PACIFIC STUDIES

a journal devoted to the study of the Pacific--
its islands and adjacent countries

SPRING 1981

Published by

THE INSTITUTE FOR POLYNESIAN STUDIES

sponsored by the

Polynesian Cultural Center

and the

Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus

PACIFIC STUDIES

Pacific Studies is published twice yearly by the Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus, Laie, Hawaii, 96762, but responsibility for opinions expressed in the articles rests with the writers alone.

Subscription rate is US $5.00. Accounts payable to the Institute for Polynesian Studies should be sent to the editor. Articles submitted to the editor should be the original typewritten copy, double spaced, following a recognized, scholarly style. Books for review should also be sent to the editor.

The Institute for Polynesian Studies is a joint organization supported both by the Brigham Young University--Hawaii Campus and the Polynesian Cultural Center. The major part of the expenses of publishing *Pacific Studies* is underwritten by the Cultural Center through the Institute. The Institute assists the Center in meeting its cultural and educational goals by undertaking a program of teaching, research, and publication. The Institute cooperates with other scholarly and research institutions in achieving its objectives. It publishes monographs, produces films, -underwrites research, and sponsors conferences on the Pacific islands. Further information on the activities of the Institute may be obtained by writing to its Director, Jerry K. Loveland, at the address above.

ISSN 0275-3596

Vol. IV Spring 1981 Number 2

CONTENTS

Articles

Editor's Forum

Reviews

PACIFIC STUDIES

Vol. IV, No. 2 Spring 1981

CULT AND CULTURE: AMERICAN DREAMS IN VANUATU[1]

by Monty Lindstrom

During the recent and troubled independence of Vanuatu, marred by secessionist attempts on two of its islands (Tanna and Santo), an "American connection" attracted international attention. This connection consisted of an idealized conception of America entertained by certain *ni-Vanuatu* (people of Vanuatu) and of a number of links between political organizations in both countries, A singular concept of America as supreme source of Western material goods, knowledge and power, for example, has been a basic tenet of the John Frum Movement on the island of Tanna. John Frum, unusual for its longevity among South Pacific social movements, is one of those phenomena generally described as "cargo cults" (Worsley 1968, Burridge 1969). One of the factors sustaining the John Frum cult during the past forty years is the special relationship it claims with the United States. This relationship originated in a Tannese-American interaction during 1942 to 1946 when the United States government established large military supply bases in the New Hebrides.

The John Frum cult has evolved over the years through a number of organizational and ideological phases. The most recent of these was the participation by cult members in a revolt during May and June 1980 against the soon-to-be independent government of Vanuatu. This secessionist attempt on Tanna, and a companion one on the northern island Santo by members of a second organization called Nagriamel, received at

[1]Vanuatu, once the New Hebrides, achieved its independence on 30 July 1980. My wife and I lived twenty months, during 1978 and 1979, on Tanna. We would like to thank Fulbright-Hays, the English Speaking Union of the United States, San Francisco Branch, the Department of Anthropology of the Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, the Department of Anthropology of the University of California at Berkeley, our John Frum friends at Iapiro and our Vanuaaku Party friends at Samaria for the assistance we received and the welcome we experienced during this period.

the least the good wishes and encouragement of leaders of a third group, the Phoenix Foundation (Riley 1980). Phoenix is an American organization dedicated to founding a new nation in which the glorious, although presently beseiged and tattered, principles of free enterprise and libertarian economics might be revitalized and put into full practice.

I review in this paper the history of the John Frum Movement and discuss the symbolic importance of America within this history. I also examine the several attractions linking John Frum, Nagriamel, and Phoenix together in the recent political turmoil in Vanuatu. These attractions consist of obvious overlapping political interests but also of more subtle (and more speculative on my part) cultural harmonics. Similar interpretations of the nature of man, of history, of human dignity and freedom, of power and of society are overtones which resonated throughout the disturbingly successful convergence of these Vanuatu and American cargo cults.

Although enigmatic rumor, scattered dances, and other cultic activity existed on Tanna in the late 1930s, what first drew the attention of James Nichol, the British District Agent, was a series of nocturnal meetings held in 1940 at Iamwatakarek, a kava-drinking ground near Green Point on Tanna's southwestern coast (Guiart 1956:152). Nichol investigated and learned of a mysterious figure, dressed in white trousers, long-sleeved shirt and hat with veil obscuring his face who appeared and spoke in a strange voice. Men from all parts of Tanna converged on Green Point to hear this being who said his name was John Frum. Older men today describe these pilgrimages of their youth and most claim that they saw John Frum personally or, at least, heard his voice emanating from inside a house.

John Frum, at first, urged people to more cooperative effort in clearing land for gardens and in building houses and also told them to obey both the government and the missionaries working on the island at that time (Guiart 1956:155). His message soon changed, however, into one of cultural revitalization. People say John Frum ordered them to return to the traditions (or *kastom* as these are called in Vanuatu) of their fathers. The years 1900 through 1940 had witnessed the widespread success of the Presbyterian mission. About two-thirds of the island's population had converted and submitted to missionary demands to abandon traditional practices such as dancing, the drinking of kava *(piper methysticum),* polygyny, and all labor on the Sabbath. Upon hearing John Frum's words, the Tannese of 1940 revived traditional dances and kava drinking. They also abandoned the church. On one astonishing Sunday, 11 May 1941, only a handful of worshippers attended the Presbyterian churches on the island (Campbell 1974:118). A census made in October 1939, seven months pre-

viously, had reported a population of 3,381 Presbyterian adherents (*Quarterly Jottings,* October 1939).

Nichol, the district agent, assumed that a small group of devious men were conspiring to make fools of their fellow islanders for some reason he could not quite understand--although he described the apparition of John Frum as both a "hoax" and a "racket" (quoted in Guiart 1956:408). He arrested two men, one of whom eventually confessed to dressing and acting the part of John Frum. The British and French Condominium government exiled these men to Vila (the capital of the group 140 miles north of Tanna) for several years. This capture of the purported impersonator did not dampen cultist enthusiasm, and these deportations were the first of many as cultist activity broke out at a number of other villages. The government arrested more than 140 men during the years 1940 to 1956 (Rice 1974:251-262). In 1956, it redefined the movement to be religious rather than political subversion and maintained generally a hands-off policy until the events of May and June 1980.

The early John Frum message developed millenarian tones in addition to encouraging the resumption of *kastom*. John Frum proclaimed the coming of a new age. He told people to throw away their European money, to kill their cattle and goats, and to abandon their gardens and houses as he would soon provide new money, new houses, food and animals. There are reports John Frum warned that the island would turn over and emerge joined with neighboring islands; that mountains would flatten and valleys fill; that all Europeans would vacate Tanna; and that anyone arrested by the government would gain freedom (Barrow 1952:4). Many people did kill their animals, quit productive labor and discard their money (C. McLeod, personal communication). Some threw it into the sea (Barrow 1952:4) while others participated in a run on trade stores (Guiart 1956:159, O'Reilly 1949:195, see also Priday 1950 and Marsh 1968).

The first mention of the United States in cult ideology occurred several months after the initial arrests. This was in a letter sent by Joe Nalpin, a British policeman in Vila, to his father at Isini village, Tanna. The letter arrived in September 1941--three months before Pearl Harbor. Nalpin wrote that the people at Isini were to build a house for John Frum and:

> then John Frum will gather the white man and talk to them. He will send his son to America to bring back the King. You must not be afraid. He showed me aeroplanes at Lonopina [name for Tukosmera, the highest mountain on Tanna] as thick as the bush. (Guiart 1956:410)

The reference here to America may have been in fortuitous counterpoint to the British and French governing the country at that time. Fischer

(1964) has suggested that colonized people call upon some nation they expect to help resolve economic and social inequalities because of its perceived power and difference from local colonial authority. Whatever the factors underlying this choice of America, it was a successful shot in the dark. Six months later on 17 March 1942, an American fleet arrived in Vila harbor and stormed the town expecting to discover the Japanese in control (Geslin 1956:249, Heinl 1944:234).[2] US armed forces quickly established themselves near Vila and, several months later, opened a second base on Santo to the north. These bases served first as front-line establishments supporting the battles of the Solomons and Coral Sea. As the war moved north, they became permanent supply depots with a personnel of over 100,000 servicemen. More than a half million soldiers and sailors passed through the New Hebrides on their way to and from the front. The total population of New Hebrideans at this time was less than 60,000 people (Geslin 1956:257).

The US military command soon discovered it needed additional labor and obtained permission from the British and French Resident Commissioners to recruit New Hebrideans. Tanna provided the largest number of these recruits (Geslin 1956:277, Rice 1974:214). Major Heinl, of the US Marine Corps, described islanders as "genuinely friendly and incredibly eager to help any Americans" (1944:239). Almost every Tannese man, young and old, spent at least one three-month tour of duty laboring at the bases. Older men today talk with pride about the help they gave to America. Although the salary the US paid was kept very low (about 25¢ a day) at the insistance of the French who did not want to inflate the cost of plantation labor after the war (Rice 1974:215), workers were housed and fed by means of similar support facilities servicing US military personnel. They ate rations in cafeterias, slept in Quonset huts and were issued military bedding (Geslin 1956:227). Certain of their Army and Navy bosses also managed to present them with illegal goods such as clothing, shoes, pots, pans, and cigarettes during and after their recruitment (Rice 1974:215). Men today on Tanna explain that what impressed them about America was its *nepwusien,* or wealth of possessions; its machines which made easy work such as garden preparation; and the generosity of the soldiers. The resident French and British colons in this once isolated colony, with only meager possessions at their command, were no match for the

[2]Barrow, district agent on Tanna in the early 1950s, notes "the natives around Vila had scoffed at the stupid Tannese for their wild ideas but now, when everything seemed to be turning out as they had foretold it, it was the turn of the Tannese to laugh" (19527). America was also an important ideological symbol of another cult, the "Naked Movement," which developed on Santo in the mid-1940s (Miller 1948).

Americans. In Tannese eyes, America became the origin of all good things.

Back on Tanna, cultists began predicting the arrival of American soldiers either by ship or from the bowels of the central mountain range (Guiart 1956:182-183). Cult ideology began to manifest a concern with obtaining material goods in addition to freedom from the colonial powers with the assistance of America. O'Reilly (1949:199) suggests that people perceived the American dollars which were inundating the archipelago to be John Frum's promised new money. A major cult outbreak occurred in north Tanna in October 1943 (O'Reilly 1949:201-203, Guiart 1956: 184-188). This was organized by a man named Neloiag who, with a group of supporters, began constructing an airstrip on which US planes might land to discharge soldiers. Neloiag claimed to be John Frum's spokesman and also to be the ally of "Rusefel," the king of America. After being threatened for the first time with an armed resistance, the district agent summoned from Vila troops of the New Hebrides Defence Force. These sailed to Tanna and arrested Neloiag with over fifty of his followers. Two American officers participated in the raid. One of these, Major Patten, addressed a crowd of about two hundred to 'explain the truth about America: that the US had no plans to land soldiers and, therefore, had no need of an airfield. "The troops then showed what they could do with Brens, Tommy guns, and rifles against a notice board of Neloiag's" (Barrow 1952:9).

This American disclaimer, however, did not discourage Tannese interest and faith in the United States. Four decades later, people continue to sing out to the US to help them achieve their goals of economic and social development. The idea of America, along with certain military objects, continues to symbolize the cult's commitment to these goals. Cult leaders continue to communicate with John Frum and America, receiving knowledge in their dreams.

The John Frum Movement, in its beginning a collection of rumor and scattered gatherings, has been most successfully institutionalized at Ipikil on Sulphur Bay, a village of east Tanna. The cult is now a powerful combined political party and church (Lindstrom 1981). This institutionalization became possible when government prosecution of cultists ended in the mid-1950s. A man named Nampas, along with other Ipikil bigmen returning from exile off Tanna, raised a red flag on Friday, 15 February 1957. Nampas claimed this flag had been given to him by John Frum and the Americans as a pledge of continuing responsibility and assistance although noncultists claim Nampas stole it from a US military fuel dump. John Frum leaders, in institutionalizing the cult, created a

number of ceremonies modeled upon the Christian. A night dance every Friday, lasting until Saturday dawn, corresponds to Christian Sunday worship. Members of the Ipikil organization (there are other political groups on Tanna in which John Frum is important) meet weekly at Sulphur Bay and dance to string bands. People claim that faithful attendance will eventually result in America's arrival on Tanna. The 15th of February has become the major annual cult holiday. Every 15 February, cult members hold festivities to celebrate John Frum's message and victory over the government in 1957. The cult also has its hymns, its prayers, its missionaries, and its offerings (which consist of flowers rather than money). Leaders claim to have the support of twenty-six "teams" (or villages) around the island, an approximate membership of 1,500 people.

Cult symbols derive from the wartime experience. These include wooden crosses painted red, copied from the doors of Army ambulances. US military uniforms and insignia, provided by passing yachtists and tourists, are prized possessions. A few men were lucky enough to secretly retain the numbered dogtags issued to them during tours of labor for the US military. Others still recall the songs they learned from American servicemen and are pleased to sing creditable renderings of "God Bless America" and the "Marine's Hymn" (Heinl 1944:240). Men also recall wartime institutions such as *iapiekus* (the PX). Every 15 February, a military drill team marches with bamboo rifles and the logo USA painted in red across the marchers' chests and backs. The team is commanded by a sergeant, "with stripes," who calls out still recognizable commands (which are, however, unintelligible to the Tannese) such as "to the right!" During the celebrations of 15 February 1978, cultists raised for the first time a United States flag.[3] Although leaders claimed this had been sent by John Frum, it was apparently obtained from an American yacht.[4] In 1979, cultists raised

People say the US flag is *rapsan, rapituv em raruveruv*--"white, black and red." (There is no distinct color lexeme "blue." The term which designates green also includes light blues while that for black refers to darker blues.) These colors symbolize for some the unity between white Americans, black Tannese (and also "negro" Americans) and the red indians people have heard about.

[4]Sulphur Bay appears to be a popular port of call for American and other yachts. Rumors of cult activities circulate in the trans-South Pacific yachtist grapevine. Sulphur Bay also enjoys visits of numbers of tourists (American, French, English, Australian) who have heard of John Frum. There is a guest house in the village for these tourists and if cultists judge them to have a certain importance, they may perform a special flag raising or other ceremony. These visitors often subsequently supply cultists with military uniforms and insignia via the mails in return for Sulphur Bay's hospitality. The tourist who finds his way to cult headquarters is not the sort discovered at the more packaged and opulent resorts elsewhere in the Pacific.

two US flags (the second provided by a tourist from Venice, California). The people at Sulphur Bay continue to raise these flags at 8:00 A.M. and lower them at 4:30 P.M. with military precision. An honor guard watches continuously over the flying Stars and Stripes.

In addition to institutionalizing the movement, cult leaders have also modernized its ideology. John Frum's message has changed depending on social context over the past forty years. It began as exhortations to good, cooperative behavior; it then stressed cultural revitalization and a return to *kastom;* then predicted eschatological change and an exodus of the European colonials; then the arrival of American soldiers and material goods. Although cult ideology continues to reflect all of these themes, people today talk in terms recalling the early days of the American Peace Corps. Cultists expect that America will come to Tanna via Sulphur Bay (Lindstrom 1979) to teach people knowledge of how to construct and organize factories to produce the goods they must purchase since they do not yet know how to make them for themselves. What people presently expect from America are not fleets of cargo ships or squadrons of planes but industrial knowledge and instruction in the American way. Instead of being a mere source of raw material (i.e. coconut with a little value added by drying) people would vastly prefer to control the entire productive process--a control which would support dignity and their self-vision.

Who is John Frum? He may once have been Manehevi, the man Nichol arrested as the great impersonator in 1941. Others at the time suspected John to be a Japanese spy operating in advance of some planned military occupation (Rice 1974:216). The origin of the name is also unclear. It may be a reflection of a number of Biblical Johns the missionaries emphasized. It may originally have been John Broom--John being a broom to sweep the whites from the island (Rentoul 1949:39). It probably is not "John From America" as suggested by some (Dobson 1980:68). The similarity of Frum to another word, *urumun,* which means "spirit medium" in the Kwamera language of southeast Tanna, seems to me to be if not indicative at least evocative. A spirit medium serves as middleman between the living and the dead, linking Tanna to *ienkaren pen,* "the side away." He passes messages to ancestors and receives knowledge from them in return. John Frum is also a middleman who links Tanna with America. He travels back and forth between the two lands, carrying messages to America and bringing back knowledge and, perhaps someday, the Americans themselves.

People wonder if John Frum is a man or a spirit. They cannot explain how he travels but maintain he continues to visit the island, especially on Fridays. Cult leaders have constructed a special bed for him at Sulphur

Bay where he sleeps, secretly, after arriving to advise his friends. Some people claim to see John on his travels and to speak with him; others do not, although they may dream of him; and others, members of competing political groups, scoff and laugh and say John is nothing but the wind *(rosi nematagi).* The idea of a being such as John fits well with the traditional cosmological cast of characters which includes ancestors, spirits of place, and powerful culture heroes who remain active today (Lindstrom 1980).

The measure of support the John Frum Movement enjoys on Tanna and' its relatively tight, by Melanesian standards, organizational structure make it inevitably of great importance within the local and national political arenas. The population of Tanna, about 17,000 people, is divided into a number of competing social groups. After suffering almost complete loss of support in 1941, the Presbyterian and other churches have gradually rebuilt and now encompass about half the island. Nearly all Presbyterians are also members of the Vanuaaku Party (which is now in power as the first independent government). Founded in the early 1970s by English educated New Hebrideans, this party demanded early independence and land reform. Colons and French speaking *ni-Vanuatu* founded a number of competing parties soon afterwards. Supported by the French government in opposition to the anglophonic Vanuaaku Party, these have united several times under different names. In the elections of November 1979, they ran as *La Partie Fédérale.* In the period leading to independence, these parties were commonly designated (first by the French and then generally) as "the moderates."

Moderate party leaders courted the John Frum organization as it historically opposed those people who were members of the Presbyterian Church and Vanuaaku Party on Tanna. Cult leaders agreed to take part in politics and gave their approval in the founding of a John Frum Party. A John Frum candidate won a seat in the National Assembly in the elections of 1975, 1977, and again in 1979 as a member of the moderate team. The French--who had joined with the British in repressing the Movement in the 1940s and 1950s--became both its benefactor and protector in the 1970s. Sulphur Bay received a sixteen-foot boat with two twenty-five horsepower motors and also access to a new Toyota Landcruiser among a number of other gifts from the French during the critical period before the elections of 1979. The French Resident Commissioner, the highest colonial officer in the country, began to attend the 15th of February celebrations in the mid-1970s. He was there 15 February 1978 when, to his astonishment and probable chagrin, cultists raised their first Stars and Stripes. He was more pleasantly surprised in 1980, no doubt, when they added a French *tricouleur* to the flags flying at cult headquarters.

In 1978, cult leaders also organized the John Frum guards--a police force which arrested people accused of crimes ranging from adultery, to sorcery, to pig killing. (Leaders have established several sorts of "guards" or "armies" over the years organized along western military lines; O'Reilly reports John Frum guards active in 1940 [1949: 194].) The guards hogtied these unfortunates and brought them to Sulphur Bay where cult bigmen held meetings to judge and sentence them. The French representative on Tanna refused to investigate seriously any complaints arising from these vigilante police actions and, at the time, the British were unwilling to do anything unilaterally. Noncultists and members of opposed political organizations were genuinely afraid of the cult guards (whom they perceived as terrorists attacking mostly Vanuaaku Party supporters) and felt themselves abandoned by the British government.

As the elections of November 1979 approached, cult leaders appeared to be about to decide that John Frum people would not vote. They claimed to be satisfied with their own gardens and with their belief that John Frum and the Americans would soon help them out. After pressure from leaders of the francophonic parties, cult bigmen reversed their decision at a meeting held in October at Sulphur Bay. The French Resident Commissioner, Inspector-General Jean- Jacques Robert, made several trips to the island immediately before the November poll and distributed gifts (food, cigarettes, cloth, kerosene, etc.) to voters in a number of key locations. The period leading up to elections was quiet, but this quietude did not survive the electoral results. To most people's surprise (the John Frum moderate parties had polled more votes in 1975) the Vanuaaku Party won three of the five Assembly seats on Tanna (polling 2,784 votes to the moderates' 2,718) and also won eight of the fifteen seats on a new island council the French had unluckily insisted be written into the 1979 Constitution expecting this to serve as a John Frum power base. In the country as a whole, the Vanuaaku Party won twenty-six out of thirty-nine Assembly seats--a two-thirds majority. The new government and the two colonial powers agreed, after prolonged negotiation, on 3 July 1980, as independence day.

The losing moderate parties, however, complained of electoral irregularities and most newly-elected members--including the two moderate candidates elected from Tanna--boycotted the sessions of the Assembly. John Frum leaders, along with those of allied political organizations on the island, declared themselves independent on 15 February 1980 and proclaimed themselves to be the new nation of Tafea (this an acronym of the first letters of the five southern Vanuatu islands: Tanna, Aniwa, Futuna, Erromanga, Aneityum). They took little action following this decla-

ration until 26 May when Tafea supporters attacked the government offices at Isangel and took prisoner the newly appointed district commissioner, Ruben Tamata, and his deputy. Shortly before this attack, most French officials including the head of the gendarmerie left the island and the inevitable rumors claim that, before doing so, had left keys and full tanks of gas in the French government trucks which the rebels used to transport the kidnapped officials to Tafea headquarters in Middle Bush and to set up roadblocks (Ken Calvert, personal communication).

The following day, 27 May, the government's Joint Mobile Force flew to Tanna, cleared the roads, and proceeded to Tafea headquarters where it engaged the rebels. Tafea supporters attempted to dynamite the Mobile Police but were routed with teargas. The two government officials escaped in the confusion and eventually made their way to safety (*Nabanga* 158, 31 May 1980). The police arrested some twenty people whom they jailed at the government station. Relative calm returned to the island. This lasted several weeks until the John Frum Member of Assembly, Alexis Iolou, convened a meeting of all Tafea supporters at Sulphur Bay. These united into an army and marched the night of 10 June the fifteen miles across the island to Isangel in order to free their arrested compatriots. Although half of the Mobile Police had left Tanna, those remaining were supported by a group of irregulars--Vanuaaku Party members who had gathered to help guard the government station. After talks between Iolou and W. Korisa (the Minister for Social Affairs in the new government who was at Isangel) had failed, someone began shooting. In the darkness, the Tafea army broke rank and disappeared. Near dawn, police discovered the body of Alexis Iolou. He had been shot by two rifles of different calibre and also knocked on the head. Although his death threw the island into a panic--most Vanuaaku Party supporters fled their villages and spent several nights in the bush--independence arrived three weeks later without major incident.

On 27 May, the day following the beginning of the revolt on Tanna, Nagriamel supporters on Santo also attacked the government offices there. Nagriamel, like Tafea, had declared unilateral independence on 11 January (*Nabanga* 141, 12 January 1980) and established a "new nation" called Vemarana, following a similar defeat at the polls. These two secessionist revolts in the north and south of the archipelago were obviously coordinated although all the details of this have yet to emerge.[5] Unlike on

[5]It appears that certain members of the French administration conspired with leaders of the moderate parties meeting in Noumea, New Caledonia, in April in order to plan possible rebel action (Reinhardt 1980).

Tanna, the revolt on Santo was successful. Vermarana supporters kidnapped the government's representative, Job Dalesa, and occupied Santo town. Vanuaaku people fled the island along with most British and Australian citizens who were ordered to leave by their respective governments. Vemarana exercised total control over Santo town for two months. After much negotiation, the British and French governments finally agreed to send troops to Santo. These landed on 26 July to reoccupy Santo town the week before independence. Papua New Guinean troops replaced the joint British and French force on 16 August, and on 31 August, raided Vanafo village, the headquarters of Nagriamel, and arrested the leader of the rebellion, Jimmy Stevens along with ninety of his followers.

Jimmy Stevens had established Nagriamel in the mid-1960s as an organization demanding the reestablishment of *kastom* and the return of alienated, mostly French plantation land (Plant 1977b:35-41). Paradoxically, after making a land deal with the French government, Nagriamel subsequently received much support from French interests. It and the John Frum Movement were the two pillars of the Federal Party in rural areas of the country. Jimmy Stevens served as honorary president of this party.

In 1971, Stevens had also met an American named Michael Oliver. Oliver was in the South Pacific buying land and, after their meeting, became an adviser to Stevens. He financed a number of overseas trips which Stevens made, including one to the United Nations in 1976 where Stevens argued for the independence of Santo under the Nagriamel Federation (Plant 1977a:55). In June 1975, Oliver and a number of other Americans united in despair over the US economy, and in their predictions that the U.S. was headed for totalitarian socialism, founded the Phoenix Foundation. The philosophical underpinnings of this organization derive from the work of the economist Ludwig Von Mises (see Von Mises 1957, for example) and, more recently, from that of John Hospers, a philosopher at the University of Southern California and Libertarian Party presidential candidate in 1972 (St. George 1975:151).

In 1968, Oliver had published a book entitled *A New Constitution for a New Country* and had been involved in unsuccessful attempts to establish his new country on Minerva Reef, north of Tonga in 1972 (Du Bois 1976), and on the island of Abaco in the Bahamas in 1975 (St. George 1975). The *Phoenix Newsletter* of May 1977 warns of an increasing threat to economic freedom and argues, "It is necessary to have counter action. Our new nation project constitutes one such action which must succeed."

Back on Santo, Nagriamel declared independence several times in 1976 (in April and December). Oliver advised Jimmy Stevens in these at-

tempts at independence and told him to go "the free enterprise route and make your central government as small as possible" (Du Bois 1976:70). Reports that Phoenix also offered more substantial assistance--allegedly automatic weapons and ammunition--have been common over the past five years (Plant 1977a). The most recent of these reports surfaced during the Santo rebellion. Nagriamel did receive equipment enabling it to set up an illegal radio station which, in 1980, broadcasted on 3522 KHz as Radio Vemarana. In May 1977, the Phoenix Foundation published a *Na-Griamel Announcement* offering two-hundred year leases on four hectare plots of land in the New Hebrides for US $9,000. The announcement described the Nagriamel Federation as a country without taxes, with free banking, and one in which "you will be left alone, as long as you do not infringe on the rights of others" (Phoenix Foundation 1977a). *A Na-Griamel Federation Constitution* also appeared at this time which guaranteed these rights. Oliver contracted with the Letcher Mint of Lancaster, California, to manufacture one ounce gold and silver coins with Jimmy Stevens' head on the front and a Nagriamel logo on the back underneath the motto "Individual Rights for All." The Phoenix Foundation sold these to its supporters in 1977 for $200 and $25 respectively although some pieces also found their way to Vanuatu both before and during the rebellion.

Phoenix was also interested in the possibilities of the John Frum Movement on Tanna. In 1979, a *Constitution of Tanna Federation*--essentially the same as the earlier Nagriamel version--appeared. Apparently, this was directed more to Phoenix supporters than to John Frum people since it made little impression on Tanna. Nevertheless, Tafea leaders may have expected significant American support when they stormed the government offices acting upon their earlier declaration of independence. When interviewed in Carson City, Nevada, in June 1980, Oliver denied being behind the dual revolts on Santo and Tanna although admitted that "the separatist movement in the New Hebrides island chain was scheduled to be capped June 18 by orderly takeovers on northern and southern islands" (Riley 1980). He also described the newly elected Prime Minister, Walter Lini (who is an Anglican priest) as a "Marxist-Leninist racist bastard of the worse kind," and had previously stated: "I want Jimmy Stevens to become independent" (Dobson 1980:68).

I do not know how much and what type of assistance and encouragement the Phoenix Foundation gave Nagriamel on Santo and John Frum on Tanna. The Vanuatu government certainly assumed that the revolts were assisted by French colons and by rogue Americans. Walter Lini reported several times to the international press that Phoenix was behind the rebellion and that "at least three or four Americans from the Phoenix

Foundation" were in Santo during the revolt (*Contra Costa Times*, 2 June 1980:10). After his capture, Radio Vanuatu reported that "rebel frontman Jimmy Stevens has named the Phoenix Foundation as a source of money to the rebel movement and has blamed foreign influence for the arming of the rebellion" (*Voice of Vanuatu* 41, 6 September 1980). An authority discovered in Vemarana records empowered Stevens and other rebel leaders to draw up to $20,000 a month on an account held in the names of Vemarana Federation and Tafea Federation by the Noumea branch of the Banque de l'Indochine et Suez. Other signatories of the account were Michael Oliver and F. Thomas Eck, principals of the Phoenix Foundation (Reinhardt 1980).

Whatever the actual facts, it is certainly true that John Frum people on Tanna have long expected America to help them achieve material well-being and freedom from the French and British. These expectations, along with the interests and character of the Phoenix Foundation were important calculations in the consideration and planning of their revolt.

After reestablishing its control on Santo, the Vanuatu government set up a number of courts to try the rebels. These courts fined or sentenced to prison those *ni-Vanuatu* found guilty of participating in the revolt. The government also deported a number of French nationals (and local people who carried French citizenship), and, as many people had already fled the country, declared more than a hundred people to be prohibited immigrants (*Voice of Vanuatu*, 7 October 1980). In November, the government also declared Jean-Jacques Robert, the last French Resident Commissioner, to be a prohibited immigrant (Reinhardt 1980).

Jimmy Stevens faced eleven charges (pleading guilty on all but one) which ranged from kidnapping the government's district commissioner, to importing illegal Vemarana passports and copies of the Nagriamel constitution, to operating an illegal radio station (on which he had, on 28 May, urged the Tannese to rebel). After being found guilty on all counts, Justice Cooke, the Chief Justice, sentenced Stevens on 21 November 1980 to fourteen and a half years in jail and to fines totalling 220,000 FNH (about 3,380 US dollars) or to an additional two year and eight months jail time in lieu thereof. In his summation, Cooke noted that Stevens

> was invited to America by some bogus society called the Phoenix Society--was feted there and received legal assistance in the drafting of a Lincolnian Constitution for Nagriamel which included all essentials for a full government.

He also refused to accept the defense counsel's argument that the imported passports and copies of the constitution were actually intended as

tourist souvenirs being merely "the completion of a dream or a fairy tale . . . not really intended for an independent state" (*Voice of Vanuatu* 53, 27 November 1980).

Underlying the rebellion was a convergence of interests and goals of these two Vanuatu organizations and the American Phoenix Foundation. Obvious political attractions link Phoenix and Nagriamel and, to a lesser extent, John Frum. For Phoenix, successful secessionist movements on Santo and Tanna would provide the long-sought new nation and the possibility of enacting the new constitution. In early June, a week after Vemarana's success on Santo, the Phoenix Foundation distributed a prospectus to Europeans in Vila offering shares in a "Vemarana Development Corporation in a way that suggested it will virtually run Santo if the secession should succeed" (Salmon 1980:11). For Vemarana and also for the less-successful Tafea, Phoenix offered several things: a source of monetary and alleged logistic support, an advantage over competing local organizations stemming from these contacts (or "roads" as *ni-Vanuatu* call them) with America and the outside world, and an ideology derived from American libertarianism (Hospers 1971) which demands a very weak and limited central government. Jimmy Stevens and leaders of John Frum, upon losing the elections, insisted that the 1979 constitution be rewritten. They demanded that Vanuatu be a confederacy of islands without a strong federal government (*Nabanga* 153, 11 April 1980:4; *Nabanga* 156, 9 May 1980:3; *Nabanga* 157, 20 May 1980:8). They argued that only Tannese should govern Tanna and that only people from Santo were qualified, by *kastom*, to govern Santo. Here, the political aims of both the Phoenix free enterprisers and Vanuatu cultists ran in tandem.

Finally, the fact that Phoenix members are mostly American is an added attraction." Perhaps John Frum's predictions were at last coming true. When asked by a reporter for the French newspaper *Nabanga* if he feared that the Americans he was inviting to install themselves on Santo would completely transform the island and its culture, Jimmy Stevens replied:

> I say this squarely, I am not afraid. Since I do not fear the English or French, I do not fear the Americans. I know the Americans; I worked here with their parents in the 1940s. They can return and help us (*Nabanga* 157, 20 May 1980).

[6]Any American group may be welcomed, given the facts of historical and symbolic circumstance, by disaffected *ni-Vanuatu*. Most US groups, however, do not share Phoenix's goal of establishing a redesigned type of state organization on small islands.

Besides these shared political interests--John Frum and Nagriamel looking for support in their dispute with the newly elected government and Phoenix searching for unencumbered land on which to establish its new world--there are a number of cultural similarities and interpretive structures shared by members of the interacting groups. Anthropologists have frequently pointed out parallels in the economic behavior and concerns of both Melanesians and Americans. They have described Melanesians as primitive capitalists (Pospisil 1963:3) and (although this is an admitted caricature), "thoroughly bourgeois, so reminiscent of the free enterprising rugged individual of our own heritage" (Sahlins 1963:289)--men greatly interested in controlling others by controlling the production and exchange of material goods and knowledge.

If Melanesians are free-enterprising, primitive capitalists, are Americans free-enterprising sophisticated cultists? There are other, more subtle similiarities between the two cultures which might be adduced. These involve notions of the individual, of human ontology, of freedom and dignity, of the nature and scope of society, and of the means by which society may be changed and improved. Of course, none of these cultural similarities are exact. Most exist only on a superficial level. The fact that they do exist, however, can explain the ease of communication between Vanuatu and American cultists and the discovery by those involved of shared interests and goals. Even a superficial, surface-level similarity in one's approach to the world allows Americans and *ni-Vanuatu* to agree on bounded, simple goals and the means by which these might be achieved although each side fundamentally misunderstands the totality of expectation and real concerns of the other. These cultural similarities perhaps become especially apparent and notable as they are manifested in concentrated and extreme form in political fringe groups such as John Frum, Nagriamel, and Phoenix.

A notable component of both cultures is a stress on the importance of the individual, although this is an individual within society. Read, who worked in the New Guinea Highlands, writes of the Melanesian person:

> a highly developed feeling and regard for the "lower" psychic-physical self, the ideosyncratic "me" is clearly evident in a wide range of characteristic behavior . . . the desire to dominate, to stand out from one's fellows, to receive their submission and their adoration is characteristic . . . (1955:273).

A successful man is one who

> can to a certain degree manipulate public opinion and if necessary defer to it without relinquishing his control of his individ-

> uality, a man who is insightful and aware of group needs (Read 1959:427).

Similarly, the successful man in Vanuatu (as are Jimmy Stevens and the John Frum leaders) is one whose name becomes known; a man who, because of his knowledge, his ability, and his links with others, stands out. He does not stand alone, however, but stands as a leader of some group of followers. A man is successful to the extent that others agree he is so.

The idea of the individual is also an important theme within American culture--although there is more stress on the notion of autonomy and less on the necessity of followers. In Melanesia, to paraphrase Henley, a man is only captain of his soul if he has passengers on board. In America, on the other hand, there exists a notion of antisocial individuality and those people recognized as playing this role earn a peculiar sort of respect and prestige. A person can legitimately act according to his reading of some higher set of moral rules, even if his actions infuriate or threaten others around him. As Michael Oliver puts it: “Each of us according to his own conscious and beliefs must control his own actions” (Du Bois 1976:21).

A related notion, shared by members of both the Melanesian and American organizations, is that capable individuals can change or make history. Von Mises, the Phoenix ideologist, argues a “great man” interpretaton of history against any theory of ineluctable destiny or historical laws of change. He writes:

> Only individuals think and act . . . What produces change is new ideas and actions guided by them . . . These innovations are not accomplished by a group mind; they are always the achievements of individuals . . . It is always an individual who starts a new method of doing things, and then other people imitate his example. Customs and fashions have always been inaugurated by individuals and spread through imitation by other people (1957: 191-192).

Although Tannese may not phrase their notions of social change in exactly these words, they too recognize that men create history by purposely altering social configurations. Groups, whether these are based on cognatic or unilineal descent, on kindreds, on residence, or on some end people gather to accomplish, are contingent, surviving at the pleasure of individuals. If dispute occurs, people quit, move away, and join or form other groups. Sometimes a person destroys what has been; sometimes he builds anew. By conceiving some idea and acting upon it, people reshape their society. Men trace the emergence of a new moiety system, which developed within historical time, to four men. I witnessed the birth of

several new villages--new residence groups founded by men with ideas. The new village built as Tafea headquarters in Middle Bush on Tanna is another example of the malleability of social form. In both America and Vanuatu, individual efforts change the structure of society. Phoenix members expect to succeed in establishing a new country. Vemarana and Tafea expect to establish a confederacy in Vanuatu. By dancing and following John's word, John Frum adherents expect to establish a new Tanna.

A third notion shared by actors in the two cultures is that of the importance of success in the economic realm in the evaluation of personal honor and dignity. Americans have welfare cheats; Melanesians their "rubbish men"--these denigrating appellations reserved for those people who fail as economic actors and partially opt out of the exchange system. Both welfare cheats and rubbish men receive without being able to give; they take but do not repay. Brunton (1971) has argued that cargo cults in Melanesia are political attempts to cope with disruptions in traditonal exchange systems. One such disruption occurs when new wealth objects--such as European money-that are uncontrollable by the people who use and desire them--enter into an economic system. Writing of the introduction of money at Mt. Hagen, New Guinea, Strathern notes the people there

> did not, however, understand its true source, and therefore they did not properly control it. Indeed, this perception was accurate: they could not fix rates of exchange for goods they sold and were dependent on the mystery of the "world market." The Red Box cult clearly expressed a desire for inordinate amounts of cash, to make Hageners equal if not superior to Europeans, and also a wish to know money's true origins and so to manage its supply for themselves (1979:96; see also Burridge 1969:41-46).

I have made the same point above with regard to the modernization of the John Frum ideology. What people on Tanna want is knowledge which would allow them to manufacture and thereby control the economic goods (including cash) they now must obtain from European sources. The sudden appearance of gold and silver coins bearing Jimmy Stevens' likeness must have been a convincing argument for Phoenix's power.

Brunton's theory--that cults arise in times of disruption in the economic system--seems also applicable outside Melanesia. The existence of the Phoenix Foundation in the US is predicated on fears of the breakdown of the American economy. Its newsletter of May 1977 contains a litany of dire warnings:

> phony environmental issue . . . dire energy crises . . . breakup or outright nationalization of most industries . . . anti-free enterprise news media . . . more and more inflation . . . government controls increase . . . each month, more people come under communist domination . . . the viability of the western nations' structure is becoming more untenable.

The emergence of Phoenix--whose name itself suggests millenarian rebirth through fire--and the emergence of Melanesian cargo cults such as John Frum also interested in salvation through wealth are responses to the same sorts of economic concerns.

The loss of control by Melanesians and Americans over their own wealth and over the choice of how this wealth is obtained, managed, and exchanged threatens their dignity and sense of personal worth. Cults, such as John Frum on Tanna or Phoenix in America, aim to reconstitute dignity by recapturing control of exchange systems and wealth objects from either the Europeans or the overblown American government, whatever the case may be. Cult ideology stresses a reformulation of the economic system in order to reformulate human nature. Relative success in economic exchange is the measure of man but, more importantly, the particular type of exchange system involved constitutes his nature.

Both groups share an idea that the planned, reconstituted society and economy will forward the betterment of all. Although John Frum cargo ideology and also that of Nagriamel (Hours 1974) have become modernized and sophisticated to a great extent, people are still interested in obtaining material goods and material knowledge. When John Frum returns from America, these goods and this knowledge will be enjoyed by all loyal cult supporters. Likewise, if free enterprise and libertarian principles could truly be put into effect, the lives of all citizens would improve. Only the deserving poor would be left in an "unfettered economy" (Hospers 1977) as a free market system would insure less unemployment, greater productivity and more material goods, and satisfaction for all. Only when the tyranny of government is abolished will individuals enjoy true economic freedom and experience real human liberty.

Finally, in the design of future new nations, John Frum, Nagriamel, and Phoenix all hearken back to a more perfect past. Each perceives its actions as guided by a body of inviolable law: *Kastom* on the one hand, free enterprise on the other. The historicity of these moral systems is to a great extent myth, the ethics being continuously revised to address current interests and problems. John Frum and Nagriamel leaders both stress the importance of upholding and maintaining *kastom*. Jimmy Stevens argues:

> one of the other areas of disagreement between the two parties is respect for the culture and the tribal customs of the people. The National Party [Vanuaaku Party] pays only lip service to these customs while the Nagriamel has made the respect for them a basic part of its party's philosophy (Plant 1977b:40).

Cultists use their ideas of true *kastom* to justify and legitimate political action including the recent secessionist revolts (*Nasiko,* 28 February 1980).

The Phoenix Foundation also looks to a more perfect past when the economy was unfettered, when there was no income tax, when powers of government did not overly impose on the individual. Hospers argues:

> the idea of having a free enterprise republic, however small [such as Vemarana or Tafea] could be a signal beacon, reminding people of the potential which existed in the US more than 200 years ago (Du Bois 1976:69).

These two charter myths, *kastom* and free enterprise, serve both as political ideology in the respective organizations and provide guidelines for the establishment of a more perfect future.

Would the revolt in Vanuatu and the association of these Vanuatu and American organizations have been so successful if shared cultural styles of perception and interpretation did not exist? This is, of course, impossible to positively answer. I have suggested, however, that these thematic cultural harmonics did strike notes which resonated in the heads of rebels of both cultures. It seems particularly appropriate that an American movement, coming out of the acknowledged spiritual home of cargo and materialism, should find support in Melanesia. Vemarana and Tafea, willing even to have their constitutions written by Phoenix, recognized in these Americans (as they had recognized in the American soldiers of a generation before) a knowledge of the importance of exchanging goods: a people who really know how to handle cargo.

The secessionist attempts have failed and the properly elected Vanuatu government is back in control. John Frum members on Tanna may once again withdraw from national politics--as they threatened to do in 1979--to cultivate both their gardens and their expectations of America's imminent arrival. The failure of America (in the guise of Phoenix) this time around will not destroy the cult. John Frum survives not only because its ideology addresses concerns people find serious, but because the group is a strong competitor in the island's political arena. A symbolic affiliation with America serves as an ideological boundary marker differen-

tiating John Frum people from other Tannese. As long as the idea of America symbolizes this local political distinctiveness, an answer to economic desires, and a solution to economic inequality (a problem perhaps insoluble in a ministate such as is Vanuatu), the Tannese will continue to dream upon John Frum and his friends, the Americans.

Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley

LITERATURE CITED

Barrow, G. L.
1952 "The Story of JonFrum," unpublished report to the Western Pacific High Commission.

Burridge, K. O.
1969 *New Heaven, New Earth.* New York: Shocken Books.

Brunton, R.
1971 "Cargo Cults and Systems of Exchange in Melanesia," *Mankind* 8:115-128.

Campbell, M. H.
1974 "A Century of Presbyterian Mission Education in the New Hebrides: Presbyterian Mission Educational Enterprises and their Relevance to the Needs of a Changing Society, 1848-1948," unpublished Masters Thesis, University of Melbourne.

Contra Costa Times. Walnut Creek, California.

Dobson, C.
1980 "Independence--And Paradise Lost?," *Now* (29 February 1980) 67-69.

Du Bois, P.
1976 "Another Utopia? Limited Government Arises from the Ashes in the New Hebrides," *Barrons* 56:9, 21-22, 69-70.

Fischer, H.
1964 "Cargo-Kulte und die 'Amerikaner'," *Sociologus* 14(1):17-30.

Geslin, Y.
1956 "Les Américains aux Nouvelles-Hébrides," *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* 12:245-286.

Guiart, J.
1956 *Un Siècle et Demi de Contacts Culturels à Tanna.* Paris: Museé de l'Homme.

Heinl, R. D.
1944 "Palms and Planes in the New Hebrides," *National Geographic* 86:229-256.

Hospers, J.
1971 *Libertarianism: A Political Philosophy for Tomorrow*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing.

1977 "Getting From Here to There," *Reason* 8(10):24-29.

Hours, B.
1974 "Un Mouvement Politico-Religieux Néo-Hébridais: Le Nagriamel," *Cahiers ORSTOM, séries Science Humaines* 11:227-242.

Lindstrom, M.
1979 "Americans on Tanna: An Essay from the Field," *Canberra Anthropology* 2(2):37-46.

1980 "Spitting on Tanna," *Oceania* 50:228-234.

1981 (in press) "Bigman or Chief? Knowledge in Political Process on Tanna," *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers* 57/58.

Marsh, D.
1968 "The Surprising Gospels of John Frum: He Who Swept Sin Away," *Pacific Islands Monthly* (October):83-90.

Miller, G.
1948 "Naked Cult in Central West Santo," *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 57:330-341.

Nabanga: Hebdomadaire d'Information. Port Vila, New Hebrides.

Nasiko. Port Vila, New Hebrides.

Oliver, M.
1968 *A New Constitution for a New Country* [Revised Edition]. Reno: Fine Arts Press.

O'Reilly, P.
1949 "Prophetisme aux Nouvelles-Hérides: Le Movement JonFrum à Tanna," *Le Monde Non Chrétien*, new series 10:192-208.

Phoenix Foundation
1977a *Phoenix Newsletter* (May). Amsterdam.

1977b *Na-Griamel Announcement: Confidential-Private-Not for Circulation or Publication* (May). Amsterdam.

1979(?) *Constitution of Tanna Federation.* [unknown place of publication].

Plant, C.
1977a "The Nagriamel Federation: New Country, Old Story," *Pacific Perspective* 6:49-57.

1977b *New Hebrides: The Road to Independence.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

Pospisil, L.
1963 *The Kapauku Papuans of West New Guinea.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Priday, H.
1950 "JonFrum is New Hebridean Cargo Cult," *Pacific Islands Monthly* (January):67-70; (February):59-64.

Quarterly Jottings From the New Hebrides. South Sea Islands (issued by the John G. Paton mission fund for the Evangelization of the Remaining Cannibals on these Islands).

Read, K. E.
1955 "Morality and the Concept of Person Among the Gahukn-Gama," *Oceania* 25:223-283.

1959 "Leadership and Consensus in a New Guinea Society," *American Anthropologist* 61:425-436.

Reinhardt, D.
1980 "Island Ban on French Diplomat," *Sunday Times* (London), 23 November 1980.

Rentoul, A.
1949 "John Frum of the New Hebrides Movement," (letter), *Pacific Islands Monthly* (January):31.

Rice, E.
1974 *John Frum He Come.* New York: Doubleday & Co.

Riley, B.
1980 "The Taking of a South Pacific Island: Carson City Man Tells of his Role in Separatist Action," *Reno Evening Gazette* (30 May):1, 5.

Sahlins, M.
1963 "Poor Man, Rich Man, Big-Man, Chief: Political Types in Melanesia and Polynesia," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5:285-303.

Salmon, M.
1980 "Hebrides: A Sorely Troubled Run-Up to Freedom," *Pacific Islands Monthly* 51(7):10-11.

St. George, A.
1975 "The Amazing New-Country Caper," *Esquire* (February):60-64, 151-154.

Strathern, A.
1979 "The Red Box Money Cult in Mount Hagen, 1968-71," *Oceania* 50:88-102.

Voice of Vanuatu. Port Vila, Vanuatu.

Von Mises, L.
1957 *Theory and History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Worsley, P.
1968 *The Trumpet Shall Sound.* New York: Shocken Books.

THE MEANING OF *KO* IN NEW ZEALAND MAORI

by D. Cleve Barlow

In very general terms *ko* can be described as a multi-functional particle in the Maori language of New Zealand. This rather vague definition naturally implies that *ko* is to be discovered in a variety of environments; and as a further consequence of its multi-functional role, it has been attributed several semantic interpretations. These conclusions are validated through studies of Maori made by eminent scholars over the past 150 years.

The first formal study of the Maori language was made around 1815 by a European missionary linguist, Thomas Kendall. Since then, several more grammatical analyses have appeared ranging from prescriptive traditional grammars to modern American descriptive and structuralist approaches including immediate constituent analysis and transformational generative grammar. While on the one hand it cannot be denied that much fruitful understanding can be gleaned from the above studies, there still remain a number of areas requiring more thorough research using approaches from different theoretical viewpoints. This present study, however modest it may be, is an attempt to add a further dimension to the study and understanding of Maori. One can approach the study of language from two broad structural bases: (1) the paradigmatic or substitutional axis where *meaning* resides; and (2) the syntagmatic or combinational axis where *order* is determined. Ideally, the paradigm should be studied first (or at least simultaneously with the syntagm) since the paradigm predicts (to a large degree) the syntagm. Although this semantic analysis will be restricted to a single particle, *ko* in Maori, the author is confident that the theoretical model adopted and the procedural techniques have significant implication for valuable application in other areas of language study.

To date, the most authoritative reference available on word definitions of New Zealand Maori is William's *Dictionary of the Maori Language* (1971) which assigns the following meanings (p. 121) to *ko:*

(A) Particle: used in conjunction with proper names, pronouns and common nouns preceded by a definitive:

1. For emphasis, and as a predication indicator:

Ko *taku potiki, te tangata nei.* 'This person is my last born.'

2. A subject marker to which our attention is to be directed:

Ko *Maketu pa, e tu kau ana.* 'Maketu fortress is still standing.'

3. To specify a previous generalization:
   Tera ano tetahi pa nui onamata, ***ko*** *Maunga-whau.* 'That was one of the great fortresses in bygone days, i.e. Maunga-whau.'
4. To show plurality of individuals:
   Ko *Rau-ka-tauri, ratou* ***ko*** *Raukatamea,* ***ko*** *Itiiti,* ***Ko*** *Rekareka.* 'They, Raukatauri, Raukatamea, Itiiti and Rekareka.'

(B) Preposition: of place with reference to future time:

1. To. *Whiti atu* ***ko*** *te motu i Makoia.* 'Cross over to the island of Mokoia.'
2. At. ***Ko*** *reira au tu ai, kia tae ake ano koe.* 'I will be at that spot when you arrive.'

In addition to the above situations, K. T. Harawira in *Teach Yourself Maori* (1974:40), lists these further uses of *ko:*

1. With interrogatives *wai* or *hea:*
   Ko *wai tenei tangata?* 'Who is this man?'
   Ko *hea tena wahi?* 'What is (the name of) this place?'
2. Local noun: *ko*--yonder place:
   (a) *Haere ki* ***ko!*** 'Go to yonder place!'
   (b) *Kei* ***ko*** *nga tangata.* 'The people are over there.'

These contextual usages of *ko* are by no means considered to be a completely exhaustive representation of all the possible contexts in which *ko* might occur. I dare say that if anyone cared to make a thorough investigation of the language, other situations with *ko* could be proposed, and futhermore, other uses (contexts) could possibly be created in the future. Although not specifically stated in the literature I have studied on this subject, I have realized two other legitimate functions of *ko*--its direct use with particular time adverbials and adjectives like:

1. ***Ko*** *hea* (when) *te hui o nga apiha?* 'When is the meeting of the officers?'
2. ***Ko*** *apopo te hui o nga apiha.* 'The meeting of the officers will be tomorrow.'
3. *E pehea ana te whare?* 'How is (the condition) of the home?'
4. ***Ko*** *ma te whare.* 'The house is clean.'

Needless to say, some of the various uses of *ko* have not been presented without contradiction and some controversy in academic debate (verbally,

or in print). Most authors of Maori grammars have claimed that Maori lacks the equivalent of the verb "to be" as in English (Hararawira 1974:40, Maunsell 1894), but H. M. Stowell (1911:243, 244) definitely refutes especially Maunsell's remarks touching "the want of a verb substantive" in the Maori language.

However, for the purposes of this investigation, the foregoing explication of *ko* is sufficient to make this general observation: that the traditional approach of semantic inquiry (into Maori) has been to look at the language from an atomistic perspective. That is to say that grammarians have "merely categorised and recategorised the various uses" (7:2, 3) of *ko.* With such an approach, the possibility for contextual variants is infinite; and, therefore, with each new context, a particular linguistic form, like *ko,* will add a further degree of specificity to each new contextual meaning. The value of this type of linguistic analysis is viewed critically by Linda Waugh (1976:54) where she states: "An atomistic methodology will always fall short of discerning the structure of language, since *atomism* is not one of the defining characteristics of language." What then, is the alternative to this seemingly narrow consideration of language?

Two major motivating factors underlie the research on this thesis: (1) the apparent contradiction I have found (in some instances) as to the meaning of *ko;* and (2) the postulate made by Roman Jakobson that every linguistic form has a *general invariant meaning.* Accordingly, Jakobson (1966) maintains that a sign necessarily exists as a perceptible phenomenon, signans (form) in symbolic relationship to an interpretable counterpart, signatum (value)--one cannot exist without the other. A semantic value (signatum) can only exist in the mind, consequently, there can be no meaning or interpretation without the coexistence of a signans. Jakobson (5:52, 53) further states "any symbol is endowed with a general meaning, and the general meaning, of any symbol, or any verbal symbol, has a generic character. Any further segmentation and individuation of a symbol is determined by its context." The general meaning is the common denominator to all its uses; more specific meaning is determined by context.

For those unfamiliar with this perspective of language analysis, perhaps a simply analogy will serve to enlighten the basic tenets of this theory. If we take ordinary water (H_2O) and expose it to a number of different environments, we can come up with these results:

1. Water in a tap, river or ocean (all above 0° C) = liquid (running water)
2. Boiling water (above 100° C) = steam
3. Water in a freezer (below 0° C) = ice

Now in each of these contexts, water has more specific "meaning;" for one thing, it exists in different states: liquid, vapor, and solid. But the common denominator (general meaning) in all situations is the matter constitution of water, two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen (H_2O). No matter what form water takes (dew, frost, snow, hail, steam, ice, etc.), it is basically H_2O; otherwise, without this combination of hydrogen and oxygen, it could not possibly be water. In relation again to our previous discussion concerning *atomization* in language, Jacobson (5:53) claims that, "The disavowal of general meaning" results in the dissolution of "the relation between sign and meaning." Taking our water analogy one step further, should there be a disruption of the molecular bond between the elements of hydrogen and oxygen in the water molecule two separate identities are created. It will be a difficult task indeed to recognize water as either hydrogen or oxygen in their isolated independent states:

H_2O (water) = H_2 (gas) + O (gas).

At best, we can only visualize the possibility of water being created, and this is perceived only by those who understand the processes of chemical synthesis.

Here then lies the impetus for the main thrust of this paper: to test the hypothesis that the morpheme *ko* has a general invariant meaning that is ever present in all its legitimate uses.

In his treatise on the Russian case system, Roman Jakobson develops the following semantic conceptual features: a) marginality (restrictedness); b) directionality (extension); and c) quantification (objectiveness).[1] Any linguistic form described as having the feature *objectiveness* infers that the "referants are related to the narrated situation independently of any neighborhood," also "objectiveness means that the perceptibility of the referent is potentially maximally distant from the act of perception" (1:4, 6). Now, without dogmatically imposing the objectiveness feature on this analysis, but rather to employ it here as a convenient guideline in deriving the meaning of *ko,* we discover that *ko* is endowed with the features of objectiveness. A more explicit distinction attributable to the meaning of *ko,* however, is encompassed within the following definition: the coexistence of *ko* with other parts of speech serves to create a relationship of complete autonomy (independent existence) even though at times the relationship is projected out of the immediate narration event

[1]C. H. van Schooneveld (1977) when elaborating upon Jakobson's conceptual semantic features uses parallel terms, viz. restrictedness = marginality; extension = directionality; and objectiveness = quantification.

(as with specified future time and location). Simply put, *ko* identifies a particular thing, person, place, time, attribute, or action which can then either exist in a narrated event alone, or be further 'modified by the narrated event according to the following formulation (examples included):

I. (premodification) *ko* + *substantive* (postmodification), or
II. (Pr-M) *ko* + *substantive* (Ps-M)
   a. ***Ko*** *wai, tena?* (Ps-M) 'Who is that?'
   b. ***Ko*** *Hemi.* (Alone) 'It is Hemi.'
   c. *Kua mate te toa,* ***ko*** *Hemi.* (Pr-M) 'Hemi, the hero, has died.'
   d. ***Ko*** *hea, koe?* (Ps-M) 'Where will you be?'
   e. ***Ko*** *runga,* ***ko*** *te maunga* (Two independent units). 'On top of the mountain.'

Thus having defined *ko,* the remainder of this research will be devoted to the justification of the position that *ko* ascribes unrestricted autonomy to the substantive it modifies such that a phrase initiated by *ko* can either exist by itself or anywhere in a string of discourse. It forms the most basic and complete kernel sentence (utterance) in Maori.

The paramount direction of this semantic analysis will focus on paradigmatic oppositions exploiting *ko* and other particles in relation to their contextual functions. Much of the meaning and the operational parameters of the particles can best be exhibited and understood in contrast with other particles which can either substitute in a given paradigm, or have no grammatical function within the given paradigm. Therefore the use of minimal pairs will figure prominently in this investigation and analysis.

Five general categories of contextual variants of *ko* will be discussed, including: (1) *ko* as a particle of specification of subjects, objects, and in apposition, etc.; (2) *ko* as a preposition; (3) *ko* in conjunction with specific adverbs and *adjectives;* (4) *ko* itself, as a local noun; and finally, (5) *ko* in predication. This classification does not mean that I concur with all or any of the above interpretations, but rather it is merely a convenient grouping to facilitate the organization of the various aspects of the ensuing discussion to be covered.

1. Ko as a Particle of Specification

Perhaps the most understood meaning of *ko* is its use as a particle of identification and specification. *Ko* emphasizes the following substantive. Normal Maori sentence topology is represented: verb, subject, object (VSO), but *ko* can serve the function of prefocusing a subject to clause or sentence initial position.

1. *E haere ana,* (pred.) *a Pita* (subj.) 'Peter is going.'
*2. ***Ko*** *a Pita, e haere ana.* 'Peter is going.'
3. ***Ko*** *Pita, e haere ana.* 'Peter is going.'
4. *E haere ana,* ***ko*** *Pita.* 'Peter is going.'
5. *Pita, e haere ana.* 'Peter is going.'

Sentence 1 exhibits the normal pattern of Maori sentence word order (unmarked); in sentence 2 and 3, *ko* is the initiator of the sentence followed by *Pita.* The use of the proper article *a* in 1 indicates that *Pita* is dependent upon the proper article *a* for its grammatical function as subject of the sentence without any special emphasis. When preceded by *ko,* a phrase, like ***ko*** *Pita,* becomes an autonomous independent unit and is free to exist anywhere in a string of discourse. When *ko* is used with a proper name, it becomes obligatory that the proper article *a* be excluded. This is why 2 is incorrect. With simple declarative statements as in 3, if the subject is to be emphasized, it invariably takes up sentence initial position preceded by *ko.* This becomes an index that forces us to direct our attention to the first part of the sentence; the marked presence of *ko* violates the norm (VSO) where the subject has been projected out of its usual environment. However, 4 becomes a highly likely situation when both the predicate and the subject are marked for equal emphasis. A grammatical form in Maori requires that when a proper noun, a pronoun, or common noun preceded by a definitive occupies sentence or clause initial position, it must necessarily be prefixed by *ko* (Biggs 1969:25); 5 is invalidated by this rule. Sometimes in rapid speech, ellipsis inadvertently takes place where the enunciation of *ko* is omitted. This phenomenon is apparently more prevalent when *ko* is followed by a definitised nominal as in:

6. ***(ko)*** *te kurii, e auau ana.* 'The dog is barking.'

The use of *ko* with common nouns is governed by the condition that the noun must be premodified by one of the definitive articles. *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1976) defines the term definitive as: 1. Precisely defining or outlining; explicit, and 2. Determining finally; conclusive; decisive. Here the usage of definitive is equivalent to definite, that which restricts or particularizes a noun or noun phrase following it. Under no circumstances will *ko* occur with the indefinite article, *he* (= a, an, some).

7. *E mahi ana,* (pred.) *he tangata* (subj.). 'A man is working.'
*8. ***Ko*** *he tangata, e mahi ana.* 'A man is working.'

But 9 and 10 are legitimate. It seems that *he* has the same type of mobility with regard to its use in the subject or object or predicate of a sentence in that it can occupy prepredicate, postpredicate, or intrapredicate position depending on what function of the sentence is being emphasized.

9. *E mahi ana,* (pred.) *he tangata.* (subj.) 'A man is working.'
10. *He tangata, e mahi ana.* 'A man is working.'
11. *E auau ana,* (pred.) *te kurii.* (subj.) 'The dog is barking.'
*12. ***Ko*** *kurii, e auau ana.* 'The dog is barking.'
13. ***Ko*** *te kurii, e auau ana.* 'The dog is barking.'

In 12 there is no obligatory definitive between *ko* and *kurii* (dog = common noun). The requirement has been satisfied in 13 where the definitive article *te* (the) has been inserted. Any one of a number of possible definitive articles (singular or plural) can be substituted for *te;* the paradigm includes: *taku/aku* = my; *tau/au* = your; *tona/ona* = his/her; *tenei/enei* = this/these, etc.

A similar situation arises where *ko* is used with numerals; the numeral must be preceded by the definitive article *te* (= the, singular) being peculiar to its use with ordinal numbers:

14. ***Ko*** *tehea, te kurii pai?* 'Which is the good dog?'
15. ***Ko*** *te rua o nga kurii te mea pai.* 'The second one of the dogs is the good one.'

Where a common noun, for example, a tree, is identified by a given name, the definitive curb does not apply, and *ko* can be directly associated with the given name. Presently standing in the Waipoua forest of New Zealand is one of the largest living specimens of vegetation in the entire world; it has been appropriately named *Tane Mahuta* (Lord of the Forest). With respect to the above rule, no definitive is required and *Tane Mahuta* will be found in free association with *ko:*

16. *He Atua,* (pred.) *a Tane Mahuta.* (subj.) 'Tane Mahuta is a god.'
17. ***Ko*** *Tane Mahuta, he Atua.* 'Tane Mahuta is a god.'

Ko is always used with the interrogatives *wai* (who, what) and *hea* (where, what--signifying: what name?). Here *ko* functions to single out a particular person or thing from an undefined corpus of people, names, or places and gives recognition of specific individuality.

18. ***Ko*** *wai,* (pred.) *tenei kotiro?* 'Who is this girl?'
19. ***Ko*** *Hera, tenei kotiro.* 'This girl is Sarah.' (identified)

Out of all the possible names (identities) that are unknown to the questioner, the one that distinguishes this girl from the rest is Sarah. The same reasoning underlies this next example:

20. ***Ko*** *hea,* (pred.) *tenei wahi?* (subj.) 'What is the name of this place?'
21. ***Ko*** *Utaa, tenei wahi.* 'This place is Utah.'

It has been proposed that *ko* can highlight any functional unit within a sentence. Besides the subject, predication (including the action and the direct object) can receive the focus of attention. Here is an incidence where the object is prefocused following a quesion--the answer (the nominal accusative) is given first.

22. *He aha koe, i mahara ai?* 'What did you remember?'
23. ***Ko*** *te ahi, i mahara ai ahau.* 'I remembered the fire.'

An equivalence (appositional) relationship is often expressed with *ko.* When a sentence contains a composite subject of which the same thing is affirmed, *ko* will be prefixed to both.

24. ***Ko*** *te aroha, ko te whakapono, he taonga nui.* 'Love and faith are great principles.'
25. ***Ko*** *taku tamaiti,* ***ko*** *Wiremu, te toa.* 'My son, William, is the champion.'
26. ***Ko*** *Ihu te Karaiti,* ***ko*** *ia, te kaihoko o te Ao.* 'Jesus the Christ, he (emphasized) is the Redeemer of the World.'

In connection with these usages, *ko* also specifies what has been previously alluded to in a more general way.

27. *Ka kata nga tangata,* ***ko*** *nga Wairangi.* 'Then the people laughed,' i.e. the foolish ones.
28. ***Ko*** *toku whare,* ***ko*** *tera e tu mai ra.* 'My house is that particular one standing over there.'

Thus far we have encountered situations where *ko* normally precedes the predicate, but this is not always the case as is borne out in examples 29 through 32. These three further contexts can account for the use of *ko:* a) in lively narrative 29; b) in personative locutions (30) and c) in interjectory speech (31-32).

29. *Katahi ka oma mai,* ***ko*** *te whurupeke.* 'Suddenly the fullback burst through.'

No distinction is made between the action and the actor in the above sentence 29. Both action and actor attract attention, but because *ko* cannot coexist with the verb,[2] it is omitted. The fullback is identified first out of all the players as the one responsible for the spectacular action.

30. *E tu ana, a Wiremu raua* ***ko*** *Hemi.* 'Both William and James are standing.'

When enumerating two or more persons the dual 30 and plural pronouns are used with *ko:*

Ko *Pita raua* ***ko*** *Mere.* "Both Peter and Mary.'
Ko *tatou* ***ko*** *Pita,* ***ko*** *koe,* ***ko*** *au.* 'All of us, Peter, you and I.'
Ko *kaoutou ma.* 'All of you (3 or more.)'
E mahi ana, a Pita raua ***ko*** *Hone.* 'Peter and John are both working.'

Again with greetings and salutations, *ko* specifies more directly the person being addressed:

31. *Tena ra* ***ko*** *koe, e Pita.* 'Greetings to you, Peter.'

And in responding with acknowledgment and recognition:

32. *A,* ***ko*** *koe tena, e Haki.* 'Oh! Jack, it is you.'

All of the above contexts demonstrate that *ko* initiated phrases are self-governing domains empowered to stand independent of all other neighborhoods in a text of narration and thereby forming a grammatical unit. At the same time, it has dynamic options being able to exist anywhere in an extended piece of narration (refer to formula).

2. Ko as a Preposition

Prepositional uses of *ko* with reference to direction, place, and time (adverbial) are concerned with future time only. Direction is illustrated by *ko* (to) towards a goal that is riot yet realized, or the motion towards said goal is not yet undertaken. Here the particular aspect that objectiveness signifies is that the referent is "potentially maximally distant from the act of perception." The referent (place, time, location) is perceived to be outside or beyond (future as well) the present narration event and normally involves a situation yet to be realized. *Ko* (to) seems to identify the place to which a person will be travelling, and *ko* (at) the realized destination (both really amounting to one and the same thing).

[2]This point will be fully amplified in section 5, *Ko* as a Predicating Particle.

33. ***Ko*** *hea koe, e haere ai?* 'Where are you going to (what place)?
34. *E haere ana, ahau,* ***ko*** *Rotoiti.* 'I am going to Rotoiti.'

33 is asking what particular place a person will be going to; and 34 specifies that destination as being Rotoiti. Looking at the situation with respect to other prepositions, the function of *ko* as a preposition is more clearly perceived:

35. *E haere ana ahau,* ***ko*** *Rotoiti.* 'I am going *to* Rotoiti (specific place).'
36. *E haere ana, ahau* ***ki*** *Rotoiti.* 'I am going *to* Rotoiti.'
37. *E haere ana ahau,* ***i*** *Rotoiti.* 'I am going *from* Rotoiti.'
*38. *E haere ana ahau,* ***hei*** *Rotoiti.* 'I am going (travelling) *to be* at Rotoiti.'

Sentence 35 again determines the place of my going by using *ko* to single out Rotoiti. I feel that *ko* is not really a preposition as defined in English, but as with all our discussion thus far, *ko* gives the following substantive singleness of identity and independent existence, separating out from the unknown an independent autonomous unit.

In designating a future location, *ko* (at) is the proper prepositional particle according to traditional grammarians.

39. ***Ko*** *hea koe tatari ai?* 'Where will you wait at?'
40. ***Ko*** *reira au tatari ai.* 'I will wait there (at that place).'

Ko is used freely with locatives in denoting a specified future location: *runga*--on; *raro*--under; *muri*--behind; *mua*--in front of, etc., and with place names like Rotorna, America, and Honolulu.

41. ***Ko*** *Honolulu te hui apopo.* 'Tomorrow the meeting will be at Honolulu.'
42. ***Ko*** *runga, a Hone e waita ana.* 'John will sing on top.'
43. ***Kei*** *runga a Hone, e waiata ana.* 'John is singing on top.'
44. ***I*** *runga a Hone, e waiata ana.* 'John was singing on top.'
45. ***Hei*** *runga a Hone, e waiata ana.* 'John is to be singing at the top.'

The relative time elements (tense) in Maori sentences is not determined by *ko* (will be, is, was, were, etc.) as some have suggested. Instead, other time indices determine past, present, and future tense (*apopo*--tomorrow, *inanahi*--yesterday, *aianei*--now). If there is no contextual evidence as to the time of the action indicated in a sentence, it is presumed to be in the present (*ko Pita, he tangata*--Peter is a man).

3. Ko with Time Adverbials and Adjectives

After much searching, I have only been able to come up with one time adverbial (*apopo*--tomorrow) that can directly coexist with *ko* and which specifically indicates time in the future when some action or event is to take place. The accepted translation for the use of *ko* here is "will be."

48. ***Ko*** *apopo te hui o nga apiha.* 'Tomorrow will be the meeting of the officers.'

Such a unique usage of *ko* serves to further substantiate my claim that *ko* in its true sense means objectiveness in that it coexists with time adverbials which specify future time. All other time adverbials must be used with a definitive to be associated with *ko.*

49. ***Ko*** *nga ra kei te heke mai nei, he wa pakeke.* 'The days to come will be hard times.'
*50. *E hui ana tatou,* ***ko*** *ahiahi nei.* 'We will be meeting this evening.'
51. *E hui ana tatou* ***ko*** *te ahiahi nei.* 'We will be meeting this evening.'

Along with its direct use with adverbs, *ko* is used with adjectives as in:

52. ***Ko*** *ma te whare.* 'The house is clean.'
53. ***Ko*** *pai nga mahi.* 'The work is fine.'
54. ***Ko*** *tika te korero.* 'The talk is right.'

The use of *ko* with adjectives serves to express a specific attribute or condition that has been achieved by a person, thing, or situation. Adjectives can also be used with verbal particles:

55. *Kua pai nga mahi.* 'The work has been fine.'
56. *E pai ana nga mahi.* 'The work is going fine.'
57. *Kei te pai nga mahi.* 'The work is fine.'
58. *I te pai nga mahi.* 'The work was fine.'
59. *Kia pai ai nga mahi.* 'That the work will be fine.'

It may possibly be disputed that *ko* should be *kua* as in 55, but I have personally checked the use of *ko* with adjectives amongst speakers from my own area (Ngapuhi) and they agree that *ko* with adjectives identifies an existing quality or state of being equivalent almost to an abstract noun. Imagine for a moment that you are inquiring about the condition of a sick relative (grandmother) whose condition you have previously heard to be

somewhat critical. You have not heard any more for a couple of days, but then you meet a cousin (Hine) who has just been visiting with her. Anxiously you inquire:

59a. *E Pehea ana, to taua karani?* 'How is our granny?'

and Hine reports:

59b. *Ahua hemanawa ia inanahi, engari aianei* ***ko*** *pai ia.* 'She was pretty low yesterday, but today she is just fine.'

A definite state, quality, or condition must be attributable to someone or something (59b) demonstrates that the health of the grandmother has progressed from a serious condition to where now her condition is described as indisputably good (out of danger). There is no doubt she is indeed well. The indefinite article *he* can also be used with adjectives, but there is no specification as to what degree of goodness, bad, beauty, etc., is intended to be conveyed.

59c. *He pai, nga kai.* 'The food is fine (very general comment).'
59d. *He kino nga mahi.* 'The work is bad.'
59e. ***Ko*** *kino nga mahi.* 'The work is bad.'

In describing the nature of the work, 59d in very general terms says it's not too good, but 59e leaves no doubt in our minds that the work is indisputably of inferior quality. It is just as common to prefix an adjective with a definitive (nomonalizing) and in conjunction with *ko* this becomes an autonomous entity.

59f. ***Ko*** *te pai o nga kai.* 'The goodness of the food.'

4. Ko--A Local Noun?

The particle *ko* itself can be used as a local noun meaning "yonder place." This use is designated as indicating that the referent (*ko* = yonder place) is isolated outside of the vicinity of the participants in a particular speech event.

46. *Haere koutou ki* ***ko.*** 'You (plural) go to yonder place.'
47. *Kei* ***ko*** *oku hoa e takaro ana.* 'My friends are playing at yonder place.'

If the use of *ko* is legitimate here, sentences 46 and 47 reveal that *ko* as a local noun is absent from the immediate context of a narration situation (in point of proximity) being separated from both the addresser and the addressee.

Another problem has arisen as to whether *ko* is homonymous with *koo* (geminate /o/). Even with older native speakers, I have found it very difficult to differentiate between *ko/koo* during regular speech. Sometimes *ko* is pronounced short, and at other times there is noticeable vowel (/o/) lengthening. Should it be maintained that the /o/ in *Ko* is really a geminate vowel, then I would need to account for the objectiveness feature in *koo* (Williams 1971: 120):

(1) *Koo*--a digging instrument.
(2) *Koo*--to plant with a digging stick.
(3) *Koo*--to protrude the lips in contempt.
(4) *Koo*--a form of address for male and female.
(5) *Koo*--to sing, resound, chant, and shout.

The answer to this situation can best be resolved by the fact that *ko* and *koo* ought to be treated as two distinct morphemes. The unmarked form contains the short /o/ as in *ko* which has been discussed throughout this article in its primary role as a particle. In actual speaking it is common to detect vowel lengthening when *ko* is used in these primary contexts. This can be considered more an aspect of stylistics and dialect variation rather than the intentional substitution of *ko* for a new word *koo.* The underlying form of the morpheme in its use as a particle or preposition is still *ko* whether or not during actual speech production *ko/koo* is perceived.[3]

5. Ko--a Predicating Particle--(like the verb “to be” in English)

There has been no end of controversy over the issue of *ko* as a deixis of predication. As a matter of fact, this has been a source of some frustration

[3]Williams defines *koo* ‘yonder place’ showing the geminate /o/, but earlier in this discussion I pointed out that Harawira (1974:40) treats *ko* ‘yonder place’ as *ko* = preposition and particle with the short vowel /o/. I would like to propose a couple of plausible explanations. Harawira is renowned for his great scholarship of the Maori language, and I am not sure that his classification of *ko* ‘yonder place’ with *ko* (= prepositions, particle use) was intentional. His *Teach Yourself Maori* is a very elementary text for beginners, and perhaps he was making some very broad generalizations so as not to confuse the learner. On the other hand, it is possible that *ko* is the correct form and that this is the form used within the dialect boundary of Harawira’s tribe (Nga-Puhi). The *koo* ‘yonder place’ that Williams describes is marked for gemination and *ko* is the underlying unmarked form. I am more in favor of the fact that *koo* ‘yonder place’ is the correct form in this instance because as a native speaker the geminate /o/ in *koo* is subliminally more natural to me in speech when referring to yonder place. Looking at the definitions of *koo,* it is either defined as a noun or a verb and *ko/koo* ‘yonder place’ is a noun. To be consistent with this observation *ko/koo* ‘yonder place’ would more naturally follow the marked form *koo* with verbs and nouns, and the unmarked form *ko* occurs as a particle.

to me, especially when I find prominent scholars of Maori at diffidence as to whether or not *ko* is synonymous in function with the English verb "to be" (am, is, are, was, were). Hohepa claims that,

> In the absence of other evidence, */ko/* specifies that the phrase it initiates is a noun phrase. When other noun phrases are also part of a sentence, */ko/* also specified that the nucleus of the one it initiates is not the subject of the sentence. (1967: 19)

The following examples show *ko* as a predication initiator in compliance with Hohepa's supposition.

60a. ***Ko*** *Rapata,* (pred.) *taku tamaiti.* (subj.)
b. My son is Robert.
*c. Robert is my son.
61a. ***Ko*** *Pirongia,* (pred.) *te maunga tapu.* (subj.)
b. The sacred mountain is Pirongia.
*c. Pirongia is the sacred mountain.

Once again it could be argued that sentence 60b, c and 61b, c respectively amount to one and the same thing. This may be so, but the point that I wish to stress here is that sentences 60a and 61a have their interpretations according to Hohepa in 60b and 61b.

Apparently Bruce Biggs does not share the same viewpoint as Hohepa regarding this matter. Although he does not make any conclusive statement with regard to the use of *ko* in predication, or specifically as a subject marker, he nevertheless alternates between *ko* as a predicator/subject initiator in translating from Maori into English. Briefly, he points out (1969:25) that when two definitive nominal phrases are the total components of a sentence the first one must be preposed by *ko.*

62a. ***Ko*** *te tariana,* (subj.) *te hoiho tere.* (pred.)
b. The stallion is the fast horse.
c. The fast horse is the stallion.

The first NP is interpreted as the subject 62b, but following Hohepa's reasoning 62c would be the correct interpretation. A further example shows Biggs reversing the situation where *ko* has become a predicating particle.

63a. ***Ko*** *te hooro,* (pred.) *tenei.* (subj.)
b. This is the hall.
c. The hall is this (? whatever).

In 63b this is relegated to the subject position and *ko* introduces the predication.

Without belaboring the issue indefinitely, I wish to propose that the function of *ko* is neither a predication marker, subject marker, object marker nor whatever else, but that it has an independent function of its own. This does not deny the interpretation of *ko* in these contexts as has been the case when translating from Maori to English, but rather to insist that the function of *ko* should be perceived within the boundaries of its natural linguistic environment without imposing meaning ad infinitum from "alien-codes." Certainly, in translation, the nearest equivalent construction and meaning can be sought out in the target language, but under no circumstances can we declare exact correspondences between languages. The introduction to Williams's dictionary (1971) supports this point, "As grammatical relations exist in Maori which have no exact counterpart in English grammar, terms have had to be adopted to express these relations." Also Jakobson in his article, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation" (1971:261) remarks: "on the level of interlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of alien code-units or messages."

Referring back to the definition of objectiveness, "independent existence" is the aspect that most adequately interprets the general meaning of *ko.* In reviewing the various contextual environments in which *ko* occurs, a salient criterion for its presence is determined by the dichotomy of "definiteness" vs. "indefiniteness." It has been observed that *ko* will only occur in particular environments (see Table 1). Thus, even verbs need to be nominalized in order to stand with *ko: haere* (go), *te haerenga* (the journey), *ko te haerenga* (independent, autonomous). With this being an obligatory condition for *ko*'s presence even with noun-verbs, it would be difficult to explain *ko* as a marker of predication.

Particle	*Environments*
Ko	Proper noun
	Pronoun
	Locatives
	Adverbials (time)
	Adjectives
	Interrogatives
	Definitive and noun (common)
	Definitive and derived nouns

Table 1

Conclusion

The principal objective of this paper was formulated upon the premise that the morpheme *ko* is consistently imbued with a general invariant meaning that should be recognizable in whatever genuine context *ko* is featured. Much of the introductory material concentrated on attempting to define the theoretical basis for such an assertion, which, according to Jakobson, is fundamental in defining and perceiving an overall structure in language. By merely listing all of the individual meanings of *ko,* there will never be a possibility of recognizing a general meaning present in all its uses. As the number of contextual uses increase, so will the variety of specific meanings resulting in the dissolution of "the relation between sign and meaning."

Having set the foundation, the process of investigating the various uses of *ko* was then undertaken. It was discovered that although *ko* appeared to have several different meanings, a general observation could be formulated: that the use of *ko* in any particular context was governed by a unique condition which in turn provided revealing implications as to the common semantic interpretation peculiar to *ko* wherever it could be found.

The complete listing of all the environments of *ko* is outlined in Table 1 (refer to previous section) and a general condition can account for *ko*'s presence in every case.

First, proper names and pronouns including the interrogative pronouns *wai* (-who) and *hea* (-where, when and what) can be used directly with *ko.* Proper names identify specifically an individual or group of persons, things, or places. Pronouns, on the other hand, indicate that the person, thing, or place it substitutes for has had former specific reference in some other context. The interrogatives *wai* and *hea* are used directly with *ko* and function to identify definitively an individual or group of persons, places, or things: *Ko wai koe?*--Who are you?; *Ko Pita au.*--I am Peter; *Ko ia, ko Pita.*--He is Peter. Second, *ko* can be used freely with locatives, adjectives, and time adverbials. Locatives describe a particular location as: *ko mua*--the front; *ko muri*--the back; *ko raro*--under; *ko roto*--the inside. The forms *konei* (-this place), *kona* (-that place, near addressee), and *kora* (-that place, beyond both addresser and addressee) also specify particular location; and although each is a single word, they were probably formed from two distinct stems: *ko + (nei + na + ra). Ko mai* (-near side) and *ko atu* (-further side) identify position in front of, or behind a solid object like a house or stone, relative to the position of the speaker. For example: *Ka noho mai te wahine i* ***ko*** *mai o te kohatu,* ***ko*** *tana tane i*

ko *atu.* 'The woman sat on this side of the stone and her husband on the further side.'

Adjectival uses of *ko* suggest that a definite quality, state, or condition exists that is attributable likewise to an individual or group of persons, places, or things: *ko tawhiti te wahi* 'the place is far distant'; *ko pai nga kai* 'the food is fine.' In this role, the adjective should be considered as an abstract noun of quality, etc., but often during translation from Maori to English, it is recognized as an adjective.

Finally, our table shows that *ko* can be used with all common nouns that are preceded by a definitive. Likewise derived nouns (noun-verbs, noun-adjectives, and noun-adverbs) which must also be preceded by a definitive can occur with *ko; ko te rakau roa* 'the tall tree'; *ko te poturi o tona haere* 'the slowness of his movement'; *ko te kino o ona whakaaro* 'the evil of his thoughts.'

The purpose for this review has been to emphasize again that the particle *ko,* wherever it exists can only do so in the presence of a definitive substantive. When such a combination is created, it is empowered with complete autonomy (independent existence)--meaning that *ko* as a preposition and predication marker are interpretations that have been adopted as near equivalents from the English code. Unfortunately this has resulted in *ko* being ascribed the functions of everything else but its true role which is (in combination with a definitive substantive)--to evolve a viable, dynamic, autonomous, self-governing, totally independent linguistic form in Maori.

Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

LITERATURE CITED

Armstrong, Daniel and C. H. van Schooneveld.
1977 *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of His Scholarship.* Lisse, The Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press.

Biggs, Bruce.
1969 *Let's Learn Maori.* Wellington. New Zealand: A. H. and A. W. Reed, Ltd.

Harawira, K. T.
1974 *Teach Yourself Maori.* Wellington, New Zealand: A. H. and A. W. Reed, Ltd.

Hohepa, Patric W.
1967 *A Profile Generative Grammar of Maori.* Bloomington, Indiana: Waverly Press Inc., Indiana University. Supplement to the *International Journal of American Linguistics.*

Jakobson, Roman.
1966 "The General Theory of Case: General Meanings in the Russian Case System, Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasus Lehre," in *Readings in Linguistics II,* edited by Eric P. Hamp, Fred W. Householder, and Robert Austerlitz. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 51-89.

Maunsell, R.
1894 *Grammar of the New Zealand Language.* 4th ed. Auckland, New Zealand: Upton and Company.

Robertson, John S.
1979 "The Meaning of -ed," (unpublished article).

1979a "On the Meaning of *un,*" (unpublished article).

1979b "Meaning in the Numbeline," (unpublished article).

Stowell, Henry M.
1911 *Maori-English Tutor and Vade Mecum.* Wellington, New Zealand: Whitcome and Tombs, Ltd.

Waugh, Linda R.
1976 *Roman Jakobson's Science of Language.* Lisse, The Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press.

Williams, Herbert W.
1971 *A Dictionary of the Maori Language.* 7th ed. Wellington, New Zealand: A. R. Shearer, Government Printer.

THE *TONGA MA'A TONGA KAUTAHA*: A WATERSHED IN BRITISH-TONGAN RELATIONS

by Penny Lavaka

In late 1910, an extremely popular Tongan cooperative society, the *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* (The Tonga for the Tongans Company) was closed at the instigation of the British Agent in Tonga. The incident demonstrated the extent to which the British government, through its Agent, had usurped political responsibility in Tonga; it also provided the Tongan government with an opportunity to win back some of the autonomy it had lost during the previous decade. By early 1912, as a result of the *Kautaha* crisis, the British-Tongan relationship had been redefined to Tonga's advantage, and the authority of King Tupou II within his own kingdom had been reestablished.

Although Tonga was officially proclaimed a British Protectorate in 1900, its colonial status was unique in the Pacific. Its national coherence under a strong monarchy and organized central government had given the kingdom the machinery to resist formal domination. Under the 1900 Treaty of Friendship, the British government controlled Tonga's foreign relations and exercised jurisdiction over British and foreign residents, but possessed no authority to intervene in Tonga's domestic affairs.[1] In 1905 however, this latter provision had been overruled by an agreement, signed by Tupou II under threat of annexation and deportation, which specified in part that the British Agent was "to be consulted and his advice taken."[2] Thus empowered, British officials began force-feeding advice into an administration which they viewed as inefficient and often corrupt. Tupou II, who ruled Tonga from 1893-1918, fought unsuccessfully against this intrusion on his sovereignty, arguing that it contravened not only the 1900 treaty but also his kingdom's own 1875 constitution.

With the appointment in September 1909 of William Telfer Campbell as British Agent in Tonga, British interference in the kingdom's affairs reached new heights. An Ulster man of imposing stature and irascible

[1]Treaty of Friendship Between Great Britain and Tonga, 18 May 1900, *Laws of Tonga* (revised 1948), Government Printer, Wellington, 1951.

[2]Article II, "Supplementary Agreement" Between Great Britain and Tonga, (or "Note of Points Accepted by the King"), 18 January 1905, ibid.

temper, Campbell was by nature an autocrat and regarded himself as "Administrator of Tonga."[3] His record as Resident Commissioner in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands Protectorate over the previous twelve years, coupled with "idiosyncracies of temper and tact" made his appointment to Tonga a "dangerous experiment" even in the eyes of interventionist-minded British officials.[4] Campbell epitomized the paternalistic attitude which had underlain all the more recent dealings of the British with Tonga. He saw no worth in the Tongan way of life or of government and believed it was his duty to save the Tongans from their "conceit and Constitution"--the two principal stumbling blocks which in his opinion prevented Tongans from deriving full benefit from the Protectorate.[5] Given Campbell's attitudes and the Tongans' desire for independence, the situation in Tonga was ripe for political crisis, and the *Kautaha* provided the catalyst.

The *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* was established in May 1909 by a local European resident, Alexander D. Cameron. Within a few months, it had become a very important organization, both commercially and symbolically, for a great many Tongans. The *Kautaha* provided an avenue for Tongans to participate in the European commercial trading system and so usurp the role and profits of foreign traders. Through it, Tongan producers were able to sell their copra to the best advantage, bypassing the European middleman. Initially, the *Kautaha* was simply a "commission agency" which exported its members' copra and gave them the exact overseas price less duty, freight and 6 d. a sack (approximately 8/- a ton) commission which went to the president. It also handled the direct importation of goods in wholesale quantities; members could obtain flour, cabin biscuits, tinned beef or fish or other necessaries at cost price, plus the expenses incurred in importation and five percent commission. Plans to expand into the retail business had little time to come to fruition.

Set against the normal profits which the European traders expected--£3 to £4 a ton on copra and 15 to 20 percent on imported goods--the *Kautaha* idea meant real savings for its members. The difference in prices may well have been greater than is reflected by these figures; it seems to have been common enough for traders to charge Tongans twice what they

[3]Campbell to im Thurn, 19 November 1909, Western Pacific High Commission, Inwards Correspondence General (WPHC 4), MP 1720/09; I am also indebted to Dr. Barrie Macdonald for information on Campbell.

[4]im Thurn to Secretary of State (S/S), 11 March 1908, Public Records Office, London, Original Correspondence, Western Pacific (CO225), 81.

[5]Campbell, Trade Report for 1910, WPHC 4, 2032/11. This remark was omitted from the published Report.

charged Europeans, an issue which intensified resentment against the traders.[6] There were some drawbacks to shipping through the *Kautaha,* though. Payment was sometimes subject to a two-month delay 'so that when members needed ready money, they would still sell to European traders. Members also contributed towards the *Kautaha's* working expenses. Apart from the membership fee of 12/- and annual payments of 4/-, there were collections, usually in the form of a sack of copra, towards new ventures such as the purchase of a schooner or building of a copra shed. From the evidence available, it seems certain, however, that through the *Kautaha,* Tongans could and did save money.

But it was not the commercial advantage alone which attracted members. As the name *Tonga Ma'a Tonga* signified, the *Kautaha* served as a vehicle for Tongan aspirations, a means of regaining some of that prized Tongan independence which had been eroded in the economic as well as the political field. The business skills of the white man would provide the key not merely to economic improvement, but to a new kind of existence in which foreigners would no longer be needed. Although four of the key posts in the *Kautaha*--president, accountant, and branch managers in Ha'apai and Vava'u--were occupied by Europeans, it was the avowed aim of this "progressive movement" to lift the Tongans out of the "sticky mud of ignorance" and throw "the whole light of day on the business habits of the *pāpālangi.*"[7] The *Kautaha* bore resemblance to a cult movement and members looked towards their association and its president, Cameron, with almost mystical reverence. According to the Premier, Mateialona, Cameron was spoken of generally among *Kautaha* members as "an angel descended from Heaven to deliver them from the bondage of the White traders."[8]

With its nationalistic overtones and economic advantages, it is little wonder that the *Kautaha* rapidly took hold throughout Tonga. Its mass membership was testimony to its popularity: by February 1910, the *Kautaha* boasted 3,280 members (1,280 in Tongatapu, 1,200 in Vava'u and 800 in Ha'apai), some 60 percent of all taxpayers.[9] Included in this number were many of Tonga's most influential chiefs and nobles. Although real control of the organization lay with the president, the *Kautaha's* formal constitution (drawn up by a friend of Cameron and colorful local figure,

[6]May to S/S, confidential (conf), 23 September 1911, and enclosures (encls), CO 225/97.

[7]Document "C," Appendix to *Tonga Government Gazette Extraordinary,* No. 8, 1911.

[8]Interview with Premier, 9 September 1911, encl 6 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[9]Document "M" Appendix to *Tonga Government Gazette Extraordinary,* No. 8 1911.

Robert Hanslip) provided the Tongans with a system of trustees and representatives; the former to collaborate on important decisions and safeguard the Tongans' interests, the latter to convey information back to the villages. On Cameron's advice, the organization of the *Kautaha* was based on that of the Free Church,[10] and it seems likely that this was also a base for membership. After all, the *Kautaha's* concern for autonomy was the same force that had provoked the formation of the Free Church in 1885.[11]

The popularity of Cameron and the *Kautaha* contrasts strongly with the official condemnation heaped upon them by Campbell and other European officials. As the colonial office later noted, the officials involved made a crucial mistake in failing to appreciate early enough just how firmly the *Kautaha* as an idea and Cameron as its apostle had gripped the people of Tonga.[12] Far removed from the villages and the attitudes of *Kautaha* members, Campbell seemed to find the whole attempt to bypass European traders contemptible. There can be little conjecture as to where his sympathies, and those of his superiors in the High Commission, lay. British and German merchants were definitely feeling the effects of the *Kautaha* trade. For individual small traders in particular, the *Kautaha* threatened ruin.[13]

While these conditions lay in the background, the decision to close the *Kautaha* was not taken in this context. It was the character and financial operations of the president, Cameron, on which the justification for the closure was to hinge. Cameron, a thirty-seven year old Englishman, had spent four years in Ceylon, India, and Australia before being appointed manager of the Tongan branch of Bums Philp in 1901. When his business ventures on their behalf failed, Cameron took to drink and apparently banished himself to "a distant island" for fifteen months to regain "moral control." In 1903, he married Kelela Cocker, the daughter of a European trader and a Tongan woman and for a time worked lands belonging to her family.[14] Cameron's local marriage, together with his style of life, made him anathema to Campbell. The fact that Cameron had been declared a bankrupt shortly before the *Kautaha* opened and that, within a year of its operation, he had earned between £1,300 to £1,500, was not overlooked by Campbell. There was, no doubt, at all in the latter's mind

[10]Cameron, Memoirs (unpublished manuscript in writer's possession).

[11]For an account of this struggle see Noel Rutherford, *Shirley Baker and the King of Tonga,* Melbourne, 1971.

[12]Minute, 25 November 1911, on May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[13]May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911 and encls, CO 225/97.

[14]Petition of A. D. Cameron, 10 November 1910, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

that Cameron was a rogue who was shamefully exploiting "ignorant and trustful natives."[15] It was a view shared by nearly every other British official involved.

Campbell's first official involvement with the *Kautaha* occurred in August 1910, when he presided over a libel suit which Cameron brought against R. G. M. Denny, a former employee who was now promoting a rival *Kautaha.* After giving judgement against Cameron, Campbell impounded the *Kautaha's* books (an action which Cameron claimed was illegal) and handed them over to the Tongan government, declaring that the Tongans were being exploited "in a scandalous manner."[16] On Campbell's urging and with Cameron's blessing, an audit was made by T. V. Roberts, the Auditor-General, and G. B. Humphries, a Sydney accountant who happened to be passing through. Their report, published on the Premier's sole authority in a *Tonga Government Gazette Extraordinary* on 26 August 1910 was, as an editorial in the Fiji Times commented, certainly extraordinary.[17] It began its indictment with the statement:

> That all the assets appearing in the Balance Sheet do not exist; and that liabilities incurred by the *Kautaha* before the date of balance do not appear on the sheet, and the whole of the books are without a doubt faked.[18]

Nowhere in the report was there any admissible evidence to prove this claim. While it showed that the *Kautaha* had not been run very efficiently and was subject to chiefly appropriation, the report contained inconsistencies and was obviously the result of prejudices running deeper than a mere perusal of the books.

It was on the strength of this report that the *Kautaha* was closed. But the decision did not come from the Tongan Privy Council. In a move which reflected the extent of *Kautaha* support, the Council ruled that the Premier and Roberts should meet *Kautaha* members, read them the report, and seek their opinion regarding the *Kautaha's* closure. The meeting took place on 25 August and, although members and trustees were present, Cameron was not invited. After the report was read, the Premier, Mateialona, on his subsequent admission, merely notified the meeting that the government would close the *Kautaha.* In response to objections from

[15]Campbell to Major, 26 August 1910.

[16]Campbell to Mateialona, 18 August 1910, encl 1 in Campbell to Major, 12 September 1910.

[17] *Fiji Times,* 12 October 1910.

[18] *Tonga Government Gazette Extraordinary,* No. 25, 1910.

those present, he directed the Minister of Police, Polutele Kaho, to guard the *Kautaha* premises and to seize its assets.[19]

Mateialona's action, taken in open opposition to the Privy Council and the wishes of the *Kautaha* members, was clearly the result of Campbell's influence and backing, and reflected the Premier's political allegiance. An illegitimate grandson of Tupou I, Mateialona's Wesleyan affiliation had long marked him out as a member of a dissident political minority--those who suffered exile under Tupou I rather than join the State Free Church. In 1905, Mateialona had been prominent among a number of high-born Tongans who had courted British support against the paramountcy of Tupou II; and in the wake of the deportation of the previous Premier, Sateki Veikune, Mateialona had been foisted onto the government by the British High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, Sir Everard im Thurn.[20] It was hardly surprising that Mateialona heeded advice from the British Agent rather than the King.

In Privy Council, Mateialona had apparently argued strongly against closing the *Kautaha,* and in view of this, the Minister of Police questioned on whose authority the instructions were given. Kaho later reported to the High Commissioner:

> The Premier told me he had instructions from the Consul and that these instructions were more powerful than the Privy Council. . . . The Premier told me to close it or I might get into trouble.[21]

This report of Campbell's attitude was subsequently confirmed from a number of sources, including Campbell himself. In his memoirs (written in old age but not published), Cameron claimed the existence of a letter from Campbell to the Premier, instructing him to close the *Kautaha.*[22] No other mention of such a letter has been found, however, and it may well have been no more than a Cameronian literary device.

Subsequent to the closure, Cameron was charged in the High Commissioner's court with having "unlawfully, wilfully and with intent to defraud' published a false balance sheet, and with a further charge that he "did use moneys of the *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* for his own personal

[19]Evidence of Mateialona in *Cameron et al v Campbell et al,* unsorted papers in the possession of Mrs 'E. Fusitu'a, Canberra.

[20]Sir Everard im Thurn, Report on Tongan Affairs (December 1904-January 1905), encl in im Thurn to S/S, 15 March 1905, printed copy, Western Pacific Archives, Suva.

[21]Interview with Minister of Police, 9 September 1911, encl 7 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[22]Cameron, Memoirs.

use without the authority of the trustees of the said *Kautaha.*"[23] The embezzlement charge was thrown out at the preliminary examination before Campbell on 26 and 27 October 1910. And at the trial, from 27 to 29 December, Honorable A. Ehrhardt, the acting Chief Judicial Commissioner for the Western Pacific, acquitted Cameron of falsifying the balance sheet. No evidence of deliberate falsity could be produced. Moreover, as Ehrhardt pointed out in his judgement, Humphries, the liquidator, had been forced to admit that though the *Kautaha* was not being run for profit, he had realized more than the book debts for most of the assets and with prudent management there would be sufficient funds to pay the creditors in full.[24]

Ehrhardt's judgement, delivered on 29 December, was openly and severely critical of the authorities actions. Of Humphries he declared: "His evident bias, and prejudice, amounting to animosity against the accused, and his want of candor, left a very bad impression on my mind." As for the closure itself, Ehrhardt concluded that it had been carried out by the "very high-handed and I cannot but think ill-advised action of the authorities." While noting that it would be a matter of some surprise if those in power did *not* regard the formation of such a large and important association with some uneasiness, he pointed out:

> I need hardly say that they should take measures to secure that such associations are conducted in a proper and business-like manner. . . . They should not, by indirect and high-handed action, attempt to wreck them or without just cause which can be upheld in a court of law stop their operation.[25]

Ehrhardt's judgement weighed heavily on Campbell; he complained to the acting High Commissioner of the criticisms made in court and argued that the Tongan government had never attempted to wreck the *Kautaha.* Rather, "On my recommendation, steps were taken to prevent, if possible, the *Kautaha* becoming bankrupt." If they had wanted to destroy it, he claimed, the best way would have been to take no action at all, in which case the *Kautaha* would have ended up "hopelessly bankrupt and irrevocably wrecked."[26] The assistant High Commissioner, Arthur Mahaffy, who was in Tonga during the trial, was also upset at the

[23]Copy of Information, encl in Campbell to Major, 9 November 1910, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

[24]Copy of Judgement in *Rex v Cameron,* encl in May to S/S, 13 April 1911, CO 225/95.

[25]Ibid.

[26]Campbell to Major,6 January 1911, WPHC 4, 102/11.

outcome. In a personal letter to Ehrhardt, which the latter saw as serious contempt of -court, he wrote: "I am very sorry indeed that this prosecution failed to prove that Cameron is the swindler that he most certainly is."[27]

Although the court had failed to implicate Cameron in any fraudulent dealings and despite Ehrhardt's remarks, the campaign against Cameron and the *Kautaha* continued. Not long after the trial, a move was afoot to exclude from Tonga not only Cameron but also his former Auckland agent, Ambrose Millar, who was building a flourishing business out of the wreck of the *Kautaha* with the support of Cameron and his disappointed followers. The proposal was put before the acting High Commissioner in Fiji by two lawyers--Lancelot Indermaur, a recent arrival in Tonga who had been counsel for the prosecution at Cameron's trial, and Humphrey Berkeley, a somewhat notorious Suva lawyer whose retention by the Premier (with the Consul's connivance) as adviser to the government at the exorbitant fee of 2,000 guineas was to become yet another nail in the official coffin of W. T. Campbell. Campbell vigorously supported the prohibition of Cameron from the entire western Pacific, although he felt Millar's exclusion premature.[28] His views on Cameron were shared by a number of European merchants and traders who, in January 1911, petitioned the High Commissioner to the effect that "such a state of affairs as conducted by the said A. D. Cameron is calculated to seriously prejudice the whole community as a whole in the eyes of the natives."[29]

By this time the acting High Commissioner, Sir Charles Major, was becoming wary of the goings-on, It seems he realized that the situation was rapidly becoming explosive, especially in view of Cameron's acquittal. He wanted no part at all in the decision and instructed Campbell to be particularly careful not to involve the High Commissioner, even by implication, in any step to be taken by the Tongan government:

> The matter at present solely concerns the Government of Tonga and your position as adviser to that Government does not imply that the High Commissioner is in any way concerned in the matter. . . . I sincerely urge upon you the absolute necessity of regarding the matter in its present stage as wholly a Tongan one to the absolute exclusion of the High Commissioner.[30]

[27]Mahaffy to Ehrhardt, 20 January 1911, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

[28]Campbell to Major, tel, 26 January 1911.

[29]Petition of Merchants and Traders of Tonga, encl in Campbell to Major, 7 January 1911.

[30]Draft telegram to Campbell, in Minutes, 26 January 1911.

Major's words highlighted a somewhat anomalous position: Campbell's advice as British Agent to the Tongan government should no longer be regarded as British advice. Was it then to be merely the advice of an individual? If so, was the Tongan government still bound by the treaty to take it? Although Major's confusion may in part be attributed to the temporary nature of his appointment, it also reflects the uncertainty of the British position in Tonga.

Major's determination that the High Commissioner should in no way be identified with the matter at this stage was also reflected in his instructions to Mahaffy to proceed to Tonga "to assist Mr Campbell in a difficult position in which he was faced owing to the anticipated resusitation *[sic]* of the *Kautaha* and the return of Mr Cameron from Fiji"[31] (where he had gone to seek legal advice). It seems that Major did not trust Campbell's ability to keep aloof from the crisis in Tonga, and so Mahaffy was sent to watch events, *not* to interfere in any way, but to impress upon Campbell the necessity of leaving the matter to the Tongan government. Mahaffy's brief visit in February/March 1911 earned him the name "picnicing Mahaffy" because the *Fiji Times* correspondent could not discover what else he did;[32] he certainly did nothing to alleviate the situation. Mahaffy's sympathies decidedly lay the same place as Campbell's, and the latter was already too far embroiled to extricate himself easily. Besides, the *Kautaha* battle had developed its own momentum, provoked by Berkeley and Humphries on one side and the *Kautaha* lawyer, George Scott, together with the Chief Justice, Robert Skeen, on the other.

By the time of Mahaffy's visit, the forces of the *Kautaha* had begun to rally; and, taking strength from Cameron's acquittal, they prepared for an assault on the authorities who had deprived them of their association and property. On 8 February 1911, Scott, acting under instructions from the *Kautaha* trustees, asked Campbell to issue summonses against Roberts, Humphries, and himself as British Agent, for illegally entering the *Kautaha's* premises and carrying off its assets. The *Kautaha* trustees claimed a total of £11,500 (£4,500 for the value of the assets and £7,000 damages).[33] Campbell refused to issue the summonses, informing Scott that he would not be a party to "farcical proceedings."[34] The *Kautaha* promptly took out the summonses in Suva and the hearing was set down for mid-June, although it was subsequently delayed until August.

[31]Minute by Mahaffy, 1 April 1911.

[32]*Fiji Times*, 15 June 1911.

[33]Writ of Summons and Particulars of Claim, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

[34]Campbell to Major, 17 February 1911.

In addition to seeking legal redress, Scott proposed to the Premier in mid-January that a meeting between Cabinet and Council might settle the matter amicably, but the offer was declined,[35] and in mid-March, the *Kautaha* solicitors in Fiji, William Scott and Co. (no relation to George Scott) called on Sir Francis May, the new High Commissioner, asking him to appoint a Commission of Inquiry, or to go himself to Tonga and inquire into the circumstances of the *Kautaha's* suppression. But May, who at that stage had been in Fiji only about two weeks, followed Major's example of not getting involved. He told Scott that the Tongan government had taken legal action in the matter and that he could not interfere.[36]

The threatened action by *Kautaha* trustees, together with rumors that the *Kautaha* was soon to be revived, created what Mahaffy described as "a big stir" among Tongans.[37] According to Campbell, the unrest was so considerable that "strong measures" might be needed if it continued.[38] This unrest, together with the completion of two further official reports on the affairs of the *Kautaha,* apparently convinced the Tongan government, or at least its advisers, that the immediate suppression of *Kautaha* activities was desirable. The reports--one by the liquidator, Humphries, and one supplied by the Fiji government auditor at the request of the acting High Commissioner--were published as a *Tonga Government Gazette Extraordinary* (No. 8/11), on 3 March. Humphries' report concentrated particularly on what he called the exploitation by Cameron of the religious and nationalistic feelings of the Tongans, and repeated many of the charges already thrown out of court. The reports did prove that the Tongans themselves had very little idea of the financial workings of the *Kautaha,* and that the financial side had not been managed very efficiently, but their authors continued to overlook the fact that the *Kautaha* had never been intended to run for a profit.

Subsequently, the Tongan Privy Council--on the advice of Berkeley and in the absence of the King--passed two ordinances directed at the *Kautaha.* There can be little doubt that both Mahaffy and Campbell supported the legislation--Mahaffy reported that they both believed the government to be "perfectly justified."[39] One of the ordinances (No. 5/11), gave the King in council wide powers to issue an order of prohibition against any non-Togan believed to be disaffected to the King or govern-

[35]Evidence of Mateialona in *Cameron et al v Campbell et al.,* unsorted papers.
[36]Minute by May, 31 March 1911, WPHC 4, 1278/10.
[37]Mahaffy to May, 28 March 1911, encl in May to S/S, 13 April 1911, CO 225/95.
[38]Campbell to May, 18 April 1911, WPHC 4, 1278/10.
[39]Mahaffy to May, 28 March 1911, encl in May to S/S, 13 April 1911, CO 225/95.

ment "or otherwise dangerous to the peace or good order of the kingdom."[40] Obviously designed for use against Cameron, the ordinance was criticized by European church leaders as abrogating the right of non-Tongans to the jurisdiction of the High Commission's court, as provided in Section V of the 1900 treaty.[41] Perhaps because of this, and because the support of the High Commissioner could not be guaranteed in the event of a deportation, the ordinance was never invoked. The other ordinance (No. 4/11), was an even more remarkable piece of legislation, revealing "a control and restriction of the liberties of private individuals . . . that can only be described as amazing."[42] Aptly labelled "panic-stricken,"[43] it was designed to replace an earlier ordinance, 17/10,[44] until proper company legislation could be introduced. Sections 4 and 5 had the effect of forbidding associations between Tongans and non-Tongans for the purpose of trading on the grounds that such associations were "likely to be to the loss and damage of the natives of Tonga" and more significantly, were "likely to lead to exclusive dealing or boycotting and hence . . . likely to cause loss and damage to non-native persons occupied in the legitimate conduct of trading operations with His Majesty's Tongan subjects." Section 3 amounted to an indemnity for the authorities who had closed the *Kautaha*, and was obviously designed to forestall the threatened court action:

> It shall be unlawful for any Tongan to bring any action at law in any court against any member of the Tongan Government or against any officer or officers employed by the said Government or acting by the authority of the said Government on its behalf for any act done by them or any of them in the suppression, winding up or liquidation of . . . The *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha*.

This section of the ordinance was made effective retrospectively to August 1910, thus coming into conflict with clause 20 of the constitution which forbad retrospective legislation. As a final touch, a further section hit directly at Cameron's connections with the Tongan people. It was made unlawful for any Tongan

[40]Ordinance No. 5, 1911.

[41]Page, Watkin, Willis, Petition to Sir Francis May, 26 June 1911, WPHC 4, 1152/11.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ordinance No. 17, 1910, forbad the connection of a European with a *Kautaha* without Cabinet consent.

> to give, subscribe, collect, or to aid, assist or abet in the subscription or collection of any money or produce for the purpose of helping any non-native who in the past may have been associated with natives of Tonga for the purpose of trading or in any *Kautaha*.[45]

These strenuous efforts to disarm the *Kautaha* had little effect other than to make martyrs of its members and supporters. The court action went ahead because the case was to be tried in the High Commission court and not under Tongan law. Thus the case of *Cameron and the Kautaha Trustees v Campbell, Roberts and Humphries* was heard in Tonga before packed houses from 9 to 18 August 1911. The court was presided over by none other than Sir Charles Major, who had now returned to his substantive post of Chief Judicial Commissioner for the Western Pacific. After three days, Major dismissed the charge against Campbell on the grounds of insufficient evidence. The case against the other two defendants continued, and Major finally found for the defendants with costs, on the grounds that their acts were acts of state into which he could not inquire.[46]

Major's judgement was, to say the least, open to attack. In a private letter to Sir Francis May, Major himself admitted that his judgement had been given "not however without some doubt."[47] Legal officials in the colonial office had little doubt that it would be reversed on appeal.[48] The case was also suspect from another point of view. Few officials doubted that the evidence given by Mateialona was perjurious. He claimed that he had received no instructions to close the *Kautaha*--that he had read the reports and come to his own conclusions. This, as the *Fiji Times* acidly commented, was rather strange when the Premier could not read English.[49]

The *Kautaha* had lost the battle but not the war. Just a week after the trial, Skeen facilitated the reformation of the *Kautaha* when, in response to an application from Cameron and the trustees, he suspended the ordinance which prohibited it. That Skeen had good grounds for doing so cannot be refuted. Even Major, in the course of his judgement, had expressed himself in agreement with the *Kautaha* lawyer's contention that the ordi-

[45]Ordinance No. 4, 1911.

[46]May to S/S, 1 September 1911 and encls, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

[47]Major to May, private, 18 August 1911, WPHC 4, 753/11.

[48]Minutes on May to S/S, conf, 2 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[49]*Fiji Times*, 31 August 1911; see also minute by A. B. Keith, 2 February 1912, on May to S/S, 21 December 1911, CO 225/98.

nance "was and is null and void, as being contrary to the Constitution of Tonga and not enacted as an amendment to that Constitution in valid manner."[50] However, Campbell, who had no legal qualifications, was not really interested in legal considerations. As far as he was concerned, Skeen's action would have the effect of "nullifying all the endeavours made by the Government of Tonga and myself to protect the interests of the people of Tonga."[51] He reacted by going immediately to the King in company of Humphrey Berkeley and demanding that the suspension be withdrawn and that Skeen himself be suspended.

This interview, which took place on 25 August 1911, represented the climax of Campbell's attempts to force his advice onto an unwilling King. Tupou II had already fought hard to retain Skeen and had no intention of losing him now. He based his stand entirely on the constitution, arguing that the advice now tendered conflicted with the constitution, while the action of the Chief Justice was in accordance with that revered document. But to Campbell the constitution was nothing more than a hindrance to be relegated to second place behind the agreement under which the King was pledged to take British advice. Campbell and Berkeley demanded a simple "Yes" or "No" answer to their "advice" before they would leave the room. If the answer was no, Campbell told the King, "By this one act you are cutting the halliards of your own flag, and sooner or later it must come down." With a characteristic lack of diplomacy, he chided the King: "I object to being sent by His Majesty's British Government to deal with children, I want to deal with men."[52] But the King remained adamant. He refused to sign a document agreeing to Skeen's immediate suspension from office, and the ordinance remained in abeyance.

Campbell's bluff had been called. Berkeley declared that the agent should himself suspend Skeen, but Campbell was not prepared to go this far. He turned initially to the cabinet, hoping to use his influence there to obtain a vote against Skeen with which he might then override the King's resistance. But the cabinet was no longer with him--loyalties were beginning to change. Even the Minister of Police, Polutele Kaho, who had once courted British support to get rid of the King, refused to cast his vote against Skeen despite Campbell's threats of dismissal.[53] Polutele's change

[50]Judgement in *Cameron et al v Campbell et al.,* 18 August 1918, WPHC 4, 1278/10.

[51]Campbell to May, 28 August 1911, WPHC 4, 1489/11.

[52]Iterview with His Majesty the King, 25 August 1911, sub-encl (b) in encl, May to S/S, 2 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[53]Interview with Minister of Police, 9 September 1911, encl 7 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

of allegiance indicated the extent to which Campbell had alienated himself from Tongan opinion.

Finding no support in Tonga, Campbell then turned to the High Commissioner, sending the new government auditor, H. Harcourt, to Suva to lay the situation before May. Campbell's own recommendation was that the King be removed from Tonga, for a time at least, and that two or three foreigners be deported. But for the Premier, he felt himself to be alone against a formidable array of enemies. The only way he could see to improve the situation was by force. He was prepared "to adjust matters and to maintain my position here as far as circumstances will admit" but, ominously, he wanted to be supplied with a small number of reliable police in order to carry out the strong measures he believed necessary.[54]

May judged the situation serious enough to warrant his immediate personal intervention and visited Tonga from 7 to 16 September 1911. Because of the time-lag involved in communication with the colonial office, he was without his superiors' advice throughout the visit, but the outcome accorded closely with the views which officials in London had been advocating all along in connection with Tonga. May immediately saw the extent of political turmoil and unrest amongst the Tongans which Campbell's policy of intervention had provoked, particularly in regard to the *Kautaha.* Ironically, Campbell's meddling had strengthened the Tongans' position, Having usurped political responsibility in Tonga, he could not now escape accountability. He had given bad advice on a number of occasions and had insisted that it be taken. His attitude was also partly responsible for the fact that the King's fight to regain some of his lost independence was now supported by a more united group of Tongans.

Before his visit, May noted that he was not impressed by the action Campbell had taken over Skeen, nor by the "singularly tactless language" he and Berkeley had used to the King in their 25 August interview.[55] During his first interview with the King, May even went so far as to disassociate himself from the demand for Skeen's immediate suspension which he described as "bad advice."[56] But instead of learning caution, the High Commissioner met the King on 8 September with a letter of demands based for the most part on Campbell's reports. It was even more unfortunate for May that the legal advice tendered to him in Fiji by Major also turned out to be "hopelessly wrong."[57] May's demands were three:

[54]Campbell to May, 28 August 1911, WPHC 4, 1489/11.
[55]May to S/S, 2 September 1911, CO 225/97.
[56]Ibid; encl 1 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.
[57]Minute, 11 December 1911, on May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

that the King dispense with Skeen's services by 31 December; that a proclamation be issued declaring Skeen's suspension of the ordinances to be null and void; and that no *Kautaha* be permitted without certain stipulated safeguards. Although the last demand was eventually satisfied in principle, the first two were never met. As one official in the colonial office commented, May

> ... had to undergo the humiliation of having to withdraw every one of his demands, and to appear as a humble suitor before the King who was triumphed all along the line.[58]

Obviously Tupou II had neither the legal knowledge nor the awareness of European political thinking to fight his own battle against the High Commissioner, and the quality of the advice he received was crucial. In the past he had used a variety of European advisers, including traders, minor officials, and resident lawyers. In 1905, he had employed an Auckland lawyer, Thomas Cotter, to plead his case; and now in 1911, he engaged another, R. N. Moody, whose ability and qualifications were of the highest.[59] Moody's connection with Tonga seems to have begun through A. D. Cameron, who engaged him in the *Rex v Cameron* case in December 1910, and he subsequently acted for the *Kautaha* in *Cameron et al. v Campbell et al.* But Moody was not only solicitor to the *Kautaha.* In early 1911, Tupou II, while on a three-month visit to New Zealand, engaged Moody as his legal adviser, instructing him

> to take such steps and make such representations to such persons as may seem to you advisable, with a view to . . . secure the due observance of the Treaty (dated 18 May 1900 and ratified 16 February 1901) made between Great Britain and Tonga, and to remedy the grievances of which my subjects complain in connection with the present administration by the British Agent in Tonga.[60]

To this end, Moody was responsible for nearly all of Tupou II's correspondences. Thanks to Moody, the King's letters were a great success--well framed and maintaining his zeal for the constitution and for his proper position as an independent sovereign. As one official in Fiji minuted on the receipt of one of Tupou II's adroit letters--"The voice is

[58]Ibid.

[59]Moody, the first Master of Laws in New Zealand, was Lecturer in Law at the Auckland University from 1908. He also worked as a barrister and solicitor in the firm Moody, Hackett and Moody. (Obituary, *Auckland Star,* 2 January 1937; Moody to Greene, 27 February 1911, WPHC 4, 388/11).

[60]Tupou II to Moody, 25 March 1911, Palace Office, Tonga (PO), unsorted papers.

Tupou's voice, but the hands are the hands of Mr Moody."[61] With Moody's capable advice, Tupou II acquitted himself extremely well throughout his negotiations with May.

With the law and constitution on his side, and Moody to argue them, the King had a strong case. It was doubtful, he contended, if he actually had the power to dismiss the Chief Justice even if he wanted to. According to clause 88 of the constitution, the Chief Justice held office "during good behaviour," and the only means provided for his removal seemed to be impeachment by the Legislative Assembly for improper conduct. Although Tupou II refused to dismiss Skeen arbitrarily, he was prepared, in proper legal form, to support a proposal to impeach Skeen at an early meeting of the Legislative Assembly, provided the High Commissioner would supply him with the necessary facts concerning Skeen's improper conduct.

Finding himself apparently without legal sanction, May decided to settle for the offer of impeachment. But when he attempted to find evidence, he was forced to back down. A charge of drunkenness could not be pressed, though it was considered, because there was no firm evidence that Skeen did habitually drink to excess, and even May conceded that he did not have the appearance of such a man. Other possible charges, relating to the taking of private practice and a failure to revise the statute books, were similarly based on shaky ground. Perhaps the only substantial charge against Skeen was that he was known to consort with "small traders and the lower class men on the beach," which might be undesirable in a Chief Justice but was hardly grounds for impeachment. Thus on the day of his departure from Tonga, May wrote to Tupou II, informing him that he did not wish to pursue further the matter of Skeen's removal and regretting that so much of the King's time should have been occupied by a question which he now found himself unable to press.[62] Skeen continued as Chief Justice till his death in late 1915.

Of wider importance was the settlement of the future of the *Kautaha.* In all the turmoil surrounding the *Kautaha* up to this point, the King had taken no part. As he explained to Moody sometime later: "I had no interest in the *Kautaha:* but when I saw the unjust way they were treated by the Government, I stood by the *Kautaha.*"[63] Tupou II made no attempt to deny his sympathy with the views of his people, and he took issue with the British officials' belief that such companies were inimical to the wel-

[61]Minute, 12 April 1912, on Tupou II to May, 1 April 1912, WPHC 4, 1855/11.
[62]May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, and encls (especially 10 and 25), CO 225/97.
[63]Tupou II to Moody, 25 November 1911, PO, unsorted papers.

fare of Tongans.[64] Again with the support of the law, Tupou II refused to issue May's proclamation declaring ordinance 4/11 still in force, contending that Skeen's suspension of it was quite in order. May, having been handicapped by Major's advice to the contrary, wisely decided not to press the point. But he was not happy with Tupou II's proposal to leave to the Legislative Assembly the question of whether future *Kautahas* should be subject to restrictions. Well aware how the representatives, many of them outraged members of the *Kautaha,* would vote, May proposed, and was eventually successful in seeing passed, an ordinance placing minimal restrictions on future *Kautahas.* Provided that their rules of association were approved by His Majesty in Council and that the accounts were regularly audited by the Auditor General, *Kautahas* were free to conduct business.[65] An attempt to make the rules subject to the High Commissioner's approval was removed at the King's insistence.[66]

Under this temporary ordinance and subsequent comprehensive and complex company legislation prepared by High Commission officials, the new *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* Ltd., was set up. Public opinion in Cameron's favor was so strong that May realized it was hopeless to try to induce the Tongan government to eliminate him from the management of the new *Kautaha,* but it seems Cameron's enthusiasm had waned.[67] The second *Kautaha* never regained the popularity of its predecessor and was not a commercial success. In 1918, it was finally wound up by the government Receiver.[68]

The overall cost of the *Kautaha* episode to the Tongan government was considerable. A total of £7,742 was paid out, including over £4,000 in legal expenses.[69] Shortly after the trial, Scott announced the *Kautaha's* decision to appeal against Major's judgement unless a satisfactory settlement was achieved out of court. Tupou II had no wish to leave his subjects with such a grievance, and in December 1911, Privy Council voted £3,604 to restore the costs of liquidation. It seems that the liquidator's ledgers were even more suspect than the *Kautaha's* books. Further, the costs of the trial were never enforced against the *Kautaha.* Cameron also sought compensation from the Tongan government, and although he received only £200 of the £2,500 he claimed, all imputations on his character and con-

[64]Tupou II to Campbell, 28 August 1911, WPHC 1489/11.

[65]Ordinance No. 7, 1911.

[66]Notes of an Interview on 11 September 1911, encl 17 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[67]Cameron's association with the new *Kautaha* was short-lived. (Cameron, Memoirs).

[68] *Tonga Government Gazette,* No. 19, 1918.

[69]Treasury Report for 1909--12, *Tonga Government Gazette,* No. 6, 1912.

duct were withdrawn from the *Gazettes* by order of Privy Council in September 1914.[70]

Although the *Kautaha* closure resulted in heavy financial loss to the government, it also brought its own victories. Tupou II had been fighting for more than just the *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* or for Skeen; his constitutional right to control his own kingdom, and his government's right to make its own decisions unfettered by British demands had been at stake. Tupou II had never acknowledged Britain's right to interfere in his kingdom, and he was now in a good position to capitalize on Britain's mistakes. Appealing to clause III of the 1900 treaty which precluded the British Agent from interfering in internal affairs, the King argued that Campbell's view of his own position was "totally erroneous."[71] He claimed that the 1905 agreement did not give Campbell license to insist that his advice be "slavishly followed' when it was opposed to the best interests of the kingdom as perceived by the King. Such a course would rob Tonga of the slightest vestige of autonomy and

> would lead to the absurd result that the King of Tonga is to have no voice in any matter which he believes affects the welfare of his subjects; in other words the King would not be the reigning monarch, but the British Agent.[72]

In the course of demanding Skeen's suspension, Humphrey Berkeley had assured the King that if the British Agent gave bad advice, he alone would suffer.[73] But events had proved otherwise. It was not Campbell, but the Tongan government and the Tongan people who had suffered from his ill-conceived "advice." Tupou II had good reason to call the system into doubt; and with Moody's pen, he made an impassioned plea for Tonga's independence:

> I am weary beyond measure of the existing condition of things. I have tried to preserve to my people their national existence, but there is a limit to my endurance. What does Great Britain want? Does she desire to further extend her dominions by adding to her wide empire the little kingdom of Tonga? No resistance can be offered. We can make no appeal to arms--our only appeal can be made to the justice which is supposed to characterise Great

[70] *Tonga Government Gazette,* No. 17, 1914; see also WPHC 4, 2408/14 and 2413/14.

[71] Tupou II to May, 7 September 1911, encl 4 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[72] Tupou II to Campbell, 28 August 1911, WPHC 4, 1489/11.

[73] Interview with His Majesty the King, 25 August 1911, sub-encl (b) in encl, May to S/S, 2 September 1911, CO 225/97.

> Britain's treatment of weaker nations. . . Does Great Britain desire to render the foreign traders richer, or does she truly desire to leave my people happy and contended?. . . .
>
> If we do not adopt the wisest course in managing our own concerns, that will be our affair. No nation has always seen clearly the right course to follow. If we are to make mistakes, then let us learn wisdom by experience, but as long as the interests of the few foreigners living in our midst are not endangered, no just cause can be found for robbing us of our independence, under the guise of giving us the 'advice' of the British Agent.[74]

Tupou II's plea for a reexamination of the relationship between Britain and Tonga was accompanied by an official request for the recall of Campbell from Tonga. Not only was Campbell the embodiment of the British attitude of which the King complained, but he was also, the King contended, quite unfitted for his position. The language he had used to the King and the threats which were a regular feature of his repertoire made him "personally most distasteful" to the King and also, the latter surmised, to most of his subjects and to many foreign residents.[75] With point, Tupou II argued: "We are not deficient in intelligence--send us a wise and tactful man, to whom we can safely appeal for advice, and you will find that we are not slow to take advantage of wisdom."[76]

The request was sympathetically received. By the end of his visit to Tonga, May was convinced that Campbell's removal was absolutely necessary. He considered Campbell "lacking in tact and dictatorial in his methods," and called on him to apologize to the King for the "truculent attitude" he had adopted during the interview on 25 August.[77] Colonial office officials agreed with May; they could see little in Campbell's favor and held him responsible for the problems arising from the closure of the *Kautaha,* including the heavy financial loss to the Tongan government. Although he was credited with having acted in what he believed to be the best interests of the people of Tonga, Campbell was censured for having "failed to realise the necessity of showing great tact in dealing with the King and to accept the limitations which have been imposed upon the action of the British Agent by His Majesty's Govemment."[78] That these limi-

[74]Tupou II to May, 7 September 1911, encl 4 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Ibid.

[77]May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[78]5/S to May, conf, 16 February 1912, WPHC 4, 1489/11.

tations had never been spelled out to Campbell, or that he had acted with the tacit support and more often the active encouragement of his superiors in the High Commission, was not permitted to cloud the decision to remove him.

Campbell's removal from Tonga was a sign that the colonial office had in large measure accepted the King's interpretation of Tonga's status. In fact, for the colonial office there was nothing new--it had always maintained that the King and his ministers should not be deprived of their lawful authority. One official minuted:

> I do not understand the objection to the King being an active Ruler. I can find nothing in the Cnstitution to indicate that he was intended to be anything else; I can see no ground on which we can desire that he should be a figurehead.[79]

But for the first time since the signing of the 1900 treaty, officials at the Western Pacific High Commission gained a new respect for the kingdom's autonomy. Early in his visit, May had demurred to Tupou II's statement that Tonga was an independent state. Rather, he claimed, it was "a state under the protection of Great Britain whose full liberty of independent Government is somewhat circumscribed by Treaty and by the Supplementary Agreement."[80] On the day he left, however, he addressed a letter to Campbell which amounted to a redefinition of High Commission policy and prescribed a much more limited role for the British Agent. May's letter, subsequently endorsed by the colonial office, stated that the 1905 agreement "does not mean that the agent and consul can insist on his advice on any matter being followed." All it implied was that the agent should be consulted on important issues, and could offer advice if he saw the administration being mismanaged. If he was not consulted, or if his advice on important issues (such as trade, administration or external relations) was ignored, then he could do no more than report the matter to the High Commissioner.[81] This interpretation, which formed part of the instructions to the incoming agent, left much less room for initiatives by over-zealous British officials.

Tupou II welcomed these reappraisals, informing May that his "impartiality and tact" had reestablished his own faith, and that of his people, in Great Britain. But there was one further change which Tupou II

[79] Minute by A. B. Keith, 2 February 1912, on May to S/S, conf, 21 December 1911, CO 225/98.

[80] May to Tupou II, 8 September 1911, encl 5 in May to S/S, conf, 23 September 1911, CO 225/97.

[81] May to Campbell, 16 September 1911, encl 34.

planned before he could again call the kingdom his own. Since Mateialona's appointment as Premier in 1905, his presence had been a source of great irritation to the King. Mateialona had obviously become "completely subservient to the British Agent,"[82] and with unforgivable indiscretion had publicly declared: "I tell you our country is protected, and if it is protected, it is (i.e. the country) the protector's, and it is right if the Consul says he is going to jump into the sea, [for] the King to follow him . . ."[83]

On 14 October 1911, Tupou II informed the High Commissioner that Mateialona had lost the confidence of the King, ministers and people, and that the interests of Tonga demanded his replacement. The Tongan constitution empowered the King to dismiss his Premier, and Tupou II wanted that unfettered authority. In this he met determined opposition from May and the colonial office who realized that Mateialona was being punished for his loyalty to the British Agent and for his belief that Tonga should be ruled in accordance with British advice. Weighed against their reluctance to see Mateialona removed, however, was the question of their legal right to prevent it. The High Commissioner was authorized to make. "strong recommendations" to the King, but no more--annexation was not yet completely ruled out in the colonial office, but it had been threatened too often and too cheaply. The British were finally forced to admit that without the King's consent there were "no legal means of intervention."[84]

On Moody's advice, however, Tupou II allowed himself to be persuaded. But he was not conceding anything; he had simply found a surer way to outwit the British. Relying on the Legislative Assembly's power of impeachment, Tupou II announced that he would wait and see whether any "spontaneous action" was taken against Mateialona during the next session.[85] This was a brilliant move, for it took the responsibility away from the King and was fully in accord with the fundamental British constitutional principle that a Premier should retain the confidence of the people. The colonial office had no answer. On 15 May 1912, Mateialona was charged in the Legislative Assembly with having closed the *Kautaha* "against the instructions of His Majesty and Privy Council" and with having acted without the authority of the Council on other specified occasions. With the outcome a foregone conclusion, the acting British Agent,

[82]Tupou II to May, 7 September 1911, encl 4.

[83]Ibid.

[84]Minute by A. B. Keith, 4 October 1912, on Sweet-Escott to S/S, conf (3), 9 August 1912, CO 225/105.

[85]Tupou II to May, 1 April 1912, WPHC 4, 1855/11.

Islay McOwan, arranged a last-minute honorable settlement for Mateialona. In return for the withdrawal of the charges, Mateialona agreed to resign from the Premiership.[86]

One final touch completed the King's ascendancy over the British and over his own kingdom. At the same session of the Legislative Assembly the governors of Ha'apai and Vava'u, Sione Tu'itavake and Sione Tupou Faletau, were impeached and subsequently removed from office. The charges against them were not particularly grave--Tu'itavake was accused of preventing the collection of money for the *Kautaha* law suit, and Faletau was accused with supplying liquor to a Tongan woman.[87] But the real offense of each in the eyes of the King and the assembly was that he had been in the wrong camp. Both had supported Campbell and not the *Kautaha,* and, like Mateialona, both were Wesleyans and, therefore, permanently at odds with the officially-endorsed Free Church. Their impeachment and dismissal was, therefore, not without point. All who had opposed the King and supported Campbell had now paid the penalty. There could be no doubt that, as the Secretary to the Western Pacific High Commission minuted, "deference to the British power is unadvisable for Tongan officials."[88]

Although the *Tonga Ma'a Tonga Kautaha* was not set up for any overt political objective, it became the occasion of an important turning point in British-Tongan relations. As an expression of the desire of many Tongan villagers to eliminate European middlemen from commerce, the *Kautaha* had its own intrinsic importance. But, ironically perhaps, it achieved even greater significance when closed down. Left to itself, the *Kautaha* may well have come to an inglorious end, as its successor did, but its arbitrary closure provided the Tongans with a genuine grievance against British encroachment. The *Kautaha* had set out to eliminate economic domination and ended up involved in the struggle against political domination. Henceforth the authroity of the British Agent to intervene in Tonga's domestic affairs was carefully circumscribed.

Pacific and Southeast Asian History
Australian National University
Canberra

[86]McOwan to May, 27 May 1912 and encls.
[87]McOwan to May, 22 June 1912 and encls.
[88]Minute by C. H. Hart-Davis, 8 July 1912.

EDITOR'S FORUM

DEVELOPING A STANDARDIZED HAWAIIAN ORTHOGRAPHY[1]

by William H. Wilson

The Hawai'i Constitutional Convention of 1978 designated the Hawaiian language an official language of the State of Hawai'i along with English.[2] This very positive initial step towards reestablishing the prestige of the Hawaiian language carries with it the promise for more concrete actions in the same spirit in the future. One of the most important of these is to establish a standard Hawaiian orthography.

The problems of establishing such a standard have been recognized since the mid-1820s when a group of Protestant missionaries met to finalize a standardized alphabet to be used by their mission in writing the Hawaiian language. Until this time, there had been considerable confusion regarding the spelling of Hawaiian words, especially those containing the consonants now symbolized with the letters *k, l,* and *w* (Harvey 1968).

Although it is popularly believed that these missionaries solved all the problems of writing Hawaiian, they did not. They simply established a set of letters. They never fully addressed the problems of word division, capitalization, and punctuation, all important parts of writing a language. Word division problems in particular are causing much confusion among modern users of Hawaiian.

[1]Although I assume full responsibility for the contents of this article, I would like to thank Dr. April Komenaka Purcell for her helpful comments on an earlier draft, and also my many colleagues and friends in the Hawaiian language field who have shared an interest with me in Hawaiian orthography.

[2]Amendment 31 established the official languages of Hawai'i in Section 4 of Article XV (formerly XIII) as follows: "English and Hawaiian shall be the official languages of Hawai'i except that Hawaiian shall be required for public acts and transactions only as provided by law." Also pertinent is the revised Section 4 of Article X establishing a Hawaiian Education Program also passed in the 1978 Constitutional Convention. The adopted Amendment 20 reads as follows: "The State shall promote the study of Hawaiian culture, history and language. The State shall provide for a Hawaiian education program consisting of language, culture and history in the public schools. The use of community expertise shall be encouraged as a suitable and essential means in furtherance of the Hawaiian education program."

The missionary alphabet of twelve letters, while very ingenious, was never completely perfected. Problems faced by the missionaries involving when to use the *w* and a set of supplementary "foreign letters" (e.g., *s, f, r,* etc.) remain with us today. Furthermore, the missionaries never completely adopted their alphabet to the glottal stop and differences of vowel length which are such an important part of the spoken Hawaiian language. The glottal stop (now often marked with a single open quote ‘) and vowel length (now often marked with a macron ¯) are phonemic in Hawaiian. That is, they are sounds that distinguish meaning.[3] There are many words in Hawaiian that have different pronunciations and meanings and yet are spelled identically in the missionary alphabet as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Some Words Distinguished Solely By a Glottal Stop or Vowel Length

Missionary Spelling	Modern Spelling	English
kala	*kala*	a kind of fish
	kālā	money
kai	*kai*	sea
	ka‘i	march
	kāī	a kind of taro
pau	*pau*	ended, over
	pa‘u	soot
	pa	damp
	pa	a kind of riding skirt
au	*au*	current
	āu	your
	‘au	swim
	a‘u	marlin

Reading the missionary orthography is like reading an English writing system devised by a foreigner in which certain important sound differ-

[3]A good introduction to modern Hawaiian orthographic symbols and proper Hawaiian pronunciation is *The Hawaiian Language: Its Spelling and Pronunciation* by Silva and Kamanā. This book is accompanied by a cassette tape illustrating the various features of proper Hawaiian pronunciation such as use of the glottal stop and contains exercises in distinguishing these features.

ences (such as *l* versus *r*, *g* versus *k*, and *f* versus *p*) are not distinguished by separate symbols. It requires a person to guess which word is meant based on the context of the sentence. Unfortunately, there is no way that the pronunciation of certain rare words and proper names in old documents can be guessed accurately. The pronunciation of a number of these terms has become lost forever because of the deficiencies of the old twelve-letter alphabet.

The various deficiencies of the missionary writing system mentioned above are reflected in the great variability in spelling found in Hawaiian language texts, publications in the Hawaiian language, and scholarly works dealing with the Hawaiian language and culture. Furthermore, individual Hawaiian language teachers often differ from each other in their spelling practices and even from themselves from semester to semester.

The lack of a recognized standard for the spelling of Hawaiian words affects not only those who use the language extensively as part of their daily lives, but also the general English-speaking public. Visual representation of Hawaiian terms is extremely common in Hawai'i, in media ranging from books, bracelets, record covers, and street signs to maps, leaflets, newspaper articles, and telephone directories. Without a recognized standard orthography, the attitude towards the spelling of Hawaiian terms has been much more lax than that accorded the spelling of English or foreign languages. Even such models of public language use as the daily Honolulu newspapers frequently print misspellings of the sort illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2. Some Commonly Misspelled Hawaiian Words

Incorrect	**Correct**	**English**
poki	*poke*	a way of preparing raw fish
maili	*maile*	a popular type of *lei*
mahi-mahi	*mahimahi*	a type of fish
mu 'u mu 'u	*mu 'umu 'u*	a type of dress
lau lau	*laulau*	a type of Hawaiian food
Keone	*Keoni*	the Hawaiian equivalent of John
hao	*hau*	a type of tree

The rather negligent attitude of the newspapers is reflected in the general community as well where spelling of Hawaiian terms has become so slipshod that even the long-established use of the basic twelve letters is falling into disuse. For example, recently a shellfish spelled ***wī*** in the Hawaiian dictionary was spelled "vee" in a local market and a fish named *uouoa* was labeled "woowoo." More shocking is the spelling found in the

Foxfire-type publications produced by the language arts classes in local high schools where Hawaiian words are frequently misspelled (e.g. "hook-ey" for *huki* 'pull' in *Moolelo,* Vol. II No. 2, Fall 1977, p. 14).

With the present lax attitude concerning the use of the basic twelve letters, it is not surprising that symbols for the glottal stop and vowel length are used unsystematically and without understanding of their functions. One frequently finds, for instance, organizations like a hypothetical *Hui o Hilo,* "Association of Hilo" where *o* 'of' is spelled *o'* or *o*ʻ. This may look "more Hawaiian" to some people because it includes a symbol for the *ʻokina* or *ʻuʻina* (glottal stop) but such spellings show ignorance of the fact that Hawaiian words never end in a consonant, and the *ʻokina* is a consonant. The spelling of *o* 'of' in this way is based on English traditions rather than Hawaiian ones (compare cup o' soup, will-o'-the-wisp, and O'Connor).

The major media offer little direction to the public in the marking of vowel length and the *ʻokina.* In the newspapers, the *ʻokina* is sometimes indicated properly with a single open quote mark (ʻ) as it is in the Hawaiian dictionary. More frequently an apostrophe (') is used, and most commonly, the *ʻokina* is completely ignored.[4] Local newspapers are also guilty of haphazardly inserting the *ʻokina* where it does not belong.

The situation is even worse for the contrast between plain and long vowels. Judging from local newspapers, it would be difficult for an outsider to discover that the written Hawaiian language employs a symbol for long vowels at all. Newspapers have yet to modify their typesetting facilities to accommodate the *kahakō* or macron (¯) used to mark long vowels in Hawaiian (and several other languages spoken in Hawaiʻi, including Japanese and Samoan.) However, a *kahakō,* has, on occasion, been added in special cases in the newspapers using existing facilities. For example, a *kahakō* has appeared in *Shōgun,* the title of a novel about Japan, but none in *Hōkūleʻa,* the name of the Hawaiian voyaging canoe which was much discussed in the newspapers. This is an indication of the lax attitude of local models of language use toward Hawaiian in contrast to foreign languages. Table 3 is a list of some common Hawaiian proper names spelled with the *ʻokina* and *kahakō* which are spelled without them in the local newspapers.

[4]An exception to this generalization is *The Garden Island,* published in Līhuʻe, Kauaʻi. The editor of this newspaper, Jean E. Holmes, has been very conscientious about including the *ʻokina* in all words where it belongs.

Table 3. Some Common Proper Names Spelled with the ʻOkina and Kahakō

Hawaiʻi	Kaʻū	Kaʻahumanu
Kahoʻolawe	Halemaʻumaʻu	Kalākaua
Lānaʻi	Haleakalā	Kapiʻolani
Molokaʻi	Kalamaʻula	Liliʻuokalani
Oʻahu	Wahiawā	Kaʻiulani
Kauaʻi	Lāʻie	Hawaiʻi Ponoʻī
Niʻihau	Līhuʻe	ʻIolani

Recently, the state and county governments have become concerned about the correct spelling of Hawaiian names and words. The City and County of Honolulu, for example, has amended its street name ordinance to include "appropriate diacritical marks" in all new street signs erected after 3 July 1979.[5] There remains, however, no officially recognized authority for appropriate use of symbols for the glottal stop and vowel length. It is customary in the English speaking world to look to the dictionary as the ultimate authority on standard usage, especially in the area of spelling. This attitude has carried over in the view held by the majority of Hawaiʻi's residents regarding the *Hawaiian Dictionary* (Pukui-Elbert 1971). However, the editorial policy of Elbert in particular, who is responsible for orthographic conventions in the dictionary, is quite different from the popular notion.

Elbert endorses the "descriptive approach" where ideally one reports the entire range of usage of a language without making judgments prescribing one over another. The descriptive approach encourages frequent reanalysis, as can be seen in the different spelling conventions used not only in different editions of the Pukui-Elbert dictionary, but also in other publications of Elbert's dealing with the Hawaiian language as illustrated in Table 4.

[5]See Bill No. 46 (1979) Ordinance No. 79-54 amending Chapter 22 of the Revised Ordinance of Honolulu 1969. This chapter also requires that in the City of Honolulu: "Street names selected shall consist of Hawaiian names, words or phrases and shall be selected with a view to the appropriateness of the name to historic, cultural, scenic and topographical features of the area."

Table 4. Differences in Spelling of Selected Terms from Elbert's Publications

	A.	B.	C.	D.	E.
stand	*ku*	*ku*	*kū*	*kū*	*kū*
one	*ho*	*ho'okahi*	*ho'okahi*	*ho'okahi*	*ho'okahi*
until	*a*	*ā*	*a*	*a*	*ā*
the (plural)	*na*	*na*	*nā*	*nā*	*nā*
and as a	*a me mehe*	*a me mehe*	*ame mehe*	*a me mehe*	*ā me me he*
for (A-form)	*na*	*na*	*nā*	*na*	*na*
for (O-form)	*no*	*no*	*nō*	*no*	*no*
indeed the of	*no*	*no*	*nō*	*nō*	*nō*
(O-form) vocative	*ko*	*ko*	*kō*	*ko*	*kō*
particle	*e*	*e*	*e*	*e*	*ē*

A. *The Hawaiian-English Dictionary,* 1957
B. *Conversational Hawaiian,* 1961
C. *Nā Mele O Hawai'i Nei,* 1970
D. *The Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary,* 1975
E. *Hawaiian Grammar,* 1979

Elbert's attitudes have also influenced other researchers, resulting in a large number of different orthographic conventions being used in the spelling of Hawaiian. Elbert has been a pioneer in the important effort to systematically record all phonemic glottal stops and long vowels in Hawaiian, using a model based on the better recorded Polynesian languages of the South Pacific such as Tongan, Samoan, and New Zealand Māori. His work has resulted in a remarkable change in public attitude concerning the proper spelling of Hawaiian terms, but as he has stated himself, "he is a reporter, and in his role of lexicographer he never takes the part of teacher, missionary, innovator, or purist." (Pukui-Elbert 1965:xi) The Pukui-Elbert dictionary must therefore be viewed, not as an authoritative, prescriptive guide to Hawaiian spelling, but as an individual linguist's analysis of the phonology and morphology of the language at a

given point in time. The Hawai'i community wishing to use the Hawaiian, language as a mode of written communication, rather than as an object of scientific study, must look elsewhere to find prescriptive standards of Hawaiian language use.

In a number of European countries, there are nationally recognized academies or boards that monitor the orthography of their languages along with other matters pertaining to proper usage and language planning. Such groups have started to appear in the Pacific as well. In the Kingdom of Tonga, official meetings on Tongan orthography were held by the Privy Council as early as 1943. An Academy of the Tahitian language was established in Pape'ete on 2 July 1974. Closer to home, the Linguistics Department of the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa has worked closely with the governments of the various districts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific in establishing committees to standardize the orthographies of Micronesian languages in the 1970s.

The closest thing that Hawai'i has to a board of the above sort is the orthography committee of the 'Ahahui 'Olelo Hawai'i, a Hawaiian language organization that counts most Hawaiian language teachers among its members. This group held periodic meetings during 1978 to decide on some spelling guidelines for members to use in their classrooms and continues to operate on a less regular basis today. The emphasis in the 1978 meetings was on the spelling of grammatical words such as prepositions, verb markers, and possessives. These words are of extremely common occurrence and some of the most readily observed differences in spelling could be found in grammatical words. Some time was also spent discussing punctuation, capitalization, proper names, and compound words, but these topics were covered less thoroughly and remain to be discussed in more detail.

Although the spelling guidelines of the 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i represent the most comprehensive and thorough list of prescriptive rules for the spelling of the Hawaiian language agreed upon by any body of Hawaiian language scholars, they are incomplete at present. Furthermore, they lack official recognition outside the 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i and its membership. A true standard orthography of the Hawaiian language requires recognition of a broader sort. The 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i Orthography Committee remains, however, a prototype of the sort of official board needed for the entire state and certainly many of the same highly qualified individuals currently serving on this committee would serve on a board having broader powers. The creation of such a board might best be realized through the governor's office, the legislature, or the Office of Hawaiian Affairs.

Political considerations aside, it was stated earlier that there are a number of specific practical problems that must be solved before a standardized Hawaiian orthography can be established. These problems and different approaches used in dealing with them are addressed in the remainder of this article.

Five major approaches have been used in developing Hawaiian spelling systems. Three of them, the phonetic approach, the phonological approach, and the historical approach deal mainly with the arrangement of symbols for sounds while the other two, the Anglophile approach and the nativistic approach, have to do with word divisions.

The phonetic approach requires that a word be spelled exactly as it is pronounced. This principle appears sound until one realizes that the same word is often pronounced slightly differently by the same individual under different circumstances. An example from American English is the word *you* of *Did you eat?,* pronounced depending on speed, "yoo" *(did yoo eet?),* "yah" *(did yah eet?),* and "j" *(di-j-eet?).* There are similar situations in Hawaiian as with the word *laila* 'there' pronounced *"laila," "leila,"* and *"lila"* depending on the rate of speed at which it is pronounced. The phonetic approach has been rejected by almost everyone, including the missionaries, who abandoned it when they decided that the letter *k* would be used for a sound sometimes pronounced *k* and sometimes *t* without a difference in meaning.

The second approach for determining the representation of sounds, the phonological approach, is the most widely accepted means of deciding the spelling of Hawaiian words. The phonological approach is similar to the phonetic approach except that one does not spell words exactly as they are pronounced "by the mouth" but as they are pronounced "in the mind." Differences between "pronunciations in the mind" and "pronunciation by the mouth" are explained as predictable by customary changes usually described as phonological rules.

That is, in the case of the word for "there" mentioned earlier with three pronunciations *laila, leila,* and *lila* depending on the speed of speech, *laila,* the one produced during the most careful speech, is the one that people are generally conscious of and the one that is spelled. It is, in fact, possible to predict from speech tempo, which pronunciation, *laila, leila,* or *lila,* will be used. Similarly for some Hawaiian speakers, the sound *k* is frequently not used after *i,* being replaced in this position by *t,* while *t* occurs nowhere else in their vocabulary. In the phonological approach, one assumes a basic sound *k,* and predicts that *k* becomes *t* after *i* for these speakers.

The phonological approach to Hawaiian spelling is not only the most sensible and practical one, it is also the most traditional approach. Hawaiian speakers have always spelled words in their most careful form and avoided spellings characteristic of rapid informal conversation. Many speakers are, in fact, unaware that when speaking rapidly their pronunciation of certain words changes in the manner shown in Table 5.

Table 5. Basic and Colloquial Pronunciations Compared

Basic Pronunciaton (Spelled Form)	**English**	**Colloquial Pronunciation** (Never Spelled)
maikaʻi	good	*meikaʻi, maikeʻi, meikeʻi*
Hawaiʻi	an island name	*Hawaʻi*
puaʻa	pig	*puʻa*
laila	there	*leila, lila*
māʻona	full (of food)	*mā*
inā	if	*inē, nā, nē*

Some of the differences in spellings used by different individuals and groups have to do with different viewpoints of predictable variation in pronunciation.[6] An example of this is the possessive often translated as

[6]Differences in spelling may also be due to different investigators hearing different distinctions, or from different meanings attached to the same symbol. The ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi Orthography Committee has a number of small differences of these sorts with Elbert. Note, for example:

Pukui-Elbert Dictionary 1957	**ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo, Hawaiʻi 1978**	**English**
hoʻoūna	*ho ʻouna*	send
Kalīkimaka	*Kalikimaka*	Christmas
ʻaīwa	*ʻaiwa*	nine
puīa	*pūia*	sweet-smelling
p	*puaaloalo*	hibiscus

A number of such differences are due to the fact that while Elbert uses the *kahakō* for two (and possibly more-see note 8) purposes, the ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi uses the *kahakō* to mark only long vowels. Elbert has used the *kahakō* as "a sign indicating both stress (or accent) and length" (Elbert-Pukui 1979:14) and has also claimed that "double vowels" fuse into a single long vowel" (Elbert-Pukui 1979:15) marked with a *kahakō*. Elbert's analysis seems to be changing, however. He notes that two like vowels may fuse as a single short vowel (Elbert-Pukui 1979:22, 37). He (Elbert-Pukui 1979:16-18) has also found a way of marking off stress groups with periods rather than by using a *kahakō* (e.g., Pukui-Elbert 1957 *kanaīwa*, Elbert-Pukui 1979 *kana. iwa* 'ninety').

"of," spelled *ā* by some and *a* by others. Both pronunciations occur, with the long form before stressed syllables and the short form before unstressed syllables. In this case, the choice of one over the other as the basic pronunciation is a difficult and somewhat arbitrary one. Current linguistic theory has a convention of picking the form occurring in the "least marked environment" as basic. (see Langacker 1972:239 and Schane 1973: 112-121). That is, the form which occurs in a position which is the most specialized is the derived form. In this case, a stressed position is more specialized than an unstressed position, so the form occurring before an unstressed syllable (i.e., *a)* would be chosen as basic. Again, the variant long form is predictable.

A third approach, the historical approach, bases spelling of Hawaiian words on ancestral forms. Linguists have reconstructed an ancestor language of Hawaiian called Proto-Polynesian with among its phonemes **k* and **m* which correspond to the Hawaiian sounds ‘ and *m.* For example, Proto-Polynesian **manu* 'bird,' **ika* 'fish,' and **kakala* 'fragrant,' correspond to Hawaiian *manu* 'bird,' *i‘a* 'fish,' and *‘a‘ala* 'fragrant.' If one spelled Hawaiian with ‘ and *m* wherever Proto-Polynesian had **k* and **m* respectively, one would be representing the language by the historical approach. Although this approach works fairly well, it leads to inaccuracies. A historically accurate spelling of the Hawaiian word for sweet potato would be *‘umala* (PPN **kumala)* but this word is *‘uala* in Hawaiian. Similarly, the historical approach would lead us to write the Hawaiian marker of completed action or state as *‘ua* rather than *ua* as tapes show it to be actually pronounced. In Proto-Polynesian this word was **kua.* Table 6 shows that the historical approach is not a reliable method of determining the spelling of Hawaiian words.

Table 6. Unexpected Hawaiian Developments from Proto-Polynesian

Proto-Polynesian Form	Expected Form in Hawaiian	Actual Form in Hawaiian	English
**kumala*	*‘umala*	*‘uala*	sweet potato
**kaloama*	*‘aloama*	*‘oama*	young *weke* fish
**taokete*	*kao‘eke*	*kaiko‘eke*	brother-in-law
**ai*	*ai*	*wai*	who
**tokelau*	*ko‘elau*	*ko‘olau*	windward
**tavake*	*kawa‘e*	*koa‘e*	a kind of bird
**lano*	*lano*	*nalo*	fly
**ta‘etuli*	*kaekuli*	*kokuli*	earwax

Elbert has applied a historical approach in his treatment of "foreign letters" in the *Hawaiian-English Dictionary* (Pukui-Elbert 1965:xix) where all Hawaiian words of nonnative origin are spelled with native consonants according to a set formula (see also Elbert-Pukui 1979:13). This analysis is based on the historical fact that previous to Western contact, Hawaiian had no phonemes *s, f, g,* etc. It is no longer true that "foreign letters" are unpronounceable for Hawaiian speakers and that they are always replaced with native ones in speech. There are, for example, a number of commonly used Hawaiian words pronounced consistently with *s* (e.g. *'ekalesia* 'church organization,' *Iesu* 'Jesus,' and *hosana* 'hosanna') rather than with *k* as listed in the Pukui-Elbert dictionary. The sound *s* has become so firmly incorporated into the Hawaiian phonological system that new words have been spontaneously created with this phoneme (e.g., *sila,* 1978 Ni'ihau slang for a teller of tall tales; *so'e,* Hawai'i Island slang for an effeminate male). To deny the position of *s* as a true modern Hawaiian phoneme is akin to purging the English alphabet of *v,* a nonnative phoneme incorporated in to English from French and other foreign sources.[7] Table 7 contrasts some Hawaiian words consistently pronounced with *s* with some consistently pronounced with *k.* Note that some of the *k*-words derive from English *s*-words.

Table 7. The Contrast Between S and K in Hawaiian

K-words	English	s-words	English
kilu	steel (Eng. *steel)*	*sila*	seal (Eng. *seal)*
ko'e	worm (PPN **toke)*	*so'e*	effeminate male (?)
kopa	soap (Eng. *soap)*	*hosana*	hosanna (Eng. *hosanna)*
kekake	donkey (Eng. *jackass)*	*nahesa*	snake (Heb. *nâchâsh)*
Kamuela	Samuel (Eng. *Samuel)*	*Iesu*	Jesus (Grk. Iesous)
penikala	pencil (Eng. *pencil)*	*'ekalesia*	church organization (Grk. ēkklēsia)

(Eng. English, PPN Proto-Polynesian, Heb. Hebrew, Grk. Greek)

[7]Old English originally had only the phoneme /f/ which, however, was pronounced /v/ rather than /f/ in certain specified environments. A carryover from this original situation is the existence of singular/plural pairs like *leaf/leaves* in modem English. With the introduction of words from other languages where /v/ was pronounced outside of the originally specific environments, /f/ and /v/ became separate phonemes in English. English distinctions between the pairs /s/ and /z/, and / / (e.g., the *th* in *bath*) and /c/ (e.g., the *th* in *bathe*) are also largely the result of outside influences as is the adoption of the phoneme /z/

Elbert has also applied a sort of historical approach in determining his use of the letter *w* after *o* and *u* within Hawaiian words, There has never been any problem over the spelling of words containing an initial *w,* or a *w* after the vowels *a, e,* and *i.* However, a number of Hawaiian words spelled with a *w* after an *o* or *u* are also frequently spelled without a *w* in older Hawaiian writings (e.g., *kowali/koali* 'morning-glory plant,' *uwila/uila* 'lightning'). These spelling differences do not reflect any pronunciation differences, and choosing one spelling over the other in such pairs is an important step toward creating a uniform spelling system.

Elbert (1979:12-13) proposes that *w* be spelled after an *o* or *u only when the* w *can be shown to be the initial sound in a recognizable base* which makes up part of a compound word. Elbert's examples of such a situation are *kūwili* 'move restlessly' (compare *wili* 'twist') and *ʻuwīʻuwī* 'squeak' (compare *wī* 'squeal'). This proposal is a historical one in that it requires a theory of the history of the formation of these words.

The central problem of writing a *w* after *o* and *u* is really one involving pronunciation. That is, it is a phonological problem, rather than a historical one. At the beginning of a word and after the vowels *a, e,* and *i,* the letter *w* is pronounced variously like English *v* (International Phonetic Alphabet *v*), a soft English *v* (IPA *v*), Spanish *b/v* (IPA *ß*), and English *w* (IPA *w*) by different speakers of Hawaiian. In some words *w* can be pronounced all four ways after *o* or *u* (e.g., Elbert's example *kūwili*), while in others the *w* can only be pronounced as *w* in this position (e.g., Elbert's example of *ʻuwīʻuwī*).

It is this second group of words like *ʻuwīʻuwī* (and not those like *kūwili*) that the *w* is frequently omitted in older Hawaiian writings. In actuality, the *w* here is not a significant consonant, but is an unavoidable byproduct of gliding from an *o* or *u* to a following vowel. Writing this *w*-glide in such words can be confusing, especially for students who have been taught to pronounce all *w-s* in Hawaiian with a soft *v*-sound. Deleting *w-s* after *o* and *u* which cannot be pronounced *v,* effectively eliminates the confusion and this is the solution adopted by the ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi Orthography Committee for use in Hawaiian language classrooms. Table 8 illustrates some of the words that students of Hawaiian

(e.g., the *g* in beige) (Hook 1975:113, 155). A number of Polynesian languages have developed new phonemes through contact with other languages. Modern Tongan has a phoneme /s/. Before contact with English /s/ was only a conditioned variant of /t/ in Tongan. Rennellese borrowed /l/ and /ɣ/ (written *gh*) from the language of an unknown Melanesian people very early in its history. Some Tuamotuan dialects have borrowed the glottal stop from Tahitian.

sometimes incorrectly pronounced with a *v* when reading the variant spellings in which the *w*-glide was spelled out. *W*-glides are crossed out in these words since they are not written in most Hawaiian language classrooms today.

Table 8. The W-Glide and True W-Consonant Contrasted after O and U

W-Glide (never pronounced v, *v,* or *ß)*		**True W-Consonant** (pronounced v, *v, ß,* or w)	
auẇe	a common exclamation	*ʻāweoweo*	a type of red fish
lauẇaʻe	a type of fern	*puʻuwai*	heart
ʻuẇehe	a *hula* step	*lapuwale*	worthless
koẇali	morning-glory vine	*kawowo*	sprout
pōẇā	rob	*olowī*	long and narrow
ʻuẇīʻuẇī	squeak	*kūwili*	move restlessly

The fourth approach to establishing spelling rules for Hawaiian, the Anglophile approach, developed from attempts to resolve one special problem, word divisions. Word divisions were considered only briefly by the missionary innovators of the Hawaiian spelling system, and this area still remains the biggest problem in the creation of a standard Hawaiian orthography. An approach commonly taken in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century was to follow English word division practices, hence the name, Anglophile. While the Anglophile approach seems to make things simple on the surface, it instead creates numerous difficulties. Essentially, it requires anyone writing Hawaiian to know English as well and to be aware of English translations when using Hawaiian. An example is the English term or, usually expressed in Hawaiian by a phrase *a i ʻole* meaning literally, *and if not.* The phrase *a i ʻole* is written as one word by some since the English translation or is one word.

One can get an idea of the problems the Anglophile approach causes in Hawaiian word division by looking at what would happen if English expressions translating single Hawaiian words were written as single words. By analogy with Hawaiian *naʻu,* there would be the English words, "belongingtome," "forme," and "madebyme," and by analogy with *pēlā* there would be "inthatway" and "likethat."

Although strong forms of the Anglophile approach have lost proponents, it is still common to find some persistent spellings based on

English in the writing of modern users of the Hawaiian language. Some of the most common of these are listed in Table 9.

Table 9. Anglophile versus Nativistic Spelling of Some Hawaiian Terms

English Translation	Anglophile Spelling	Nativistic Spelling	Literal Hawaiian Meaning
or	*ai'ole*	*a i 'ole*	and if not
him	*iāia*	*iā ia*	object-marker him
upon, above	*maluna*	*ma luna*	on top
what	*heaha*	*he aha*	a what
because	*nokamea*	*no ka mea*	due-to the matter
yesterday	*inehinei*	*i nehinei*	on yesterday
all	*apau*	*a pau*	until completely-included

The nativistic approach to word divisions is to devise spelling criteria according to internal patterns of the Hawaiian language. With grammatical terms, this approach usually advocates more word divisions than the Anglophile approach as shown above. There are cases, however, where a nativistic approach advocates spelling as a single word rather than segmentation. One of these is in the spelling of proper names. Traditionally in Hawaiian, proper names are written as single words. This reflects an internal pattern of the language in which names, although often composed of more than one word, are treated as single units and so marked grammatically by certain proper name markers such as *'o,* the proper name subject marker. An American tradition of segmenting "native" names according to their derivation has often been followed in scholarly works (e.g., Ka-lā-kaua, the name of a king, literally the-day-of-war).

This practice is beneficial from a scholarly viewpoint, much as derivations listed after English words in the dictionary are, but it can pose difficulties when carried over into everyday use of names. The derivations of many names are unknown and such names would hypothetically be incapable of being spelled. With many other names, pronunciation changes often hundreds of years old make them quite different from the phrases from which they were originally derived. Compare *Mōkapu,* a place on O'ahu with its source *moku kapu* 'sacred district' and *Kaunakakai,* a place

on Moloka'i with its source *kauna kahakai* 'beach landing.' (Pukui-Elbert-Mookini 1974: 153-154, 95).[8]

The most serious problem in segmenting proper names is disputes over derivation. An example of such a dispute is the name of a place in North Kona which is pronounced *Ka'ūpūlehu* by all, but which some propose as deriving from *ka 'ulu pūlehu* 'the roasted breadfruit' (Pukui-Elbert-Mookini 1974:96) and others from *ka'u pūlehu* 'my roasted food (Joseph Maka'ai--native of Ka'ūpūlehu 1980). Of the two suggested segmentations *Ka-'ū-pūlehu* and *Ka'ū-pūlehu*, which should be adopted? The nativist would adopt neither. In the nativistic approach, *Ka'ūpūlehu* means neither 'the roasted breadfruit' nor 'my roasted food' but a particular area in North Kona as shown by its use with the proper name subject marker *'o* and also by the fact that many native speakers of Hawaiian familiar with the place and its name have no idea as to how the name should be segmented. There are, in fact, many possible derivations of old Hawaiian place names like Ka'ūpūlehu as shown in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Possible Derivations of the Name Ka'ūpūlehu*

ka 'ulu pūlehu	the roasted breadfruit
ka'u pūlehu	my roasted (one)
Ka pūlehu	roasted Ka'ū (a district name)
ka ū pūlehu	the roasted breast
ka 'upu lehu	the recollection (of) ashes
ka 'ū pū lehu	the groan blowing ashes
kau pule hua	place prayers (for) fruits

*Note that only the third possibility has the same pronunciation as the actual name of the place, and every possibility has a different pronunciation.

As stated earlier, the nativistic approach has been followed traditionally in the spelling of proper names in Hawai'i and the few cases where a

[8]In spelling single vowel reduced morphemes in proper names such as *mō* from *moku* 'district,' Elbert has established a convention of consistently using a *kahakō* without regard to pronunciation. There are, however, examples of reduced morphemes in proper names that are pronounced short. For example, the *o* of the chiefs name Keoua (Elbert's *Ke-ō-ua*) is a reduction of the word *ao* 'cloud' but is always pronounced short. Elbert's use of the *kahakō* here serves a derivational function rather than a phonological one. This usage of the *kahakō* and all other usages of the *kahakō* for purposes other than marking phonologically long vowels have been rejected by the 'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i based on a principle of 'one symbol-one function' (see note 4).

more Anglophile approach has been used usually involve recently coined names such as *ʻAina Haina* and *Hawaiʻi Kai* on Oʻahu. Exceptions to this statement can be found, however, such as the traditional names *Mauna Loa* and *Mauna Kea* on the island of Hawaiʻi, now commonly spelled as two words although there are older documents where they are spelled as single words. Compare these with *Maunaloa* on Molokaʻi and *Maunakea* as a street and family name derived from the Hawaiʻi place name.[9]

The nativistic approach does not offer easy answers to all word division problems. One of the most difficult areas for the ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi Orthography Committee has been to establish criteria for spelling compound words using a nativistic approach. The basic problem is to distinguish compounds in which two or more words are fused together to create a new term, from phrases where one word is simply modifying the other. An illustration from English is the contrast between the compound *blackbird,* a specific type of bird, and *black bird,* any bird that is black. In some languages, there are obvious clues in the spoken language that distinguish a modifier from part of a compound. In German, modifiers take special endings which are not found with parts of a compound. In Fijian, a marker *ni* is often inserted between the parts of a compound, and in English stress distinguishes compounds from phrases (Compare the pronunciations of *blackbird* and *black bird).* In Hawaiian, there are no such obvious spoken clues to distinguish compounds from phrases and there has been considerable difficulty in deciding on a criteria for spelling terms such as *hale pule/halepule* 'church,' (lit. pray house) and *maile lau liʻi/maile lauliʻi/mailelauliʻi,* a type of vine, (lit. small leaf *maile*). Table 11 gives some examples of the many terms for which word division remains a problem in Hawaiian.

In the Pukui-Elbert dictionary, some of these problem terms are written with hyphens, but there is not much consistency to the usage (e.g., *leho-ʻōkala* [lit. rough cowry] and *leho puʻupuʻu* [lit. bumpy cowry] are given as variant names for the same shell but a hyphen is used in only one of them). The ʻAhahui ʻŌlelo Hawaiʻi Orthography Committee discouraged the use of hyphens by its membership, not only in proper names, but also in compounds, since they are not traditional and do little more than imply a specious derivation. For example, consistent use of the hyphen would suggest separating all individual parts of compound words

[9]Note, however, that it is traditional and also quite sensible to write a word which modifies a name separated from that name. Examples are *Kalihi Waena* 'Central Kalihi,' *Kīlauea Iki* 'Little Kīlauea,' *Lāʻie Wai* 'Wet Lāʻie,' *Kīnaʻu Lio* 'Kīnaʻu the horse' (lit. Horse Kīnaʻu), *Kīnaʻu Puka Pā* 'Kīnaʻu the gate' (lit. Gate Kīnaʻu), *Kīnaʻu Aliʻi* 'Kīnaʻu the chiefess' (lit. Chief Kīnaʻu).

Table 11. Some Problem Terms for Word Division

Spelled as One Word	Divided into Components	Meaning of Components	English Translation
halepule	*hale pule*	pray house	church
ʻelepanikai	*ʻelepani kai*	sea elephant	walrus
ʻualakahiki	*ʻuala kahiki*	foreign sweet potato	Irish potato
manualoha	*manu aloha*	greeting bird	parrot
ʻōhi	*ʻōhiʻa ʻai*	edible ʻōhiʻa	mountain apple
ʻakaʻakailau	*ʻakaʻakai lau*	leaf onion	green onion
ʻaiakanēnē	*ʻai a ka nēnē*	food of the nēnē	a type of plant
wahinenohomauna	*wahine noho mauna*	mountain living woman	a type of fern
lolewāwae	*lole wāwae*	leg clothes	pants
lauhala	*lau hala*	*hala* leaf	leaf of the *hala* tree
makuakāne	*makua kāne*	male parent	father
mo	*moʻopuna kāne*	male grandchild	grandson
mailelauliʻi	*maile lau liʻi*	small leaf *maile*	a type of vine

giving such unusual spellings as *komo-hana* 'west' (lit. entering), *make-wai* 'thirst' (lit. die-water), and *ʻō-maʻi-maʻi* 'somewhat sick' (lit. somewhat-sick-sick). Furthermore, such segmentation of compound words is subject to the same sort of difficulties with conflicting derivations as faced with proper names. For example is *ʻohana* 'family' a compound, and does it derive from *ʻōhā-na* 'taro shoot *-na* suffix' (since the family resembles a spreading taro plant), *ō-hana* 'continuation-work' (since the family is the basic economic unit in Hawaiian culture), or some other source?

Although segmentation problems remain the most troublesome areas in current efforts of individuals and groups to establish a uniform Hawaiian spelling system, the least investigated area at present is that of punctuation and capitalization. There are no major stumbling blocks readily apparent in this area, for punctuation and capitalization practices are frequently idiosyncratic. Compare the German practice of capitalizing all nouns, and the English practice of capitalizing primarily proper nouns. Similarly, in Spanish, a question has special punctuation initially as well as finally, while in English only the final position is punctuated distinctly.

The idiosyncratic nature of capitalization and punctuation practices in different languages serves to make the point that the most important aspect of a standardized orthography in any language is not that it be entirely logical or scientific, but that it be all encompassing and accepted as the recognized medium in which ideas are presented visually for that language. There are many standardized orthographies, those of English and Chinese being prime examples, that are illogical and difficult to use, but they cover every aspect of how their individual languages should be written and are accepted by speakers of the languages.

A standardized Hawaiian orthography will necessarily be a compromise of different people's analyses and emotional reactions. Once accepted, it will become a stable medium rather than a matter subject to individual reanalysis. Such a medium will encourage persons to do more writing *in* Hawaiian and less *about* it in English. For a standardized orthography is a positive statement that a language is to be an integral part of today's world.

University of Hawai'i
Humanities Division--Hawaiiana
Hilo, Hawai'i

LITERATURE CITED

'Ahahui 'Ōlelo Hawai'i Orthography Committee.
1978 "Recommendations of the 'Ahahni 'Ōlelo Hawai'i 1978 Hawaiian Spelling Project." (Unpublished report).

Constitution of the State of Hawai'i (as amended in 1978)

Elbert, Samuel H. and Samuel A. Keala.
1961 *Conversational Hawaiian.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Elbert, Samuel H. and Noelani Mahoe.
1970 *Nā Mele o Hawai'i nei: 101 Hawaiian Songs.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Elbert. Samuel H. and Mary Kawena Pukui.
1979 *Hawaiian Grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hervey, Wesley David.
1968 "A History of the Adaptations of an Orthography for the Hawaiian Language." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oregon.

Hook, J. N.
1975 *History of the English Language.* New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Langacker, Ronald W.
1972 *Fundamentals of Linguistic Analysis.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Pukui, Mary Kawena and Samuel H. Elbert.
1957 *Hawaiian-English Dictionary.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

1965 *Hawaiian-English Dictionary.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

1971 *Hawaiian Dictionary, Hawaiian-English, English-Hawaiian.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Pukui, Mary Kawena, Samuel H. Elbert, and Esther T. Mookini.
1974 *Place Names of Hawai'i.* Revised edition. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.

1973 *Pocket Hawaiian Dictionary with a Concise Hawaiian Grammar.* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawai'i.

Revised Ordinances of Honolulu (as amended in 1979)

Schane, Sanford A.
1973 *Generative Phonology.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Silva, Kalena and Kauanoe Kamanā.
1979 *The Hawaiian Language: Its Spelling and Pronunciation.* Honolulu: Sturgis Printing Co., Inc.

REVIEWS

Helen Delpar, ed., *The Discoverers: An Encyclopedia of Explorers and Exploration*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980. Pp. viii, 471, maps, illustrations, bibliography, index. $29.95.

For once the flier rather understates: there are nearer 300 than 200 illustrations, and the "200 articles" are about 275. Some fifty of these deal with major regions or themes such as the exploration of the oceans or of space. As signs of the times, these include "Africa: Contribution of Non-Europeans" and "Women in Travel and Exploration;" both are rather hard put to it to round up enough notables, though they do introduce some engaging personalities--Jeanne Baret, who sailed with Bougainville, is in, but not Isabel Barreto, the first known woman to cross the Pacific both ways, and that in the sixteenth century. But not a nice lady.

The book is well produced: good typography with very few misprints indeed, and a binding which seems stout enough for a volume of this size. By and large, the text is remarkably readable. Bibliographies are brief but sound, except that one wonders why the only reference for Dezhnev is to Golder, whose account is a demolition job, now itself demolished by R. H. Fisher. The maps, however, are too few, too commonplace in design, and too limited in scope. The index is good.

As for the pictures, most are lively and some aesthetically pleasing; but their sources are not given and it is not made clear, as in a reference work it should be, that many are the work of artists far more anxious to be picturesque than accurate. Properly explained, this could be a bonus, throwing light on the changing European images of exotic places or events; but with no explanation at all, the high incidence of anachronism could confuse the earnest but uninitiated student. Thus we find La Salle (1643-87) apparently in Napoleonic Hussar kit, looking like Conan Doyle's Brigadier Gerard; Cortés and Columbus each shown in three distinct costumes, two of each set being fancy dress; an authentic portrait, austere and spare, of Henry of Portugal, and another depicting him as a jovial soldier of fortune of about two centuries later on; and as climax an Indian village in Mississippi properly bastioned and defending itself with 30 cannon--in 1541! But one can forgive even Columbus's wildly unstable shipping for the sake of St Brendan's delightful whale (or is he an Orc?), serving at once as dry dock and chapel.

Turning to content, there are very reasonable allocations of space to the continents and the chronological surveys, and to such major topics as the Northeast and Northwest Passages, or Muslim and Norse exploration. But there is an odd imbalance in the personal entries, which show a heavy Muscovite bias. Altogether thirty-seven out of the 224 or so individually entered names are those of Russians or men in Russian service; of the forty-six Polar explorers listed, twenty-three worked only in Russian waters form Okhotsk to Alaska. Fraser, Mackenzie, Vancouver, and Shelekhov have separate entries, yet in "Northwestern America," which extends as far south as the Columbia, room is found only for the last-named, an unscrupulous company promoter whose " 'discoveries' (he was to be called the Russian Columbus) were minimal."

The reviewer is no Russophobe, and has warm memories of a month with the geographers of Moscow's Lomonosov University. But about half of those on the Russian list added little to geographical knowledge, and some seem less important than even the minimal Shelekhov--Basargin, for instance, simply charted parts of the Caspian in 1819-31, hardly epoch-making work. The inclusion of such obscurely illustrious people would not matter were it not for those crowded out: such names (to cite only non-Pacific explorers) as Bouvet, Foxe, Garcés, Garcia, James, Jenkinson, Kerguelen, Kingsley (Mary), Kino, Pinto (Serpa, not Fernão Mendes!), Pond, Raleigh. But, though both are well discussed in "Natural History Exploration," the most spectacular omissions are those of Banks, for fifty years the presiding genius of travellers in many parts, and the greatest of all scientific travellers--Humboldt.

On the all-important matter of accuracy, there can be little serious complaint. Every specialist will, of course, find a number of places where emphasis or expression might be queried, but most of these are minor, and there seem very few definite errors of fact. Unluckily, some relate to the Pacific.

The main Pacific article runs to nine pages, which is fair enough, and Australia with about the same space perhaps gets rather more than its share; more might have been said of *Terra Australis* and Polynesia--though "Maritime Exploration" does have a well-phrased tribute to the "exemplary maritime enterprise that went unchallenged in the Pacific until Magellan. . . ." But it is really astonishing that there is no separate treatment of such men as Freycinet, Loaysa, Saavedra, Mendaña, Quiros, Torres, Le Maire, Roggeveen, while (not to cite any more Russians) Beechey and Belcher have this honor.

The general article on the Pacific is disappointing. As an outline of the process by which the lineaments of the great Ocean were placed on

the charts, it is clear and reasonably balanced--but marred by some curious errors. Magellan may have sighted Caroline Island, but not “an island in the Carolines;” Tasman did not land in New Zealand; the references to Dampier’s books are inaccurate; Byron’s instructions seem completely misunderstood; neither Wallis nor Cartaret had chronometers.

However, with some tidying-up this could be made into a very satisfactory article, and the balance is to some extent redressed by the articles on individual Pacific explorers. Drake and Dumont d’Urville seem treated generously in comparison with say Bougainville, who has only marginally more space than Daniel Boone; Barry Gough on Cook has an adequate map and gives a very good account but, although one sees what is meant, surely Europe did not have to wait for Cook to prove that “long-distance voyaging by sea was practical and could be healthy.” Bouvet, for instance, sailed from France to the sub-Antarctic and back nonstop, and lost one cabin-boy, washed overboard. One could wish that Magellan had received some of the space allotted to his immediate predecessor the legendary Prince Madoc; what we have is little more than a bare outline of his exploit with no discussion of the significance of this greatest of all single voyages. Tasman has only half a page, a clear account except that it is pointless to refer to “a place of the same name” as Straten Landt unless one indicates where that place is; the more so as there is no article on Le Maire, though he is of course in the index. Considering the relegation to the general Pacific article of the great sixteenth-century Spaniards, it is a welcome surprise that one of them makes it to a separate entry--Urdaneta. The rear is brought up by Vancouver and Wilkes; in both cases, space limitations lead perforce to rather too much simplification.

Of course there is no such thing as a perfect book, least of all a book of reference, and no reference can satisfy all its potential users. Pacific historians may well feel that their field--and it is hardly a small one!--does not receive its due in this book; nevertheless, despite the imperfections noted, *The Discoverers* as a whole is at once instructive and delightful reading. As prices go nowadays, the volume is remarkably inexpensive; certainly for school and college libraries; but even for the home, such a compendium of information, with many lively sidelights on the quirks of personality and social history, would be a good buy.

O. H. K. Spate
Pacific and Southeast Asian History
Australian National University
Canberra

Thor Heyerdahl, *Early Man and the Ocean*. 438 pp., bibliography, index, several unnumbered figures. New York: Doubleday, 1979. Pp. 438, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $12.95.

Whatever one might think of the varied interpretations of the human past set forth in this book, the author surely has a deserved place as one of the great "inspirational priests" of mid-twentieth century prehistoric studies. His navigational experiments have achieved worldwide fame, and his writings display the kind of emotion which serves to sway countless readers. I know from my own experience that the average nonprehistorian, should he take an interest in such matters, will, if asked, volunteer the view that the Polynesians migrated from the Americas. If he reads this book, he may well also volunteer the view that the Olmecs migrated from the Mediterranean.

The book contains fourteen previously published papers from Heyerdahl's fairly long career, each separately updated by an introduction. Many have been reprinted before; and as far as the Pacific is concerned, his views have changed little in the past twenty years. Heyerdahl's approach is to polarize entities in an all-or-nothing fashion, a goal which all politicians must strive for, but which is far outside the theoretical stream of modern prehistory. For instance, isolationists are ranged against diffusionists, "culture bearers" against "primitives," and Heyerdahl's choice to explain all civilization centers on the diffusion of "high culture" on the currents of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. As far as the Americas and the Pacific Islands are concerned, there is only one source of "high culture" (a term which Heyerdahl seems unwilling to define), and this lies in the Mediterranean. He does not really address himself to the Indian and Chinese spheres, but reveals enough to make it clear that he believes the same may well apply.

During reading, the precise theme of the book takes a long time to appear, mainly because many arguments are repeated in different chapters from different viewpoints, and the contexts seem to hop rather randomly from one part of the earth to another. Instead of merely lumping together a group of somewhat disparate articles, Heyerdahl might have done better simply to write another book, setting out the whole story from start to finish in one go.

The chapters are an unusual mixture of worthy and scholarly observations, and factually outdated diffusionist dogma. Falling mainly in the worthy and scholarly class, and presenting arguments which I find quite acceptable (perhaps because the subjects are outside my own field of specialization) are Chapters 1, 5, 8, 10 and 11. In these, Heyerdahl presents

the views that the first ocean-going planked ships developed from reed boats in the Mediterranean region, that Columbus knew of the earlier discovery of America by the Vikings, and that the Galapagos Islands were reached by South American balsa rafts in prehistoric times. He also gives an excellent account of balsa raft navigation by using centerboards, and discusses the reports of coconuts growing on Cocos Island in the seventeenth century. So far, so good, and all pleasant, informative reading.

The problems, of course, arise with the remaining chapters, and I know that I am not the first to criticize Heyerdahl for some of his views. He kicks off in Chapter 2 by describing the great current systems which flow from east to west across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and suggests that if the Spaniards were obliged to use them to make their voyages, then so were all other prehistoric ocean travellers. He uses the results of the Levison, Ward, and Webb computer simulation to suggest that it is easier to sail into Polynesia from the east than the west, but anyone who reads this volume carefully, particularly with respect to the results for drift versus intentionally sailed voyages, will realize that this generalization is not strictly true. Furthermore, Heyerdahl quickly reveals that he is unaware of, or unwilling to use, the voluminous data pertaining to the Polynesians from the past twenty-five years of research in linguistics and archaeology. A quick scan of the bibliography will reveal this immediately.

In the third chapter, Heyerdahl goes on to polarize the isolationists and diffusionists, to berate the former, to ask why American civilizations start at the top and then decline, and generally to put the Olmecs and Tiahuanaco on a pedestal as foci of Mediterranean influences (surely he knows that the Tiahuanaco monuments are a millennium younger than those at La Venta?) In Chapter 4, he relates these influences to the "bearded white gods" of American traditions--Viracocha, Quetzalcoatl and so forth--and in Chapter 6, he has them sweeping on with their followers into Polynesia, in a manner unchanged from that reconstructed in his 1952 *magnum opus, American Indians in the Pacific.* The same rather antiquated sources are requoted, the true Polynesians continue to sail into Polynesia from British Columbia around the fourteenth century, and Heyerdahl reveals his ignorance, or disdain, of modern sources by making some startling factual mistakes, in a volume which is quite liberally peppered with such lapses. For instance, on page 179, he quotes Fornander on the cessation of pyramidal stone platform construction in Polynesia some thirty generations ago (the largest was actually built in 1767), he then says feather headdresses were unknown in Southeast Asia (they were depicted frequently on Dong-Son drums), and then claims that Southeast

Asian pottery was always made on a wheel. These statements are totally erroneous, and the book has many more in the same vein.

In Chapters 7 and 9, Heyerdahl claims that the Incas told the Spaniards about the existence of the Polynesian islands, and he discusses the numerous plants of American origin which grew prehistorically in Polynesia. Much scope for long argument here, but I will merely state that I would be the last person to claim that no American Indians every reached Polynesia. Indeed, I find the arguments presented in these two chapters quite acceptable, but not the general framework in which Heyerdahl sets them.

In Chapters 12 and 13, Heyerdahl presents his views on Easter Island, as derived mainly from the results of his very competent expedition of 1955. There is little new, and I will only state that I have discussed all this at length elsewhere (*Man's Conquest of the Pacific*, pp. 361 ff.), as has Jack Golson (*Oceania* 36:38-83). The Polynesian-over-Peruvian scenario really doesn't work any more, and many of those long lists of items which Heyerdahl says are common to Easter Island and the Americas, but not found in the Western Pacific, contain lame ducks; for instance, the bird-men, the double-bladed paddles, the stone-lined ovens, the obsidian spear-heads, the extended earlobes, and even cremation. I could add more, and even specify the westerly parallels, but space does not permit.

In the final chapter, Heyerdahl seems to get to his main overall synthesis, in between mentions of Atlantis, megaliths, the Canary Islands, and a general odd bag of Mediterranean archaeology. He regards ca. 3,100 B.C. as a kind of "super-date," when upheavals in the Mediterranean sent people off to Mexico, Ecuador, and led to the unification of Egypt and the start of historical civilization in Sumer. A second series of upheavals around 1,200 B.C., naturally much better documented in connection with the eruption of Santorini, sent off a second wave of peoples related to the Phoenicians, Hittites and "Sea Peoples" across the Atlantic--hence the Olmecs. Even the remote Morioris of the Chatham Islands are said to have had "Arabic-Semitic countenances." The Spaniards were, in Heyerdahl's view, the last in a long line of Old World colonists when they reached Mexico and Peru.

Perhaps people did drift in prehistoric times along those currents which Heyerdahl sees as so powerful and unchanging. At least he has sailed (or drifted) on them; I haven't. But the modem studies in archaeology and linguistics which Heyerdahl ignores make it so clear that Polynesians *did* sail from west to east out of Melanesia and Indonesia, and that American Indian cultures *did not* suddenly leap forward from hunting and gathering at the dates Heyerdahl suggests. If any Phoenicians ever did

reach Mexico, and it is, of course, very possible that some did, then one could argue that the evolving local cultures simply ignored them, or perhaps merely borrowed the name of a god or carved a representation of a Semite on a monument. One has only to look at the varied range of impacts of the past 400 years of European colonization on the cultures of the world to see that "culture bearers," as potent and clearly visible agents for converting savagery to civilization, simply do not exist.

Peter S. Bellwood
Institute of Archaeology
University of London

Ben R. Finney. *Hōkūleʻa: The Way to Tahiti.* New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1979. Pp. x, 301, maps, illustrations, color supplement, appendices, index. $17.50.

To the first Europeans who visited the South' Seas, the Polynesians presented an almost intolerable mystery: how could a preliterate people have established and maintained a voyaging ability over most of the world's greatest ocean and settled practically all of its habitable islands? Without metals, how could they have built the vessels that carried whole communities with their useful plants and animals to new but surely known destinations thousands of seamiles distant from their departure point? They had established themselves in exclusive occupation of an area twice the size of the continental United States, an area 98.5 percent water. How could they have developed this voyaging ability at a time when the people of the great continents were barely able to trust themselves out of sight of land?

The comfortable answer was that they could not. Their distribution was fortuitous. Sheer chance had stranded a few fortunate survivors of thousands of maritime accidents on islands where they could survive, along with their wives, their pigs, their chickens, and a score or more of useful plants. In 1952, Thor Heyerdahl's mainly untenable theory that they had simply followed winds and currents to whatever future a blind chance might find them was widely accepted with relief; and five years later, the late Andrew Sharp's further contribution, based on the assumption that Polynesians did not have the means to mount colonizing voyages of more than a few hundred miles, was also taken seriously, though it denied a proud people any credit for one of the world's most sustained and venturesome achievements. Those who could not accept the purposeful

nature of the long-distance voyaging were unfamiliar with the maritime mentality of these island people.

My first acquaintance with Ben Finney's spirited defense of Polynesian achievement came with the essay he contributed to *Polynesian Culture History,* a Festschrift in honor of Kenneth P. Emory (Bishop Museum Press, 1967). He was already promoting pragmatic tests with a sailing double canoe, built of modern materials to an ancient Hawaiian design. His enthusiasm mated with a similar sentiment in two associates, Herb Kawainui Kane and Tommy Holmes, and the three of them formed the Polynesian Voyaging Society, a membership fund-raising corporation. They honed up the project of a Hawai'i/Tahiti return voyage for which navigation would be restricted to the noninstrument methods of the ancients, and food and equipment to such as was carried by the early voyagers. A freight of food animals and plants would be preserved alive to grow at voyage end. Though this could not prove the early two-way communication, it could certainly demolish some of the arguments in opposition. It should silence the sceptics who still could not believe in the Polynesian achievement and by their disbelief disparaged the Polynesian--and indeed the human--potential.

Kane, an excellent artist and a student of voyaging canoes, designed the vessel and his work publicized the project, accelerating a move then in progress towards a Hawaiian cultural revival. In December 1974, *National Geographic Magazine* ran a Polynesian issue featuring seven major Kane paintings and a supplement of his drawings of ancient canoe types. The following March, the Society launched the sixty-foot double canoe *Hōkūle'a*, named for Arcturus, the zenith star of Kaua'i island, the homing beacon of the ancient voyagers. The expensive project was financed in part by an arrangement with the National Geographic Society assigning film rights, and in part by donations made more impressive because of the appeal to Hawai'i's pride in her past.

Though no Hawaiian still retained the ancient skills of deep-sea navigation without instruments, they had not been lost. David Lewis, a celebrated lone-hand voyager had studied them and was proficient and could enlist the services of a Micronesian navigator Mau Piailug. Enthusiastic helpers preserved foods by ancient methods, a dog, a pig and some poultry were secured, and *Hōkūle'a* was scheduled to make her voyage in 1976, as part of Hawai'i's celebrations of the Bicentennial American Independence.

It is on record that she magnificently demonstrated the ability of the ancient canoe design to sail comfortably to windward and the trained human to navigate the ocean distances to a planned destination without

instrumental assistance. The feat was accomplished in good time, and after a crowd of record proportions greeted her arrival in Tahiti, Polynesians all over the Pacific were delighted that their version of their own history had been so thoroughly vindicated at a first attempt.

But that all was not well with the voyage was immediately obvious. Piailug refused to entertain participation in the return trip and made public his intention to have no more truck with Hawai'i or Hawaiians. Several publications admitted difficulties with a mutinous crew, including Professor Finney's contribution to *The Prehistory of Polynesia* (edited by Jesse D. Jennings, Harvard, *1979).* In his *From Maui to Cook* (Doubleday, 1977), David Lewis touched very lightly indeed on the refusal of some crew members to observe the restrictions on communications and modern foods, In *The Voyaging Stars* (Collins, 1978) he observed simply: "Piailug has listed the names of those who so betrayed their trust in a subsequently recorded taped message; I think it better that their disgrace be forgotten."

But Finney has now given a very full account of everything that went wrong, apparently in justifiable reaction to the contemptuous response of some crew members to his beautifully tempered deference to national feelings, and his tribute of years of admiring study. Much more went wrong than has previously been admitted.

After a launching which followed all the precepts of tradition, *Hōkūle'a,* under the captaincy of Herb Kane, embarked on a year of sea trials, necessary because of unfamiliar design, the probable need to adjust rigging, and the intention to use no instruments. Then, Finney tells us: "Kane proved to be an inspired leader, although it was not long before his enthusiasm developed into a messianic vision. *Hōkūle'a's* sacred mission, Kane began to teach, was to uplift the Hawaiian people, to be *the* catalyst for the Hawaiian renaissance."

A tour of the Hawaiian islands had the regrettable effect of putting the cultural mission ahead of the experimental voyage; flattering receptions of crew and canoe made visiting preferable to hard training runs. The tour also got mixed up with the militant movement organized by Hawaiian malcontents for return of alienated lands. From then, it became difficult to combine scientific research and cultural revival. After a swamping incident revealed the untrained nature of the crew and the necessity of modifying the rig design, Kane was replaced by Elia Kapahulehua, a good captain but no disciplinarian.

Kane's continuing dedication, however, was apparent when towards the end of that year, Island Heritage published his magnificent book *Voyage: The Discovery of Hawai'i,* a book which, like the *Hōkūle'a* canoe, is

surely destined to remain a point of bright inspiration to Polynesians everywhere and their sincere admirers.

The chosen crew was a misfortunate one, apparently born of the "'chiefs outnumbering the Indians." The worst elements were encouraged by a film crew, sent by National Geographic and apparently dedicated to the recording of highly emotional moments, possibly to enhance dramatic effect. Once chosen, the crew attempted to delay departure as long as possible, with no care for the changing season. Some came aboard with supplies of marijuana. Harder drugs were suspected from their behavior, and they also managed to get some supplies of liquor. They brought a cooking stove and totally ignored the huge supplies of traditionally-preserved foods.

The troubles they caused were augmented by the film crew which, with one member on *Hōkūleʻa* herself, had arranged to make transfers of fresh and exposed film between her and the accompanying yacht. Their several attempts to communicate position reports looked like deliberate sabotage. Six members of the crew refused duties, camped in a little hide-away amidships, smoked marijuana, complained, and muttered threats. Arrived off Tahiti, they were presented at sea with a case of champagne, tossed aboard by the National Geographic people. It promoted a mêlée in which Finney, with others, was damaged. Afloat or ashore, this group continued as a heavy drag on the efforts of the other nine who in spite of them completed this magnificent voyage.

There are some, and presumably Lewis is one, who regret that such details had to be recorded, and Finney, with his great sympathy for the Polynesian race, has done it reluctantly. I believe it to have been a necessity, for it has highlighted the single factor missing from this modern expedition. In all other details, the voyage was well conceived. The one element missing was that which, in my own conviction at least, was what made possible the venturing, voyaging existence of mankind in the Pacific, the element that developed him into a superior kind of human when he reigned undisturbed in his own communities. That element was the self-sufficiency trained into him in childhood, and providing him with a happy discipline which eliminated most of the problems of living.

That element can still be found in a diminishing number of islands and groups of which I'll instance the Kingdom of Tonga, where I have had some experience. Whenever two Tongans meet in any part of the world, one is superior to the other, and his decision on any matter where dissent arises is final. The pecking order is established in the family, then the *kainga* or expanded family, then the nation. Even the highest in the land has someone he must obey--and women top the pecking order. Even the

lowest can find someone to whom he can issue orders and expect to see them carried out. Other behavior is unthinkable. The system, a complicated one, is inherent with their history. True, there were revolts; there were also delegations of authority which temporarily altered the order. But the framework for discipline was well established and afforded the pleasure of obedience as well as the joy of command for everyone. This convention, however, has tended to disappear wherever, as in Hawai'i, Tahiti, and most other groups, a foreign authority has supplanted the Polynesian system.

It was this that was absent from the *Hōkūle'a* experience, and for this reason I think that David Lewis was wrong to write: "Better that their disgrace be forgotten." Because it was the absence of this shared discipline and its linked self-confidence that almost wrecked the venture, and with it the hopes and trust of the islanders who are all too few today.

The *Hōkūle'a* voyage was a great performance; and in Finney's book, we can determine the dangers of the reefs it skirted, the intensity of the storms that so nearly swallowed them up.

Olaf Ruhen
Sydney, Australia

Shirley Lindenbaum. *Kuru Sorcery: Disease and Danger in the New Guinea Highlands.* Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company, 1979. Paper. Pp. xii, 174, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index, glossary. $4.95.

Those who enjoy a good detective story will be intrigued with Shirley Lindenbaum's book. *Kuru Sorcery* is about puzzling mysteries and the slow, sometimes frustrating search for clues and solutions. What causes kuru, a debilitating and fatal degenerative disorder of the central nervous system? *Who* causes kuru, and why? How do the Fore people of the Eastern Highlands of Papua, New Guinea cope with the social and biological devastation caused by kuru? What can we learn from kuru and the Fore? Lindenbaum ably answers these questions with an engaging writing style all too often absent from anthropological works.

Lindebaum first guides us through the process of discovering the cause of kuru. Patrol officers formed the first hypothesis, that kuru was psychosomatic, but observation of kuru victims in a clinical setting led medical researchers to reject this idea. They then speculated that, because of its localization in a small breeding population, kuru had a genetic basis.

However, anthropologists demonstrated that many of the supposed genetic relationships between victims were actually forms of fictive kinship. Furthermore, they documented the slow spread of kuru among the Fore during the twentieth century. The incidence of kuru seemed to be correlated with the introduction and dispersion of endocannibalism in the south Fore region. Kuru affected those who were cannibals, namely, mature and productive women. Where cannibalism was on the decrease, the incidence of kuru was also falling. Epidemiological evidence suggested that kuru was caused by a slow virus, transmitted through Fore funerary customs. A medical model for kuru had been found, although the virus itself has not yet been isolated.

For the Fore, the question of "what causes kuru" was simple to answer: kuru is but one of many forms of sorcery. Who was causing kuru, and why, were the real problems. Kuru sorcery disrupted Fore society: in a single decade, 1,100 people in a population of 8,000 fell victim to the disease. Its victims were mainly child-bearing, pig-raising, gardening women, the mainstay of Fore society. Once-powerful men were reduced to "rubbish men" as their wives died. They could no longer participate in the exchanges and redistributions of wealth on which they had built their reputations. The increase in kuru both raised and reflected political animosities, as once-friendly neighboring groups came under suspicion of harboring and encouraging kuru sorcerers. The Fore world had become one of chaos, confusion, and distrust.

Lindenbaum documents the Fore search for resolution of the physical and social problems posed by unchecked kuru sorcerers. She presents us with an "epidemiology of social relationships." Kuru is not the only disease caused by sorcerers, and sorcerers are not the only causal factor of diseases. Sorcery and disease in Fore society can only be understood in the context of social organization. Fictive kinship affiliations predicated on the exchange of food are an important feature of Fore social organization, but these affiliations are brittle, and one always fears betrayal by one's neighbors. Thus, danger lies not only outside the community: danger lurks within. Fore attempts to curb kuru reflect this evaluation. At first, the Fore sought physical cures from Gimi and other outside groups. When that failed, they used old, but disregarded, large-scale associations to call meetings denouncing the practice of kuru. Their search had turned inward, and they pleaded with one another to stop the killing.

As Lindenbaum sees it, the underlying problem, of which kuru sorcery is a manifestation, is one of dominance, power, and marginality. Therein lies a lesson for us all: we fear those we dominate and those who are mar-

ginal to our existence because they have the power to disrupt our world. To the "haves," tyranny and chaos are the tools of the "have-nots,"

This is an important book in several respects. It is timely in that it deals with current issues in medical anthropology and the study of cannibalism. It is timeless because it discusses age-old human conditions of fear and despair. Lindenbaum treats the Fore and their condition sympathetically, setting an excellent standard for anthropological reporting. Such treatment does not cloud an engaging analysis and the presentation of ideas on sorcery and social change, formation of groups and boundaries, and other themes.

The analysis does have its weak points, however. In particular, the argument on pollution and sorcery could bear some rethinking. At one point, we learn that "Sorcery is a severe case of pollution." Two pages later, sorcery is convincingly disassociated from pollution. Conceptual refinement and clarification would help here. Overall, though, the integrity of the work does not suffer from the few weak points.

Footnotes at the bottom of the pages rather than at the end of the book would have preserved continuity for the reader and would have lessened the reader's sense of frustration.

Kuru Sorcery's minor drawbacks are far outweighed by the breadth and depth of ideas presented. It is a provocative work that has appeal for a wide audience, and I highly recommend it for scholars and students alike.

Marty Zelenietz
Department of Anthropology
St. Mary's University
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Canada

Gavan Daws. *A Dream of Islands, Voyages of Self-Discovery in the South Seas.* New York and London: W. W. Norton and Co., 1980. Pp. xiv, 289, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $14.95.

Here is historical biography at its best! Daws has provided five carefully crafted psychological portraits that are scholarly without being pedantic. The author offers a glimpse of the thorough research that underlies this book ("A Note on Sources," pp. 275-281), but it is much to his credit that the text is left uncluttered by footnotes and citations. As such, the book

will not only be widely read by academics, but should prove equally of wide appeal to the intelligent lay reader.

The five men whose life vignettes are presented span the nineteenth century: John Williams ("an entrepreneur of religion"), Herman Melville ("a common sailor who was uncommon"), Walter Murray Gibson ("a confidence man"), Robert Louis Stevenson ("literary ectomorph"), and Paul Gauguin ("a demented Mr. Hyde with a paintbrush"). For all their idiosyncracies, Daws shows that these men shared a number of common characteristics. Above all, each sailed to the Pacific in search of "self-expression, self-realization, self-justification"- -each sought to "reveal himself to himself."

In a way, the men Daws sketches were misfits in their own societies who became larger than life on the Pacific stage. Each of the three artists was in revolt against the conventions of home (Stevenson perhaps least of all), Williams the missionary "had a solitary, driven, almost uncontrollable streak," and Gibson is described as "a man of considerable talent imperfectly harnessed--in fact, out of control." Each man was driven by an internal need for recognition from members of the society he rejected, but like Gauguin, each in the end "remained nailed to the cross of his culture."

Several recurrent themes come to light from Daws' accounts. All five men suffered disturbed family relationships of one sort or another, which may explain in part the difficulty each had in adjusting to his own society. Williams had a domineering mother and a not entirely satisfactory relationship with his long-suffering wife. Melville's father died when he was thirteen, a loss that forever troubled him, and he felt overshadowed by his older brother. Gibson entertained the fantasy that the parents who reared him were not his real parents and seemed unable to establish satisfactory relationships with women. Stevenson rebelled against his father and became something of a Bohemian. Gauguin, more than the others, "was incapable of caring about anyone other than himself." His father died when he was young, he had a disastrous marriage, and he was forever haunted by fears of latent bisexuality.

Each man whose life we enter in Daws' pages suffered as well from uncommon illness which, in at least two cases, led to heavy drug use. Williams endured filariasis. Melville, who remained physically healthy for most of his life, was held to be slightly mad by his close relatives, who intervened in his affairs on this account. Gibson, in the end, was ill, consumptive and under great personal stress. Stevenson fled to the Pacific in search of a healthy climate for his respiratory problems, and while the tradewinds and salt air clearly suited him, he never achieved surcease

from his bad lungs. Gauguin had a leg broken in a fight that never healed properly and in his final years was syphilitic with open lesions and failing sight. Both Stevenson and Gauguin resorted to powerful drugs--cocaine, morphine, laudanum and liquor--in an effort to find relief, and drug use may well have influenced their art: Daws notes (p. 184) that Stevenson may have written *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* while on cocaine.

A third theme encountered in the book concerns only the three artists. Melville became labelled early in his career as "the man who lived among cannibals" and Stevenson as the "light, pungent, witty" author of "children's books and romances for adults," when each desperately wanted to become known for weightier material. Neither entirely escaped this straitjacket, despite valiant efforts to break away. Daws asserts that "Melville had become aware of the savage within himself, and this was what he wanted to write about." In like manner, Gauguin fled to Tahiti to confront the savage within. In the art of both of these men "the savagery of civilization" emerges as an enduring motif--a motif underscored for each by the deleterious effects of Western society on the islanders.

The book is beautifully produced and flawlessly edited, and I find myself with only three small disagreements. First, Daws is incorrect in claiming (p. 192) that Fanny Stevenson "never did write her own book;" she is the author of *The Cruise of the "Janet Nichol" Among the South Sea Islands,* published by Scribner's in 1914. Second, reference to Ocean Island "northwest of Hawaii" (p. 155) is at best misleading; Ocean Island is the name usually applied to Banaba in Micronesia and Daws would better have used the more widely known name for the island to which he refers: Kure. Finally, in my opinion, Daws gives Langdon's hypothesis that shipwrecked Spaniards account for the "European-like" features of many Polynesians (pp. 7 and 89) more credence than it deserves.

This book about self-discovery of the savage within simultaneously chronicles in yet another way what Morehead called "the fatal impact." It is fitting, therefore, that Daws ends his *tour de force* with an old, blind Marquesan woman disappearing "into the darkness with a single word. *'Pupa,'* she croaked--White Man."

Mac Marshall
Department of Anthropology
University of Iowa

Nat J. Colletta. *American Schools for the Natives of Ponape: A Study of Education and Culture Change in Micronesia.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, 1980. Paper. Pp. xiv, 181, illustrations, appendices, index. $10.00.

Nat Colletta has written a critique of elementary and secondary education on the island of Ponape in the US Trust Territory of Micronesia. The author is a former Peace Corps Volunteer, who first served as a teacher in the educational system, and later returned as a graduate student to conduct research on the schools for his doctoral dissertation. He regards the American educational system in the islands as, on balance, a failure. This opinion is largely shared by the writer of the foreword, Richard King of the University of Victoria, who had also served at an earlier period as an American educator on Ponape.

The schools have produced generations of graduates, many of whom are alienated from their traditional culture and at the same time are often poorly equipped to participate in the modern world. The educational system is expensive and requires outside support (US funds) to keep it going. The outside funding has tended to keep it beyond effective local control, in spite of the official policy of turning over more and more government functions to Micronesians. Moreover, while in traditional Ponapean society young people have been integrated in moderate numbers into a hierarchical family and community in which they are gradually drawn into adult responsibilities, in the modern schools--especially in the high school--young people are removed from home and assembled in large groups poorly controlled by their teachers. Strong peer groups develop, which after graduation resist control by the traditional authorities, and have at the same time little socially useful direction of their own. Colletta further criticizes the schools for being elitist in nature, since students are graded on their work, and access to higher education is restricted to those who receive good enough grades, thus depriving the rest of the young people of further education.

Colletta has a number of suggestions for improving the educational system. For one, he believes that more local control is desirable. He also proposes that a broader conception of education is needed which would emphasize learning outside formal classrooms in on-the-job training and adult education on current issues. He proposes educational efforts where possible in existing groups in the society, such as “women’s organizations, farmer’s clubs, youth groups,” etc. (p. 148). He also cites favorably the example of schools in various developing socialist countries which are partly self-supporting through the productive labor of the students, a system

which was also briefly in effect on Ponape under the American regime, as he notes.

Obviously, Colletta is thoroughly familiar with public schools on Ponape and their history. His criticisms and proposals strike me as often very pertinent and always at least plausible. With the approach of independence for Micronesia, the time seems ripe for a thorough reconsideration of the educational system in all the islands, including Ponape. The educational authorities would do well to listen to Colletta and think hard about what he has written in this book.

I suggest, however, that there are at least two issues which he could usefully have considered further. These are individualism and elitism. According to popular Western (especially American) stereotypes, which Colletta seems at times to share, individualism is good and elitism is bad. I suggest this assignment of values is probably maladaptive for most other cultures, including Ponape.

US educators typically consider it their duty to identify the unique potential of each student and to develop this as far as possible. The needs of the society for individuals with certain special training come in for some consideration, in that it is assumed that so far no real school system has supplied all the varied education its students need and "deserve," and that with limited resources it is sometimes necessary to cater more to the needs of students interested in certain specialties urgently needed by the society, e.g., physicians, nurses, engineers. However, there is a feeling that such favoring of students with certain interests over others is basically unfair, and that as soon as sufficient funds can be obtained, each student should be provided with the unique education suited to his unique potential, be it great or trivial, socially useful or useless, so long as it is not specifically and intentionally antisocial.

Colletta admits that individualism has characterized the American schools for Ponapeans (e.g., p. 94) and recommends that the curriculum should be redesigned to meet village needs (p. 150), but it is my feeling that this position deserves much more attention than he has given it in this book. American educators tend to assume that for each individual there is one and only one ideal life's work, and that in an ideal society the school system should identify this career for each child and get him off to a good start, regardless of the costs to society or its changing needs for different kinds of labor. Moreover, it is assumed that the child has a right to this special education, and that he owes nothing to the society for it during it or afterwards, except to pay taxes and avoid harming others as a competent adult. This is a view which could have arisen only in a society of abundance--in fact, only in a social class of abundance, since even our

own society does not actually have sufficient resources to offer such lavish education to children of all social strata.

Even in a society of abundance, this extreme individualistic principle is highly questionable. Individuals must eventually exercise their training in a real society with a real economy and real needs. If the individual's training is to be useful to him, there must be a suitable position where he can make use of his training after graduation. Even in a society of abundance, some jobs are needed in much greater numbers than others to keep the economy going.

On the contrary, in developing societies such as Ponape and Micronesia, which have limited resources, limited economic possibilities, and severe problems of transportation and communication, it is especially important to consider how many of what kinds of specialists the society is likely to need, and to organize the educational system accordingly. If this means that a potential atomic physicist ends up as a fisherman or pig farmer, so be it. A Ponapean atomic physicist will never have the facilities to work effectively on his home island. While he might succeed in getting a suitable job in the United States, we already have enough potential atomic physicists here, and there is no need to devote limited societal resources to the education of a Ponapean atomic physicist. (Of course, the Ponapean public needs general information about such issues as the advantages and dangers of nuclear power plants, the possible latent effects of the atomic bomb tests upwind of Ponape on Eniwetok in the 1950s, etc., but these are matters of general education in the modern world and do not require the production of any Ponapean Ph.D. in atomic physics.)

Advocates of extreme individualism ignore the great adaptability of the normal healthy human child and his multiple potentialities. Certainly there are important individual differences in ability and interest dependent on both heredity and early experience, and it is in the interest of the society to take these into account in providing education and jobs for its members. It is inescapable that some education and jobs will have more prestige than others, and it is only reasonable that the assignment of these choice jobs, like all others, should be based on ability and interest. This prospect seems to be grudgingly recognized by Colletta, but he seems to dislike it because it implies "elitism." He recognizes, for instance (p. 151), a continuing need for a "deemphasized, but still important secondary and tertiary education system," but adds, "the equitable selection of the participants at varying levels of education and training will be highly problematic," and leaves the matter there. I presume he is in a quandary because he has repeatedly attacked "elitism" and competition in the Ponapean schools as American introductions, but is forced to acknowl-

edge that they will have their place even in an ideal reformed school system.

A certain kind of elitism and competition within limits is surely inevitable and useful in a complex society, even one as small as modern Ponape. Moreover, elitism and competition, within certain conventions, are in fact characteristic of traditional Ponapean society: they are not "corruptions" introduced by the modern school system. At Ponapean feasts, food is distributed in order of rank and the title of each recipient is called out with his share of food. Age and matrilineal descent play a part in determining a man's title, but every Ponapean knows that an individual's feast contributions and public service can greatly help a man achieve a high title, regardless of his age or ancestry. The most beautiful smiles I have ever seen on Ponapean faces have been in response to congratulations for promotion to a new title. Of course, in such a system there are losers as well as winners. The losers grumble, but they generally survive nevertheless and continue their effective participation in the society even after someone else has been awarded the title they had been hoping for.

It is true, as Colletta points out, that Ponapeans are trained to be modest verbally and to feign ignorance in public even when they know perfectly well something a little esoteric. This makes necessary a revision of American classroom techniques. A chorus response is preferable to answers by individual students. Students can still be evaluated on the basis of their written work. Brief individual tutorial sessions held in an office away from the rest of the class would also be helpful, though time-consuming. Perhaps older students could become involved in these.

Colletta is right in calling for substantial reform of the Ponapean educational system, and in asking more specifically for trials of various forms of adult education, for the reduction of the number of students in the upper levels of the schools, for an attempt to make the remaining schools more nearly self-supporting or partly supported by parents, for adapting the school schedules to the existing annual work cycle, etc. At the same time, we may wonder how much the schools are responsible by themselves for the generation conflict and other social problems of modern society. Probably culture contact usually causes some social disruption in the politically and economically weaker society, and the best educational system could at the most simply alleviate this somewhat. Even with educational reform, Ponapeans would still be subject to the disruptive effects of tourists, economic entrepreneurs, missionaries, anthropologists, bureaucrats, and other visitors in person, as well as all sorts of information from the outside world arriving in the form of radio broadcasts, motion

pictures, printed matter, and recently, television. These visitors and messages often have positive effects as well, but certainly they are often inconsistent with traditional Ponapean culture, as well as with each other, and to that extent can be regarded as disruptive. Moreover, this disruption is probably more than simply a manner of speaking about social change: it is probably reflected in a rising crime rate, alcoholism, psychosomatic disease, a decline in the quality of the diet, economic disorganization, lowered worker productivity, and the like. But the very diversity of outside influences helps prevent any one influence from becoming excessively dominant, and may leave room for positive aspects of the traditional culture to survive and flourish, at the same time permitting some negative aspects to be replaced by foreign innovations.

Probably some readers will question the right of Colletta or this reviewer to make pronouncements on the future of Ponapean education as independence draws near. But as long as the United States continues to finance the government and educational system of Ponape, American citizens can argue that they have not only a right but an obligation to be concerned with the uses of the funds supplied. Of course, most Americans lack enough knowledge of Ponapean education to raise useful questions about it. Nat Colletta possesses such knowledge. It would be fortunate if those who control the future of Ponapean education would read Colletta and ponder his ideas well as an aid to making the decisions which they must make.

J. L. Fischer
Department of Anthropology
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Greg Dening, *Islands and Beaches. Discourse on a Silent Land, Marquesas, 1774-1880.* Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii, 1980. Pp. 355, illustrations, maps, bibliography, index. $27.50.

A new genre of Pacific island history has emerged in Professor Dening's reflective work on the Marquesas *(Te Henua).* Fundamentally, "islands and beaches is a metaphor for the different ways in which human beings construct their worlds and for the boundaries that they construct between them." Every obtrusive influence and artifact has had to cross the island beaches in order to be assimilated, transformed, or discarded by the host society.

Enata, the identity term used by the Marquesans for themselves, and their relations with *Aoe,* their term for foreigners, is the historical scenario constructed over 116 years. The tableau of violence, disease, death, and anthropophagism is unfolded in the author's narrative. Voyager, beachcomber, trader, and missionary barter with *Enata* for their goods, hospitality, labor, and souls, with each group attempting to construct their respective boundaries and terms of transaction. To *Enata, Aoe* were outside their traditional systems of rights, privileges and, therefore, were fair game for exploitation by force, chicanery, and furtiveness. To *Aoe, Enata* were superficial and callous people without attachment to culture and dispossessed of the emotional depth that true culture brought. To both *Aoe* and *Enata,* fate brought advantage, isolation, and death in a different land.

Relations among *Enata* were also marked with boundaries. *Tapu* was an organizing principle of *Enata* social and physical environment. It defined their personal space and gave a semblance of order and focus to their larger environment. *Enata* possessing *tapu* preyed among the *kikino,* those of marginal social importance, for *heana* (human sacrifices). Such sacrificial feasts expressed *Enata* social action and the ultimate price that one human can exact from another. Though their pantheon contained a vast membership of deities, *Enata* were very selective in their acts of worship, rejecting Christianity as an unwelcomed intrusion into their metaphysical universe. Conversions to Christianity of one sort or another were temporary and fatuous convulsions. Not until the mid-1880s did the *tapu* system decay into oblivion without the ceremony seen in Hawai'i and Tahiti. This and related changes were not necessarily internally induced. Goods coming across the beach came divorced from their mode of production and, as such, changed the relations of production between *Aoe* and Enata. The exchange and *tapu* system that went with production disappeared. Firearms made traditional warrior ornamentation irrelevant and superfluous. Ceremonial fetishes decline in importance and imported commodities were of no substitute value.

Unlike in other islands of the Pacific, competition over land between *Enata* and *Aoe* was not a cause of cultural change. The attempts to regulate land by the French colonial administration required a more precise definition of proprietorship rather than a redistribution of property to expatriate entrepreneurs. As demands made by *Aoe* became the prevailing principle of social relations, a policy of domestication of *Enata* proceeded in earnest. Adaptation to *Aoe* ways required modifications in *Enata* behavior, self-definition, and even social definitions in order to maintain the relationship. Although elements of violence and submission were present

in such changing relationships, it is doubtful that competition for resources between *Aoe* and *Enata* developed during this period of time.

Islands and Beaches is an intriguing work product of historical, ethnological, and social theories coexisting in a readable discourse. The bibliography is the most comprehensive to date on the Marquesas and the notation system abates any threat of obfuscation to the narrative. This volume is above all a stimulating interpretation of island history and society.

William E. H. Tagupa
University of Hawaii
Kauai Community College

M. A. Jones, *The Australian Welfare State.* Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 1980. Paper. Pp. 244, bibliography, index. $A10.95.

Before the First World War, Australia had the reputation of a social policy laboratory, attributable in large part to the early rise of an organized working class. Since the Second World War, that reputation dissipated as Australia fell behind the burgeoning welfare states of western Europe. Today a conservative national government of mildly Friedmanite persuasion struggles unsuccessfully to cut back what it calls unnecessary expenditure and waste, which its opponents claim are the already inadequate provisions of welfare.

Mike Jones's useful introduction to the contemporary scene provides: a potted history of Australian welfare services; a quick survey of what some (mainly American) sociologists and political scientists have had to say about the welfare state; and fairly detailed studies of seven central problems--payment of cash benefits, the measurement of poverty, taxation, employment, health, housing, and personal services. There is a brief conclusion which affirms that much has gone badly wrong, and an excellent bibliography.

In the nineteenth century, Australians looked to the state for the infrastructure of economic development. A young and wealthy population made few demands for social services, and although the level of urbanization was already high, a selective immigration policy and suburban sprawl mitigated the social problems that come with city life. In the twentieth century, the growth of the welfare state was more a consequence of *ad hoc* vote-buying in a competitive two-party political sys-

tern than recognition of needs or pressures from the needy. Federalism divided responsibility between the national and state governments until the early 1940s when the federal government's assumption of a monopoly of income taxes ensured that thereafter the initiative for expansion would be national.

Three factors obstructed, without totally preventing, increased provision of public welfare: loss of national economic momentum that began with the depression of the 1890s and lasted until the 1950s, the greater electoral success of conservative parties which have controlled the federal government for more than three-quarters of the period since 1901, and prevalence of the belief that scarce resources were better invested in "development" of a harsh continent than in "welfare" for a population that was still relatively well-off by world standards. The defeat of a Labor Government in 1949 suggested that in a choice between moderate socialism with expanding welfare and pragmatic free enterprise plus modest welfare, Australian voters would take their chances in "The Lucky Country."

Then in the late 1960s the tide began to turn. The existence of poverty on a scale far greater than had been previously admitted became a matter of concern in the mass media and subsequently in politics. The seriousness, and intractability of the Aboriginal minority's problems were recognized. A massive immigration program which had been predicated on speedy assimilation encountered difficulties and, incidentally, alerted Australians to the extent to which their welfare schemes now lagged behind what was available in western Europe. Conservative governments floundered once Sir Robert Menzies's guiding hand was lost on his retirement, and a resurgent Labor Party collected support from suburban areas where the contrast between private affluence and public poverty was most obvious.

For a brief period, existing welfare schemes expanded both in the number of their beneficiaries and in their total cost, new schemes were introduced, and even grander schemes were investigated. In financial year 1970-71, 17 percent of the federal budget was expended on social security and welfare, in 1976-77, it was 27 percent. In 1969, those dependent on federal pensions equalled 17 percent of the work force, in 1978 about 28 percent. Underlying that expansion had been the belief, held particularly strongly in the Labor Party, that the natural growth of income tax revenues would make the process politically painless. A sudden surge in inflation and a virtual halt in economic growth, coupled with public awareness of an ever-increasing burden of taxation as payers moved into higher brackets with heavier marginal rates, destroyed that illusion. Fol-

lowing the dismissal of the Whitlam Labor Government in 1975, the conservative coalition was swept back into office with a commitment to stopping the growth of the public sector but only the haziest ideas on how to go about it.

As Jones says, the Labor Government shifted the balance of the welfare state in Australia from cash benefits toward specific purpose programs. Whereas the levels of cash benefits could be allowed to lag without attracting much political attention, specific purpose programs generate their own self-interested monitors in the administering bureaucracies. Thus, it is virtually as difficult to redirect expenditure out of existing programs into new and more effective programs as it is to wind them up completely. Recently, a committee of the federal Senate described the welfare system as a giant jelly which resumes its original shape as soon as pressure is removed from any part. Jones is very good on how the jelly got that way and what it looks like now. How to change it is a much harder question, and here his call for harder, more realistic thinking is only a first, very tentative, step.

Cohn A. Hughes
Australian National University
Canberra

Roger C. Thompson, *Australian Imperialism in the Pacific. The Expansionist Era 1820-1920.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1980. Pp. 289, maps. $A29.00.

Until the publication of Roger C. Thompson's volume, *Australian Imperialism in the Pacific. The Expansionist Era 1820-1920,* in early 1980, a deep hiatus existed in Pacific and Australian historiography. Since 1964, New Zealand history writing has been complemented by Angus Ross's study of that country's aspirations in the Pacific in the nineteenth century, but Australia had no comparable work. Noting this, Thompson has set out to survey the history of Australian subimperialism in Melanesia, or in his words, write "a study of Australian moves for the addition of Pacific islands to the British Empire."

At the outset, Thompson declares that his approach is two-sided. On one hand, he seeks to contribute to the body of political and diplomatic research which, although he does not admit it, has become a relatively unfashionable pursuit amongst Pacific historians in the last two decades.

Quite explicitly, he states that this history is not one of Pacific island peoples per se, but of Australian public and political opinions which laid the foundations for distinctive Australian foreign policies and postures in the post-Federation era. On the other hand, however, Thompson also addresses his study to the genre of literature which seeks to analyze the broad field of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

In general, Thompson successfully accomplishes these tasks, but in doing so, he has had to grapple with several methodological difficulties, the most problematic being the task of defining Australian public opinion and attitudes toward the Pacific. To this end he places heavy emphasis on a wide range of Australian newspaper editorials although, by his own admission, he is wisely and preemptorily weary about the extent to which the views of editors equated with public opinion of the times. Moreover, Thompson attempts to tackle the shadowy, often ambiguous, distinction between Australian policies and attitudes toward the Pacific. Noting that although many historians still decline to talk of Australian foreign "policies" toward Oceania prior to Federation, Thompson concludes that clearly defined expansionist postures were being espoused by some Australian colonial governments as early as the 1880s.

Structurally, Thompson's work is based on eleven chapters; the first eight deal with Australian attitudes and policies in the nineteenth century, whilst the remainder examine Australia's imperialist aspirations from 1901 to 1920. This schema, however, conceals two important chronological distortions. First, well over one-third of the entire study or four chapters are devoted to the events of only four years between 1883 and 1887. Secondly, chapter one, which investigates the 1820-1953 era, or one-third of the total time span of the study, only comprises about 5 percent of the written text.

Moreover, by way of examining Thompson's work, the reader must firstly ask why he choose 1820 as the starting point for his study. As Thompson admits, commercial intercourse between Sydney and the Pacific islands was the embryo of later attitudes, but he fails to acknowledge that early Australian colonial trade with the islands, though desultory, actually began in the last decade of the eighteenth century. Whaling, sealing, and the trade in pork, *bêche-de-mer*, trepang, sandalwood, coconut oil and pearl shell were being actively pursued throughout the administrations of Governors King (1800-1805), Bligh (1806-1808) and Macquarie (1809-1821), and a *mélange* of Sydney-based entrepreneurs such as the exconvicts Simeon Lord, James Underwood and Henry Kable were growing rich on the proceeds.

Chapter 1 is too truncated in relation to the ground Thompson attempts to cover and, besides, contains at least three errors of fact or interpretation. For example, he argues that when Dumont D'Urville voyaged to the Pacific in 1826 the French were "not yet interested in annexing any territory in the remote Pacific region." But Thompson failed to note that D'Urville himself considered that New Zealand would become a seat *"d'un grand empire"* and that during the Bourbon Restoration in 1818 the Minister for Navy and the Colonies urged the establishment of a colony in the South Seas. Subsequently, a French naval station was built at Akaroa, on the east coast of the South Island of New Zealand in 1829. Similarly, it is plainly wrong for the author to assert that "pressure from Australia . . . had nothing to do with the decision to annex New Zealand" in 1840. The facts are that since the early 1830s the governors and many sections of the public and press of New South Wales had been agitating for British intervention in New Zealand especially in light of the absence of law and order and the detrimental effect that this lawlessness was having on the burgeoning trade between New Zealand and the Australian colonies.

Moreover, Thompson considerably underscores the significance for Australians of the French move into New Caledonia in 1853 by stating that even "in New South Wales, the colony closest to New Caledonia, the threat of a French military outpost was not widely discussed." Again, this is an understatement as reactions to France's activities in the region were widespread and damning. The French seemed to be moving closer to Australia with each annexation--to some Australians stepping nearer to realizing the earlier French plan to make the continent *Terre Napoléon*--and the British appeared to be doing little about it. The significant point, which Thompson neglects, is that the 1853 incidents mark an important point of departure between Australian views and British policy toward the Pacific. Thus the *Sydney Morning Herald* in late 1853 condemned "the laxity of the British Government, not withstanding the earnest representations that have been made to it" and the Crown's "cowardly policy" in letting the French gain strategic bases in the south Pacific.

Desite these initial problems, the remainder of the work is usually well written and highly interesting. Chapter 2 discusses the Australian agitation to "raise the flag in Fiji" between 1853 and 1874 through such devices as Australian-backed commercial imperialism, especially by the Melbourne-based Polynesia Company, and political ruminations like those heard at the 1870 Intercolonial Conference which demanded that no foreign powers occupy the islands of the South Seas. The third chapter, entitled "Attempts to Extend the Empire in Melanesia, 1872-1882" analyzes the growing Australian interest in the strategic and economic

advantages which were to be gained by annexing New Guinea and the New Hebrides principally gleaned from a survey of over fifty newspapers, even as far afield as the *Western Australian Times.*

Chapters 4 to 7, which deal with the period from 1883 to 1887, however, form the crux of the study. Thompson discusses Queensland's unilateral annexation of New Guinea in order to forestall alleged German moves into the group; the attitudes of prominent Australian leaders such as Victoria's Premier James Service; the Intercolonial Convention in 1883 which advocated the so-called Australian "Monroe Doctrine;" Britain's grudging abandonment of its minimum intervention policy in respect of the acquisition of New Guinea in 1885; and, the public agitation against any French moves into the New Hebrides in 1887. Chapter 8 provides a close analysis of the Melbourne-based campaign which was waged to eject the French from the New Hebrides throughout the 1890s. Of special interest is Thompson's study of the connection between the Presbyterian church, many prominent Victorian politicians and businessmen, and the formation of the Australian New Hebrides Company whose major aim was to debunk the powerful *Compagnie Calédonienne des Nouvelles-Hébrides.*

The last three chapters deal with the policies of the Australian Commonwealth governments toward the Pacific from 1901 to 1920 and dwell particularly upon the clashes between Australian policy which viewed the Pacific, especially the New Hebrides, as a *de facto* part of the Australian empire, and British imperial policy which was more concerned with complexities of continental diplomacy than Pacific politics. Thompson concludes the work by noting the Australian occupation of German New Guinea at the outbreak of the Great War and the attempts by the fiery Australian Prime Minister, William Morris Hughes, to secure an indefinite Australian mandate over these territories at Versailles in 1919: certainly a far cry from the all-encompassing cries of the 1880s.

In all, Thompson's study is a valuable contribution to a much neglected area of Australian and Pacific history. As Thompson admits, the book took twelve years to research, but the product is well worth the wait.

Brian Babington
Department of Political Science
University of Sydney

Roger G. Rose, *Hawai'i: The Royal Isles.* Honolulu, Hawai'i: Bishop Museum Press, 1980. Paper. Pp. xii, 223, illustrations. $18.00.

Considering the amount of research materials available in ethnographic museums, it is good that some of it is squeezed out in a form accessible to a broad public as in this catalogue for an exhibition, *Hawai'i: The Royal Isles,* that is to travel between September 1980 to March 1983 to nine major museums across the United States. The exhibit was developed and organized by the Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum in Honolulu; the catalogue prepared by project directors Roger Rose and Adrienne Kaeppler.

The exhibit is one of a distinct type supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities--and in this instance assisted by United Airlines--that pays respect to an ethnic culture within the United States by presenting a panorama of its past in the form of old drawings, photographs, recorded statements and a range of interesting objects, a kind of retrospective cultural history. All the different materials that make up this exhibit come from privately held collections in Hawai'i: such as the royal estates, but the majority are from the Bishop Museum. This is the first time most of the objects will leave the islands to allow us mainlanders to enjoy the treasures of Hawaiian history.

Such an exhibit is a genuinely complex undertaking and this catalogue provides a comprehensive documentation of the Bishop Museum's efforts: most of the exhibited objects are illustrated: 138 are in black and white, and sixty-six color plates enliven this large format catalogue. Most commendably there are sixty pages of excellent explanatory notes by Roger Rose on the illustrations. In a nine-page essay, Adrienne Kaeppler, the noted authority on Polynesian ethnography, contributes descriptive summaries of traditional Hawaiian customs and beliefs: on gods and spirits, taboo, political units, knowledge of the sea, marriage, child rearing, medicine, amusements, wars, music, clothing and food habits. Her special message is to emphasize the persistence of traditional values, in spite of the many changes.

In eye-catching style, the book begins with page after page of dazzling color plates. These are attractively designed as photographs, although the color processing of reds and yellows tends to be over-vivid. The series starts with a version by George Carter of the violent encounter that led to Captain Cook's death at the hands of the Hawaiians, the event that first brought Hawai'i to Europe's attention in the late eighteenth century. Next we see examples of the art works for which Hawaiian craftsmen have become famous: vigorous representations of human fig-

ures, food bowls, musical instruments and the glorious featherwork. However, what follows departs from the ordinary, in order to fulfill the aim of the exhibition which is to focus on Hawaiian values over time. For we see what interested (at least some) Hawaiians in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: painting or photographs of Hawaiian royalty and all the paraphernalia of their class. Of special interest is a portrait of the famed King Kamehameha I who founded the first Hawaiian dynasty after contact with Captain Cook's expedition. Another gem of contact history is Plate 12, showing the baptism of the prime minister in 1819 by a visiting mission from the court of France. What is most apparent is the increasingly Victorian character of the scenes and objects: scepters, swords, silver cups and medals, coats of arms, elaborate court costumes and portraits. It is intriguing to see the nineteenth century trappings of royalty given the same photographic attention or glorification as the traditional symbols.

The assembly of black and white prints that make up the bulk of the catalogue may strike one first as haphazard, but these do cluster about selected topics: images of deities, the arrival of the first missionaries, calabashes and kings, the hula, and symbols of sovereignty. They are arranged so that a few pictures of objects alternate with a number of scenes, recorded by various means, from the Hawaiian past as landscapes, activities of groups of people or portraits of individuals, so that the sequence sustains and stimulates one's unflagging visual attention. The powerful messages on cultural contact from some of the scenes are unforgettable: the Hawaiian king and queen at the Royal Theatre in London in 1824, the assembly of chiefs in European clothes in 1837, the Christianized princesses and missionaries in a view of Honolulu in 1837, the Lincolnesque portrait (1857) of Charles Reed Bishop who married the royal heiress Bernice Pauahi and who later founded the Bishop Museum to preserve the vanishing relics of Hawai‘i in her memory, the Victorian mansion of Princess Ke‘elikolani (1883) and the grass house in which she died, the *lu‘au,* a nineteenth century invention, or feast at the shore in 1885, and the memorable image of Queen Lili‘uokalani posed in full Victorian dress in 1892.

The outstanding and lasting treasure of this catalogue consists of the informative notes by Roger Rose, who deserves a special award for this research effort. In a lively style, he presents an excellent selection of interesting facets on each picture or object, often drawing on eye-witness accounts from the archives or on contemporary Hawaiian opinions. One of the most stimulating comments by a Hawaiian (1977) offers an interpretation of the strange form of the hook-pendant, the most valuable ornament of the Hawaiian repertory.

Rose may supply the history of an object, how it was made or used, comment on the varied and conflicting personalities in the royal dynasties, or trace the path through kings and queens to the end of the monarchy in 1893. Some of his remarkably comprehensive knowledge fills every paragraph with interesting concrete details and informed assessments so that even in capsule views, we grasp the course of events.

After perusing this catalogue, I would assume that even though monarchy per se may not be a significant value for Hawaiians today, the perspicacity and tenacity of the royal elite as reflected in their adoption and valuation of the trappings of English monarchy serves as an assertion of identity for Hawaiian people. What actually persists seems to be the more commonly held objects or customs, such as family lifestyle or the hula dance, although this dance costume has changed drastically with the introduction of grass skirts from the Gilbert Islands and the consequent showing of bare thighs.

Considering the evidence in the exhibition, Kaeppler's emphasis on the persistence of tradition seems more an article of faith than a reality. Some flat statements need qualification, such as the following (p. 57): "Changes in similar kinds of objects over time are visual representations of changes in social relationships. Changes in status, rank, prestige, and power are reflected in objects and the ways in which they were made and used." This may seem a well-accepted generality but elsewhere in the catalogue, Rose says (p. 185): "While utensils and costumes may have changed . . . the enduring social relationships of the *'ohana,* or family, symbolized by the poi bowl, are still fundamental to the Hawaiian life style of today."

Carved wooden bowls for poi (a food staple) seem to have been used and valued by the elite or upper class of Hawaiians (pp. 178-179) and their manufacture nearly vanished in the early part of this century (p. 178). This example suggests that it is misleading to declare a simple correlation between objects and social relationships, for, according to catalogue information, the family style continued although the elite poi bowl disappeared, only to be revived as a symbol today of contemporary ethnicity. It is also risky to assume, as Kaeppler goes on to declare (p. 57), that from an examination of objects the underlying concepts that persisted and changed can be followed. In some instances objects may not be the medium for carrying messages about enduring social relationships, which may be expressed in other forms; in other cases, objects may come to stand for quite another concept. Aside from this minor pitfall, likely to occur in a general essay, this catalogue, for its many illustrations and its concrete and informative texts that reveal the long chapter of contact

with Europeans in a vivid way, is highly recommended for all levels of interest in the Pacific.

Marie J. Adams
Harvard University

Terence Barrow, *The Art of Tahiti, and the Neighbouring Society, Austral and Cook Islands.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 1979. Paper. Pp. 96, maps, illustrations, bibliography, index. $6.95.

Images of the gods, the regalia of chiefs, ornaments, adzes, fishhooks, and fallen temples--the vestiges and fragments of South Sea civilizations--have fascinated Western man ever since European adventurers first penetrated the South Pacific. With these introductory words, Terence Barrow brings to the uninitiated a beautiful, affordable view of southeast Polynesia as it was before the traditional culture was "destroyed by time and vandalism." Using more than a hundred illustrations (nearly half in color), Barrow has given us a pleasing and sometimes visually stunning mix of artifacts, drawings and engravings from Cook's voyages, and other supporting materials that evoke the context in which southeast Polynesian art was made and used.

The volume is divided into four sections. An introductory essay, spanning some fifteen pages, gives a brief overview to the general reader unfamiliar with Polynesia. Topics include migration and settlement theory, geography, early contact and missionary history, postcontact "degeneration" of traditional art forms, and so on. A set of maps (one shows the Polynesian Triangle) brings the region into perspective and provides a helpful key to the remaining sections of the booklet: the Society Islands (thirty pages); the Austral Islands (twenty pages); the Cook Islands (twenty-four pages). Each section treats a wide range of subjects, as appropriate to the culture: social structure, domestic crafts, carving, clothes and tattooing, symbols of rank, canoes, houses, temples and religious images, war, and funeral rites.

Not surprisingly, Tahiti and the Society Islands receive the most comprehensive and balanced treatment, presumably because of the greater abundance of artifactual and documentary material. Tools, ornaments, barkcloth, and a few domestic and ceremonial implements are illustrated, as well as the usual god images of wood and one of coconut husk fiber. The Austral Islands are represented mainly by fly-whisk handles, wooden and stone god/ancestor images, and the decorated paddles and food

scoops made famous by the carvers who supplied the nineteenth-century curio trade. The Cook Islands discussion focuses on the diversity and provenience of ritual carvings: from Rarotonga, fishermen's gods, images with attached secondary figures, and staff gods with anthropomorphic heads and phallic ends; mace and slab gods from the Atiu-Mitiaro-Mauke cluster; and ceremonial adzes from Mangaia. Only passing reference is made to items such as plaited fans and belts, weapons, carved seats, and a spectacular headdress from Aitutaki. While informative, albeit not exhaustive, Barrow's discussions reflect his caution that in books dealing with art, ritual objects tend to get "pride of place"--usually at the expense of ordinary utilitarian objects that are often more revealing of a community's aesthetic values.

To assemble this volume, the author has drawn upon a dozen public and private ethnographic collections in Europe, the United States, New Zealand, and Tahiti. Nearly two-thirds of this material comes from two familiar resources, the Cambridge University Museum and the British Museum. Thus, students or scholars using this book will find little new material for study. For the specialist, the utility of this slender volume is lessened by frequent gaps in collection data. Without disrupting the text or picture captions, known details concerning collector, date, and locality would have made a worthy addition to the "Acknowledgments and list of illustrations" (pp. 94-95), an otherwise redundant and totally useless appendage. Such information is invaluable to students attempting to place, chronologically and geographically, those controversial pieces that continue to defy satisfactory provenancing in an area noted for its complex stylistic and cultural interrelationships.

The author is to be congratulated for a concise introduction to the major artistic traditions of three closely related Polynesian societies. Some of the latest research is incorporated (including my own on the attributions of Austral and Society Islands fly whisks, listed in the bibliography, although not credited in the text). Barrow's book will help a new generation of students to unravel the tangle of aesthetic conventions shared among these three Polynesian cultures. Yet, it is clear that more research is needed before the more elusive components of individual island styles can be isolated or fully understood. For example, there are questions about the Society Islands provenance assigned to a barkcloth *tiputa* or poncho (Fig. 33). The style is uncharacteristic of pre-European Tahiti; either the decorative motifs and cut of the garment are indicative of later introductions, or the object comes from elsewhere, perhaps Niue. (Incidentally, the classic fern leaf imprints on Society Islands barkcloth were made with a bright crimson, not brown, pigment [p. 27], most specimens

having darkened with age.) Also, the "necklace" in Figure 29 is made from land snails of the genus *Partula*, not cowrie shells; it is apparently a head or hat band of the type popularized in Tahiti and elsewhere toward the end of the last century. The basalt *poi* pounder illustrated in Figure 24 (center) is not Tahitian, as stated, but comes from the Austral Islands, probably Rapa. A few inevitable misprints have occurred, too: *maro* (p. 30) and *tupapa'u* (p. 45) are the correct Tahitian renderings for loincloth and corpse / ghost, respectively.

Despite an occasional but forgivable blemish, *The Art of Tahiti* may well prove to be an enlightening stimulus, even to those with only romantic curiosity about these islands. As Barrow observes in the first paragraph of his introduction, "The vision of Tahiti as an island paradise is at the heart of much of the romantic feeling about the islands of the Pacific. This emotional attachment to Tahiti has endured for over two centuries but the nature of Tahitian arts and the facts of Tahitian life remain obscure. This book is published in the hope that the veil will be lifted a little more."

Roger G. Rose
Curator of Ethnology
Bernice P. Bishop Museum

Douglas M. Johnston, ed., *Regionalization of the Law of the Sea.* Proceedings Law of the Sea Institute Eleventh Annual Conference, Honolulu, Hawai'i, 14-17 November 1977. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1978. Pp. xx, 346. $20.00

By 1977, it had become obvious that the declaration of two-hundred-mile zones of extended jurisdiction would have a profound effect on the management of ocean resources even though most countries had not yet declared their zones. It was generally anticipated that the global acceptance of a Law of the Sea Treaty would form the basis for cooperative arrangements, regional or otherwise, for future resource management and allocation. Consideration of "Regionalization of the Law of the Sea" by the Law of the Sea Institute at its Eleventh Annual Conference in Hawai'i, 14-17 November 1977, was therefore indeed timely. This book is a record of the proceedings of that meeting.

Following a foreword by the Director of the Law of the Sea Institute, John Craven, and an opening address by the US Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and Environmental and Scientific Affairs, the Honorable

Pasty Mink, the book is presented in seven parts, comprised of a total of eighteen chapters. There is an additional section covering a special caucas on the South Pacific and the Law of the Sea plus addresses at two luncheon meetings and a banquet meeting, Each chapter is basically a paper presented on a title topic, plus, in some cases, one or more commentaries by selected participants and questions and answers. Presentation is inconsistent in that some parts have commentaries and/or questions and answers while others do not.

Part I, "Regionalization and its Consequences to UNCLOS III," is made up of the chairman's comments, three papers, discussion and questions. It gives an excellent introduction to the regional consideration of Law of the Sea issues. The overall concepts-are excellently presented in the first paper by Lewis Alexander, even if the presentation is a little heavily biased towards the sentiments embodied in UNCLOS documentation. The third paper by Richard B. Bilder gives a realistic appraisal of how countries approach regionalism and includes a prediction which appears accurate: "I believe that the most realistic expectation is that nations will turn to regional solutions when these seem clearly in their interest, either in terms of inherent rationality or for political or bargaining purposes, and that the basic factors in such decisions will be to a considerable extent independent of whether an UNCLOS III treaty is or is not achieved."

The remaining six parts deal in turn with issues relating to regional politics, problems in the developing world, marine resource management in the northern Pacific, ocean management in southeast Asia, problems of anthropology and comparative analysis, and specific problems in economic zone management. These parts do not follow any logical sequence and their disjointed nature seriously detracts from the book as a whole. Under Part II, one chapter deals with the Caribbean and the next three with the situation in Europe. Part III then deals with the feasibility of ocean management in the developing world. This is followed in Part IV by discussion of the northern Pacific, Part V with southeast Asia and Part VI with general problems of anthropology and comparative analysis. Part VII then reverts to problems in localized areas and deals specifically with Indonesia, which one would think should have been included in the sections on problems in the developing world or southeast Asia. These sections should in turn have been closely related to the discussion of the Caribbean, and could also have been tied to the special caucas section on the South Pacific. The agenda for the meeting is not included in the book so the disjointed presentation has not been justified on the grounds of adherence to the meeting timetable.

Notwithstanding problems associated with discontinuity, of overall presentation, the book contains many excellent papers on most of the topics it covers. Papers have been presented by many world authorities in the field and they have, in general, been well researched and written. Overall, the problem of regionalism and the Law of the Sea, as it stood in 1977, is exhaustively covered in a scholarly manner. The book gives a very wide coverage of factors relating to regionalism and the Law of the Sea, and the papers adhere surprisingly well to the rather difficult topic. Issues dealt with in detail vary from political and economic problems of resource management to pollution and environmental protection, transit rights for vessels and even the problems of corruption, bribery and piracy.

What has happened since 1977 strongly suggests that national interests and declaration of exclusive rights to resources within two-hundred-mile zones will be far more influential than was commonly accepted. This possibility is, of course, mentioned in several of the papers presented in this book, most specifically by Edward Miles who pointed out that regionalism in Law of the Sea issues will only work if political tradeoffs are possible; those countries with nothing to trade will miss out.

Even though the book contains many excellent articles, one feels that the meeting was more timely and of greater value in 1977 than the book is in 1981. Nonetheless, it is recommended to anybody with an interest in either regionalism as a concept or the changing opinions on Law of the Sea issues.

R. E. Kearney
Skipjack Programme
South Pacific Commission

George Kent, *The Politics of Pacific Island Fisheries.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1980. Pp. ix, 191, bibliography, index. $22.00.

Given the paucity of contemporary studies on marine affairs in the Pacific in general and the islands in particular, this book is a most welcome addition to the literature. Covering such a vast portion of the globe, the author makes ample use of international reports, yearbooks, technical papers, and statistics (24 tables). Yet, many chapters in the book are generally articulated around issues between developed and developing nations of the Pacific rim and not Oceania as is claimed in the Introduction. Nonetheless, the study provides the reader with a broad picture of the current conditions of fisheries in the Pacific Ocean and details a wide range of problems as well as possible solutions.

The text is divided into three parts each containing several chapters on a related theme. Part I, entitled “The Situation” describes general production patterns, it profiles the fishing industry for some twenty-eight islands and island groups, and it surveys international organizations concerned with fisheries in the region. The country profiles not only point out a continuous shortage of information on which to build management schemes, but also, their dependency on outside nations resulting in high levels of subordination and lack of initiative: On the whole, the first four chapters introduce the reader to a more detailed treatment of the subject in part II and III.

The second part of the book covers a series of familiar problems in fisheries common to most developing economies. The problems described range from the need to improve production, limit environmental impacts, recognize the nutritional value, obtain more reliable information, create a better trade balance and to resolve a variety of management conflict in the islands. While these issues need to be understood within the context of a new management scheme, what role do they play in the politics of fisheries in the Pacific? The point to be made is that the objectives of this work are not clearly stated and the title does not fully illuminate the economic, environmental and social questions raised in the book.

From a geo-political perspective, part III is certainly the most interesting and revealing section in the book. In lieu of current, less effective management options and regional organizations, the author looks at several alternative arrangements such as the Common Heritage idea, the conference of the Law of the Sea and the new Forum Fisheries Agency. As important as these organizations might be to the future of fisheries in the islands only marginal coverage is devoted to them.

Throughout the book, however, Kent is perhaps at his best in tracing some of the unique features in Pacific island fisheries. For instance, the multinational arrangements and corporate linkages among fishing nations make it virtually impossible to interpret trade and production data accurately. He asks “if Koreans fish Samoan Waters and sell their catches to American fishing boats, whose fish are they?” (p. 10). “The Soviets supply fishery products to Singapore only to be processed and exported to Japan” (p. 92). In such cases, the true quantities of fish caught, traded and consumed in the islands tend to be systematically underestimated. Another issue of considerable international interest in the Pacific is the management of highly migratory species. On this point, the United States and the South Pacific nations have long been at odds particularly over the inclusion of migratory species within the two-hundred-mile zones of national jurisdiction. Then, there is the problem of comparative disadvantage in

the endowment of natural resources. Due to the variation in environmental factors and the behavior of fish, the northern Pacific is generally richer in fish stock than the water in the South Pacific. These kinds of conditions raise the question of what should be regarded as significantly in need of deliberate international management.

In examining fisheries management in the Pacific, the author concludes that outside agencies may be consulted, but solutions to the problem of development should ultimately come from the island nations themselves. Only remedies which are essentially their own can be the best solutions to local problems. What is regarded as a rather modest step toward a workable arrangement for the islands is the creation of the South Pacific Forum Fisheries Agency. The full text of the convention creating the agency is included in this volume as an appendix. The major function of the agency is to (a) collect, analyze and disseminate information on fish resources, legislation, pricing, marketing, shipping, and management procedures, (b) provide technical assistance on fisheries development policy, negotiation, licensing, surveillance and enforcement and, (c) establish working arrangements with other regional organizations in the South Pacific. Despite good intentions, the organization turned out to be a rather weak service agency because it was not being delegated any power by the participating members nations. Meanwhile, many island nations are playing out some of the familiar dynamics of world politics with all kinds of bilateral negotiations with outside powers underway. The author, however, is still hopeful that some bases for cooperation of at least a few resources be regarded as the common heritage of all people in the region.

The Politics of Pacific Island Fisheries is a well-documented and informative study, a progress report of practical value, suggestive rather than definitive, speculative rather than explanatory. On the other hand, anyone hoping to find a model or concept-oriented analysis in Political or Regional Science will be disappointed. It is equally unfortunate that the author chose not to address the subject of small-scale artisanal fisheries even though the point is made that on a per capita basis subsistance production in the Pacific islands is still relatively high. Despite these weaknesses, Kent's book is of particular interest to those concerned with international and regional fisheries management. Perhaps the most salient success of this work is the author's new interpretation of the island systems in the Pacific which are not important for their total production but for the access they have to some of the world's major fish stocks.

Gerald H: Krausse
University of Rhode Island

Clarence E. Glick, *Sojourners and Settlers: Chinese Migrants in Hawaii.* Honolulu: Hawaii Chinese History Center and The University Press of Hawaii, 1980. Pp. 389, illustrations, index, glossary. $20.00.

If it is possible to consider any work definitive, Professor Glick's exhaustively researched book on the Chinese in Hawai'i up to 1950 deserves that accolade. Certainly anyone mining this topic in the future will have to consult this monumental effort as the author appears to have left no stone unturned in constructing this fascinating story. Indeed, if the book has a major flaw, beyond its lack of a bibliography, it may be that some readers will find it too encyclopedic, expecting more interpretation from an author trained in sociology rather than history.

Glick began his research more than fifty years ago, interviewing migrant leaders in 1929, picking up a feeling, at least, for the various Kawangtung dialects, and even visiting that province in 1932 in an effort to acquire a better sense of the socio-cultural matrix of these migrants to the "Sandalwood Mountains." Organized around traditional sociological categories, the book examines rural and urban living and working conditions, the many social, economic and political organizations, familial and socialization systems, and the processes of acculturation and integration as these immigrants developed a sense of nationalism that they, or their parents never had in China. In part, this last phenomenon was a function of a gradual regrouping around new common interests that transcended older kinship, dialect, and district divisions. Prejudice and discrimination directed at the Chinese enhanced this process. Ironically, when the Sam Yup, See Yup, Hakka, Punti, Christian and non-Christian finally became united as "Chinese," they soon became fragmented politically as Sun Yat-sen republicans, constitutional monarchists, supporters of Yuan Shih-k'ai, or opponents of Chiang Kai-shek.

One of the author's great strengths is his ability to select sympathetic illustrative material depicting the hopes of these migrants as well as the realities of isolation, hard work and discrimination. One letter from a wife left behind in China is particularly moving (p. 162). Overall, the story is one of even greater and more accelerated success than that achieved by Chinese immigrants on the US mainland, which Glick attributes to the absence of "overwhelming competition from Caucasian workers" (p. 83). A cultural price was paid for this success as hoary traditions gave way to new tastes and a different language developed in American schools. He illustrates this process beautifully with the Cantonese theatre which soon went the way of the Yiddish one in New York. This is the dilemma for all

immigrant groups which must choose between American success and cultural self-preservation, if, indeed, there actually is a choice.

I have but one minor argument with this impressive work. Glick contends early that "whatever anti-Chinese feeling did appear later among Hawaiians was as likely to be a reflection of, if not actually instigated by, Caucasian agitation as a result of any grievance toward the Chinese" (p. 13). He offers no evidence in support of this, and much of what follows in his own book seems to challenge this contention, which smacks too glibly of the currently popular myth that racism is a white monopoly. The almost exclusively male Chinese migrants frequently married Hawaiian women, competed successfully with Hawaiian males for unskilled jobs, were perceived as a health threat, probably looked upon Hawaiians as cultural inferiors, and soon made up almost half of the total adult male population in the islands. The Hawaiians, particularly the males, would have to have been saints not to have reacted angrily with little prodding from Caucasians. Intermarriage is not necessarily a viable index for good racial relations. The despised Chinese in the Philippines also intermarried with Filipinos, and the highly successful mestizos that resulted from such unions were not immune to violent anti-Chinese outbursts. Nevertheless, it is clear that the Chinese migrants in Hawai'i fared much better than did their compatriots in the American West, or in the Philippines.

Stuart Creighton Miller
Department of Social Science
San Francisco State University

BOOKS RECEIVED AND BOOK NOTICES

Ronald Amundson, *The Issue of Hawaiian Claims: A Source Book.* Honolulu: Hawaiian Island Media Advisory Council, 1980. Paper. Pp. 46, bibliography. $2.00.

Russell A. Apple, *Guam: Two Invasions and Three Military Occupations. A History Summary of War in the Pacific National Historical Park, Guam*. Guam: Micronesian Area Research Center, 1980. Paper. Pp. iii, 93, bibliography, appendices.

Paul Bailey, *Hawaii's Royal Prime Minister: The Life & Times of Walter Murray Gibson*. New York: Hastings House, 1980. Pp. 315, bibliography, index. $13.95.

Ulli Beier, *Voices of Independence.* Australia: University of Queensland Press, 1980. Pp. ix, 251, glossary. $A 17.95.

Diane Bell and Pam Ditton, *Law: The Old and the New Aboriginal Women in Central Australia Speak Out.* Canberra: Australian National University, 1980. Pp. viii, 129, index, appendix. $A 5.95.

Leonard B. Bell, *The Maori in European Art*. Wellington: Reed, 1980. Pp. 138, bibliography, index. $19.95.

Mark Berg, *The History of Palau*. (3 vols.) Palau: Palau Community Action Agency, 1979. Paper. Pp. 547. $18.00.

Nico Besnier, *Tuvaluan Lexicon.* Suva: US Peace Corps, 1981. Paper. Pp. 780. $F 30.00.

Alan Bollard, *T-Shirts and Tapa Cloth:* A *Handbook of Small Rural Businesses for the Pacific.* Noumea, New Caledonia: South Pacific Commission, 1979. Paper. Pp. 118. $A 3.50.

C. M. H. Clark, *A History of Australia. Vol. I: From the Earliest Times to the Age of Macquarie. Vol. II: New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, 1822-1838. Vol. III: The Beginning of an Australian Civilization, 1824-1851. Vol. IV: The Earth Abideth For Ever, 1851-1888.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1979. Pp. 422, 364, 491, 427, $60.00

Nat J. Colletta, *American Schools for the Natives of Ponape.* Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i, 1980. Paper. Pp. xiv, 181, illustration, appendices, index. $10.00.

Edwin Cooke and Denise O'Brien, *Blood and Semen: Kinship Systems of Highland New Guinea.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1980. Paper. Pp. 511, references, index. $38.50 North Am $44.25 elsewhere.

Robert D. Craig, and Russell T. Clement, *Who's Who in Oceania 1980-1981*. Laie, Hawai'i: The Institute for Polynesian Studies, Brigham Young University--Hawaii, 1980. Pp. 219, bibliography. $12.95. Paper $7.95.

Douglas J. Cusine and John P. Grant, *The Impact of Marine Pollution.* New Jersey: Allanheld, Osmun & Co. Publisher, 1980. Pp. 336. $32.50.

A. Grove Day, *Modern Australian Prose, 1901-1975: A Guide to Sources.* Detroit: Gale Research Co., 1980. Pp. 476, index. $30.00.

A. Degage, *Les Goélettes à Voile des Iles Australs: localement dénommées Tuhaapae.* Paper. Pp. 32. CFP 300.

R. Dousset and E. Tailemite, *The Great Book of the Pacific.* New York: Nicholas Books, 1979. $60.00.

Judith Farquhar and Carleton D. Gajdusek, *Kuru: Early Letters and Field-Notes From the Collection of D. Carleton Gajdusek.* New York: Raven Press, 1980. Pp. 338, glossary, references, index. $32.00.

Robin Fisher and Hugh Johnston, *Captain James Cook and His Times.* Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1979. Pp. 276, illustration, maps. Can $14.95.

Grant K. Goodman and Felix Moos, *The United States and Japan in the Western Pacific: Micronesia and Papua New Guinea.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1981. Pp. 289. $20.00.

Barry Selwyn Gustafson, *Labour's Path to Political Independence.* Fairlawn, New Jersey: Oxford University Press, 1980. Pp. 183, bibliography, index. $18.50.

Francis X. Hezel and Mark Berg, *History of Micronesia.* 2 vols. Guam: Naval Printing Office, 1980.

L. R. Hiatt, *Australian Aboriginal Concepts.* Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, Inc., 1978. Pp. 206, notes, index. $17.00 Paper $9.75.

David Hillard, *God's Gentlemen: A History of the Melanesian Mission, 1849-1942.* Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1979. $A 14.95.

Walter T. Herbert, *Marquesan Encounters: Melville and the Meaning of Civilization.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980. Pp. 256. $15.00.

Earl R. Hinz, *Landfalls of Paradise: The Guide to Pacific Islands.* Ventura, California: Western Marine Enterprises, 1980. $29.95.

P. Hope, *Long Ago is Far Away: Accounts of the Early Exploration and Settlement of the Papuan Gulf Area.* Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979. Pp. 264.

Institute of Pacific Studies, *Vanuatu.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, 1980. Paper. Pp. 291.

Jesse D. Jennings, *The Prehistory of Polynesia.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980. Pp. 399, illustrations, maps, glossary, index. $35.00.

R. E. Johannes, *Words of the Lagoon: Fishing and Marine Lore in the Palau District of Micronesia.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980. Pp. 275. $14.95.

Paul Johnstone, *The Seacraft of Prehistory.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980. Pp. xviii, 260, illustration, index. $25.00.

Janet Kear and A. J. Berger, *The Hawaiian Goose: An Experiment in Conservation.* Vermillion, South Dakota: Buteo Books, 1980. Pp. 178. $30.00.

R. M. Keesing and P. Corris, *Lightning Meets the West Wind: The Malaita Massacre.* Fairlawn, New Jersey: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1980. Pp. 208. $28.00.

Beatrice H. Krauss, *Native Plants Used as Medicine in Hawaii.* Honolulu: Lyon Arboretum, 1979. Paper. Pp. iii, 50. $2.50.

Jay L. Lather, Patrick W. Giese, and Robert F. Rogers, *Guam's Political Status: Military, Airline and Energy Aspects of Change.* Guam: Micronesian Area Research Center, University of Guam, 1980. Paper. Pp. v, 29.

Maurice Leenhardt, *Do Kamo: Person and Myth in the Melanesian World.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979. Pp. xxxiii, 205. $15.00.

Anne Leonard and John Terrell, *Patterns of Paradise: The Styles and Significance of Bark Cloth Around the World.* Chicago: Field Museum of Natural History, 1980. Pp. 76, bibliography.

Stephen Levine, *The New Zealand Political System: Politics in a Small Society.* Reading, Mass.: Allen & Unwin, Inc., 1979. $18.95.

Father Walter Lini, *Beyond Pandemonium: From the New Hebrides to Vanuatu.* Wellington: Asia Pacific Books, 1980. Pp. 63.

W. G. McMinn, *A Constitutional History of Australia.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1979. Pp. 213. $29.95.

George Marcus, *The Nobility and the Chiefly Tradition in the Modern Kingdom of Tonga.* Honolulu: University of Press of Hawai'i, 1980. Paper. Pp. vi, 170, references, index. $12.00.

James K. Morishima and others, *Handbook of Asian American/Pacific Islander Mental Health.* Volume 1. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, 1979. Pp. x, 135, annotated bibliography.

Clive Moore, *The Forgotten People: A History of the Australian South Sea Island*

Community. Sydney: Australian Broadcasting Commission, 1979. Pp. 95, illustration. $A 3.95.

W. H. Morris-Jones and Georges Fisher, *Decolonisation and After: The British and French Experience.* Totowa, New Jersey: Frank Cass, 1980. $17.50.

John Nation, *Customs of Respect: The Traditional Basis of Fijian Communal Politics.* Canberra: The Australian National University, 1979. Paper. Pp. xx, 168, references. $A 8.00.

Valerie Noble, *Hawaiian Prophet: Alexander Hume Ford.* New York: Exposition Press, 1980. Pp. xii, 264. $15.00.

Martin Painter and Bernard Carey, *Politics Between Departments: The Fragmentation of Executive Control in Australian Government.* St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979. Pp. 132. $21.75.

Roderic Owen, *Great Explorers.* New York: Mayflower Books, 1979. $10.98.

Frederick Perry, *Fair Winds and Foul.* Standfordville, New York: Earl M. Coleman Publisher, 1979. Pp. x, 204.

Aloi Pilioko, *Pilioko.* Suva, Fiji: South Pacific Social Science Association in association with the Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, (no date). Paper. Pp. ix, 42.

Phyllis Rabinear, *Feather Arts: Beauty, Wealth, and Spirit from Five Continents.* Chicago: Field Museum of National History, 1979. Paper. Pp. 88. $7.95.

Richard L. Rapson, *Fairly Luckly You Live Hawaii: Cultural Pluralism in the Fiftieth State.* Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1980. Pp. iii, 157. $7.80.

Ray Riegert, *Hidden Hawaii: The Adventurer's Guide.* Berkeley, California: And/Or Press, 1979. Paper. Pp. xxiv, 369, index, maps and illustrations. $8.95.

Neville K. Robinson, *Villagers at War: Some Papua New Guinean Experiences in World War II.* Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979. $A 8.00.

Roger Rose, *A Museum to instruct and Delight.* Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press, 1980. Pp. vii, 77, bibliography. $6.50.

P. G. Rubel and A. Rosman, *Your Own Pigs You May Not Eat: A Comparative Study of New Guinea Societies.* Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1979. Pp. 368.

Francis J. Saemala, *Our Independent Solomon Islands.* Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies in association with the University of the South Pacific Solomon Islands Centre, 1979. Paper. Pp. 49, appendices.

Deryck Scarr, *The Majesty of Colour: A Life of Sir John Bates Thurston, II, Viceroy of the Pacific.* Canberra: Australian National University Press, 1980. $9.00.

Deryck Scarr, *Ratu Sukuna: Soldier, Statesman, Man of Two Worlds.* New York: Macmillan, 1980.

Wilber Schram, Lyle Nelson and Mere Betham, *Bold Experiment: The Story of Educational Television in American Samoa.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1981. Pp. xvi, 244, works cited, index. $17.50.

Axel Steensberg, *New Guinea Gardens: A Study of Husbandry with Parallels in Prehistory Europe.* San Francisco: Academic Press, 1980. Pp. xxvi, 224. $25.00.

Judi Thompson and Alan Taylor, *Polynesian Canoes and Navigation.* Laie, Hawai'i: Institute for Polynesian Studies. Paper. Pp. 32, illustrations, bibliography. $2.50.

Roger C. Tompson, *Australian Imperialism in the Pacific: The Expansionist Era 1820-1920.* Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1980. Pp. 289, maps. $A 29.00.

Robert Wenkam, *Maui No Ka Oi.* San Francisco: Rand McNally & Co., 1980. Pp. 144. $29.95.

Albert Wendt, *Leaves of the Banyan Tree* (Fiction). Auckland: Longman Paul, 1979. Pp. 416. NZ $13.95.