

Review: JULIA A. HECHT
GROUP HEALTH COOPERATIVE OF PUGET SOUND
SEATTLE

Borofsky's *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge* focuses on the *Akatawa*. This is a form of social organization into moieties that he purports had been missed by previous anthropological students of Pukapuka including me, to whom he credits a "vague" recollection (p. 13).

When Borofsky interviewed me, I was not aware of being so much the subject of his work. I had written an article on community organization and land tenure in Pukapuka (Hecht 1987), which had been in press since 1980—long before I discussed these matters with him. I did not share the article with Borofsky, expecting it to be published at any moment and not realizing that he was going to build such an elaborate edifice (his dissertation and *Making History*) on the very small foundation of the *Akatawa*.

In the article I state that following a natural disaster some hundreds of years ago, the population of Pukapuka as a whole is said to have moved into one settlement and operated as a single unit in order to husband resources. Some informants suggest that, following this "island as a whole" organization, and before moving back into three villages, the island was organized on the basis of the Tawa Lalo and Tawa Ngake moieties or sides. This was all I could say about the *Akatawa* form of organization, admittedly a "vague understanding." I am also baffled about how the "island as a whole" form operated, and suspect that it, like the moiety organization, was short lived.

In the absence of activities based on a particular form of organization with little cultural elaboration, it is difficult to ascertain much about a phenomenon like the *Akatawa*. Borofsky had an opportunity unique among the anthropologists who have worked on Pukapuka. Yet his book

is disappointingly weak on the social and political organization of the island during the period he was there, given that he purports to describe modern social organization in detail (chapter 2).

Borofsky clearly recognizes that the village and *Akatawa* coexisted as frames of reference and modes of social organization during the period (p. 36). He says that, at least initially, the *Akatawa* was regarded as temporary, but his evidence indicates that it was never regarded as more than that. It does not appear to be the fully fledged alternative to village organization that he suggests. For example, he speaks of household heads belonging in Ngake *village* in 1978, that is, during the *Akatawa*. Apparently affiliation *through the moieties* was never organizationally or culturally expressed.

While I was vaguely aware of the *Akatawa* form of organization, I never heard it called such. I wonder if use of the term "*Akatawa*" is in fact new, as Borofsky seems to imply (pp. 6-7).

I particularly enjoyed Borofsky's chapters on acquiring and validating traditional knowledge, which give one a real sense of how discourse operates on Pukapuka. David Friedman's illustrations, based on Rob and Nancy Borofsky's photographs, are an additional pleasure.

REFERENCE

Hecht, Julia A.

1987 "Pukapuka: Community Organization and Land Tenure." In *Land Tenure in the Atolls*, edited by R. G. Crocombe, 188-201. Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.