ANUTANS IN HONIARA: A POLYNESIAN PEOPLE'S STRUGGLE TO MAINTAIN COMMUNITY IN THE SOLOMON ISLANDS

Richard Feinberg
Kent State University

As formerly isolated peoples are brought under the umbrella of a new international political system and the world market economy, the moral order that underpins their old communities is inevitably challenged. In an attempt to meet this challenge, they may look to common origin, distinctive genealogical characteristics, shared connections to a special place, or their unique beliefs and customs. This essay examines people of Anuta, a remote Polynesian outpost in the Solomon Islands—the pressures and enticements encouraging Anutans to emigrate to Honiara, the national capital, and the way in which resettlement has created opportunities and problems for both the home community and the resettled enclave. It considers the Anutans' perceived need to balance a commitment to old symbols, values, and worldview against the changes wrought by new ideas, experiences, and economic forces. Lastly, it explores the complex relationship between the urban and home communities, with a special focus on the development of political factions in both Honiara and Anuta.

Pacific Islanders, like people elsewhere, are concerned with questions about who they are and what makes their communities unique. In attempting to resolve such questions, they may look to common origin, distinctive genealogical characteristics, connections to a special place, or a system of beliefs and customs that supposedly endows them with a unique moral standing. Such symbolic foci form the basis of Durkheim's (1965) characterization of the social order as a moral order (see also Parsons [1937] 1968). They provide people with a sense of commonality, set them apart from others, and are a defining feature of what is often termed "ethnicity" or "cultural identity" (see, for example, Barth 1969; Linnekin and Poyer 1990).

Pacific Studies, Vol. 25, Nos. 1/2—March/June 2002

As formerly isolated people are brought under the umbrella of a new international political system and the world market economy, the moral order that provides the underpinning of their old communities is inevitably challenged. Transportation, communication, commodity production and exchange, and the international division of labor bring people in increasing numbers from their rural villages or outer-island home communities to urban centers. There they deal with others who are different from themselves. Interethnic ties are frequently intensified through intermarriage. As this occurs, older customs often must be modified—sometimes, entirely discarded. In consequence, the values and implicit understandings that once served as a kind of social glue are questioned, and the task of holding old communities together assumes gargantuan proportions.

Several contributions to this volume focus on the problems faced by people from tradition-based, kin-oriented communities as they move to urban centers.[1] Essays by Macpherson on Samoa, Donner on the Sikaiana, and Tapsell on the Maori of Aotearoa (New Zealand) deal with Polynesian peoples who are struggling to maintain or regain a sense of community based on customary practices when moving away from ancestral lands and becoming immersed in capitalist relationships. Notions of custom or tradition, in each case, serve as shared symbols of community, while land, whether it be the islands of Samoa or Sikaiana, or the Maori homelands and *marae,* evokes the image of a former time and better way of life.

Here, I explore this issue as it has developed among people of Anuta, a remote Polynesian outpost in the Solomon Islands; pressures and enticements encouraging Anutans to resettle in the central Solomons, particularly on Guadalcanal in the area around Honiara, the national capital; and the way in which resettlement has created opportunities and challenges for both the home community and the resettled enclave. I consider the Anutans' perceived need to balance a commitment to old symbols, values, and worldview against the changes wrought by new ideas, experiences, and economic forces. Lastly, I examine the relationship between the urban settlements and home communities as well as the articulation between political factions and distinct, often incompatible, cultural orientations both within each enclave and in the overall Anutan population.

The title of this volume poses the salient problem as the creation of moral communities, implying that community structures have, in some way, broken down and must be revitalized. Anutans have not yet lost the sense of oneness that holds them together as a people while setting them apart from the remainder of humanity. Rather, their struggle is to maintain the sense that they are a community despite sometimes overwhelming pressures toward fragmentation.

As is true of other peoples featured in this volume, the Anutans have refused to become helpless pawns or victims of external forces beyond their control but have worked actively to forge a destiny of their own making. Still, as arguably the most recent Polynesian people to become incorporated into the world economic and political order, the factors with which they contend are only vaguely understood, and attempts to bring about a synthesis of old and new, traditional and modern in many cases have produced internal conflicts and dilemmas.[2] Here, I analyze the web of factions and alliances, of conflicts, plans, and aspirations that beset Anutans as they struggle to maintain what they take to be vital aspects of their culture while they grapple with realities of urban life and their position in the wider world.

This essay will focus on a devastating housing shortage that has plagued Anutans in the Honiara area and the ways in which attempts to redress this problem have affected a series of related dilemmas, generating further challenges to the Anutans' sense of who and what they are. To provide an appropriate context for assessing these dilemmas, I will begin with a discussion of Anuta, its traditional culture, and the conditions faced by Anutans when they move to the central Solomons.

Anuta: Ethnographic Background

Anuta is among the most remote and recently contacted islands in the Pacific. It is a half mile in diameter, seventy miles from Tikopia, its nearest populated neighbor, and more than two hundred miles from the closest significant population center. Over the generations, Anutans have interacted extensively with Tikopians, whose language and culture are similar to their own. By contrast, contacts with other Solomon Islanders, most of whom Anutans see as very different from themselves, have been few and sporadic until recent decades. Even today, Anuta receives visitors no more than once a month, and sometimes many months may pass without a ship.[3]

Owing to Anuta's isolation, small size, and absence of commercially exploitable resources, its traditional culture has remained remarkably intact up to the present. Subsistence gardening and fishing dominate the economy. The polity is led by two hereditary chiefs who, as senior male descendants of the ancient leaders, are thought to be imbued with awesome *mana*.[4] Houses and canoes are constructed of traditional materials in the traditional manner. Gardens are cultivated and fish caught using old techniques. Kinship remains the cornerstone of economic and social organization and, itself, is intimately associated with *aropa*—positive affect as expressed through economic sharing and cooperation.

Despite strong elements of continuity, however, change has been inexo-

rable. Through two centuries of European contact, Anutans have had access to expanded travel, new ideas, worldly experience, and a variety of European goods. More than a hundred years ago, a few Anutans traveled as deck hands to such far-flung places as New Zealand, Australia, and America's Pacific Coast (see Feinberg 1998: chapter 14). During the second decade of the twentieth century, the Melanesian Mission established the Anglican Church on Anuta, and since that time the population has been at least nominally Christian. Metal axes, knives, and fish hooks were introduced relatively early; now commodities including kerosene, lanterns, cotton cloth, and nylon fishing line are felt to be necessities. Tinned meat, rice, ship's biscuits, and the like are sought as luxuries.

In order to acquire cash to purchase foreign-made commodities and as a safety valve for an expanding population, Anutans in increasing numbers have moved off their home island. At first, such emigration was limited to a few individuals joining groups of Tikopian plantation workers—mostly at the Levers copra plantations in the Russell Islands of the central Solomons (see Firth 1969; Larson 1966, 1977). Starting around 1960, however, the number of Anutans traveling for a variety of purposes increased dramatically. By 1972, the time of my first visit to Anuta, every adult male had been overseas at some time during his life. In some cases, this travel amounted only to brief stays on Tikopia; in others it involved a permanent move to the central Solomons. Most émigrés have been employed as low-paid manual laborers for the Levers plantations, the Honiara Town Council, or one or another shipping company. In recent years, Anutan men in Honiara have gravitated to private security work. A few, however, have attended secondary school and even held prestigious jobs.[5] Until the middle 1990s, almost half the Anutans who traveled to the central Solomons went on to the Russell Islands; the other half remained in Honiara.

Honiara clearly holds attractions for many Anutans, and there is a steady stream of visitors.[6] At the same time, life in town is difficult for outer islanders. Some of these difficulties are a direct result of urban life; others derive from the attempt to maintain a distinctively Anutan lifestyle in a distinctly non-Anutan environment.

Trouble at Home: The Commercialization of Interpersonal Relations

Problems in the overseas Anutan community reflect tensions on Anuta and must be understood in light of pressures affecting the home island. These include a contradiction between *aropa*—which entails mutual obligation and material support among community members, all of whom are consid-

ered to be kin—and a preoccupation with individual gain that is imposed by life in a market-oriented urban center. *Aropa* is intertwined with chieftainship in that a chief must use his *mana* to ensure prosperity and health for the community, thereby expressing *aropa* for his followers. The latter, then, return the *aropa* as respect and obedience. Yet, competition to make money conflicts with the collectively based morality championed by the chiefs, whom people begin to resent as an impediment to their aspirations for social mobility. These contradictions, after incubating on Anuta, soon took on the aspect of a crisis in the overseas community.

I first became aware that something was amiss in 1983, when I learned of tensions that had developed during the mid-1970s. The major issue of contention on Anuta was the sale of taro, betel, tobacco, and bananas by several households to those that were short of food. This was a departure from traditional behavior, and it contradicted principles of *aropa* and kinship underlying proper action in the older system.

An Anutan chief is charged with the responsibility to guard the island's welfare; and in discharging this responsibility, the present senior chief has emphasized the community's collective character. Thus, during a food shortage in 1972, he ordered the entire population to act as one domestic unit, preparing and consuming food together. Anuta, he said, was a single family, and it would not be right for some members to eat while others starved. Sale of food challenged the basis of this action, and the chief forbade the practice.

By contrast, from the viewpoint of the sellers, exchanging food for money was part of a new orientation involving commitment to upward mobility in European terms. It provided an opportunity to accrue cash on Anuta and was thus part of a strategy for obtaining Western commodities. Moreover, the first two "houses" *(pare)* to start selling food had children in school overseas, whom they felt obliged to support financially. Thus, these "houses" did not share the positive value the chief placed on collective enterprise, discipline, and community harmony. They openly resisted orders to desist from selling food, and, indeed, the practice spread. To make matters worse, the *maru*—men of the two leading *kainanga,* "clans"—on whom the chief depended for enforcement of his orders were among the leaders of the opposition.

These tensions alternately waxed and waned over the next several years. During this period the chief's authority, both secular and in the church, was challenged. Finally, when threat of open violence was followed by a rash of accidents, a major epidemic, and at least three deaths—all of which Anutans took to be punishment for social discord—people came to the conclusion that their community's survival would be jeopardized if they should fail to

heal the breach. Since that time, both sides have worked to cool tempers and reestablish overt peace. This truce has been accomplished, however, by people talking less about the sources of tension, not by resolving them. Families that had been selling food desisted, but they still maintained that their actions were morally justified and wholly appropriate under the circumstances. And the chief refrained from vocal opposition to what he perceived as incorrect behavior, but he registered his protest by refusing to attend church services on Sundays.[7]

A second point of contention, with implications for Anutans in both Honiara and at home, involves relations with the Solomon Islands government. Despite factional strife, islanders throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s were united in their dislike for the central and provincial governments that claim dominion over them.[8] Anutans are acutely conscious of being part of a small Polynesian minority in an overwhelmingly Melanesian country. They perceive the government as being under the control of people who are very different from themselves and, therefore, have no interest in their welfare. Furthermore, despite some criticism of the chief, the chieftainship itself has long been a classical Durkheimian collective representation (Durkheim 1965)—a key symbol of Anutan cultural identity, distinctiveness, and self-respect. There is general agreement that traditional custom and local sovereignty are important and should be preserved, and for that reason many Anutans have advocated independence from the Solomon Islands. They still refuse to pay the national head tax or to participate in elections. Nonetheless, Anutans recognize the problems posed by the small size and isolation of their island, and they know that they receive important services from the government. The most essential of these, in their minds, is shipping. Shipping means access to Western commodities. It offers a safety valve in case of population pressure and provides opportunities for wage employment, education, and medical care. Therefore, Anutans have devoted a great deal of energy to obtaining a ship. However, acquisition of a ship is no mean task for outer islanders with limited resources, and the attempt involved the overseas communities—especially in Honiara.

Anutans in Honiara

At least since the 1950s, Anutans have been traveling to Honiara for a variety of reasons. While most short-term (and some long-term) laborers have, until recently, worked in the Russell Islands, many prospective wage earners have gravitated to Honiara. As the Solomons' capital, Honiara is the country's center of commerce and shipping. It is a convenient stopover point for travelers to and from the Russells. A number of Anutans have attended

school on Guadalcanal Island; others have worked as carpenters or gardeners for the Honiara Town Council, as bus and taxi drivers, as officers in the national police force, or as local security guards. In addition, people sometimes visit Honiara to see kin who have settled there or to enjoy a change of scenery. For those residing in the Honiara area on a long-term basis, material rewards and opportunities for social advancement in Western terms can be substantial. But these rewards come at a heavy price.

The price inheres largely in contradictions between what Anutans view as ancient custom and realities of urban life. Anutans, regardless of where they live, consider themselves to be members of one overarching community. Even those who have spent most of their lives in town and may never return home except for brief visits do not perceive themselves to be part of a community that is in any significant way different from or independent of Anuta and its chiefs. Without exception, Anutans value their home island and its customs *(nga tukutukunga).* For Anutans in the central Solomons, what sets them apart from other people with whom they come into daily contact is (1) their attachment to Anuta Island, (2) recognition of the island's chiefs as foci of collective loyalty and centers of authority even for matters arising outside of Anuta, and (3) participation in a system of relationships based on *aropa.*[9] Yet, they are hundreds of miles distant from Anuta. They are subject to a government and system of laws that is wholly independent of the Anutan chiefs. And the system of wage labor and production for private profit directly contradicts the *aropa* ethic, which emphasizes sharing, care, and mutual assistance as the basis of social relationships. As is true of Maoris and Samoans in New Zealand's urban centers (Macpherson, Tapsell, both in this volume), much of Anutan life in Honiara revolves around the drive to reconcile these contradictory impulses—to strike a balance between custom and the practicalities of living in an urban center immersed in the money economy, and being subject to national and local governments whose power is recognized even if their legitimacy is questioned.

Commitment to Anuta and its way of life is visible in many of the Honiara enclave's living arrangements. As of June 1988, I counted sixty people living in the Honiara area who might reasonably be called Anutans. These include people born on Anuta; their spouses, whether of Anutan birth or not; and all their children. Of these, thirty-six slept in a cluster of three houses in White River, a Honiara "suburb" to the west of town. Several others lodged with Tikopians in White River and were regular visitors in the three Anutan houses.

The three houses formed the core of the Anutan community on Guadalcanal. They were all within a few dozen yards of one another, and their residents were in constant contact. Approximately eleven people regularly slept in the smallest of the houses, a simple concrete structure with four bed-

rooms separated by a central foyer and graced with electric lighting but no plumbing. A somewhat larger wooden house, with raised floor, indoor plumbing, and a full kitchen, held about a dozen bodies. The largest of the houses, a not-quite-completed structure on stilts, perhaps ten feet off the ground, with two large bedrooms, living room, kitchen, and veranda, held about fourteen persons including myself. People in the largest and the smallest houses operated as a single household, cooking and eating their evening meals together in the foyer of the concrete structure. People in the third house usually ate separately. However, parties and dances drew participants from all three houses plus assorted friends and relatives from the surrounding area.

Within each house, the usual pattern was for a married couple and their children to share a room. Unmarried boys and men slept in a common area like a veranda, cook house, or living room. However, this arrangement was flexible. For example, Pu Penuamuri, a married man, often preferred to sleep outside in a shed next to the middle house to get away from his baby's crying. When the shed was full, he often slept in the living room of the large house. His wife and child, then, shared a bedroom with another woman and her baby.

Each morning someone from each house would heat water for coffee, while someone with a few cents to his credit walked three blocks to the local store to bring back two or three loaves of bread. As people awoke, they would help themselves to bread and butter, fix some instant coffee, and drift off to work. Those not holding paying jobs or watching children might go to the nearby garden land that had been allocated to the Anutan community by the Honiara Town Council and spend a few hours cultivating manioc or yams. Wage workers, on their way home at the end of the work day, were likely to stop at the market for fresh fish, vegetables, and betel, or at a store for biscuits and tinned fish. Their purchases were then pooled with the garden produce, cooked communally, and eaten by the household as a collectivity. On weekends and special occasions, members of all three households plus other Anutans in the area worked together to prepare "puddings" and other traditional foods. These were then shared at communal feasts and dances. Anutans in Honiara have, thus, done their best to recreate their traditional socioeconomic system under conditions of wage employment and commodity production. This attempt to retain ancient custom as well as the difficulties in doing so also can be seen in marriage patterns.

Through the generations, the vast majority of Anutans have married other Anutans. In part, this practice may be attributed to the insular character of the Anutan community and lack of contact with outsiders. But in large part it is also the result of a conscious decision to maintain Anutan customs and the feeling that, should people marry outside their community, customs would quickly become diluted.

By 1973, there had been a number of marriages between Tikopians and Anutans. They were deemed acceptable because of the similarity between the two communities. And if one goes back six generations or more, oral traditions identify immigrants from several Polynesian islands who married Anutans. However, as of 1973, there was only one Anutan who had ever married a non-Polynesian.

As more Anutans spent increasingly long periods away from home, the old marital patterns became harder to maintain. Long-term emigrants were predominantly male, and by the time they returned home, most women of their age group had already married. Thus, the men were faced with a choice between wedding non-Anutans or remaining single. In the Russell Islands, Anutan men married either Anutan or Tikopian women; in Honiara, not one Anutan man in 1983 had an Anutan wife. A few have opted not to marry. Two were married to Tikopians. Two were married to Melanesians—one from Santa Isabel and one from Malaita. And one was married to the daughter of a Tuvaluan couple who had immigrated to the Solomons. By 2000, the constellation of personnel included several couples in which both spouses were Anutan. Still, the tendency is more and more to marry non-Anutans.

The dilemma facing Anutan men in Honiara is well exemplified by the marriage of Frank Kataina (Pu Teukumarae), the younger brother of Anuta's senior chief. In 1983, Frank was a high-ranking official in the national police force. Despite his lack of formal education, he is literate and worldly, having visited Australia and Papua New Guinea in addition to much of the Solomons. His wife was the Solomons' first policewoman. She had been raised in Kira Kira, one of the country's main administrative centers, and in Solomon Islands terms she was a city girl. She also was literate, sophisticated, intelligent, and outgoing. Apparently an ideal match.

However, as a "city girl," she had assimilated Western feminist values of independence and self-realization. Although attached to her husband, she continued to associate with many of her old friends, going by herself to concerts, dances, and parties, and sometimes wearing slacks or even shorts—daring attire for a Solomon Islands woman in Honiara in the 1980s. Had the husband been an ordinary man, people might have registered their disapproval and then left the matter. As he was a leading officer and brother of Anuta's senior chief, however, his wife's behavior was perceived as an attack on the integrity of traditional custom, and pressure mounted upon Frank to leave her. By June 1984, the two had separated. Four years later, it was clear the break was permanent.

Frank's marriage and its unhappy outcome illustrate the value that Anutans place on keeping their community distinct by maintaining rigid island endogamy. While divorce among Anutans is virtually nonexistent, marriages to non-Anutans (with the exception of Tikopians, who are almost regarded

as honorary Anutans) often have dissolved under the influence of social pressure. In this way, even interisland marriage, in the end, has served to underscore Anutan distinctiveness and maintain cultural boundaries rather than to break them down.[10]

To operate within the framework of a money economy and remain faithful to the principles of *aropa* poses no fewer problems for Anutans overseas than does marriage. Particularly in Honiara, housing and food are expensive —comparable to the United States or Western Europe. For government employees, including police officers, housing is partially subsidized. A certain amount of garden land is provided. And many people build canoes so they can fish on their days off. Still, the amount of time available and the productivity of garden land and ocean are far more meager than back home. Substantial sums of money, therefore, are essential to survival. Yet, there are many pressures on the wage earner in Honiara, making it difficult to save and accumulate financial resources.

Every Anutan, regardless of how long he has been overseas, is a member of one or another domestic unit *(patongia)* and, as such, is expected to contribute to the unit's well-being.[11] Anutans have come, over the years, to depend on a variety of commodities of European manufacture, and their acquisition requires money. In addition, Anutans need money for boat fare if they are to travel overseas and tuition for children seeking secondary education. Opportunities for monetary income on Anuta are virtually nonexistent; therefore, a substantial proportion of the money that is earned by Anutans in the Russells and the Honiara area finds its way back to Anuta. Requests from home by people with little concept of the cost of living in town are often exorbitant. Yet, to deny assistance to one's closest kin violates *aropa* and inflames Anutan moral sensibilities.

Anutans constantly pass through Honiara, visiting for periods of anywhere from a few days to many months—or even years. Typically, these visitors are unemployed, with little cash. Furthermore, a housing shortage makes it difficult to find accommodations on short notice even for people who do have money. Thus, visitors inevitably stay in the houses of their employed fellow islanders.

For the people who own or rent a dwelling, it is a burden to accommodate as many as a dozen long-term visitors. The houses become crowded and uncomfortable. Often, the best rooms or sleeping places must be turned over to guests of high rank in the traditional system. These guests use water, electricity, and gas; and they must be fed. They are unfamiliar with city foods, do not shop, and have little concept of the relative expense of various comestibles; thus, they often indulge in the most expensive items, which then have to be replaced or done without. In short, visitors rarely contribute financially

to the household and often are a major drain. Yet, to put them out or even to suggest that they eat more of the less expensive items would be a breach of etiquette and is not done.

It is easy to appreciate the dilemma faced by an Anutan wage earner in Honiara after even a short period of participant observation. For several months in 1983–1984, my family and I stayed in the house of Frank Kataina. Of the fifteen or so people with whom I shared the house, only Frank was regularly employed. The two of us, then, were supporting the entire household. The following experiences, recorded a few days before I left, are typical:

> We got a large jar of shampoo for about $4.50. Rachel [a pseudonym] used it to wash clothes, and within one afternoon, the jar was empty.
>
> Last Thursday, I bought a large tin of Milo [a powdered chocolate drink] so that there would be some for our children to take with their antimalaria medication on Sunday. Sunday morning, my wife went to fix the Milo, and it was gone. That afternoon, I got another tin from the Rove store; the next morning, it was finished.
>
> Frank purchased a case of Taiyo tuna, and the first day, several tins were devoured with rice and potato. Toward the end of the meal, a new tin was opened, a few bites taken out, and as the meal was over, the almost-full tin was fed to the cat. This is the only case of pure waste that I saw; but just three of our current visitors seem quite capable, by themselves, of going through five cans at a meal. They also open tins for breakfast and lunch. Among people more accustomed to city life, two tins suffice for a large household for a day.
>
> A kilo of sugar lasts around three days.
>
> The household has been going through about two rolls of toilet paper a day.
>
> Peanut butter, at $2.80 a 375-gram jar, now lasts about a day.
>
> Two to three loaves of bread last a day. If there is just one loaf, it also lasts; but the more you get, the faster people eat. It does not last any longer.
>
> I bought a block of stick tobacco for the household. I mentioned it to Pu Matapenua [a pseudonym] and, within a day, it disappeared.
>
> Water is left running in the sinks.
>
> We boil water to sterilize it for the children, as Honiara tap water is considered to be unsafe. The water is then used for coffee or Milo before we can save it in a jar. Meanwhile, other people fill jars from the tap and put them into the refrigerator, making it impossible to know which water has been boiled and which has not.

> A large parcel of matches lasts two to three days.
>
> When someone makes a large pitcher of coffee or Milo for the household, immediately either Pu Matapenua or Tuku [pseudonym] grabs the pitcher to use it as a personal cup. They may go through a quart apiece at a sitting.
>
> Since the guests tend not to have money, they have no way to pay their own fare back home. Therefore, you have to pay again to get rid of them. Furthermore, they probably don't have the knowledge or initiative to book their own passage. Consequently, you must make arrangements for them, or they will stay indefinitely. Frank missed the latest booking deadline and will therefore have all of his visitors for at least another month.
>
> The alternative is a combination of pressure and bribery. Thus, Pu Matapenua was staying for some time with a Tikopian in Rove. For a while, his host accepted the burden with equanimity; but finally, he announced that his wife was about to give birth and he would need the space for her relatives. He tried to soften the blow by offering to pay Pu Matapenua's fare to the Russells while he awaits transport back to Anuta. Pu Matapenua declined, opting instead to move back in with Frank.
>
> The remaining defense mechanism is to buy only the bare necessities. Thus, when gas [for the kitchen stove] ran out, Frank declined to order a refill. If I had not made up the difference, all cooking from that time on would have been over wood fires—as indeed it was for a week.

As all that happens among Anutans in the central Solomons occurs with reference to events back home, the leadership crisis of the 1980s involving the Anutan chief made itself felt in Honiara as well. Factional lines developed following those on Anuta. While some issues of contention on Anuta were attenuated in Honiara, other problems, particularly those involving distance and the population's geographical dispersal, came to the fore.

In 1983, the structure of authority, in principle, was clear. The senior chief was represented by his brother, Frank, who also was a leading officer in the police. Frank had one or two close confidants with whom he consulted on matters of major importance, but when he spoke, it was with the chief's authority. Tikopia was similarly represented by Fred Soaki (Pa Nukuriaki), the commissioner of police, who also is, in the traditional political system, a member of a leading "house" *(paito)* in Tikopia's leading *kainanga* (clan). On matters concerning the two islands jointly, the two officers would consult, and the commissioner would speak for the combined community.

By 1988, the Anutans withdrew from their joint arrangement on the grounds that Tikopians had monopolized community resources.

The major difficulty with the authority structure was less its ambiguity or lack of legitimacy than it was the physical dispersal of the population and the fact that the leaders simply could not be everywhere at once. Coupled with this, the leaders had no enforcement powers; they had to depend on moral suasion and their subordinates' cooperation to implement decisions. Thus, for the most part, their pronouncements could be ignored with impunity. The one exception was in cases where a breach of custom also violated national law. Thus, when a man used funds belonging to a relative for his own bridewealth payment, Frank and his associates presented him with the choice of repaying the relative or having the matter turned over to the courts. The accused decided on the former option.

Anutans, then, have been faced with a set of pressing dilemmas. Among their chief moral values is *aropa,* which requires kindness, compassion, commitment to mutual assistance in matters related to material well-being, and a communal outlook upon social life. *Aropa* is associated with chiefly authority as a core symbol of cultural identity and differentiation of Anuta from other communities. In the old system, the chief was expected to ensure the community's prosperity and welfare. In doing so, he manifested *aropa* for his people while providing them with the material resources and moral bearing to reciprocate with their own expressions of *aropa* toward him and other men of rank. Every Anutan with whom I have discussed the matter over a period of almost thirty years has expressed commitment to these symbols, values, and understandings. Yet, in the view of many Anutans, to maximize their material well-being requires a large dose of self-interested individualism and intracommunity competition. Interest in money and competition for its acquisition conflicts with chiefly authority. It places pressure on individuals and families not to share. Anutans visiting relatively well-off kin residing overseas see a share in their relatives' prosperity as their fundamental right, while the hosts view the demands of less-than-understanding kinfolk as an economic burden even as they continue feeling pressure to display *aropa* in their outward behavior. These conflicts and dilemmas are illustrated in the case of an Anutan housing project that I had the opportunity to observe during a visit to Honiara in 1983–1984.

Housing: Proposed Solutions and New Problems

Through the last decades of the twentieth century, Honiara experienced a population explosion, and housing was at a premium. A few Anutans had access to their own houses, but most were not so fortunate. A majority of

Anutans in Honiara stayed with fellow islanders, sleeping on mats strewn about the floor. For example, Frank Kataina's house in 1983 was rather large by Solomon Islands standards, with three large bedrooms, a living room, a kitchen, a veranda, and an indoor bath. During my visit, the house's population ranged from twelve to almost twenty persons.

Under these conditions, Anutans in the Honiara area set as a priority both more and better housing. Their first attempt to address the problem was to have Anutans in the area contribute toward the purchase of a plot of land near a Tikopian settlement in White River and build a small dwelling. The house was under construction during my visit to Honiara in early 1972 and was completed later that same year.

According to the story I was told in 1988, the building was intended to be a collective dwelling for any Anutans in the Honiara area who might need a place to stay. But one particularly persuasive leader convinced the rest of the community that, for legal purposes, the house should be titled in the name of one individual. As a sophisticated, long-term resident of Honiara, he suggested he should be that individual, and the rest of the community agreed. However, before long, he took advantage of his new position to sell the house to the Honiara Town Council. He pocketed the proceeds, resigned from his job, purchased a small fleet of vehicles, and started his own taxi company. At the same time, he purchased for himself an outboard motorboat and a smaller house on the other side of town. Within a few years, the boat sank, the motor was destroyed, and the taxis developed mechanical problems. He went out of business, had to sell his house, and abruptly left the Solomons to work for several years for Nauru Shipping.[12]

The first attempt at an Anutan house near Honiara, then, was a disaster. Still, the housing problem remained, becoming more severe each year. At that point, Pu Avatere, a man known to non-Anutans as John Tope, took the initiative.

Pu Avatere is unusual among Anutans. Inspired by a dream he took to be divine inspiration, he left home as a boy to attend school, initially on Tikopia and later on Guadalcanal. He attended Kohimarama Theological College during the early 1970s, training to become an Anglican priest. However, his assertive ways offended several leaders of the church, and on completion of his training, he was not ordained. This decision was eventually reversed, but by that time John had soured on the church, and he refused to join the priesthood. Instead, he took a number of secular positions—first as secretary to the Melanesian Mission and later with the Pijin language training program for U.S. Peace Corps volunteers.[13] The program at the time was headed by John Roughan, a former Catholic priest from the United States with long experience in the Solomons. After two years with the Peace Corps, Tope and

Roughan left to create the Solomon Islands Development Trust, a nongovernmental organization oriented toward promoting self-reliance and appropriate development in rural villages. Tope became the trust's first field officer; Roughan, the technical adviser.

During the two years that John worked for the Solomon Islands Development Trust, he initiated a number of development projects for the Anutan community. His first major project was to build a rest house for Anutans in White River.

In an effort to accumulate the capital needed to support his project, John approached governmental agencies, banks, and private individuals to ask for grants and loans. Not surprisingly, lending agencies demanded a plan to guarantee repayment of their loans, and even would-be grantors asked for assurance that the house would have some source of income for continued maintenance once it had been constructed. Thus, by almost imperceptible stages, the plan began to change. No longer was the building to be a rest house to provide free lodging for Anutans passing through the nation's capital. Instead, the plan was now to rent the house to non-Anutans. After the loans were repaid, profits would be used to maintain a piped water system, improve the school and clinic, and promote similar development projects on Anuta.

The point at which Tope became aware that the project had changed focus is unclear. It is clear that the process by which the change had come about and the rationale for the change were communicated poorly if at all to the community. By the time the change was common knowledge, many Anutans had already come to distrust Tope's motivations, and the change of plans confirmed their suspicions. John had a tendency to work by himself or with a small circle of confidants. Somehow, he had purchased land near Lata at Graciosa Bay, the capital of Temotu Province, and on Utupua, a large but sparsely populated island in the Santa Cruz group. No one knew how he had gotten the money, the nature of the financial agreements that made these purchases possible, or what he intended to do with this land. It was widely assumed, however, that he had acquired the land to promote his personal self-interest, caring little for the overall community's well-being. The change in plans regarding the White River rest house seemed to fit the larger pattern.

One of John's severest critics was Eric Toarakairunga (Pu Taumako), a man who had lived for many years in Honiara. He worked there first as a driver for Peter's Taxi Service; after about 1980, he drove for the Rainbow Bus Company, eventually working his way up to head driver. According to Eric's story, while he was a taxi driver, he became a trusted friend of Peter, the company's proprietor. Peter also owned a sizable tract of land in White

River; and when he left the Solomons upon retirement, he gave the land to his good friend. In 1983, Eric and his Tikopian wife were living in a small leaf oven house erected on that land. Out of a sense of social consciousness, he agreed to allow Tope to build the community rest house on his land, assuming that it would be used for the collective benefit. However, as suspicions rose about the project and its organizer, Eric grew increasingly annoyed and started threatening to give the land away to someone more deserving, thereby effectively quashing the rest house project.

John's understanding of the situation was rather different. By his account, Peter never gave the land to anyone. Rather, his intention from the start had been to sell it. Eric expressed interest, and Peter was prepared to sell it to him. However, Eric never tendered the money, and the deal would have fallen through had John not bought the land with his own earnings. Therefore, he contended that the land was his, and it was only through his own good graces that others might stay there.

In the event, the loan applications were turned down because of the amount of money requested and the small likelihood of its being repaid. In addition, potential lending institutions may have become soured on the project as they began to hear murmurings of the community's misgivings. Still, Tope persisted, eventually receiving a SI$10,000 grant from the Canadian Diocese of the Episcopal Church, to be administered by the local Church of Melanesia.[14]

With this grant in hand, construction was begun. Still, the confusion persisted. Most Anutans remained under the impression that the house was being built for them to occupy. As soon as it was livable, John and his wife moved in, intending to oversee construction and move to different quarters when the building was completed. Immediately, other Anutans moved into the house, but with no understanding that their occupation would be temporary. Soon the building felt the effects of heavy occupancy, and it became apparent that, upon completion, it would not be a new house.

While this was going on, Tope also was involved in several other projects. In partnership with a man from the Gilbert Islands community that had been resettled in the Solomons (see Knudsen 1977), he purchased a second house, a small concrete structure a few dozen yards from the one under construction. He successfully petitioned the Honiara Town Council to return to the Anutans the dwelling that had been sold without community authorization. And he convinced the Town Council to allot a plot of undeveloped land to the Anutans for the purpose of subsistence cultivation.

Many of John's fellow islanders happily availed themselves of the resources that he had procured. At the time of my 1988 visit, three dozen people were living in the three White River houses. The garden land was

virtually all cultivated—with manioc, sweet potato, yams, a small stand of taro, and a few fruit trees. Still tension continued and, in fact, increased.

John suggested to the Anutan community in White River that they construct one or more leaf houses in the garden area and vacate the new house so that it might be rented out, as required by his agreement with the church. It seemed to most occupants, however, that he wished to expel them in order to convert the building into his personal business enterprise. Almost to a person, his suggestion was resisted. Undeterred, John began construction of a small leaf house by himself. But without assistance this was a slow process.

In the midst of all this turmoil, the man who sold the first White River house returned from Nauru. He took a job with the police, settled once again in Honiara, and managed to regain possession of the building. Then he moved in, along with his wife from Santa Isabel, a number of her kin and fellow islanders, their children, and some Bellonese friends. Anutans in the house were now in a minority.

Other Anutans resented this turn of events, particularly their being displaced by people from other islands. Some believed that the Town Council still controlled the dwelling and had agreed to make it available to the Anutan community. Since it was not being used for its intended purpose, they feared that the Town Council might attempt to take it back.

Controversy also surrounded the small concrete house. Although no one doubted that John had contributed toward its purchase, there were questions as to where he got the money. As of 1988, he had not held a paying job for almost four years. Still, he managed to feed his family, he owned land on Ndeni and Utupua Islands in the Santa Cruz group, and he purchased a dwelling in White River. Suspicions turned to an earlier scheme to buy a ship.

As noted above, the Anutans decided in the early 1980s that if they could acquire a ship to be used for transport and commercial fishing, they could effectively be independent of the Solomons. Around that time, John organized the Anuta Community Development Project, one of whose goals was to obtain a vessel. In the name of the project, he contacted a number of granting agencies and the governments of many foreign countries. In addition, he took up a collection from Anutans both at home and overseas to contribute toward the purchase of a vessel. From the latter sources he accumulated approximately SI$500.

Eventually, he claims, the government of Singapore came forward with an offer of a ship. To finalize the deal, however, he felt he had to travel to Singapore. The trip cost SI$6,000 for food, lodging, and airfare. Unfortunately, the deal (if it ever existed) fell through.

John claims to have spent his own savings on the trip. When the ship did

not materialize, he says, he declared his intention to return all the contributions. However, I am unaware of his ever having done so. Meanwhile, his detractors were convinced that he pocketed the community's money, used it for his trip to Singapore, and spent the remainder on the White River house.

There is logic on both sides of this argument. It seems dubious that John saved enough while working to be able to support his family for four years, pay for a trip to Singapore, and purchase a house. When pressed on this question, he stated that he was assisted by his cousin, John Teonge, who had worked for many years as a deckhand with a Solomon Islands shipping company. Tope and Teonge had established savings accounts and, by being frugal, were surviving on the interest. This seemed plausible until I learned that Teonge was severely diabetic, spent much of his time in the hospital, and had, himself, not worked for almost two years. Still, wherever Tope got the money, most of it could not have been from contributions toward the ship, as the amount collected for that purpose, even by liberal estimates, was well under SI$1,000. The important issue, nonetheless, is less what really happened to the money than people's perceptions.

Given the atmosphere of extreme suspicion, it did not take long for some Anutans to conclude that Tope also was diverting funds allotted by the church for house construction to his own nefarious purposes. These suspicions were reported to the church, which rightly was concerned. To ensure that its funds would be used as first intended, the church decided to hold the grant in trust, select the carpenters, and pay the bills itself. No more money, then, would pass through Tope's hands.

At this point, the house was almost finished. The contractor, however, insisted that his bills had not been fully paid and refused to complete the job until he received what he felt was his due. Since the church would not release the funds, John could not pay him. Some members of the Anutan community convinced the government to prosecute John for misuse of funds. The contractor sued John for his back fees. And John sued the church for release of the funds so that he could complete the house. As of August 1988, John was cleared of criminal wrongdoing. The civil suits were eventually dropped without resolution.

Although the most active, John was not the only Anutan pursuing plans for community improvement. Alternative leadership in this area was provided especially by Frank Kataina. After he retired from the Royal Solomon Islands Police in 1985, Frank's interests turned to promoting a number of development projects. The most noteworthy of these were establishment of a community store to be run as a cooperative rather than for private profit, acquiring a ship, and convincing the U.S. Peace Corps to post a teacher or two on Anuta. Thus far, none of these projects has come to fruition.

The community store proposal, in particular, was as much a political statement as a plan for economic development. As the chief's brother and leading assistant, he felt compelled to guard tradition and the community's collective identity. For precisely these reasons, however, his efforts met with opposition from the several families that were trying to establish their own private stores.

Since these projects had such limited success, Frank's major contribution was to serve as watchdog to protect the community from schemes that might be detrimental to its interests. Frank's long experience with government and public service made him effective in this role. The net effect of his efforts, however, was to thwart most of the projects Tope had promoted. Since John so infrequently delivered on his promises, everybody's worst suspicions were confirmed. And without community support, chances of success for his endeavors were minimal.

Unlike Tope, who was a gold mine of ideas but often was inept at managing relationships, Frank was a master of symbolic manipulation. Several months before my arrival in 1988, the chief's son, Mataki, came to Honiara on another mission. Because of shipping problems, he was unable to return home for several months, during which time he stayed in the White River enclave. He and his wife were given a room in the small concrete house, and they contributed to the local community by working in the manioc gardens and helping prepare food. As chief's son and heir apparent, Mataki should have been exempted from the less desirable work, and he should have been shown special recognition. At meal times, he should have been presented with a special portion of food before anyone else might eat. He should have been given a special seat of honor and shown the utmost deference. Although he was entitled to such considerations, however, he never asked for special treatment, nor was he given any.

In Frank's view, this treatment was an insult to Mataki, the chief, the chieftainship itself, and custom. Rarely, however, do Anutans directly confront one another about perceived misbehavior. Thus, rather than berate the offending parties, Frank moved out of the house. He set up a bed and a box containing all his worldly goods in a small, unwalled oven house with coconut-thatch roof. Although he consumed food prepared collectively, he refused to take his meals with other members of the household, eating by himself in his small oven house.

This behavior was directly counter to all normal expectations. Sharing of food is the prime expression of *aropa,* and refusal to eat with other members of the group was seen as contrary to custom. For such behavior to come from the guardian of custom was perplexing and disturbing to virtually everyone. Clearly, something was very wrong, although most Anutans were un-

certain of just what the problem was. Meanwhile, Frank refused to discuss his motivation with other Anutans, leaving them to guess. He confided to me that he would return to the main house only after Mataki left Honiara and he was convinced that the community had resumed acceptable behavior.

Frank, because of his symbolic acumen, genealogical status, and long-standing position of leadership among Anutans in Honiara, occupied a pivotal position. Although many people had at least a few misgivings about Frank's judgment and decisions, he remained the most important leader during my 1988 and 1993 visits to the Solomons and continues as a major force at the dawn of the new century. John, by contrast, had but two supporters: his cousin John Teonge and a Tikopian named Elliott, who had been staying with Anutans in the small White River house. Increasingly, John was becoming isolated and faced the prospect of not only social ostracism but perhaps even prison. Within a month the tide had turned.

In June 1988, Pu Rotopenua, one of Anuta's traditional leaders, came to Honiara with a message from the chief. The chief had grown weary of reports of conflict in the Honiara community and decided to throw his support to Tope. Despite his sometimes clumsy handling of interpersonal relations, John was the only one who had managed to get anything concrete for the community. While not all his projects were successful, he had procured three houses and a large tract of garden land. The chief, through his assistant, stated that Anutans with jobs in Honiara had a legitimate reason to be there and could stay. However, those who were not working had no grounds to be there on a prolonged basis, and he ordered them all home. In the meantime, those who stayed in Honiara should treat Tope as their leader, scrupulously following his instructions.

This message was relayed at a community meeting a few evenings after Pu Rotopenua's arrival. The next morning, a dozen Anutan men were hard at work helping Tope build his leaf house in the garden. As quickly as John's star had risen, Frank's had set. Still, the issue was far from resolved.

Frank remained convinced that he was right to be suspicious of John's actions. He felt that the chief had been misled because he was not there to observe what was going on. But Mataki was there, knew the truth, and would explain it to the chief when he got home. At that time, Frank was sure, he would be exonerated.[15] Meanwhile, he would stay in Honiara, continue to survey events, and guard against abuse of the community. In order to conform with the letter of the chief's edict, he took a job as a projectionist at Honiara's Lena Cinema, and he refused to return to Anuta.

This story has no ending. Several months after my return to the United States in 1988, I received a phone call from the Canadian Diocese of the Episcopal Church, seeking advice on how to handle its part in the troubling

saga. After several years, Frank resigned his job at Lena Cinema; however, more than ten years later he still lives in Honiara, having returned home only for a few brief visits. The controversy has continued on and off. Anutans often are suspicious of each other's motives. For much of the ensuing period, the community remained divided against itself, estranged from Tikopia, and at odds with the central and provincial governments.

Conclusion

In 1973, shortly after my first visit to the Solomons, a fellow graduate student asked me to describe the nature and development of conflicts on Anuta and processes of resolution. My response was, "There are no conflicts."

That answer was tongue-in-cheek. I was aware that there were conflicts; indeed, I have written about some of them (e.g., Feinberg 1979, 1980b). Still, I was impressed at just how little overt strife there was and how well people for the most part got along, both with each other and with their cultural and social systems. Ten years later, the contrast was striking.

Some of the changes might have been in my perceptions rather than in the community. As my linguistic capabilities improved on later visits, it was easier for people to talk to me about sensitive issues. At the same time, islanders may well have grown more comfortable and willing to confide in me because of my prolonged association with them and their island. However, my perceptions of increasing conflict and discord were felt by Anutans as acutely as by me. Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, they openly spoke about deteriorating social relationships in their community and referred to the early 1970s—the time of my first visit—as almost a golden age. Why should such severe disruption have occurred?

In part, the problem has derived from the large number of Anutans migrating to urban centers, most notably to Honiara. However, it is not urbanism per se, but rather urbanism within the context of a global sociopolitical and economic system that has exerted pressure on Anuta's social fabric.

Anutans are accustomed to crowded conditions. The sanitation system in White River differs from arrangements on Anuta, but it is probably no worse from the viewpoint of public health and safety. Anutans find the weather and physical surroundings less attractive. And diet in the Honiara enclave suffers somewhat in variety and from an easier availability of processed junk foods. These factors, however, are perceived as minor inconveniences compared with the social discord that Anutans have experienced.

The problems that have the Anutans most concerned spring from their participation in world capitalism and a certain incompatibility between this economic system and the traditional order on which their sense of cultural

identity depends. As Anutans try to operate within a system that promotes individual accumulation of material resources, the old social order based on mutual support and sharing becomes difficult to sustain. To survive in the new system, one needs money. Those without money look to those who have it for assistance and, according to the older value system, negatively evaluate those fellow islanders with access to cash income who are reluctant to share what they have.

By contrast, those with paying jobs are caught between a wish to help their kin, thus meeting their customary obligations, and the knowledge that if they do not place limits on their generosity, they cannot succeed in the new economic order. These contrary pressures generate confusion with regard to goals and strategies, and mutual suspicion on the part of people who find that one another's actions both fall short of the traditional ideal and are internally inconsistent. Mistrust, in turn, leads people to obstruct each other's plans, and negative evaluations turn into self-fulfilling prophecies.

Anuta has not broken into multiple communities with multiple moralities. Interaction among virtually all Anutans is too constant and intense to permit such an outcome, at least at the present time. Most Anutans share the same values and ambivalences, and are faced with the same dilemmas. However, different people have found differing solutions to the paradoxes that they all face. This has produced radically divergent strategy decisions and behavior patterns; and those, in turn, have led to conflicts, animosities, deep-seated distrust, and development of sharply differentiated factions, all of which are exacerbated by problems of geography and communication.

Where all this will lead is unpredictable. Other communities depicted in this volume have weathered similar stress and managed to emerge in their new sociopolitical and economic contexts with a renewed sense of moral solidarity. Perhaps a combination of determination and good fortune will enable the Anutans to reap similar results. Meanwhile, the current tale is devoid of villains; the antagonists are more like tragic heroes from the pages of a classic drama. Anutans have been struggling to make sense of a new world in terms of a symbolic system that no longer fits and to act according to a value system that is virtually impossible to realize given the economic pressures of the modern age. Whether, like the Sikaiana, Maori, and Samoans, they at length can reach a workable accommodation remains uncertain. The final chapter to this drama remains to be written.

Postscript

From September through November 2000, I spent two and a half months with Anutans, both in Honiara and on Anuta. Conditions in the Solomons at

this time were very different from those of my earlier visits. Two years of civil war on Guadalcanal and a paramilitary coup in June 2000 have shaken the country to its foundations. Anutans no longer perceive the government to be a powerful adversary, but they are increasingly dubious about its ability to provide even the most basic services. Meanwhile, military conflict and the breakdown of law and order have led most Anutans to return home. There is presently but one Anutan living in the Russell Islands, and the Anutan Honiara community has declined to approximately thirty persons. At the same time, the home island's population has risen to well over three hundred—more than double what it was during my first study. Thus, many of the older issues seem less pressing to Anutans and have been moved to the back burner, while new conditions have generated a fresh set of problems, pressures, and political alignments. These important changes will require further discussion and careful analysis. Their explication, therefore, will have to be deferred to future publications.

NOTES

1. The concept of "tradition" is problematic, since it implies an objectively identifiable baseline with which modernity may be compared. The fact is that cultural and social systems are constantly changing, and indigenous concepts of tradition are defined in the present, reflecting contemporary social and political concerns (see, for example, Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Keesing and Tonkinson 1982; Keesing 1989; Feinberg 1994; Feinberg and Zimmer-Tamakoshi 1995; Feinberg and Watson-Gegeo 1996). My point here is that many peoples differentiate what they term "the traditional" or "ancient custom" (in Anutan, this is known as *nga tukutukunga mai mua*) from recently introduced practices, and they retain a sense of loyalty to the former even as the latter are incorporated into their daily lives.

2. Tapsell (this volume) eloquently describes disputes among Maori factions promoting divergent strategies for dealing with the pressures of modern capitalism and urban migration. The New Zealand context is quite different from the Solomon Islands; yet, the two sets of experiences show remarkable qualitative similarities.

3. In 1988, I spent three months in the Solomon Islands attempting unsuccessfully to reach Anuta. While awaiting transportation, I learned that the previous year the entire province of which Anuta is a part had been without a ship for approximately eight months and without air or radio contact for two or three. For further details, see Feinberg 1990.

4. See Feinberg 1978, 1981, and 1996 for discussions of *mana* in Anutan culture.

5. Frank Kataina, who will be discussed below in more detail, has been the most remarkably successful Anutan by Western standards, rising, with a minimum of formal education, to hold several prominent positions in the Royal Solomon Islands Police. Another remarkable success story is Lilian Takua, who could not read or write and spoke no English

until after she left Anuta when she was well into her twenties. She has become a widely respected national leader among the Sisters of the Church of Melanesia.

6. Honiara's attractions for Anutans are similar to those described by Donner (this volume) for the Sikaiana. It is for many of the same reasons that Samoans migrate to Hawai'i, California, and New Zealand (see Macpherson, this volume) and that rural Maoris move to urban centers such as Auckland (Tapsell, this volume).

7. Anutans are extraordinarily devoted Christians, attending church twice a day, seven days a week. Furthermore, the chief had been, for many years, the undisputed leader of one of the island's two churches. His refusal to attend services in the church whose construction he had personally overseen was a powerful statement of his moral opprobrium at the state of Anutan behavior.

8. Since my visit to the Solomons in 1993, the administrative structure of the country has been changed to reflect some of the Anutans' concerns. First, Anuta and Tikopia were removed from Temotu Province and administered directly by the central government in Honiara. Later, in 1997, I was informed that the easternmost islands of the old Temotu Province—Taumako, Vanikoro, Utupua, Tikopia, and Anuta—had been reconstituted as a separate, largely self-governing region within the province. Although the rationale behind this reorganization appears sound, it is too early to assess the results.

9. For a remarkably similar situation in a different part of the Pacific, see Flinn 1990.

10. Other interisland connections are more ambiguous. Through school and work, Anutans have come into contact with large numbers of non-Polynesian Solomon Islanders as well as European and Asian expatriates. In many instances, such contacts have led to the development of mutual respect and, in some cases, even close friendships. However, they have also reinforced among Anutans a sense of distinctiveness and, perhaps, of moral superiority in relation to the other peoples of the world. For further comment on this issue, see Feinberg 1980a and 1990.

11. I say "he" intentionally because a woman, when she marries, leaves the domestic unit into which she was born and joins her husband's. Therefore, a woman who marries a non-Anutan ceases to be a member of an Anutan *patongia.* Still, she may maintain emotional and economic bonds with her consanguineal kin.

12. Not surprisingly, this man's version of events is very different. He insists that he paid for construction of the house and that it was his from the start.

13. Pijin is the version of neo-Melanesian pidgin English spoken in the Solomon Islands. Although English is the Solomons' official language, Pijin is the lingua franca.

14. According to some informants, the grant may have been for substantially more—perhaps as much as SI$20,000.

15. In fact, Mataki did agree with Frank's assessment of the Honiara situation. He returned to Anuta around the same time that I left the Solomons in 1988.

REFERENCES

Barth, Frederick, editor
1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Durkheim, Emile
1965 *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* New York: Free Press. Original English edition, 1915.

Feinberg, Richard
1978 Rank and Authority on Anuta Island. In *Adaptation and Symbolism: Essays on Social Organization and Symbolism,* edited by Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo and S. Lee Seaton, 1–32. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.
1979 *Anutan Concepts of Disease: A Polynesian Study.* Institute for Polynesian Studies Monograph 3. Lā'ie, Hawai'i: Institute for Polynesian Studies.
1980a History and Structure: A Case of Polynesian Dualism. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 36 (3): 331–378.
1980b Supernatural Sanctions and the Social Order on a Polynesian Outlier. *Anthropological Forum* 4 (3): 331–351.
1981 *Anuta: Social Structure of a Polynesian Island.* Lā'ie and Copenhagen: Institute for Polynesian Studies and the National Museum of Denmark.
1986 The "Anuta Problem": Local Sovereignty and National Integration in the Solomons Islands. *Man* 21 (3): 438–452.
1990 The Solomon Islands Tenth Anniversary of Independence: Problems of National Symbolism and National Integration. *Pacific Studies* 13 (2): 19–40.
1994 Contested Worlds: Politics of Culture and the Politics of Anthropology. *Anthropology and Humanism* 19:20–35.
1996 Sanctity and Power on Anuta: Polynesian Chieftainship Revisited. In *Leadership and Change in the Western Pacific: Essays in Honor of Sir Raymond Firth,* edited by Richard Feinberg and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, 56–92. London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology 66. London: Athlone.
1998 *Oral Traditions of Anuta: A Polynesian Outlier in the Solomon Islands.* Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, volume 15. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feinberg, Richard, and Laura Zimmer-Tamakoshi, editors
1995 *Politics of Culture in the Pacific Islands.* Special issue, *Ethnology* 34 (2–3).

Feinberg, Richard, and Karen Ann Watson-Gegeo, editors
1996 *Leadership and Change in the Western Pacific: Essays in Honor of Sir Raymond Firth on the Occasion of His Ninetieth Birthday.* London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology 63. London: Athlone.

Firth, Raymond
1969 Extraterritoriality and the Tikopia Chiefs. *Man* 21 (3): 438–452.

Flinn, Juliana

1990 We Still Have Our Customs: Being Pulapese in Truk. In *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific,* edited by Jocelyn Linnekin and Lin Poyer, 103–126. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric J., and Terence Ranger, editors

1983 *The Invention of Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keesing, Roger M.

1989 Creating the Past: Custom and Identity in the Pacific. *The Contemporary Pacific* 1/2:19–42.

Keesing, Roger M., and Robert Tonkinson, editors

1982 *Reinventing Traditional Culture: The Politics of Kastom in Island Melanesia.* Special issue, *Mankind* 13 (4).

Knudsen, Kenneth

1977 Sydney Island, Titiana, and Kamaleai: Southern Gilbertese in the Phoenix and Solomon Islands. In *Exiles and Migrants in Oceania,* edited by Michael D. Lieber, 195–241. Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania Monograph 5. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.

Larson, Eric H.

1966 *Nukufero: A Tikopian Colony in the Russell Islands.* Eugene, Oregon: Department of Anthropology, University of Oregon.

1977 Tikopia in the Russell Islands. In *Exiles and Migrants in Oceania,* edited by Michael D. Lieber, 242–268. Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania Monograph 5. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.

Linnekin, Jocelyn, and Lin Poyer, editors

1990 *Cultural Identity and Ethnicity in the Pacific.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Parsons, Talcott

[1937] 1968 *The Structure of Social Action,* volume 1: *Marshall, Pareto, Durkheim.* New York: Free Press.