Pacific
Studies

PACIFIC STUDIES

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

DECEMBER 2015

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

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

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

PACIFIC STUDIES

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

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

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

CONTENTS

RESEARCH IS RELATIONAL: EXPLORING RESEARCHER IDENTITIES AND COLONIAL ECHOES IN PACIFIC AND INDIGENOUS STUDIES

Tui Nicola Clery
Independent Researcher

Acacia Dawn Cochise
University of Auckland

Robin Metcalfe
Independent Researcher

RESEARCHERS IN PACIFIC AND INDIGENOUS STUDIES SEEK TO RECLAIM, celebrate, and remember Indigenous epistemologies that have been systematically marginalized by histories of colonialism. This colonial lineage, emphasizing simplistic categorizations of peoples often based primarily on race, also contributes to ideas about which researchers can and should be "in" and "out" within contemporary Pacific and Indigenous research. These constructions affect the ability of Indigenous scholarship to impact other disciplines. Polarizing binary definitions and ideas about race and place being synonymous with a researchers' "authenticity" are enduring colonial echoes, limiting possibilities for participation and dialog. Researchers are never simply "insiders" or "outsiders"; instead they work within complex and fluid relational continuums. We offer the broad category of the *Multi Perspective Culturally Responsive* (MPCR) researcher to better acknowledge complex, multifaceted, and intersectional researcher identities. Through naming an

inclusive identity pathway, we hope to support collaborations between academics and researchers in Pacific and Indigenous Studies.

> The intellectual project of decolonizing has to set out ways to proceed through a colonizing world. It needs a radical compassion that reaches out, that seeks collaboration, and that can only be imagined as other possibilities fall into place (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, xii)

Classifications of researchers as insiders or outsiders oversimplify the relational and ethical complexities of research processes. These categorizations reinforce racist historical divisions, with significant consequences for participation, voice, and collaboration in the present. Indigenous researchers are increasingly writing that, even when we construct ourselves as insiders in relationship to a community, we are never simply either/or but always both inside and out. Without seeking to reify the binary discourses that exist, but to acknowledge their wide-reaching implications, this paper addresses the possibilities and limitations inherent in understanding the value of research as linked to the researchers' insider or outsider status.[1]

Categories are always reductive; consequentially, there is a need to acknowledge multiplicity and diversity within broad social categories. This paper considers possibilities for relationships between people who might be located, or locate themselves, within a variety of social categories (for example, categories based on nationality, class, gender, race, religion, ability, or sexual orientation). Rather than emphasizing differences and divisions, our intersectional approach looks for commonalities and possible relationships between and across categorical divides. Relationships and allegiances can be built through acknowledging that people across different social categories may, in fact, experience many commonalities in terms of experiences of marginalization in relationship to prevailing power structures (Cole 2008). Through supporting understandings across difference, a relational and intersectional approach opens possibilities for new perspectives, relationships, and coalitions (Cole 2008).

This paper contributes to conceptualizing Pacific and Indigenous Studies in a world still grappling with colonial legacies.[2] The authors are "outside-in" (Minh-ha 1995, 217) researchers, all born in nations outside of the Pacific region,[3] with postgraduate research experience in Australia, Aotearoa/New Zealand, Fiji, and Samoa. We have been powerfully informed by discourses in Pacific and Indigenous Studies. We grapple with insider/outsider definitions, both as scholars engaging in relational research with Indigenous communities and in the process of seeking to be part of academic communities in Pacific/Indigenous Studies.

We understand insider/outsider identities as complex performative and relational social constructions. Identities are "continuously negotiated, unfinalized and open-ended" (Blix 2015, 179). They are created and performed by people in specific social situations, through relationships, conversations, and interactions that are "framed and shaped, facilitated and inhibited by broader stories and discourses that are available in particular socio-historical context" (Blix 2015, 177). The process of constructing identities is also influenced by "cultural metanarratives" within particular social and historical contexts. These are referenced and made relevant through ongoing dialogs between people involved in research processes (Blix 2015, 175). Research is relational.

In Indigenous epistemology, place is vitally important. "[T]he location from which the voice of the researcher emanates" establishes relationships between people (Aveling 2012, 204) and reveals the power structures surrounding complex, intersectional identities. To name your location(s) is to begin to acknowledge the places and perspectives from which you speak. As Hall (1991, 18) argues, "You have to position yourself somewhere in order to say anything at all." To acknowledge all our identities, through which we intend to challenge whiteness as an assumed, hegemonic, normative, and anonymous category (Graveline 2010, 367), we have chosen to locate ourselves, to name some of the places from which we speak. Our introductions are rooted in place, mirroring traditions of oralcy and performances of land-based authenticity in the Pacific. Our intention is not to authenticate or to challenge place-based notions of belonging. We hope to introduce ourselves in a way that is culturally situated and respectful and to point toward some of our intersectional identities, both through genealogy and relationality.

Tui Clery has English, German, Irish, and Belgian heritage. She was born in London, England, and has lived, studied, and worked in the United Kingdom, Fiji, and Aotearoa. Her son also has Fijian heritage; his village is Logani, Tailevu. Acacia Cochise has Native American, African American, English, and Lebanese heritage. She has developed deep relational connections to people and places in Samoa and Aotearoa; these links are demonstrated through her choice to scatter her father's ashes in culturally significant places in both countries. Robin Metcalfe was born in Edmonton, Canada. She has Ukrainian, Polish, Scottish, and English ancestry. She has lived and studied in Canada, Fiji, and Australia.

None of the authors is connected genealogically to the Pacific from birth. We have all chosen to develop intimate and complex relationships with people, places, and communities in the Pacific region. We share an interest in Pacific studies and in using Pacific, narrative, and arts-based research methods to engage in community-centered, participatory research.[4] We have research experience working together with Pacific communities in Fiji,

Samoa, and Aotearoa, and we seek to be reflexive[5] and open to having our own epistemologies challenged and transformed by these cultural encounters. We are interested in research as a form of activism, which is useful, useable, and of benefit to Pacific people.[6]

As scholars we strive to continually reflect on our intersectional identities and to recognize the layers of power and privilege involved in these various spaces and identities. We write this article to acknowledge the importance of relationality in research processes involving Indigenous communities. Through building relationships and engaging in participatory, collaborative research that acknowledges and seeks to build upon intersectional identities, we can achieve greater empathy, understanding, and solidarity.

We draw upon an intersectional genealogy of ideas that includes a wide variety of voices, cultures, and methods. This includes not only academic genres but also literature, story, performance, poetry, and song. Embodied knowledge and learning through doing, learning from silences, and listening are also important parts of how we have learned and continue to learn about relational approaches to research.

Our ideas of the importance of relationality in research are inspired by the Samoan concept of *teu le va* (Anae 2007, 2010a, 2010b). To teu le va is to attend to, care for, and nurture the relationships and relational spaces among and between people to ensure that the quality of relationships and the process of research are recognized and respected. Working within the *va* involves working critically and thoughtfully in the "inter" in the spaces between people, cultures, and disciplines (Whimp 2009).

Teu le va as a relational methodology rooted in Indigenous Pacific epistemology has been generative for us in the process of conceptualizing MPCR. Advocates of teu le va as a methodology argue that the concept of the va represents "pan-Pacific" relational values (Airini, Anae, and Mila-Schaaf 2010, 2) of "linking, interdepending and building our diverse relationships" (Nabobo-Baba 2004, 18). We argue that "relational accountability" (Ray 2012, 91) is a core Indigenous principal. It can be used to guide the ethics and values of research in ways that prioritize relational arrangements as a central concern in culturally respectful and reflective research processes.

This article begins by exploring 1) insider research in the context of how insider/outsider debates have been used by and are useful to Indigenous peoples, recognizing that research that is by and for Indigenous people has helped to reclaim space for Indigenous voices and Pacific epistemologies in the wake of colonialism. 2) We then critique the insider/outsider binary, illustrating through a review of existing research, the necessity of moving away from identity politics that define people on socially constructed scales of inside or out as though these categories were whole and tangible. 3) We offer

the idea of the *Multi Perspective Culturally Responsive* (MPCR) researcher as one response to the complexity of navigating hybrid and multiple intersectional researcher identities. An identity pathway that is committed to reflexivity in research relationships can enlarge dialog, enabling us to explore and access a broader spectrum of possibilities and outcomes for the inclusion of diverse perspectives.

Exploring commonalities between the practice of MPCR researchers and Indigenous approaches to research helps to move past static notions of inside and out. We seek to "acknowledge and negotiate not only difference but also affinity" (Meredith 1998, 1), aiming for a critical consideration of the positionality of researchers and the multiple, intersectional identities that they navigate (Cole 2008). We conclude that a range of diverse perspectives, epistemologies, methods, and methodologies in the academy contributes to creating a "new non-homogenous academic landscape" (Kovach 2009, 157), which better reflects the complex realities of an increasingly globalized and transnational world.

Insider Research: Processes of Indigenous Resistance, Reclaiming, and Cultural Revitalization in Pacific and Indigenous Studies

Academic knowledge has often been constructed in terms of conceptions of inside and out and by ideas of who has the right and ability to speak.[7] Colonialism involved processes of categorization and stereotyping that powerfully excluded Indigenous peoples,[8] who were often constructed as less than human (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 27). Indigenous knowledge systems were marginalized, belittled, and often systematically destroyed (Dei 2010, 126; Donald 2009: 1–24; Kovach 2009: 77–78; Wilson 2008).

The structural power of colonialism extends through systems of policy and governance, which often endure even after colonial leadership has formally ended.[9] Colonial ideologies also extend into the minds of colonized peoples, who internalize and recreate the vision that colonizing powers have created of them (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 24; Gegeo 2001, 492).[10] Therefore, Indigenous scholars have argued that Indigenous peoples need to "decolonize our minds, to recover ourselves, to claim a space in which to develop a sense of authentic humanity" (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 24).

Processes of decolonizing the mind have included creating spaces in the academy in which to resist colonial legacies and cultural hegemony. Through disciplines including Indigenous Studies, Pacific Studies, Critical Race Theory, Gender Studies, and Cultural Studies, Indigenous scholars are challenging the dominance of Western philosophies and research methods. Tuhiwai Smith (2012, 4) argues that processes of Indigenous resistance and cultural revitalization are closely linked:

The past, our stories local and global, the present, our communities, cultures, languages and social practices all may be spaces of marginalization, but they have also become spaces of resistance and hope.

Pacific Studies originated as a form of area studies[11] and it has undoubtedly white male, patriarchal, and colonial origins (Teaiwa 2014, 50). As a discipline, Pacific studies assisted colonial powers in knowing and controlling the "other." This need was particularly acute during and after World War II, because Western powers expanded into unknown territories (Wesley-Smith 1995, 117). Despite these militarized origins, and the fact that much research in the Pacific continues to be funded by "metropolitan states with national interests at stake in the Pacific Islands" (Firth 2003, 144), Indigenous researchers in the contemporary Pacific have also used the discipline to reclaim Pacific ways of knowing and being. [12]

As early as 1976, Wendt called on Indigenous Pacific peoples to "take the places of the outsiders who act as experts in and on the region" (cited in Wood 2003, 352) and to tell the stories of Pacific peoples and communities from the inside, rewriting history to include Indigenous voices, perspectives, and worldviews.[13] Decolonizing Pacific Studies involves "reclaiming Indigenous Oceanic perspectives, knowledge, and wisdom that have been devalued or suppressed because they were not considered worthwhile" (Thaman 2003, 2). Contemporary Pacific Studies has involved scholars privileging "a cultural group's ways of thinking and of creating and reformulating knowledge, using traditional discourses and media of communication, and anchoring the truth of the discourse in culture" (Gegeo 2001, 493).

Part of this movement toward reclaiming Pacific ways of knowing and being has involved insider researchers consciously engaging in research within their own communities (White and Tengan 2001), seeking highly contextualized, place-based, linguistically, and genealogically embedded knowledge, which would not be easily accessible to outsiders. Indigenous researchers acknowledge the complexities of insider research, the community roles that need to be fulfilled and cared for, and the skill needed to navigate different social positions, relationships, and responsibilities in communities (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 14; Uperesa 2010, 291). The forms of knowledge that insiders might access are significantly impacted by factors including status, seniority, religious affiliation, gender, sexuality, and community expectations.

Brayboy and Deyhle (2000, 164) describe the challenge of moving from the position of family member or friend, to the role of a researcher. "Traditional" qualitative methodologies often involve Indigenous research-

ers transgressing cultural protocols by, for example, inviting themselves into social situations where they would not usually be present, or asking direct questions that may feel intrusive or have a distancing effect on relationships.

Insider researchers may also be faced with difficult decisions in terms of balancing university research ethics and community expectations to protect certain forms of "closed" knowledge (Nabobo-Baba 2006).[14] Community elders reminded Nabobo-Baba (2006) to care for relationships surrounding her research with great sensitivity, and this included deciding which stories to tell and to hold back (Nabobo-Baba, 2006, 1).

Insider research also responds to a history of relationally disconnected research in the Pacific. Outsider researchers often conceptualized research as a detached "practice of studying others" (White and Tengan 2001, 388). Thaman (2003, 5) argues that outsider researchers have been so fundamental to representations of the Pacific that the region as it is currently understood has been "produced politically, socially, ideologically, and militarily by westerners."

Without the inherent accountability found within lived relationships, outsider researchers in the Pacific have often misrepresented and interpreted others from an anonymous distance and for their own benefit. In contrast, insider researchers face the consequences of the representations, promises, and products of research every day. Intimately accountable for the representations they create, insider researchers embody the long-term consequences of their research journey because they are the subject of the research.

Western research methods, rooted in empiricism and scientific paradigms, assumed that maintaining critical and objective distance from communities was a necessary part of good research. Within Indigenous methodologies, safeguarding relationships always takes precedence over claims to objectivity (Brayboy and Deyhle 2000, 165; Wood 2003: 351–353; Nabobo-Baba 2006). Research is inherently subjective. Researchers are conceptualized as culturally, socially, and historically situated and gendered. Indigenous methodologies emphasize the importance of researchers openly acknowledging how they are related to their research, describing the relationships surrounding it, and reflecting upon the possible consequences of their positionality. Through openly mapping relationships within and surrounding the research, readers can access the web of ideas places, people, discourses, and organizations to which the research is connected.

Insider discourses have been used as spaces of reclamation, renaissance, and celebration, encouraging and supporting Indigenous Pacific researchers to explore their cultures, languages, and communities. Colonial legacies are challenged through recognizing cultural knowledge and understandings as valid and valuable research topics.

The Insider/Outsider Binary: Possibilities, Limitations, and Moving beyond Dichotomies

Indigenous researchers in the contemporary Pacific argue for the recognition and inclusion of Indigenous research ethics in the academy.[15] They have been leaders and innovators in conceptualizing culturally appropriate research methods and methodologies for use with Indigenous peoples. The methodologies that are emerging are grounded in Pacific epistemologies as a way of decolonizing research. They celebrate Pacific cultures, diverse Indigenous knowledge systems, and identities.

Insider research locates and develops work about the Pacific in Oceania, claiming central space for Indigenous epistemologies and recognizing the forms of knowledge that researchers from the inside access, experience, and articulate. Jones (2012, 100), commenting on relationships between Pākehā and Māori researchers in Aotearoa/New Zealand, argues that calls for research that is by and for Indigenous peoples should be seen as emphasizing the inclusion of Indigenous researchers, rather than the exclusion of researchers from mixed or non-Indigenous backgrounds.

However, racialized and place-based notions of authenticity can and do function to exclude communities of difference. Research that involves Indigenous epistemologies, methods, and methodologies is often seen as possible only for insiders. This has significant impacts for developing research practice and critical reflection upon that practice, often determining who is able to learn from and engage in critical dialog about Indigenous epistemologies. Although dialogs privileging insiders can claim important space for denigrated and marginalized ideas, this exclusivity can also limit possibilities for wider interdisciplinary interaction and dialog outside of the disciplines of Pacific and Indigenous Studies. Denzin (2001, 35), citing Smith (1993, xxix), argues, "If only a man can speak for a man, a woman for a woman, a Black person for all Black people. If this is so, then a bridge connecting diverse racial and gendered identities to discourse in the public arena cannot be constructed."

Defining people on a binary scale of either inside or out perpetuates historic and colonially inscribed divisions between people and re-inscribes these powerfully into the present. Rigid notions of identity, authenticity, belonging, and indigeneity can discount people who would seem to belong in relatively conventional ways, people who can trace genealogical or intergenerational connections to the Pacific, Pacific people who live or work away from home, people who have children with Pacific heritage, or who have lived in Pacific Islands for all or most of their lives. Such discourses also construct certain people living within Pacific communities as outsiders.

This includes migrants, settlers, city dwellers, and people of mixed Pacific ethnicity and cultural heritage.[16]

The persistence of the insider/outsider binary in Pacific and Indigenous Studies puts issues of identity at the heart of Pacific Studies scholarship. Sanga (2004, 49) reflects that historically, Indigenous Pacific research has tended to make arguments along "political and cultural lines" for the exclusion of outsiders and their "imperialist research practices." The assumption underlying much of the discourse around insider research is that if you are of Indigenous Pacific heritage you will necessarily be more committed to Pacific people than would someone who is not. It is assumed that Indigenous researchers will engage in the process of research with greater care for issues of relational accountability and that consequentially research products with greater levels of authenticity and value will emerge.

The binary is too simple; there are always complex "spaces between" inside and out (Kerstetter 2012, 101). Research identities, positionality, and belonging to communities are fundamentally relational, coconstructed, flexible, and subject to change (Clery 2013; Kerstetter 2012; Nabobo-Baba 2006, 29). All communities are subject to complex, intersectional power relationships.

Racially rooted assumptions about belonging, authenticity, and voice have a variety of consequences for Pacific peoples and consequences for the participation and collaboration of outside-in researchers who are committed to research that is grounded in Pacific methodologies and epistemologies. Mila-Schaaf (2009, 2) eloquently cautions against a rigid imagery of belonging in the Pacific:

> How we are imagined, inevitably can become the cage in which we become captured. How we are imagined, as well as *how we imagine* counts. The way that we imagine ourselves, as Pacific peoples, and *who is in* and *who is out*, and whose behaviour exceeds the limits of our comfortable criteria and ideas about "who" and "what we are." This is contested and political. Do you happen to be too white, too feminist or too liberal, too gay, too self-mutilating, too outrageous, too much of a stickler for time or too upwardly mobile to comfortably fit within the boundaries of the Pacific social imaginary?

Although Indigenous methodologies invoke notions of authentic or traditional knowledge, they never work exclusively within these paradigms (Ray 2012, 86). Indigenous methodologies involve complex blends of Western and traditional knowledge. Rigid notions of tradition can confine Indigenous research within ideational frameworks, which are legacies of colonialism (Ray 2012, 88). Teaiwa and Henderson (2009, 430) also argue that Western

and traditional knowledge systems are not binary constructs. Instead these multifaceted ways of knowing continually inform and influence one another.

In the Pacific, authenticity is not only defined in terms of blood and place of birth but also by an embodied and ongoing connection to land, language, and culture (Anae 2010a, 223; Gegeo 2001, 496). Indigenous people who are born or who live out of place are often accused of being less authentic. Their insider status becomes increasingly vulnerable and open to challenge. Exposure to multiple cultures and urban centers is thought to leave Pacific Islanders culturally contaminated (Gegeo 2001, 495), with less right to speak about indigeneity and native peoples than if they had remained in place.

Gegeo (2001, 495) uses Kwara'ae epistemology to argue that identity and place are portable. The strength with which traditions and cultural practices from home are upheld by diasporic people living in new places suggests that assumptions that detachment from place leads to a loss of cultural identity are unfounded (Diaz and Kauanui 2001, 324). Remittances from Pacific and diasporic peoples are another way in which connections and identities are powerfully and continually demonstrated. However, the widespread impacts of defining who is in has impacts for issues of power, voice, authenticity, collaboration, and participation in Pacific and Indigenous Studies.

Recognizing and Including *Multi Perspective Culturally Responsive* (MPCR) Researchers

Research as "An Activity of Hope"[17]

Researchers using Indigenous research methods and methodologies often seek to better understand their cultures and communities and to be useful through proposing practical solutions to real life issues (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 152; Kovach 2005, 31; Nabobo-Baba 2006; Anae 2007; Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo 2001; Gegeo 2001). In this spirit of conceptualizing research as a pragmatic activity of hope (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 203), we close by arguing for the recognition and inclusion of the presence of MPCR researchers in Pacific and Indigenous Studies, and in the wider academy.

We offer MPCR to interrupt certainties that are rooted in Western universalism (Bell 2009, 188). It contributes to processes of change through which the often unconsciously assumed dominance of colonial/white/settler cultures is revealed and challenged. Inspired by the work of hooks (2003), we argue that idealism and hopefulness are pragmatic and necessary strategies that can reinforce resilience, helping us to withstand the significant divisiveness that arises from histories of colonialism, globalization, and neoliberalism. Exploring the possibilities inherent within MPCR research contributes to processes

of reimagining possibilities for supporting connected and "meaningful community" (hooks 2003, 197). It is an approach that questions and challenges dominant, hegemonic approaches to research:

> When we only name the problem, when we state complaint without a constructive focus or resolution, we take hope away. In this way critique can become merely an expression of profound cynicism, which then works to sustain dominator culture (hooks 2003, xiv).

> Dominator culture has tried to keep us all afraid, to make us choose safety instead of risk, sameness instead of diversity. Moving through that fear, finding out what connects us, reveling in our differences, this is the process that brings us closer that gives us a world of shared values, of meaningful community (hooks 2003, 197).

The need to name and acknowledge MPCR researchers was initially conceptualized in the doctoral thesis of Acacia Cochise (2013). Cochise recognizes the need to legitimatize the perspectives of researchers who have lived in multiple places, cultures, and communities. She was inspired by the work of Gay (2010), which considers culturally responsive theory, research, and practice. Her embodied experiences as an inside-out' researcher in the Pacific, and as an Indigenous person of mixed ethnicities and cultural heritage, were also significant inspirations for articulating the importance of including MPCR research approaches and researchers in the academy.

We have developed MPCR as a way of helping to create conceptual space, which better reflects multiple and hybrid cultural positionings. In the process of writing about our research experiences and commitment to relational methodology, we have extended these initial ideas as the basis for encouraging wider praxis and dialog. We argue that place and belongingness are not just located genealogically through blood ties, but they are also located relationally—created through continuous cycles of reflexivity, effort and engagement with people. The importance of place within Indigenous epistemologies is valued within MPCR; also, it acknowledges and seeks to include people who transcend overly simplified racial or national affiliations and who have many places and relational understandings from which to contribute.

Through a relational approach to research, we can gain multifaceted and complex understandings of location and of how identities and cultures change and evolve through relationships with others. If we accept that "all forms of culture are continually in a process of hybridity"[18] (Bhabha 1990, 211), then the academy needs to work toward a greater recognition of "multiple, collective and collaborative dimensions of knowledge" (Dei 2010,

119). MPCR is part of creating and claiming spaces through which people can holistically acknowledge all of the cultural, ethnic, experiential, and lived identities that they embody.[19]

The inclusive category of the MPCR researcher is an identity pathway that acknowledges the power of language. Words to describe researchers with multiple ethnicities and identities are not always easy to find. The language that exists influences the ways in which we are able to theorize our own experiences of others and of otherness. Names are powerful. They can lead to recognized identities and approaches, to processes of negotiation, reclaiming, and renaming.

Naming can function to limit and fix identities, but it is also true that we need words that strive to reflect the realities we experience. Friere (1970, 69) argues that "to exist, humanely, is to *name* the world, to change it." The process of naming the world is not mere semantics but is a significant act of praxis (Friere 1970, 68). Naming involves a necessary dimension of action that provides possibilities for transforming the world through dialog.

The intended audience for this paper is the academic community; however, we recognize the limitations inherent in this focus. Not only is the academy an artifact of colonial priorities and discourses, but the academic community is also often maintained and sustained by such discourses. Academic writing about decolonization, which takes place among academic elites and in the English language, will necessarily tread into this kind of tension. Because the academy is founded on and shaped by deeply rooted colonial legacies, these power dynamics shape and constrain the possibilities for dialog. There is a need to engage in ongoing dialogs about the sociocultural norms, values, and possibilities that language communicates more broadly, across cultural contexts, languages, and communities.

MPCR seeks to name, and therefore to better see, the commitment and engagement of researchers and students who are often caught between or excluded from conventional notions of belonging-ness, because of their nonconforming or multiple racial/ethnic identities or because of the multiple places/cultures in which they have lived, studied, and worked. We offer the encompassing category of the MPCR researcher as one way of resisting reductive notions of identity and ethnicity, of acknowledging intersectional researcher identities, and of creating safe space. MPCR is an invitation to other researchers to self-describe and become part of the reflective process.

Through naming the MPCR researcher, we intend to support processes of dialog about the complexity of researcher identities, and about the impacts of identities on belonging, authenticity, participation, and collaboration in

Pacific and Indigenous Studies. Although our paper is a small contribution to what must be a wider process of dialog about what might constitute MPCR researcher identities and what they might contribute, following the work of Dei (2010, 127) we argue that "small acts" are "cumulative and significant for social change."

Towards an Understanding of Multi Perspective Culturally Responsive Researcher Identities

This section explores ideas, ethics, and approaches that might be associated with MPCR researchers. These are not intended to be prescriptive. They are offered as a way of considering both differences and areas of common practice between MPCR researchers and Indigenous scholars.

MPCR researchers often have lived experience in a variety of different spaces, places, cultures, religions, and languages. Their commitment to exploring cultures and to community-based research often grows from these embodied, affective experiences. Some MPCR researchers are "third culture kids" (TCK's) (Pollock and Van Reken 2009, 19). Raised with multiple cultures, in or across a variety of locations, their identity is rooted in many places.

Through their lived experiences and the relationships that they establish, MPCR researchers can gain an intimate and nuanced awareness of cultural experiences supported by the use of reflective, appropriate, and culturally situated research methods. Enabling outside-in researchers to use Indigenous methods and methodologies[20] supports the creation of research that grounded in Indigenous ways of knowing and being, thus deepening the MPCR researcher's knowledge of culturally situated understandings through and across the process of research.

MPCR researchers gain a level of community acceptance observable through their inclusion, access, and ability to collaborate. They are listeners, active participants, and coconstructers of knowledge, who recognize the necessity of reflecting on the impacts of their positionality and research relationships. MPCR researchers recognize that their identities always operate within wider structures of power:

> The relationship begins with decolonizing the mind and heart. Non-Indigenous academics who have successful relationships with Indigenous communities understand this. This means exploring one's own beliefs and values about knowledge and how it shapes practices. It is about examining whiteness. It is about examining power. It is ongoing (Kovach 2009, 169).

MPCR researchers work toward achieving mutually empathetic relationships with Indigenous communities (Cochise 2013). Mutual empathy begins when research communities feel researchers have a good understanding of local cultures and that they have demonstrated their commitment to the well-being of Indigenous peoples. It emerges from continuing processes of engagement, and it occurs when relationships are strong.

Some success in research is experienced by both researchers and communities when there is a sense of mutual empathy between them. Through their willingness to enter into research and all of the complex relationships that surround it, researchers and participants consciously enter into an engaged, relational process. Mutual empathy involves finding ways to relate across differences and to understand one another's perspectives through dialog. It involves a genuine openness to reciprocal processes of learning, change, and discovery.

Mutually empathetic relationships help to embody research ethics and principles advocated by many contemporary Indigenous/Pacific Studies scholars, who argue that good research is fundamentally relational. MPCR researchers recognize and value the process of research over and above any standardized research products (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 130).

Collaboration and dialog are central concerns for MPCR researchers, who seek to involve communities and Indigenous peoples at all stages of the research process. This approach involves moving away from conventional and essentially linear sequences of data extraction, interpretation, and return and extending a relational commitment across the entire research endeavor (Benmayor 1991, 165).

MPCR offers ways for researchers to check their academic and institutional privilege, not only through analyzing a researcher's racial heritage and positioning in relationship to colonial narratives and histories, but through acknowledging relationality and intersectionality as key analytic frameworks that represent and reflect the complexity involved in research relationships.

MPCR is based on relational praxis and communal ways of being alongside and in solidarity with people involved in and surrounding research. It intends to be reflexive and critical without being divisive or excluding researchers or participants on the basis of their race, ethnicity, or location. MPCR focuses attention on how we engage in research and relate to others, rather than on essentialized ideas of what we are.

Although categories such as White and Settler have relevance in terms of analyzing historically embedded and current power relationships, these terms were born out of violent opposition and othering, and they can function to create and reinforce simplistic binary divisions (Nichols 2010, 4). They can also significantly mask sociocultural diversity, inhibiting dialog between Indigenous and White peoples and epistemologies. We offer MPCR as a tool

that cuts across such categorizations. MPCR does not only concern itself with racial identities concordant with White or settler, but involves reflection and checking privilege at all levels, including Whiteness.

MPCR researchers conceptualize research projects and questions with communities engaging in the analysis of data together and inviting participants to become involved in processes of editing representations created about them. The process of coconstructing representations with Indigenous communities reflects the need to care for relationships and relational spaces between people (Anae 2007).

MPCR research is not about learning about culture to tick cultural boxes to help ensure that data is efficiently gathered.[21] MPCR researchers avoid using culture to gain access to communities and knowledges solely for their own purposes and benefit. Instead MPCR researchers seek to establish ongoing trusting and reciprocal relationships with people and communities as a necessary foundation for research. They take time to build relationships and actively look for ways in which they can be useful to communities, thus embodying a relational methodology throughout the research process and generating deeper researcher reflexivity.

MPCR researchers at best become accepted as allies who are willing and able to listen deeply and who value the stories and testimonies shared as ways of telling not only the diverse stories of individuals but also of contributing to telling a collective story (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 145). Ideas about detachment and objectivity are replaced with a commitment to be open and accountable to communities and participants, and to be reflective about the impacts of relationships throughout the process of research.

Processes of engagement in which people can find and claim space to act on their empathic response are important. MPCR researchers are expected to be of use, to return the products of research in ways that are relevant and accessible, and to act in solidarity with people in research communities throughout and beyond the formal research process. MPCR researchers should be able to engage emotionally and with humility demonstrate culturally respectful and engaged behaviors, increasing cultural fluency, continuous reflexivity, and an ongoing willingness to learn.

Conclusion

Constructions of researchers as either insiders or outsiders essentialize and fix identities, oversimplifying the lived complexities of researchers who often bring multiple ethnicities and cultural identities to their research endeavors. Binary definitions contain racially biased and divisive judgments about whose voices or perspectives are more valuable or authentic, with various conse-

quences for dialog, collaboration, and participation and for the possibility of ideas found within Indigenous scholarship being able to reach out to and influence other disciplines.

We have argued that perceptual shifts that allow us to recognize intersectional identities as a part of life, and to see possibilities for collaborations across categorical divides, require a vision of relationship. This paper attempts to think creatively about possibilities for allegiances in Pacific and Indigenous scholarship. We argue that people are social beings who exist in and navigate a variety of intersectional and relational identities and that recognizing this diversity as a source of strength and opportunity is a necessary part of building relationships across broad categorical divides that might otherwise be divisive or isolating.

This paper has suggested that the broad identity pathway articulated through the idea of the MPCR researcher is one way of recognizing and legitimatizing diverse researcher experiences and identities and of acknowledging identity as coconstructed, multiple, and fluid. Through offering the inclusive category of the MPCR researcher, we aim to provide language that enables dialog and acknowledges the complexities surrounding ideas of identity and belonging in an increasingly globalized and transnational world. Recognizing hybrid and multiple researcher identities and the different ways that these are performed in relationship with others is an important step toward more collaborative and inclusive research practices, challenging inside/out dichotomies, and helping us to move toward more innovative and engaged communities of inquiry and practice. By naming the MPCR researcher, we hope that this idea can tangibly exist and be accessible to others as one way of reflecting on inside-out/outside-in research ethics and intersectional research identities in Pacific and Indigenous Studies.

MPCR offers a relational approach to acknowledging privilege and power relationships by suggesting a research identity and methodology that hopes to articulate and acknowledge sociocultural complexity. It problematizes colonial/white/settler privilege and Western epistemological dominance in the academy. The MPCR researcher identity is reflexive and fluid; it is intentionally open to redefinition and continually in process.

MPCR challenges us as researchers to reflect upon what we could have done better, to think deeply about how we could have acted or positioned ourselves from a more relational space. It pushes us to question the wellbeing of people involved in and surrounding research, and to use a relational lens to assess and acknowledge our inevitable mistakes and shortcomings. Rather than seeing challenges in relational processes as indications that collaboration is not possible, MPCR challenges us to be open to mishaps as an integral part of the research process and to humbly work from and with

these experiences, incorporating them in our growing understandings and empathy.

NOTES

1. Following the work of Teaiwa (2001, 353) we hope that Pacific Studies can be "available to challenge, criticism, connection to all."

2. "Many Indigenous communities continue to live within political and social conditions that perpetuate extreme levels of poverty, chronic ill health and poor educational opportunities" (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 4). Indigenous peoples are also grappling with the emotional and psychological consequences of historical and ongoing deficit messaging about their supposed inabilities, inferiorities, laziness, and dependence.

3. In Indigenous epistemology "the location from which the voice of the researcher emanates" is important because it establishes relationships (Aveling 2012, 204). To name your location(s) is to begin to acknowledge the places and perspectives from which you speak. As Hall (1991, 18) argues "you have to position yourself somewhere in order to say anything at all." To challenge whiteness as an assumed, hegemonic, normative, and anonymous category (Graveline 2010, 367), we specifically name where we are from.

4. Evans et al. (2009, 1) suggest that Participatory Action Research (PAR) approaches have a conceptual base in common with many Indigenous Methodologies (IM). They suggest that a fusion of these approaches, together with the critical angle offered by White Studies, can be useful in terms of collaborative work with Indigenous communities. Both PAR and IM challenge the dominance of positivism in the academy and seek to accept diverse ways of knowing, highlighting the processes of power that play a significant part in the social construction of knowledge. Other commonalities include a commitment to social transformation and to honoring the lives and experiences of participants and a broad commitment to sharing power and ensuring collaboration (Evans et al. 2009, 4).

5. Margaret Kovach (2009, 33) describes reflexivity as "the researcher's own self-reflection in the meaning-making process."

6. We have been involved in research processes working with marginalized communities including women and girls (Clery and Nabulivou 2011; Clery 2013), people with disabilities (Clery 2008), Fiji's LGBT community (Clery 2014), people living in informal settlement communities (Clery 2006; Metcalfe 2009), and young people of mixed ethnicity (Cochise 2013).

7. By excluding Indigenous knowledge(s), universities claim "a monopoly on what does and does not count as knowledge" (Kovach 2009, 79).

8. The term Indigenous Peoples recognizes the shared experiences of "peoples who have been subjected to the colonization of their lands and cultures and the denial of their sovereignty by a colonizing society" (Tuhiwai Smith 2012, 7).

9. Indigenous elites, as well as others who benefit from existing power structures and divisions, have been involved in maintaining and re-inscribing colonial realities, inequalities, and power structures.

10. Gegeo and Watson-Gegeo (2001, 492) argue that the political independence of nations formally under colonial rule has not necessarily meant the decolonization of minds or processes.

11. Area studies is "based on the assumption that it is possible to understand other societies and even whole regions in their totality, that there are certain essential characteristics that, once grasped, will lead to adequate understanding of the whole" (Wesley-Smith 1995: 118–19).

12. Firth (2003) notes that ideas about cultural reclamation and renaissance are particularly strong parts of Pacific Studies scholarship in Hawai'i and Aotearoa/New Zealand. Scholarship in the wider Pacific region has focused on issues of development rather than cultural revitalization.

13. This movement has helped to write Indigenous Pacific women back into the history books, because colonial accounts had systematically misrepresented and excluded women (Tuhiwai Smith 2012: 29–30). Creative approaches to understanding Pacific ways of knowing and being are a strong feature of contemporary Pacific Studies. Creative approaches seek to better reflect oral cultures in the Pacific, conveying metaphoric and emotional understandings alongside more conventional forms of academic writing, and providing important epistemological challenges to dominant "rational" Western modes of thinking.

14. Smith (cited in Kovach 2009:92) cautions against bringing "sacred" or "restricted" knowledge forms into the academy because adequate care, respect, and preservation cannot be guaranteed.

15. Many Indigenous scholars who have contributed to rethinking methodologies and methods for research with Indigenous peoples are mentioned in this paper. Other important researchers include: Hau'ofa 1993, 2000, 2008; Meyer 2001; Nabobo-Baba 2008; Subramani 1993; Taufe'ulungaki 2003; Tuhiwai Smith 1999, 2012; Tuwere 2002; Vaioleti 2006.

16. Tuhiwai Smith (2012, 28) points to the colonial origins of processes of categorization by race and notions of racial purity. Children who were born out of relationships between colonizers and colonized were labeled half-castes or half-breeds, stigmatized and excluded from both White Settler and Indigenous communities. Kovach (2009, 10) tells the story of an Indigenous student in Canada who wanted to use Indigenous research methods but was concerned she did not have the "necessary cultural connections" because she had been brought up in the city.

17. Tuhiwai Smith (2012, 203).

18. Bhabha (1990, 211) describes hybridity as a "third space" that emerges: When "a new situation, a new alliance formulates itself, it may demand that you should translate your principals, rethink them, extend them" (1990, 216)

19. Because MPCR researchers are often highly mobile and have been exposed to multiple sociocultural realities, they are clearly linked to processes of globalization, but MPCR researchers are not purveyors of globalization. They do not seek to homogenize or disregard culturally situated forms of knowing and being.

20. Support is needed on a variety of levels. University systems need to acknowledge the value and validity of Indigenous approaches to research; supervisors should support rather than gate-keep Indigenous methodologies as only being usable by/accessible to Indigenous researchers; non-Indigenous researchers should be supported to explore, critique, and adapt Indigenous methods and methodologies.

21. For example, researchers using local/traditional protocols as tools for negotiating access need to approach this interaction relationally rather than functionally (now I have made this presentation to this community or eaten this meal with this person I can ask this sensitive question). Respecting cultural protocols is one aspect of nurturing relationships in the process of research.

REFERENCES

Airini. Anae, M., and K. Mila-Schaaf, with E. Coxon, D. Mara, and K. Sanga
    2010   Teu Le Va—Relationships across research and policy in Pasifika education:
            A collective approach to knowledge generation and policy development for
            action towards Pasifika education success. Report to the Ministry of Education,
            Pasifika Education, Research Division.

Anae, M.
    2007   Teu le Va: Research that could make a difference to Pacific schooling in
            New Zealand. "Is your research making a difference to Pasifika education?"
            Wellington: Paper commissioned by the Ministry of Education.
    2010a   Teu le Va: Towards a *native* anthropology. *Pacific Studies* 33 (2): 222–40.
    2010b   Research for better Pacific schooling in New Zealand: Teu le va—A Samoan
            perspective. *Mai Review* 1:1–25.

Aveling, N.
    2012   "Don't talk about what you don't know": On (not) conducting research with/in
            Indigenous contexts. *Critical Studies in Education* 54 (2): 203–14.

Bell, A.
    2009   A conversation through history: towards postcolonial coexistence. *Journal of
            Intercultural Studies* 30 (2): 173–91.

Benmayor, R.
    1991   Testimony, action research, and empowerment: Puerto Rican women and
            popular education. In *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history*, ed.
            S. B. Gluck and D. Patai, 159–74. New York: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K.
    1990   *Nation and narration.* London: Routledge.

Blix, B. H.
    2015   "Something decent to wear": Performances of being an insider and an outsider
            in Indigenous research. *Qualitative Inquiry* 21 (2): 175–83.

Brayboy, B. M., and D. Deyhle
    2000   Insider–outsider: Researchers in American Indian communities. *Theory into Practice* 39 (3): 163–69.

Clery, T. N.
    2006   Place, cultural identity and the consequences of change for the Korova "squatter" community. In *Livelihoods and identity in Fiji*, ed. R. T. Robertson, 57–87. Fiji: Pacific Institute for Advanced Studies in Development and Governance, Univ. of the South Pacific.
    2008   I can see a little with my eyes: Conceptions of disability and philosophies of inclusion from Fiji. Master's diss., Univ. of the South Pacific.
    2013   The art of peace: Performative and arts-based peace practices in contemporary Fiji. PhD diss., Univ. of Otago.
    2014   The F word; challenging gender norms, performing possibilities, and celebrating lesbian relationships in Fiji. *Intersections: Gender and Sexuality in Asia and the Pacific* 35: July 2014.

Clery, T. N., and N. Nabulivou
    2011   Women's collective creativity—Playful and transgressive processes for building peace in Fiji. *Journal of Pacific Studies* 31 (2): 163–83.

Cochise, A.
    2013   Multi-perspective, culturally responsive students within experiential jeducation paradigms: A case study of select programmes in Samoa. PhD diss., Univ. of Canterbury.

Cole, E. R.
    2008   Coalitions as a model for intersectionality: From practice to theory. *Sex Roles* 59 (5–6): 443–53.

Dei, George J. Sefa
    2010   Rethinking the role of Indigenous knowledges in the academy. *International Journal of Inclusive Education* 4 (2): 111–32.

Denzin, N. K.
    2001   The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research,* 1:23–36.

Diaz, V. M., and K. J. Kauanui
    2001   Native Pacific cultural studies on the edge. *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 315–42.

Donald, D. T.
    2009   Forts, curriculum and Indigenous Métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal–Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations Perspectives* 2 (1): 1–24.

Evans, Mike, Rachelle Hole, Lawrence D. Berg, Peter Hutchinson, and Dixon Sookraj
2009.   Common insights, differing methodologies: Towards a fusion of Indigenous methodologies, participatory action research, and white studies in an urban aboriginal research agenda. *Qualitative Inquiry* 15 (5): 893–910.

Firth, S.
2003   Future directions for Pacific studies. *Contemporary Pacific* 15 (1): 139–48.

Friere, P.
1970   *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. London: Penguin Books.

Gay, G.
2010   *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gegeo, D. W., and K. A. Watson-Gegeo
2001   How we know: Kwara'ae rural villagers doing Indigenous espitemology. *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (1): 55–58.

Gegeo, David W.
2001   Cultural rupture and indigeneity: The challenge of (re)visioning "place" in the Pacific. *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 491–507.

Graveline, F. J.
2010   Circle as methodology: Enacting an Aboriginal paradigm. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 13 (4): 361–70.

Hall, S.
1991   Ethnicity: Identity and difference. *Radical America* 23 (4): 2–20.

Hau'ofa, Epeli
1993   Our sea of islands. In *A new Oceania: Rediscovering our sea of islands*, ed. E. Wadell., V. Naidu, and E. Hau'ofa, 2–19. Suva: School of Social and Economic Development, Univ. of the South Pacific.
2000   Epilogue pasts to remember. In *Remembrance of Pacific pasts: An invitation to remake history*, ed. R. Borofsky, 453–73. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.
2008   *We are the ocean—Selected works.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press.

hooks, b.
2003   *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* New York: Routledge.

Jones, A.
2012   Dangerous liaisons: Pākehā, kaupapa Māori, and educational research. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies* 47 (2): 100–12.

Kerstetter, K.
   2012   Insider, outsider, or somewhere in between: The impact of researchers' identi-
            ties on the community-based research process. *Journal of Rural Social Sciences*
            27 (2): 99–117.

Kovach, M.
   2005   Emerging from the Margins: Indigenous methodologies. In *Research as resist-
            ance: Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*, ed. L. Brown and S.
            Strega, 19–36. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
   2009   *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* Toronto:
            Univ. of Toronto Press.

Meredith, P.
   1998   Hybridity in the third space: Rethinking bi-cultural politics in Aotearoa/
            New Zealand. Paper presented to Te Oru Rangahau Maori Research and
            Development Conference, 7–9 July 1998, Massey Univ., New Zealand.

Metcalfe, R.
   2009   Policy dialogue: Examining squatter resettlement in Fiji, a case study of the
            Peceliema community relocation in 2007 from the Suva Pony Club to Waila
            Housing City. Master's diss., Univ. of the South Pacific.

Meyer, M. A.
   2001   Our own liberation: Reflections on Hawaiian epistemology. *Contemporary
            Pacific* 13 (1): 124–48.

Mila-Schaaf, K.
   2009   *Epeli Hau'ofa: The magical metaphor man.* Paper presented at the Epeli Hau'ofa
            Symposium, Dunedin, University of Otago. http://www.otago.ac.nz/humanities/
            otago060724.pdf.

Minh-Ha, T. T.
   1995   No master territories. In *The post-colonial studies reader*, ed. B. Ashcroft,
            G. Griffiths, and H. Tiffin, 215–18. London: Routledge.

Nabobo-Baba, U.
   2004   Research and Pacific Indigenous peoples: Silenced pasts and challenged futures.
            In *Researching the Pacific and indigeous peoples: Issues and perspectives*, ed.
            T. Baba., O. Māhina., N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 17–32. New Zealand:
            Center for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.
   2006   *Knowing and learning: An Indigenous Fijian approach.* Suva: Institute of Pacific
            Studies.
   2008   Decolonizing framings in Pacific research: Indigenous Fijian Vanua research
            framework as an organic response. *AlterNative: An International Journal of
            Indigenous Peoples* 4 (2): 140–54.

Nichols, Dana
2010 Teaching critical whiteness theory: What college and university teachers need to know. *Understanding and Dismantling Privilege,* 1 (1): 1–12.

Pollock, D. C., and R. Van Reken
2009 *Third culture kids: Growing up among worlds*. Boston: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

Ray, L.
2012 Deciphering the "Indigenous" in Indigenous methodologies. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples* 8 (1): 85–95.

Sanga, K. F.
2004 Making philosophical sense of Indigenous Pacific research. In *Researching the Pacific and Indigenous peoples: Issues and perspectives,* ed. T. Baba., O. Māhina., N. Williams, and U. Nabobo-Baba, 1–52. New Zealand: Center for Pacific Studies, Univ. of Auckland.

Subramani
1993 The Oceanic imaginary. In *Pacific Epistemologies,* Monograph Series 1. Suva: Pacific Writing Forum.

Taufe'ulungaki, A. M.
2003 The role of research: A Pacific perspective. In *Global/local intersections: Researching the delivery of aid to Pacific education,* ed. E. Coxon and 'A. M. Taufe'ulungaki, 19–40. New Zealand: Research Unit of Pacific Education (RUPE), Univ. of Auckland.

Teaiwa, T. K.
2001 Lo(o)sing the edge. *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 343–57.
2014 The ancestors we get to choose: White influences I won't deny. In *Theorizing native studies,* ed. A. Simpson and A. Smith, 43–55. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press Books.

Teaiwa, T. K., and A. K. Henderson
2009 Humanities and communities: A dialogue in Pacific studies. *Pacific Studies* 32 (4): 421–38.

Thaman, K. H.
2003 Decolonizing Pacific studies: Indigenous perspectives, knowledge, and wisdom in higher education. *Contemporary Pacific* 15 (1): 1–17.

Tuhiwai Smith, L.
2012 *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples.* 2nd ed. London: Zed Press.

Uperesa, F. L.
  2010   A different weight: Tension and promise in "Indigenous anthropology." *Pacific Studies* 33 (2): 280–300.

Vaioleti, T.
  2006   Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific research. *Waikato Journal of Education* 12:21–34.

Wesley-Smith, T.
  1995   Rethinking Pacific Islands studies. *Pacific Studies* 18 (2): 115–36.

Whimp, G.
  2009   Working the space between: Pacific artists in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In *The space between: Negotiating culture, place, and identity in the Pacific*, ed. A. M. Tamaira, 9–23. Occasional Paper Series 44. Honolulu, Hawaiʻi: Center for Pacific Islands Studies, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Univ. of Hawaiʻi at Mānoa.

White, G. M., and T. K. Tengan
  2001   Disappearing worlds: Anthropology and cultural studies in Hawaiʻi and the Pacific. *Contemporary Pacific* 13 (2): 381–416.

Wilson, Shawn
  2008   *Research is ceremony, Indigenous research methods.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Wood, H.
  2003   Cultural studies for Oceania. *Contemporary Pacific* 15 (2):340–74.

FIJI'S ELECTORAL STRATEGIES: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Sanjay Ramesh
University of Sydney

This article analyzes Fiji's electoral projects by comparing Fiji's electoral experiences with those of South Africa, Namibia, Guyana, and Suriname. I argue that Fiji's electoral project of the 1990s was fraught with difficulty because it failed to reconcile competing communal and reformist positions within the democratic framework established by the 1997 Fiji Constitution. As a result, the electoral project of the 1990s failed, resulting in further coups in 2000 and 2006, with the political designers reframing the political agenda and adopting a proportional system of governance to promote national identity and interethnic collaboration following the 2006 coup. However, I contend that while a proportional electoral outcome was achieved in the 2014 general elections, the political and institutional structures, in particular the parliamentary committees, remain underdeveloped, resulting in a continued partisan and confrontational political landscape with potential for further conflict and instability.

Background on Electoral Engineering

IN FIJI, ELECTORAL SYSTEMS as a means of facilitating consensus democracy have had mixed outcomes. Following the promulgation of the 1970 Constitution, Fiji held its first postindependence election under the majoritarian first-past-the-post electoral system in 1972. As expected, the election result was divisive and highlighted ethnic fault lines that had plagued the island nation since the arrival of Indians in 1879. In postindependence Fiji, there was an expectation within the indigenous community

that Fijians of European descent, indigenous Fijians, and Indo-Fijians would vote for the chief-led Alliance Party. However, by 1977, this view of the political engineers in Fiji became contested as indigenous Fijian votes split in the 1977 Fiji general election, resulting in the defeat of the Alliance Party. Ten years later, split again in the indigenous Fijian urban votes led to the victory of the Fiji Labour Party and the National Federation Party (NFP) coalition, resulting in Fiji's first military coup on May 14, 1987. The postcoup political engineers reframed the first-past-the-post electoral system under the 1990 Constitution, ensuring that indigenous Fijians held political power in perpetuity, with Indo-Fijians relegated to the opposition. As expected, the political arrangement of 1990 continued to cause disunity within the indigenous Fijian community, resulting in another constitution and electoral review in the mid-1990s.

The 1990s electoral engineering project in Fiji was bold at best, because most indigenous Fijians preferred chief-led political parties and murmurs of a new electoral system modeled along the alternative vote, used in electing the Australian Senate, were greeted with skepticism. Moreover, the proposal to soften a majoritarian electoral system with compulsory power sharing became the subject of intense debate among various political factions. For Indo-Fijians, power sharing was a laudable effort on the part of the political engineers but unworkable because ethnicity continued to play a dominant role in political outcomes. The political issues caused by the 1997 Constitution led to two further coups: one in 2000 and the other in 2006. Following the 2000 coup, the 1997 Constitution of Fiji survived, but the coup set in motion a series of unfortunate events: tensions between the government and the Republic of Fiji Military Forces triggered the December 2006 coup and the subsequent abrogation of the Fiji Constitution in 2009.

A new constitutional and electoral project was undertaken after 2009 based on the People's Charter for Change, Peace and Progress that argued for de-ethnicization of the Fijian state via a proportional electoral system. The election of September 2014 was a culmination of the aspirations of the military-backed regime for nonethnic political discourse based on one person, one vote, and one value. Leading the change in Fiji's political landscape was Voreqe Bainimarama, who formed the FijiFirst political party and won the election with a majority of seats.

This article analyzes Fiji's electoral projects by comparing Fiji's electoral experiences with those of South Africa, Namibia, Guyana, and Suriname. South Africa and Namibia are countries that had long periods of undemocratic rule similar to Fiji, where one ethnic group dominated political authority. Similarly, South Africa's minority preapartheid regime dominated the politics of Namibia from 1915 to 1989, when a popular movement led by

the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) forced the exit of South Africans in 1989. Since then, both Namibia and South Africa have embarked on significant political reforms, and these reforms—institutional, constitutional, and political—were undertaken at the same time as reforms in Fiji. The Fiji Constitution Review Commission (CRC), established in 1995, extensively drew on the experiences of structuring postapartheid multiethnic governance in South Africa. However, at the same time, Namibia established a hybrid form of a presidential and parliamentary system. In Fiji, the CRC also recommended a hybrid parliamentary and presidential system with a proposal for a Fijian parliament modeled along the Westminster system and a senate elected using the presidential system of electoral colleges. While there were challenges in South Africa, Namibia, and Fiji on reconciling ethnic and political interests, Guyana in the Caribbean and Suriname in South America have been closer cousins to Fiji when it comes to ethnic tensions and in particular the question of Indian indentured workers and their descendants who continue to claim political equality (27% of Suriname citizens are Indians, compared to 37% in Fiji and 43.5% in Guyana). Guyana and Suriname are highlighted as examples because these countries, which were prone to military coups, were able to break the cycle of political instability and coups through political engineering. In contrast, Fiji has failed in its national unity initiatives, and there are concerns that a large proportion of the indigenous community in the country voted against the multicultural vision of FijiFirst in the September 2014 general election.

Fiji's 1990 electoral project was fraught with difficulty because it failed to reconcile competing communal and reformist positions within the democratic framework. As a result, Fiji's electoral project failed, leading to further coups and political designers reframing the political agenda and adopting a proportional system of governance as a means for promoting national consciousness and interethnic collaboration. However, although a proportional electoral outcome was achieved in the 2014 general elections, the political institutional structures remain underdeveloped, resulting in a continued partisan and confrontational political landscape.

Comparisons with the Fijian Electoral Project

During the 1990s, electoral engineering as a means for promoting inclusion of minorities became a growing theme among political theorists as they tried to address majority and minority representations in parliamentary and presidential forms of government. In 1994, South Africa reorganized its government institutions (Ross 2008, 214) following the implementation of a new constitution that institutionalized mandatory power sharing. According to

the South African Constitution, any party with a minimum of 5 percent of the seats in the national parliament had the right to be in the cabinet. This institutional structure was the brainchild of Donald Horowitz (2000), who argued that the role of formal institutions was to structure incentives for political behavior in divided societies. For example, if group A was 55 percent of the population and group B was 45 percent but group A was divided into three political parties competing for the votes of group A, then according to Horowitz, "it is a dangerous situation in which ethnic outbidding can occur, but the situation is not necessarily solved by splitting support for group A, which is already split" (2000, 600).

As a political strategy, Horowitz suggested that institutional incentives be provided for the parties belonging to group A so that they behave moderately toward group B. As a consequence of this logic, multiparty governance as a power-sharing instrument was recommended for South Africa and then adopted for Fiji. Electoral theorist Arend Lijphardt argued that Horowitz's perspective on power sharing was fundamentally flawed, saying it was difficult to establish and maintain compulsory power sharing or multiparty government in divided societies because "it was not sufficiently democratic, could not work in practice, did not contain incentive for moderate political behaviour, could lead to secession and partition, and strengthened rather than weakened the cohesion and distinctiveness of ethnic groups" (Lijphardt 2002: 38–40). Furthermore, Lijphardt (2004, 98) argued that Horowitz's model "has found no support from either academic experts or constitutional writers. Its sole, and only partial, practical application to legislative elections in an ethnically divided society was the short-lived and ill-fated Fijian constitutional system, which tried to combine Alternative Vote with power sharing." Despite the misgivings of Lijphardt, South Africa's postapartheid institutions, unlike institutions in Fiji, have performed remarkably well despite ongoing racial schisms. According to Steven Friedman (2009, 109), "regular national, provincial, and local elections have produced results that are largely accepted as an accurate reflection of the voters' will. The relative ease with which society has moved from an authoritarian racial oligarchy to a functioning democracy remains remarkable, even though it is often taken for granted, particularly by many in the white minority."

While a multiparty cabinet worked for South Africa, in Fiji, constitutionalization of compulsory power sharing under the 1997 Constitution ended with the abrogation of Fiji Constitution by the military in April 2009. Fiji, unlike South Africa, had a general absence of multiparty consensus-building mechanisms, and as a result, there has been crisis in political governance since the inception of the 1997 Constitution. It was hoped by the constitutional designers that parliamentary committees would support multiparty

initiatives, but communal and ethnic issues dominated national politics from 1999 to 2006, with multiple points of failure. The first point of failure was that the 1997 Constitution failed to address divergent views on indigenous rights and the rights of minorities in the community. The second point of failure was the preponderance of communal seats and communal influence in national politics. Other points of failure included lack of clarity about the role of the military in national affairs and the continued extra parliamentary role of the Great Council of Chiefs in choosing presidents. Only a semblance of political unity was created in 1996 with the establishment of the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee on the Constitution, which had a mandate to reach consensus on the CRC Report that genuinely attempted to address and balance the centripetal forces of communalism with the centrifugal forces of interethnic accommodation (Alley 1997: 248–9). Borrowing from South Africa, the CRC recommended the best parts of parliamentarianism and presidentialism while de-emphasizing communal representation. In the end, the Joint Parliamentary Select Committee on the Constitution significantly changed the CRC Report in favor of communal politics.

An authoritative analysis on centripetalism was conducted by Benjamin Reilly (2006, 816), who argued that three factors can collectively promote accommodation in divided societies: the provision for electoral incentives, the presence of an arena of bargaining, and the development of centrist, aggregative, and multiethnic political parties or coalitions. The 1996 CRC in Fiji made recommendations for the development and promotion of centrist, aggregative parties and coalitions; Fiji's political leaders, however, reversed these recommendations of the CRC in favor of communal representation (45 communal seats vs. 25 common roll seats, as opposed to the 45 common seats and 25 communal seats recommended by the CRC). Worse, the indigenous nationalist governments in Fiji from 2001 to 2006 focused on parts of the Fiji Constitution to implement affirmative action policies in favor of its indigenous Fijian constituents while largely ignoring disadvantaged groups in nonindigenous communities. As a consequence, interethnic collaboration was defeated, resulting in two coups: one in 2000 and the other in 2006.

Looking toward West Africa, Namibia, unlike Fiji, has a mixture of presidential and parliamentary systems in which the president shares executive power with the prime minister and cabinet ministers are appointed by the president from among the members of the National Assembly. There are specific safeguards and checks and balances in the Namibian Constitution against the abuse of power by either the executive or the cabinet ministers. According to van Cranenburgh (2006, 590), Namibia is a consensus, multiparty system based on proportional representation with a party list. The Namibian National Assembly has the power to remove ministers from office following a

vote of no confidence by a simple majority, and there are safeguards against the abuse of authority by the president. In a sense, the Namibian model is based on a balance of power type of constitutional structure, even though the government has been dominated by the SWAPO Party since the end of civil conflict in 1989 (Hinz, Amoo, and van Wik 2002).

While South Africa and Namibia have with a degree of success sustained a consensus model of governance, Fiji moved in the opposite direction and mauled the intent of the 1997 Constitution following the indigenous nationalist coup of 2000. The indigenous nationalist government that came to office following the 2001 general election focused its energy on reinterpreting the Fiji Constitution to provide a legal rational argument in support of discriminating against Indo-Fijians, who in 2001 constituted nearly 40 percent of the population. Cottrell and Ghai (2007) analyzed in detail the affirmative action provision in the 1997 Constitution and argued that the provision for affirmative action could not be looked at in isolation. The principle features of affirmative action in Fiji Constitution were that programs had to be approved by parliament "for the benefit of all disadvantaged groups—no mention of ethnicity, gender or disability" (Cottrell and Ghai 2007, 239). In practice, the indigenous government implemented a number of affirmative action programs exclusively for indigenous Fijians and provided only "token" programs for other disadvantaged communities, including Indo-Fijians. However, since the indigenous government came into office entirely on indigenous Fijian votes, it chose to underfund programs for Indo-Fijians, leading to accusations of racial discrimination from the Indo-Fijian political parties.

In Fiji's case, while the constitutional engineers envisaged moderate political parties to come together and build bridges among Fiji's communal political leaders, in practice, there was selective use of constitutional provisions to fulfill communal agendas, resulting in constitutional failure. Moreover, unlike, the Namibian Constitution, Fiji's executive authority under the 1997 Constitution lay with the appointed president, who was accountable only to the Great Council of Chiefs, which was an unelected body comprising traditional hereditary indigenous chiefs from Fiji's fourteen indigenous provinces. In addition, a compulsory power-sharing requirement created political gridlock in the cabinet. Amendments to the Fiji Constitution were extremely difficult because changes required two-thirds support from an ethnically divided House of Representatives and the Senate. There was ongoing debate in Fiji that the constitution should serve as a higher law binding the parliament, as is the case with other polities (Bulsara and Kissane 2009, 181). For example, in Ireland, one of the means for occasioning constitutional change is via a referendum. Since the inception of the 1937 Irish Constitution, there have been more than thirty proposed amendments, and most

of these amendments have been backed by cross-party consensus (Bulsara and Kissane 2009, 182). In Fiji's case, constitutional amendments did not get cross-party support. As a result, no major amendment to the Fiji Constitution was undertaken between 1999 and 2006, indicating constitutional rigidity and the prevalence of communal politics at the national level.

Fiji is not alone when it comes to a problematic constitution. Suriname's 1987 Constitution failed to incorporate the lessons from the past, and the governance structure, as set out in the constitution, failed to cement an effective political system. The Suriname Constitution was a long, wide-ranging document that established a mixed presidential–parliamentary system with weak checks and balances. On certain important constitutional matters, such as the procedures for removing a president, the constitution lacked clarity, and this contributed to a constitutional crisis in 1999. According to Kambel and Mackay (1999, 147), the Suriname Constitution is more a "policy document rather than an effective legal instrument protecting the rights of Suriname citizens."

The political situation in Suriname can be compared with that of Fiji as debates over the powers of the president ended with the abrogation of the 1997 Constitution in April 2009. Similar to Fiji's situation, Suriname's National Assembly performed poorly, resulting in lack of legislative accountability and causing institutional fragmentation and collapse. Taylor and Berns (2010) argued that contemporary Suriname politics is based on consociational democracy, where friendship and collaboration among political leaders are greatly valued as noninstitutionalized binding forces among political parties. However, Roeder (2005, 61) argued that a consociational system has not worked well in the country and constitutional fragility remains. Nevertheless, the Suriname experience included fewer political and institutional failures compared to the experience in Fiji, where contending views on governance and political institution led to factionalization of the state and military intervention.

Electoral Engineering Following the 2006 Military Coup

Electoral engineering is an important element in the political engineering process. Poorly structured constitutions, such as Fiji's 1997 Constitution and Suriname's 1987 Constitution, amplified intergroup conflict and led to, in the case of Fiji, the collapse of the legal–constitutional authority. To fill the political vacuum, the military in Fiji intervened in national affairs and permanently implanted an authoritarian agenda of forcing ethnic unity. Following the 2006 coup, the military regime in Fiji realized that the indigenous nationalist order it replaced was still active with an agenda to undermine the

forced reforms of the military. The deposed Prime Minister of Fiji Laisenia Qarase challenged the 2006 military coup, and in 2009, the Court of Appeal of Fiji adjudicated that the 2006 coup was illegal and advised the president of Fiji to hold elections under the 1997 Constitution.

The military regime abrogated the 1997 Constitution and started a new political process for a nonethnic constitution. The framework for the new constitution and the electoral system was finalized in the People's Charter for Change in 2008, which was endorsed by the National Council for Building a Better Fiji. It proposed shared values, vision, and principles as the basis for eleven key pillars for building a better Fiji. The pillars were ensuring sustainable democracy and good and just governance; developing a common national identity and building social cohesion; ensuring effective, enlightened and accountable leadership; enhancing public sector efficiency, performance effectiveness and service delivery; achieving higher economic growth while ensuring sustainability; making more land available for productive and social purposes; developing an integrated development structure at the provincial level; reducing poverty to a negligible level by 2015; making Fiji a knowledge-based society; improving health service delivery; and enhancing global integration and international relations. Proposed actions include the use of proportional electoral systems for all future elections, realigning the role of the military, a common national identity, and the promulgation of an antidiscrimination act.

The charter also proposed to end the cycle of coups by applying a number of principle-based strategies, including political reforms addressing ethnonationalism, leadership, good governance, human rights, and national reconciliation.

As part of an agenda to engineer a nonethnic outcome, two proportional electoral systems were examined: d'Hondt and Sainte-Lague. These systems allow divided communities to engineer inclusive proportional electoral outcomes. The Sainte-Lague method was introduced in Latvia in 1922, was used for the interwar-period parliamentary elections, and was reintroduced in the country in 1992. Modified versions of the Sainte-Lague system have been used in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden (Grofman and Lijphardt 2002). In the d'Hondt divisor method, the division of votes is sequential—one, two, three, four, etc.—among the contesting political parties. For example, if there are three parties contesting three seats, each party's seat is divided sequentially by one, two, and three, and depending on the proportion of votes following division, the seats are allocated accordingly.

In the Saint-Lague methodology, the votes are divided by one, three, five, and so on, and because the second and third divisors are more than double, smaller parties with fewer votes have a higher weighting and as a result

have a greater probability of electoral success than do larger parties (Riedwyl and Steiner 1995: 357–69). According to Brendan O'Leary, Bernard Grofman, and Jorgen Elkit (2005), d'Hondt is most commonly used for European party-list proportional representations. However, to address collective choice problems including ethnic conflict and multiparty governance, these authors recommend sequential portfolio allocation based on party seat shares: "The basic idea is that each party's seat share in the legislature is used as a measure of its legitimate claims to ministerial office" (O'Leary, Grofman, and Elkit 2005: 198–200). The sequential divisor method is considered appropriate when there is a climate of distrust and hostility among the parties that are forced to share governing responsibilities.

In Fiji, the military regime chose a modified d'Hondt proportional electoral system under the 2013 Constitution of the Republic of Fiji.

The 2014 Fiji Elections

Fiji went to the polls on September 17, 2014, as overseas antigovernment blog sites ramped up their anti-FijiFirst commentary, even though there was a 48-hour political campaign blackout. Blog sites accused FijiFirst of manipulating the election, planning curfews, buying votes, and threatening non-FijiFirst participants, but the international observer group found no evidence of such activities. Some disgruntled political candidates engaged in nuisances such as defacing party posters, making prank calls, smashing party-car windows, and threatening journalists.

There were 590,000 registered voters, out of which 496,364 people (83.9 percent) voted in the 2014 general election. The voting was carried out at 1,500 polling stations, where voters showed their identity cards to electoral officers who verified their name on the voter list, marked their finger with an indelible ink, and then issued them the ballot paper, whereupon the voter marked with a cross or a tick against the preferred candidate's number and deposited the ballot into a secured ballot box. Most of the voting on September 17 was completed before 3 p.m., and the provisional results were published in the morning of September 18.

The provisional election figures placed FijiFirst in the lead with 60 percent of the seats, followed by the Social Democratic Liberal Party (SODELPA) and the NFP. The Fiji Labour Party, the Peoples' Democratic Party, One Fiji, and the Fiji United Freedom Party failed to secure the required 5 percent threshold of 24,818 votes.

In the afternoon of September 18, the Fiji Labour Party, the Peoples' Democratic Party, SODELPA, One Fiji, and the NFP issued a joint statement, arguing that there were irregularities in the conduct of the election

TABLE 1. **Fiji Political Parties' Performance in the 2014 General Election.**

Political Parties	% Votes	Total Votes	Total Seats
FijiFirst	59.2%	293,714	32
FLP	2.4%	11,670	0
NFP	5.5%	27,066	3
PDP	3.2%	15,864	0
SODELPA	28.2%	139,857	15
One Fiji	1.2%	5,839	0
FUFP	0.2%	1,072	0
Roshika Deo (independent)	0.2%	1,055	0
Umesh Chand (independent)	0.1%	227	0
Total	100.0%	496,364	50

FLP, Fiji Labour Party; PDP, Peoples' Democratic Party; FUFP, Fiji United Freedom Party.

Source: Fiji Elections Office (2014).

and requesting that the count of the votes be suspended. The supervisor of elections responded that the allegations from the political parties were too general and refused to suspend counting. On September 19, the political parties questioning the election produced a list of "evidence," claiming that extra ballot papers were printed, seals on the ballot boxes were broken, the count was suspended without explanation, and ballot papers were tampered with. The Elections Office rejected the claims on September 20, and the full and final results of the election were published on September 21.

FijiFirst won a majority of the seats with 59.2 percent of the votes (Table 1). The majority of support for FijiFirst was from Indo-Fijians (80 percent), urban indigenous Fijians and youths, and rural indigenous Fijians. More than 50 percent of indigenous Fijians voted for FijiFirst.

Testing Proportionality

The promise of the 2014 Fiji election was that it would be the most proportional election compared to previous elections based on majoritarian and

TABLE 2. **Gallagher Index—2014 Fiji General Election.**

Political Parties	% Votes	Total Seats	% Seats	Seats – Votes	Difference Squared
FijiFirst	59.2%	32	64%	0.05	0.22
FLP	2.4%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
NFP	5.5%	3	6%	0.01	0.07
PDP	3.2%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
SODELPA	28.2%	15	30%	0.02	0.13
One Fiji	1.2%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
FUFP	0.2%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
Roshika Deo (independent)	0.2%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
Umesh Chand (independent)	0.1%	0	0%	0.00	0.00
Total	100.0%	50	100%		0.42
				Total difference squared/2	0.21
				Gallagher Index (square root of total/2)	0.46

FLP, Fiji Labour Party; PDP, Peoples' Democratic Party; FUFP, Fiji United Freedom Party.

preferential electoral systems. The regime in Fiji argued that the election was based on one person, one vote, and one value, and this system was aimed at forcing political parties to put in place political manifestos that addressed national issues as opposed to communal ones.

Michael Gallagher (1991, 1992) developed a quantitative methodology on measuring proportionality. The formula prescribed used the least squares statistical method to the measure disproportionality of an electoral outcome. Known as the Gallagher Index, the calculation involves taking the square root of half of the sum of the squares of the difference between the percentage of vote and the percentage of seats for each of the political parties (Table 2).

One the face of it, Fiji's 2014 general election was highly proportional compared with elections in other countries with proportional systems

(Vanhanen 2003). The closer the calculated value is to zero, the greater the proportionality of the electoral outcome, and the farther the value is from zero, the lesser the proportionality. However, the proportional system with a 5 percent electoral threshold in Fiji favored larger political parties such as FijiFirst and SODELPA. Five factors played a significant role in determining the electoral outcome: the modified d'Hondt electoral divisor rule, the 5 percent electoral threshold, the ballot structure, the Government of Fiji's Electoral Decree 2014, and the political parties' registration rules. The modified d'Hondt method used was unique to Fiji, where the whole country became one constituency and each voter casted a single vote for their preferred candidate. There were a number of candidates, and these candidates were ranked according to the number of votes received. After all votes were received, the Elections Office allocated the candidate votes to parties, eliminated those parties and independent candidates that did not meet the 5 percent threshold, and then redistributed the seats, recalculated the seats to the parties as percentages, and allocated them to successful candidates. The ballot structure also played an influencing role in the electoral outcome. The ballot paper consisted of numbers from 135 to 382, and each number was randomly allocated to a candidate who represented a political party. The ballot structure was influenced by the Government of Fiji's Electoral Decree 2014, which implemented a national candidates' list, where the number allocated to the candidate was randomly selected. According to Section 36 of the decree, a number of balls equal to the number of candidates, being balls of equal size and weight and each of which was distinctly marked with a number commencing from number 135, were placed in a container. A blindfolded individual then randomly picked a ball, whose number was assigned to a candidate. The issues with random numbers for political candidates were that the voters found memorizing the numbers of their preferred candidates problematic and confused the random number and its relationship with the party because voters in the past mainly voted along party lines.

There were also concerns about the rules governing the registration of political parties, the Government of Fiji's Political Parties (Registration, Conduct, Funding and Disclosures) Decree 2013. The Electoral Commission requires 5,000 signatures before a party can be registered, and the party must have at least 5,000 members from all four divisions of Fiji—2,000 members from the Central Division, 1,750 members from the Western Division, 1,000 members from the Northern Division, and 250 members from the Eastern Division. Public servants were disbarred from holding party positions, and union members were reminded that they had to resign from their positions before taking up a position in a political party. The union-led parties, the Peoples' Democratic Party and the Fiji Labour Party, protested that these

were restrictive conventions and that the same did not apply to the political representatives of the military regime.

Following the 2014 election, Fiji embarked on embedding democratic institutions, but compared to South Africa, Namibia, Suriname, and Guyana, Fiji's political institutions remain grossly underdeveloped, mainly due to eight years of authoritarian rule that did not champion any form of democratic bargaining. The constitution-making process, initiated in 2009, was seen by the antiregime groups as a carefully managed process aimed that facilitating the agenda of the coup leaders. While there were a number of issues leading to the 2014 general election, the elected government of Fiji used a parliamentary committee system to manage issues of national importance. However, soon after the election, partisan politics emerged, leading to allegations that the newly elected Fiji government is continuing with its authoritarian past and not engaging effectively with the opposition parties.

Parliamentary Committees

The new parliament of Fiji is a multiethnic polity, with FijiFirst firmly in control of the legislative agenda. Prime Minister Voreqe Bainimarama was sworn into office by the president of Fiji on September 23, 2014, with fourteen cabinet ministers and five assistant ministers sworn in on September 24. SODELPA and the NFP banded together and formed the opposition bloc, with Ro Teimumu Kepa as the elected leader of the opposition and NFP's Professor Biman Prasad as deputy.

The first order of government business was the scrutiny by the Public Accounts Committee of the Auditor General's Report into government finances, which highlighted a number of problems emanating from lack of accountability and probity in the financial dealings of various government departments since 2006. While the debate within the Public Accounts Committee heated up, the government tabled its first budget, which was criticized by the opposition as fiscally irresponsible. However, the budget provided for the many promises made by FijiFirst during the election; the most important features included government subsidies to water, electricity, and education, followed by an ambitious infrastructure and investment plan. On the day the budget was passed, the opposition members walked out in protest, arguing that none of their suggestions had been taken into consideration via the various parliamentary committees and not enough time was allocated to the budget debate.

In multiparty settings such as in Fiji, consensus-based decisions strengthen governance, and there are studies (Reynolds 1995; Blaug 2002; Premdas 2004; Reilly 2007) that prove that in divided communities, democratic

elections are not sufficient for consensus building among political parties. Structures must be in place that support discourses between and among political parties that represent a multitude of interests, values, and perceptions. The problem with the current Fijian committee system is that it is extremely partisan and fails to instill deliberative democracy, whereby committee systems are enabled to build and sustain consensus political and policy outcomes.

While countries such as Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, and Scotland have advanced forms of the committee system, Fiji's committee system fails to meet the consensus-building threshold established in countries like Guyana, Suriname, South Africa, and Namibia.

South Africa has made great advances on encouraging committees by establishing sixty parliamentary committees with various degrees of engagement with both the public and the opposition (Geisler 2000; Rose-Ackerman, Egidy, and Fowkes 2015). The most significant contribution of South Africa is its ability to engage the opposition in the committee system (Nijzink 2001, 53) and in particular the establishment of the Parliamentary Committee on Women's Rights (Anne Marie Goetz and Shireen Hassim 2003, 75). South Africa has not only adopted the basic concept of democracy but has expedited the involvement of the opposition and the public in political and policy processes. Guyana, which, like Fiji, struggled with questions of ethnicity and culture, was successful in rising above communal politics and instituting controls on public accounts via the Public Accounts Committee (Ann Marie Bissessar and John Gaffar La Guerre 2013). A similar outcome to that of South Africa and Guyana was achieved by Suriname (Singh 2014: 131–48), which engaged in a broad-based consensus initiative on fundamental social issues affecting the community. Namibia, the shining beacon of West Africa, has implemented similar consensus-based programming that allows the country to progress consensus democracy (van Cranenburgh 2006).

In Fiji, the committee system of parliamentary governance is seen by many political observers as institutional engineering by the elected government to manage opposition views. The Privileges Committee was used to punish an opposition member of Parliament who made comments on the Speaker of the House at a SODELPA rally. The opposition was concerned that government members who raised privilege issues in the House against the opposition member were also on the Privileges Committee and as such, the committee processes could not be seen as free from political influence and fair to the accused.

The ongoing failures of parliamentary committees in Fiji raise further questions on good governance and accountability in the country. The

objective of the post-2009 electoral project was to develop and implement consensus-based democracy based on the principles of the 2008 People's Charter for Change. However, as I have highlighted, the institutional structures, such as parliamentary committees, are used not for consensus building but rather to further partisan politics. While the elected government has made significant progress on national identity and proportional-based electoral outcomes, it remains far from instituting deliberative changes that will allow collaborative decision making and an end to the confrontation politics that still is a feature of the new Fijian democracy.

Conclusion

As discussed, compared with South Africa, Namibia, Suriname, and Guyana, Fiji's electoral project of the 1990s failed because it was unsuccessful in reconciling communal and national agendas within a nonethnic political framework. The 1997 Constitution struggled on a number of fronts, including curbing rampant communalism and multiparty governance. Forcing communal parties to work together as a unified cabinet not only created further ethnic tensions but also triggered military intervention in the forms of a civilian coup in 2000 and a military coup in 2006. The post-2006 regime reframed the electoral and the constitutional agendas after 2009 and sought to lead nonethnic political and institutional reforms via the 2013 Constitution, electoral rules, and rules on registration of political party. However, as I have argued, while the 2014 election was highly proportional, a number of factors influenced participation in the election and the final result. These included the ballot structure, the electoral system, and the electoral and political party registration rules. After the 2014 election, a number of parliamentary committees were established to assist in embedding democracy in Fiji. However, the intention of the government was to use the committees to manage opposition views instead of a building consensus democracy, as was the case in other democratic nations that use committee systems. Partisan-led approaches in Fiji have a potential to cause political instability and ethnic tensions that have marred the country's postindependence politics.

REFERENCES

Alley, R.
    1997   Fiji at the crossroads? *Round Table* 342:245–56.

Bissessar, A., and J. G. La Guerre
    2013   *Trinidad and Tabago and Guyana.* Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.

Blaug, R.
    2002   Engineering democracy. *Political Studies* 50:102–16.

Bulsara, H., and B. Kissane
    2009   Arend Lijphardt and the transformation of Irish democracy. *West European Politics* 32 (1): 172–95.

Constitution of the Republic of Fiji
    2013   Constitution of the Republic of Fiji, accessed December 15, 2013. http://www.electionsfiji.gov.fj/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Constitution-of-the-Republic-of-Fiji-.pdf.

Cottrell, J., and Y. Ghai
    2007   Constitutionalising affirmative action in the Fiji islands. *International Journal of Human Rights* 11 (1): 227–57.

Fiji Elections Office
    2014   www.electionsFiji.gov.fj.

Friedman, S.
    2009   An accidental advance? South Africa's 2009 elections. *Journal of Democracy* 20 (4): 108–22.

Gallagher, M.
    1991   Proportionality, disproportionality and electoral systems. *Electoral Studies* 10:33–51.
    1992   Comparing proportional representation electoral systems: Quotas, thresholds, paradoxes and majorities. *British Journal of Political Science* 22:469–96.

Geisler, G.
    2000   Parliament is another terrain of struggle: Women, men and politics in South Africa. *Journal of African Studies* 38 (4): 605–30.

Goetz, A. M., and S. Hassim, eds.
    2003   *Parliamentary standing committees on women's rights.* London: Zed Books.

Government of Fiji
    2013   Political parties (registration, conduct, funding and disclosures) decree 2013, accessed October 12, 2014. https://aceproject.org/ero-en/regions/pacific/FJ/fiji-political-parties-registration-conduct.
    2014   Electoral decree 2014, accessed 15 June 2014. http://www.electionsfiji.gov.fj/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Electoral-Decree-2014.pdf.

Grofman, B., and A. Lijphardt, eds.
    2002   *Electoral rules and party systems in the Nordic nations.* New York: Agathon Press.

Hinz, M., S. Amoo, and D. van Wyk
   2002   *The constitution at work. 10 years of Namibian nationhood*. Windhoek: University of Namibia Press.

Horowitz, D.
   2000   *Ethnic groups in conflict*. Los Angeles, California: Univ. of California Press.

Kambel, Ellen-Rose, and F. Mackay
   1999   *The rights of indigenous peoples and maroons in Suriname*. Copenhagen: International Workgroup for Indigenous Affairs.

Lijphardt, A.
   2004   Constitutional design for divided societies. *Journal of Democracy* 15 (2): 97–109.

Nijzink, L.
   2001   Opposition in the new South African parliament. *Democratization* 8 (1): 53–68.

O'Leary, B. B. Grofman, and J. Elkit
   2005   Divisor methods for sequential portfolio allocation in multi-party executive bodies: Evidence from northern Ireland and Denmark. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (1): 198–211.

Premdas, R.
   2004   The Guyana ethnic quagmire: Problems and solutions for reconciliation. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 10 (2): 251–68.

Reilly, B.
   2006   Political engineering and party politics in conflict-prone societies. *Democratization* 13 (5): 811–27.
   2007   Political engineering in the Asia-Pacific. *Journal of Democracy* 18 (1): 58–72.

Reynolds, A.
   1995   Constitutional engineering in South Africa. *Journal of Democracy* 6 (2): 86–99.

Riedwyl, H., and J. Steiner
   1995   What is proportionality anyhow? *Comparative Politics* 27 (3): 357–69.

Roeder, P. G.
   2005   Power dividing as an alternative to ethnic power sharing. In *Sustainable peace: Power and democracy after Civil Wars*, ed. P. G. Roeder and D. Rothchild, 51–82. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.

Rose-Ackerman, S. S. Egidy, and J. Fowkes
   2015   *Due process of law making: The United States, South Africa, Germany and the European Union*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Ross, R.
  2008   *A concise history of South Africa.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Singh, C.
  2014   Suriname and the limits of consociationalism. *Third World Quarterly* 31 (1):
         131–48.

Taylor, S., and J. Berns
  2010   *Country studies series: Suriname.* Waltham, Massachusetts: Brandeis Univ.
         Press.

van Cranenburgh, O.
  2006   Namibia: Consensus institutions and majority politics. *Democratization* 13 (4):
         584–604.

Vanhanen, T.
  2003.   *Democratization: A comparative analysis of 170 countries.* London: Routledge.

PUTTING KANAK TO WORK: KANAK AND THE COLONIAL LABOR SYSTEM IN NEW CALEDONIA

Adrian Muckle
Victoria University of Wellington

Examining the different categories of "native labor" established in New Caledonia, from the 1870s to the 1940s, this article assesses the extent to which Kanak labor was mobilized en masse for colonial development. It outlines the shift from a perception of Kanak labor as of little value (1880s–1910s) to an awareness of its potential and the need to effectively harness it for colonial interests (1920s–1940s). The mobilization of Kanak labor steadily increased in the 1920s and 1930s and reached an unprecedented level during World War II. This overview and assessment provides a corrective to the colonial discourse of Kanak as lazy or reluctant laborers and its postcolonial equivalent, the idea that Kanak did not contribute to colonial development. It also challenges the perception that only Loyalty Islanders provided labor and analyses of the interwar decades that have focused almost exclusively on the development-oriented initiatives of *la nouvelle politique indigène*.

Putting Kanak to Work: Kanak and the Colonial Labor System in New Caledonia

IN HER 1999 STUDY *The People Trade: Pacific Island Laborers and New Caledonia, 1865–1930*, the definitive history of immigrant "Pacific Island" laborers in New Caledonia, the late Dorothy Shineberg recorded her hope "that this work will soon be followed by a study of indigenous Melanesian workers

in New Caledonia, whom the administration was eventually to succeed in coercing into the labor force, for their story remains to be written."[1] Since then, more has been written about the experiences of the various categories of immigrant laborers brought to New Caledonia from Asia and elsewhere in Oceania, but New Caledonia's internal labor system remains only partially examined.[2] It also has been overlooked in characterizations of the interwar period that emphasize the positive achievements of this era.[3] This article provides the foundations for the kind of history that Shineberg envisaged by examining the different categories of labor created by the colonial administration and assessing the extent to which Kanak labor was mobilized for colonial development.

The following overview of the principal labor mechanisms outlines the colony's growing interest in and demand for Kanak labour. The seven decades at the center of this study saw a shift from a perception of Kanak labor as ineffective and of little value (1880s–1910s) to an awareness of its potential value and the need to harness it more effectively to assist colonization (1920s–1940s). The principal data available are summarized in Table 1 along with estimates for the number of Kanak mobilized as "equivalent full-time laborers" (EFLs).[4] The table shows that the mobilization of Kanak labor increased markedly from the time of World War I, was maintained in the 1920s and 1930s, and reached an unprecedented level during World War II. An understanding of how demand for Kanak labor intensified can be gauged from a survey of the principal direct measures used by the administration to mobilize Kanak labor for itself, for settlers, and for colonial industry more generally.[5]

The Mobilization of "Native" Labor, 1871–1946

During the early decades of French rule (from 1853), Kanak were employed in various ways, including most notoriously as rural police for the penitentiary. It was not until the 1870s and 1880s that the first mechanisms for the mass recruitment and regulation of Kanak labor were established and not until the end of the interwar period that they achieved their objective. The three principal mechanisms were requisitions, indenture, and *les prestations* (labor taxes).[6] Over a period of five to seven decades, each developed from arbitrary attempts to cajole or coerce Kanak into labor with uneven geographical reach to widespread and systematic schemes that directly affected every Kanak man and many women and children besides.

Requisitioned Labor

The earliest and also the most notorious of all the mechanisms for obtaining Kanak labor was the 1871 regulation allowing laborers to be requisitioned for

public services. Introduced to address the difficulties involved in recruiting labor for public services and invoking the civilizing benefits of bringing Kanak "closer to us without the use of coercive measures," the regulation stated that chiefs could be "requested" to provide labor for designated "public services" and set the rates at which requisitioned workers were to be paid.[7] Requisitions had been used before 1871 (when they were referred to as *corvées*), but the 1871 regulation sought to stem abuses that had created tensions.[8] In the following decades, the principal employers of requisitioned labor would include the Post and Telegraph Service and the Topographical Service, and under a 1914 amendment, Kanak could for a time be requisitioned for the French section of the New Hebrides militia.[9]

Like most of the other measures described here, the requisitions were subject to constant critique—especially for their arbitrary and indefinite nature.[10] Particular communities—especially those closest to Nouméa—could find themselves under requisition again and again. Circulars to officials periodically sought to curb abuses, such as the use of requisitions as punishments and the requisitioning of men who were not fit to work,[11] but it was not until 1931–1932—following the International Labour Organization (ILO) Abolition of Forced Labour Convention in 1930 and the French decree of August 21, 1930, organizing *travail public obligatoire* (compulsory public labor) in the colonies—that notable reforms were made. Revised regulations limited the period of the requisition to twelve months and to men ages eighteen to twenty-two. After this time, however, requisitions were used more systematically to ensure that no eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds were omitted.[12]

There are few records of the numbers of people requisitioned in any single year and none that indicate the duration of requisitions. The estimates used in Table 1 (showing 200 laborers under requisition annually in the period up to 1921 and 275 in the following period) draw primarily on Leenhardt's 1918 estimate that the administration needed only about 200 men and a report by the Service des Affaires Indigènes (SAI) from 1930 reckoning that 1 percent of the entire Kanak population (i.e., 270–280 men) was being requisitioned in any given year.[13] The few annual figures located fall in the range of 91 and 400.[14] Tellingly, colonial inspector Georges Gayet found in 1929 that requisitions were a greater burden than *les prestations*,[15] which mobilized the equivalent of about 221 laborers on average (or in the range of 135–275). Some localized records indicate that the burden could have been greater, however; a report for the Poum circonscription shows that in 1939, twenty men had been requisitioned (the equivalent of 8 percent of all adult men in the circonscription). The requisition of a similar percentage across the entire colony would have mobilized approximately 800 men.[16] As shall be seen, the regime intensified markedly during World War II.

Indenture

Between the 1880s and 1930s, various forms of indenture (*le régime de l'engagement*) regulated the ways in which Kanak laborers could "voluntarily" be recruited for private enterprises and public services. The first provisions for the indenture of Kanak were set out in 1882 following the suspension of recruitment from the New Hebrides.[17] In the hope that Kanak could replace imported labor, the 1882 regulation extended to them the 1874 regulations governing Asian (Indian and Chinese), African, and Oceanian laborers from non-French territories as well as Asian, African, and other workers "of non-European race" from elsewhere in the French Empire.[18]

Remaining in place until 1929, the 1882 indenture system's provisions reflected and further inscribed the emerging distinctions between laborers from the Grande terre and Loyalty islands. It applied most rigorously to Loyalty Islanders, to whom it afforded greater protection, and remuneration in return for longer contracts, whereas inhabitants of the Grande terre were subject to a more laissez-faire approach that may be read as accommodating both settler interests and Kanak resistance: the provisions governing the maximum duration of contracts (five years) and the salaries payable for different categories of work were deemed "special to the natives of the Loyaltys," while "the natives from the colony proper" (the Grande terre and other islands) were allowed to agree to shorter contracts and different salary conditions.[19] In theory, the 1882 regulations and associated measures (such as restrictions on movement outside of reserves or districts) forbade Kanak from contracting their labor without entering the indenture regime. In practice, only Loyalty Islanders were fully subject to the regulation, and few efforts were made to inspect arrangements on the Grande terre. In 1911, the administration reported that it had never been able to strictly control this measure, which was applied less and less to "Calédoniens" in the interior but still applied strictly for "Loyaltiens."[20] Notwithstanding efforts in 1912–1913 to remind the public that Kanak could not freely contract their labor, the effect was to leave much of the labor provided by Kanak to settlers on the Grande terre unregulated and therefore unquantified in the administrative archive and statistics. As a result, Loyalty Islanders benefited from a greater archival visibility that was compounded by the administrative division, which until 1928 placed indentured Kanak labor under the Service de l'Immigration and unindentured Kanak labor under the SAI.

Also escaping much of the oversight and protection of the indenture regulations in certain periods was the recruitment as domestic laborers of Kanak women. Evidence of a significant decline in the female population in

the 1911 prompted a 1912 regulation forbidding Kanak women from leaving their *tribus* and ending all current labor contracts. Women could still be employed, but they could not be indentured, and they were expected to "reintegrate" their *tribu* if summoned by a parent, husband, or chief.[21] In 1913, following an outcry from settlers deprived of domestic labor, the measure was modified to allow women employed on contracts to remain in Nouméa—on the grounds that it was pointless to force "uprooted women" to return to their *tribus*—and to allow that women could be granted "free residence" in exceptional circumstances.[22] Women certainly continued to be employed, but it appears that an effect of the 1912–1913 regulations was to deregulate and thus render less visible in the administrative archive much of the labor provided by women, both those from the interior and those from the Loyalty Islands.

Some of the norms that were established for the recruitment of women are revealed in a 1943 investigation into complaints that the administration's representative on Maré had attempted to recruit the wives of Kanak soldiers to work in Nouméa. A newly appointed Resident (a gendarme) had received requests for about ten female laborers and had asked local chiefs to assist with their recruitment. The investigation noted, however, that the chiefs had not been obliged to meet this request. The Resident was instructed that in future, he should not get involved in the recruitment of laborers for private parties, who ought to be making their own arrangements directly with the chiefs. The chiefs were warned that the wives of soldiers should not be recruited unless the women themselves had given their consent.[23] The report indicates the considerable power that remained with chiefs to organize the recruitment of women as well as the willingness of the administration to allow private arrangements to be made between the employers of women and their chiefs.[24]

While there are some gaps in the statistics compiled for this study (notably 1930–1934 and 1938–1942), the numbers of Kanak under indenture were significant. Statistics for the period 1884–1912 indicate an annual average of 824 Kanak under indenture (or in the range of 495–1,243). Of particular note is the recourse to Kanak labor during World War I, when, as shown in Table 1, the combined number of indentured laborers and volunteer soldiers alone reached 1,704 in 1916 (and 2,138 in 1917). In the 1920s, more than 1,800 Kanak were indentured in certain years (1921 and 1925). In terms of the overall number of EFLs, the increased contribution was clearly maintained in the postwar period. In the figures identified for ten of the twenty-one years from 1925 to 1945, the average number of indentured laborers was 1,300, the equivalent of as many as 25 percent of the men fit to work (though some women were certainly included in these figures).[25]

That Loyalty Islanders in particular were sought out for their labor is evident both in the way that indenture was organized and in the results obtained. No details of the proportion of Loyaltiens to Calédoniens recruited are available after 1921, but for earlier years in which a break down is available, Loyaltiens made up 63 percent of indentured laborers on average (or in the range of 37–79 percent). Although representing only about 42 percent of the total Kanak population, Loyalty Islanders certainly figured disproportionately in the indentured labor force, but Kanak from the Grande terre were by no means unrepresented, and, as indicated above, there is ample evidence that the labor they provided was unregulated and therefore underreported.

Harvest Labor

The most hidden of all the labor mobilization mechanisms were the various forms of short-term indenture that existed to provide labor for plantation harvests. The earliest form that this labor recruitment took was the annual recruitment of children for the harvest of coffee and other crops. Records from the early 1900s indicate that about 130 Loyalty Island children were being recruited in this way each year.[26] Initially, the only regulations that existed were those of 1882, which stipulated that for those who had attained their majority, an indenture contract could not be for less than six months (implying that the minimum did not apply to minors); that children (up to fifteen years of age) could not be recruited without the consent of their chief; and that children could not be paid more than 12fr50 a month for agricultural or domestic work. Minimum ages do not appear to have been stipulated, and it is likely that practices were similar to those observed by Shineberg in the recruitment of New Hebridean children.[27]

In 1917, in the face of growing criticism from Loyalty Islander parents and growing demand from settlers, the system of recruiting harvest labor was put on a firmer basis by a regulation for "the employment of native labour for coffee harvests, etc." This provided that "Loyalty islanders or New Caledonians can each year, as far as practicable, be placed at the disposal of settlers in the interior so as to be assigned exclusively to the harvest of coffee, cotton or any other similar culture as well as the harvest of niaouli leaves." Salaries were fixed at 12 francs per month and the maximum period of indenture at four months. The 1917 regulation did not specifically refer to the recruitment of children, but, as noted above, the 1882 indenture regulations (which were included in its preamble) simply required the consent of a chief.[28] The aim of the 1917 regulation was to lessen dependency on Loyalty Islander children and to mobilize more workers from the Grande terre. Facilitated by the Syndicat Agricole and Chambre d'Agriculture, the annual requests for laborers

made by planters to the SAI became unofficial quotas that the SAI's *syn-dics* (agents)—members of the Gendarmerie coloniale—across the Grande terre and Islands were enjoined to fill. Prior to 1920, most of this labor was obtained from Loyalty Islander children, but by the end of the decade, the annual requests for harvest labor were largely being filled on the Grande terre.[29] In the absence of any official records, however, it is difficult to know to what extent children from either the Loyalty Islands or the Grande terre were mobilized for harvest labor in the period after 1920.

Les Prestations

In the mid- to late 1920s, the demand for all Kanak labor stepped up further. In 1924, the requisitions and the various forms of contracted labor were com-plemented on the Grande terre by *les prestations*—an annual labor tax—that required most adult men to provide a fixed number of days of labor each year. As with the indenture system, significant differences initially existed between the Loyalty Islands and the Grande terre. The system existed in a very lim-ited form in the Loyalty Islands from 1893 and the Ile des Pins from 1915, where the labor provided was generally put to the maintenance of roads and schools.[30] On the Grande terre, calls by settlers for the introduction of *presta-tions* had been long resisted on the grounds that Kanak were already provid-ing labor and that it might provoke resistance,[31] but in 1924, a separate regime was introduced for the Grande terre, and from 1929, a single and expanded system applied across all of New Caledonia.[32] The former required twelve days of labor from each adult male with some exceptions, while the system operating from 1929 on had a graduated scale of fifteen days for single men or those without children, twelve days for married men with one to three children, and eight days for married men with four or five children. Their labor was to be restricted to "public works" or, at the governor's discretion, works of "general" but not "private" interest. On the Grande terre, most of the labor was allocated to settler municipalities for road maintenance (work for which some chiefs previously had been contracting the paid services of their subjects), though it could also be directed toward improvements within the reserves (as had been the intent of the earlier regimes on the Loyalty Islands and Ile des Pins).[33]

The 1929 *prestation* system gave some Kanak the option (deemed a privilege) of buying out their *prestations* for a set number of francs per day (*le rachat*). Set annually by the administration, *le rachat* was notionally the equivalent to the wage for a single day's labor. All indentured laborers were required to buy off their *prestations* to minimize interference with their labor contracts. For an unmarried man, between 1933 and 1939, when

le rachat was set at five francs, the annual cost of buying out one's *prestations* (75 francs) was significantly greater than that involved in paying the more notorious head tax (30 francs).[34]

An idea of how the prestations were distributed is provided in an SAI report for 1934 showing that 81,213 days were worked as follows: 41,027 for Municipal Commissions, 37,566 for Travaux Publics on road works, and 2,620 for the Post and Telegraph Service. In the Loyalty Islands and Ile des Pins, all *les prestations* came under the second category, but on the Grande terre, the majority were allocated to the Municipal Commissions. The sum allocated to the Municipalities and the Post and Telegraph Service to oversee *les prestations*, 54,254 francs, was a little less than the amount collected as *le rachat*, 55,055 francs.[35]

Reports from the circonscription level also give some idea of the labor obtained from *les prestations*. In 1937, men in the Kaala-Gomen circonscription were called on to provide 1,586 days of labor on projects that included the repair and maintenance of existing roads, wharves, telegraph lines, and the Gendarmerie; the building of an airstrip and new roads; and making covers for tools.[36] The records of the Koné municipality for 1940 show that it was allocated 2,482 days of labor from 185 *prestataires* (the equivalent of eight full-time workers).[37] Measured in terms of equivalent full-time laborers, *les prestations* annually provided the colony as a whole with about 221 laborers on average.[38]

Labor for Colonization and Public Works

Further intensifying the interwar pressure on Kanak labor were new forms of short-term indenture. In April 1925, shortly after *les prestations* came into effect on the Grande terre, a circular issued to the *syndics* by Governor Guyon on "native labor for colonization" foreshadowed the increased pressure that would henceforth be brought to bear on Kanak. The supply of labor was, Guyon explained, a matter of the greatest importance, and as it was no longer possible for the colony to rely on imported labor, the "autochthonous native population" would have to play its part. Guyon enjoined *syndics* to "convince" Kanak that this was in their own best interests. In carrying out this task, *syndics* were to pay special attention to salaries and conditions, but Guyon referred to no specific regulations other than "the normal rates" established for categories of labor or services.[39] *Syndics*, though, were required to regularly report on the willingness of Kanak to meet calls for labor.

In 1929, a form of short-term indenture was introduced in a drive to provide labor to the Service des Travaux Publics for Guyon's public works schemes. The May 1929 regulation on the employment of native laborers

for public works provided a new device for putting Kanak to work. Under its principal article,

> Adult natives of the male sex, who are fit to work, are called on to carry out works on the worksites of the Public Works Service.
>
> Requests for labour are to be addressed by the Head of the Public Works Service to the Head of the Service of Native Affairs who will submit them to the Governor and then transmit them to the Agents of Native Affairs to be executed with the assistance of the Great Chiefs in the *tribus* and with regard to local requirements both those of colonisation and those of the native collectivities.

The regulations limited the duration of work to three consecutive months in any one year "so as not to distance natives from their *tribu* or family for too great a period."[40] As colonial inspector Gayet noted, this was a limited form of indenture rather than *travail public obligatoire* (compulsory public labor), but such distinctions were not, he observed, so clear in practice, as the recruitment was carried out by gendarmes and chiefs "whose authority is very much respected in the bush."[41] The monthly reports provided by gendarmes who acted as *syndics* for the SAI show that chiefs who were called on to supply such laborers had limited margins for maneuver; when chiefs failed to comply, a *syndic* could secure compliance by threatening to designate the laborers himself and to report the chief to the authorities in Nouméa.[42] The following comment by a *syndic* on the refusal of men at Nékliai to obey the orders of a chief who had designated them was by no means atypical: "I was therefore obliged to make myself feared and to make a request for a punishment against two natives from the tribu of Nékliaï."[43]

The period 1925–1929 marked a turning point in awareness of the potential value to the colony of Kanak labor—as illustrated in the findings of the 1929 colonial inspection. Inspector Gayet concluded that the exploitation of Kanak labor was at saturation point: "There is therefore no longer any excess native labour in New Caledonia. The numbers requisitioned and under indenture are at a maximum level which it would be desirable to lower," he wrote, so that families could be reconstituted and so that *tribus* had the freedom to develop their own lands.[44] The administration had required Kanak to develop their own coffee plantations, but when it came to harvest time, it was not prepared to let up on its commitment to provide settlers with cheap seasonal labour. By Gayet's estimate, only seven *tribus*, each with more than 300 residents on the Grande terre (mainly in the north and east) and the Loyalty

Islands, were capable of providing an appreciable number of seasonal workers for settlers.[45]

Gayet intended his report as a warning to the administration to relax the pressure on Kanak, but he himself observed that recourse to Kanak labor was growing *despite* the expansion of immigration.[46] Moreover, his report certainly was not interpreted as a warning by the local administration, on whom it was dawning that Kanak were a resource of as-yet-unrealized potential. In reply to Gayet, the acting governor, Arboussier, acknowledged that "all matters relating to native policy had long been very neglected in this colony" due to its status as "a country of settlement for the white race." "We didn't realise until very late," he continued, "perhaps too late, that the natives represented, from an economic point of view, an interesting element."[47] Arboussier hoped that better results (and more labor) might be obtained from a more efficient service, which was effected by definitively separating the SAI from the Immigration Service. From October 1929, the SAI alone became responsible for supervising all workers of *"race océanienne"*—"New Caledonians, Loyalty Islanders, New Hebrideans and Wallisians." In the subsequent overhaul of the 1882 indenture regulations, the distinctions made between the Loyalty Islands and the Grande terre disappeared.[48]

By the 1930s, the mobilization of Kanak labor had been firmly established among the key functions of the SAI. In 1937, the SAI reported that "native labour is the only sort in New Caledonia that does not entail a significant increase in the costs of production; it alone has the capacity to create a favourable balance sheet for the territory's economy." Its aim, therefore, was "to obtain the complete replacement of recruitment by the spontaneous offer of labour."[49] By this time, the labor provided under the 1917 and 1929 regulations was being referred to as *"aide à la colonisation"* (assistance for colonization) and measured annually in terms of the total number of days worked. The extent of this has been obscured by catchall terms such as "forced labor" and understandable confusion with the requisitions and *les prestations*; the *"aide"* provided was remunerated (unlike *les prestations*) and was officially unforced (unlike the requisitions, though in practice, it may have been indistinguishable). Providing the equivalent of 530 full-time laborers annually (see Table 1),[50] it was also much more extensive than the *prestation* system.

Notwithstanding the increasingly systematic recourse to labor from the Grande terre, the indentured labor provided by Loyalty Islanders remained more clearly in the official eye. There was growing concern that the social and economic impacts of mass indenture weighed disproportionately on Loyalty Islanders. This issue had been identified as a concern as early as 1918 (when it was noted that they had made up more than 75 percent of indentured laborers that year) and raised again during the 1929 inspection, which found

that 27 percent of the adult male population of Lifou alone was working offshore.[51] Eventually, in 1936, more restrictive indenture regulations were introduced for the Loyalty Islands to encourage "repopulation" and to address the problems presented for "everyday life" by the overrecruitment of young or married men. The new regulations limited recruitment to no more than one-third of any *tribu*, but the administration reserved the right to authorize exceptions to meet labor shortfalls on the mainland. Married men could not be indentured unless able to provide for their dependents, and one-third of their salary would be retained for their family. Women could not be indentured until their thirtieth year and then only if they did not have any children.[52]

The War Years: "The Hardening" of the Colonial Labor System

If recourse to Kanak labor had intensified and become more systematic since the 1920s, it also had become less arbitrary, and in the 1930s, some modest reforms and restrictions had been introduced. However, with the outbreak of war in 1939, most of these reforms went out the window, and by 1945, the mobilization of Kanak labor had reached new heights. Historian Ismet Kurtovitch has described a "hardening, without any precedent in the history of the country," of the labor regimes.[53] This was evident in all aspects of labor mobilization but especially in the use of requisitioned labor.

In a measure anticipated by military authorities since the 1920s,[54] a regulation introduced in December 1939 removed all earlier exemptions relating to labor requisitions, stating,

> For the duration of the war, the native Oceanians, non-French citizens living in New Caledonia and its dependencies, are required to defer to the orders given to them by the agents of native affairs for the purposes of carrying out works of *public, strategic, national or colonial interest.*[55]

The use of requisitioned labor was no longer formally restricted to "public services"; it could now also be used for works of "public interest" (including work on coastal shipping, the loading of nickel ore, and the harvesting of coprah and coffee).[56] As Kurtovitch has explained, these measures were not endorsed by the central government in Paris, and the local administration was forced to abrogate them in June 1940 (shortly before France's surrender to Germany). However, in February 1941, after New Caledonia rallied to the Free French movement, the Sautot administration signed the abrogated measures back into effect. This too ought to have been approved by central government, but approval was never solicited.[57] Further adjustments

hardened and widened the regime (most notably by allowing women and children to be requisitioned as harvest labor), and despite complaints from the Catholic mission, the measures remained in place until *travail public obligatoire* was abolished in 1946.[58]

Under the wartime regulations, requisition was again openly used as a punishment and a means of removing "troublemakers." Minor offenders could be requisitioned until they had earned enough to be sent back to their districts.[59] In more serious cases, as in 1943, when three men from Poneri-houen were suspected of secretly plotting for the American takeover of New Caledonia, the offenders could be requisitioned for a full year.[60]

One area of the labor regime that was slightly reformed during the war was the indenture regulations. In 1943, the regulations that had been in place since 1929 were replaced.[61] Although the basic provisions remained the same, the new regulations contained some modest improvements, including more detailed provisions regarding workplace accidents, a provision that minors had to have parental consent (rather than the consent of a chief), a reduction of the "bonus" paid to chiefs from 10 to 5 percent (and payable only during the first year rather than the first two years), and the removal of the bonuses paid to police for the capture of laborers in breach of their contracts. It also set the maximum number of hours that could be worked each day at nine and included provisions for paid maternity leave for women (ten days before giving birth and twenty afterward).[62] It is possible that such reforms were a factor in helping to maintain recruitment levels during the war.

Further increasing the wartime pressure on Kanak labor, however, was the enlistment of Kanak in the Free French army and the demands of the Allied (mainly US) forces based in New Caledonia from 1942. By the end of 1942, 1,137 Kanak men had enlisted as volunteers in the armed forces.[63] Fewer than one hundred of these men saw service overseas (about sixty-eight in the army); the majority remained in barracks in New Caledonia, where they were put to laboring duties. The extent of this laboring contribution is thus disguised by their status as military personnel; rather than being distanced from the labor regime,[64] they were in fact under the thumb of a more intense system. In addition, in December 1942, French and US authorities agreed that Kanak labor for the Allied forces would be recruited through the SAI and employed on terms similar to those operating before the war. Five hundred men were to be employed at docks on three-month rotations under French overseers. Another 150 were to be made available as guides (though as many as 250 were initially recruited before being reduced to 170) and as many as 200 more for other duties. Many more were reportedly employed on the US bases without authorization. By August 1943, authorities were concerned that there were insufficient workers available for the harvests, and

later in 1943, they urged that the Allied forces make workers available for roadworks.[65]

The numbers of Kanak mobilized as laborers during the war years largely speak for themselves, though they were also talked up by the administration. In November 1943, the administration reported that out of 5,340 "Natives fit for work," 1,186 had enlisted as volunteers in the army and navy, about 1,000 were employed by private enterprises, 500 were employed by public services, and at least 1,142 were employed by the US Army (not including those who had been recruited unofficially). Only 1,512 able-bodied men remained in the *tribus*.[66] At about the same time, statistics showing that 11 percent of the population of Canala, Kouaoua and Nakéty (or 21 percent of that region's adult male population) were volunteers or permanently mobilized as indentured or requisitioned laborers prompted the Catholic missionary Luneau to observe that the same level of mobilization in the United States would raise more than 15.6 million men.[67] Still higher figures were reported in 1944 and 1945. For the head of the SAI, writing at the end of 1945, "These figures require no commentary. They show the extraordinary effort that the natives have made for the war. (Let's not forget either that 1,000 of them were mobilised, from a total of 5,000 fit to work.)" The only wonder, he reported, was "that the native has been so malleable—and this is truly extraordinary in the literal sense of the word."[68]

Counting the Laborers

How many laborers did Kanak provide? The preceding overview on its own points to the increased demands placed on Kanak from the 1920s on as the mechanisms for labor recruitment multiplied and became more systematic. As the arbitrary aspects of the system were attenuated, its reach widened. Although this article has only begun to trace the official/unofficial or public/private contours of labour, it reveals the mass mobilization of Kanak labor for colonial projects and interests, especially during the interwar era.

Charting the extent to which Kanak labor was *formally* mobilized has been a considerable challenge due to significant gaps in the archives. It must be remembered that the figures provided here are only the surviving archival tip of the iceberg. The discussion above has identified several official blind spots concerning the more casual employment of Kanak on the Grande terre, the unregulated recruitment of women as domestic servants, and the use of children for harvest labor. Furthermore (and again with the exception of the Loyalty Islands), very little information remains from the level of the *tribus*, and it is difficult to examine the degree to which particular communities were prevailed on for labor across the period.

What the emerging picture shows is that Kanak were mobilized as labor-
ers far more extensively than colonial officials usually dared admit and more
than some contemporary representations of colonial labor might allow. The
figures compiled for this study suggest that through requisitions, the inden-
ture regime, *les prestations*, and *l'aide à la colonisation*, the colony annually
mobilized an average of 2,579 Kanak in the period 1925–1945. Relative to
the 7,000 to 10,000 immigrant workers under indenture during the 1920s,
this may seem modest, but, as shown in the Table 2, it was the equivalent
of about 25 percent of all adult Kanak men and 45 percent of those "fit to
work." In the principal war years (1942–1945) and taking into account the
volunteers in the armed forces, these figures rose to around 37 and 68 per-
cent, respectively.

These figures tend to confirm Kurtovitch's estimate that prior to 1939,
about 25 percent of Kanak men were working outside of the reserves.[69]
They also show that during the war years, the administration managed to at
least maintain at prewar levels the number of laborers mobilized while also
enlisting one-fifth of all able-bodied men in the armed forces. Regardless
of whether Kanak were willing to work on colonial terms—and bearing in
mind that the figures presented here must be read as minimums that do not
account for unregulated forms of labor for settlers (including much of the
labor of women and children), for military service in the 1920s and 1930s,
for mandatory penal work, or for labor within the reserves—there were not
enough Kanak workers to meet colonial demand.

Indeed, this was the conclusion that the Catholic mission came to in 1943–
1944 in a series of complaints about the impact of excessive labor mobiliza-
tion on *tribus* and families, and it was one that the colonial inspectorate also
reached following the war.[70] Called in 1946 to report on a development pro-
gram for New Caledonia, the colonial inspector Emmanuel Tupinier iden-
tified the supply of labor as the critical challenge facing the colony. New
Caledonia, he reported, had never been able to meet its labor needs: "From
about 30,000 natives we can scarcely count on more than 4,500 adult men fit
to provide a sustained effort." However, to maintain production within the
reserves,

> it is not possible to count on more than 1,800 to 2,000 natives who
> may be recruited on salaries in the public services as well as in the
> agricultural and mining sector.

In fact this number has been largely surpassed in recent years through the
use of requisitions. These requisitions, which may have been justified in part
by the wartime situation and especially by the presence of the American

troops, were used in an abusive fashion, notably for the supply of labour to the European settlers.[71]

To this, it must be added that the figure of 1,800 to 2,000 had been not only exceeded in the war years but also regularly exceeded in the two decades before the war.

Further Evaluations

The labor provided by Kanak prior to 1946 has been remembered and forgotten in two distinct ways. On the one hand, it has been collectively remembered by Kanak as "forced labor." On the other hand, the extent of the Kanak contribution to colonial development has been understated in contemporary political discourses that privilege the contributions made by immigrant workers and free or penal settlers. A good example is the preamble to the 1998 Nouméa Accord, which explains that "the Territory's new communities participated in mining and agricultural activity, often under difficult circumstances, and, with the help of the State [also participated] in the shaping of New Caledonia. Their determination and inventiveness made it possible to use resources and lay a foundation for development." On the other hand, Kanak "were relegated to the geographical, economic and political fringes of their own country, which, in a proud people not without warrior traditions, could not but cause revolts."[72] As important as it is for recognizing Kanak identity, the preamble reinscribes some long-standing colonial tropes by reducing Kanak history under colonial rule to a series of violent outbursts that occurred while settlers and immigrants got on with the development of the colony.

Indeed, characterizations of Kanak labor in the interwar era are still beholden to persistent colonial commonplaces of the sort captured in a 1943 US Army report: "The natives, being comfortable landowners, will not work in the mines, etc. and the French have been compelled to import large numbers of Pacific islanders and Asiatic laborers for the mines and plantations, and even as house servants."[73] The more recent historiography of the interwar era has generally emphasized the positive achievements of the so-called new native policy (*la nouvelle politique indigène*)—the term associated with Albert Sarraut's post–World War I call for a more humane colonial policy and greater colonial development—in the 1930s. In 1979, geographer Alain Saussol characterized the period 1925–1946 as one of "renewal" or even a "peaceful revolution" associated with slow rise in the population and the efforts made to develop coffee plantations in the reserves.[74] A later study of this era and discussions of the colonial period in the Kanak cultural review *Mwà Véé* have emphasized the efforts of Governor Guyon between 1925 and 1932; the head of the SAI, Meunier, between 1931 and 1934; and the

particular achievements made in the development of coffee plantations in the reserves.[75]

As this article has shown, however, Kanak were extensively mobilized as laborers (whether voluntarily or through coercion) from the 1920s on. The fundamental problem for colonial authorities was not that Kanak would not work or were not suited to the kinds of labor required (though these were sometimes cited as issues); it was first and foremost that they were not available in sufficient numbers. The development-oriented initiatives of *la nouvelle politique indigène* had an important counterpart: the mass mobilization of Kanak labor outside of the reserves. Some of the more arbitrary aspects of the colonial regime did diminish in the interwar period, but at the same time, the colonial regime became more intensive and systematic in calling on Kanak labor.

The distinctions between the formal categories examined in this article—indenture, requisitions, labor taxes, and short-term contracts—certainly were not always respected and were not necessarily meaningful to the laborers themselves. In all cases, considerable power lay with chiefs and *syndics* to compel men to work, and it is understandable that the collective Kanak memory of this era as that of "forced labor" elides the official distinctions. However, an appreciation of the official categories is essential for any attempt to evaluate the extent of labor mobilization and in turn for any attempt to evaluate the experience. Most important, they throw into relief the various blind spots in the colonial administration's regulation of Kanak labor and in its archives. This in turn helps explain why Kanak labor has not been much studied as well as why it has been unevenly represented in public discourse.

In charting the development of the various categories of labor and their regulation, this article helps to explain the greater visibility of Loyalty Islander laborers in the colonial archive (and in popular representations of colonial labor) and the relative invisibility of workers from the Grande terre. Not only have the contributions made by Kanak in general been overlooked or downplayed, but the contributions of Kanak from the Grande terre in particular have been understated.

Appendix: Notes on Tables 1 and 2

Table 1 estimates the number of Kanak mobilized as laborers using the notion of an equivalent full-time laborer (EFL). Where the original data have been recorded in terms of days of labor, the number of EFLs has been calculated on the number of days labor expected from a laborer indentured for a full year: approximately 305 (i.e., 365 days less Sundays and public holidays). The estimates used in years where no data have been obtained are based on the

TABLE 1. **Equivalent full-time laborers (EFLs), 1897–1945.**

Year	Requisitions	Indenture	Prestations		"Aide a la colonisation"		Allies and Public Services, 1943–1945		Army, 1916–1917, 1942–1945	Total EFLs
			Days	EFL	Days	EFL	Days	EFL		
1897	200	635			50,000	164				999
1901	200	1,243			50,000	164				1,607
1906	200	757			80,000	262				1,219
1911	200	719			100,000	328				1,247
1916	200	988			100,000	328			716	2,232
1917	200	1,001			100,000	328			1,137	2,666
1921	200	1,837			100,000	328				2,365
1925	275	1,863			161,546	530				2,668
1926	275	1,356	41,268	135	161,546	530				2,296
1927	275	1,282	42,036	138	161,546	530				2,224
1928	275	958	42,288	139	161,546	530				1,901
1929	275	1,573	83,200	273	161,546	530				2,650
1930	275	1,300	83,955	275	161,546	530				2,380
1931	275	1,300	80,351	263	161,546	530				2,368

TABLE 1. CONTINUED.

Year	Requisitions	Indenture	Prestations		"Aide a la colonisation"		Allies and Public Services, 1943–1945		Army, 1916–1917, 1942–1945	Total EFLs
			Days	EFL	Days	EFL	Days	EFL		
1932	275	*1,300*	80,632	264	*161,546*	*530*				2,369
1933	275	*1,300*	79,181	260	*161,546*	*530*				2,364
1934	275	*1,300*	81,070	266	*161,546*	*530*				2,370
1935	275	1,359	79,892	262	183,748	602				2,498
1936	275	1,095	72,946	239	155,113	509				2,118
1937	275	1,095	75,417	247	*161,546*	*530*				2,147
1938		*1,300*	78,764	258	261,380	857				2,415
1939	275	*1,300*	80,176	263	160,054	525				2,363
1940	275	*1,300*	70,411	231	147,436	483				2,289
1941	275	*1,300*	66,869	219	189,092	620				2,414
1942	275	*1,300*	56,182	184	174,636	573			1,300	3,632
1943		1,250	53,111	174	117,608	386	141,153	463	1,157	3,430
1944		*1,300*	54,166	178	122,043	400	215,705	707	*1,078*	3,663
1945		1,168	48,775	160	145,410	477	240,630	789	1,000	3,594

Figures in italics are estimates.

TABLE 2. **Equivalent full-time laborers (EFLs) as a percentage of the population, 1897–1945.**

Year	Kanak Population	Adult Women	Adult Men	Men "Fit to Work"	EFLs (Table 1)	EFLs as % of Kanak Population	EFLs as % of Men	EFLs as % of Men "fit to Work"
1897	30,304	8,862 (29%)	10,350 (34%)	5,693	999	3	10	18
1901	29,158		9,914	5,453	1,607	6	16	18
1906	28,597	7,861 (27%)	9,957 (35%)	5,476	1,219	4	12	29
1911	28,075	7,987 (28%)	10,133 (36%)	5,573	1,247	4	12	22
1916	28,868		10,104	5,557	2,232	8	22	22
1917	28,922		10,123	5,567	2,666	9	26	40
1921	27,100	8,604 (32%)	9,385 (35%)	5,162	2,365	9	25	52
1925	27,337		9,295	5,112	2,668	10	29	52
1926	27,470	8,779 (32%)	9,034 (33%)	4,969	2,296	8	25	46
1927	27,616		9,389	5,164	2,224	8	24	43
1928	27,776		9,444	5,194	1,901	7	20	37
1929	27,774		9,443	5,194	2,650	10	28	51
1930	27,987		9,516	5,234	2,380	9	25	45
1931	27,896	9,530 (34%)	9,511 (34%)	5,231	2,368	8	25	45
1932	27,966		9,508	5,230	2,369	8	25	45

TABLE 2. CONTINUED.

Year	Kanak Population	Adult Women	Adult Men	Men "Fit to Work"	EFLs (Table 1)	EFLs as % of Kanak Population	EFLs as % of Men	EFLs as % of Men "fit to Work"
1933	28,063		*9,541*	*5,248*	2,364	8	25	45
1934	28,272		9,330	*5,131*	2,370	8	25	46
1935	28,404		9,089	*4,999*	2,498	9	27	50
1936	28,760	8,976 (31%)	9,299 (32%)	*5,114*	2,118	7	23	41
1937	29,048	9,167 (32%)	9,649 (33%)	*5,307*	2,147	7	22	40
1938	28,986		9,565	*5,261*	2,415	8	25	46
1939	29,368	9,069 (31%)	9,086 (31%)	*4,997*	2,363	8	26	47
1940	29,467		*9,135*	*5,024*	2,289	8	25	46
1941	29,920		9,574	*5,266*	2,414	8	25	46
1942	30,194	9,221 (31%)	9,586 (32%)	5,125	3,632	12	38	71
1943	30,432	9,352 (31%)	9,713 (32%)	5,340	3,430	11	35	64
1944	30,489		9,756	5,366	3,663	12	38	68
1945	30,515		9,765	5,390	3,594	12	37	67

Figures in italics are estimates.

averages of the known figures in the period 1925–1945 (and lower estimates have been suggested for the pre-1925 period).

The forms of labor documented in the statistics obtained are generally biased toward the labor provided by adult men. The few statistics relating to children have not been included, though some of their labor (and that of women) will have been captured under "*aide à la colonisation.*" Some of the indenture figures will also include women, though breakdowns by gender are generally not available. Only men were subject to *les prestations*, and until 1941–1945, only men were subject to the requisitions.

In the more detailed statistics available for 1943–1945 ("Allies and Public Services, 1943–45"), the work for Allied forces accounted for 60 to 73 percent of the days worked, with others recorded as allocated to public works, the Post and Telegraph Service, the Topographical Service, and the municipalities. I have assumed that this includes all of the labor that might be counted as requisitions. The SAI itself estimated in 1945 that 1,000 to 1,100 of 2,571 laborers employed in 1945 had been requisitioned.[76]

Space does not permit a listing of all the sources used to compile Table 1. The principal sources used are as follows: for *prestations*, the proceedings of the Conseil général and the annual taxation lists published in the *Journal officiel*, and, for "*aide à la colonisation*," the annual reports of the SAI from 1935 to 1945 (held mostly in the Archives de la Nouvelle-Calédonie). Figures on indenture come from a more diverse range of secondary and primary sources, including annual reports of the SAI and Service de l'Immigration, the Conseil général, census data, and reports by the colonial inspectorate.

In Table 2, the total number of EFLs is shown as a percentage of the total Kanak population as well as of the adult male population (men age 16 and over) and the number of men fit to work (estimated at 55 percent of the adult male population). As noted above, however, some of the data (notably for indentured labor) do include women, and therefore the comparison with the male workforce should be treated as indicative rather than absolute. The estimate that only 55 percent of adult men were fit to work is derived from figures dating from 1942, 1943, and 1945. Supporting evidence for generalizing this estimate can be found in Leenhardt's 1918 estimate that only about 52 percent of the adult male population of Monéo was fit to work; detailed statistics for Kouaoua, Canala, and Nakety from around 1942 that show that men ages 16 to 60 made up 55.9 percent of the adult male population; and records from Koné in 1939, where the 185 *prestataires* identified for 1940 represented 55.7 percent of the region's adult male population (using 1937 figures).[77] However, higher estimates for the percentage of men fit to work can be found; for instance, a 1929 report on Lifou indicated that 87 percent of the island's adult men were fit to work.[78]

Censuses were conducted on a quinquennial basis, and the SAI often provided interim figures showing annual movements in the population. The principal sources used include census figures (reported variously in the *Journal officiel* and the local press), SAI reports, and an article by Pierre Métais.[79]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

1. Dorothy Shineberg, *The people trade: Pacific Island laborers and New Caledonia, 1865–1930* (Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 1999), 10.

2. Aspects of Kanak labor recruitment are examined in Sonia Grochain, Les Kanak et le travail en Province Nord de la Nouvelle-Calédonie, Thèse de doctorat en sciences sociales (Paris: EHESS/ENS, 2007), 108–43; Ismet Kurtovitch De la réglementation du travail obligatoire pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, *Études Mélanésiennes* 29 (1995): 37–55, and *La vie politique en Nouvelle-Calédonie: 1940–1953* (Lille: Atelier national de reproduction de thèses, 2000); Frédéric Angleviel, De l'engagement comme "esclavage volontaire": Le cas des Océaniens, Kanaks et Asiatiques en Nouvelle-Calédonie (1853–1963), *Journal de la Société des Océanistes* (hereinafter *JSO*) 110, no. 1 (2000): 65–81; and Donna Winslow, Workers in Colonial New Caledonia to 1945, in *Labour in the South Pacific*, ed. Clive Moore, Jacqueline Leckie, and Doug Munro (Townsville: James Cook Univ. of Northern Queensland, 1990), 108–21.

3. See the final section of this article.

4. The notion of an EFL is an artificial one used here to help estimate the proportion of the Kanak population mobilized for colonial work. A detailed note on the table and the assumptions underlying the estimates is provided at the end of this article.

5. To focus on the extent of labor mobilization, this article sets aside associated questions about labor conditions and the degree of coercion involved in recruitment.

6. Indirect measures to encourage Kanak participation in the labor system, such as head taxes (1899–1945), war taxes (1941–1945), and fines imposed under the *indigénat*, are to be examined in a larger project. Three other forms of labor mobilization used in New Caledonia but not examined here were the mandatory penal work carried out by prisoners, military service (from 1920), and compulsory cultivation in the reserves. A discussion of how these operated in French West Africa is provided in Babacar Fall, *Le travail forcé en Afrique occidentale française (1900–1945)* (Paris: Karthala, 1993).

7. Arrêté no. 130, May 6, 1871 (recrutement des travailleurs indigènes pour les services publics), *Bulletin officiel de la Nouvelle-Calédonie* (hereinafter *BONC*), May 1871, 213–15.

8. Joël Dauphiné, *Chronologie foncière et agricole de la Nouvelle-Calédonie, 1853–1903* (Paris: Harmattan, 1987), 17, 42, and 55.

9. Arrêté no. 357, March 16, 1914, 97W17, Archives de la Nouvelle-Calédonie (hereinafter ANC).

10. Criticisms were regularly documented by the colonial inspectorate. Another notable critic was Maurice Leenhardt, La Réquisition des indigènes en Nouvelle-Calédonie (1918), 12J4, ANC.

11. For example, Repiquet to syndics, delegates, etc., no. 1143, September 16, 1918, CONTR 828, Centre des Archives d'Outre-mer, Aix-en-Provence (hereinafter CAOM); Gouverneur to Min. des Colonies, no. 682AI, Nouméa, December 15, 1930 (Réponse à une lettre de la Ligue des Droits de l'Homme), 107W, VII 3, ANC.

12. Arrêté no. 220, February 25, 1931, *Journal officiel de la Nouvelle-Calédonie* (hereinafter *JONC*) 3591 (March 7, 1931); Arrêté no. 694, June 15, 1932, *JONC* 3665 (1932). Although the ILO convention came into effect in 1932, France would not ratify it until 1937–1938. The practice of recruiting only eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds appears to have begun in the mid-1920s.

13. Leenhardt, La Réquisition des indigènes en Nouvelle-Calédonie; SAI, Rapport no. 151 (travail public obligatoire), February 12, 1931, Conseil privé, February 25, 1931, 44W, ANC.

14. In 1918, the colonial inspector Jean Pégourier found that 404 people had been requisitioned, but the SAI insisted that the actual figure was only 378; see Pégourier, Rapport no. 106 (SAI), May 1, 1919, CONTR 828, CAOM. As Leenhardt's 1918 report made clear, however, official statistics included only those requisitioned to work in Nouméa, and requisitions made in the interior were not reported. An SAI report for 1936, gives the lowest figure encountered: 91 Kanak requisitioned; see SAI, Rapport du 27 janv. 1937, 97W43, ANC.

15. Gayet, Rapport no. 33 (Vérification de M. le Commandant Harelle), June 29, 1929, AFFPOL 746, CAOM.

16. René Patoche (Syndic des Affaires Indigènes), Rapport no. 28/AI, Poum, September 20, 1939, 107W #720, ANC.

17. Compare Shineberg, *The people trade*, 50–51.

18. Arrêté no. 192, August 8, 1882 (organisant l'engagement des travailleurs indigènes de la Nouvelle-Calédonie), *BONC*, August 1882, 340–49. Denouncing its illegality (on the grounds that it breached the Civil Code), Leenhardt provided an extensive critique of the 1882 régime and its coercive practices in Un texte inédit: "Notes sur le régime de l'engagement des indigènes en Nouvelle-Calédonie, mars 1914," *JSO* 58–59 (1978): 9–18.

19. In 1902, both Calédoniens and Loyaltiens were being indentured on contracts of a year or more, while other "*Calédoniens des tribus*" were "working temporarily without

contracts." Aubry Lecomte (chef SAI), Note relative aux salaires des Indigènes calédoniens et loyaltiens, October 10, 1902, 12J62, ANC.

20. Situation Générale de la Colonie pendant l'année 1911, AFFPOL 271, CAOM.

21. Arrêté no. 160, February 12, 1912 (interdisant aux femmes et aux filles indigènes de la Nouvelle-Calédonie et Dépendances de quitter leur tribu), *JONC* 2632 (February 15, 1912).

22. Arrêté no. 102/4 bis, October 17, 1913 (modifiant celui du 12 fév. 1912 relatif au rengagement des femmes et filles indigènes), *JONC* 2684 (January 3 and 10, 1914).

23. Robert (Inspecteur des Affaires Indigènes), Rapport no. 1046 AI (sur des griefs formulés par les Grands chefs indigènes de Maré), May 7, 1943, 98W89, ANC.

24. For further discussion of labor mobility and gender, see Adrian Muckle, "Natives," "immigrants" and "*libérés*": The colonial regulation of mobility in New Caledonia, *Law Text Culture* 15 (2011): 135–61, and Dorothée Dussy, *Nouméa, ville Océanienne? S'approprier la ville* (Paris: Karthala, 2012), 110–14.

25. In most extant statistics, no gender breakdown is provided, but one exception indicates that women continued to be recorded as indentured labourers after 1912: in 1936, women made up 252 (23 percent) of the 1,095 *engagés* reported by the SAI (SAI report for January 27, 1937, 97W43, ANC). Another potential measure of the numbers of women working—though not necessarily indentured—can be obtained from the quinquennial census figures for Kanak living outside their *tribus*, for example, 217 women in 1901, 108 in 1911, and 312 in 1921. I have not been able to obtain data for after 1921.

26. This is the average for 1909–1911 and 1916. The census figures for the number of children outside of their *tribus* in 1901, 1911, and 1921 were 95, 41, and 140, respectively.

27. See articles 8 and 23, respectively, of the 1882 regulations: Arrêté no. 192, August 8, 1882, and *BONC*, August 1882, 340–49; cf. Shineberg, *The people trade*, 116–18. Shineberg noted, "The legal indenture of unaccompanied children was a phenomenon peculiar to the New Caledonian segment of the labor trade." From 1865 to 1882, unaccompanied children as young as six years were recruited from the New Hebrides and from the age of ten thereafter. Leenhardt reported that the children "recruited" were ages 11–13 years. Leenhardt, Un texte inédit, 14.

28. Arrêté no. 11 bis, January 4, 1917 (réglant l'emploi de la main d'oeuvre indigène pour la cueillette du café), *JONC* 2832 (January 13, 1917); cf. article 8 of Arrêté no. 192, August 8, 1882, and *BONC*, August 1882, 340–49.

29. Harelle, the head of the SAI, noted in 1929 that since 1919, "Loyaltiens" had been recruited for the coffee harvest only in 1927 and 1929. Gayet, Rapport no. 34 (Vérification de M. Tivollier, Résident à Lifou), April 23, 1929, CONTR 828, CAOM.

30. Arrêté no. 862, September 8, 1893 (réglementant les diverses corvées auxquelles peuvent être assujétis les indigènes des Loyalty), *JONC* 1768 (September 16, 1893); Arrêté no. 323, April 16, 1915 (relatif à l'entretien des routes et sentiers de l'Ile des Pins); *JONC* 2741 (April 24, 1915).

31. Conseil Général, November 23, 1918, CONTR 828, CAOM.

32. Arrêté no. 999, December 6, 1922 (réglementant les prestations des indigènes); AFF POL 741, CAOM; Arrêté no. 1198, October 27, 1928 (promulguant le décret du 15 mai 1928, sur le régime des prestations); *JONC* 3466 (November 10, 1928). The 1922 regulations came into effect in 1924. The 1928 regulations came into effect in 1929.

33. *Prestations* were not remunerated, but expenses for overseers, equipment, and, under the 1928 regulation, rations (if provisions could not be transported from the *tribu* to the work site) were provided.

34. In 1933–1939, the rate set for *le rachat*, five francs per day, was equivalent to the minimum salary for indentured laborers (150 francs per month).

35. SAI, Prestations Indigènes—Année 1934, December 11, 1934, 98W81, ANC. The total given in this report shows that prestation labor exceeded the 81,070 days estimated in the annual listing of expected contributions (*le rôle général des prestations*) on which the figures used in the table are based. The colony's final accounts (*Comptes définitifs*) for 1934 show that *le rachat* eventually amounted to 57,595 francs.

36. SAI, Circonscription de Kaala-Gomen, Prestations effectuées . . . , July 5, 1937, 97W8, ANC.

37. [Municipalité de Koné], Plan de Campagne—Prestations indigènes, November 30, 1939, E-DC9 2D1, ANC. This figure suggests that those deemed "fit to work" were providing 13.4 days of labor on average.

38. Average for 1926–1946 inclusive.

39. Circulaire (du 10 avril 1925) au sujet de la main d'oeuvre indigène pour la colonisation, *JONC* 3270 (April 11, 1925).

40. Arrêté no. 473, May 11, 1929 (conditions d'emploi de la main d'oeuvre indigène sur les chantiers des Travaux Publics), *JONC* 3494 (May 15, 1929).

41. Gayet, Rapport no. 33 (Vérification de M. le Commandant Harelle), June 29, 1929, AFF POL 746, CAOM.

42. For example, Poste de Muéo/Poya, Rapport mensuel au Cdt du Détachement, No. 5/2 bis, May 31, 1935, 98E47, Archives de la Gendarmerie, Vincennes.

43. Poste de Muéo/Poya, June 1936, 5–6, 98E48, Archives de la Gendarmerie.

44. Gayet, Rapport no. 33 (Vérification de M. le Commandant Harelle), June 29, 1929, AFF POL 746, CAOM.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid.

47. Réponse faite par le Gouverneur H. D'Arboussier en trois pages, June 13, 1929, 97W11, ANC. Arboussier was the acting governor in Guyon's absence.

48. Arrêté no. 1046, October 4, 1929 (conditions d'emploi de la main d'œuvre indigène de race océanienne); *JONC* 3517 (October 19, 1929). This involved several small improvements of benefit to Kanak, including minimum and maximum contracts of six months and two years, respectively (whereas the maximum had been five years).

49. SAI, Rapport du 27 janv. 1937, 97W43, ANC.

50. Average based on SAI figures provided for 1935–1936 and 1938–1945 inclusive.

51. Gayet, Rapport no. 34 (Vérification de M. Tivollier, Résident à Lifou), April 23, 1929, CONTR 828, CAOM.

52. It also limited contracts to two years' duration for men ages twenty (the minimum age) and thirty years and required that they be in good health. Beyond this age, however, there was no limit to the length of the contract. Réglementation de l'engagement des indigènes, Conseil privé, November 7, 1936, 44W, ANC; Arrêté no. 1192, November 7, 1936 (réglementant l'engagement des indigènes des Iles Loyauté); *JONC* 3807 (November 15, 1936).

53. See Kurtovitch, *La vie politique en Nouvelle-Calédonie*, 26 (and, for more detail, 17–59). See also Elizabeth Brown, Les Mélanésiens et "Le temps des Américains": L'impact de la présence alliée sur les Mélanésiens de la Nouvelle-Calédonie pendant la Seconde Guerre mondiale, BA (Hons) diss. (French), Massey Univ., Palmerston North, 1995.

54. Projet de décret sur le régime de l'indigénat, Conseil privé, December 29, 1922, 44W, ANC.

55. Emphasis added. Arrêté no. 1297, December 1, 1939; *JONC*, December 11, 1939.

56. Décision no. 57, January 17, 1940, cited in Recueil de la réglementation particulière appliquée à la population mélanésienne en Nouvelle-Calédonie (1853–1949), 37W, ANC; Arrêté no. 377, April 15, 1940 (infractions spéciales); *JONC* 3940 (April 22, 1940).

57. Kurtovitch, *La vie politique en Nouvelle-Calédonie*, 28–32.

58. Recueil de la réglementation, 37W, ANC. Arrêté no. 545, June 8, 1940, replaced no. 377 and removed the references to "travaux d'intérêt public." See also Arrêté no. 196, February 15, 1941 (travaux d'intérêt public à effectuer par les indigènes océaniens), and *JONC*, February 24, 1941. The measure concerning the requisition of women and children was adopted on February 22, 1941.

59. Arrêté no. 978, September 12, 1941 (au sujet des indigènes en situation irrégulière au chef lieu); *JONC*, September 22, 1941, 409.

60. Guigen (Adjutant), Rapport sur les agissements des indigènes des tribus de Goa-Goyetta et Tchamba en 1942 & 1943, Ponérihouen, August 13, 1945, 97W, ANC. For examples of complaints about wartime requisitions, see Kurtovitch, *La vie politique en Nouvelle-Calédonie*, 31–40.

61. Arrêté no. 162, February 11, 1943 (conditions d'emploi de la main d'oeuvre indigène de race océanienne); *JONC* 4077 (February 22, 1943).

62. Ibid.

63. A note in the Catholic mission archives cites SAI statistics dated September 9, 1942, according to which the 1,137 volunteers represented 22 percent of 5,125 "hommes valides." "Note sur les charges fiscales et réquisitions excessives imposées aux indigènes de la Ncie," Archives de l'Archévêché de Nouméa (hereinafter AAN), 131.5.

64. Compare Brown, Les Mélanésiens et "Le temps des Américains," 30.

65. Stephen Henningham, "The French Administration, the local population and the American presence in New Caledonia, 1943–44," *JSO* 98, no. 1 (1994): 27–29.

66. Laigret, Discours prononcé à l'ouverture de la session du Conseil d'Administration le 20 nov. 1943, *JONC* 4117 (November 29, 1943); cf. Etat faisant connaître la répartition de la main d'oeuvre indigène, November 12, 1943, 98W123, ANC. The figures provided in the latter differ slightly.

67. Luneau to Bresson, Région Canala–Kouaoua–Nakety: Population indigène—Emploi de la main d'oeuvre au 30 juillet [1942], AAN 131.5.

68. Rapport du Chef du SAI sur le fonctionnement du Service pendant l'année 1945, November 23, 1945, IJ16, ANC.

69. Kurtovitch, New Caledonia: The consequences of the Second World War, 36.

70. Some of these are documented in Kurtovitch, *La vie politique en Nouvelle-Calédonie* (e.g., 34–38, 49–50, and 54 n. 101). More generally, see the Catholic mission's exchanges with the administration in AAN 131.5.

71. Tupinier to Min de la France d'Outre-Mer, no. 21, August 23, 1946, CONTR 834, CAOM.

72. Nouméa Accord, 1998.

73. South Pacific Force New Caledonia Administrative History, NRS II-430, Microfilm, Naval Yards, Washington, D.C.

74. Alain Saussol, *L'Héritage: Essai sur le problème foncier mélanésien en Nouvelle-Calédonie* (Paris: Musée de l'Homme, 1979), 331–64.

75. Jean-Marie Lambert, *La Nouvelle Politique Indigène en Nouvelle-Calédonie. Le Capitaine Meunier et ses gendarmes 1918–1954* (Paris: Harmattan, 1999); Les kanak à l'heure de la "nouvelle politique indigène," *Mwà Véé: Revue culturelle kanak*, no. 57, August–September 2007, 4–6. In the former (66–67), Lambert accepts the colonial-era argument that requisitions provided "a necessary labour force." In the latter, Sylvette Boubin-Boyer (5) characterizes this era as finally providing Kanak with protection from the *indigénat*: "in relation to the *indigénat* regime the natives were finally protected." I would contend that far from protecting Kanak, the *indigénat* underpinned their mass mobilization.

76. Boyer, Rapport no. 22 (Le problème de la main d'oeuvre), August 6, 1946, CONTR 834, CAOM.

77. Leenhardt, La Réquisition en Nouvelle-Calédonie; Luneau to Bresson, Région Canala–Kouaoua–Nakety, 131.5; [Municipalité de Koné], Plan de Campagne—Prestations indigènes, November 30, 1939, E-DC9 2D1, ANC.

78. Gayet, Rapport no. 34 (Vérification de M. Tivollier, Résident à Lifou), April 23, 1929, CONTR 828 CAOM.

79. Pierre Métais, Démographie des Néo-Calédoniens, *JSO* 9 (1953): 99–128.

REVIEW

Jack Corbett. *Being Political: Leadership and Democracy in the Pacific Islands.* Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2015. Pp. xii, 243. ISBN 978-0-8248-4107-7. US$54.00 hardcover. Notes. Bibliography.

Reviewed by Lamont Lindstrom, University of Tulsa

POLITICIANS DESPITE THEIR OCCASIONAL FAULTS can make entertaining conversationalists. Jack Corbett, a research fellow at Griffith University's Centre for Governance and Public Policy, interviewed more than 110 active and retired Pacific politicians. Also, he read through forty some political biographies and autobiographies. Corbett's goal is to humanize his subjects who, if lucky, can be heroized and, if unlucky, demonized. The book hopes "to better understand how politicians in the Pacific Islands see and give meaning to the work they do" (p. ix).

The politicians came from fourteen countries of the postcolonial, English-speaking Pacific. Corbett excluded leaders from New Zealand and Hawai'i and also New Caledonia, French Polynesia, Wallis and Futuna, Northern Marianas, and Easter Island. His 151 sources (interviews and texts combined) provided abundant life narratives to identify generalities in Pacific political careers. Material on female politicians comprised 17 percent of these narratives, reflecting common gender disparities in Pacific politicking.

Notwithstanding an impressive assortment of politicians from Oceania's three subregions Polynesia, Melanesia, and Micronesia, Corbett is able to tease out common themes from diverse careers: how politicians get into the business; their experiences as candidates and representatives; service as legislators and, sometimes, ministers; political motivations and rewards;

and stepping down, defeat, or retirement. Most of Corbett's interviewees went into politics after the heady 1960s–1980s when island colonies gained their independence, and they experience invidious comparison with first-generation leaders whose service spanned the transformation from colony to state. The main political project has shifted from independence to development, and today's leaders find this goal much more difficult to achieve than did their predecessors' drive for independence given the relatively tranquil departure of colonial powers from much of the Pacific. If Corbett had interviewed politicians in New Caledonia and French Polynesia, he would have tapped into politicking where independence remains a goal—although given the longevity or these yet unsuccessful movements, today's leaders are no longer comparable with "first-generation" politicians elsewhere. Alongside "developmentalism," which typifies much recent political discourse, Corbett also notes in passing the impact of Christian themes and identity that also shape contemporary Pacific politicking.

Second, despite current complaint about corruption and bad governance, Corbett finds that Pacific politicians in general put themselves forward with at least some good intentions to serve their community and their nation. He agrees with other culturally informed observers that much of what is decried as corruption (gifts to voters, nepotism and services to kin, and so forth) are basic elements of Pacific societies themselves, many with compact populations that enjoy face-to-face, overlapping relationships, where boundaries between the "elite" and the people are thin, and where people remain motivated by kinship responsibility.

Third, political parties have become less significant in many Pacific states. Many onetime party organizations that previously united voters from across geographic regions and social groups, when colonies were gaining independence, have splintered or collapsed. Current leaders complain of increased electoral competition even as campaigning has become more expensive and as candidates need to demonstrate greater educational, business, or other useful experience than they once did to win elections.

Corbett briefly mentions several aspects of Pacific politics that could bear additional attention. Many island leaders are bedeviled, one way or the another, by the attention of nongovernmental organizations who come into the Pacific with their own agendas, and also they have to deal with meddlesome projects, pushed by larger, metropolitan neighbors who are concerned, notably, to give firm instruction on good governance. More personally, many Pacific politicians get fat thanks to the duties and rewards of their positions, as local critics like to point out. Obesity and, one thinks of several examples, an early demise have been fateful political consequences in more than one island nation.

Finally, Corbett remarks the growing importance of social media in the Pacific, particularly in campaigns and in maintaining communication with voters, especially urbanites. Future political scientists will have to scrutinize blogs, Facebook, and Twitter along with personal interviews and published biographies when studying political careers in the Pacific. In the meanwhile, the book ends with a useful appendix that catalogs the 59 politician autobiographies and biographies that Corbett consulted. Only committed political junkies would tackle this list, but thankfully, Corbett has done readers the favor of digesting these for us.

REVIEW

Giff Johnson. *Don't Ever Whisper: Darlene Keju, Pacific Health Pioneer, Champion for Nuclear Survivors.* CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2013. Pp: 444. ISBN-10 1489509062. US$14.00 paper.

Reviewed by Miriam Kahn, University of Washington

Don't Ever Whisper is a personally touching and politically powerful biography of the late Darlene Keju, who was a preeminent nuclear activist, advocate for social justice, and organizer of local health care programs in the Marshall Islands. Her husband, Giff Johnson, is the author of the book. The reader never loses sight of his admiration for the woman he loved and his pride for the work she accomplished. He includes copious quotes by those who knew Darlene as well as entries from Darlene's diaries, all of which add interesting perspectives and dimensions to the text.

The book follows a chronological path. The first half covers Darlene's early life, her education, and her nuclear activism. The second half turns to her contributions to health care. Throughout the text, engaging details enliven the many events that influenced her life and labor. Examples include growing up on her mother's homeland of Wotje Atoll, moving to Ebeye as a child, the unnecessary death of her older sister, leaving the Marshall Islands to study in Hawai'i, her return to the Marshall Islands to conduct research on the legacies of the nuclear testing, and experiencing health care on remote outer islands that had no power and where a ship arrived only every few months.

Darlene's life was intimately intertwined with nuclear testing in the Pacific. After World War II, the United States took possession of the Marshall Islands from the Japanese and then used the islands to test various nuclear

weapons from 1946 to 1958. During this period, the United States exploded the equivalent of one Hiroshima-sized bomb every day (63). Born in the Marshall Islands in 1951, Darlene grew up during this era. Shortly before her third birthday, the United States tested Bravo, its first and largest hydrogen bomb, exposing Darlene and others to Bravo's radioactivity. Because of the veil of secrecy surrounding the US involvement in the Marshall Islands, it was not until Darlene was twenty-seven years old and a student at the University of Hawai'i that she began to learn about the nuclear history of her homeland. It was at a campus talk by Giff Johnson that she first heard the details. She approached Giff after his talk—itself a brave act for a young Marshallese woman—in order to learn more. She was upset that an American knew more about her islands' history than she did and, at that moment, decided to conduct her own research. This meeting between Darlene and Giff was the beginning of their eighteen-year relationship, including fourteen years of marriage.

The next summer, in 1979, she flew home to interview older Marshallese about their experiences during the testing. She traveled to the northernmost islands (areas the US government claimed had been unaffected by the testing) and interviewed both men and women about their health conditions, thus making her the first Marshall Islander to record the statements of the nuclear test survivors. She listened to women's stories about miscarriages, stillbirths, and giving birth to babies that looked like jellyfish or clumps of grapes, all things that the US government had covered up. Their heartrending stories inspired her to make a personal commitment to help the victims of the testing.

A turning point in Darlene's life occurred in 1983 when she was invited to be one of four speakers as part of a "Pacific Plenary" at the World Council of Churches Assembly in Vancouver, Canada. With purpose and passion ("don't ever whisper" was her motto), she captivated the audience with her words. She told them that radioactive fallout from the nuclear testing on her islands was more widespread than admitted by the US government and was responsible for serious but unrecognized health problems. Her poignant twenty-minute speech lifted the veil of silence, which had shrouded the consequences of the nuclear testing program. With tumors growing in her body, she told the audience, "Remember, we are the victims of the nuclear age; don't you become a victim."

Soon thereafter, Darlene turned her attention to public health. She was accepted into the one-year Pacific Islands Program at the University of Hawai'i's School of Public Health, where she was the only Marshall Islander in the program. As part of her graduate work during the 1980s, she proposed a pilot epidemiology study of certain atolls in the Marshall Islands, only to

discover that many roadblocks were placed in her path because of her activism. For example, the scholarship board refused to fund her. Being brave and outspoken, she demonstrated her power of persistence and risk taking by going directly to the minister of education. She told him bluntly, "I'm not begging you to help me. . . . But I want to hear it directly from you that the scholarship board is not going to support a Marshallese who is studying to get a master's degree in public health" (114). Eventually, they gave her some money although not as much as she needed. On graduation, Darlene became the first Marshallese woman with an advanced degree in public health to work for the Marshallese government.

She created innovative health programs and delivered reproductive health services to underserved populations and to the youth of the Marshall Islands. She also planned formal training for youth peer educators. What previously had been known as the Jodrikdrik (Youth) Drama Team was renamed Youth to Youth in Health (YTYIH). Starting with a group of only fifteen teenagers, she established YTYIH as a branch of the Ministry of Health's Family Planning Office. As YTYIH grew in size, she transformed it from a branch of the government into a nonprofit agency.

Darlene understood that building a cultural foundation was key for the group's success. She taught the youth to use culturally appropriate forms to deliver health information. They combined humor, oratory, and cultural talent (song, music, skits, singing, dancing, and food) to educate the villagers about such things as contraception and family planning. For example, they performed entertaining skits about unwanted pregnancy, where more and more "babies" (in the form of a bundled-up shirt) arrived for a family. The activities were fun for the youth, but, equally as important, the activities also incorporated a high degree of discipline and adherence to rules of behavior. Darlene laid down several rules of which the most important was to not make fun of youth who were learning to speak in front of others. Marshallese culture values personalities that are reserved rather than outspoken, and Darlene wanted the youth to speak up and be heard. While modeling the behavior they were teaching, the youth also gained pride in being Marshallese. Recognizing the power that Marshallese had in their own hands, she empowered them to face their challenges, take control of their communities, and solve their own problems—and never to whisper.

With the youth's interest always in mind, Darlene planned events that allowed them to broaden their horizons. For example, she took the drama team to Hawai'i, where they had to perform in front of others—in English—providing another occasion for them to gain self-assurance and pride. While they were in Hawai'i, she arranged for them to attend theatrical productions, meet with the drama education director of the Honolulu Theater for Youth,

tour colleges, visit hospitals and church groups, and do radio interviews. As time went on, YTYIH grew in scope and included the Outer Islands Income Generating Project, youth leadership, health assistant training, women's business workshops, school and community outreach health programs, clinic services, and sports activities.

Sadly, as Darlene's work broadened and intensified, her health deteriorated. In 1991, she learned that her cancer had spread to her spine and pelvic area. Yet she continued with her work. Darlene died in 1996 soon after her forty-fifth birthday. The YTYIH program that Darlene headed for twelve years still flourishes today, now in its twenty-seventh year of operation.

Don't Ever Whisper is an eloquent, momentous, and highly accessible book from which readers can learn much about the Marshall Islands as well as about the inspirational woman whom Johnson, on the last page, compares to Nelson Mandela because of her courage to change the world.

BOOKS NOTED

RECENT PACIFIC ISLANDS PUBLICATIONS: SELECTED ACQUISITIONS, JANUARY 2014–DECEMBER 2014

THIS LIST of significant publications relating to the Pacific Islands was selected from new acquisitions lists recovered from Brigham Young University–Hawaii, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, University of Auckland, and Macmillan Brown Library at University of Canterbury. Other libraries are invited to send contributions to the Books Noted editor for future issues. Listings reflect the extent of information provided by each institution.

Adams, Ayin. *African Americans in Hawai'i: A Search for Identity.* K'a'a'awa, HI: Pacific Raven, 2010.

Allen, Matthew G. *Greed and Grievance: Ex-militants' Perspectives on the Conflict in Solomon Islands, 1998–2003.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Allnutt, Greg. *Keeping the Peace: A Kiwi's Modern Conflict Experience.* Christchurch: John Douglas, 2012.

Angus, Beverley M. *My Colonial Fiji.* Singapore: Trafford, 2013.

Armitage, David, and Alison Bashford, eds. *Pacific Histories: Ocean, Land, People.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Bailey, Rochelle. *Ni-Vanuatu in the Recognised Seasonal Employer Scheme: Impacts at Home and Away.* Canberra: ANU College of Asia and the Pacific, School of International, Political and Strategic Studies, Australian National Univ., 2013.

Barton, Gerry, and Stefan Dietrich. *This Ingenious and Singular Apparatus: Fishing Kites of the Indo-Pacific.* Heidelberg: Völkerkundemuseum, 2009.

Bay-Hansen, C. D. *Power Geopolitics in the Pacific Age: East Asia, the United Nations, the United States and Micronesia at the Edge of the 21st Century, 1991–2001.* Portland, OR: Inkwater, 2011.

Beaglehole, J. C, and T. H. Beaglehole. *"I Think I Am Becoming a New Zealander": Letters of J. C. Beaglehole.* Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press, 2013.

Bellwood, Peter S. *First Migrants: Ancient Migration in Global Perspective.* West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2013.

Benton, Richard, Alex Frame, and Paul Meredith. *Te Mātāpunenga: A Compendium of References to the Concepts and Institutions of Māori Customary Law.* Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press, 2013.

Besnier, Niko, and Kalissa Alexeyeff. *Gender on the Edge: Transgender, Gay, and Other Pacific Islanders.* Honolulu: Univ. Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Best, Simon. *Frontiers: A Colonial Dynasty.* Wellington: Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2013.

Bezane, Norm. *Paradise Voices: 32 Profiles of Remarkable People of Aloha.* Lāhainā, Maui: Voices of Maui Talk Story, 2013.

Boast, Richard. *The Native Land Court 1862–1887: A Historical Study, Cases, and Commentary.* Wellington: Brookers, 2013.

Borneman, Walter R. *The Admirals: Nimitz, Halsey, Leahy, and King—The Five-Star Admirals Who Won the War at Sea.* New York: Back Bay Books, Little, Brown, 2012.

Boston, Jonathan, and Simon Chapple. *Child Poverty in New Zealand.* Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2014.

Braunias, Steve. *Civilization: Twenty Places on the Edge of the World.* Chicago: Awa, 2012.

Bright, Debbie. *Ngā Puna Mātauranga: How Do We Know?* Hamilton, NZ: DA Bright, 2013.

Brown, Charles S. *The Coming of Pākehā Religion: The Spiritual Significance for Māori; New Zealand's Lost Legacy; A Revisionist Analysis of Māori Spirituality and Pākehā Religion.* 3rd ed. Titirangi, NZ: Crystal, 2011.

Brown, Penny. *Maori Designs: 100 New and Original Hand-Drawn Copyright-Free Designs*. Tunbridge Wells, UK: Search Press, 2012.

Buckton, Roger. *Bohemian Journey: A Musical Heritage in Colonial New Zealand*. Wellington: Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2013.

Burlingame, Burl. *I'll Fly to Hawaii: A Century of Aviation*. Kailua, HI: Pacific Monograph, 2013.

Butt, Tony. *Surf Science: An Introduction to Waves for Surfing*. 3rd Ed. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Calcott, Maria. *Voyage of HMS Blonde to the Sandwich Islands, in the Years 1824–1825: Captain the Right Hon. Lord Byron, Commander*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013.

Calder, Alex. *The Settler's Plot: How Stories Take Place in New Zealand*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2011.

Carson, Mike T. *First Settlement of Remote Oceania: Earliest Sites in the Mariana Islands*. New York: Springer, 2014.

Chand, Pratap. *A Fijian Memoir: Footprints of a Girmitya's Grandson*. Lautoka, Fiji: Vicas, 2013.

Chappell, David A. *The Kanak Awakening: The Rise of Nationalism in New Caledonia*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Childs, Elizabeth C. *Vanishing Paradise: Art and Exoticism in Colonial Tahiti*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2013.

Chun, Malcolm N. *Nā Inoa: Selected Historical Hawaiian Personal & Proper Names*. Honolulu: First People's Productions, 2013.

———. *No Nā Mamo: Traditional and Contemporary Hawaiian Beliefs and Practices*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2011.

Cleave, Peter. *Te Rāngai Mana Māori: The Māori State*. Palmerston North, NZ: Campus Press, 2012.

Cochrane, Ethan E. *The Evolutionary Archaeology of Ceramic Diversity in Ancient Fiji*. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2009.

Connell, John. *Islands at Risk?: Environments, Economies and Contemporary Change*. Cheltenham, UK; Edward Elgar, 2013.

Dando-Collins, Stephen. *Taking Hawai'i: How Thirteen Honolulu Business-men Overthrew the Hawaiian Monarchy in 1893, with a Bluff*. New York: E-Reads, 2012.

D'Arcy, Jayne, and Jocelyn Harewood. *Vanuatu & New Caledonia*. 7th ed. London: Lonely Planet, 2012.

Day, David. *Conquest: How Societies Overwhelm Others*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Demos, John. *The Heathen School: A Story of Hope and Betrayal in the Age of the Early Republic*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2014.

Demuth, Patricia, and John Mantha. *What Was Pearl Harbor?* New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 2013.

Doughty, Andrew, and Leona Boyd. *Hawai'i, the Big Island Revealed: The Ultimate Guidebook*. 5th ed. Lihu'e, HI: Wizard, 2014.

Doyle, Randall J. *The Geopolitical Power Shift in the Indo-Pacific Region: America, Australia, China, and Triangular Diplomacy in the Twenty-First Century*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014.

Drahos, Peter, and Susy Frankel. *Indigenous Peoples' Innovation: Intellectual Property Pathways to Development*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2012.

Dupont, Stephen. *Piksa Niugini*. Cambridge, MA: Peabody Museum Press; and Santa Fe, NM: Radius Books, 2013.

Dussy, Dorothée, and Eric Wittersheim. *Villes Invisibles. Anthropologie Urbaine Du Pacifique*. Paris: L'Harmattan Editions Distribution, 2014.

Dutton, T. E., and Dicks Thomas. *A New Course in Tok Pisin (New Guinea Pigdin)*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 2012.

Dwight, E. W., and Henry Obookiah. *Memoirs of Henry Obookiah: A Native of Owhyhee and a Member of the Foreign Mission School, Who Died at Cornwall, Connecticut, February 17, 1818, Aged 26 Years*. Honolulu: Woman's Board of Missions for the Pacific Islands, 2012.

Engledow, Jill. *Haleakala: A History of the Maui Mountain*. Wailuku, HI: Maui Island Press, 2012.

Evans, Jeff. *Waka Taua: The Maori War Canoe*. 3rd ed. Oratia, Auckland: Libro International, 2013.

Eyre, David L., and Brook K. Parker. *Kamehameha: The Rise of a King*. Honolulu: Kamehameha Publishing, 2013.

Faugère, Elsa. *Les économies de l'échange en Nouvelle-Calédonie. Mariage et deuils à Maré*. Paris: Karthala, 2013.

Fernandez, Susan Lehua. *Drink the Bitter Waters: On the Social Conditions of the Native Hawaiians*. Honolulu: ʻOhiʻa Publishing, 2010.

Firth, Raymond. *Rank and Religion in Tikopia: A Study in Polynesian Paganism and Conversion to Christianity*. London: Routledge, 2011. (Reprint of 1970 ed.)

Firth, Stewart. *Political Status and Development: The Implications for Australian Foreign Policy Towards the Pacific Islands*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2013.

Fisher, Denise. *France in the South Pacific: Power and Politics*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2013.

Fox, Bettye O. *Privilege of Man Is to Dream: Mark Twain's Visit to Hawaii*. West Conshohocken, PA: Infinity, 2013.

Franks, Jo. *Hawaiian Greats*. Brisbane: Emereo, 2012.

Fulton, Richard D., and Peter H. Hoffenberg, eds. *Oceania and the Victorian Imagination: Where All Things Are Possible*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2013.

Gascoigne, John. *Encountering the Pacific in the Age of Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2014.

Gauguin, Paul, and Suzanne Greub. *Gauguin, Polynesia*. Munich: Hirmer, 2011.

Geismar, Haidy. *Treasured Possessions: Indigenous Interventions into Cultural and Intellectual Property*. Durham, NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2013.

Gentry, Steven. *Raoul & the Kermadecs: New Zealand's Northernmost Islands*. Wellington: Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2013.

Gerrard, Michael, and Gregory E. Wannier. *Threatened Island Nations: Legal Implications of Rising Seas and a Changing Climate*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013.

Ghosh, Devleena, Heather Goodall, and Stephanie H. Donald. *Water, Sovereignty, and Borders in Asia and Oceania*. Milton Park, UK: Routledge, 2009.

Golub, Alex. *Leviathans at the Gold Mine: Creating Indigenous and Corporate Actors in Papua New Guinea*. Durham NC: Duke Univ. Press, 2014.

Graham-Stewart, Michael. *Negative Kept: Maori and the Carte De Visite*. Auckland: John Leech Gallery, 2013.

Harrington, David. *Timeline Hawai'i: An Illustrated Chronological History of the Islands*. Honolulu: Mutual, 2013.

Heni, Jacob. *Mai I Te Kakano*. Otaki, NZ: Te Takupu, 2012.

Higgins, Nancy, and Claire Freeman. *Childhoods: Growing up in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin, NZ: Univ. of Otago Press, 2013.

Higuchi, Wakako. *The Japanese Administration of Guam, 1941–1944: A Study of Occupation and Integration Policies, with Japanese Oral Histories*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, 2013.

Hoffman, Carl. *Savage Harvest: A Tale of Cannibals, Colonialism, and Michael Rockefeller's Tragic Quest for Primitive Art*. New York: William Morrow, 2014.

Hommon, Robert J. *The Ancient Hawaiian State: Origins of a Political Society*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Hooper, Antony, and Iuta Tinielu. *Echoes at Fishermen's Rock: Traditional Tokelau Fishing*. Paris: UNESCO, 2012.

Hotta, Eri. *Japan 1941: Countdown to Infamy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2013.

Hoult, Chris. *New Zealand Tattoo: In the Home of the Tattooist's Art*. Auckland: Libro International, 2012.

Howarth, Crispin, and Kirk Huffman. *Kastom: Art of Vanuatu*. Canberra: National Gallery of Australia, 2013.

Howitt, William. *The History of Discovery in Australia, Tasmania and New Zealand: From the Earliest Date to the Present Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011.

Huia Short Stories 10: Contemporary Maori Fiction. Wellington: Huia, 2013.

Japanese Eyes, American Heart: Voices from the Home Front in World War II Hawai'i; Personal Stories. Honolulu: Watermark, 2012.

Japanese Eyes, American Heart: Volume III. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Johnson, R. W. *Fire Mountains of the Islands: A History of Volcanic Eruptions and Disaster Management in Papua New Guinea and the Solomon Islands*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2013.

Ka'ai-Mahuta, Rachel, Tania Ka'ai, and John C. Moorfield, eds. *Kia Ronaki: Maori Performing Arts*. Auckland: Pearson Education NZ, 2013.

Kalk, Bethany, and Brian Nigus. *Sawiyano: Daily Life Admist Cultural Change*. Omaha: B. Kalk, 2013.

Katene, Selwyn. *The Spirit of Māori Leadership*. Wellington: Huia, 2013.

Katene, Selwyn, and Malcolm Mulholland. *Future Challenges for Māori: He Kōrero Anamata*. Wellington: Huia, 2013.

Kaufmann, Christian, Oliver Wick, Nigel Stephenson, and Nora Scott. *Nukuoro: Sculptures from Micronesia*. Riehen, Switzerland: Foundation Beyeler, 2013.

Kawai, Kei, and Sueo Kuwahara. *Research on the Influence of Globalization and Global Warming on Life in Chuuk Atoll, Federated States Micronesia*. Kagoshima, Japan: Kagoshima Univ. Research Center for the Pacific Islands, 2013.

Kawharu, Merata. *Maranga Mai! Te Reo and Marae in Crisis?* Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press, 2013.

Ketan, Joseph. *Political Governance and Service Delivery in Western Highlands Province, Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: State, Society, and Governance in Melanesia, School of International, Political and Strategic Studies, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National Univ., 2013.

Kimber, Gerri, and Delia S. Correa. *Katherine Mansfield and the (Post)colonial*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press, 2013.

King, Samuel P., Jerry Burris, and Ken Kobayashi. *Judge Sam King: A Memoir*. Honolulu: Watermark, 2013.

King, Serge. *Happy Me, Happy You: The Huna Way to Healthy Relationships*. Wheaton, IL: Quest Books / Theosophical Publishing House, 2014.

Kinzey, Bert, and Rock Roszak. *Attack on Pearl Harbor: Japan Awakens a Sleeping Giant*. Blacksburg, VA: Military Aviation Archives, 2010.

Kirch, Patrick V. *Kua'āina Kahiko: Life and Land in Ancient Kahikinui, Maui*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Kwa'ioloa, Michael, and Ben Burt. *The Chiefs' Country: Leadership and Politics in Honiara, Solomon Islands*. St. Lucia: Univ. of Queensland Press, 2012.

Lacabanne, Sonia. *Histoire Littéraire D'océaniens Anglophones*. Nouméa: Centre de documentation pédagogique de la Nouvelle-Calédonie, 2012.

Laderman, Scott. *Empire in Waves: A Political History of Surfing*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2014.

Lal, Brij V. *Chalo Jahaji: On a Journey through Indenture in Fiji*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2012.

Lampe, Evan. *Work, Class, and Power in the Borderlands of the Early American Pacific: The Labors of Empire*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2014.

Laracy, Hugh. *Watriama and Co.: Further Pacific Islands Portraits*. Canberra: Australian National Univ. Press, 2013.

Larrue, Sébastien. *Biodiversity and Societies in the Pacific Islands*. Aix-en-Provence: Presses universitaires de Provence, 2013.

Lee, Seonju L. *When the Korean World in Hawaii Was Young: 1903–1940*. Seoul: Ewha Inst. for the Humanities, 2013.

Lewis, M. P. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*. Dallas: SIL International, 2009.

Liava'a, Christine. *Le Fitafita Mai Samoa = The Force from Samoa: Soldiers from the Samoan Islands in the Great War*. 2nd ed. Auckland: Polygraphia, 2013.

Lili'uokalani, Queen. *Hawai'i's Story*, ed. David W. Forbes. Honolulu: Hui Hānai, 2013.

MacDougall, Debra. *Spiritual Capacity? Overseas Religious Missions in Ramsi-Era Solomon Islands*. Canberra: College of Asia and the Pacific, School of International, Political and Strategic Studies, Australian National Univ., 2013.

Makos, Adam, and Marcus Brotherton. *Voices of the Pacific: Untold Stories from the Marine Heroes of World War II*. New York: Berkley Caliber, 2014.

Mangos, Therese, John Utanga, and Kirsty Griffin. *Patterns of the Past: Tattoo Revival in the Cook Islands*. Auckland: Punarua Productions, 2011.

Marks, Kathy. *Trouble in Paradise: Uncovering the Dark Secrets of Britain's Most Remote Island*. London: Harper Perennial, 2008.

Marshall, Mac. *Drinking Smoke: The Tobacco Syndemic in Oceania*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Mayer, Carol E., Anna Naupa, and Vanessa Warri. *No Longer Captives of the Past: The Story of a Reconciliation on Erromango = Ne Plus Être Esclaves Du Passé: L'histoire D'une Réconciliation Sur Erromango*. Vancouver: Univ. of British Columbia Museum of Anthropology and Erromango Cultural Association, 2013.

McAdam, Jane. *Climate Change, Forced Migration, and International Law*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

McFarland, Agnes J. *Kawea Te Wairua O Te Kupu*. Te Whanganui a Tara, NZ: NZCER Press, 2012.

McLauchlan, Gordon. *A Short History of New Zealand*. Auckland: David Bateman, 2014.

Mesenhöller, Peter, and Oliver Lueb. *Made in Oceania: Tapa—Kunst Und Lebenswelten = Tapa—Art and Social Landscapes*. Köln: Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum and Mainz am Rhein: Nünnerich-Asmus, 2013.

Meyer, David. *Early Tahitian Poetics*. Boston: De Gruyter Mounton, 2013.

Mikaere, Annabel. *Colonising Myths—Māori Realities: He Rukuruku Whakaaro*. Wellington: Huia / Te Wānanga o Raukawa, 2011.

Mikaere, Buddy. *Mori in Aotearoa New Zealand: Understanding the Culture, Protocols and Customs*. Auckland: New Holland, 2013.

Milham, Allison Leialoha. *Uncovering Hawai'i's Past: Beyond Textbooks and Travel Guides*. Tallahassee, FL: Great Basin, 2012.

Moon, Paul. *Encounters: The Creation of New Zealand; A History*. Auckland: Penguin Group, 2013.

———. *The Voyagers: Remarkable European Explorations of New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2014.

Morrison, James, Nicholas Thomas, and Vanessa Smith. *Mutiny and Aftermath: James Morrison's Account of the Mutiny on the Bounty and the Island of Tahiti*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Moutu, Andrew. *Names Are Thicker than Blood: Kinship and Ownership amongst the Iatmul*. 1st ed. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Moyle, Richard M. *Takuu Grammar and Dictionary: A Polynesian Language of the South Pacific*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National Univ., 2011.

Muench, M. N. *The Vengeance of Kahekili: The Battle for O'ahu and Decline of the Maui Brotherhood of Kings*. 2012.

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

Murphy, Ngāhuia. *Te Awa Atua = Menstruation in the Pre-Colonial Māori World: An Examination of Stories, Ceremonies and Practices Regarding Menstruation in the Pre-Colonial Māori World; Based on a Master's Thesis*. Ngaruawahia: He Puna Manawa, 2013.

Murray, Keith W. J. *New Zealand Cruising Guide: Central Area*. Wellington: Steven William, 2013.

Newman, Keith. *Beyond Betrayal: Trouble in the Promised Land; Restoring the Mission to Māori*. Auckland: Penguin, 2013.

Newton, John S. *A Savage History: The Story of Whaling in the Pacific and Southern Oceans*. Sydney: New South, 2013.

Newton, Marjorie. *Tiki and Temple: The Mormon Mission in New Zealand, 1854–1958*. Salt Lake City, UT: Greg Kofford Books, 2012.

Noury, Arnaud, and Jean-Christophe Galipaud. *Les Lapita, Nomades Du Pacifique*. Marseille: IRD éd. Institut de recherche pour le développement, 2011.

Oachs, Emily R. *Hawai'i: The Aloha State*. Minneapolis: Bellwether Media, 2014.

Odo, Franklin. *Voices from the Cane Fields: Folk Songs from Japanese Immigrant Workers in Hawai'i*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

Onnudottir, Helena, Adam Possamai, and Bryan S. Turner. *Religious Change and Indigenous Peoples: Global Discourses and Aboriginal Religions*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2013.

Ono, Rintarō, David J. Addison, and Alex Morrison. *Prehistoric Marine Resource Use in the Indo-Pacific Regions*. Canberra. Australian National Univ. Press, 2013.

Orange, Claudia. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2011.

Osorio, Jon K. *I Ulu I Ka 'Āina = Land*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Pawson, Eric, and Tom Brooking. *Making a New Land: Environmental Histories of New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago Univ. Press, 2013.

Pedersen, Marianne. *Conversation Complexities: Conservationists' and Local Landowners' Different Perceptions of Development and Conservation in Sandaun Providence, Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: Australian National Univ., 2013.

Pichevin, Bernard. *Généalogies Et Histoire De Tahiti Et Des Îles De La Société: De Prestigieuses Lignées D'arii*. Pirae: Au vent des îles, 2013.

Piguet, Etienne, Antoine Pécoud, and P. F. A. Guchteneire. *Migration and Climate Change*. Paris: UNESCO, 2011.

Poata, Tama, and Prue Poata. *Poata: Seeing beyond the Horizon; A Memoir*. Aotearoa, NZ: Steele Roberts, 2012.

Potter, George, Frank Linehan, and Conrad Dickson. *The Voyages of the Book of Mormon*. Springville, UT: Cedar Fort, 2011.

Pretor-Pinney, Gavin, and Tom Hodgkinson. *The Ukulele Handbook*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Puette, William J., and Richard K. NeSimith. *Nā Lula Hālāwai: A Parliamentary Guide to Conducting Meetings in Hawaiian*. Honolulu: Hawai'i State Association of Parliamentarians, 2014.

Rapaport, Moshe. *The Pacific Islands: Environment and Society*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2013.

Reed, A. W., Roger Hart, and Ross Calman. *Favourite Māori Legends*. 2nd ed. Auckland: Libro International, 2013.

Rems, Alan. *South Pacific Cauldron: World War II's Great Forgotten Battlegrounds*. Annapolis: Naval Inst. Press, 2014.

Richards, Rhys. *The Austral Islands: History, Art and Art History*. Porirua, NZ: Paremata Press, 2012.

Riley, David. *We Are the Rock!* Auckland: Little Island, 2012.

Riley, Murdoch. *Wise Words of the Māori: Revealing History and Traditions; Selected from 19th Century Māori Newspapers and Other Sources of Yesterday and Today*. Paraparaumu, NZ: Viking Sevenseas, 2013.

Ripoll, Céline. *Contes Des Sages De Polynésie*. Paris: Seuil, 2013.

Ritchie, Jenny, and M. Skerrett. *Early Childhood Education in Aotearoa, New Zealand: History, Pedagogy, and Liberation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Rodriguez, Vincent. *Nouvelle-calédonie: Des Tabous, Du Nickel Et Des Hommes*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2013.

Rogers, Anna. *The Shaky Isles: New Zealand Earthquakes*. Wellington: Grantham House, 2013.

Rosa, John P. *Local Story: The Massie-Kahahawai Case and the Culture of History*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Russell, Lynette. *Roving Mariners: Australian Aboriginal Whalers and Sealers in the Southern Oceans, 1790–1870*. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press, 2012.

Schultz, E. *Alaga'upu Fa'a Samoa = Samoan Proverbial Expressions*. Auckland: Pasifika, 2008.

Schultz, Julianne, and Lloyd Jones. *Pacific Highways*. South Brisbane: Griffith Univ. and Text Publishing, 2014.

Seeger, Leina'ala R. *Hawai'i State Documents: A Selective Bibliography of Legal Publications and Related Materials*. Chicago: Government Documents Special Interest Section, American Association of Law Libraries, 2010.

Shaffer, J. R. *Samoa: A Historical Novel*. Dryden, NY: Ithaca Press, 2011.

Siméoni, Patricia, and Vincent Lebot. *Buveurs De Kava*. Port-Vila, Vanuatu: Vanouatou Géo-consulte, 2014.

Smyth, Naomi, and Miriana Ikin. *Taking Care of Business: Business Terms in Aotearoa; He Papakupu Pākihi; English-Māori Business and Financial Dictionary*. Te Kuiti, NZ: Aotahi, 2012.

Souhami, Diana. *Coconut Chaos*. London: Quercus, 2013.

Spahan, Rose M. *Smash: International Indigenous Weaving*. Victoria, BC: Art Gallery of Greater Victoria, 2010.

Tagoilelai-Leota, Sala F., and Tafili Utumapu-McBride, eds. *O Pelega O Fanau / Treasuring Children Saaia*. Auckland: Printsprint, 2013.

Talagi, Maru. *Politics, Propositions and Perspectives: Niue and Nationhood*. Niue: Solomua, 2013.

Tamanui, Virginia. *Our Unutterable Breath: A Maori Indigene's Autoethnography of Whanaungatanga*. Auckland: Tuhi Tuhi Communications, 2013.

Tāwhai, Wiremu. *Living by the Moon: Te Maramataka O Te Whānau-Ā-Apanui*. Wellington: Huia, 2013.

Teaiwa, Katerina M. *Guide De Mise En Oeuvre, De Suivi Et D'évaluation Des Politiques Culturelles En Océanie*. Suva: Secrétariat général de la Communauté du Pacifique, 2012.

Thigpen, Jennifer. *Island Queens and Mission Wives: How Gender and Empire Remade Hawai'i's Pacific World*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Thomson, G. M. *The Naturalisation of Animals and Plants in New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2011. (Reprint of 1922 ed.)

Threlfall, Neville. *Mangroves, Coconuts and Frangipani: The Story of Rabaul*. Rabaul Town, PNG: Rabaul Historical Society, 2013.

Tipene, Tim. *Patu: A Novel*. Auckland: Libro International, 2012.

Tomlins-Jahnke, Huia, and Malcolm Mulholland. *Mana Tangata: Politics of Empowerment*. Wellington: Huia, 2011.

Turner, Peter, and Colin Monteath. *New Zealand*. 2nd ed. Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2013.

Valentine, Karen M. *Hilo*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia, 2014.

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

Vecchia, Stefano. *Art of the Pacific: Kunst Des Pazifikraums = Kunst Van Oceanië = Arte Del Pacífico*. Florence: Scala, 2011.

Vevehupa, Lucian, and André Itéanu. *The Man Who Would Not Die: The Autobiography of an Orokaiva Man*. Port Moresby: Univ. of Papau New Guinea Press and Bookshop, 2013.

Vitti, Jim. *Baseball in Hawai'i*. Charleston, SC: History Press, 2014.

Vltchek, Andre, Noam Chomsky, and Steven Ratuva. *Oceania: Neocolonialism, Nukes & Bones*. Auckland: Atuanui, 2013.

Vuataki, K. *Softly Fiji*. Bloomington, IN: West Bow, 2013.

Warne, K. P., and Peter Quinn. *Tūhoe: Portrait of a Nation*. Auckland: Penguin Books, 2013.

Warren, Andrew, and Chris Gibson. *Surfing Places, Surfboard Makers: Craft, Creativity, and Cultural Heritage in Hawai'i, California, and Australia*. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press, 2014.

Wassmann, Jürg, Birgit Träuble, and Joachim Funke. *Theory of Mind in the Pacific: Reasoning across Cultures*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2013.

Winduo, Steven E. *Land Echoes*. Papua New Guinea: Univ. of Papau New Guinea Press / Manui Publishers, 2014.

Wolfe, Richard. *New Zealand's Lost Heritage: The Story behind Our Forgotten Landmarks*. Auckland: New Holland Publishers, 2013.

World Health Organization. *HIV and Sexually Transmitted Infections in the Western Pacific Region: 2000–2010*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2012.

Yoshioka, Masanori, and David Tevimule. *The Story of Raga: David Tevimule's Ethnography on His Own Society, North Raga of Vanuatu*. Tokyo: Japanese Society for Oceanic Studies, 2013.

Young, David, and Aliscia Young. *Rivers: New Zealand's Shared Legacy*. Auckland: Random House NZ, 2013.

Young, Russell. *The Story of Te Kuiti*. Wellington: Winter Productions, 2013.

Zipp, Lena. *Educated Fiji English: Lexico-Grammar and Variety Status*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2014.

CONTRIBUTORS

Tui Nicola Clery, Independent Researcher. Email: tuinic222@yahoo.co.uk

Acacia Dawn Cochise, University of Auckland. Email: acaciacochise@gmail.com

Robin Metcalfe, Independent Researcher. Email: rmetcalfe@gmail.com

Sanjay Ramesh, University of Sydney. Email: sanjay.ramesh@sydney.edu.au

Adrian Muckle, Victoria University of Wellington. Email: Adrian.Muckle@vuw.ac.nz

Lamont Lindstrom, University of Tulsa. Email: lamont-lindstrom@utulsa.edu

Miriam Kahn, University of Washington. Email: mkahn@u.washington.edu

Zoi Falevai, Brigham Young University Hawai'i. Email: zoia.falevai@byuh.edu

The Jonathan Napela Center for Hawaiian and Pacific Islands Studies

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY HAWAI'I