

Review: F. ALLAN HANSON
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The two villages of the title are given the pseudonyms Fatata and Atea. The former is located on Mo'orea and the latter on Huahine. (Oliver stretches the term "Tahitian" to cover the Society Islands as a whole.) The Polynesians of these villages manifest neither the easy insouciance of Margaret Mead's Samoans nor the taut anxiety and hos-

tility of those same Samoans when viewed through Derek Freeman's eyes. If Society Islanders suffer from anything, it seems to be boredom in a humdrum existence that they themselves characterize as "narrow, monotonous, and stale" (497).

Local ennui did not deter Oliver, who found enough to say from his 1954-1955 fieldwork to fill more than 500 pages. His strategy is to undertake "controlled comparison" of the two communities, attempting on the broad base of similarity between them to pinpoint reasons for their relatively few differences. Oliver focuses particularly on economic life and, within that, on the role of money in the two villages. There is more of it in Fatata than in Atea, and that, coupled with other consequences of Fatata's greater proximity to the urban center of Pape'ete, Tahiti, turns out to be responsible for most of the observed differences between the villages.

Oliver is an ethnographer of uncommon candor. On numerous occasions he acknowledges that he did not collect the data necessary to a satisfactory resolution of the issue at hand. His reasoning, he complains, is sometimes tautologous (e.g., 504, 505) and has a "Euclid-like tread" (502). He confides further that his explanations of the differences between Fatata and Atea span the entire distance from "the clearly obvious through the plausibly likely to the wild-shot guess," instancing as an example of guesswork his suggestion that the frequency of neolocal residence is higher in Atea than in Fatata because houses tend to be smaller in the former village (524). One can sympathize with a certain frustration that probably fuels these admissions, especially when it is recognized that he gamely tries to account for virtually every difference in social and economic life for which he has data. Who would not tear their hair trying to explain, as Oliver does, why households that contain just one adult predominate in Atea, two-adult households in Fatata, three-adult households in Atea again, four-adult households in Fatata, while the villages do not differ with respect to households containing five or more adults (509)? It might be as well, and certainly more conducive to the analyst's peace of mind, simply to let facts such as these lie without explanation, especially since the numbers are so small that the differences may not be significant anyway.

On the other hand, at a few points Oliver might have been a good deal more expansive in his analyses. This is particularly true in the Post-script, where he confronts the issue of why, following the 1958 referendum on whether French Polynesia was to remain associated with France or become independent, Atea experienced a great deal of internal dissension while Fatatan society was essentially unruffled by the

event. This circumstance is surprising because in 1954-1955, when Oliver did the initial fieldwork for the book, Atea had appeared to be the more cohesive and stable of the two communities, Oliver's explanation: "the factor of *distance* [presumably distance from Pape'ete; he does not elaborate]--which accounted for much of Atea's relatively tighter prereferendum cohesiveness, accounted also for much of its more divided postreferendum falling apart" (529). He leaves the subject at that, with no account of how these opposite results can be derived from the same condition.

Among inter-village differences, Oliver found Atea to enjoy a higher degree of cooperation between households than Fatata, both in terms of informal mutual aid and exchange of surplus food, as well as in the prevalence of organized cooperative work groups (*pupu*). His explanation for this revolves around money: in both villages people are more willing to share goods and services generated directly by labor than those secured by money. Because money plays a larger role in Fatata's economy than in Atea's, there is less inter-household cooperation in Fatata (511). The situation on another French Polynesian island--Rapa, in the Austral group-- may be instructive here. Of Rapa's two villages, Ha'urei and 'Area, I found there to be more inter-household cooperation in the latter. Money was not a significant variable, there being no distinguishable difference between the predominantly subsistence economies of the two villages on that score. Ha'urei, however, had an appreciably higher proportion of extended family households than 'Area did. My analysis was that an extended-family household is more self-sufficient than a nuclear-family household, because its larger labor force enables it simultaneously to accomplish the variety of tasks necessary in Rapa's economy. On any given day, one man may go fishing, another may prepare a new taro garden or work on house maintenance, one or two women may cultivate and harvest taro, another can prepare the meals, clean the house, and look after small children, and so on. Nuclear-family households are less able on their own to accomplish this variety of tasks, many of which must be done in widely separated locations. However, it is possible for them to benefit from different jobs if they share the fruits of their labor with other households. This analysis may apply to Oliver's material as well because, as in the Rapan case, he found extended-family households to be more prevalent in Fatata, which had less inter-household cooperation, than in Atea. At least as important, a household dependent on money, be it composed of a nuclear or extended family, is more able to acquire the desired *range* of goods and services than is a household dependent on the subsistence

labor of its members because it can have them by the relatively quick means of purchase. Therefore money is indeed significant to the difference in inter-household cooperation between Fatata and Atea, but not, I would suggest, for Oliver's reason that people are more selfish about things connected with money. Instead, it may be because households more deeply involved in a money economy are more self-sufficient in acquiring the goods and services of daily life and so have less need of the benefits of inter-household cooperation.

The cultures of the two villages are presented piecemeal rather than as organized systems. This is particularly clear in chapter 12, where the explanations for the differences between the villages take the form of a numbered list. Certain explanatory factors, such as Atea's greater distance from Pape'ete, occur repeatedly in the list, but that does not knit the diverse explanations together, nor does it provide a sense of these societies as structured wholes.

Two Tahitian Villages lacks an index--an unfortunate omission for any book as large and information-packed as this one is. Indeed, such a full account of social and economic organization in Fatata and Atea is given that this book should serve as a useful source of comparative data for other studies of contemporary village life in Polynesia and elsewhere.