BOOK REVIEWS

From this we can see the anthropologist looking at the people who are looking at the anthropologist. Borofsky was acutely aware that what he was doing was not of the people's culture but about both theirs and his own and the culture of anthropology as well. He has told how Pukapukans construct their reality and at the same time shown how he constructed his reality concerning their reality. His last chapter is a reflection of anthropological ways of knowing—fresh, open, accessible.

Borofsky's discussion of how the Pukapukans value the Beaglehole ethnography as an account of themselves will in time be echoed in his own work for he has presented Pukapukans to themselves without condescension or concession. His informants would surely agree with his statement, "part of the reason for the differing accounts ... stems from my being too curious. I asked too many questions." To his credit, no one could possibly think that this ethnography is any the worse for it.

JAMES RITCHIE
University of Waikato


This massive document is the first systematic review of the Solomon Islands constitution since it was enacted by the British parliament in 1978. Criticism of the politicians who formed a majority of the review committee made them publish the evidence and background papers that led, they say, to their recommendations. The three volumes are a fascinating source of material on Solomon Islands political culture, and raise wider questions about participation, popular authoritarianism, federalism, the rights of indigenous people, and the role of constitutions. Many of the documents and recommendations bear the strong imprint of the ideas of one of the country's most original politicians, Solomon Mamaloni, who chaired the committee.

The first volume, Evidence, records the 131 oral and written submissions made to the committee, mainly by individuals, but also by groups of "chiefs," professional associations, and government departments. Only one submission was made by a political party (the People's Alliance Party)—perhaps an indicator of the irrelevance of parties in the Solomons political system. The volume also includes 14 "tour reports" of the visits made by committee members to public meetings in most parts of the country. Some of the reports provide an engaging diary of the trip: rows over cabin allocations, "very filling" breakfasts, meetings skipped because local people were in mourning, and a submission so long that it covered seven blackboards.

The results are summarized, if somewhat slanted, as the "people's views" in Volume 2, Background Papers. It also includes an interim report, seeking an extension of time and money; a summary of the provisions of the existing constitution, and the questionnaire used during public meetings; a summary of the written and oral submissions; a paper on
bicameralism; and a paper on "Fundamental Defects of the Present Constitution." The last recapitulates many of the "New Right" ideas that were part of Solomon Mamaloni’s platform as Prime Minister from 1981 to 1984: hostility to government regulation and joint ventures with foreign capital, criticism of the "discriminatory" lending policies of banks, and support for a federal system of government.

The "people's views," as summarized, were roughly as follows. The 1978 constitution, enacted by a foreign parliament and embodying foreign ideas, is no longer appropriate. Its democratic ideals must be "considered in the context of the long term interests of indigenous Solomon Islanders," and the new constitution must include reference to the "wisdom and authority of chiefs," cultural diversity, indigenous ownership of land and natural resources, and the rights of communities and clans as well as individuals. Community rights should be expressed in various ways: a restoration of capital punishment; limits on the introduction of new religions; limits on the number of political parties (no more than three); limits on freedom of movement between provinces (perhaps by internal passports); and economic discrimination in favor of indigenous people, as against naturalized citizens and resident foreigners. Citizenship laws should be tougher (the tour reports contain frequent references to Fiji as a negative example, to foreign businessmen, and to the several thousand Gilbertese settlers in the Solomon Islands). The country should become a "Republican Confederation of States," with an indigenous elected president.

Chiefs should be represented in an upper house. Alienated land should be returned to its traditional owners, whose rights should extend to minerals found under their land. The views about provincial government are, appropriately, different for each province, most preferring a form of federalism, but some of the small islands preferring rule by lower level "Area Councils" dealing directly with the central government in the capital, Honiara.

When it comes to Recommendations, however, the committee is of two minds. Volume 3 contains two inconsistent recommendations, with detailed "drafting guidelines" for each, but does not say which the committee favors. Recommendation One, for a "Federal Republic," roughly follows the summary of the tour reports and Mamaloni’s economic critique of the constitution set out in Volume 2. But it fudges the politically important question of the number of states (particularly whether Choiseul Island should have its own) and whether they should incorporate the smaller outlying islands. Recommendation Two, for a "Unitary Republic," is more incremental. The queen is replaced by an indigenous, largely ceremonial president. There is a new senate, constituted rather like Fiji’s before the coups. Otherwise, the changes are minor, though the constitution would be adopted by parliament sitting as a constituent assembly and would thus achieve formal autochthony.

Many of the issues canvassed by the committee, such as the position of the head of state, the powers of provincial governments, and the place of tradi-
tional leaders, were also discussed by its predecessors in the 1970s (who also extensively toured the country). But there have been changes to the agenda. Almost nobody now seems to favor a continued link with the British monarchy (even the governor general’s own submission is noncommittal). A woman is now on the committee, and a submission from the National Council of Women recommends constitutional amendments against wife-beating and rape (while a tour report records the countersuggestion of constitutional amendments to keep women in their traditional place). And the process of review is now carried out without foreign advisers and consultants. At least two themes are of wider relevance to the South Pacific. First, the continuing pressure to incorporate traditional leaders (“chiefs”) into the formal structures of government and to qualify liberal constitutional provisions for individual rights. Second, the fate of constitutional reviews: a similar committee reported in Papua New Guinea in 1983, for example, but only some of its report has been debated by parliament. Meanwhile, piecemeal constitutional amendments continue to be proposed by members of parliament, not necessarily following the review’s recommendations.

PETER LARMOUR
University of Tasmania

As I started *Return to the High Valley*, I harbored some doubts about the book. Although the book was very good reading, I wasn’t quite sure that it was “good” anthropology. I soon realized that Read, with his eloquent and accessible writing style, offers an excellent and engaging description of the changing world of the Gahuku Gama of the Papua New Guinea Highlands. He has given us what is perhaps the best anthropology available these days.

Read describes *Return* as a postscript to his earlier book, *The High Valley* (1965), but *Return* stands on its own. I do not doubt, though, that the new book will stimulate many to either read or reread the older work, and thus enrich their understanding of the Gahuku. In *Return*, Read embarks on a voyage of self-discovery, returning to a world unseen for three decades. In trying to understand the present, he constantly bumps into the past. Indeed, just as he expanded his knowledge and understanding of the Gahuku through comparing the present with the past while he was there, so too does he teach us by weaving the past and present together, presenting a changing tapestry of Gahuku culture.

Read charts the course of change from the immediate postwar period to the beginning of the eighties. He contends that the people of Susuroka village, where he lived among the Gahuku, far from mourning their lost past and passively receiving imposed Western institutions and cultural patterns, are rather pragmatic, taking the main chance offered by contact with the outside world.

The Gahuku showed no regrets.