical Services, Fiji, June 8, 1951, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

154. CMO to Acting Secretary, Lepers Trust Board, April 9, 1951, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ); CMO to OS, October 12, 1951, Medical 6/6 7 (NACI).

155. Secretary for Island Territories to Secretary for External Affairs, March 8, 1951, IT 1 W2439 4 1/66/7/7 (ANZ).

156. Acting Secretary, Lepers Trust Board, to CMO, May 22,1951, Medical 6/6 7 (NACI).

157. Numa to CMO, October 26, 1951, H 1 336/4 (32644) (ANZ).

158. CMO to OS, February 18, 1952, H 1 336/4 (32644) (ANZ); OS to Acting CMO, July 7, 1952; RA, Aitutaki, to OS, July 22, 1952; Acting CMO to OS, March 20, 1953, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

159. OS to Secretary for Island Territories, July 7, 1952; CMO to OS, October 1, 1952; Numa to CMO, December 15, 1952, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ); Numa, Prevalence, 154.

160. Medical Superintendent, Makogai, to Numa, September 11, 1952, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

161. Secretary for Island Territories to OS, January 16, 1953; Secretary for Island Territories to Director-General of Health, January 29, 1953; Secretary for Island Territories to OS, February 18, 1953, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ).

162. R. D. G. P. Simons, Modern conceptions concerning the compulsory isolation of lepers, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* 41 (1948): 751–54.

163. OS to Secretary for Island Territories, March 25, 1953, IT 1 W2439 86 90/10/14 pt. 1 (ANZ); CMO to RC, September 19, 1953; RC to Secretary for Island Territories, September 24, 1953, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ); Secretary for Island Territories to Director-General of Health, November 13, 1953, H 1 131/12 (26331) (ANZ).

164. Secretary-General, South Pacific Commission, to Island Territories Department, August 9, 1953, IT 1 W2439 4 1/66/7/7 (ANZ). The report was published in 1954.

Norman R. Sloan, *Leprosy in Western Samoa and the Cook Islands: A survey*, Noumea, 1954, 14, 20–21.

165. Deputy Director-General of Health to Secretary for Island Territories, November 23, 1953, March 17, 1954, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ).

166. CMO, monthly report, November 30, 1953, H 1 333.12/2 (27868) (ANZ).

167. Sloan, 15–16, 18, 19.

168. Secretary for Island Territories to Minister, June 12, 1953, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ); South Pacific Health Service, Inspector-General's Report, 1951–53, 8, H 1 1750 333/1/1 (27287) (ANZ).

169. The figure is the total of admissions as reported at the time of each transfer. Compare the figure of 280 given by Stella (171) and also McCarthy and Numa (77).

170. McCarthy and Numa, 81.

171. J. M. Wogan, Report on the Medical Services of the Cook Group of Islands, August 20, 1954, H 1 333/12 (25441) (ANZ); Wogan to Turbott, January 18, 1955, H 1 131/12 (26331) (ANZ).

172. Deputy Director-General of Health to Secretary for Island Territories, March 22, 1955, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ).

173. CMO, monthly report, October 1955, November 1955; Numa to CMO, March 5, 1956, H 1 333/12/2 (27868) (ANZ).

174. D. D. McCarthy (Acting CMO), Leprosy in Aitutaki: An appreciation of the present position, September 2, 1957; Numa to Acting CMO, December 9, 1957, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 2 (ANZ).

175. McCarthy and Numa, 77.

176. A. S. Wallace (Acting CMO), Report on public health in the CI, January 6, 1958; D. D. McCarthy, Notes on activities in Aitutaki during the past year, n.d. [July 1958], IT 1 W2439 90/10/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); CMO, monthly report, October 1958, H 1 333/12/2 (27868) (ANZ); McCarthy and Numa, 77, 80.

177. Leprosy statistics, December 1958, H 1 333/12/2 (27868) (ANZ).

178. Twomey to Secretary for Island Territories, March 3, 1958; Acting Secretary for Island Territories to OS, April 29, 1958; Twomey to Secretary for Island Territories, May 1, 1959, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/15 (ANZ).

179. CMO, Notes on Cook Islands health problems during 1959, December 1959, IT 1 W2439 90/10/1 pt. 2 (ANZ); Leprosy statistics, May 1960; CMO, monthly report, December 1960, H 1 333/12/2 (27868) (ANZ).

180. Tables 1, 3, 4, CMO to OS, February 6, 1959, IT 1 W2439 87 90/10/14 pt. 3 (ANZ).

181. McCarthy and Numa, 77.

182. Report on Health Department for year ended March 31, 1967, Cook Islands Legislative Assembly paper no. 7, 4.

183. South Pacific Commission Epidemiological and Health Information Service, Annual Summary of the Reported Diseases for 1975–76, tables 1 and 25, filed in ABQU (Health) 632 W4415 273 131/49/7 (52236).

184. World Health Organization (WHO), *Country health information profile: Cook Islands* (Geneva, 1983), table 8, 38.

185. WHO, *Overview and epidemiological review of leprosy in the WHO Western Pacific Region 1991–2001* (Manila, 2003), 10.

186. WHO, Western Pacific Region, *Epidemiological review of leprosy in the Western Pacific Region* (Manila, 2007), 7.

187. WHO, Global leprosy situation, 2010, *Weekly Epidemiological Record*, no. 35, 2010, 346–47.

188. Victor Heiser, *A doctor's odyssey* (London, 1936), 236.

189. Ibid.

190. Stella, 90.

191. Bob Madey and Larry Thomas, *Compassionate exile*, video recording, Suva, 1999.

ON SPANISH LOANWORDS AND LOANBLENDS IN HAWAI'I CREOLE ENGLISH

Robert N. Smead
Brigham Young University

Hawai'i Creole English (HCE) has been the object of much linguistic research. Virtually all researchers agree that its principal lexical sources include English, Hawaiian, and Japanese. Other languages, such as Chinese and Portuguese, have also contributed. To date, however, few sources have considered Spanish as an important lexical source for HCE. The research reported herein attempts to remedy that oversight by considering ten putative loanwords and loanblends thought to derive from Spanish. These include ethnic markers associated with and local dishes brought by Filipino and Puerto Rican immigrants in the early twentieth century. By documenting cultural traditions and consulting authoritative sources, I conclude that eight of the ten items reported on are unquestionably of Spanish language origin. By also employing survey methodology, I observe that five of the ten terms are used or recognized by at least half of my thirty-three respondents, attesting to their vitality in HCE.

Introduction

Due to its cultural history and ethnic mix, the Hawaiian archipelago is rightly associated with Polynesian and Asian cultures. However, other ethnic/cultural groups have played important roles in Hawaiian history. In particular, the Hispanic influence has been noteworthy, although it remains largely unknown to most scholars, historians, and linguists alike. A brief historical survey of Hispanic influences in the Islands would include at least the following six entries: (1) the possibility that the Spanish may have been the first Europeans to set foot on Hawaiian soil (sometime prior to Cook's

Pacific Studies, Vol. 36, No. 3—December 2013

discovery of the archipelago in 1778); (2) the visit in 1791 of a Peruvian sea captain, Manuel Químper, who reconnoitered the Sandwich Islands under the Spanish flag with an eye toward establishing a strategic outpost for the galleon trade between Mexico and the Philippines; (3) the forty-year presence of the Andalusian Don Francisco de Paula Marín, who arrived in Hawai'i during the winter of 1793–1794 and later became a trusted adviser to Kamehameha I (serving in several roles, including that of royal translator and interpreter), who also introduced and cultivated many useful plants and became a successful businessman; (4) the enduring legacy of the *paniolos*, Alta California mission ranch hands of Indian and Spanish/Mexican extraction who taught the Hawaiians how to handle cattle during the period 1830–1859; (5) the immigration of Filipino (120,000), Spanish (7,735), and Puerto Rican (5,200) laborers at the beginning of the twentieth century who harvested and processed sugarcane on Hawaiian plantations; and (6) the presence of numerous Hispanics in the Islands today—according to the 2000 Census, 87,699 persons, or 7.2 percent of the population in Hawai'i, were of Hispanic origin (in 2010, that number had risen by 37.8 percent to 120,842, or 8.9 percent of the total; Ennis, Ríos-Vargas, and Albert 2011: 6). The label "Hispanic" is a broad one, including the descendants of some immigrants, recent Mexican immigrants, and other Latinos. Their presence is also manifested by some Spanish language media and institutional and commercial resources in the Islands.

This article deals specifically with the legacy of the Hispanic immigrants (Filipinos and Puerto Ricans), who introduced certain Spanish terms and expressions into plantation pidgin, which later became Hawai'i Creole English (HCE). Ten of these terms are examined using survey methodology and written sources (fiction and nonfiction, including reference works). In order to contextualize the Hispanic contribution to Island English, we briefly consider the history of the immigrant laborers in Hawai'i and the development of HCE. Furthermore, we consider certain cultural practices that made possible the dissemination of these loanwords.

Immigrants and the Development of a Pidgin/Creole

A brief note on pidgins and creoles may be helpful at this point. *The Oxford English Dictionary* (*OED* 2013) observes that *pidgin* derives from *business* as filtered through Chinese; its earliest attestation with that meaning dates to 1807, while the earliest documentation for its use to refer to what some have called a trade jargon, Chinese Pidgin English, dates from 1845. According to the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics* (*CODL* 2007), a pidgin is "a simplified form of speech developed as a medium of trade,

or through other extended but limited contact, between groups of speakers who have no other language in common."

A creole, on the other hand, is defined by the *CODL* (2007) "as a language that has developed historically from a pidgin. In theory, accordingly, a pidgin develops from trade or other contacts; it has no native speakers, its range of use is limited, and its structure is simplified. Later it becomes the only form of speech that is common to a community, it is learned by new speakers and used for all purposes, its structure and vocabulary are enlarged, and so on." Technically speaking, in addition to standard varieties of English, what is spoken by many "locals" in Hawai'i today is a creolized form of English. Informally, however, it is often referred to as Pidgin (English).

Pidgin Hawaiian, according to Reinecke (1969: 24–25), may have begun as early as 1786 (some eight years following Cook's discovery of the archipelago). It was spurred on by commercial activities: fur trade between America and China, sandalwood trade (1810–1830), whaling (1820–1880), and, of course, the sugar industry, which began in 1835 with the first plantation and lasted almost 150 years. Siegel (2008: 46) notes that varieties of pidginized English were also introduced early on and may have become more important as the white population in the Islands grew (originating mainly from the United States and Great Britain).

While Pidgin Hawaiian dominated during the first part of the sugar plantation era, with the decreasing numbers of native Hawaiians available as laborers and their increasing dissatisfaction with the demands of plantation life, the Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association began to import contract laborers from distant shores. According to materials summarized in Siegel (2008), Norma Carr (1989), and Lozano (1984), the first to arrive were Chinese (mainly Cantonese speaking) who came in two waves; in total, some 39,000 took up residence in Hawai'i from 1852 to 1897. Other numerically significant groups who also immigrated as laborers in the sugar industry include 23,000 Portuguese (also in two waves, mainly from the Azores and Madeira islands) from 1878 to 1913; 200,000 Japanese in 1884–1924; **5,200 Puerto Ricans** (mainly during 1900–1901, with an additional group arriving in 1921); 7,850 Koreans in 1903–1905; **7,735 Spanish** (from Andalucía, also in two waves) from 1907 to 1913; and **120,000 Filipinos** (mainly Ilocanos and Visayans) between 1907 and 1930. Of the three Hispanic groups (bolded for easy reference), it is noteworthy that the Spanish did not remain in Hawai'i; nearly all of them left the Islands for California following their plantation experience. With the exception of *paella*, a Valencian dish that may have been introduced by the other two groups, no known remnant, linguistic or otherwise, of the Andalusians' presence in the Islands is evident today.[1]

I include the Filipinos as Hispanics since many spoke Spanish or had borrowed a significant number of Spanish language loanwords (e.g., a conservative estimate places these at 20.5 percent of the Cebuano lexicon, according to Quilis 1995: 300); furthermore, during three centuries of Spanish rule, they had incorporated many Hispanic cultural practices into daily life, some of which will be treated in the following pages.

The sugar plantations were organized into camps according to ethnicity. That is, a few Puerto Ricans, for example, were assigned to a particular plantation and lived in dwellings grouped together. However, they rubbed shoulders with others in their daily work assignments and celebrated certain holidays and important life events with other ethnic groups. As Siegel (2008: 47) observes, the first generation maintained its ethnic tongue and created a restricted pidgin for intergroup communication (Hawai'i Pidgin English [HPE]). The second generation, segregated as it was on the plantation, learned their parents' language first and was not exposed to other languages until they entered school. In school, they began to interact with others, and their socialization included acquiring some Hawaiian or Pidgin Hawaiian and some English. However, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, due to the sheer number of immigrant languages spoken, the second generation, now off the plantation, began to employ HPE as the preferred mode of interethnic communication. In the period from 1895 to 1920, older second-generation children and adults adopted HPE as their primary language. As their children were born during the years 1905 through the 1920s, the third generation became the first monolingual speakers of Hawai'i Creole English (HCE).

HCE, traditionally associated with poverty and illiteracy in the Islands, has enjoyed a resurgence and a greater appreciation in recent years. Formerly the bane of "local" comedians and storytellers like Frank Da Lima, Andy Bumati, Bula'ia, and Kent Bowman, HCE has received considerable attention during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. On the linguistic front, one can point to the creation in 2002 of the Charlene Sato Center for Pidgin, Creole, and Dialect Studies at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa as well as publications like Sakoda and Siegel (2003), an introductory grammar of HCE. With respect to literature, Bess Press, Bamboo Ridge, and others have published anthologies including prose and poetry in HCE (examples are cited herein), and there is even an HCE translation of the New Testament, titled *Da Jesus Book*. The persistence of HCE is due in large part to its perception as a marker of "local" identity and the fact that for many speakers it is still the preferred form of expression in private domains. In essence, for many of these bidialectal speakers, diglossia obtains. Diglossia can be defined as "the case in which a community uses two distinct forms of the same language, one acquired through

education and appropriate to one range of contexts, the other acquired before formal education and appropriate to another" (*CODL* 2007). These varieties are commonly designated, on the basis of overt prestige, as High (H), for academic or standard varieties, and Low (L) for vernacular or home/community varieties. Applying these values to the situation in the Islands, Standard English is H, and HCE is L.

Siegel (2008: 92–103) advances the hypothesis that Portuguese and Cantonese are the source for the grammatical markers in HCE.[2] It has long been recognized that the vocabulary of HCE has been drawn from English (the principal or lexifier language), Hawaiian, and some other immigrant languages, such as Japanese or Portuguese. Some representative examples follow (compiled from Elizabeth Carr 1972; Sakoda and Siegel 2003; Tonouchi 2005). Note that the Hawaiian replicas do not appear with long vowels (marked by macrons) or glottal stops (marked by the *'okina*, or reverse apostrophe) since these are not realized as such in HCE.

English: *beef*, "to fight"; *bulai* (<*bull* + *lie*), "to tell lies"; *cockaroach*, "to steal, sneak away with"; *da kine* (<*the kind*), a universal filler word with numerous meanings; *garans*, "sure, guaranteed"; *howzit*, "hi, how are you"; *mo bettah*, "better"; *shave ice*, a Hawaiian-style snow cone; *stink eye*, "dirty look"; *talk story*, "converse; gossip, tell stories"
Hawaiian: *akamai*, "smart"; *hapai*, "pregnant"; *huhu*, "mad, angry"; *kapulu*, "messy, half-done"; *kumu*, "teacher"; *lolo*, "crazy, stupid"; *make*, "die, dead"; *niele*, "nosey, curious"; *pau*, "done, finished"; *okole*, "rear end"
Japanese: *ajinomoto*, "monosodium glutamate"; *bachi*, "punishment; payback"; *daikon*, an edible root similar to a radish or turnip; *hanabata*, "snot"; *ichiban*, "number one"; *mochi*, "rice cake"; *musubi*, "one or two slabs of rice frequently with a Spam center and wrapped in *nori*"; *nori*, "dried seaweed wrapper"; *shoyu*, "soy sauce"; *skebbe*, "dirty old man"
Portuguese: *babooze*, "stupid (guy) "; *malassadas*, "donut holes"; *pão doce*, "Hawaiian sweet bread"; *vinha d'alhos*, "pork marinated in vinegar and garlic"

Shared Food Traditions

Kirkendall (1985: 249), who reviewed oral history data collected by the University of Hawai'i with respect to culinary customs and food practices, notes that Filipinos [and others] who lived in multiethnic communities customarily shared their own foods with those of other backgrounds and, in turn, enjoyed the foods of other groups. The following three excerpts illustrate this practice: the first is from a Filipino immigrant who arrived in Hawai'i in 1915, the second from a Puerto Rican who reminisces about the

plantation experience and the work camps in particular, and the third from a woman of an ethnically mixed background who grew up in Waimea, on the Big Island.

> 1: Filipino
> I get some friends, lunchtime. They tell me . . . "Come eat." And they offer me da kine sandwich peanut butter sandwich, you know. Or sometimes, some of those Japanese boys . . . they got rice with sardine or da kine they call "iriko," you know. Iriko o da kine codfish. . . . They share. . . . Come eat some. . . . Sometimes, when I bring my lunch, I bring plenty lunch. I share my food with them, too. My mother fry fish or some iriko, codfish, like that. Sometimes, she make a little bit soup . . . we used to bring what we call this kau kau tin . . . [plantation-style lunch box]. Double-decker lunch can, small one . . . Japanese kids . . . American kids. . . . They bring sandwich . . . peanut butter sandwich. (Kirkendall 1985: 249)

> 2: Puerto Rican
> When the Japanese had anything to do like New Year's, they celebrate. They bring all kinds Japanese [food]. . . . Our people, they don't care too much for Chinese food, Oriental food, but the Japanese used to enjoy our food. You know, all the *pasteles* and all that. Oh, Mama, good all. I always used to like Japanese food. Had this old lady. "Mama, you get sushi?" Come, come . . . you come tomorrow. . . . She would cook something good, eh? We used to enjoy. All the Japanese, the Portuguese, and the . . . didn't have too much Hawaiians in our camp; Russians, all stick together. Whenever something, everybody invited. Then everybody bring, you know what they cook. Then everybody bring, you know what they cook for the Christmas and New Year's. That's why, everybody was very much sharing . . . (Kirkendall 1985: 250; italics added)

> 3: Mixed Ethnicity
> NP (Interviewer): When you went to school, did you bring your own lunches?
> BR: Um hmm.
> NP: Remember what you used to take?
> BR: My mom used to make little biscuits with the sardine filling. I used to like that.
> NP: Canned sardines?
> BR: Sardines, you know? In the biscuits or she would cut them, like a sandwich?

NP: Yeah.
BR: And then little crackers, she put on top, and, ah, she peeled an orange and one piece of orange or two. And then the other children used to look in my lunch and tell, "Hoy! What kind lunch that?" [Laughter] I said, "what kind lunch you have?" [Laughter] The Japanese, they used bring rice in their bags, and they hide, they hide and eat.
NP: Yeah, to be polite.
BR: You can't even look inside at what they got, but some girls would show, "Oh!" "That's good! "Oh!" 'Give me one of your sandwich, I give you some rice!" [Laughter]
NP: So you would share.
BR: Yeah, but you have to be good friend. (Friends of the Future 2005, 2: 239)

As the preceding excerpts have shown, familiarity with ethnic foods in Hawai'i occurred not in the restaurant setting (as is the case for Mexican or Chinese food on the Mainland) but through the cultural practice of food sharing at lunchtime (at school or on the plantation) and during holiday celebrations. Among those that intermarried or who were the product of such unions, the family usually experienced at least two culinary traditions firsthand. Both types of experiences led to a more intimate experience and greater appreciation of ethnic foods—so much so that certain ethnic dishes may represent "comfort foods" for some individuals of another ethnicity. As we shall see, a number of Hispanic foods and ingredients are known to HCE speakers today, having been introduced by shared food traditions. The linguistic labels of these foods were, of course, borrowed into HCE. This is one important source for the terms investigated in this article.

Demographic Data: Structure of the Survey

In order to more completely document some of terms derived from Spanish in HCE, I devised and administered a survey designed to test familiarity with these terms among a small sample of self-identified speakers of the variety in question. Thirty-three HCE speakers responded to the survey instrument. Of these, thirty respondents completed the survey. With respect to gender, the sample is quite balanced: eighteen males and fifteen females began the survey. In terms of age, the fifteen to twenty-five, twenty-six to thirty-five, and forty-six to fifty-five age groupings all consist of eight respondents, respectively, while the thirty-six to forty-five grouping consists of nine respondents.

The ethnicity of the respondents is not straightforward; indeed, the respondents were instructed to check all applicable categories. Because intermarriage among the different ethnicities began during the plantation period and is common today, very few individuals can claim a single ethnic label. In almost all cases, then, each respondent has claimed a mixed ethnicity, selecting two or more categories. Eighteen respondents claim (part) Chinese ancestry, sixteen claim (part) Japanese origins, and fifteen claim at least part Hawaiian ancestry. Nine can be classified as (part) *haoles*, a Hawaiian term with the meaning of "foreigner, white or Caucasian"; this category in our sample corresponds to Irish, English, German, and Caucasian origins. Other (part) ethnicities include six Portuguese, four Filipinos, four Polynesians (whose ancestry is from Samoa or Tahiti), two Okinawans, and one Puerto Rican.

Eighty-eight percent (or twenty-nine) of the respondents were raised in the Islands. Over half of these (sixteen, or 55 percent) were raised on O'ahu; seven respondents claim to have spent some time growing up on the Outer Islands, including Maui, Kaua'i, and Moloka'i. Five respondents claim to have been raised in/on Hawai'i. It is not clear whether they are referring to the state (without specifying a particular island or islands) or whether they mean the island of Hawai'i (often referred to as the Big Island to avoid the ambiguity demonstrated here). Only four respondents were raised on the Mainland: in Utah, Arizona, and California.

Two-thirds (or twenty-two) of the respondents claim at least a part-time residence in the Islands today. Sixty-eight percent (or fifteen) of the respondents claim O'ahu as their home. One-third of the respondents claim either Utah (seven) or Arizona (four) as their (part-time) residence. When queried as to where they had lived the longest, 94 percent (or thirty-one) responded that they had spent more time in the Islands.

The questionnaire proper consisted of sixteen items (fourteen individual terms; two items had additional extended meanings, and these were presented separately). The terms themselves were selected from Elizabeth Carr (1972), Sasaki, Simonson, and Sakata (1986), Sakoda and Siegel (2003), Simonson, Sasaki, and Sakata (2005), and Tonouchi (2005); with the exception of the first source cited, the terms were not designated as of Spanish origin, but their association with Local Ricans (those descendants of the original immigrants who still reside in the Islands) and/or Filipinos was noted in some instances. Each item, along with variant forms (if any) and a brief definition, was presented with three possible choices. The respondent was asked to indicate whether the item was "a term I use," "a term someone else would use," or "a term I'm not familiar with." If he or she selected the first option, the respondent was also asked to "please provide

a sentence that includes it." If the respondent selected the second option, he or she was asked to indicate "what group of people would use it." All complete responses were analyzed; thus, the total number of these varies from thirty to thirty-one. These responses provide the bulk of the results.

It is noteworthy that the terms included on the instrument were referenced to authoritative Spanish, English, and, in some cases, Filipino lexicons, including regional dictionaries. In addition to the survey results, the terms in question were documented in print and Web sources (both fiction and nonfiction). Because three terms, *tilapia*, *ratoon*, and *paniolo*, were devised as distractors and the other three items did not elicit enough responses to fully analyze, only ten terms will be analyzed.[3] Statistically, the analyses are purely descriptive since my limited sample does not lend itself to additional tests of significance. Each putative Spanish language borrowing will be presented along with its definition and the results of the survey. Additional documentation and commentary will follow. Note that one respondent has provided his responses in Odo orthography for HCE (Sakoda and Siegel 2003: 23–30), which I have reproduced along with a (Standard) English version.

Ethnic Foods: Spanish Loanwords or Loanblends and Their Referents

Five terms and their variants are addressed in this section. These include *achiote*, "a red coloring or flavoring"; *pastele*, "a Puerto Rican–style tamale"; *gandule rice*, "rice with pigeon peas"; *adobo*, "a sauce of vinegar and garlic for chicken or pork"; and *lechon*, "roast suckling pig." Each term will be presented and illustrated and commentary provided for the linguistic elements and the referent itself.

Again, it may be helpful to review the basics of borrowing and two common, related results. All of our terms can be categorized as loanwords or loanblends. These are formed when a model from the source language is borrowed into the host language. The replica thus formed incorporates both the form and the meaning of the model, although it may be adapted to an appreciable extent and realized according to host language rules. The difference between the two lies in the addition of host language elements in the case of the loanblend. Two examples should suffice to make these distinctions clear. The model, *adobo*, is pronounced in Spanish as [aðóβo] with the approximates and simple vowels as transcribed. At some point, the loanword, while written the same way, acquired English pronunciation and was realized as [adówbow] with the occlusives and diphthongs as noted. When a host language element (bolded for easy reference in the following

examples) co-occurs regularly with the loanword, as in the case of *gandule* ***rice*** or *bolo**knife***, a hybrid is created, named a loanblend. Lastly, for our purposes, a referent is the object in the real world that the linguistic expression denotes.

Achiote or Achote: A Red Seasoning or Coloring Used to Prepare Some Dishes

Only eleven (or 36 percent) of the respondents indicated that they were familiar with the term; five marked the "I use" category, and six marked it as "a term someone else would use," principally Puerto Ricans (four responses). Some example sentences from my respondents follow.

(1) My father-in-law uses *achote* in his delicious Spanish rice.
(2) You can buy *achote* at the Puerto Rican market in Kahili.
(3) I just found out that *achiote* is what makes gandule rice mo ono [more delicious].
(4) *Achote* kam fram da lipstick plaent. [Achote comes from the lipstick plant.]

According to Cabrera (1982: 27) and Santamaría (1992: 28), *achiote* is Spanish term of Aztec origin. The variant form *achote* can be explained as a case of yod absorption (Whitley 2002: 98) wherein the preceding palatal consonant absorbs the high front vowel, a glide in this instance.[4] Spanish historical linguistics designates a high or mid-front vowel as a *yod*, hence the name. This phenomenon is commonly found in Spanish with verbs like *reñir*, "quarrel"; *henchir*, "swell"; and *bullir*, "boil, seethe," whose stem ends in a palatal consonant. When conjugated in the preterite for the third-person singular, for example, the expected forms **riñió*, **hinchió*, and **bullió* do not obtain. Rather, the <i>, which represents the glide [j], is absorbed or elided, leaving the standard forms *riñó*, *hinchó*, and *bulló*, "he, she, it, or you singular, formal quarreled, swelled, boiled or seethed." Similarly, *achiote* reduces to *achote*, particularly in rapid, relaxed speech. *Achote* is attested to in Spanish.

Achiote seeds produced from the fruit of the *Bixa orellana* can be processed either as an (industrial) dye or as a condiment/coloring. As one respondent noted, it is commonly known in English as the "lipstick plant" since the coloring obtained from the seeds can be used to dye the lips red. As a condiment or food additive, the technical term employed in Standard English (on packaging or ingredient lists) is *annatto*.

Achiote is available commercially as dried seeds, powder, or paste. Its use is common in Latin America; in southern Mexico it is used as a substitute for *chile*, "hot pepper" (it adds red coloring but no "heat"). It is also manufactured in Central America (the paste or powder available in local Hispanic markets on the Mainland is frequently manufactured there). In the Philippines, it is known *achuete* or *atsuete* (most likely derived from *achiote*, probably via metathesis or transposition of /i/ and /o/ with the accompanying lowering of /i/ to /e/ and the raising of /o/ to /u/, where the high vowel becomes mid- and the mid-vowel high).

Vaquero and Morales (2005: 39) cite Hernández Aquino, who notes that the Nahuatl term "ha substituido literaria y oralmente en Puerto Rico a la voz antillana [*bija*]" [(it) has replaced in both written and oral sources in Puerto Rico the Caribbean Spanish word (*bija*); my translation]. He also observes that the first attestation of *achiote* for this Caribbean isle occurs in 1765. The *OED* (2013) records the first attestation of the term in English in 1648; the citation notes that *achiote* was added to chocolate to give it a brick-red color.

"Local" ethnic cookbooks, such as Sasaki, Simonson, and Sakata (1986: 7) and Corum (2000: 117, 214), as well as Starbulletin.com (the online newspaper archives for the *Honolulu Star Bulletin*), provide recipes for *achiote* oil and note its use in both local Filipino and Puerto Rican cooking. It is used as a condiment or coloring in rice and meat dishes, including *pasteles*. According to Norma Carr (1989: 178), some Puerto Ricans immigrants brought *achiote* with them, although they were not the first to do so. Norma Carr (1980: 21–24) provides further information on *achiote* and other Puerto Rican dishes. The fact that only about one-third of the respondents were familiar with this term is indicative of its technical nature (one would have to at least observe the preparation of some dish that incorporates that ingredient and learn its name).

Pa(s)tele(s): Similar to Tamales; Made with Green Banana, Pork, and Wrapped in Ti Leaves

Over three-quarters of the sample claimed to be familiar with the term and referent. Of these, fourteen (or 47 percent) reported using the term themselves; nine (or 30 percent) reported hearing others use it. Three of these respondents claim to have heard the term from Puerto Ricans; others claim that Filipinos, Portuguese, Hawaiians, Tongans, and other "locals" use the term. Perhaps this can be taken as an indication of the popularity of the dish. Only eight (or 27 percent) of the respondents claimed they were not familiar with the term. A few of the respondents' sentences follow:

(5) I want to go to the swap meet to see if the *patele* woman is there.
(6) We go buy *patele* on the side of the road. Da buggah stay winnah! [It's a real winner!]
(7) Had taim fo pil grin baenaena fo mak *patele*. [It's hard to peel the green banana to make *patele*.]

The variant form *patele* can be derived from *pasteles* via aspiration or elision of /s/, a common feature of Caribbean Spanish.[5] However, *patele* is frequently employed as a singular form in HCE, similar to *abalone* (<*abulón*) and *tamale* (<*tamal*), where dialect features may not account for the elision of word-final /s/. Furthermore, the term is frequently viewed on roadside stands and some menus and pronounced via English spelling pronunciation—with an aspirated <p> and <t>, a "dark" or velarized <l>, a schwa and other English vowels. The plural form is commonly pronounced as [pʰətʰɛɬɪyz], with primary stress on [ɛ], as in *bet*.

Vaquero and Morales (2005: 586–87) cite Del Rosario, who defines the traditional Puerto Rican *pastel* as

> Masa de plátano y yautía, con relleno de carne de cerdo y que para cocinarla se envuelve en hojas de plátano atadas con cordón u hollejo de plátano. Se hace también con otros ingredientes. Considerado uno de los platos más típicos de Puerto Rico. [Dough made of plantains and yautia (a dryland taro; my addition), with a filling of pork and wrapped in banana leaves tied with string or a strip of the banana peel to cook it. It is also made with other ingredients. Considered one of most typical Puerto Rican dishes; my translation.]

Two recipes for *pasteles* "local style" mention only green bananas, plantains, and potatoes as the chief ingredients for the dough (Sasaki, Simonson, and Sakata 1986: 110–12; Corum 2000: 111, 119, 218). Other descriptions of this Puerto Rican delicacy in Hawai'i include yautia (mentioned above), cassava and pumpkin in addition to (green) bananas.[6] A "local" innovation is noted in the definition; ti leaves (*Cordyline terminalis*) are regularly used instead of banana leaves for the husk or wrapper. Also popular in the Islands is *patele stew*, a tangy tomato-based broth with typical fillings: pork, olives, celery, and other ingredients.

While recipes for and descriptions of *pasteles* are readily available, the beginner is warned that making *patele* is a labor-intensive process and is best left to the experts. Many roadside stands and restaurants include *pateles* on the menu; indeed, it is reported that some of the best *patele* makers in Hawai'i are not of Puerto Rican ancestry.

Gandule or Gandude Rice: Rice with Pigeon Peas

Apparently, this Puerto Rican dish does not enjoy the same level of popularity in the Islands as *patele*. Over half of the respondents (seventeen, or 57 percent) reported that they were unfamiliar with the loanblend or referent. Only nine (or 30 percent) claimed to use the term themselves; another five (or 17 percent) claim to have heard others use it; however, only two respondents correctly attributed it to Puerto Ricans. Some of their example sentences follow:

(8) I am craving some *patele* and *gandule* rice.
(9) My neighbor used to make *gandude* rice.
(10) Ho, you get some *gandule* rice wit chicken and *bacalao* . . . winnahs! [Wow, you eat some *gandule* rice with chicken and *bacalao* (cod) . . . it's a real winner!]
(11) *GanduDi* rice aen Spanish rais seim ting? [Are *gandude* rice and Spanish rice the same thing?]

Candule has also lost the word-final /s/. However, since it is a plural (one would not prepare or consume rice with a single *gandul*!), we can assume that the /s/ deletion in this case is indeed the result of aspiration or elision in Spanish. The final consonantal segment, a liquid, is also variable in its realization. It can be realized as lateral or a vibrant (as a /l/ or a /r/). This phenomenon, which results in a partial neutralization of these two liquids in coda or syllable-final position, is common in Caribbean Spanish. Thus, the following forms obtain: *gandule(s)* or *gandure(s)*.[7]

According to the *DRAE* (Real Academia Española 2001), the term and referent are found in parts of Central America, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Colombia. Vaquero and Morales (2005: 355) cite Nazario, who states,

> La voz *gandul* o *gandur* denomina a una semilla o grano comestible producido por el arbusto leguminoso de igual nombre (*Cajanus indicus*, *Cytisus cajan*, *Cajan cajanus*). [The term *gandul* or *gandur* names an edible seed or grain produced by the leguminous bush of the same name; my translation.]

Pigeon peas, the English translation equivalent, may be named for the shape of the pod, which resembles a dove, or because the seeds were feed to pigeons, according to the *OED* (2013). Again, Corum (2000: 114–15, 120, 218) and Starbulletin.com contain information on and recipes for *arroz con gandules* Hawaiian style.

Adobo: A Dish Made with Pork or Chicken Cooked in Vinegar and Garlic

Nearly all respondents (twenty-nine) indicated a familiarity with the loanword *adobo*. Twenty (or 67 percent) of our HCE speakers claimed to use the term themselves; another nine (or 30 percent) correctly claimed that local Filipinos used the term. Some example sentences follow:

(12) My grandpa makes the most awesome pork *adobo*.
(13) Ho, some mean dat guy's *adobo*. Talk about some ono grinds. [Wow, that guy's *adobo* is really good. Talk about some delicious eats.]
(14) I hope dat not dog *adobo*.
(15) Brah, Manang's *adobo* was winnas! [Bro, Manang's (stereotypical Filipino name) *adobo* was a winner!]

According to Kirkendall (1985: 242–43), an expert on ethnic Island cuisine,

> Food cooked in the *en adobo* style may be called the Philippines' national dish. The combination of garlic and vinegar is added to meat or fish in a two-fold cooking process of simmering in seasoned water followed by frying, a process which was probably introduced by Spanish explorers in the sixteenth century.

The *OED* (2013) also provides a pertinent definition, stating, "[Adobo is] a spicy stew, typically consisting of pork, poultry or seafood cooked in a vinegar-based sauce, seasoned with garlic, soy sauce, bay leaves, and peppercorns." Their earliest attestation is from the *Los Angeles Times* in 1938; no citation is included from Hawai'i.

The *DRAE* also includes a similar definition for *adobo*:

> Caldo, y especialmente el compuesto de vinagre, sal, orégano, ajos y pimentón, que sirve para sazonar y conservar las carnes y otras cosas. [A marinade, in particular the combination of vinegar, salt, oregano, garlic, and sweet red peppers, that is used to season and preserve meat and other things; my translation.]

However, neither this definition nor the previous one refers to the "twofold cooking process," which may be an innovation practiced by some Filipino cooks. Indeed, *adobo* was originally used as a means to preserve meat

without refrigeration. *Adobo* is found in Waray (Unruh 1993: 59), while the form in Cebuano is *adúbu* (Wolff 1972, 1:10).

Again, "local" cookbooks, such as, Sasaki, Simonson, and Sakata (1986: 7–8), Corum (2000: 146–47, 153, 214), and Laudan (1996: 155), as well as Starbulletin.com, contain further information and recipes for chicken or pork *adobo*.

Finally, Filipinos are often accused of being "dog-eaters" as sentence 14 (p. 18) intimates. In a real sense, it constitutes a racial slur, particularly since other ethnic groups, such as the Native Hawaiians, also include or have included dog as a source of protein in the diet.

Lechon: Roast Suckling Pig

Only eleven respondents (or 37 percent) claimed to be familiar with *lechon*. Five indicated that they used the term themselves; another six claimed to have heard others use it. Four respondents attributed the term to Filipinos; one ascribed it to caterers and another to Puerto Ricans. One can easily imagine lechon replacing the Hawaiian speciality, *kalua* pig (pork steamed and roasted in an *imu*, or underground oven, and served shredded), particularly if the caterers are Filipino. Then again, the term and its referent are also associated with Puerto Rico and the Local Ricans. Vaquero and Morales (2005: 457) include both *lechonera*, "establishment where *lechones* are roasted and sold," and *lechonada*, "a feast where *lechon* figures prominently" for Puerto Rico (my translation). Two example sentences follow (neither of these appear to incorporate any features of HCE):

(16) Thelma's (restaurant in Waipahu, O'ahu) has a fantastic *lechon* special.
(17) Some like *lechon* cold; I like to eat it hot.

Two Puerto Rican recipe books that specialize in traditional dishes (Dooley 1948: 49–50; Sivila Vda. De Fernández 1982: 193–94) include instructions for the preparation and cooking of *lechón a la vara* [lechon on the spit; my translation]. Norma Carr (pers. comm.) also informs me that the dish figured prominently in the annual Three Kings Celebration in Honolulu (sponsored by the United Puerto Rican Association) held around Christmastime. Finally, in an oral history interview conducted by Norma herself in 1976 with Miguel Guzmán, a first-generation Local Rican, he mentions *lechón asado* as part of the traditional marriage celebration (Guzmán 1976).

Indeed, the dish appears to have originated in Spain, where the term *cochinillo* is also used. The entry for *lechón* in the *DRAE* refers the reader to the corresponding entry for *cochinillo* and Lynn Williams (pers. comm.) assures me that the latter is preferred term.

Variant forms for *lechon* are found in two Visayan languages, according to sources I consulted. For Cebuano, Wolff (1972, 2:624) provides *litsun* with the meaning "pig roasted whole over coals." With the addition of *dilitsi*, the term comes to mean "roast suckling pig." Unruh (1993: 120) provides the form *litson*, meaning "(young) roasted pig" for Waray.[8]

Kirkendall (1985) provides some insights into the importance of this dish for the Filipino immigrants to Hawai'i and describes the preparation of the same. She notes that during the plantation period, it was prepared and served for Christmas, Easter, and the daylong celebration following births in the Filipino camps. Regarding its preparation, she observes, "At these fiestas, lechon was cooked by roasting the whole pig skewered on a long steel pole with a steering wheel mounted at one end which served as an effective rotisserie" (254).

She also describes how this dish was served:

> Lechon, roast pig, is considered a delicacy. . . . Slaughtered just prior to the feast, the pig is roasted over an open pit and basted with flavorful sauces. Diners pull off pieces of the crisp skin with bare hands, and afterwards eat the tender white meat with a vinegar flavored sauce made from the pig's liver. (240)

Finally, while *lechon* continues to be prepared and consumed on certain occasions, it is no longer as common as it once was. She provides the following reasons:

> For example, whole pigs are not easy to obtain in urban areas. Such animals are expensive, slaughtered under non-traditional conditions (when blood and entrails are reserved), are difficult to transport and to prepare in the customary manner. (262)

A final note on the local or HCE pronunciation is in order. Some speakers preserve the word stress evident in the model [leʧón], where the final syllable is stressed, while others adopt a spelling pronunciation with the stress on the first syllable, rendered with a diphthong in the first syllable and a reduced vowel (schwa) in the second [lɛyʧən].

It should be observed that the handful of terms here do not exhaust the Spanish terms for ethnic dishes or foods prepared and eaten by the Puerto

Ricans, Filipinos, and others in Hawai'i . According to Sasaki, Simonson, and Sakata (1986), Corum (2000), Laudan (1996), and Bueno (2008), there are many others. For example, other Puerto Ricans foods include *bacalao*, "dried salted cod"; *cazuela*, "sweet potato-pumpkin pudding"; *chicharrones*, "fried pork rinds"; *paella*, "rice, seafood and/or poultry, and vegetables" (originally a Spanish dish); *pastelillos*, "fried pork turnovers"; *pescado en escabeche*, "pickled fish"; *serenata*, "codfish salad"; *sancocho*, "vegetable stew"; *sopa borracha*, "cake with rum sauce"; and *tostones*, "plantain fritters." Other Filipino foods include *bunuelos*, "fried dumplings rolled in sugar" (<*buñuelos*); *camote*, "sweet potato"; *cascaron*, "sweet dumplings"; *chicharones* (noted above), "fried pork rinds" (commonly spelled with a single <r> among Filipinos) *embutido*, "meat rolls"; *pork with guisantes* or *gisantis*, "pork and peas stew"; *karabasa*, "a type of squash" (<*calabaza*); *leche flan*, "caramel custard"; *menudo*, "pork and potatoes"; *pochero*, "casserole of meat, vegetables, garbanzos, and sweet potatoes" (<*puchero*); and *sayote*, "similar to a pear in appearance and eaten like squash" (<*chayote*, a Mexican Spanish term derived from Nahuatl). However, most of these terms and their referents may represent intraethnic food choices and may not be as well known to other ethnic groups in the Islands.

Ethnic Markers: Expressions, Referents, and Associations

In addition to ethnic foods, our instrument also investigated the five ethnic markers: *Ay soos*, "an exclamation denoting surprise and other related emotions"; *boloknife*, "a straight machete or long knife"; *tata*, "a polite term of address for (grand)fathers or older, respected men"; *kompa*, "an invitation to share or partner with"; and *Borinkee*, "a 'local' Rican or person of Puerto Rican ancestry." These terms, along with their variants, meanings, and usage, will be presented and discussed in the following subsections.

Ay soos, Aysus or Isus: "Oh, no!" or a Similar Exclamation

Twenty-five (or 83 percent) of the respondents claimed to be familiar with the expression. Ten respondents (33 percent) reported that they used it themselves, and fifteen (50 percent) claimed to have heard it from other speakers of HCE. Only six speakers reported that they were unfamiliar with the expression. Ten respondents correctly attributed the exclamation to Filipinos and two to the Elderly/Older Generation, while one respondent each referenced Tongans, Part Hawaiians, and Everyone. Some example sentences follow:

(18) *Ay soos*, you cut your hair bolohead [shaved your head, cut your hair very short].[9]

(19) *Ay soos*! What sa matta with you? Why you tro [throw] the oil in the stream?

(20) You take some chicken or pork with dis one here. *Aysus*, broke da mouth [it's delicious]. Bueno (2008: 91)

Two "local" lexicons include this Filipino expression: Tonouchi (2005: 6) and Simonson, Sasaki, and Sakata (2005: 2).[10] Linguistically, the source of this expression is fairly transparent. *Ay* is a standard exclamation in Spanish and is agglutinated with the final syllable of *Jesús*. It probably derives from an abbreviation of a litany used as an interjection, *Jesús, María y José* (Jesus, Mary, and Joseph), which, according to the *DRAE*, "denota admiración, dolor, susto o lástima" (denotes wonder, pain, fright or pity; my translation). With regard to Filipino sources, Wolff (1972, 1:69, 334–35) defines *ay* as a "particle showing exasperation or frustrated helplessness," and *Hisus*, "Jesus" as a "mild interjection uttered when something happens that cannot be remedied." *Hisus, Mariya i Husip* (frequently agglutinated as *Hisusmaryusip*) is Cebuano for *Jesús, María y José* and "is a rather strong interjection expressing fright or discomfiture." *Aysus* is widely attested to in Visaya and other parts of the Philippines as discussions with my son, Justin Smead (pers. comm.), who spent nearly two years in the region, have led me to believe.

Boloknife: A Short, Straight Machete Used to Cut Vegetation or as a Weapon

Nearly three-quarters of the sample claimed to be familiar with the loanblend. Thirty-three percent (or ten) of the respondents marked it as "a term I use." Another thirteen (or 43 percent) marked it as "a term someone else would use." Only eight (or 27 percent) indicated that they were unfamiliar with it. Four speakers attributed the expression to Filipinos, three to the Plantation/Older Generation, and one each, respectively, to Locals, Hawaiians, Farmers, or Polynesian Landscapers, Samoans, and "Nut Guys." A few of the respondents' sentences follow:

(21) Eh cuz, you no like mess wit dat Filipino guy, bumbai he go bust out his *boloknife* on you. You know dem ah, dey no scare pull knife. [Hey, dude you don't want to mess with that Filipino guy, 'cos he's gonna bust out his *boloknife* on you. You know what they're like, they're not afraid to pull out a knife.]

(22) Da bugi maen wen cheiz mi wit wan *bolonaif*. [The boogey man chased me with a *boloknife*.]
(23) I used to play wit my faddas *boloknife*. [I used to play with my father's *boloknife*.]
(24) Was anykine knives, like *bolo knife* and swords from all ovah da world and put on one piece of wood, j'like one shield. [There were all sorts of knives, like a *boloknife* and swords from all over the world and they were attached to one piece of wood, just like a shield.] (Lum 1998: 72; italics added)

Santamaría's (1992: 1165) brief definition of *bolo* observes that the term is not uncommon in Mexico, stating that is also known by other names: "En algunas partes del país, [es] el machete llamado *mojarra, moruna*, etc." [In some parts of the country, it is the machete called *mojarra, moruna*, etc.]. The *OED* (2013) also provides a Spanish etymology for the term while referencing two other loanblends found in the Philippines: *bolomaker*, "one who manufactures the item," and *boloman*, "one who wields it as a tool or, more commonly, a weapon." However, Quilis (1995: 295) puts forth the opinion that *bolo* is not of Spanish language origin. He notes,

> Hay también palabras filipinas que se utilizan en el español de aquel territorio: *bolo* (machete recto), que se distingue del *machete*, que es curvo. [There are also Filipino terms that are used in that región: *bolo* (a straight machete), which is distinguished from *machete*, which is curved; my translation]

Unruh (1993: 73) includes *bólo* glossed simply as "weeding knife" for Waray. In Cebuano, *búlu* (from *bolo* via vowel raising) refers to a "heavy weeding knife with a blunt rectangular end" (Wolff 1972, 1:116).

Lastra (1992: 250), speaking of the Iberian creoles in the Philippines and the Spanish military presence there, flatly states, "Las tropas españolas pertenecían a las clases bajas, y muchos de los soldados eran mestizos mexicanos" [The Spanish troops were from the lower classes, and many of the soldiers were Mexican mestizos.]. Linguistically, there is ample evidence of Mexican influence since many Aztequisms that are restricted to Mexico (and perhaps Central America) are found in Filipino languages. These include some terms noted here (*atsuete*, *camote*, and *sayote*) and others, such as *sakati* (<*zacate*, "grass"). Nonetheless, the origin of *bolo* remains unclear. Were the referent and its linguistic sign carried from the Philippines to Mexico or vice versa? The addition of *knife* to form the loanblend is, of course, unproblematic since the referent does resemble a large, long, straight knife.

Tata: Father; a Respectful Address to an Old Man

Only five (or 17 percent) of the respondents indicated that they used the term. Another nine (30 percent) claimed that they had heard others use *tata*. Five respondents attributed it to Filipinos, while one indicated that it was heard in New Zealand. Other respondents simply indicated that they had heard it somewhere. Thus, the majority (seventeen, or 57 percent) were unfamiliar with the term *tata*. Some example sentences follow:

(25) Eh *tata*! Mahaloz fo' da da kine, ah! Now I know how fo' catch dem oama. [Hey, tata! Thanks for this thing here, yeah! Now I know how to catch those young goatfish.]
(26) Don't walk in front of *Tata* without saying "excuse me."
(27) Anybody who might have worked on the plantations, his own *tata*, might have spent two weeks below deck coming to Hawai'i so far down in cargo that they were actually below the water line. (Lum 1997: 148; italics in the original)

Some lexicologists, such as Cabrera (1982: 123), have posited Nahuatl or other Latin American indigenous languages as the source for *tata*. However, Corominas and Pascual (1983, 5:380–81) trace the origin of the term to Latin and further note that it exists in other unrelated tongues as a simple reduplicative creation characteristic of child language. Santamaría (1992: 1014) observes that "en algunas partes se usa como tratamiento aplicado a los hombres de avanzada edad" [in some places it is used as a form of address for men of advanced age; my translation], and the *DRAE* states that in certain regions of the Americas, it is used "como tratamiento de respeto" [a polite or respectful form of address; my translation]. All sources concur with the principal meaning of "father or grandfather." Cebuano has two related loans: *tatang*, "an address of respect given to an old grandfather or great-grandfather, sometimes used to address an old and well-respected leader in a community," and *tatay* or *tátay*, "term of address to one's father and sometimes uncle or grandfather," according to Wolff (1972, 2:996). Waray also has the form *tátay*, "daddy or father" (Unruh 1993: 163). The latter term may have derived from *taita*, a variant form, via metathesis.[11]

Kompa or Kompan: An Invitation to Share or Be Partners With

Only eight respondents (27 percent) indicated that they were familiar with *kompa*: four indicated that they used it themselves, and another four had

heard others use it; two attributed it to Old Plantation and one each to Filipinos and Japanese. Nearly three-quarters of the sample claimed to be unfamiliar with the term. A few of the respondents' sentences follow:

(28) *Kompa kompa* your grapes (and said only to little kids).
(29) Nobadi laik *kompa* dea mani aezwai weis taim dis hui. [Nobody wants to *kompa* their money that's why this club is a waste of time.]
(30) Plantation days, husband, wife used to *kompan*, work together, and den wen dey harvest da cane dey get bonus. [On the plantation, the husband and wife used to *kompan*, work together, and when they harvested the sugar cane, they got a bonus.] (Tonouchi 2005: 52)

At least three possible Spanish models exist for this borrowing: *compartir*, "to share"; *compadre*, "godfather of one's child; (intimate) friend" (often abbreviated *compa*; see Santamaría 1992: 281); and *compañero*, "companion." *Compa* would seem to be the most likely model. According to Vaquero and Morales (2005: 230), *compa* does exist in Puerto Rico; however, the more common form is *compae* or *compay* (also spelled *compai*). Furthermore, in Cebuano, *compadre* has been borrowed as *kumpadri* or *kumpári* (Wolff 1972, 2:501), but the expected form **kumpa* remains unattested. The form *kompan* also renders *compañero* a likely model. Wolff (1972, 2:501) notes that *kumpanyíru* functions as a "term of address to intimates." Whether through the Puerto Ricans or the Filipinos, the model is likely an apocopated or shortened form of *compadre* or *compañero*. It also is an older term, probably originating during the plantation era in HPE. It may have been disseminated by first-generation immigrants who became caretakers for their grandchildren and used this term to teach them to share.

Brinki, Borinque, or Borinkee: A "Local Rican," a Person of Puerto Rican Ancestry

One-half of the respondents recognized this term, although some attributed extended meanings to it, as we shall see. Nearly a quarter (or seven) of the respondents claimed to use the term themselves. Another eight respondents have heard others use it; they attributed to Puerto Ricans, "Locals," Portuguese, Japanese, and the older generation; and three respondents were unsure of whom they heard use it. Fifteen (50 percent) were unfamiliar with the term. Some of their sentences follow:

(31) Eh, da kine's family is *borinkee* 'o what? [Hey, whachamacallit's family is *borinkee* or what?]
(32) Ah, *borinkee* food!
(33) Yu mas no hau fo daens kachi kachi if yu wan *BoDingki*. [You must know how to dance kachi kachi if you're a *Borinque*.]
(34) I have *borinki* hair when it rains! (Interesting, I never would have associated it with this group always thought it described kinky hair, i.e., black).
(35) That boy has big *borinkee* hair.
(36) He is so *borinkee*. (A less refined individual with regard to manners and cleanliness.)

Bori(n)quen, the Taíno term for Puerto Rico, serves as the model for the replicas presented here. According to materials summarized in Vaquero and Morales (2005: 120–21), the model means "tierras de los valientes señores [land of the brave men]" or "tierras de los fuertes hombres [land of the strong men;" my translations]. The form *borinque*, where the final *-n* is apocopated or eliminated, is pronounced in English as the other two forms suggest: *borinkee* and *brinki*. The latter form has undergone two additional steps that affect the first syllable: vowel reduction and, subsequently, schwa deletion.[12] Additionally, as Solís (1995: 123) notes, the <*-i*> may be pronounced as a long vowel in English (actually a diphthong). Sentences 31 and 32 provide examples of the core meaning of the loanword. Sentence 33 introduces the term *kachi kachi*, coined by the Japanese immigrants to refer to traditional *jíbaro* music, featuring the *güiro* (a gourd scraper) and the *cuatro* (a guitar-like instrument), that the Puerto Ricans brought with them (Norma Carr 1989: 231).[13] Sentences 34–36 introduce extended meanings that do not appear in the reference materials I consulted. Frizzy or kinky hair, typical of (Puerto Rican) Blacks, is referenced in Sentences 34 and 35. Sentence 36 indicates that unfounded racial/ethnic bias and prejudice have persisted (for the history of such sentiments against the Local Ricans, see Norma Carr 1989: 356–80).

Conclusions

This article has opened the door on empirical research into the lexical contribution from Spanish to HCE via the Filipino and Puerto Rican immigrants to Hawai'i. It has focused on ten putative Spanish loanwords or loanblends in HCE. Five of these denote ethnic dishes or ingredients that originate among either the local Puerto Ricans or Filipinos: *achiote* (*achote*), *pa(s)tele(s)*, and *gandule rice* (*gandure* or *gandude rice*) are Puerto Rican

in origin. *Adobo* is of Filipino origin. *Lechon* is a shared item; both Puerto Ricans and Filipinos have prepared this dish in the Islands. All of these are attested to in Spanish, and their existence in HCE is due to a "shared food tradition."

Five other expressions or terms that constitute ethnic markers for either the Filipinos or the Local Ricans were also analyzed. *Ay soos* (*Isus*, *Aysus*), *boloknife*, and *tata* are clearly of Filipino origin. The language origin of *bolo* remains unclear; it is found in Visayan languages and is also documented for Mexico. Likewise, the term *kompa* (*kompan*) may derive from Spanish but cannot be attributed definitively to either the Puerto Rican or the Filipino immigrants. Finally, the term *borinkee* or *brinki* (*borinque*) is of Puerto Rican origin.

All of the terms are documented for HCE. According to the survey I employed, *adobo*, *patele*, *Ay soos*, *boloknife*, and *borinkee* were recognized by at least half the sample. *Achiote*, *lechon*, *gandule rice*, *kompa*, and *tata* were all recognized by substantially less than half the respondents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My deep, heartfelt thanks to the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, the College of Humanities, and the Latin American Center at Brigham Young University and to Brigham Young University Hawai'i for their financial and moral support of my *Hispanics in Hawai'i* project, of which this a part. Also, *mahaloz* (thanks) to David Keala, Makana Whitford, Nahinu Navares, Linden Wada, Jodie Mattos, Lee Tonouchi, and all the other respondents for their *kokua* (help) and *aloha* spirit; it is greatly appreciated. Kent Sakoda deserves a *mahalo nui loa* (mil gracias or thanks a million) for his expertise and willingness to help as I consulted with him on several occasions. Last but not least, thanks and a big *abrazo* to my research assistant, Anthony Gardner, for his tireless research and admirable computer skills (placing the questionnaire online, researching the terms in question, and creating PowerPoint presentations, among many other tasks).

NOTES

1. On Spanish immigration to Hawai'i and subsequently to California, see Schmack (1940), Lozano (1984), Santucci (1994), and Ma and Cader (2006).

2. For another view on the genesis of morphosyntax in creoles, see Bickerton (2008).

3. Both *ratoon*, "shoot or sprout," a term commonly used in the planting and cultivation of sugarcane, and *paniolo*, referenced above, are thought to derive from Spanish; however, *tilapia*, "a type of trash fish," does not, although the *DRAE* notes its use in the

Philippines. Nonetheless, neither the Puerto Ricans nor the Filipinos were responsible for introducing these terms into any variety of English spoken in the Islands.

4. The phoneme or sound family /ʧ/, represented orthographically as <ch>, is an alveo-palatal consonant, meaning that the blade of the tongue straddles the alveolar and palatal regions in its articulation. Since the glide [j] (a realization of the vowel phoneme /i/) begins its articulation in approximately the same position in the bucal cavity, the consonant and vowel fuse. This leads to the perception that the vowel has disappeared or been elided. A simple experiment can illustrate this: if one articulates the syllable <chio> (represented phonetically as [ʧjó]), with increasing rapidity, <cho> (or [ʧó]) will emerge.

5. Aspiration is common in "lowland" Spanish (on the mainland coasts and islands where Spanish is spoken). Sociolinguistically, it is more frequent in the relaxed speech of all classes while being more common in lower classes. It generally affects the /s/ in the coda or syllable-final position. In terms of its articulation, it occurs when the tongue is left in rest position in the mouth and a puff of air is produced instead of [s]. This realization is represented phonetically as [h], a voiceless glottal fricative. The grapheme or letter <h> in English represents the same sound. When it is shortened or otherwise rendered imperceptible, it results in Ø, or consonant deletion.

6. Additional information is available at Starbulletin.com. See, for example, Sofrito: The Heart of a Puerto Rican Meal, April 15, 1998, and Hispanic Group Cherishes Food, Heritage at Maui Festival, September 2, 2007, *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*.

7. The form *gandude* represents an attempt to render the Spanish tap or flap [ɾ] in English orthography, where an intervocalic <t, tt, d, dd> is also tapped or flapped in American English; that is, said consonants in intervocalic position are pronounced like the simple vibrant in Spanish. For example, compare the pronunciation of pairs like *write* and *ride* (easily distinguishable) to *writer* and *rider*. In the latter pair, the <t, d> is flapped or tapped (and is voiced, in the case of /t/), and the pair becomes homonymic in normal, relaxed conversation. See Whitley (2002: 57–58) for further details on this phenomenon.

8. Both *litsun* and *litson* provide evidence of vowel raising. In other words, the two mid-vowels [o,u] are realized as high vowels [i, u] in the first case. Since we have seen examples of other Spanish loanwords in these Filipino languages undergo vowel raising (and lowering), I will assume that it is a regular feature.

9. See the discussion on *boloknife* below. *Bolohead* is likely another loanblend with the figurative meaning of being "scalped" with said tool or weapon, resulting in a "buzz cut" or baldness.

10. This popular collection of "local" expressions, while quite accurate in its definitions and usages, is actually not paginated. On the second page, they list "Ai-Sos or Ai-Zoos," defined as "Sound of Filipino praying." All in all, this is a very enjoyable read, intended for the average "Pidgin" speaker, not the academic.

11. Earlier I provided the synonym *transpose* or *transposition* to help define metathesis. The process may be mutual; two elements may "exchange places," or, as we see in this case, a single element, written as <i> or <y>, shifts its placement. The process is an

important one in historical linguistics, but I suspect it is quite common as well in language contact.

12. A schwa is mid-central vowel represented phonetically as [ə] with the approximate value of "uh." It is a reduced vowel that occurs regularly in unstressed syllables in English. In this case, the two transcriptions correspond to [bəɹɱkɪy] with the vowel reduction (creation of the schwa in the first syllable) and [bɹɱkaɪ] with the schwa deletion in the first syllable (and a diphthong in word-final position). See Whitley (2002: 60–61) for further details.

13. A popular song, "Katchi Katchi Music Makawao," composed and sung by Willie K. (2000), celebrates Local Rican music. Makawao is an up-country Paniolo town on Maui.

REFERENCES

Bickerton, Derek
2008 *Bastard tongues: A trailblazing linguist finds clues to our common humanity in the world's lowliest languages*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Bueno, Amalia
2008 The Chicharon widows. In *We go eat: A mixed plate from Hawaii's food culture*, ed. Susan Yim, 87–96. Honolulu: Hawai'i Council for the Humanities.

Cabrera, Luis
1982 *Diccionario de aztequismos*. 4th ed. México, City: Ediciones Oasis.

Carr, Elizabeth Ball
1972 *Da Kine talk: From pidgin to Standard English in Hawaii*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Carr, Norma
1980 *Puerto Rican: One identity from a multi-ethnic heritage*. Honolulu: Office of Instructional Services/General Education Branch, Department of Education, State of Hawai'i.
1989 The Puerto Ricans in Hawaii: 1900–1958. PhD diss., Univ. of Hawai'i.

Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics, The
2007 *CODL*. 2nd ed. Electronic application version 2.0.0. Accessed on multiple occasions.

Corominas, Joan, and José A. Pascual
1983 *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. Vol. 5. Madrid: Editorial Credos.

Corum, Ann K.
2000 *Ethnic foods of Hawaii*. Rev. ed. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Dooley, Elizabeth B. K.
1948 *Puerto Rican cook book*. Richmond, VA: Dietz Press.

Ennis, Sharon R., Merarys Ríos-Vargas, and Nora G. Albert
2011 *The Hispanic population: 2010*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau. http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf.

Friends of the Future (Waimea, Hawai'i)
2005 *Paniolo house stories: From the Kupuna of Waimea, Hawaii*. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Friends of the Future/Xlibris.

Guzmán, Miguel
1976 Unpublished oral history interview conducted and recorded by Norma Carr on August 12. Transcribed by Bryan Clayton and revised by Robert Stnead.

K., Willie
2000 Katchi Katchi Music Makawao. Track 5 on *The Uncle in Me*. Vol. 1. Honolulu: Mountain Apple. Also available as an mp3 download and on *YouTube*.

Kirkendall, Judith Midgely
1985 Hawaiian ethnogastronomy: The development of a pidgin creole cuisine. PhD diss., Univ. of Hawai'i.

Lastra, Yolanda
1992 *Sociolingüística para hispanoamericanos: Una introducción*. México, City: El Colegio de México.

Laudan, Rachel
1996 *The food of paradise: Exploring Hawaii's culinary heritage*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Lozano, Beverly
1984 The Andalucia-Hawaii-California migration: A study in macrostructure and microhistory. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (2): 305–24.

Lum, Darrell H. Y.
1997 Local genealogy: "What school you went?" Stories from a pidgin culture. PhD diss., Univ. of Hawai'i.
1998 Fourscore and seven years ago. In *Growing up local: An anthology of poetry and prose from Hawaii*, ed. Eric Chock, James R. Harstad, Darrell H. Y. Lum, and Bill Teter, 63–74. Honolulu: Bamboo Ridge Press.

Ma, L. Eve Armentrout, and Jaime Cader
2006 *Weaving with Spanish threads*. Berkeley, CA: Palomino Productions.

Oxford English Dictionary, The
2013 *OED*. Electronic version, revised September. Accessed on multiple occasions

Quilis, Antonio
1995 El español en Filipinas. In *Spanish in four continents*, ed. Carmen Silva-Corvalán, 293–301. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Real Academia Española
2001 *DRAE o Diccionario de la lengua española*, 22nd ed, with material previewed from the 23rd ed. Electronic version. Accessed on multiple occasions.

Reinecke, John
1969 *Language and dialect in Hawaii: A sociolinguistic history to 1935*, ed. Stanley M. Tsuzaki. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

Sakoda, Kent, and Jeff Siegel
2003 *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the creole language of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Santamaría, Francisco J.
1992 *Diccionario de mejicanismos*, 5th ed. México, City: Editorial Porrúa.

Santucci, Anne Aguilar
1994 *Memories of Spain*. California: [s.n.].

Sasaki, Pat, Douglas Simonson, and Ken Sakata
1986 *Pupus to Da Max!: The all purpose illustrated guide to the food of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Schnack, George
1940 Subjective factors in the migration of Spanish from Hawaii to California. Thesis, Stanford Univ.

Siegel, Jeff
2008 *The emergence of pidgin and creole languages*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Simonson, Douglas, Pat Sasaki, and Ken Sakata
2005 *Pidgin to da max:25th Anniversary Edition*. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Sivila Vda. de Fernández, Raquel
1982 *Así se cocinaba en Puerto Rico*. Madrid: Ediciones, S.M.

Solís, Ted
1995 Jíbaro image and the ecology of Hawai'i Puerto Rican musical instruments. *Latin American Music Review* 16 (2): 123–53.

Tonouchi, Lee A.
2005 *Da Kine dictionary: Da Hawai'i community pidgin dictionary projeck*. Honolulu: Bess Press.

Unruh, Vernon Dale
1993 *Speak Waray*. 2nd ed. Tacloban: n.p.

Vaquero, María and Amparo Morales
2005 *Tesoro lexicográfico del español de Puerto Rico*. San Juan, Puerto Rico: Editorial Plaza Mayor.

Whitley, M. Stanley
2002 *Spanish/English contrasts: A course in Spanish linguistics*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press.

Wolff, John U.
1972 *A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. 2 vols. New York: Cornell Univ., Southeast Asia Program and Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Wycliffe Bible Translators
2000 *Da Jesus book: Hawaii pidgin New Testament*. Orlando, FL: Wycliffe.

FILM REVIEW

Breadfruit and Open Spaces. 30 minutes, 59 seconds. Featuring the members of the United Pacific Islanders Corporation and Dr. Lola Quan-Bautista.

Film review by Rosalind "Rose" Meno Ram, Brigham Young University Hawai'i

SINCE THE LATE 1980s when the United States of America signed the Compact of Free Association with the island nations in the then Trust Territory of Micronesia, numerous Micronesians have traveled easily back and forth between Guam and islands such as Chuuk and Yap. Many of these Micronesians come to Guam to be educated, and some chose to make Guam their home. The desire to own land on Guam has always been part of their dream. Other Micronesians came to Guam and worked on locally owned farms or what the Chamorros called ranches. As a rancher and researcher, Lola Quan-Bautista was exposed to the Micronesian farm-workers. Over time, her interest and connection with these people has led to this documentary.

This film documents a particular group of Micronesians, mostly Chuukese and Yapese, living on the Gill Baza subdivision, situated in the village of Yigo in northern Guam. Quan-Bautista carefully weaves the stories of these Micronesians in this 31-min film. She features members of the United Pacific Islanders Corporation, a nonprofit organization, created by the residents of the Gill Baza subdivision, after learning that they would be evicted from their lands for not adhering to the Guam law requiring homes on certain-sized lots be connected to sewer systems. Despite the difficult situation they were facing, these Chuukeese and Yapese people speak of their great desire to own land in Guam and to raise their families on their

land based on their cultural knowledge of space. Quan-Bautista documents space from the lenses of Chuukese and Yapese viewpoint. Their view of space comes in the form of landownership, communal living, and communication.

Breadfruit and Open Spaces is filled with stories of these families and their joys and struggles of being landowners on Guam. One landowner in the Gill Baza Subdivision, Kini Sinanap, talks about planting things that his family can eat. "I grow breadfruit, I grow bananas, I grow sweet potatoes, and I grow things that we can consume." When it comes to land, he remembers his grandmother's counsel to him back in Chuuk. The wisdom this Chuukese grandmother passed on was, "Take care of the land and it will take care of you."

Joshua Martin talks about coming to Guam and struggling to get his education and eventually owning his own land. His daughter Kathy Martin is the promise sister of Lola Quan-Bautista. A promise sister in Chuukese culture is when two non–blood-related women come together and promise each other that they will support and be there for each other. Upon purchasing land in the Gill Baza subdivision, Kathy recounts how her father, uncle, and brothers helped clear the then overgrown thick jungle area into space where homes can be built to fit the communal lifestyle of her family. Martin points out the first breadfruit tree her father, Joshua, planted and how great and large it is now. On their land, the breadfruit tree continues to provide sustenance to her family and many other Micronesians.

Other women who are landowners such as Justina Hartman speak out about no longer being evicted by landlords. In a fervent fashion, she speaks of how great it is to own the ground upon which she stands, the space in which she and her family can live on into the future.

Despite the passion for landownership on Guam expressed by these Micronesians, Quan-Bautista weaves in the struggles that accompany landownership in Chuukese culture. She does this by defining the role of men in Chuukese culture as being that of provider and protector. Joshua Martin shared his role of *manigi* or first-born son in Chuukese culture. They are responsible for the well-being of the family. The reference to family here means immediate and extended family members. Quan-Bautista and her position as promise sister to Kathy Martin helped to gain further insight on Joshua Martin's struggle with his older sister who is the first-born daughter or in Chuukese culture is the *finigi*. The role of the finigi is to manage the entire assets of the family including land. Like many cultures in Micronesia, land is passed on through the women, denoting a matrilineal society. Joshua Martin speaks to how he resolved issues over land use in Chuuk with his older sister. He came to the conclusion that the bond between brother and

sister was far more vital for the well-being of a family than was land. As a reviewer and an interculturalist, I know that Quan-Bautista was able to acquire this information because she was seen by the Martin clan as not an outsider but an insider. Her position as promise sister enabled her to navigate this space with insider status, a position that could only be achieved over time. Where trust and confidence are built, lives are intermingled, promises are kept, and sacrifices are made for one another.

When it comes to communal living, Justina Hartman speaks to the Chuukese cultural use of space. She helps bring understanding to the Micronesian approach to "living space." Hartman explains how she started with a one-bedroom home on her land. Overtime, she discovers her daughter needs a place, and she adds on a room to the structure as a way of providing for the family. Other rooms are added onto the structure when other familial needs arise. Quan-Baustista develops this a bit more in the film by explaining that on a piece of land families, such as the families of a brother and sister, can have separate living quarters yet can share a kitchen in a communal fashion built between the two living structures. Other women speak as to how women in the Gill Baza subdivision often use the communal kitchen area as a gathering place where they cook using open fire, eat meals together, and share stories and laughter. This type of setting or use of space is one that resembles how life would be back on the home islands of Chuuk and Yap.

The space for communication is very hard to come by in a communal style of living. Everyone is busy taking care of everyone else. Quan-Bautista documents how Kathy Martin discovers the use of email and how, through it, Kathy strengthens her relationship with her father. Email, as a space to strengthen bonds in a family, has been rewarding for Kathy and Joshua. The film further develops the space for communication as these Micronesians are served notices to appear in court. Justina Hartman, when questioned about the pending court appearance, recounted that for a long time it was as though no one was listening to her. She felt like she was on a boat adrift calling out to others and was not heard by anyone. Now with the pending court appearance, she felt that her voice was being heard not only by the courts but also by her neighbors and the larger Guamanian community. Kini Sinanap proposed the idea of having a Micronesian Food Fair at the subdivision to show the larger Guamanian community just how they are using the land and growing. This sharing of thoughts, feelings, struggles, and ideas, whether it be through email, in a court setting, or at a fair, has helped this group of Micronesians develop an even more important space, that of human understanding.

The title of this film, *Breadfruit and Open Spaces*, explains the imagery captured by Quan-Bautista as she mingled and became a part of these

Micronesian families. She saw the deep value these people had in being connected to the land. She saw how they managed their space through a shifting of her Chamorro lenses to that of her promise sister Kathy Martin's lenses. Key to Quan-Bautista's successful documentary was this very relationship with Kathy. Kathy was able to open the way for Quan-Bautista to capture varied cultural nuances and deep cultural values and philosophies of the Micronesian families in the Gill Baza subdivision. Kini Sinanap's sharing of the Chuukese value of *wurufutu*, something deeply felt which is ripped out from you, speaks to the depth of Quan-Bautista's relationship with these people.

Important to note is how the documentary captured the real intenseness of the eviction notice, the struggle regarding what to do, the value of coming together, and the educating each other. Quan-Bautista said it best, "The whole process helped them to find their voice." She further observed how they recognized the power that comes in working together. Even more brilliant is Quan-Bautista's capturing of how these Micronesians in this Gill Baza subdivision navigate space as landowners, families, or communal living, and the ever challenging space of being understood. She is to be commended for her work with the Micronesians on Guam and for this film. As a Chamorro, she truly lives the Chamorro value of *Inafa'maolek yan fan aayuda*; translated this means to get along and help each other. You see this Chamorro value lived by the Micronesians in this film.

BOOKS NOTED

RECENT PACIFIC ISLAND PUBLICATIONS SELECTED ACQUISITIONS JANUARY 2013–JULY 2013

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

Agee, Margaret, et al. *Pacific Identities and Well-Being: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 2013.

Anderhandt, Jakob. *Eduard Hernsheim, die Südsee und viel Geld*. Münster, Germany: MV-Wissenschaft, 2012.

Anderson, Atholl, Judith Binney, and Aroha Harris. *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2013.

Arredondo, Ana Maria. *Rapa Nui: Takona Tatu*. Rapa Nui: Rapa Nui Press, 2009.

Ballantyne, Tony. *Webs of Empire: Locating New Zealand's Colonial Past*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2012.

Bastogi, Marion. *Le gouvernement pluraliste en Nouvelle-Calédonie et aux Fidji*. Nouméa: SCEREN-CDP Nouvelle-Calédonie, 2008.

Baudoux, Georges. *Kanak*. 4 vols. Paris: Editions du Lampion, 2011.

Benoit, Trépied. *Une mairie dans la France coloniale, Koné, Nouvelle-Calédonie*. Paris: Karthala, 2010.

Berentson, Quinn. *Moa: The Life and Death of New Zealand's Legendary Bird*. Nelson, NZ: Craig Potton, 2012.

Bolton, Kerry Raymond. *The Parihaka Cult*. London: Black House Publishing, 2012.

Bushey, James. *Hawaiiana Story: A Fantasy, Fact & Folklore Adventure*. Baltimore, MD: Publish America, 2011.

Campbell, Matthew, Simon Holdaway, and Sarah Macready. *Finding Our Recent Past: Historical Archaeology in New Zealand*. Auckland: New Zealand Archaeological Association, 2013.

Chastel, Patrick. *Mythes et légendes des îles Marquises*. Papeete: Haere Po, 2012.

Chaudron, Gerard. *New Zealand in the League of Nations: The Beginnings of an Independent Foreign Policy, 1919–1939*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2012.

Colin, Patrick Lynn. *Marine Environments of Palau*. Koror, Palau: Coral Reef Research Foundation, 2009.

Council of Pacific Arts. *Regional Culture Strategy: Investing in Pacific Cultures 2010–2020*. Suva: Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2012.

Crosby, Ron D. *Musket Wars: A History of Inter-Iwi Conflict, 1806–45*. Auckland: Libro International, 2012.

Cruchet, Louis. *Les dons du ciel des anciens Polynésiens: Archéoastronomie en Polynésie française*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2013.

Cushman, Gregory T. *Guano and the Opening of the Pacific World: A Global Ecological History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Dinety, Jean-Claude. *Patrimoines polynésiens*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2012.

Doyle, Brian, ed. *Ho'olaule'a. Celebrating Ten Years of Pacific Writing*. Honolulu: Pacific Writers' Connection, 2012.

Dunsford, D., et al. *Better Lives: The Struggle for Health of Transnational Pacific Peoples in New Zealand, 1950–2000*. Auckland: Department of Anthropology, Univ. of Auckland, 2011.

Dussy, Dorothée. *Nouméa, ville océanienne?: S'approprièr la ville*. Paris: Karthala, 2012.

Elder, Chris. *New Zealand's China Experience: Its Genesis, Triumphs, and Occasional Moments of Less Than Complete Success*. Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press, 2012.

Ellis, David, and John Huria, eds. *Maori i Ngaara Rapu Matauranga: Maori Education*. Wellington: NZCER Press, 2012.

Faberon, Jean-Yves, Viviane Fayaud, and Jean-Marc Regnault, eds. *Destins des collectivités politiques d'océanie: Peuples, populations, nations, états, territoires, pays, patries, communautés, frontières: Actes du colloque international organisé du 7 Au 10 mars 2011 á Nouméa*. 2 vols. Aix-en-Provence, France: Presses Univ. d'Aix-Marseille, 2011.

Filer, Colin, ed. *Dilemmas of Development: The Social and Economic Impact of the Porgera Gold Mine*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2012.

Fischer, Steven Roger. *History of the Pacific Islands*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Forbes, David W. *Engraved at Lahainaluna: A History of Printmaking by Hawaiians at the Lahainaluna Seminary, 1834 to 1844*. Honolulu: Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, 2012.

Gagné, Natacha. *Being Māori in the City: Indigenous Everyday Life in Auckland*. Toronto, ON: Univ. of Toronto Press, 2013.

Gilbert, Jarrod. *Patched: The History of Gangs in New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2013.

Goodyear-Ka'ōpua, Noelani. *The Seeds We Planted: Portraits of a Native Hawaiian Charter School*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Guiart, Jean. *Religions d'Océanie*. Rev. ed. Papeete: Haere Po, 2012.

Gwynne, Joel. *The Secular Visionaries: Aestheticism and New Zealand Short Fiction in the Twentieth Century*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2010.

Hampshire, David. *Living and Working in New Zealand: A Survival Handbook*. 6th ed. Bath, UK: Survival Books, 2012.

Hamson, Michael, ed. *Art of the Boiken*. Palos Verdes Estates, CA: Michael Hamson Oceanic Art, 2011.

Hegarty, David, and Darrel Tryson, eds. *Politics, Development and Security in Oceania*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2013.

Hemer, Susan. *Tracing the Melanesian Person: Emotions and Relationships in Lihir*. Adelaide, SA: Univ. of Adelaide Press, 2013.

Hezel, Francis X. *Making Sense of Micronesia: The Logic of Pacific Island Culture*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Hicks, Geoffrey R. F., and Hamish Campbell, eds. *Awesome Forces: The Natural Hazards That Threaten New Zealand*. Rev. ed. Wellington: Te Papa Press, 2012.

Higuchi, Wakako. *The Japanese Administration of Guam, 1941–1944: A Study of Occupation and Integration Policies, with Japanese Oral Histories*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2012.

Hindmarsh, Gerard. *Outsiders: Stories from the Fringe of New Zealand Society*. Nelson, NZ: Craig Potton, 2012.

Hommon, Robert J. *The Ancient Hawaiian State*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Howarth, Crispin, ed. *Kastom: Art of Vanuatu*. Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2013.

Igler, David. *The Great Ocean: Pacific Worlds from Captain Cook to the Gold Rush*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Inglis, Kerri A. *Ma'i Lepera: Disease and Displacement in Nineteenth-Century Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Kakazu, Hiroshi. *Okinawa in the Asia Pacific*. Naha, Okinawa: The Okinawa Times, 2012.

Kanahele, George S., and John Berger. *Hawaiian Music and Musicians: An Encyclopedic History*. Rev. ed. Honolulu: Mutual Publishing, 2012.

Keppel, Gunnar, and Shahina A. Ghazanfar. *Trees of Fiji: A Guide to 100 Rainforest Trees*. 3rd rev. ed. Suva: Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2011.

Lal, Brij V., ed. *Fiji before the Storm: Elections and the Politics of Development*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2012.

Lal, Brij V., and Peter Larmour, eds. *Electoral Systems in Divided Societies: The Fiji Constitution*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2012.

Lal, Brij V., et al. *Chalo Jahaji: On a Journey through Indenture in Fiji*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2012.

Lepani, Katherine. *Islands of Love, Islands of Risk: Culture and HIV in the Trobriands*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt Univ. Press, 2012.

Maaz, Klaus, and Daniel Blau. *Fish Hooks of the Pacific Islands: A Pictorial Guide to the Fish Hooks from the Peoples of the Pacific Islands*. Munich, Germany: Daniel Blau, 2012.

MacWilliam, Scott. *Securing Village Life: Development in Late Colonial Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: ANU E Press, 2013.

Majid, Nadi. *"My Mother Was the Earth, My Father Was the Sky": Myth and Memory in Maori Novels in English*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang, 2010.

Malo, Makia, and Pamela Young. *My Name Is Makia: A Memoir of Kalaupapa*. Honolulu: Watermark Publishing, 2011.

Manhire, Bill, and Damien Wilkins, eds. *The Best of Best New Zealand Poems*. Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press, 2011.

Mansell, Roger. *Captured: The Forgotten Men of Guam*. Annapolis, MD: Naval Inst. Press, 2012.

McClean, Rosalind, Brad Patterson, and David Swain, eds. *Counting Stories, Moving Ethnicities: Studies from Aotearoa New Zealand*. Hamilton, NZ: Univ. of Waikato, 2012.

McLachlan, Craig, Brett Atkinson, and Celeste Brash. *Rarotonga, Samoa & Tonga*. 7th ed. Footscray, VIC: Lonely Planet, 2012.

McMullin, Juliet. *Healthy Ancestor: Embodied Inequality and the Revitalization of Native Hawaiian Health*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, 2010.

Mesner, Patrick. *Kanak: portrait de groupe*. Bezouce, France: Idées plus, 2011.

Miroux, Daniel. *Parlons iaai, Ouvéa, Nouvelle-Calédonie*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2011.

Mokaddem, Hamid. *Littératures calédoniennes: La littérature océanienne francophone est-elle une littérature française?* Marseille, France: Éditions transit, 2008.

Moon, Paul. *Turning Points: Events That Changed the Course of New Zealand History*. Auckland: New Holland, 2013.

Muckler, Hermann. *Entkolonisierung und Probleme der Gegenwart in Ozeanien*. Wien: Facultas WUV Universitatsverlag, 2013.

———, ed. *Osterreicher in der Sudsee: Forscher, Reisende, Auswanderer*. Wien: LIT Verlag, 2012.

Muhlhausler, Peter, and Joshua Nash. *Norfolk Island: History, People, Environment, Language*. London: Battlebridge Publications, 2012.

Mulligan, Jesse. *How to Speak New Zenglish*. Auckland: Penguin, 2013.

Munro, Doug. *J. C. Beaglehole: Public, Intellectual, Critical Conscience*. Wellington: Steele Roberts, 2012.

Nihipali, Elizabeth "Nani" et al. *Hawaiians in Los Angeles*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2012.

Noury, Arnaud. *Grammaire des decors Lapita*. Paris: Andromaque, 2012.

Orange, Claudia. *The Story of a Treaty*. 2nd ed. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2013.

O'Sullivan, Vincent. *Katherine Mansfield's New Zealand*. Wellington: Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2013.

Pere, Vernice. *Into the Luminous Tide: Pacific Poems*. Provo, UT: Center for the Study of Christian Values in Literature, Brigham Young Univ., 2009.

Plommée, Gérard. *Tanna, Kwerya, Itonga—Histoires océaniennes au Vanuatu*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2012.

Robinson, John, et al. *Twisting the Treaty: A Tribal Grab for Wealth and Power*. Wellington: Tross Publishing, 2013.

Ruby, Laura, and Ross W. Stephenson. *Honolulu Town*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishing, 2012.

Salmond, Anne. *Hui: A Study of Maori Ceremonial Gatherings*. Auckland: Penguin, 2009.

Schachter, Judith. *The Legacies of a Hawaiian Generation: From Territorial Subject to American Citizen*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2013.

Schlossmuseum Sondershausen, James N. Bade, and James Braund, eds. *Zehn Jahre auf den Inseln der Südsee 1887–1897: Aus dem Tagebuch der Paula David: Ten Years in the Islands of the South Seas 1887–1897: From the Diary of Paula David*. Dresden, Germany: Sandstein Verlag, 2011.

Schultz, Susan M., ed. *Jack London Is Dead: Contemporary Euro-American Poetry of Hawai'i*. Kāne'ohe, Hawai'i: Tinfish Press, 2013.

Sen, Benton. *Men of Hula: Robert Cazimero and Halau Na Kamalei*. Rev. ed. Honolulu: Island Heritage, 2011.

Shaw, Susan, Lindsey White, and Bron Deed, eds. *Health, Wellbeing & Environment in Aotearoa, New Zealand*. South Melbourne, VIC: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Simmons, David R., and George Graham. *Greater Maori Auckland*. Auckland: Bush Press, 2013.

Six, Janet L. "The Ahupua'a of Hīlea: A Case Study in the Realities of Applied Historical Archaeology." PhD diss., Univ. of Pennsylvania, 2010.

Stafford, Jane, and Mark Williams, eds. *Auckland University Press Anthology of New Zealand Literature*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2012.

Stanley, Nick. *The Making of Asmat Art: Indigenous Art in a World Perspective*. Wantage, UK: Sean Kingston Publishing, 2013.

Stephens, Māmari, and Mary Boyce, eds. *He Papakupu Reo Ture: A Dictionary of Māori Legal Terms*. Wellington: LexisNexis NZ, 2013.

Strathern, Andrew, ed. *Inequality in New Guinea Highlands Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2009.

Strickland, Mana. *Say It in Rarotongan: An Instant Introduction to the Common Language of the Cook Islands*. Pukekohe, NZ: J. and T. Bailey, 2012.

Tabani, Marc, and Abong Marcellin, eds. *Kago, Kastom and Kalja: The Study of Indigenous Movements and Melanesia Today*. Marseille, France: Pacific-credo Publications, 2013.

Tarquada, Jim, and John King. *The 'Ukulele: A History*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2012.

Tau, Te Maire, ed. *I Whānau au ki Kaiapoi: The Story of Natanahira Waruwarutu as Recorded by Thomas Green*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2011.

Toll, Ian W. *Pacific Crucible: War at Sea in the Pacific, 1941–1942*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2012.

Torrente, Frédéric. *Buveurs de mers, Mangeurs de terres. Histoire des guerriers de Anaa, atoll des Tuamotu*. Papeete: Haere Po, 2012.

Towards Gender Equality in East Asia and the Pacific. Washington, DC: World Bank, 2012.

Van Fossen, Anthony. *Tax Havens and Sovereignty in the Pacific Islands*. St. Lucia, QLD: Univ. of Queensland Press, 2012.

Von Poser, Anita. *Foodways and Empathy: Relatedness in a Ramu River Society, Papua New Guinea*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2013.

Wheen, Nicola R., and Janine Hayward, eds. *Treaty of Waitangi Settlements*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2012.

Wilson, John. *Historic Canterbury*. Auckland: David Bateman, 2012.

Yim, Susan. *We Go Jam: Celebrating Our Music, Our Soundscape, Our Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Hawai'i Council for the Humanities, 2012.

Younger, Stephen. *Calculating Chiefs: Simulating Leadership, Violence, and Warfare in Oceania*. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing, 2012.

CONTRIBUTORS

Laurence Marshall Carucci, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717. Email: lamaca@montana.edu.

Raeburn Lange, Golden Bay, New Zealand. Email: raeburn.lange@gmail.com.

Robert N. Smead, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602-6702. Email: rob_smead@byu.edu.

Rosalind "Rose" Meno Ram, Brigham Young University Hawai'i, 55-220 Kulanui Street, BYUH 1977 Laie, HI 96762. Email: rose.ram@byuh.edu.

The Jonathan Napela Center for Hawaiian and Pacific Islands Studies

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY HAWAI'I

0275-3596(201312)36:3;1-C